

## Faculty Union Issues Bibliography

Arnold, G. B. (2000). *The politics of faculty unionization: The experiences of three New England Universities*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Harvey.

This book describes the process of unionization among university faculties using case studies of unionization campaigns at three universities. In higher education, faculty unions may have improved the situation of many faculties, but they may have accomplished this at the cost of increasing public skepticism and even antagonism. The chapters are: (1) "Introduction"; (2) "Faculty and Labor"; (3) "Three Decades of Faculty Unionism"; (4) "Faculty Unionization at the University of Rhode Island"; (5) "Failure and Success at the University of Massachusetts"; (6) "Faculty Unionization at the University of Connecticut"; and (7) "Epilogue."

Ashraf, J. & Williams, M. F. (2008). *The effect of faculty unions on salaries: Some recent evidence*. *Journal of Collective Negotiations* 32, 2, 141-150.

No study has recently examined how unions affect professors' salaries. In the only studies using micro-level data, both Ashraf (1992) and Barbezat (1989) used data from 1977. I update earlier work by using data from 1988. In conjunction with data from 1969 and 1977, the effect of faculty unions over a twenty-year period is examined. While faculty at unionized colleges earned significantly less than their counterparts at nonunion institutions in 1969, they earned marginally more in 1977 and 1988.

Berry, J. & Savaris, M. (2012). *Directory of U.S. Faculty Contracts and Bargaining Agents in Institutions of Higher Education*. New York: The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions.

This Directory details unionization activities among college and university faculty in 1995 in the United States and Canada. It indicates that the number of professors represented by academic unions has increased 1.65 percent from the previous year, with 434 bargaining agents on 1,022 public sector campuses and 70 bargaining agents on 98 private colleges and universities. It also discusses the six collective bargaining elections held in the year, including four first contracts and participation by the American Association of University Professors, the American Federation of Teachers, and the National Education Association.

Bucklew, Neil, et al. *Faculty Union and Faculty Senate Co-Existence: A Review of the Impact of Academic Collective Bargaining on Traditional Academic Governance*. *Labor Studies Journal*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2013, pp. 373–90.

This paper examines the intersection between faculty unions and faculty senates along with the costs and benefits that each pays and receives relative to one another. More specifically, the authors examine the impact of academic collective bargaining on shared governance traditions, providing an analysis of whether the relationship of unions and governance systems has been symbiotic or non-symbiotic. The authors also explore the overall beneficial and negative outcomes of academic collective bargaining in higher education before developing and presenting a framework of four models of academic collective bargaining that offers historical descriptive value as well as prescriptions for academic collective bargaining in the future. The

paper makes a significant contribution to the faculty governance and higher education collective bargaining literature by being among the first to provide a comprehensive review of the faculty governance literature over the last four decades and to present an integrative framework of the possible relationships between faculty unions, faculty senates, and institutions of higher education.

DeCew, J. W. (2003). *Unionization in the Academy: Visions and Realities*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

The first part, labeled "Commentary," provides the reader with an overview of the issues surrounding academic unions and addresses the many distinct sub-issues within the debate over union representation of academic related positions on today's modern collegiate campuses. The second part, labeled "Selected Readings," brings together a series of articles written by other commentators that supplement her commentary in more detail and offer a thoughtful and complete analysis of the particular issues addressed. These articles cover three main areas: faculty unions and academic politics; faculty unions and the legal landscape; and unionization and part-time faculty.

Hasle, Frederick G. *An Assessment of Differences in Morale between and among Selected Union and Non-Union Community College Faculty*. Thesis (Ph.D. Oregon State University, 1977).

The general purpose of this study was to investigate the question: Is unionization disruptive of intra-institutional relationships on community college campuses? The introduction of faculty unions into the college community is often perceived, even by proponents, as a process which engenders hostility and disruption. Social conflict theory is the framework within which this study examines this question of unions and their alleged disruption of institutional relationships. The conclusions of this study are that faculty unions have become interest groups within the college organization. The unequal distribution of power and authority gives rise to faculty unions. Conflict between faculty unions and college administrators is normal, and is beneficial to the resolution of differences. Finally, collegial relationships between administrators and faculty are difficult because collegiality is a relationship that exists between group members that share ideas, goals and values.

Hedrick, D. W., Henson, S. E., Krieg, J. M., & Wassell, Jr., C. S. (2011). *Is there really a faculty union salary premium?* *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 64, 3, 558-575.

Studies of the effects of unions on collegiate faculty salaries are inconclusive. Some estimate a significant union premium, but such estimates suffer from endogeneity between unions and wages, non-random measurement error, and failure to adjust for local cost-of-living differences. By using data from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF, 1988-2004) as well as other sources to identify institution-specific factors omitted from previous studies, the authors estimate significantly smaller union premia than those found by other researchers.

