University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Transactions of the Nebraska Academy of Sciences and Affiliated Societies

Nebraska Academy of Sciences

1-1-1981

Attitudes of Dental Administrators Toward Faculty Unionization

Devereaux S. Peterson
Creighton University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/tnas

Part of the Life Sciences Commons

Peterson, Devereaux S., "Attitudes of Dental Administrators Toward Faculty Unionization" (1981). *Transactions of the Nebraska Academy of Sciences and Affiliated Societies.* Paper 273.
http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/tnas/273

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Nebraska Academy of Sciences at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Transactions of the Nebraska Academy of Sciences and Affiliated Societies by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

1981. *Transactions of the Nebraska Academy of Sciences,* IX:99-107.

DISCUSSION

ATTITUDES OF DENTAL ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD FACULTY UNIONIZATION

Devereaux S. Peterson

Department of Dentistry for Children
Boyne School of Dental Science
Creighton University
Omaha, Nebraska 68178

Unionization has become an increasingly significant force among professional groups. This study was conducted to determine the attitudes of dental school administrators regarding faculty unionization and their perceptions concerning dental faculties' attitudes toward it. The data reported concern information about the administrators and demographic information concerning their institutions along with attitudinal information regarding faculty unionization. The attitudinal data reported concerned the administrators' opinions regarding: (1) expectancies for future unionization, (2) faculty strikes, (3) unionization's effect on governance, (4) perceptions of the type of faculty expected to favor unionization, (5) perceptions of the factors influencing faculty to prefer unionization, and (6) bargaining component preferences.

† † †

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important developments among the teaching professions has been the increasing number of faculty who have joined unions. It would be interesting to determine how dental educators and dental school administrators react to dental faculty unionization, particularly since they are members of two proud professions, dentistry and higher education. Unionization's effect on dental education has so far been relatively modest. According to Whitman (1976), only four of the 59 dental schools in the United States reported collective bargaining units and about 7% of all full-time dental faculty are members of unions. The eventual impact of unionization on dental education, however, will depend to a large extent on dental school administrators' attitudes concerning unionization and their perceptions of faculties' attitudes toward unionization.

The purpose of the study was to determine the attitudes of dental school administrators toward dental faculty unionization and how dental administrators perceived dental faculty attitudes concerning unionization.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Survey questionnaires were sent to 240 deans, associate deans, and assistant deans of 59 U.S. dental schools. The questionnaire was designed to determine the administrators' attitudes regarding dental faculty unionization along with their perceptions of the variables that influenced faculty decisions concerning unionization. The questionnaire also identified personal and demographic data regarding the administrators and their schools. There were 59 questionnaire items, which included multiple choice and open-ended questions. The returned questionnaires were coded and analyzed statistically by frequency and percentage value, chi-square, and Cramer's statistic. Copies of the questionnaire are available upon request.

RESULTS

Response to Survey

One hundred eighty of the questionnaires were returned for a return rate of 75%.

Personal Information and Association Between Personal Variables

The highest percentage of respondents (48%) were between 46 and 55 years of age with relatively few (6%) less than 35 or more than 65. Most administrators (73%) reported clinical teaching backgrounds while 15% and 8% came from private dental practice or central university administration respectively.

Most administrators (57%) reported they were middle-of-the-road politically, while there were more conservatives (24%) than liberals (19%) among the remaining respondents. Ninety-two percent of the respondents had Ph.D. or E.ed. degrees and 31% had non-dental masters' degrees. Forty-three percent of them had completed dental specialty training.

There was a positive relationship between type of degree and political orientation ($p<0.0695$). A larger percentage of Ph.D. (28.1%) than non-Ph.D. (19.1%) degree holders tended to be liberal. Individuals having dental or other degrees did not seem to be associated with political liberalism ($p<0.9733$).

