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CHAPTER I

PER SPECTIVE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Collective bargaining in higher education probably had its formal birth when the Milwaukee Technical Institute, a two-year institution, unionized in 1963. The United States Merchant Marine Academy, a four-year institution, organized in 1967; and Central Michigan University holds the distinction of having the first four-year campus contract.

As of June, 1974, collective bargaining agents have been chosen at 338 campuses across the United States and many more are presently in some phase of collective bargaining. There are 205 campuses of two-year colleges and 133 campuses of four-year institutions that have elected formal bargaining agents.

Unionization is legalized for college faculties by twenty states; however, seven states have institutions of higher education that are bargaining without legislation to protect them. Ohio is one of these seven states. Six bargaining bills have been introduced but no legislation has been forthcoming. Two four-year institutions, Ashland College and Youngstown State University, have elected
exclusive bargaining agents and have adopted formal agreements. The University of Cincinnati began the election process in May, 1974. The University of Akron and Kent State University are in the processes of collective organization. A total of 26 states have legislation under consideration for collective bargaining for public college faculties (see Appendix A).

In 1972, Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Washington, New York, and Wisconsin accounted for 132 of the 156 higher education contracts in force. The influence of the industrial labor sectors which have unionized and the influence of the professional groups, such as the American Medical Association and the Bar Association, might provide interesting interaction for further study. The Chronicle of Higher Education (June 5, 1972) reports that medical deans of colleges received an average annual pay of nearly $10,000 above the average pay for the chief administrators of colleges.

Historically, faculty collective bargaining had its roots and still has its stronghold in the two-year colleges. Many two-year colleges, especially in the technical division, employ competent faculty from the industrial labor sector where unions are prevalent and powerful. Neil Bucklew (1973) implies that industrial unionism influences college unionism in his statement:
Central Michigan University is located in a state with an extensive history of formalized collective bargaining. Important and significant milestones in the development of private sector labor history have occurred in Michigan. Among the best-known has been the development of industrial unionism in the automobile industry in the late 1930s and early 1940s. In education, Michigan, along with New York has been the location of the earliest and most extensive experiences in public school negotiations.

Whether the hourly wage of industrial workers, the doctor's fee for a two-minute visit beside a hospital bed, or the "going rate" for an attorney probating an estate is established or not by a power group known as a union or by some other name is not the purpose of this study. However, the influences and the practices of these groups are penetrating the walls of higher education; and the ramifications and effects of these penetrations need further study.

Formal agreements in higher education appear to be somewhat similar in content across the nation and include such commonalities as grievance procedures, vacations, working conditions, fringe benefits, and salary structure. The agreements are written between a class of employees and the bargaining agent. The class of employees is defined in the agreement and may or may not include levels such as dean of admissions, dean of placement, department chairmen, and other officers who perform administrative services.
Top-level administration is rarely, if ever, included in the written agreement; and since the bargaining table assumes the role of placing one side (faculty) against the other (administration and/or state), the effect of faculty collective bargaining on administrators is worthy of exploration. There are undoubtedly numerous effects, but this study is limited to the analysis of only two of those effects: salaries and fringe benefits.

The problem, then, this study attempts to investigate is the effect of faculty collective bargaining on administrators' salaries and fringe benefit items.

Researcher's Interest in the Study

There were four influences that created the researcher's interest in collective bargaining:

(1) Family affiliation. Eight men in the writer's immediate family were divided in their support of unionism during the writer's growing years. One was a member of the United Mine Workers. One was a member of the United Auto Workers. One was a member of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Three were self-employed proprietors. One was management with a major power company. And one was engaged in professional agriculture research and production.

(2) Subject of a grievance. At the age of nineteen, the researcher was the subject of a filed grievance. It seems the writer had tread on industrial union territory as
specified in the agreement.

(3) Job position. The researcher's present job position is that of a college administrator and the activity of collective bargaining in higher education makes the subject timely and necessary.

(4) John L. Lewis. During the writer's younger years, the opportunity to hear John L. Lewis speak and to meet the labor leader presented itself. During graduate school, the writer did in-depth research of the United Mine Worker's leader which resulted in personal correspondence with Mr. Lewis.

Objectives Necessary to Reach Research Goals

(1) To identify all institutions of higher education that have faculty who have elected collective bargaining agents.

(2) To establish what states have no faculties who have elected exclusive bargaining agents in institutions of higher education.

(3) To establish, if possible, other variables besides collective bargaining which may affect and effect the salaries of administrators.

(4) To identify to what extent college faculty and college administrative salaries have changed during the period 1969 - 1973.

(5) To compare administrators' salaries to faculties' salaries for the five-year period 1969 - 1973.
(6) To identify what increases or decreases have been realized in the number of fringe benefit items for administrators.

(7) To obtain as many collective bargaining agreements as possible and cite any reference to administrative personnel and to fringe benefit items for the faculty.

(8) To compare the two-year college with the four-year college and the university in terms of the
a. number that have adopted bargaining agents
b. type of control (public or private)
c. type of school (two-year, four-year, university)

(9) To establish characteristics of the college administrator, particularly in terms of age, education level, sex, and academic rank.

(10) To compare salaries of administrators whose faculties have chosen a bargaining agent with salaries of administrators whose faculties have not bargained but whose institutions are located in states where higher education faculties have elected bargaining agents.

(11) To compare salaries of administrators in institutions of higher education in states where no faculty bargaining has been formalized to salaries of administrators in institutions in different states where faculties have elected formal bargaining agents.
Research Goals

Primary Goal

To analyze and report the comparison of yearly contract salaries of administrators in institutions where faculties have chosen collective bargaining agents to yearly contract salaries of administrators in institutions where faculties have not chosen collective bargaining agents.

Secondary Goal

To analyze and report the comparison in the number of fringe benefit items of administrators in institutions where faculties have chosen collective bargaining agents to the number of fringe benefit items of administrators in institutions where faculties have not chosen collective bargaining agents.

The Alternative and the Null Hypotheses

The alternative hypothesis under which this research was initiated was that administrators who are employed at institutions of higher education where faculties have elected a bargaining agent make higher salaries than do administrators who are employed at similar institutions where faculties have not bargained. The null hypothesis states, then, that this research will find no difference when comparing salaries of administrators at institutions where faculties have bargained to salaries of administrators
at similar institutions where faculties have not bargained.

The second alternative hypothesis was that administrators who are employed at institutions of higher education where faculties have elected a bargaining agent realize a greater number of fringe benefit items than do administrators who are employed at similar institutions where faculties have not bargained. The second null hypothesis states, then, that this research will find no difference when comparing the number of fringe benefit items of administrators at institutions where faculties have bargained to the number of fringe benefit items of administrators at similar institutions where faculties have not bargained.

**Limitations**

This study is limited to the study of two effects of collective bargaining: salaries and fringe benefit items. The other main effects analyzed in this research are not considered effects of collective bargaining. They are, however, effects which influence salaries and, therefore, must be analyzed and interpreted in order to determine statistical level of significance.

The study is further limited to salaries and fringe benefit items of administrators. The salaries and fringe benefits of faculty are studied simply to compare similarities and differences as they exist among schools and between
faculty and administrative levels.

The population is limited to:

a. 229 institutions of higher education located on 338 campuses that have elected formal bargaining agents.

b. 228 institutions that have no collective bargaining in states where other institutions of higher education have bargained collectively.

c. 222 institutions in states where NO institutions of higher education have chosen a formal and exclusive bargaining agent.

The time period of this study covers data available from January 1969, through January 1974. However, some institutions have chosen an exclusive bargaining agent prior to 1969 and after January 1974.

The geographic location is limited to the United States.

The administrative levels is limited to the top four positions as determined by the chief administrator in any institution, regardless of size of faculty or size of enrollment.

Assumptions

1. Faculties negotiate, for the most part, for the purpose of increasing salaries, increasing the number of fringe benefits, and improving working conditions.

2. Faculty and administration choose difference sides of
the bargaining table because of the nature of collective bargaining which purports an employer-employee relationship.

3. Collective bargaining is, for the most part, synonymous with unionism.

4. Administration and/or faculty has not admitted or perhaps has not analyzed the possibility that faculty collective bargaining can improve administrators' salaries and administrators' fringe benefits.

5. Faculty do not intentionally negotiate for the purpose of increasing administrators' salaries and administrators' fringe benefits.

6. Faculty bargaining will continue to increase in institutions of higher education.

7. If the State sits opposite the faculty in the negotiation process, administrators join ranks with the State representatives.

8. Faculty collective bargaining has followed and will continue to follow much of the strategy and the methodology of the industrial labor sector.

9. The top four administrators will not have the same titles. The decision of who is the top four administrators was left to the discretion of the 718 chief executives who received the questionnaire. It is assumed, however, that the responses from the chief executives will be an accurate
representation of the top four administrators throughout the nation.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **AFT** - American Federation of Teachers affiliated with the AFL-CIO and chosen as an exclusive bargaining agent by many college faculties.

2. **AAUP** - American Association of University Professors. In May 1972, the organization voted to pursue bargaining; it has been chosen as an exclusive bargaining agent by several college faculties.

3. **Bargaining Unit** - the persons who are representing all the faculty or the persons who are representing the State or administration.

4. **Bargaining Process** - involves preparing the proposal, choosing the bargaining team, the formal negotiations at the table, the external behavior of both sides related to items of collective bargaining.

5. **Collective Bargaining** - a system of representative persons speaking for the total constituency or faculty or administration, and for the purposes of this study, having one organization selected as the exclusive bargaining agent.

6. **Collective Bargaining Agent** - the elected organizational representative of the faculty, usually AAUP, NEA, AFT, and in several instances, independent representation.
7. Community College - a two-year institution offering both general transfer courses to a four-year college and courses of a technical nature ending in an associate degree. Offers curricula which meet the needs of the area in which the college is located.

8. Dual Representation - represents a merger between National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, and commonly chosen in New York as bargaining agent.

9. Fringe Benefits - includes working benefits other than salary, such as sick leave, maternity leave, military leave, pension, medical expense insurance, disability insurance, jury duty leave, sabbatical leave, bereavement, advanced study, family tuition.

10. Four-year colleges - represents baccalaureate granting institutions and may offer a master's degree; however, for the purpose of this study, does not offer a doctoral degree.

11. Higher Education - for the purpose of this study, higher education refers to post-secondary education in a two-year college, four-year college, or university.

12. Independent Representative - usually an independent, internal organization of the college which has been elected by the bargaining team or the faculty senate to represent the group as its exclusive bargaining agent.
13. NEA - National Education Association; it has been chosen as an exclusive bargaining agent by many college faculties.

14. Technical College - often located within a community college; however, in some states is independent. Offers a two-year associate degree and is job-oriented in purpose.

15. Two-year Colleges - represents associate degree granting and two-year transfer programs, associated with technical institutes, technical colleges, community and junior colleges, and general and technical schools which offer two years of post-secondary education.

16. University - for the purpose of this study, an institution of higher education offering the baccalaureate, the master's, and the doctoral degree.

17. Working Conditions - refers to improvements or changes in areas of teaching load, travel reimbursement, summer employment office hours, parking, lounges, calendar decisions, clerical help, office conditions such as lighting, furniture, and air conditioning.
CHAPTER II

RESOURCES

Introduction

The writings available in the confines of this research topic are very limited and produced few results as far as providing information for a literature review. The Mechanized Information Center of The Ohio State University Libraries was unsuccessful in locating writings that relate to administrators' salaries or administrators' fringe benefits which could be related to collective bargaining by the faculty. There is a multitude of books written and being written on the broad topic of collective bargaining but none dealing with the effect of collective bargaining on administrators' salaries and fringe benefit items.

A telephone call to the American Association of University Professors in Washington, D. C. produced the comment, "I have not seen one paragraph relating to your specific area of interest."

The Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service in Washington, D. C. was gracious in sending several pages of fine information relating to collective
bargaining, but top officials in a half-hour phone conversation could remember no literature that had ever been written on the specific topic.

The Publications Department of the American Council on Education knew of no printed materials in the subject area and suggested the ACE library. The Librarian recalled the College and University Personnel Association which had done an annual survey of salaries for administrators but indicated that the salaries had never been associated in any way with collective bargaining efforts.

The CUPA Research Reports were done for 1969-70, 1971-72, and 1973-74. No schools are identified in any of the reports; however, positions are listed and adequate comparisons and ranges provide detailed information for administrative compensation.

Phil Semas reviews a study in the CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (April 15, 1974) which is the most relevant writing reviewed for the purpose of this dissertation. Robert Burnbaum, Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, found that the average compensation of unionized teachers at 88 institutions increased by $777 more than that of faculty members at 88 similar institutions without collective bargaining.

While this writing does not intend to dwell on the salaries and fringe benefit items of faculty, it is
reasonable to assume that logically there is a significant correlation between effects of collective bargaining on faculty salaries and effects of collective bargaining on administrators' salaries in the same institution.

A publication of the Academic Center for Collective Bargaining (January, 1974), and the CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (November, 1973) provided the listing for those institutions of higher education that had chosen bargaining agent at that time. By June 1974, an additional 21 campuses had elected formal bargaining agents. These additions are listed in Appendix B and have been included in this study for analysis only if the institution happened to be one of the randomly selected schools in the non-bargaining classification at the time of selection. This constitutes only six of the 21 newly bargained institutions.

It should be noted that 20 colleges voted this year not to elect an exclusive bargaining agent. Included in this number are three Ohio colleges: Antioch College, Baldwin-Wallace College, and Oberlin College.

The Bargaining Agents

The Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service in Washington, D. C. provided a mimeographed publication (1974) which outlined the history and the position of the three most common professional organizations who
serve as exclusive bargaining agents for college faculties. Following are some of the highlights of that publication:

American Association of University Professors

This professional association first supported faculty collective bargaining in 1966; however, it was not until 1971 that the Council announced its policy on collective bargaining, and this policy was approved by the AAUP membership in 1972.

The membership of AAUP is approximately 88,000 members and this organization has had its strength in the social science and humanities disciplines of the four-year colleges.

The policy of the AAUP regarding strikes and work stoppages reads:

only in extraordinary situations which so flagrantly violate academic freedom or the principles of academic government, or which are so resistant to rational methods of discussion, persuasion, and conciliation, that faculty members may feel impelled to express their condemnation by withholding their services, either individually or in concert with others. It should be assumed that faculty members will exercise their right to strike only if they believe that another component of the institution (or a controlling agency of government, such as a legislature or governor) is inflexibly bent on a course which undermines an essential element of the educational process.