Helland, Tove, and Michael Berman. *The Role of Noneconomic Factors in Faculty Union Voting*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 66, no. 4, 1981, pp. 415–21.

The present study examined the effects of trust in administrative decision making, desire for decision-making power, satisfaction with the content of the work, and satisfaction with economic issues on pro-union voting in a representation election. The sample consisted of 109 full-time faculty members from a 4-year private college. The data were collected by questionnaires. Gamson's theory of power, discontent, and distrust served as the theoretical framework for explaining union voting. Regression analyses showed that distrust in administrative decision making and dissatisfaction with the work content contribute significantly to a pronoun vote. Demographic characteristics—such as academic rank, age, sex, tenure status, salary, and economic dissatisfaction—had no significant effects on union voting. Further analyses supported the hypothesis that pro-union voting was motivated by the desire of the faculty to improve its power position vis-a-vis the administration.

Hutcheson, P. A. (2000). *A professional professoriate: Unionization, bureaucratization and the AAUP*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Starting with the question "How have professors and educational institutions responded to pressures to be professional yet act bureaucratically," Philo Hutcheson uses federal and AAUP records and surveys and blends historical research and sociological analysis to develop a full understanding of the problem. With the dramatic expansion of the professoriate following World War II came increasing tensions between the professor's perceived traditional status as an autonomous professional on the one hand and new role as a bureaucrat subject to institutional authority and responsible for departmental and committee assignments on the other. In this increasingly conflicted realm, the AAUP functioned as a key intermediary, dealing with such issues as tenure, salary, contracts, and even faculty strikes. Hutcheson examines how tensions between the requirements of institutional bureaucracies and the norms of the academic profession resulted in contentiousness and conflict within the national AAUP, between administrators and faculty members on individual campuses, within the ranks of faculties themselves, and even deep in the consciences of many concerned individuals. The book analyzes the association's ability to respond effectively and to balance the values of collegial representation with the powers of collective bargaining. It thus offers a detailed and authoritative examination of the AAUP's search for ways to sustain professionalism while dealing with the fundamental changes in the nature of the professoriate in the post-World War II era.

Johnstone, Ronald L. *The Scope of Faculty Collective Bargaining : An Analysis of Faculty Union Agreements at Four-Year Institutions of Higher Education*. Greenwood Press, 1981.

Based on an analysis of 89 collective bargaining agreements (representing 95 percent of all those in existence at four-year institutions), this book provides an overview of what has been bargained for faculty and where it has been bargained on unionized campuses. After a discussion of the history of union activity in higher education, the report explores the results of negotiations of faculty rights--due process, grievance, machinery, access to personnel records--and faculty involvement in decisions on hiring, firing and promotion. Issues of compensation, fringe

benefits, working conditions, and faculty duties are also considered, along with the official rights of the union and its role in college governance. Within these broad categories, some issues of academic employment are discussed: tenure, merit pay, course load, sabbatical leave, and attendance at commencement exercises. Among the conclusions are the following: affirmative action commitments seldom are included in collective bargaining agreements; leaves of absence generally are included in fewer than half of the agreements; there is wide diversity among agreements regarding compensation items in terms of level of success; in regard to involvement in and responsibility for the academic program of the institution, collective bargaining agreements provide little information; there is an important concern on the part of faculty and administration regarding the effect of collective bargaining on their relationship; and new models of collective bargaining should be explored.

Fiorito, Jack, et al. *Lay Activism and Activism Intentions in a Faculty Union: An Exploratory Study*. Official Journal of United Association for Labor Education, vol. 36, no. 4, 2011, pp. 483–507.

Prior conceptual work on union renewal places activism in a central role. Understanding of activism's antecedents, however, remains limited. This study uses a sample of faculty union members at a large public university, thus providing considerable diversity in work settings within a single employer organization. Using survey and archival data, this study explores the role of selected contextual factors on faculty labor activism. A tentative but interesting finding is that linkages to other activists appear to be a stronger predictor of individual activism than does departmental membership density. That is, it seems that "subcultures of apathy" can exist in even high membership density settings and that social ties to activists may spur members to heightened levels of activism.

Goldey, G., et al. *Union Professors: Framing Processes, Mobilizing Structures, and Participation in Faculty Unions*. Sociological Inquiry, vol. 80, no. 3, 2010, pp. 331–53.