The fact that holding a Ph.D. degree related to political orientation and that Ph.D. degree holders were also associated with certain teaching areas may explain in part why the administrators' primary teaching areas were associated mildly with political orientation, since a relatively high percentage of behavioral scientists were liberal (41.7%) and none reported conservative political inclinations. There was also a higher percentage of liberal basic scientists (17.4% against 13.0%), while clinicians tended to be more conservative than liberal (27.0% against 16.5%). Although administrators from the basic sciences and particularly the behavioral sciences tended to be more liberal than respondents with clinical backgrounds, middle-of-the-road political orientation remained the political orientation chosen by all groups.

Age was the last personal variable that showed an association with political orientation ($p<0.02$). Although respondants less than 46 years of age represented only 29.9% of the total population, they represented 56.7% of the liberal opinion while individuals 46 and older represented 70% of the population and only 43.3% of the liberal responses. A corresponding reverse trend was shown with age and conservatism.

Administrative Opinions and Their Association with other Variables

The administrators seemed to agree in their judgment that unionization would not occur within one year (91%). However, their expectation that unionization would not occur within five years was not as high (65%). Most of the administrators' opinions regarding the possibility of future unionization tended to reflect the conditions of their institutions. Those who believed that unionization would not occur chose statements which manifested strong faculty and administrative satisfaction with the school, particularly with salary and governance concerns.

Most administrators perceived faculty as viewing unionization as inherently unprofessional, particularly for the health professions. Even among administrators from schools which did not report high faculty morale, there was a consensus that most of the faculty felt unionization was unprofessional. Also, there was a strong consensus that dental faculties were too independent and conservative to be interested in unions.

There appeared to be strong opposition to strikes, since 74% of the respondents believed that strikes were not justifiable compared to only 15% who did. The reason most often given for opposition to strikes was that they contradicted the professional service ideals of the health professions and the professional schools. Many also believed that strikes among educators were unjustifiable because they deprived students of their rights to an education. The administrators who felt that strikes could be justified took the view that one privilege of a free society was for people to unite for their own benefit and protection, and, it followed, they had the right to strike when necessary. However, the supporters of faculty strikes tended to limit their scope to working environment issues, *i.e.*, wages, hours, *etc.*, and not governance issues.

Personal variables in the areas of educational attainment and political orientation related positively with administrators' opinions concerning strike justifiability. Although the holding of a dental degree was not associated with opinions on strike justifiability ($p<0.2877$), holding a Ph.D. degree was associated ($p<0.0445$). More of the Ph.D. degree holders (28.1%) believed in strikes than did others (11.3%). Liberal administrators also tended to support the concept of strikes more than did middle-of-the-road and conservative administrators (36.7% to 11.2% and 5.4%).

Administrators who speculated that unionization would occur at their institutions within one year also tended to support strikes ($p<0.0652$). Thirty percent of those who believed in impending unionization within one year also felt that strikes could be justified, while only 14.1% of those not believing unionization would occur within one year supported strikes. This trend did not, however, extend to administrators who believed that unionization would occur within five years ($p<0.8080$).

There was a positive relationship between attitudes toward strike justifiability and strike effectiveness ($p<0.0001$). Fifty-six percent of those who believed that strikes could be justified also believed that strikes would be effective as opposed to 30.4% of the strike supporters who did not believe in the effectiveness of strikes. Only 19.1% of the individuals who felt strikes could not be justified believed in their effectiveness while 66.1% of them believed they were ineffective. The group as a whole tended to believe, however, that strikes were ineffective (54.8% believed they were not effective against 23.9% who believed in their effectiveness). Most administrators believed that a strike action would result in decreasing financial support for the school from alumni, legislatures, and the public. They also tended to be confident that strikes

would be ineffective because they perceived little faculty support for the method.

The respondents did not believe that unionization would give dental faculty greater governance voice. Sixty percent disagreed that unionization would result in stronger faculty voice against 23% who believed that it would. Most felt that good faculty–administration communications would be negatively affected by unionization, because an adversarial relationship would result. They believed that negotiations would result in more carefully circumscribing faculty governance prerogatives with an actual narrowing of faculty governance responsibility. The administrators felt that there was less chance for an individual to be heard in a union, resulting in a loss of individual independence to the union.