Deans, associate deans, and others above a department chairman level can be included in the bargaining unit only if elected by faculty. Top administration is excluded.
American Federation of Teachers

Statutory rights to engage in collective bargaining was granted the AFT in 1960. This organization was the first agent to represent an institution of higher education in collective bargaining. AFT is an affiliate of the AFL-CIO and has a membership of approximately 30,000. AFT has been most prevalent in two-year community, junior, and technical colleges; however, the organization is gaining strength in four-year colleges. AFT has over 40 contracts in operation and has negotiated over 125 contractual agreements.

In 1960, the AFT adopted the policy that work stoppage was a "very last resort when all other means to bring about a fair settlement of a serious controversy had failed."

Department Chairmen are usually included in the AFT bargaining unit; however, anyone who ranks above the department chairman is excluded from representation in the bargaining unit.

National Education Association

The National Education Association has over 50,000 members in the higher education division and is the oldest of the three organizations commonly chosen as exclusive bargaining agent. NEA was the first to enter collective negotiations and did so through two-year community colleges.

In 1968, NEA adopted a policy supporting work
stoppages and strikes when absolutely necessary. All three professional organizations, AAUP, AFT, and NEA, now have policies permitting strikes under a given set of conditions.

The National Education Association is the exclusive bargaining agent for 90 colleges and presently has approximately 64 contracts in force. Significant to the NEA bargaining unit is that at Edmonds Community College and at Everett Community College, the presidents are considered part of the bargaining unit. The NEA is the only professional group that permits administration to act as part of the bargaining unit; however, NEA bargaining units have not made the practice common.

**Dual Representation**

Two-year colleges in New York state have recently been choosing the dual representation of National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers. This NEA-AFT merger has brought strong expertise to the bargaining table and has represented the colleges with the highest mean salaries for four out of five years of this study.

**Local**

Several college officials responded on the questionnaires as having "local" bargaining units. It is probable that this is a local chapter of NEA, AFT, or AAUP; however, the writer did not want to make that assumption and classified these responses as "Local."
Independent

The colleges where faculties have chosen independent bargaining agents are commonly law schools; however, many non-law institutions in New York have entrusted their bargaining positions to a group of professionals outside the realm of NEA, AAUP, or AFT.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

In order to conduct this survey it was necessary to:

1. Identify the problem and establish the hypothesis.
2. Design and test the survey instrument.
3. Select the sample population.
4. Distribute the survey questionnaires and cover letter by mail and follow-up at appropriate time.
5. Seek the help of programming and statistical experts to develop the mathematical model and the design.
6. Crossmatch the respondent identity codes.
7. Obtain faculty salaries from American Association of University Professor surveys from 1969-1973 for those institutions whose administrators supplied salary data.
8. Transfer the data from questionnaires to 80-column Fortran coding sheets.
10. Match identity codes and research necessary information (faculty salaries) for comparison and analytical purposes.
11. Write Fortran IV programs to punch needed data decks, to isolate vital and adequate data, to reject insufficient data, to classify data, to interpret data, and to analyze
12. Submit and retrieve information to and from the IBM 370/165 system.

**Sample Populations**

The colleges and universities selected for the purpose of this study were sorted into three classifications: Sample I, II, and III.

Sample I colleges or universities selected were geographically located in states where two kinds of institutions exist: (1) institutions that have faculties who have elected exclusive bargaining agents, and (2) institutions that have faculties who have not engaged in any kind of formal collective bargaining. However, Sample I institutions represent the second criteria since none of those selected have bargained. The number selected was identical to the number of institutions that had bargained in that particular state. For example, in the state of Colorado, three colleges have chosen bargaining agents; therefore, three colleges where faculties have not chosen bargaining agents are listed in Sample I.

Sample II represents a group of colleges and universities located in states where no institution of higher education has elected an exclusive bargaining agent for the faculty. These 222 colleges and universities were chosen at random from the 1973-74 *EDUCATION DIRECTORY* published
by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The first college name and the last college name listed on any single page were eligible for selection; however, not every first college and last college name were selected. No rigidly structured pattern was followed in selecting every first and last name as they appeared. There was no other basis for selectivity other than placement on the page.

There were 1,292 colleges in states where no formalized collective bargaining had been recognized. The EDUCATION DIRECTORY listed the total number of institutions in each state. The number listed for each state was divided by the total number of colleges to determine the percentage of the whole that each state represented. The percentage was multiplied by two (2) since over 200 institutions (228 to be exact) have formally bargained. This method calculates an equal ratio of non-bargaining colleges to formal bargaining colleges and resulted in the selection of 222 colleges in this classification. Anything below .10 was given representation of one college in the study which produced at 228:222 ratio. The following example represents the methodology of selection for Sample II:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. of Inst. in State</th>
<th>Total No. Inst. in U.S.</th>
<th>Total No. Randomly Selected Coll. Represented in this Study From Each State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,292 = 3.9% x 2 = 7.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,292 = 1.6% x 2 = 3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample III represents ALL those colleges and universities which have formally elected an exclusive bargaining agent. Every college listed by the Academic Center for Collective Bargaining in Washington, D.C., and by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* was included in Sample III and received a cover letter and questionnaire.

Colleges and universities selected for inclusion in the survey is listed in Appendix C. This list represents 718 colleges and 859 campuses. The City University of New York system is represented as one institution even though it is a multi-campus system. Accordingly, the State University of New York system office suggested that each of their campuses be provided a questionnaire; therefore, the SUNY system is represented 58 times through their various institutions.

**Survey Instrument**

The survey instrument was designed as a single page questionnaire to be answered by the chief administrator of each of the selected colleges. The questionnaire was
tested by 25 persons including professors, administrators, instructors, and students on a four-year liberal arts campus, on a two-year technical college campus, and on a two-year regional campus. Suggestions for improvement were recommended, were adopted, and were implemented into the survey questionnaire. (see appendix D₁ and D₂).

A cover letter was individually and personally addressed to the chief administrative officer of the college or university as listed in the *NEW EDUCATION DIRECTORY* and was individually signed. (appendix E₁ and E₂). The letters and questionnaires were professionally printed along with matching envelopes and a matching postage-paid, self-addressed return envelope. The school code was indicated by the room number which was produced by a type-setting machine, matching the bold type design of the envelopes. (appendix F). The school codes were cross-matched on the master lists for follow-up.

Five days after the stated due date in the cover letter, a second letter and questionnaire were sent to all chief administrators who had not responded. This letter and questionnaire were a Xerox copy of the first one sent with the notation, "Second Request," and a postscript indicating the importance of the study printed in red. (appendix G). A dime was taped to the follow-up letter which could account for the high percentage of returns of the follow-up. It is interesting to note, however, the
number of dimes returned with the completed questionnaires, bearing a notation of thanks but explaining that the school's accounting and computer systems were insufficient to take care of the dime.

Response

As listed in the *EDUCATION DIRECTORY* (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1974), there were 2,722 institutions of higher education in the United States at the time this study was undertaken. A total of 718 questionnaires were mailed. Table 1 reflects the total 434 responses which calculates a 60.4 percent return. In order to keep confidential the salary information received from the individual schools the responding institutions are not recognized by name in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. of Institutions of Higher Education</th>
<th>No. of Questionnaires Mailed</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida*</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois*</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts*</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan*</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey*</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York*</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio*</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania*</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1-continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. of Institutions of Higher Education</th>
<th>No. of Questionnaires Mailed</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin*</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Service Schools*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*States that had bargaining agents as of November, 1973
Responses varied from positive reactions, such as a two-page letter from a Dallas president expressing good wishes on what he considered an important study and also enclosing five completed questionnaires representing five different institutions, to negative statements such as the one from a New York president, "I refuse to answer these personal questions -- you should choose another topic."

Analysis of the data revealed that college administrators whose institutions had engaged in collective bargaining responded to a much greater degree (over 7 percent) than did those administrators whose institutions had not experienced collective bargaining. (see Table 2). Table 2 also reflects the 204 colleges that had bargained at the time of the study. A total of 204 letters were mailed; however, two letters were returned for incorrect addresses. There were a total of 146 responses from this sample group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATES WITH COLLEGES WHERE FACULTIES HAVE ELECTED EXCLUSIVE BARGAINING AGENTS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE BARGAINING AGENTS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES SENT TO BARGAINING COLLEGES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED</th>
<th>PERCENT RESPONSES %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (CUNY=19; SUNY=26)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon (bargained while study in progress)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Service Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 204 | 204 | 146 | 71.7% |
Non-bargaining college administrators often responded by courteous letter indicating that since their colleges had not unionized, a collective bargaining study was irrelevant to their institution. It is hoped that this tone of complaisance is directed toward the answering of the questionnaire associated with this study and not toward the concept that their institutions are immune from collective bargaining. In spite of the fact that these administrators believe this study to be irrelevant, many requested a copy of the results which may imply the degree of irrelevance is negotiable. A total of 220 college administrators requested a copy of the results of this study. There were 59 requests from Sample I; 52 requests from Sample II; and 109 requests from Sample III.

Probably the state representation that contributed most to the study was New York. The State Universities of New York (SUNY) and the City Universities of New York (CUNY) represent the largest educational system of higher education in the United States. Over 20 percent of the institutions that have chosen collective bargaining agents are represented by these two power systems. Therefore, it is significant to the validity, to the reliability, and to the completeness of this research that SUNY AND CUNY have adequate representation in the statistical analysis.

Collective bargaining in institutions of higher education is increasing every week. A map of the United
States is shown in Figure 1 and shows the current (June, 1974) status of collective bargaining.
Fig. 1. June, 1974, status of collective bargaining in the United States. States with numbers signify the number of colleges or universities that have elected exclusive bargaining agents within the state.
Mathematical Model and Design of Analysis

Realizing that numerous variables affect the salary of college administrators, the writer approached experts in mathematics and statistics to develop the mathematical model and method of analysis best designed to test the hypothesis.

While it was impossible to attach a numerical value to some of the abstract variables such as personality, intelligence, and decision-making abilities, it is possible to measure or classify such effects as administrative level, bargaining status, bargaining agent, type of control, type of school, sex of administrator, age of administrator, number of years of service at the institution, age of the institution, enrollment, level of education, and academic rank. (see Drawing 1).
DRAWING 1. VARIABLES EFFECTING COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR'S SALARIES
In order to compare the variables, a method of analysis employing simultaneous equations and the "F" test seemed logical since it was necessary to take a look at several effects at one time and also to determine the degrees of freedom associated with each effect and among effects. The mathematical model chosen, then, employs least-squares statistical analysis to establish a mean for the many unequal subclasses and interactive effects.

The mathematical models employed are as follows:

Salary = $M + \text{Level} + \text{Bargaining} + \text{Type} + \text{Control} + \text{Sex} + b_1 (\text{year opened}) + b_2 (\text{enrollment}) + b_3 (\text{enrollment increase}) + b_4 (\text{enrollment percent})$


President's Ratio = $M + \text{Level} + \text{Bargaining} + \text{Type} + \text{Control} + \text{Sex} + b_1 (\text{year opened}) + b_2 (\text{enrollment}) + b_3 (\text{enrollment increase}) + b_4 (\text{enrollment percent})$

Salary = $M + \text{Level} + \text{Bargaining} + \text{Type} + \text{Control} + \text{Sex} + b_1 (\text{year opened}) + b_2 (\text{enrollment})$

(For 1969 analysis)
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Introduction

The first analysis begins with both faculty and administrative salary comparisons. In all remaining analyses, faculty salaries are dropped and data centers on administrators' salaries. Variables were added one at a time in order to determine the weight of each variable in influencing salaries. Interactions were calculated between and among significant variables.

Fringe benefit items were analyzed on the basis of number with no consideration given to monetary value of individual items.

State comparisons and the presentation of faculty agreements end this chapter.

Salary Comparison of Bargaining Agent to No Bargaining Agent

When comparing mean salaries of institutions that have collective bargaining with institutions that do not have collective bargaining, mean salaries for both faculty and administration were higher (27 out of 29 comparisons) in the bargaining institutions. Table 3 shows the 4,170 observations used for establishing least squares mean.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$15,828</td>
<td>$16,122</td>
<td>$17,468</td>
<td>$18,789</td>
<td>$19,379</td>
<td>2,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAUP</td>
<td>16,476</td>
<td>17,545</td>
<td>20,324</td>
<td>21,785</td>
<td>23,794</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>19,075</td>
<td>18,467</td>
<td>21,064</td>
<td>22,396</td>
<td>23,236</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>17,634</td>
<td>17,344</td>
<td>18,895</td>
<td>20,233</td>
<td>20,985</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>14,505</td>
<td>18,507</td>
<td>21,497</td>
<td>23,668</td>
<td>24,666</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>17,242</td>
<td>17,257</td>
<td>19,174</td>
<td>19,564</td>
<td>20,560</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>19,955</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18,161</td>
<td>20,936</td>
<td>18,685</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the years 1969-1973, the mean salary for non-bargaining colleges ranged from $15,828 in 1969 to $19,279 in 1973. AAUP-represented colleges had mean salaries ranging from $16,476 in 1969 to $23,794 in 1973. Schools that had elected AFT had mean salaries of $19,075 in 1969 and $23,236 in 1973. NEA with 563 observations had a mean salary of $17,634 in 1969, and $20,985 in 1973. Those schools where faculties have chosen dual representation (which is NEA-AFT and basically chosen by New York schools) averaged the overall low in 1969 with $14,505 but interestingly averaged the overall high mean in 1973 reflecting an average mean of $24,666.

The schools where faculties have chosen an independent bargaining agent had a mean salary in 1969 of $17,242 compared to $20,560 in 1973.