This study traces the development of union loyalties among community college professors. Assuming that activism is motivated by contextual and ideological factors, the paper analyzes the ways that social networks, collegiate workplaces, and framing practices transform political bystanders into committed union members. Using data from a study of junior college professors in Kentucky (N = 329), the study finds that union participation is strongly linked to a distrust of campus administrators and having pro-union friends and colleagues. Likewise, perceptions of union efficacy, a liberal identity as well the professor's education level predicted the actual joining of their campus' faculty union.

Klein, M. W. (2012). *Ten years after Managed Professionals: Who owns intellectual property now?* Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy 2. Available at: <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/jcba/vol2/iss1/2>

Between 1998 and 2008, the number of collective bargaining agreements at colleges and universities that covered ownership of intellectual property—patents and copyrights—increased dramatically. In *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor*, Gary Rhoades (1998) wrote that only about 33% of the collective bargaining agreements in the

Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS) maintained by the National Education Association had provisions that covered ownership of intellectual property (71 out of 212 contracts). In the 2008 HECAS, 55% (290 out of 525) of contracts covering faculty at two-year and four-year institutions had provisions covering intellectual-property ownership.

May, A. M., Moorhouse, E. A., & Bossard, J. A. (2010). *Representation of women faculty at public research universities: Do unions matter?* *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 63, 4, 699-718.

The authors investigate the impact of unionization on the representation of women faculty at public Carnegie Doctoral/Research-Extensive institutions in the United States from 1993-94 through 2004-05. Using institutional-level data from the American Association of University Professors and controlling for important characteristics that influence the gender composition of faculty, the authors find that important differences exist in the proportion of women faculty in total and by rank in unionized versus non-unionized settings. Specifically, unionized public research universities have a higher proportion of women faculty overall and at the ranks of associate and full professor than do non-unionized schools. The authors suggest that this issue is better understood using a segmented labor market approach since previous studies conducted on the subject may have obscured differences by rank. The results of this study reflect the historical priorities of the faculty union in formalizing tenure and promotion procedures, and suggest that these procedures are especially important for women faculty.

Porter, S. R. (2013). *The causal effects of faculty unions on institutional decision-making.* *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 66, 5, 1192-1211.

The author's goal in this article is to estimate the causal effect of unionization on institutional decision-making, using a national survey of presidents and faculty senate leaders to measure the level of shared governance at 341 public universities in 15 different areas. To handle the endogeneity of faculty unionization, an index of state employee collective bargaining rights is used as an instrument for unionization. Findings indicate that unionization greatly increases faculty influence over institutional decision-making, both in compensation and in areas outside of compensation.

Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

*Managed Professionals* is a source book on the negotiated terms of faculty work and a sociological analysis of the restructuring of faculty as a professional workforce. Based on a sample of forty-five percent of the more than 470 negotiated faculty agreements nationwide (which cover over 242,000 faculty), the book offers extensive examples and analysis of contractual provisions on: salary structures; retrenchment; use and working conditions of part-time faculty; use of educational technology (in distance education); outside employment; and intellectual property rights. Focused on the ongoing negotiation of professional autonomy and managerial discretion, the book offers insights into the broad restructuring of faculty, with conclusions that extend beyond unionized faculty to all of academe. Faculty are managed professionals, and are increasingly so. Managers have much flexibility, and as they seek to

reorganize colleges and universities, the exercise of their flexibility serves to heighten the divisions within the academic profession and to reconfigure the professional workforce on campus.

Tullock, G. (1994). *The effect of unionization on faculty salaries and compensation*. Journal of Labor Research 15, 2, 199-200.

Institutional data obtained from the AAUP and other sources are used to explore the effect of unionization on faculty salaries and compensation. This research differs from previous work in that it investigates the effect of affiliation with a particular national union, estimates the impact of decertification, and employs data from the 1980s, whereas previous research primarily used data from the 1970s. The crosssection results for the mid-1980s indicate a union-nonunion compensation differential of about 5 to 6 percent. The fixed-effects results indicate a negative union-nonunion compensation differential.

Wickens, C. M. (2008). *The organizational impact of university labor unions*. Higher Education 56, 5, 545-564.

The current review presents both postulated and empirically tested consequences of university unionization and labor strikes on the North American institution's administration, faculty, and students. The review explores the impact of collective bargaining on employee working conditions including job security, academic freedom, university governance, and due process. More importantly, this review examines the much neglected issue of organizational work relationships in a unionized academic environment. The relationships discussed include those between faculty members, between the faculty and administration, between the faculty and the university as an institution, and between the faculty and their union. The threat of unionization and labor strikes to the professor-student or mentor-mentee relationship has been a central concern of those opposed to graduate student unions, and this issue is also addressed here. The text concludes with the identification of potential areas for future research.