Administrators who believed that unionization would result in greater faculty influence believed that power in numbers and formalization of power-links could force the administration into agreements that before had been accomplished only through the power of persuasion. One administrator added that another effect could be to bypass the dental school administration entirely so the faculty would bargain with the regents and the legislature directly. He felt this would have a positive effect on faculty influence.

There was much agreement that unionization would not improve dental students' input in controlling the school (69.7% said it would not against 3.2% who believed it would). They believed that faculty and student concerns were unrelated and antithetical to each other and that students were transient members of the system who had no power base to compete with a faculty union to express their interests over the union's interests.

Perceptions of Type of Faculty Most Favorable toward Unionization

Forty-eight percent of the respondents believed that faculty members less than 35 years of age would be favorable toward unionization, while 37% felt that age would have no effect on the decision. Only 6% believed that those 35 or older would be favorable toward unionization.

They also perceived research activity and teaching ability as important determinors, since 58% believed poor researchers/publishers would support unionization while only 25% felt poor performance in those areas would have no effect. Only 5% believed superior researchers/publishers would support it. Fifty-five percent responded that below average instructors would be favorable toward unionization against 24% who felt that teaching ability would not influence the choice. Only 8% believed that superior teachers would be attracted by unionization.

More respondents also felt that politically liberal faculty members would be more influenced toward unionization (72%) than believed that political orientation would have no effect (17%). Only 1% believed that conservatives would be favorable toward unionization.

Tenure status was also perceived as influential since 65% of the respondents believed that non-tenured faculty members would be more favorable toward unionization and only 15% believed it would have no effect. Only 6% felt that the tenured faculty member would be favorable toward unionization.

Administrators did not appear to perceive other personal variables concerning faculty, such as teaching area, department size, and degree type, as influential as the other areas mentioned. Forty-one percent believed that teaching area would have no effect on favorability toward unionization. However, the 46% who did believe that teaching area had had an influence pointed to faculty in the basic sciences and behavioral sciences as being more favorable (20% and 18% respectively) than clinical faculty (7%).

Department size was also not viewed as an important variable in determining faculty attitudes toward unionization (52%). However, 33% of the respondents did feel that large departments influenced faculty members to be more pro-union against only 6% who felt that small departments did likewise.

Most administrators felt that the faculty member's degree type would not affect tendencies toward unionization (57%). However, those who did felt that Ph.D. degree holders were more favorable (20%) than the dentists, whether or not the dentists held Ph.D. degrees.

Perceived Importance of Factors Influencing Faculty to Prefer Unionization

The respondents believed the most important variable influencing unionization to be greater economic benefits and wages. Budget cuts were the second most important issue perceived as influencing unionization. The subject of faculty influence in school governance was the third most significant of all the variables influencing unionization. Related issues, such as the nature of existing faculty governance structures and fairer grievance procedure, were also viewed as somewhat important. Personal issues were also viewed as being somewhat important. Years in rank (long seniority with no promotion), lighter teaching schedules, and less pressure to publish and/or do research all elicited responses of some importance. The importance of legislation permitting unionization was seen as somewhat important; however, there seemed to be comparatively great disagreement among the respondents concerning

its importance. The variable which was seen as least influencing faculty unionization was greater professional standing.