The "Local" exclusive bargaining agents (as identified by 37 observations) had a mean salary in 1969 of $19,955 and $18,685 in 1973. This local representation is thought to be a local chapter of NEA, AAUP, or AFT, but since specific slots were marked for these three agents and the respondent chose to add "Local" as a special category on the questionnaire, the writer established a "Local" classification for purposes of analysis. This data is shown graphically in Figure 2.
Fig. 2. Least-Squares Mean Salary for Faculty and Administrators Combined. Faculty salaries reflect fringe benefits. Administrative salaries reflect only contract salaries.
Comparison of Salaries of Job Level

In order to analyze the effects of faculty collective bargaining on administrators' salaries and fringe benefits, it seemed necessary to establish effects of collective bargaining on salaries of faculty from the same institution as represented by administration. This comparison was necessary to achieve ranges of salary increases as an absolute, as a percentage, and as a ratio. The four top administrative positions in Table 4 reflect only contract salary while the faculty salaries include fringe benefits.
### TABLE 4

LEAST-SQUARES MEAN OF SALARIES RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR FACULTY LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>$25,442</td>
<td>$26,509</td>
<td>$27,704*</td>
<td>$29,731</td>
<td>$30,640</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Administrative Officer</td>
<td>20,160</td>
<td>21,125</td>
<td>22,050</td>
<td>24,058</td>
<td>24,783</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Administrative Officer</td>
<td>18,708</td>
<td>19,697</td>
<td>20,440</td>
<td>22,550</td>
<td>22,965</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Administrative Officer</td>
<td>17,730</td>
<td>18,441</td>
<td>19,354</td>
<td>21,242</td>
<td>21,799</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>16,078</td>
<td>18,145</td>
<td>21,005</td>
<td>22,526</td>
<td>22,948</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>12,040</td>
<td>14,437</td>
<td>17,387</td>
<td>18,553</td>
<td>19,034</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>14,107</td>
<td>12,017</td>
<td>14,846</td>
<td>15,695</td>
<td>16,101</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>13,695</td>
<td>9,953</td>
<td>13,309</td>
<td>14,069</td>
<td>14,650</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As a point of comparison, in the CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (June 5, 1972), information from the survey of College and University Personnel Association revealed that Presidents' salaries at 900 institutions averaged $28,891.
It should be remembered, too, that the four top administrators are employed the entire calendar year while faculty salaries reflect academic year earnings. As might be expected the salary level increased from year to year and established a normal regression line 30 times out of 32. The two exceptions were in the year 1970. The level of Assistant Professor showed a decrease of $2,090 from 1969 to 1970 and an increase of $2,829 in 1971; and the level of instructor showed a decrease of $3,742 in 1970 and an increase of $3,356 in 1971. This illogical finding may be due to the low number of observations or an error in reporting.

A significant outcome of this data was the fact that for all administrative levels, the year 1972 provided the greatest salary increase; and for all faculty levels, the year 1971 provided the greatest salary increase. The mean increase for administrators was $2,008 in 1972, and for the faculty, the mean increase was $2,999 in 1971. However, consideration must be given to the decrease from 1969 to 1970 as explained previously regarding the levels of Assistant Professor and Instructor which may or may not have influenced incorrectly the mean increase.

The faculty salaries were obtained from American Association of University Professors annual salary surveys. The data are shown graphically in Figure 3 for faculty and in Figure 4 for administrators.
Fig. 3. Least-Squares Mean by year for professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor. Standard deviation in parentheses.
Fig. 4. Least-Squares Mean Salaries of the Top Four Administrators (Contract Salaries)
Chief Administrator's Salary

The chief administrator is most commonly known as President; however, some institutions titled its chief executive as Chancellor, Superintendent, Rector, or Director.

The chief administrator's salary (less fringe benefits) is shown graphically in Figure 5 and reflects the least squares mean for the five-year period. Standard error is shown for each year and total observations for the five-year period numbered 691. The mean salary for administrators was $25,442 in 1969; $26,509 in 1970; $27,704 in 1971; $29,731 in 1972; and $30,640 in 1973.

2nd Administrative Officer's Salary

The 2nd administrative officer was reported with various titles including President, Vice President, Vice Chancellor, Assistant Director, Assistant Superintendent, Associate Director, Vice-Rector, and Dean. The mean salary for this office was $5,282 less than the chief administrator in 1969 and $5,857 less in 1973. The least squares mean is shown in Figure 6 and reflects 869 observations and standard deviations.

3rd Administrative Officer's Salary

Third administrative level officers represented various offices known as Vice Chancellor, Dean, Vice President,
Director, Business Manager, and in a few instances, Registrar. There were 811 observations and this office realized the largest increase (2,110) expressed as a mean in the year 1972. Figures are plotted graphically in Figure 7.

**4th Administrative Officer's Salary**

This administrative level represented the fewest number of observations, 657, of the four top officers. This office was called Vice President by some of the larger institutions; Business Officer, Dean, Registrar by other institutions; and several schools indicated they had no fourth administrative officer. The salary mean was $17,730 in 1969 and was $21,799 in 1973. The five-year averages and standard error for each year are shown in Figure 8.
LEAST-SQUARES MEAN SALARIES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FROM 1969 - 1973
Salaries for Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and Instructor

The salaries for the levels of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor were obtained from AAUP surveys and, unlike the administrator's salaries reported in this study, contain fringe benefits. These fringe benefits range from 9.8 to 10.9 percent of total compensation. These faculty data are for an academic year which represents 9-10 month contracts. The least squares mean of all faculty salaries were shown graphically in Figure 3 on page 44.

Type of School and Type of Control

Figure 9 plots least-squares mean salary for two-year, four-year, and university-type institutions.

The two-year college is a type of post-secondary institution which offers only two years of education. This education may be job-oriented in design and/or may offer a two-year transfer program. These colleges may be called technical institutes, community or junior colleges, or may have a name such as Johnson College. There are 1,004 two-year schools in the United States.

Four-year colleges grant the baccalaureate degree and, for the purpose of this study, may offer the masters, plus, but do not offer a doctoral degree. There are 1,384 of these institutions in the United States and include the
first-professional degree type colleges.

Universities represent the doctoral granting institutions of higher education and number 334 in the United States.

Figure 9 shows the type-of-school effect on least squares mean of salaries for the years 1969-1973, and also the standard error.

The two-year colleges have realized the greatest mean increase in the five-year period. The mean salary of this type school had an increase of $5,177 in the five-year period. Four-year colleges had a mean salary increase of $4,858 for the five-year period, and universities reflected a $4,685 increase over the five years.

Public schools realized larger salaries than private schools; however, private schools reflected a $5,409 mean increase over the five-year period compared to a $3,329 mean increase for public schools.

Significant to the private schools is the fact that probably 6 to 8 salaries were included in this study which represented sisters, priests, or brothers who received salaries in the area of $2,000 - $3,000. This undoubtedly has made the mean lower for the private school. Those parochial faculties who indicated contributed services were not analyzed with the other faculties. Several parochial faculties received regular salaries. Seminaries were not excluded from the study since a Seminary in Iowa
has chosen an exclusive bargaining agent. Figure 10 represents the least squares mean for the public and the private institutions of higher education.
FIG. 10. Least-Squares Mean Salary based on type of college/university control (public or private). Standard Deviation shown in parentheses.
Sex as an Effect on Salary

Few women held the top four positions in this study. Of the 4,649 observations 131 were identified as female. A number of additional females were represented but were associated with a women's private or parochial college. As stated before, many of the services in parochial schools are contributed. In these cases, the contributed service persons were excluded from analysis. This left 131 women to be included in analysis for the five-year period. Therefore, the standard deviation for females is much greater than for males as shown in Figure 11.

FIG II. Least-Squares Mean Salaries based on sex of the four top administrators. Standard deviation in parentheses.
**Presidents' Ratio**

Figures 12 and 13 show the presidents' mean salary expressed in a circle graph as a percentage ratio compared to the other top administrators' mean salary and also compared to the Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructors' salaries.

Two important factors must be realized, however, upon interpretation of the data: (1) administrators' salaries reflect twelve months. Faculty salaries reflect an average of 9 1/2 months. (2) The salaries of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor reflect total compensation which includes fringe benefits such as insurance, retirement, employment compensation, and various other fringe benefits available at various institutions.
Main Effects and Least Squares Mean of Administrators' Salaries

Table 5 and Figures 14 and 15 show the least-squares mean of administrators' salaries for the years 1969 through 1973, combined. The mathematical model for this analysis was

\[ Y = \text{year} + \text{sample} + \text{control} + \text{type} + \text{administrators' level} + \text{rank} + \text{education level} + \text{sex} + (\text{interactions of year by sample, year by administrative level, and sample by administrative level}) \]

The alternative hypothesis is supported in Table 5 and in Figure 14 and shows that ADMINISTRATORS WHO ARE EMPLOYED AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION WHERE FACULTIES HAVE ELECTED A BARGAINING AGENT DO MAKE HIGHER SALARIES THAN ADMINISTRATORS WHO ARE EMPLOYED AT INSTITUTIONS WHERE FACULTIES HAVE NOT BARGAINED.
TABLE 5
LEAST-SQUARES MEAN SALARIES OF COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS BY SAMPLE INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Population*</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean salary by administrative level</th>
<th>μ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$25,528</td>
<td>$19,794</td>
<td>$18,761</td>
<td>$17,310</td>
<td>$20,348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$23,839</td>
<td>$18,747</td>
<td>$17,850</td>
<td>$17,141</td>
<td>$19,394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$26,938</td>
<td>$21,330</td>
<td>$20,800</td>
<td>$19,695</td>
<td>$22,191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$25,435  $19,957  $19,137  $18,049  $20,645

*Sample I = institutions located in states where other faculties of institutions of higher education have chosen bargaining agents

Sample II = institutions located in states where NO faculties of institutions of higher education have elected an exclusive bargaining agent

Sample III = institutions where faculties have elected exclusive bargaining agents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>Number of observations by year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample I</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample II</td>
<td>1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample III</td>
<td>1,289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIG. 14. LEAST-SQUARES MEAN SALARIES FOR ADMINISTRATORS BY SAMPLE POPULATION

SAMPLE I
Schools located in states where other institutions have elected bargaining agents.

SAMPLE II
Schools located in states where no schools have bargaining agents.

SAMPLE III
All schools represented in this sample have elected bargaining agents.

Standard Deviation in parentheses.
The mean salaries of administrators were $2,797 higher in institutions where faculties had elected bargaining agents when compared to institutions located in states where no faculties of higher education had chosen bargaining agents; and the mean salaries of administrators were $1,843 higher in institutions where faculties had elected bargaining agents when compared to institutions located in states where other faculties of higher education located within the same state had chosen bargaining agents.

The mean salaries of administrators were $954 higher in institutions located in states where faculties of other institutions' had elected bargaining agents when compared to states where NO faculties in higher education had elected exclusive bargaining agents.

It should not be ignored that there remains the possibility that states which had higher salaries might have had higher salaries simply because of the geographic location, and not because the faculties had unionized. For example, average salaries of working persons in New York, Pennsylvania, and Michigan are considerably higher than the average salaries of working persons in Alabama, Georgia, or Arizona. The states, however, which have higher salaries also appear to have a much more unionized labor sector and logically have more institutions of higher education which have also unionized, thereby increasing the overall wage in these states.
The least-squares analysis of variance showed the F test measured each effect to be somewhat less than the highly significant .001 level, thus $P < .001$.

Figure 15 reflects the least-squares mean of the four top administrators. Administrative Level 1 is the chief executive of the institution. This graph shows that the top administrative officer has a yearly mean salary of $7,386 more than the 4th administrative officer.
Figure 16 shows the least-squares mean of administrative salaries with type of school as a main effect. The university-type institution had a mean salary for administrators of nearly $10,000 more yearly than the mean salary for administrators of two-year institutions.
Figure 17 shows that administrators of public institutions make an average mean salary of $22,169 while the administrators of private institutions earn a mean salary of $19,121. The main effects of year, sample, type of control, level of the administrator, level of education, sex, and the interactions of year by sample, sample by level, and year by level of administrator were all considered in the analysis.

Fig. 17. Least-Squares Mean of Administrative Salaries with type of control as main effect.
Effect of Year Bargaining Agent Elected and Year Bargaining Agreement Adopted on Administrators' Salaries

Since this study covers a five-year period, it seemed important to attempt to tune in to the exact time the bargaining agent was elected versus the time the bargaining agreement was adopted to see the effect of these two equally important times upon administrators' salaries. Unfortunately, the thought that perhaps the time of election was as important or perhaps more important than the agreement adoption date in raising the salaries of administrators did not present itself until the questionnaires had been designed and mailed.

In an effort to find the date of bargaining election results, the Negotiations and Research Division of the National Education Association in Washington D.C. was telephoned. NEA did not have the "slightest" idea when their 90 institutions had chosen them as exclusive bargaining agent and did not believe the date of election was nearly as crucial to salary as was the date of the agreement.

The American Association of University Professors in Washington, D.C., however, had the information at their fingertips for their 25 institutions.

The American Federation of Teachers quickly supplied election dates for their four-year institutions but could
supply less than half the dates for the two-year colleges.

The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education at Baruch College in New York indicated the information was available but it would take several weeks to disseminate.

Next came the perusing of every CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION published since January 1969.

After putting all the sources together, election dates were available for 74 campuses -- 59 of which had supplied administrative salary information necessary to run an analysis.

The result indicated that the year of election of a bargaining agent had significantly greater effect on administrators' salaries than did the year of agreement adoption.

From the 59 selected samples, the amount of increase averaged $2,720 for the academic year immediately following election.

As a matter of comparison, 117 observations were made following the year of agreement adoption and the increase averaged $1,941.

The mean increase when figuring administrators' and faculties' salaries together was $1,166.50 for the five-year period. When analysis was made on administrators' salaries (contract salaries for the years 1969 - 1973),
the mean increase was found to be $1,404.50. Table 6 lists the five-years' mean for both group comparisons.

**TABLE 6**

**LEAST-SQUARES MEAN OF SALARY INCREASE 1969 - 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator and Faculty</th>
<th>Mean Year</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$17,245</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>$1,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17,541</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19,512</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>$2,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,053</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>$1,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,615</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>$562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean increase of $1,166.50 for the five-year period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Mean Year</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$17,750</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>$451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19,429</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>$1,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,485</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>$1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22,191</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>$1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$23,368</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>$1,177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean increase of $1,404.50 for the five-year period
Main Effects and Least-Squares Mean of Administrators' Salaries with Year Founded and Enrollment Regression and Various Interactions Including Control/Type Interaction

The most significant and complete analysis of salary data included in this study is this final salary analysis. For this data, the mathematical model used was

\[ Y = \text{Year} + \text{Sample} + \text{Control} + \text{Type} + \text{Administrators'} Level + \text{Rank} + \text{Education} + \text{Sex} + (\text{Interactions of year x sample, year x administrative level, sample x level, and control x type}). \]

Linear regression for the year the institution was founded established a least-squares mean for the year 1922; however, standard deviation was 26 years. Linear regression for enrollment established a least-squares mean of 7,597 students; however, standard deviation was high at 20,596 students. This deviation is high because of the diversity of enrollment figures reported by the City University of New York; the 135,365 enrollment figures reported by the University of Wisconsin system; and a 62 enrollment figure and a 109 enrollment figure, both of which were reported by private, Wisconsin institutions.