Opinions on Bargaining Unit Components

Sixty-five percent believed that part-time faculty should not be included in the bargaining unit against 26% who did. There was less agreement concerning whether dental faculty should belong in the same bargaining unit as faculty from other health units (47% were in favor and 40% were opposed). There was also little agreement concerning whether the faculty should choose a nationally affiliated organization as a bargaining agent (35%) or whether the agent should represent only local dental faculty (38%). Sixty percent of the respondents had no opinion concerning which of the national organizations they preferred to represent their faculty. Those administrators who had an opinion favored (34%) the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

School Demographic Data and Associations with other Variables

The bargaining status of the administrators' parent university appeared to have an impact on their attitudes toward their school's future and the influences that shaped it. For example, there was a strong relationship between administrator's expectations of future unionization and the union status of their parent university ($p<0.0001$). The percentage of respondents whose parent university was unionized and who believed that unionization would occur within one year (66%) was greater than those who were from non-unionized universities and believed that unionization would not occur within one year (15.5%). A similar trend resulted for the group which believed that unionization would occur within five years.

A positive relationship existed between the administrators' parent university union status and their perceptions of unionization affecting faculty powers to run the school ($p<0.0295$). The individuals from unionized universities were more split in their opinion of whether or not faculty would have greater voice in a union environment (41.4% agreed they would and 44.8% disagreed). Administrators from schools whose parent universities were not unionized more overwhelmingly disagreed (66.7%) that unionization would enhance faculty voice than agreed (16.7%).

A positive relationship existed between the school funding source and budget cuts as they were perceived to influence faculty toward unionization ($p<0.0431$). Administrators whose funding came from public monies appeared to place more emphasis on budget cuts influencing faculty toward unionization. There was positive relationship between school funding source and anticipation of unionization within five years ($p<0.0465$). Administrators from publicly funded schools viewed unionization as more probable since 85.7% of those who believed unionization would occur within five years were from public schools as opposed to the 14.3% from privately funded schools.

DISCUSSION

Administrators' Attitudes toward Unionization and the Major Factors Affecting Their Attitudes

The administrators' attitudes toward dental faculty unionization tended to be very negative. Their antagonisms toward unionization rested on opinions in three areas: (1) they believed unionization was unprofessional, (2) they believed it could destroy traditional governance mechanisms, and (3) they were fearful of strikes. The only major support for unionization was motivated by what some administrators perceived as economic strangulation of dental education.

Their responses indicated that they perceived unionization of dental faculty to be in direct conflict with the faculty's role as health professionals. First, they believed that dental faculty were part of a hospital or health delivery system and that their code of service to those in need of health care must dominate over personal or selfish concerns. They felt that any departure from this strictly professional and sacrificing orientation would result in diminishing status and esteem. Second, most of them believed that unionization was influential in retaining mediocre faculty, which they also perceived contradictory to professional codes of excellence and scholarship. Carr and VanEyck (1973) stated that a frequent result of unionization was a leveling effect on faculty since many contracts provided for automatic pay increases instead of merit increases. They believed that collective bargaining often took precedence over individual bargaining and thus discouraged selective rewards for deserving superior faculty. Finally, they believed unionization had the potential of harming students, which conflicted with the faculty's professional code of service. Several pointed out that a strike could force postponement of students' graduation and licensure examinations.

Most administrators believed that unionization would have a negative impact on faculty governance mechanisms. They felt that an adversarial relationship might develop between administration and faculty due to a breakdown in communication, which they believed had been traditionally open and friendly, and that another effect of unionization could be to narrow faculty governance prerogatives through contractual neglect of faculty governance responsibilities. Carr and VanEyck (1973) pointed out that these perceptions may be quite accurate. They stated that a major risk of collective bargaining was that it often altered existing working relationships at the bargaining table and in the contract. This generated stresses between the groups to the point

that essential patterns of trust and cooperation were destroyed. They also stated that most collective bargaining contracts in higher education did not create faculty governance mechanisms where none had existed previously and most others were silent on the issue. The administrators who believed that unionization would increase faculty voice in school governance believed that power in numbers and formalization of power-links would force the administration to grant greater governance powers to the faculty.

Whatever their opinions on the effect of unionization on governance strength, they felt faculty power should be directed toward working condition areas instead of management areas. Some observers of unionization have agreed that the faculty's most effective and legitimate role was in the area of working conditions rather than governance. Lieberman (1971) felt that it was not in the faculty's best interest to attempt to govern an institution since they were not equipped to do so, and the effort would detract from their primary goal, which was economic gain.

There was almost complete agreement, which was supported by other studies, that unionization would not increase the students' governance voice. Coe (1973) felt if students attempted to participate in bargaining situations, the faculty would attempt to prevent them from doing so. Furthermore, such a development had the potential of eliminating the student participation in decision-making that once was accepted as part of a student-faculty senate procedure. As a result, Finkin (1971) believed that student participation, even in areas where students traditionally had been permitted to bargain, would be questioned by the bargaining agent. The administrators believed that faculty and students had interests which were often unrelated and antithetical to each other. Several mentioned that wage and hour demands of faculty could raise tuition and that unionization could force the school to retain mediocre faculty. Others mentioned that collective bargaining agreements rarely considered students' interests, which they also believed was true of labor contracts in general, in that contracts represented the interests of the two major parties and not the consumer.

The administrators' responses revealed that another major reason for their opposition to unionization was a fear of strikes. Most of the administrators believed that strikes were in direct conflict with the service code of the health professional and that strikes unfairly deprived students of their right to an education. However, the reason most often given for resisting strikes was the administrators' fear that a strike would so damage the professional and health care image of the school that financial support for the school could decrease. Most who responded in this manner believed that legislatures, alumni, and the public would be so enraged over a strike by dental educators that money from these sources would be reduced or eliminated entirely. It was interesting that several administrators stated that the ultimate result of a strike at their schools would be school closure.

It was possible that the administrators were overreacting to the potential effect of a strike on their schools, since there was scant support from the literature that permanently closing a school was a likely result of a strike. Carr and VanEyck (1973) pointed out that strikes in centers of higher education were very rare; and, when they did occur, long bargaining impasses were not common. They also stated that most university faculty strikes, as opposed to elementary and secondary school strikes, where parents were anxious to get their children back in school, did not enjoy great public attention or support. They added that many faculty strikes were also either prevented or abrupted by the conservativeness of many faculty members (many administrators did mention that little faculty support would be forthcoming because of the general conservativeness of dental faculty).

In spite of the administrators' general fear of strikes, they did not seem to believe that strikes would be effective in influencing change in their schools due to lack of faculty and public support. However, one administrator mentioned one strike aspect that could impact importantly on the philosophy of most administrators. He said that, "A strike would alert the central administration that something was wrong with the dental administration." Sands (1971) supported this view and found that next to student riots a faculty strike was the most visible sign that something was wrong at the institution, that administrators were anxious to avoid such signs, and that strikes or threats of strikes could be effective pressures on administrators.

The administrators' opposition to strikes was especially demonstrated by their strong opposition to its justifiability. Seventy-four percent felt that strikes could not be justified, giving reasons that strikes were unprofessional, unfair to students, and destroyed the continuous health care concept of dental schools. The dilemma over the justification or morality of strikes in higher education has received considerable attention in the literature, much of it suggesting that strikes had important negative implications for professionalism. For example, Kadish (1968) stated that faculty strikes gave the troubling impression that economic interests were more important than service interests to faculty and that professional autonomy was lost because strikes shifted professorial emphasis from their moral commitment to teaching to a competitive struggle in the institutional context. Boyd (1968) maintained that strikes taught students unprofessional styles by suggesting that coercion was an effective means of influencing relationships.

The relatively few administrators who felt that strikes

could be justified were generally more philosophical in their approach, indicating that strikes were a privilege of a free society or that strikes would be a justifiable method of calling attention to the lack of financial support given dental education.

Administrators with Ph.D. degrees were more favorable toward the concept of strikes than those with dental degrees. This trend was supported by Fox and Blackburn (1975), who showed that medical school faculty with Ph.D. degrees were more favorable toward unionization than those possessing medical degrees. Although dental administrators with Ph.D. degrees were more favorable toward strikes, it was also possible that the political orientation of the administrators rather than degree type was the more determining factor. Numerous studies have shown that political liberalism influenced faculty attitudes toward unionization. The results of this study also demonstrated a significant relationship between politically liberal administrators and positive feelings toward the justification of strikes, while at the same time there was a positive relationship between political liberalism and holding a Ph.D. degree. Non-Ph.D. degree holding administrators were found to be more conservative and were also less favorable toward strikes.