For this analysis, the following observations in the various subclasses were used and are listed:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Subclass)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1969</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1970</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1971</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1972</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1973</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample I (Schools in states where other faculties of higher education have elected bargaining agents)</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample II (Schools in states where no institutions of higher education have elected bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample III (all schools in this sample have elected exclusive bargaining agents - represents same states as Sample I)</td>
<td>1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control I (Public-supported schools)</td>
<td>2502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 2 (Privately-supported schools)</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 (Two-year institutions)</td>
<td>1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4 (Four-year institutions)</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 6 (University - awards doctoral degrees)</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (Chief Administrator)</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (Second administrative officer)</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (Third administrative officer)</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 (Fourth administrative officer)</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 0 (Administrators with no academic rank)</td>
<td>2089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 1 (Administrators ranked as instructor)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 2 (Administrators ranked as Assistant Professor)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification (Cont.)</td>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 3 (Administrators ranked as Associate Professor)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 4 (Administrators ranked as Full Professor)</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 0 (Education level other than B.S., B.A., M.A., M.S., J.D., Ph.D.)</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 1 (Specialist)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 2 (Baccalaureate Degree)</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 3 (Masters Degree)</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 4 (Doctors Degree)</td>
<td>1627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex 1 (Male)</td>
<td>3121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex 2 (Female)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample I (1969 x institutions located in states where other faculties of higher education have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample II (1969 x institutions in states where no faculties of higher education have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample III (1969 x institutions where faculties have chosen exclusive bargaining agents)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample I (1970 x institutions located in states where other faculties of higher education institutions have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample II (1970 x institutions in states where no faculties of higher education have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification (Cont.)</td>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample III (1970 x institutions where faculties have chosen exclusive bargaining agents)</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample I (1971 x institutions located in states where other faculties of higher education institutions have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample II (1971 x institutions located in states where no faculties of higher education have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample III (1971 x institutions where faculties have chosen exclusive bargaining agents)</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample I (1972 x institutions located in states where other faculties of higher education institutions have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample II (1972 x institutions in states where NO faculties of higher education have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample III (1972 x institutions where faculties have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample I (1973 x institutions located in states where other faculties of higher education institutions have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample II (1973 x institutions located in states where no faculties of higher education have chosen bargaining agents)</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Sample III (1973 x institutions where faculties have chosen exclusive bargaining agents)</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification (Cont.)</td>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 1 (1969 x chief administrator)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 2 (1969 x 2nd administrator)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 3 (1969 x 3rd administrator)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 4 (1969 x 4th administrator)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 1 (1970 x chief administrator)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 2 (1970 x 2nd administrator)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 3 (1970 x 3rd administrator)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 4 (1970 x 4th administrator)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 1 (1971 x chief administrator)</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 2 (1971 x 2nd administrator)</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 3 (1971 x 3rd administrator)</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 4 (1971 x 4th administrator)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 1 (1972 x chief administrator)</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 2 (1972 x 2nd administrator)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 3 (1972 x 3rd administrator)</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 4 (1972 x 4th administrator)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification (Cont.)</td>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 1 (1973 x chief administrator)</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 2 (1973 x 2nd administrator)</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 3 (1973 x 3rd administrator)</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year x Administrative Level 4 (1973 x 4th administrator)</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample I x Administrative Level 1</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample I x Administrative Level 2</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample I x Administrative Level 3</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample I x Administrative Level 4</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample II x Administrative Level 1</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample II x Administrative Level 2</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample II x Administrative Level 3</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample II x Administrative Level 4</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample III x Administrative Level 1</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample III x Administrative Level 2</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample III x Administrative Level 3</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample III x Administrative Level 4</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Public) x Type of school (2-year)</td>
<td>1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Public) x Type of school (4-year)</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Public) x Type of school (University)</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Private) x Type of school (2-year)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Private) x Type of school (4-year)</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (Private) x Type of school (University)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistical data of this section represents the previous observations as subclasses intermingled, analyzed, and evaluated as statistically significant as main effects on administrators' salaries by the least-squares method of computer analysis.

The least-squares analysis of variance showed type of control, type of school, administrative level, sample classification (whether or not the faculty had bargained) and educational level to be at the $P < .001$ highly significant level.

The $F$ test for interaction of type of control and type of school was significant at the $P < .020$ level.

The alternative hypothesis is supported in Figure 18 which reflects that all four levels of administrators who were employed at institutions where faculties had chosen exclusive bargaining agents made higher mean salaries than administrators who were employed at institutions in which faculties had not bargained. Chief Administrators' salaries were found to be $1,278$ higher per year in institutions that have bargained compared to institutions where faculties had not bargained but were located in the same state. These same administrators had a mean salary of $2,933$ higher per year when compared to administrators' salaries located in states where no faculties of higher education had elected exclusive bargaining agents.
SAMPLE I
NONE OF THE INSTITUTIONS IN THIS SAMPLE HAVE BARGAINED, HOWEVER, THEY ARE LOCATED IN STATES WHERE OTHER INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION HAVE ELECTED BARGAINING AGENTS.

SAMPLE II
NONE IN THIS SAMPLE OR STATES REPRESENTED HAVE BARGAINED.

SAMPLE III
ALL INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED IN THIS SAMPLE HAVE ELECTED EXCLUSIVE BARGAINING AGENTS.

FIG. 18. LEAST-SQUARES MEAN OF ADMINISTRATORS' SALARIES WITH INTERACTION EFFECTS BETWEEN SAMPLE INSTITUTIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL.
As shown in Table 7, administrators whose institutions were located in states where no faculties in institutions of higher education had chosen bargaining agents (Sample II) made lower mean salaries than did administrators in the other two samples (I and III). It would appear likely, then, that when faculties of higher education begin electing bargaining agents, the salaries are not only increased at the bargaining institution but the effect is to increase mean salaries of college administrators throughout the state.

TABLE 7
LEAST-SQUARES ANALYSIS OF ADMINISTRATORS' SALARIES BY SAMPLE POPULATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL REFLECTING TOTAL MAIN EFFECTS AND INTERACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Level</th>
<th>SAMPLE I</th>
<th>SAMPLE II</th>
<th>SAMPLE III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,314</td>
<td>$23,659</td>
<td>$26,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,278 higher than Sample I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,933 higher than Sample II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$19,594</td>
<td>$18,600</td>
<td>$20,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,389 higher than Sample I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,383 higher than Sample II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$18,539</td>
<td>$17,683</td>
<td>$20,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,877 higher than Sample I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,733 higher than Sample II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$17,134</td>
<td>$16,938</td>
<td>$19,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,120 higher than Sample I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,316 higher than Sample II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interaction of the effect of bargaining institutions versus the nonbargaining institutions also reflected a higher mean salary for administrators in bargaining institutions when analyzed on a year-to-year basis.

Figure 19 plots the curves for the five-year period with standard deviation. The year 1973 shows a much greater difference in salaries than does the year 1969. This could be because the number of institutions where faculties had bargained was smaller in 1969 (132 as compared to 212 in 1973).

If the alternative hypothesis is accepted and if the assumption that collective bargaining in higher education will continue to increase is accepted, it seems probable that the differences between the sample administrators' salaries will depict an even wider spread in future years.

Table 8 shows the importance of comparing like institutions when analyzing salaries. The administrators' least-squares mean salary for the two-year, public institution was $18,784 compared to the public university (awards doctorate) administrators' mean salary of $26,590.
Fig. 19. Least-Squares Mean of administrators' salaries showing interaction of sample institutions with year for the five-year period 1969 - 1973. Standard deviation shown in parentheses.
Table 8.
Least-Squares Mean of Administrators' Salaries
with Analysis of Interaction of Type of
Control and Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>2-year</th>
<th>4-year</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>18,784</td>
<td>20,320</td>
<td>26,590</td>
<td>21,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>15,121</td>
<td>18,290</td>
<td>23,249</td>
<td>18,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16,952</td>
<td>19,305</td>
<td>24,920</td>
<td>20,392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The private schools reflect similar differences. The private, two-year college administrators' mean salary was $15,121, compared to $23,249 for the private university administrator. The public administrators' mean salaries were higher by $3,663 in the two-year colleges; by $2,030 in the four-year colleges; and by $3,341 in the university-type institutions.

Standard deviation was highest at $613 for the private university and lowest at $413 for the public, two-year college. This reflects the 2,502 observations for the public institutions as compared to 750 observations for the private institutions. There were more two-year college
observations, (1,690) than there were four-year and university observations combined (1,562).
Fringe Benefits

The fringe benefit section of the questionnaire provided an unexpected finding: Fewer persons responded to this part of the questionnaire than to the salary part. While over 57 percent of the respondents gave information concerning salary, only 46 percent gave information associated with fringe benefits. Perhaps they believed as the writer that this area is much more abstract and more subjective to the interpretation of the writer.

A total of 335 institutions responded to the "Fringe Benefit" section. No monetary value was attached to any of the fringe benefit items. The percentage of increases, decreases, and no-change responses to the eighteen items listed as fringe benefits were rather close in percentage comparisons. The number of fringe benefits increased 16, 18, and 20 percent for the Sample I, II, and III institutions respectively for the five-year period. All three groups indicated decreases to be very close to one percent and the response "NO CHANGE" to the individual items totaled 57, 61, and 61 percent respectively (see Figure 20).
Findings indicate, then, that administrators of faculties who have elected bargaining agents had a slightly higher percentage of increase (about 1.4 percent more than Sample II institutions and 3.9 percent more than Sample I institutions). It is the opinion of the writer that this percentage is not significant enough to support the alternative hypothesis; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted relative to fringe benefit items. Administrators whose schools were located in states where there is no bargaining had a .9 percent decrease in fringe benefits, while administrators whose had elected bargaining agents realized a 1.0 percent decrease; and Sample I school administrators had a 1.1 percent decrease in fringe benefit items from 1969 through 1973. Since the classification "No change" could be debated as a positive or as a negative response depending on particular viewpoints, the writer maintained a status quo position and simply reported the percentage findings of individual items that were tallied as "No change." Sample I reported 57.7 percent "No changes." Sample II reported 61 percent "No changes," and Sample III reported 61 percent "No changes." (See Figure 20)
Fig. 20. Percentage of change in fringe benefits.
One hundred eighteen institutions responded from Sample I which were schools in states where faculties of other institutions of higher education located in the same state had chosen bargaining agents. For the Sample I group, there were a total of 2,124 responses (118 institutions multiplied by the 18 fringe benefit items). A total of 350, or 16.4 percent indicated increases; 24, or 1.1 percent indicated decreases; and 1,227 or 57 percent, indicated no change to specific items listed.

The second group in this study, Sample II, had the fewest number of responses (89) as was true for Part I of the questionnaire. There were a total of 1,602 responses (89 institutions multiplied by the 18 fringe benefit items). A total of 303, or 18.9 percent, indicated increases; 15, or .9 percent, indicated decreases; and 990, or 61 percent, indicated no change to specific items listed. Colleges listed in Sample II had not bargained and were located in states where no other institutions of higher education had elected bargaining.

Sample III represents the institutions whose faculty had elected exclusive bargaining agents. This group had the highest response rate with 128 responses which makes 2,304 responses to the fringe benefit section (128 institutions multiplied by the 18 fringe benefit items). A total of 469, or 20.3 percent, indicated increases; 25, or
1.0 percent, indicated decreases; and 1,426, or 61 percent, indicated no change to specific items listed. Table 9 reflects the changes as reported by the three sample groups for the five-year period.
### TABLE 9

**CHANGES IN FRINGE BENEFIT ITEMS 1969 - 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit Item</th>
<th>SAMPLE I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SAMPLE II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SAMPLE III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Leave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension/Retirement</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Life Ins</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Income</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Annuity</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Expense Ins</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Quarters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expense</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Duty Leave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bereavement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Study</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursed Tuition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Tuition</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE I</td>
<td>2,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE II</td>
<td>1,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE III</td>
<td>2,304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fringe benefit that had more responses designating increase than any other was medical expense insurance. Over 47 percent of the total responses indicated increase in this area. Table 10 shows the total number of respondents for each item.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit Description</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Leave</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension/Retirement</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Life Insurance</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Income</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Annuity</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Expense Insurance</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Quarters</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Duty Leave</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bereavement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Study</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursed Tuition</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Tuition</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2,759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fringe benefit that had the most respondents indicating decrease was provision for automobile; however, only seven, or 2 percent, indicated such a decrease.

Frequency orders are listed in Table 11.

**TABLE 11**

**FREQUENCY ORDER OF FRINGE BENEFITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Expense Ins.</th>
<th>159</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Life Insurance</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Income</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Annuity</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Tuition</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursed Tuition</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Study</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bereavement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Quarters</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Duty Leave</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dental, Eye, Personal, Meals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Leave</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Comparisons

It must be understood that when comparing institutions for analysis of effects of collective bargaining on administrators' salaries, like institutions must be compared. For example, the act of comparing Yale University to Rainy River Community College (enrollment 272) in terms of administrators' salaries would be absurd and would certainly result in unreliable data.

Table 12 shows the simple averages for twenty states. This is an average of the salaries of the questionnaires returned and does not intend to be an accurate overall average for the state. Six of the states listed have no institutions of higher education with exclusive bargaining agents. The remaining fourteen states have elected exclusive bargaining agents. No main effects have been taken into consideration in the preparation of these averages; therefore, the statistics involved lack formal analysis. This data is presented as a comparison.
Table 12

Simple Averages of Selected States
Over the Five-Year Period*
(No consideration for type of school, size, control,
or bargaining)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ADMIN. LEVEL</th>
<th>AVERAGE BY ADMIN. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no bargaining agents)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bargaining agents)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bargaining agents)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no bargaining agents)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bargaining agents)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bargaining agents)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bargaining agents)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bargaining agents)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE (Cont.)</td>
<td>ADMIN. LEVEL</td>
<td>AVERAGE BY ADMIN. LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota (bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey (bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina (no bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon (bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania (bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina (no bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee (no bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE (Cont.)</td>
<td>ADMIN. LEVEL</td>
<td>AVERAGE BY ADMIN. LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas (no bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$32,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin (bargaining agents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: These states were selected for representation on the basis that enough institutions had responded to make it impossible to identify any institution within the states. A minimum of six schools is represented in the above figures -- a maximum of 65.
At the onset of this study, little consideration was given to the possibility of collective bargaining on the part of administrators. While the top executive positions of college administration have not apparently bargained, it is a fact that other administrative officers have become part of a bargaining unit at some institutions. These officers include Registrar, Director of Placement, Director of Financial Aids, Director of Accounting, and other administrative support positions.