A positive association also existed between support for strikes and the belief that strikes were effective. It appeared that many administrators believed that dental education was receiving too low a financing priority and that a strike would be an effective means of attracting attention to this. In fact, the only support for unionization, apart from a general feeling among some administrators that it was a basic right in a free society, came from an apparently genuine concern over the lack of adequate salaries for dental school faculties and the optimism that unionization had the potential to increase those salaries. Their faith that unionization might improve the situation had some support from other studies. Carr and VanEyck (1973) pointed out that the external influences of government agencies, through their general retrenchment in higher education funding, had been one of the major forces influencing unionization. They also stated that legislatures, which were in large part responsible for the retrenchment, would be more responsive to collective bargaining by faculty than to lobbying by the university administration. Since the history of unionization in dental education was only several years old and had thus far affected so few dental schools, it was too premature to determine if these few devotees of unionization were correct in their assessment. However, Carr and VanEyck (1973) did maintain that bargaining contracts on most campuses had not won more economic gains than would have been made through traditional mechanisms.

Anticipation of Future Unionization

Ninety-one percent of the administrators believed that unionization would not occur within one year. However, only 65% believed that it would not occur within five years, which could indicate some uncertainty about the possibilities of unionization in the more distant future. The reasons most often given that unionization would not occur were that the faculty would perceive it as unprofessional, that governance mechanisms were already satisfactory for faculty, and that dental faculties were too conservative for unionization. Those who believed that it would occur believed salary was the essential cause.

It was very interesting that there was a positive association between administrators who believed unionization would occur within one year and those who felt that strikes could be justified, while no such association existed for those who believed unionization would occur within five years. It was possible that administrators at some schools viewed their economic situation as so poor that unionization was inevitable within one year and that a strike of their faculty was a justifiable result of the many economic pressures on them. It was also possible that administrators who believed that unionization would occur within five years still viewed circumstances as not so poor as to merit the justification of a strike – at least not yet.

The administrators believed that dental faculty who were less than 35 years of age, who had below average research/publishing and teaching skills, who were politically liberal, and who were not tenured were most likely to favor unionization. Their perceptions of these characteristics of pro-union faculty were supported by other studies.

For example, studies by Atwood and Crain (1973) showed significant associations between youth and political liberalness of the faculty and pro-union attitudes. It is conceivable, however, that the general middle-of-the-road political opinion and middle-aged status of the administrators could have caused some of them to perceive unionization as a radical departure from tradition and identify it with the political left and youth. It is also possible that the administrators associated youth with lack of tenure, which they also believed was characteristic of faculty pro-unionization. Budig and Decker (1973) pointed out that faculty without tenure tended to be pro-union because they believed that their rights and privileges were decided by tenured faculty, which the non-tenured faculty believed limited their academic and professional freedoms until they were also tenured.

The administrators identified two negative faculty characteristics as identifying pro-unionism – poor research/publishing records and less than average teaching ability. Kremerer and Baldridge (1975) and Ladd and Lipset (1973) found these characteristics among general university faculty were predisposing factors in pro-union attitudes. However, when Fox and

Blackburn (1975) studied medical school faculty they found that the individuals with the most superior research/publishing records and academic attainment were supporters of unionization. The paradox can be explained hypothetically in both medical and dental education by the generally superior research/publishing records of basic and behavioral science faculty over clinical faculty, due to greater pressure to publish in those areas. At this same time, basic and behavioral science faculty generally received lower salaries than clinical faculty.

The results of the study did not show that the administrators found faculty members' teaching areas, degree types, or department sizes to characterize pro-union individuals. However, those administrators who did feel those areas described pro-union faculty believed that pro-union faculty were more represented by basic and behavioral scientists, those faculty holding Ph.D. degrees, and those faculty who were members of large departments.

Perceived Importance of Factors Influencing Faculty to Prefer Unionization

The respondents believed the most important influences promoting faculty unionization were economic benefits and wages and budget cuts. Fox and Blackburn (1975) found that the greatest area of dissatisfaction among medical faculty was level of salary. Kemerer and Baldridge (1975) found that external pressures, especially from legislatures, that threatened budget cuts were a significant factor in influencing general university unionization. The reasons most frequently given for support for unionization and strike justification, along with reasons for certainties of future unionization, were also inadequate faculty salaries and budget cuts. It should also be mentioned that low salary levels could partly explain the administrators' opinions regarding non-tenured faculty and those faculty less than 35 years of age, because both groups were perceived to be more pro-union, since they could represent the lowest paid groups. It was also possible that the administrators recognized a relationship between low salary and poor research/publishing records and poor teaching, both of which were perceived as characteristic of pro-union faculty.

The administrators perceived governance issues as being somewhat important in influencing unionization, although not as important as economic issues. Fox and Blackburn (1975) found that the most important professional area of medical faculty dissatisfaction was governance. Ladd and Lipset (1973) also found that faculty at superior schools showed greater desire for governance reform because the ideals of professionalism and professional control over work environment were more important to the more elite type of faculty who predominated at superior schools. Certainly, professional schools could be categorized as superior institutions. It possibly followed that professional school faculty had strong desires for more power in governance areas since they presumably had strong professional identities and that the administrators recognized this drive as a reality. There was a potential for conflict, however, in the area of dental faculty governance. The administrators believed that although governance issues were important to faculty, it was also thought that existing governance mechanisms were quite adequate and that increased intrusion into traditional management areas by faculty should not be tolerated.

The area that administrators believed influenced faculty the least toward unionization was greater professional standing, which was consistent with other findings in the study. Ladd and Lipset (1973) found also that administrators on general university campuses believed desire for greater professionalism was unimportant in influencing unionization.

Opinions on Bargaining Unit Components

The choice of which units would compose a bargaining unit could have important ramifications in the event of competitive power struggles which unionization could bring to contract negotiations. The questions of whether part-time faculty should be included in the bargaining unit with campus units is important for dental faculty unionization. The National Labor Relations Board has ruled that part-time faculty should not generally be included in the same unit with full time faculty and that professional school faculty had the prerogative of choosing bargaining units separate from other units.

The question of part-time faculty in dental schools had unique considerations apart from general university faculties, since part-time dental faculty are usually private practitioners, and there was ample precedent that practicing dentists and dental educators sometimes had tensions and anxieties between them (Bradley, 1977). The administrators believed that part-time faculty should not be included in the dental school bargaining unit. They may have reacted to fears of domination over the school by the local dental societies, whose power structures were usually controlled by practicing dentists.

A slight majority of the administrators believed that dental faculty should belong in the same bargaining unit as other health units, which possibly indicated that they perceived the interests of dental education being shared by other health areas. There was little agreement concerning whether the dental faculty should be represented by a nationally affiliated organization or whether the agent should represent local dental faculty only. Those administrators who had an opinion favored the AAUP, which coincided with the Ladd and Lipset (1973) and Phelan (1975) studies which showed that most faculties believed their interests were best represented by the AAUP.

School Demographic Data and Associations with Other Variables

Two institutional demographic variables proved to be associated with the administrators' attitudes regarding unionization. There was a positive association between administrators whose parent university was unionized and their positive expectancies for future unionization within both one and five years. Other studies tended to support the view that unionization could spread more easily once it was established in an area. For example, Carr and Van Eyck (1973) and Kemerer and Baldridge (1975) believed that close proximity to an organized campus unit made the conditions for unionization more favorable. It was also interesting that administrators whose parent universities were unionized and those whose parent campuses were not unionized disagreed on the effect of unionization on faculty governance voice. Those whose parent campus was unionized felt overwhelmingly that unionization would increase faculty governance voice while those from non-unionized areas believed strongly that unionization would not improve faculty voice. It was possible that dental administrators with no close unionization models viewed it as more innocuous since they had not experienced its impact at close range.