Two agreements were returned representing the professional personnel and included those titles previously listed. For the most part, these two agreements were similar in content to those of faculty agreements; however, they might appear to be more harsh. For example, study, health, military service are termed leaves of absence without pay. One contract states, "All leaves of absences shall be without pay."

The persons under these administrative contracts are employed on a twelve-month duty basis with 20 or 22 days of vacation with pay. Each administrator was designated as having 22 days of sick leave per year. No-strike pledges were present in both agreements. Salary schedules were presented in ranges and varied from a low
of $13,983 to a high of $28,640.

Faculty Contracts

Over one-third of the faculty contracts in force were reviewed in order to present the content and references to fringe benefits and salaries in collective bargaining agreements.

Fringe Benefits

The following fringe benefits were referred to in various faculty contracts. Variations to each fringe benefit is noted under the listing.

1. Blue Cross
   - available to full-time faculty
   - paid in full by the college for full-time faculty member
   - paid one half by faculty member and one half by the college

2. Blue Shield
   - available to full-time faculty
   - paid in full by the college for full-time faculty members
   - 60 percent of cost to be paid by the college

3. Hospitalization
   - to be paid in full by the college
   - no hospitalization to be supplied to instructors whose spouses can or do cover them through a comparable policy obtained in other employment
   - not available to part-time faculty

4. Major Medical
   - up to $50,000 for one accident or each sickness
   - to be paid by the college for full-time faculty members
   - available to retired members
Fringe Benefits (Cont.)

5. Life Insurance
   - to be paid in full by college
   - $20,000 double indemnity
   - $50,000 double indemnity
   - $50,000 double indemnity, half to be paid by faculty member

6. Disability Insurance
   - temporary insurance which begins when an illness or injury extends beyond the full-pay sick leave benefit. Employee to receive 60 percent of his normal pay up to a maximum of $150 for a maximum of 26 weeks.
   - total disability insurance - provides 60 percent of the employees basic salary up to age 65.
   - no reduction for the first 30 days; 85 percent of total salary for the second thirty (30) days; 75 percent for the third thirty (30) days. If an instructor becomes disabled for a period longer than 90 days, the plan will provide payment of 60 percent of the basic monthly earnings, subject to a maximum of $1,500 per month for as long as the employee remains disabled but not beyond age 65.

7. Social Security
   - the college matches the employees required contribution

8. Workmen's Compensation
   - the employer matches the contribution of the faculty member
   - the colleges pay the total cost

9. Professional Liability
   - the Board shall provide $200,000 professional liability insurance per teacher for services rendered during the course of employment

10. Vacation with pay
    - professional other than faculty shall have vacation at the rate of 20 working days per year
    - faculty shall be on vacation between sessions and two weeks at Christmas
Fringe Benefits (Cont.)

11. Professional Travel
   - $4,500 per academic year shall be set aside for travel by the faculty
   - $5,000 for travel for the academic year for instructors
   - mileage of 12¢ a mile
   - mileage of 15¢ a mile
   - all meals, hotel, tips, fees, shall be paid by the college while faculty member is on university business.

12. Funds for Graduate Study
   - the college shall budget $8,500 for the academic year for professional development
   - the college shall set aside $350 per year per faculty member. The fund is non-cumulating.

13. Discounts and Privileges
   - Bookstore - 10 percent discount
   - Free admission to all college-sponsored events
   - cash checks up to $25

14. Permanent identity card
   - college shall provide free an identity card with picture each year

15. Bereavement
   - 5 days for immediate death in family which includes husband, wife, father, mother, son, daughter,
   - 4 days for immediate family death for husband, wife, father, mother, son, daughter, member of immediate household, grandmother, grandfather.
   - 3 days for death of family member.

16. Illness
   - 10 days a year, cumulative up to 20 days.
   - 15 days a year, cumulative up to 90 days.
   - 20 days a year, cumulative up to 120 days.
   - 12 days per academic year.

17. Maternity Leave
   - granted without pay up to two years. Blue Cross will continue until after the birth of a child.
   - guaranteed position upon return after one year.
   - such leave shall be granted for a period not to exceed six months.
Fringe Benefits (Cont.)

17. a pregnant faculty member shall not be required to leave prior to the childbirth unless she can no longer satisfactorily perform the duties of her position.

18. Military Leave
   - regular pay, but military pay must be remitted to the college
   - must be taken as vacation time, pay to be remitted to the college
   - considered as a non-paid absence
   - upon presentation of duty papers, military orders, time with pay will be granted the faculty member for a maximum of two weeks

19. Sabbatical Leave
   - after six consecutive years of full-time service
   - limited to 5 percent of the faculty in one academic year
   - may be taken for a semester, or for the academic year
   - may be taken after three years of consecutive service
   - faculty member receives half pay; must return to college for two years or refund the salary received during the sabbatical
   - after eight years of seniority, the faculty member is eligible for sabbatical leave
   - after five years of service, a sabbatical leave may be taken for (a) advanced study, (b) educational travel, (c) research, (d) restoration of health
   - during such leave, an employee will receive his full salary if the leave is for one semester. He will receive one-half of his academic year salary if the leave is for two semesters.
   - ordinarily professional sabbatical leave will not be granted to employees who, upon return from professional leave, will have less than three years of service to the institution prior to retirement.

20. Professional Leave
   - will not be granted for the purpose of working for an advanced degree
   - the purpose shall be to improve the professional skills of an employee through study, research, and creative work.
Fringe Benefits (Cont.)

20. full pay for one quarter after four years of service
   - without pay

21. Deferred Annuities
   - college contributes 5 percent and faculty members contributes 5 percent

22. Personal Affairs
   - shall be granted for a reasonable time
   - unless the situation is an emergency, request should be made one week prior to time of expected leave
   - two days per year
   - five days per year
   - one day with pay per academic year

23. Campaign for political office
   - no pay; leave shall begin with the start of active campaigning and shall be terminated at the end of the semester following an unsuccessful election; leave for office holding may be extended no longer than two years following a successful election; instructors on continuing contract who resign to hold either an elective or an appointive office will be given reemployment preferences upon completion of their terms.

24. Religious Holidays
   - three days per year
   - two days per year

25. Parental Leave
   - without pay to rear a newborn child, or an adopted child under the age of six months, for a period not to exceed one year

26. Government Service
   - Leave shall be granted to serve in government service such as the Peace Corps, Vista

27. Leave for Care of Ill Members of the Immediate Family
   - leave of absence shall be granted without pay for a period of no more than one year
   - granted with pay for one month, without pay thereafter for a period not to exceed two years
Fringe Benefits (Cont.)

28. Tuition Remission
- For self, for spouse, or dependent children
- to faculty to the extent of their in-district tuition
- tuition will be reimbursed up to 15 semester credits per academic year
- tuition will be reimbursed for undergraduate courses only and to full-time faculty members

29. Travel Insurance
- up to $100,000 for death or dismemberment while on university business and provides 24-hour coverage while in travel status
- provides ten times the annual salary with minimum of $50,000 and a maximum of $200,000

30. Retirement
- all contracts shall be terminated at the end of the fiscal year in which the employee becomes 65 years of age; terminal leave benefits of $50 a year of service with the college will be paid to an instructor who retires at the end of the fiscal year in which he attains the age of 65 and has served a minimum of 10 years; any instructor who has 20 years of service and retires at age 60
- the college shall continue to pay the retirement contribution and provide the faculty member with the retirement option contained in State law
- the institute shall contribute 6 percent to the retirement plan for each faculty member; 7 percent after 6 years of service; 8 percent after 7 years of service; 9 percent after 8 years of service; and 10 percent after 9 years of service

31. Physical Examinations
- TB test annually
- each new instructor shall submit to a physical examination before official employment begins
- college shall provide each faculty member with $30 a year to be applied to physical examination

32. Free Parking
- college shall provide hard-surface lot and free parking within reasonable distance
Fringe Benefits (Cont.)

33. Leaves for Exchange Teaching
   - one year with full pay for exchange teaching

34. Cost-of-living Allowance
   - Cost-of-living index to be paid yearly plus index
     as shown in appendices
   - Cost-of-living allowance to be reviewed at quarter­
     terly intervals based upon Department of Labor
     Index, and any increase to be paid to faculty
     member

35. Dental Care
   - college shall provide for dental care for faculty
     member

36. Infirmary Facilities
   - any faculty member or a member of his family shall
     be entitled to the use of the infirmary without
     any charge.

37. Education of Children of Deceased Tenured Faculty
    Members
   - children have guaranteed full tuition waivers
   - children and spouse have guaranteed full tuition
     waivers

38. Education of Children of Retired, Tenured Faculty
    Members
   - children have guaranteed full tuition waivers

39. No-Strike Clause
   - most of the contracts contained a no-strike
     pledge with various wording; however, the
     implication is that a strike should be
     considered as a last resort.
Salary References

The majority of agreements had an appendices in the back which listed the salary schedule. A few contracts made reference to salary in the text of the agreement.

Following are a few samples:

Two-year college in Minnesota:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Bachelors Degree</th>
<th>Masters Degree or J.D.</th>
<th>Ph. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,050</td>
<td>10,050</td>
<td>10,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td>11,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,650</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>11,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>11,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,250</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,550</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>12,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>11,850</td>
<td>12,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,150</td>
<td>12,150</td>
<td>12,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,450</td>
<td>12,450</td>
<td>13,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>13,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,050</td>
<td>13,550</td>
<td>14,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any members of the bargaining unit over scale will receive 9 percent in 1973-74 and 8 percent in 74-75.

Four-year college in Massachusetts:

"Faculty shall receive a 12 percent increase for the 1970-71 year or $1,000 whichever is greater; a 9 percent increase for the 1971-72 year or $750 for instructor, $1,000 for Assistant Professor, or $1,100 for Associate Professor, whichever is greater.

Promotion in rank:

- From Associate to Full Professor $450
- From Assistant to Associate Professor 400
- From Instructor to Assistant Professor 350
Ohio college:

Professor $15,000 -
Associate Professor $12,000 - $18,000
Assistant Professor $10,000 - $15,000
Instructor $8,000 - $12,000

+ 2.75% increase in salaries + $500 flat across-the-board increase in salaries for 1973-74. For 1974-75, also a 2.75% increase in salaries plus a $500 flat across-the-board increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,701</td>
<td>11,631</td>
<td>12,096</td>
<td>12,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,398</td>
<td>12,443</td>
<td>13,027</td>
<td>13,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,096</td>
<td>13,259</td>
<td>13,957</td>
<td>14,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,794</td>
<td>14,074</td>
<td>14,888</td>
<td>15,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13,492</td>
<td>14,888</td>
<td>15,818</td>
<td>16,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14,190</td>
<td>15,702</td>
<td>16,749</td>
<td>17,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14,888</td>
<td>16,516</td>
<td>17,679</td>
<td>17,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15,586</td>
<td>17,330</td>
<td>18,610</td>
<td>19,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16,283</td>
<td>18,144</td>
<td>19,540</td>
<td>20,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16,981</td>
<td>18,959</td>
<td>20,471</td>
<td>21,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michigan two-year college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>9,605</td>
<td>11,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>10,285</td>
<td>11,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,775</td>
<td>10,965</td>
<td>11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>11,645</td>
<td>12,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,625</td>
<td>12,155</td>
<td>13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,880</td>
<td>12,665</td>
<td>14,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,135</td>
<td>13,175</td>
<td>14,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,390</td>
<td>13,685</td>
<td>15,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,645</td>
<td>14,195</td>
<td>16,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>14,705</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,215</td>
<td>17,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,360</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington two-year college (Cont.)

A = masters degree; or bachelor's degree plus three years relevant experience; or journeyman certificate plus six years in trade; or 10 years of practical experience; or five years of formal teaching in trade or occupation

B = All of "A" plus four years of relevant experience -- two of these four years must be teaching experience.

C = Earned doctorate and two years of teaching experience

New York

A. Effective September 1, all faculty in the bargaining unit on the payroll of the College will receive an increase of 10% of their base salary.

B. Effective September 1, next year, all faculty in the bargaining unit on the payroll of the College will receive an increase of 10% of their base salary of last year.

C. It is understood and agreed that when an individual is promoted from one rank to another his or her resulting salary must be within the minima and maxima of the rank to which he or she is promoted. It is further understood that when a promotion is made from one rank to another, the recipient shall receive a minimum of $500 salary increase in addition to the regular 10% which he would have received without promotion.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary problem of this study was to analyze what effect faculty collective bargaining had on the salaries of administrators. A secondary problem was to analyze what effect faculty collective bargaining had on the number of fringe benefit items for administrators.

Chapter I provided an introduction of the status of collective bargaining in higher education and outlined the limitations, the assumptions, the goals, the objectives, and the hypotheses underlying this research. The primary hypothesis stated that administrators receive higher salaries in institutions where faculties have chosen exclusive bargaining agents than administrators do who are employed at institutions where the faculties have not elected a bargaining agent.

Chapter II outlined what resources were available on the specific topic of this study. While no books or articles were available for a literature review, professional organizations and learned persons in the field of academic collective bargaining indicated interest and support of the study and provided necessary information and guidance.
Chapter III presented the method of data collection, the mathematical basis for analysis and the main effects to be considered.

A total of 718 survey questionnaires were mailed to three sample groups. Sample I represented institutions of higher education where faculties had not elected an exclusive bargaining agent but were located in states where other faculties in institutions of higher education had elected a bargaining agent. Sample II represented institutions of higher education where NO faculties of higher education in the state had elected exclusive bargaining agents. Sample III represented institutions of higher education in which ALL faculties had elected exclusive bargaining agents.