There was also an association between the funding source of the university and the administrators' expectancies for unionization within five years. The administrators at publicly funded dental schools showed greater expectancies for unionization than those from private schools. Kemerer and Baldridge (1975) found that faculty from publicly supported schools showed greater support for unionization than at private schools. Their rationale was that the characteristic type of faculty member at public and private schools was often different, with faculty at private schools often being more parochial and more willing to accept traditional institutional patterns. The perceptions of the dental administrators were possibly more linked to economic concerns since there was also a significantly higher association between concern for budget cuts among administrators from public schools than private schools. It was mentioned that the results of this study repeatedly pointed to economic influence being more important than all others in prompting unionization. This factor was possibly the case here. However, several administrators did mention that they were from private denominational schools and that their faculty was too conservative to favor unionization. This statement was especially true with administrators from southern schools. Consequently, both faculty personality and economic issues could have influenced differing expectancies for unionization between public and private school administrators.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Administrators will resist unionization of dental faculty.

2. Administrators who favor unionization do so for reasons of protection of funding for dental education rather than for positive feelings that unionization is inherently worthwhile.

3. Administrators share similar opinions regarding the type of faculty member who will be influenced toward unionization and what factors are influential for unionization.

4. Administrators' opinions are related to personal, economic, and institutional variables.

5. Administrators believe that most dental faculties will not support unionization. However, collective bargaining units may be implemented in a few dental schools in the future, particularly in those institutions in the most serious financial difficulty.

6. Administrators believe that unionization will not affect most dental schools in the forseeable future due to perceived conflict over professional roles and the conservative nature of many dental faculty.

REFERENCES

Atwood, E., and S. Crain. 1973. Changes in faculty attitudes toward university role and governance. *Journal of Experimental Education,* 41:1-10.

Boyd, W. B. 1968. Collective bargaining in academe: causes and consequences. *Liberal Education,* 57:315-320.

Bradley, R. E. 1977. President Bradley's goal: better relations between dental educators and practitioners. *Bulletin of Dental Education,* 10:1-2.

Budig, G. A., and C. R. Decker. 1973. Assistant professors, disillusioned by tenure, believe unionization offers better protection. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 55:143-144.

Carr, R. K., and D. K. VanEyck. 1973. *Collective bargaining comes to campus.* Washington, American Council on Education: 314p.

Coe, A. C. 1973. The implications of collective bargaining for student personnel administrators. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators' Journal,* 14:9-19.

Finkin, M. W. 1971. Collective bargaining and university government. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors,* 57:149-162.

Fox, T. G., and R. T. Blackburn. 1975. Factors influencing

medical school faculty disposition toward collective bargaining. *Journal of Medical Education,* 50:229-236.

Kadish, S. H. 1968. The strike and the professoriate. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors,* 54:160-168.

Kemerer, F. R., and J. V. Baldridge. 1975. *Unions on campus.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass: 248p.

Ladd, E. C., and S. M. Lipset. 1973. *Professors, unions, and American higher education.* Berkeley, Carnegie Foundation: 124p.

Lieberman, M. 1971. Professors, unite! *Harper's Magazine,* 61-70.

Phelan, D. J. 1975. *Faculty, student, and staff attitudes toward potential collective bargaining issues at the Ohio State University.* Washington, Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, No. 3: 15p.

Sands, C. D. 1971. The role of collective bargaining in higher education. *Wisconsin Law Review,* 1:150, 163-166.

Whitman, N. A. 1976. Academic tenure and collective bargaining in American dental schools. *Journal of Dental Education,* 40:203-206.