In order to keep the identity of the school confidential, the researcher's room number appeared printed by typesetting equipment on the return envelope. Room numbers were printed consecutively and were cross-matched for follow-up. A dime was taped to the Xeroxed follow-up request.

A total of 60.3 percent responded to the questions on salaries and fringe benefit items for the period 1969 through 1973. Response was over 70 percent from institutions which had faculties who had elected exclusive bargaining agents. A total of 220 administrators requested copies of the results and 86 dimes were returned.

Many variables affect the salaries of administrators. Those effects which were analyzed in the study included
type of institution (two-year, four-year, six-year);
type of control (public, private); administrative level;
educational level; age and sex of the administrator; and
the collective bargaining status of the faculty. Other
effects which were not analyzed but were recognized as
effecting administrators' salaries were geographic location,
personality, and intelligence of the administrator, and
external influences.

The least-squares procedures which provides for
unequal subclasses and minimizes the sum of the squared
residual errors was chosen as the method of analysis for
the data. The mathematical model underlying the analysis
was:

\[ Y = \text{year} + \text{sample} + \text{control} + \text{type} + \text{administrative}
\text{level} + \text{rank} + \text{education} + \text{sex} + (\text{interactions of}
\text{year} \times \text{sample} \times \text{year} \times \text{administrative level}, \text{sample}
\times \text{level}, \text{and control} \times \text{type}). \]

Chapter IV reflected the least-squares analysis of
the data. The first analysis included evaluation of sala­
ries for administration and salaries for faculty. The data
collected from questionnaires and the annual AAUP faculty
salary survey provided administrative and faculty compen­
sation structures for each institution represented in this
analysis. It was recognized that the AAUP faculty surveys
reflect total compensation (includes fringe benefits) while
the administrative data represented contract salaries only.
All other salary analyses in this chapter centered on the salaries of administrators.

Main effects and interactions were added one at a time in the analysis in order to determine which effects and/or interactions had a highly significant effect and which ones could be eliminated.

Fringe benefit item analysis was much less complicated to analyze since the respondents identified "increase," "decrease," or "no change" answers to the individual items listed on the questionnaire. Fringe benefits were not considered in terms of monetary analysis but were considered in terms of the number and kind of fringe benefits available to college administrators. The formal contracts of the various colleges provided an in-depth look at the variation among fringe benefits. These variations were presented in Chapter IV.

Chapter V has presented thus far, a brief summary of what had been done in order to achieve the objectives of the study. The remaining part of this chapter will be the presentation of the results outlining the achievement of the research goals and objectives, the status of the hypotheses, the conclusions of this research, and recommendations for consideration.
Findings

Findings are presented in the same order as primary goals and research objectives listed on pages 4 and 5. This is done to enable the reader to readily evaluate the achievement of the purposes of this study.

1. There were 212 institutions found to have faculties who had elected bargaining agents by January 1974. These institutions are located in 23 states and the District of Columbia. States that have faculties who have elected exclusive bargaining agents are Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Washington, Wisconsin. There is one United States Service School that has elected an exclusive bargaining agent.

2. The states of Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming have a total of 1,146 institutions of higher education. None of the faculties of these institutions had elected an exclusive bargaining agent by January 1974.

3. Variables such as type of school, type of control, level of administrator, bargaining status, and education level were found to have highly significant increasing effects
on administrators' salaries at the .001 level of chance probability.

The regression of year of founding of the institution and regression of enrollment size had a significant positive effect on administrators' salaries at the .02 level of significance.

4. College faculty and administrative salaries were found to have increased an average of $4,370 over the five-year period.

5. The level of teaching associate professor was found to have realized the greatest gain ($6,994) over the five-year period. The chief administrative level was found to have realized a mean increase of $5,198 over the five-year period.

6. The number of fringe benefit items were found to have increased approximately 20 percent in number over the five-year period, 1969 - 1973. The number of individual items that had decreased for the same period was a low one percent.

Health care was found to be the primary target for fringe benefit negotiation in the five-year period for faculty and for administration.

7. Some levels of administration were found to be represented by bargaining agents completely separate from the faculty. At least three institutions have formal agreements representing administration; however, the top executive positions such as president, vice-president, and director were excluded from the bargaining unit.
At least two of the faculty bargaining agreements were found to provide for administrative personnel representation in the bargaining unit, but a vote of the faculty was required before inclusion of the support administrative officers.

Some of the unusual items listed under the fringe benefit section of the contracts were campaign time for political office, physical examination reimbursement, quarterly cost-of-living allowance, free dental care, and free infirmary facility care.

8. Collective bargaining was found to be more prevalent in two-year, public institutions. Administrators' mean salaries were higher at public institutions than at private institutions.

Administrators' mean salaries were found to be highest at institutions awarding doctoral degrees (universities) and were found to be lowest at private, two-year colleges.

9. Characteristically the college administrator was found to be male, in his late forties, education level of Ph.D., with no academic rank.

Primary Findings

10. Mean salaries of administrators whose faculties had chosen bargaining agents were found to be higher than salaries of administrators whose faculties had no bargaining agent but whose institutions were located in states where
other higher education faculties had elected bargaining agents. Thus, Sample III administrators had the highest mean salaries of the three groups.

11. The mean salary increase was found to be lower for administrators of institutions located in states where NO faculties of higher education had elected exclusive bargaining agents. Mean salary increase was higher for administrators of institutions located in states where they or other institutions in the same state had elected a bargaining agent. Thus, Sample II institutions had lower salaries than did Sample I or Sample III institutions.

Other Findings

12. For the most part, institutions where faculties had elected exclusive bargaining agents were found to be relatively young institutions and had a mean age of forty years.

13. Administrators who were associated with institutions where faculties had elected a bargaining agent were found to be more willing to participate in collective bargaining research than were administrators from institutions whose faculties had not bargained.

14. Women were found to represent four percent of the top administration studied in this research. A substantial number of the four percent were women who gave contributed services.
Findings as Related to the Two Objectives

1. When comparing like institutions, institutions where faculties had elected a bargaining agent were found to have higher mean salaries for administration than did institutions where faculties had not elected an exclusive bargaining agent.

2. The number of fringe benefit items were found to have increased nearly 22 percent in the five-year period for all administrators. The number that had decreased in this period was just over one percent for all administrators. The responses of the three groups ranged from 57 to 61 percent on the "no-change" items. The responses of the three sample groups were so close in consistency that a conclusion cannot be observed in favor of the effect of collective bargaining in increasing the number of administrators' fringe benefit items.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were based on the findings of this research:

1. Administrators make higher mean salaries in institutions where faculties have elected exclusive bargaining agents.

2. The election of an exclusive bargaining agent by one faculty of one institution indirectly and positively effects salaries for that institution and for other institutions located within the same state.
3. Administrators whose faculties have elected exclusive bargaining agents do not realize a greater number of fringe benefits than do administrators whose faculty have not elected a bargaining agent.

4. Fringe benefit items for faculty and administrators are increasing.

5. University-type public institutions pay higher mean salaries to faculty and to administrators than do two-year or four-year public or private institutions.

6. Support administrative positions are engaging in formal collective bargaining.

7. Collective bargaining among faculties of higher education is increasing. State legislation is increasing in favor of legalizing public faculty collective bargaining in higher education.

8. Administrators of faculties who have elected an exclusive bargaining agent are more receptive to collective bargaining research than are administrators whose faculties have not bargained.

9. Younger institutions are more likely to have faculties that will elect exclusive bargaining agents than are older institutions; however, it should not be ignored that the age of the institution and the age of the faculty may be positively correlated.

10. Females represent a low percentage of the positions of top college management. No assumptions will be made for
this lack of representation; however, the situation needs attention.

Recommendations

Certain recommendations seem appropriate based upon this research. Therefore, it is recommended that:

1. Administrators of all institutions acquaint themselves with bargaining issues and bargaining tactics of faculties in institutions of higher education.

2. Administrators keep abreast of legislative activity in the area of collective bargaining.

3. Administrators study the policies of the exclusive bargaining agents particularly in terms of membership in the bargaining unit, work stoppage or strike policy, governance, and academic provisions.

4. Further research be undertaken at Federal, State, and Local levels in the area of collective bargaining and that this research be made public information.

5. Faculty and administrators carefully study the restraints and the accountability that is an outcome of formal agreements.

6. All ramifications possible be considered before selecting collective bargaining tactics to resolve issues.

7. Females consider a career in college administration and prepare adequately for that career.

8. College and universities offer to students of educational administration at least one course in educational labor
relations which would present the history of collective bargaining in education; the content of faculty contracts; the negotiation process; the advantages and disadvantages of collective bargaining; and the role of college administrators in the total bargaining process.
APPENDIX A

THE STATES AND LEGAL STATUS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING*

1. States that have collective bargaining legislation (either specific or general) for faculties of public colleges:

Alaska  
Delaware  
Hawaii  
Iowa  
Kansas  
Massachusetts  
Michigan  
Minnesota  
Montana  
Nebraska  
Nevada (community colleges only)  
New Jersey  
Oregon  
Pennsylvania  
Rhode Island  
South Dakota  
Vermont  
Washington (community colleges only)  
Wisconsin

2. States where colleges are bargaining WITHOUT legislation:

Colorado  
Florida  
Illinois  
Maine  
Maryland  
Ohio  
Utah

3. States that have legislation under consideration:

Alabama  
Arizona  
Arkansas  
California  
Colorado  
Connecticut  
Florida  
Idaho  
Illinois  
Indiana  
Kentucky  
Maine  
Maryland  
Missouri  
New Hampshire  
New Mexico  
North Carolina  
North Dakota  
Ohio  
Oklahoma  
Tennessee  
Texas  
Utah  
Virginia  
Washington  
West Virginia  
Wyoming

* Source: Education Commission of the States
CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (March 4, 1974)
CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (May 20, 1974)
APPENDIX B

JUNE, 1974, STATUS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING*

Since November, 1973, the following colleges have chosen exclusive bargaining agents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>AAUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairleigh Dickinson University</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>AAUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Pierce College</td>
<td>New Hampshire*</td>
<td>AFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont State Colleges</td>
<td>Vermont*</td>
<td>AFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grahm Junior College</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>AFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Oregon Comm. Coll.</td>
<td>Oregon*</td>
<td>AFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth Institute</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>AFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown College</td>
<td>North Dakota*</td>
<td>NEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemeketa Community College</td>
<td>Oregon*</td>
<td>NEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County Comm. Colleges</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>NEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Community College</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>NEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Community College</td>
<td>Oregon*</td>
<td>NEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Stewart Mott Comm. Coll.</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>NEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan (T.A.'s)</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco Law School</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td>Oregon*</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*States that had not previously bargained.

Summary of Faculty Bargaining Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4-yr. campuses</th>
<th></th>
<th>2-yr. campuses</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAUP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT - NEA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agents</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (June 10, 1974)
APPENDIX C
LISTING OF SAMPLE POPULATIONS

Sample I - Colleges and universities located in states where other institutions have chosen bargaining agents.

Sample II - Colleges and universities located in states where there are NO bargaining agents in institutions of higher education.

Sample III - Colleges and universities that have elected exclusive bargaining agents.

Listing by sample and alphabetically by state.

SAMPLE I COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
Adams State College, Colorado
Colorado State University, Colorado
Morgan County Community College, Colorado
Albertus Magnus College, Connecticut
Fairfield University, Connecticut
Tunxis Community College, Connecticut
University of Hartford, Connecticut
Yale University, Connecticut
Goldey Beacom College, Delaware
American University, Washington, D. C.
Ediwon Community College, Florida
Chaminade College of Honolulu, Hawaii
Barat College, Illinois
Bradley University, Illinois
Carl Sandburg College, Illinois
Chicago Technical College, Illinois
Concordia Teachers College, Illinois
Eastern Illinois University, Illinois
Governors State University, Illinois
Greenville College, Illinois
Illinois College of Optometry, Illinois
Kaskaskia College, Illinois
Lewis University, Illinois
MacCormac College, Illinois
Monmouth College, Illinois
Northwestern University, Illinois
Wm. Rainey Harper College, Illinois
Allen County Community Junior College, Kansas
Barton County Community and Junior College, Kansas
Coffeyville Community and Junior College, Kansas
Friends Bible College, Kansas
Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, Kansas
Kansas Technical Institute, Kansas
Neosho County Community Junior College, Kansas
Wichita State University, Kansas
Husson College, Maine
American International College, Massachusetts
Bay Path Junior College, Massachusetts
Bay State Junior College of Business, Massachusetts
Boston University, Massachusetts
Central New England College of Technology, Massachusetts
Eastern Nazarene College, Massachusetts
Emerson College, Massachusetts
Garland Junior College, Massachusetts
Gordon College, Massachusetts
Katharine Gibbs School, Massachusetts
Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Massachusetts
Berkshire Community College, Massachusetts
Northeastern University, Massachusetts
Suffolk University, Massachusetts
Johns Hopkins University, Maryland
Villa Julie College, Maryland
Adrian College, Michigan
Alma College, Michigan
Calvin Theological Seminary, Michigan
Delta College, Michigan
Detroit Bible College, Michigan
Eastern Michigan University, Michigan
Grand Valley State Colleges, Michigan
Jackson Business University, Michigan
Lake Superior State College, Michigan
Madonna College, Michigan
Marygrove College, Michigan
Michigan Technological University, Michigan
Northern Michigan University, Michigan
Northwestern Michigan College, Michigan
Saint Mary's College, Michigan
Suomi College, Michigan
University of Detroit, Michigan
Walsh College of Accounting and Business Administration, Michigan
Aquinas College, Michigan
Andrews University, Michigan
Cleary College, Michigan
Charles S. Mott Community College, Michigan
Duns Scotus College, Michigan
Detroit Institute of Technology, Michigan
Grace Bible College, Michigan
Kalamazoo College, Michigan
Lawrence Institute of Technology, Michigan
Michigan State University, Michigan
Michigan Christian Junior College, Michigan
Muskegon Business College, Michigan
Northwood Institutes, Michigan
Sacred Heart Seminary, Michigan
Bethel College and Seminary, Minnesota
College of Saint Thomas, Minnesota
Concordia College at Moorhead, Minnesota
Gustavus Adolphus College, Minnesota
Hamline University, Minnesota
Macalester College, Minnesota
Mankato State College, Minnesota
Moorhead State College, Minnesota
Saint Cloud State College, Minnesota
Saint Paul Bible College, Minnesota
Saint Paul Seminary, Minnesota
Winona State College, Minnesota
Bemidji State College, Minnesota
Dr. Martin Luther College, Minnesota
Minnesota Bible College, Minnesota
Minneapolis College of Art and Design, Minnesota
Saint John's University, Minnesota
University of Minnesota, Minnesota
Northern Montana College, Montana
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Nebraska
University of Nebraska, Nebraska
Alma White College, New Jersey
Alphonsus College, New Jersey
The Berkeley School, New Jersey
Centenary College for Women, New Jersey
Drew University, New Jersey
Englewood Cliffs College, New Jersey
Georgian Court College, New Jersey
Katharine Gibbs School, New Jersey
Luther College, New Jersey
Princeton University, New Jersey
Rabbinical College of America, New Jersey
Stevens Institute of Technology, New Jersey
Upsala College, New Jersey
Westminster Choir College, New Jersey
County College of Morris, New Jersey
College of Saint Elizabeth, New Jersey
Fairleigh Dickinson University, New Jersey
Immaculate Conception Seminary, New Jersey
Richard Stockton State College, New Jersey
Salem Community College, New Jersey
Saint Peters College, New Jersey
Union College, New Jersey
William Paterson College, New Jersey
Felician College, New Jersey
Academy of Aeronautics, New York
American Academy of Dramatic Arts, New York
Beth Hamedrash Shaarei Yosh, New York
Canisius College, New York
Cathedral College of Immaculate Conception, New York
Colgate Rochester Divinity School, New York
Colgate University, New York
College of White Plains, New York
Cooper Union, New York
D'Youville College, New York
Friends World College, New York
Hobart-William Smith Colleges, New York
Iona College, New York
Ithaca College, New York
Keuka College, New York
King's College, New York
Mannes College of Music, New York
Mater Dei College, New York
Molloy College, New York
Mount Saint Alphonsus Seminary, New York
Nyack College, New York
Paul Smith's College of Arts and Sciences, New York
Rabbinical College Beth Shraga, New York
RCA Institutes, New York
Rensselaer Polytech Institute, New York
Rosary Hill College, New York
Russell Sage Colleges, New York
Saint John Fisher College, New York
Saint Thomas Aquinas College, New York
Union Theological Seminary, New York
Wadham's Hall Seminary College, New York
Yeshiva University, New York
Albany Medical College, New York
Bennett College, New York
Briarcliff College, New York
Cornell University, New York
Maria College of Albany, New York
Medaille College, New York
Manhattan College, New York
Touro College, New York
Woodstock College, New York
Saint Joseph's College, New York
Rockefeller University, New York
Rabbi Jacob Joseph Rabbinical College, New York
Columbus Technical College, Ohio
University of Akron, Ohio
Butler County Community College, Pennsylvania
Chatham College, Pennsylvania
Chestnut Hill College, Pennsylvania
Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture, Pennsylvania
Dickinson College, Pennsylvania
Eastern College, Pennsylvania
Franklin-Marshall College, Pennsylvania
Kutztown State College, Pennsylvania
Lackawanna Junior College, Pennsylvania
Lebanon Valley College, Pennsylvania
The Medical College of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania
Peirce Junior College, Pennsylvania
Shippensburg State College, Pennsylvania
Barrington College, Rhode Island
Johnson and Wales College, Rhode Island
Rhode Island School of Design, Rhode Island
Providence College, Rhode Island
Brown University, Rhode Island
Central Washington State College, Washington
Eastern Washington State College, Washington
Evergreen State College, Washington
Fort Wright College of Holy Names, Washington
Gonzaga University, Washington
Northwest College, Washington
Olympia Vocational-Technical Institute, Washington
Pacific Lutheran University, Washington
Saint Martin's College, Washington
Seattle Pacific College, Washington
Seattle University, Washington
Sulpician Seminary of the Northwest, Washington
University of Puget Sound, Washington
University of Washington, Washington
Walla Walla Community College, Washington
Washington State University, Washington
Western Washington State College, Washington
Whatcom Community College, Washington
Whitman College, Washington
Whitworth College, Washington
Alverno College, Wisconsin
Cardinal Stritch College, Wisconsin
Edgewood College, Wisconsin
Lawrence University, Wisconsin
Marquette University, Wisconsin
Medical College of Wisconsin, Wisconsin
Mount Mary College, Wisconsin
Mount Senario College, Wisconsin
Ripon College, Wisconsin
Saint Francis De Sales College, Wisconsin
University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin
Wisconsin College Conservatory, Wisconsin
Concordia College, Wisconsin
College of Racine, Wisconsin
Institute Paper Chemistry, Wisconsin
Holy Redeemer College, Wisconsin

SAMPLE II COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
Alabama A & M University, Alabama
Auburn University, Alabama
Faulkner State Junior College, Alabama
Jacksonville State University, Alabama
Marion Institute, Alabama
Samford University, Alabama
Theodore A. Lawson State Junior College, Alabama
University of Alabama, Alabama
Sheldon Jackson College, Alaska
University of Alaska and Ketchikan Community College, Alaska
Arizona State University, Arizona
Navajo Community College, Arizona
Northern Arizona University, Arizona
Yavapai College, Arizona
Arkansas Baptist College, Arkansas
Arkansas State University, Arkansas
Allan Hancock College, California
Art Center College of Design, California
Azusa Pacific College, California
Brooks College, California
Brooks Institute of Santa Barbara, California
California Institute of Arts, California
California Institute of Technology, California
California State University and College System, California
Cerritos College, California
Cerro Coso Community College, California
City College of San Francisco, California
Claremont College System, California
Claremont Graduate School, California
Claremont Men's College, California
Coast Community College, California
College of Marin, California
College of Notre Dame, California
Contra Costa Community College, California
Crafton Hills College, California
Don Bosco Technical Institute, California
El Camino College, California
Glendale College, California
Golden Gate University, California
Harvey Mudd College, California
Immaculate Heart College, California
Imperial Valley College, California
Lincoln University, California
Loma Linda University, California
Los Angeles Community College, California
Los Rios Community College, California
Loyola Marymount University, California
Mennonite Brethren Bible Seminary, California
Merced College, California
Moorpark College, California
Mount Saint Mary's College, California
New College of California, California
Northrop Institute of Technology, California
Pomona College, California
Pitzer College, California
Scripps College, California
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Georgia
Albany State College, Georgia
Andrew College, Georgia
Bainbridge Junior College, Georgia
Berry College, Georgia
Columbus College, Georgia
Emory University, Georgia
Floyd Junior College, Georgia
Georgia Institute and Technical, Georgia
Boise State College, Idaho
University of Idaho, Idaho
Butler University, Indiana
Indiana State University, Indiana
Indiana University, Indiana
Indiana Vocational Technical Colleges, Indiana
Buena Vista College, Iowa
Des Moines Area Community College, Iowa
Eastern Iowa District Community Colleges, Iowa
Ellsworth Community College, Iowa
Indian Hills Community College, Iowa
Iowa Center Community College, Iowa
Iowa Wesleyan College, Iowa
Iowa Western Community Colleges, Iowa
Alice Lloyd College, Kentucky
Kentucky State University, Kentucky
Morehead State University, Kentucky
Murray State University, Kentucky
University of Kentucky, Kentucky
Western Kentucky University, Kentucky
Centenary College, Louisiana
Delgado Vocational Technical Junior College, Louisiana
Louisiana State University, Louisiana
Louisiana Technical University, Louisiana
Alcorn Agri-Mech College, Mississippi
Copiah-Lincoln Junior College, Mississippi
Delta State College, Mississippi
Jackson State College, Mississippi
Jones Community Junior College, Mississippi
Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College, Mississippi
Calvary Bible College, Missouri
Evangel College, Missouri
Kansas City Art Institute, Missouri
Kansas City College of Osteo Medicine, Missouri
Missouri Western State College, Missouri
St. Louis City Community Junior Colleges, Missouri
St. Louis University, Missouri
Southeast Missouri State University, Missouri
Southwest Baptist College, Missouri
Trenton Junior College, Missouri
University of Missouri, Missouri
Washington University, Missouri
Wenster College, Missouri
William Woods College, Missouri
Sierra Nevada College, Nevada
University of Nevada, Nevada
Anson Technical Institute, North Carolina
Beaufort County Technical Institute, North Carolina
Campbell College, North Carolina
Central Piedmont Community College, North Carolina
Chowan College, North Carolina
Duke University, North Carolina
Forsyth Technical Institute, North Carolina
Haywood Technical Institute, North Carolina
Mayland Technical Institute, North Carolina
Randolph Technical Institute, North Carolina
Southeastern Community College, North Carolina
University of North Carolina, North Carolina
Vance-Granville Technical Institute, North Carolina
Wilkes Community College, North Carolina
Wilson County Technical Institute, North Carolina
Wingate College, North Carolina
Bismarck Junior College, North Dakota
Valley City State College, North Dakota
Colby College of New Hampshire, New Hampshire
New England Aeronautical Institute, New Hampshire
New Hampshire Vocational-Technical College, New Hampshire
University of New Hampshire, New Hampshire
College of Santa Fe, New Mexico
New Mexico Highlands University, New Mexico
Altus Junior College, Oklahoma
Central State University, Oklahoma
Langston University, Oklahoma
Murray State College, Oklahoma
Oral Roberts University, Oklahoma
University of Tulsa, Oklahoma
Blue Mountain Community College Oregon
Concordia College, Oregon
Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon
Mount Angel College, Oregon
Oregon College of Education, Oregon
Oregon State Higher Education, Oregon
Oregon State University, Oregon
Oregon Institute of Technology, Oregon
Portland State University, Oregon
Reed College, Oregon
Rogue Community College, Oregon
Southern Oregon College, Oregon
University of Oregon, Oregon
University of Oregon Dental School, Oregon
University of Oregon Medical School, Oregon
Aiken Technical Educational Center, South Carolina
Citadel Military College of South Carolina, South Carolina
Columbia College, South Carolina
Greenville Technical Education Center, South Carolina
Newberry College, South Carolina
North Greenville College, South Carolina
University of South Carolina, South Carolina
Wofford College, South Carolina
Huron College, South Dakota
South Dakota State University, South Dakota
Austin Peay State University, Tennessee
Cleveland State Community College, Tennessee
Fisk University, Tennessee
King College, Tennessee
Martin College, Tennessee
Maryville College, Tennessee
Milligan College, Tennessee
Tennessee Technological University, Tennessee
University of Tennessee, Tennessee
Vanderbilt University, Tennessee
Abilene Christian College, Texas
Amarillo College, Texas
Baylor University, Texas
College of the Mainland, Texas
Dallas County Community Colleges, Texas
Dominican College, Texas
Grayson County Junior College, Texas
Howard County Junior College, Texas
Lamar University, Texas
Laredo Junior College, Texas
McMurry College, Texas
Ranger Junior College, Texas
Rice University, Texas
San Antonio District Junior College, Texas
South Texas Junior College, Texas
Southwest Texas State University, Texas
Stephen F. Austin State University, Texas
Texarkana College, Texas
Texas A & I University, Texas
Texas Southern University, Texas
Texas Tech University, Texas
University of Houston, Texas
Western Texas College, Texas
Brigham Young University, Utah
Westminster College, Utah
Averett College, Virginia
Eastern Memmonite College, Virginia
Hampton Institute, Virginia
Mary Baldwin College, Virginia
Radford College, Virginia
Stratford College, Virginia
Virginia Polytech Institute & State University, Virginia
Virginia State College, Virginia
Washington and Lee University, Virginia
Bennington College, Vermont
Johnson State College, Vermont
Saint Michael's College, Vermont
Windham College, Vermont
Bethany College, West Virginia
Marshall University, West Virginia
Southern West Virginia Community Colleges, West Virginia
West Virginia University, West Virginia
Casper College, Wyoming
University of Wyoming, Wyoming
SAMPLE III COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Arapahoe Community College, Colorado
Loretto Heights College, Colorado
Regis College, Colorado
Hartford State Technical College, Connecticut
Norwalk State Technical College, Connecticut
Thames Valley State Technical College, Connecticut
Waterbury State Technical College, Connecticut
University of Bridgeport, Connecticut
University of Delaware, Delaware
Washington Technical Institute, D. C.
Indian River Community College, Florida
University of Hawaii, Hawaii
Belleville Area College, Illinois
City Colleges of Chicago, Illinois
College of Lake County, Illinois
Highland Community College, Illinois
Illinois Valley Community College, Illinois
Joliet Junior College, Illinois
Lake Land College, Illinois
Moraine Valley Community College, Illinois
Morton College, Illinois
Prairie State College, Illinois
Robert Morris College of Carthage, Illinois
Sauk Valley College, Illinois
Thornton Community College, Illinois
Triton College, Illinois
Waubonsee Community College, Illinois
University of Dubuque, Iowa
Butler County Community Junior College, Kansas
Cloud County Community Junior College, Kansas
Colby Community Junior College, Kansas
Garden City Community Junior College, Kansas
Hutchinson Community Junior College, Kansas
Independence Community Junior College, Kansas
Kansas City Community Junior College, Kansas
Labette Community Junior College, Kansas
Eastern Maine Vocational-Technical Institute, Maine
Southern Maine Vocational-Technical Institute, Maine
University of Maine, Maine
Community College of Baltimore, Maryland
Towson State College, Maryland
Endicott Junior College, Massachusetts
Bristol Community College, Massachusetts
Massasoit Community College, Massachusetts
Mt. Wachusett Community College, Massachusetts
Boston State College, Massachusetts
Fitchburg State College, Massachusetts
Lowell State College, Massachusetts
Massachusetts College of Art, Massachusetts
North Adams State College, Massachusetts
Salem State College, Massachusetts
Westfield State College, Massachusetts
Worcester State College, Massachusetts
Southeastern Massachusetts University, Massachusetts
Wentworth Institute, Massachusetts
Alpena Community College, Michigan
Bay De Noc Community College, Michigan
Central Michigan University, Michigan
Detroit College of Business, Michigan
Ferris State College, Michigan
Genesee Community College, Michigan
Glen Oaks Community College, Michigan
Gogebic Community College, Michigan
Grand Rapids Junior College, Michigan
Henry Ford Community College, Michigan
Highland Park Community College, Michigan
Jackson Community College, Michigan
Kalamazoo Valley Community College, Michigan
Kellogg Community College, Michigan
Kirtland Community College, Michigan
Lake Michigan College, Michigan
Lansing Community College, Michigan
Macomb County Community College, Michigan
Mid-Michigan Community College, Michigan
Monroe County Community College, Michigan
Montcalm Community College, Michigan
Muskegon Community College, Michigan
Oakland Community College, Michigan
Oakland University, Michigan
Saginaw Valley College, Michigan
Saint Clair County Community College, Michigan
Schoolcraft College, Michigan
Southwestern Michigan College, Michigan
Washtenaw Community College, Michigan
Wayne County Community College, Michigan
Wayne State University, Michigan
West Shore Community College, Michigan
Anoka-Ramsey Community College, Minnesota
Austin Community College, Minnesota
Brainerd Community College, Minnesota
Fergus Falls Community College, Minnesota
Itasca Community College, Minnesota
Lakewood Community College, Minnesota
Mesabi Community College, Minnesota
Metropolitan Community College, Minnesota
North Hennepin Community College, Minnesota
Northland Community College, Minnesota
Rainy River Community College, Minnesota
Rochester Community College, Minnesota
Vermilion Community College, Minnesota
Willmare Community College, Minnesota
Worthington Community College, Minnesota
Miles Community College, Montana
Chadron State College, Nebraska
Kearney State College, Nebraska
Peru State College, Nebraska
Wayne State College, Nebraska
Atlantic Community College, New Jersey
Bergen Community College, New Jersey
Bloomfield College, New Jersey
Brookdale Community College, New Jersey
Burlington County College, New Jersey
Camden County College, New Jersey
College of Medicine and Dentistry, New Jersey
Cumberland County College, New Jersey
Essex County College, New Jersey
Glassboro State College, New Jersey
Gloucester County College, New Jersey
Jersey City State College, New Jersey
Mercer County Community College, New Jersey
Middlesex County College, New Jersey
Monmouth College, New Jersey
Montclair State College, New Jersey
Newark College of Engineering, New Jersey
Newark State College, New Jersey
Ocean County College, New Jersey
Passaic County Community College, New Jersey
Rider College, New Jersey
Rutgers - The State University, New Jersey
Somerset County College, New Jersey
Trenton State College, New Jersey
Adelphia University, New York
Adirondack Community College, New York
Auburn Community College, New York
Bard College, New York
Boro of Manhattan Community College, New York
Bronx Community College, New York
Broome Community College, New York
City University of New York, New York
Clinton Community College, New York
Columbia University, New York
Columbia-Greene Community College, New York
Community College of Finger Lakes, New York
Corning Community College, New York
Dowling College, New York
Downstate Medical Center, New York
Dutchess Community College, New York
Erie Community College, New York
Fashion Institute of Technology, New York
Fordham University, New York
Fulton-Montgomery Community College, New York
Geneseo Community College, New York
Herkimer County Community College, New York
Hofstra University, New York
Hostos Community College, New York
Hudson Valley Community College, New York
Jamestown Community College, New York
Jefferson Community College, New York
Kingsborough Community College, New York
LaGuardia Community College, New York
Long Island University, New York
Mohawk Valley Community College, New York
Monroe Community College, New York
Nassau Community College, New York
New York Community College, New York
New York Institute of Technology, New York
New York University, New York
Niagara County Community College, New York
North County Community College, New York
Onondaga Community College, New York
Orange County Community College, New York
Polytechnical Institute of New York, New York
Pratt Institute, New York
Queensborough Community College, New York
Rockland Community College, New York
Saint John's University, New York
Schenectady County Community College, New York
State Universities of New York, New York
State University of New York, New York
State University of Binghamton, New York
State University of Buffalo, New York
State University of Stony Brook, New York
SUNY College at Brockport, New York
SUNY College at Buffalo, New York
SUNY College at Cortland, New York
SUNY College at Fredonia, New York
SUNY College at Genesco, New York
SUNY College at New Paltz, New York
SUNY College at Old Westbury, New York
Staten Island Community College, New York
Suffolk County Community College, New York
Sullivan County Community College, New York
Syracuse University, New York
Tompkins-Cortland Community College, New York
Ulster County Community College, New York
United States Merchant Marine Academy, New York
Upstate Medical Center, New York
Wagner College, New York
Westchester Community College, New York
Ashland College, Ohio
Youngstown State University, Ohio
Bloomsburg State College Pennsylvania
Bucks County Community College, Pennsylvania
California State College, Pennsylvania
Cheyney State College, Pennsylvania
Clarion State College, Pennsylvania
Community College of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania
Community College of Beaver County, Pennsylvania
Community College of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
East Stroudsburg State College, Pennsylvania
Edinboro State College, Pennsylvania
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania
Lehigh County Community College, Pennsylvania
Lincoln University, Pennsylvania
Lock Haven State College, Pennsylvania
Luzerne County Community College, Pennsylvania
Mansfield State College, Pennsylvania
Millersville State College, Pennsylvania
Moore College of Art, Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State Universities, Pennsylvania
Slippery Rock State College, Pennsylvania
Temple University, Pennsylvania
University of Scranton, Pennsylvania
West Chester State College, Pennsylvania
Westmoreland County Community College, Pennsylvania
Williamsport Area Community College, Pennsylvania
Bryant College of Business Administration, Rhode Island
Rhode Island College, Rhode Island
Rhode Island Junior College, Rhode Island
Roger Williams College, Rhode Island
University of Rhode Island, Rhode Island
Bellevue Community College, Washington
Big Bend Community College, Washington
Centralia College, Washington
Clark College, Washington
Columbia Basin Community College, Washington
Fort Steilacoom Community College, Washington
Grays Harbor College, Washington
Green River Community College, Washington
Highline Community College, Washington
Olympic College, Washington
Peninsula College, Washington
Seattle Community College, Washington
Shoreline Community College, Washington
Skagit Valley College, Washington
Spokane Community College, Washington
Spokane Falls Community College, Washington
Tacoma Community College, Washington
Walla Walla College, Washington
Washington State Community College, Washington
Wenatchee Valley College, Washington
Yakima Valley College, Washington
Blackhawk Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Eau Claire Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Fox Valley Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Gateway Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Indian Head Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Lakeshore Technical Institutes, Wisconsin
Layton School of Art and Design, Wisconsin
Mid-State Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Milwaukee Area Technical College, Wisconsin
Moraine Park Technical Institute, Wisconsin
North Central Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Northeast Wisconsin Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Southwest Wisconsin Vocational Technical School, Wisconsin
Superior Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Waukesha County Technical Institute, Wisconsin
Western Wisconsin Technical Institute, Wisconsin
### STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of college:</th>
<th>Type of control:</th>
<th>Enrollment: (headcount)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has any formalized collective bargaining procedures begun at your institution by the faculty? Yes ___ No ___

Has an exclusive bargaining agent been elected? Yes ___ No ___

### Chief Administrative Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank:</th>
<th>No academic rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Prof. ___

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Level of education:</th>
<th>Ph. D.</th>
<th>M. S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. S.</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of years at this institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Contract Salary, 1969

#### Contract Salary, 1970

#### Contract Salary, 1971

#### Contract Salary, 1972

#### Contract Salary, 1973

### 2nd Administrative Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank:</th>
<th>No academic rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Prof. ___

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Level of education:</th>
<th>Ph. D.</th>
<th>M. S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. S.</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of years at this institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Contract Salary, 1969

#### Contract Salary, 1970

#### Contract Salary, 1971

#### Contract Salary, 1972

#### Contract Salary, 1973

### 3rd Administrative Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank:</th>
<th>No academic rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Prof. ___

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Level of education:</th>
<th>Ph. D.</th>
<th>M. S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. S.</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of years at this institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Contract Salary, 1969

#### Contract Salary, 1970

#### Contract Salary, 1971

#### Contract Salary, 1972

#### Contract Salary, 1973

### 4th Administrative Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank:</th>
<th>No academic rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Prof. ___

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Level of education:</th>
<th>Ph. D.</th>
<th>M. S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. S.</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of years at this institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Contract Salary, 1969

#### Contract Salary, 1970

#### Contract Salary, 1971

#### Contract Salary, 1972

#### Contract Salary, 1973

APPENDIX D
II. ADMINISTRATORS' FRINGE BENEFITS:

Please check any change(s) in fringe benefits from 1969 - 1973.

No changes ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension or Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Life Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Income Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Annuity Privileges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Expense Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Duty Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bereavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursed Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments ..................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................

Would you like a copy of the results? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, please indicate your name and address.

Name .................................................................

Address ................................................................

........................................................................

Return To: Robin Rucker Livesay
The Ohio State University
University Drive
Newark, Ohio 43055
## College Administrators' Survey

### State: ____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of College:</th>
<th>Type of Control:</th>
<th>Enrollment: (headcount)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bargaining Agent:** AAUP ____ AFT ____ NEA ____ Dual representation ___

**Year collective bargaining agreement adopted:** 19_____

### Chief Administrative Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank:</th>
<th>No academic rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. ____</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male ___</td>
<td>Level of education: Ph. D. ___ M. S. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female ____</td>
<td>B. S. ___ Specialist ___ Other ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age ___**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2nd Administrative Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank:</th>
<th>No academic rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. ____</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male ___</td>
<td>Level of education: Ph. D. ___ M. S. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female ____</td>
<td>B. S. ___ Specialist ___ Other ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age ___**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3rd Administrative Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank:</th>
<th>No academic rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. ____</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male ___</td>
<td>Level of education: Ph. D. ___ M. S. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female ____</td>
<td>B. S. ___ Specialist ___ Other ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age ___**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4th Administrative Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank:</th>
<th>No academic rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. ____</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male ___</td>
<td>Level of education: Ph. D. ___ M. S. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female ____</td>
<td>B. S. ___ Specialist ___ Other ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age ___**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix D_2
II. ADMINISTRATORS' FRINGE BENEFITS:

Please check any change(s) in fringe benefits from 1969 - 1973.

No changes ___

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension or Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Life Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Income Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Annuity Privileges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Expense Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury Duty Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bereavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursed Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments __________________________________________________________
                                                                
                                                                
                                                                

Would you like a copy of the results? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, please indicate your name and address.

Name __________________________________________________________

Address _________________________________________________________

Return To:
Robin Bucker Livesay
The Ohio State University
University Drive
Newark, Ohio 43055
I am attempting to study 700 colleges to determine the effect of collective bargaining on the salaries and fringe benefits received by top administrators of colleges and universities in the United States. I am writing to the 317 campuses that have chosen formal bargaining agents, and I am writing to you because your institution, to my knowledge, has not chosen an exclusive bargaining agent.

My own negotiating experience has been limited to industry; and I believe as a college administrator in an Ohio college, it would be wise for me to prepare myself for negotiations. Ohio has pending legislation dealing with public college faculties' rights to bargain collectively.

This study will serve two purposes: (1) to acquaint me with bargaining agreements and their effects on administrators' salaries and fringe benefits, and (2) to provide the data necessary for a Ph. D. dissertation.

Your honest answers to the enclosed questionnaire will be gratefully held in strict confidence and will not be identified in any manner in the study. I would be most happy to send you a copy of the results. Please, won't you take a few minutes to answer the attached questionnaire and return it to me by May 17, 1974. A postage-paid, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in replying.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) Robin R. Livesay

Enclosure

APPENDIX E1
I am attempting to study the collective bargaining agreements of the 317 campuses that have elected exclusive bargaining agents. Your cooperation in sending me your agreement and in answering the questionnaire enclosed would be greatly appreciated.

My own negotiating experience has been limited to industry; and I believe as a college administrator in an Ohio college, it would be wise for me to better understand negotiations as practiced in institutions of higher education.

This study will serve two purposes: (1) to acquaint me with bargaining agreements as they exist in higher education and (2) to provide the data necessary for a Ph. D. dissertation.

The dissertation will center around two neglected, but important items; namely, the effect of collective bargaining on administrators' salaries and fringe benefits.

Your honest answers to the enclosed questionnaire will be gratefully held in strict confidence and will not be identified in any manner in the study. I would be most happy to send you a copy of the results. Please, won't you send me a copy of your agreement and take a few minutes to answer the attached questionnaire and return it by May 17, 1974. A postage-paid, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. I would be delighted to reimburse you for any extra mailing costs.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) Robin R. Livesay

Enclosure

APPENDIX E2
BUSINESS REPLY ENVELOPE

MRS. ROBIN RUCKER LIVESAY
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY DRIVE
NEWARK, OHIO 43055

APPENDIX F
I am attempting to study the collective bargaining agreements of the 317 campuses that have elected exclusive bargaining agents. Your cooperation in sending me your agreement and in answering the questionnaire enclosed would be greatly appreciated.

My own negotiating experience has been limited to industry; and I believe as a college administrator in an Ohio college, it would be wise for me to better understand negotiations as practiced in institutions of higher education.

This study will serve two purposes: (1) to acquaint me with bargaining agreements as they exist in higher education and (2) to provide the data necessary for a Ph. D. dissertation.

The dissertation will center around two neglected, but important items; namely, the effect of collective bargaining on administrators' salaries and fringe benefits.

Your honest answers to the enclosed questionnaire will be gratefully held in strict confidence and will not be identified in any manner in the study. I would be most happy to send you a copy of the results. Please, won't you send me a copy of your agreement and take a few minutes to answer the attached questionnaire and return it by May 17, 1974. A postage-paid, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. I would be delighted to reimburse you for any extra mailing costs.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) Robin R. Livesay

Enclosure
SECOND REQUEST

I am attempting to study 700 colleges to determine the effect of collective bargaining on the salaries and fringe benefits received by top administrators of colleges and universities in the United States. I am writing to the 317 campuses that have chosen formal bargaining agents, and I am writing to you because your institution, to my knowledge, has not chosen an exclusive bargaining agent.

My own negotiating experience has been limited to industry; and I believe as a college administrator in an Ohio college, it would be wise for me to prepare myself for negotiations. Ohio has pending legislation dealing with public college faculties' rights to bargain collectively.

This study will serve two purposes: (1) to acquaint me with bargaining agreements and their effects on administrators' salaries and fringe benefits, and (2) to provide the data necessary for a Ph. D. dissertation.

Your honest answers to the enclosed questionnaire will be gratefully held in strict confidence and will not be identified in any manner in the study. I would be most happy to send you a copy of the results. Please, won't you take a few minutes to answer the attached questionnaire and return it to me by May 17, 1974. A postage-paid, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in replying.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) Robin R. Livesay

Enclosure
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