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Introduction

The purpose of the present research was to simultaneously examine several diverse areas important to current employment issues. These areas included changing demographics of the labor market and the effect of this on unions. Unionization of white collar workers, specifically university faculty, was also examined. Additionally, the author attempted relating these market changes to classical commitment and expectancy theories in an effort to predict future trends for southern faculty unionization.

Nearly one million manufacturing jobs were added to the Sun Belt from 1966 to 1976 (Longworth & Neikirk, 1979). From 1960 to 1976 there was a 43% growth in manufacturing employment in the southeast and a 67% growth in the southwest (Kistler, 1977). These Sun Belt states are primarily agricultural with right-to-work laws and have traditionally contained workers who do not join unions. Florida and Arkansas first enacted right-to-work laws in 1944 followed by fourteen other southern states (Lumsden & Peterson, 1975). The passage or non-passage of these laws reflects the tastes and preferences of the population. Right-to-work laws allow personnel to remain non-unionized even though the representation election may have been successful. Lumsden and Peterson (1975) studied the effects of right-to-work laws on unionization. Overall, their findings were that right-to-work states had a significantly smaller
percentage of their population of workers unionized. However, the authors felt that this reflected tastes and preferences rather than impact of the law. There have been large union victories in the South, but these were extremely expensive for the victors (Longworth & Neikirk, 1979; "Union's Push South", 1977).

Union security is challenged by declining membership with blue collar workers. This has led union to seek white collar participation. In the past it was assumed that unions represent lower socio-economic blue collar workers and were unrespectable culturally and thus would hold no appeal to white collar workers. In 1970 there were 38 million white collar workers as opposed to 28 million blue collar workers (Stanton, 1972a). Union membership was 23.5% of the non-farm work force in 1976 which was the lowest since the depression (Longworth & Neikirk, 1979).

The union's success rate in white collar elections can be traced to two basic factors: 1) the economics of the union, and 2) the changing pattern of values, attitudes and expectations of the white collar employee (Stanton, 1972a,b). While white collar workers represent a new boost to the unions of America, they might still run into trouble in the South. Organized labor campaigns include the Department of Organization and Field Services instituting programs in major southern areas. The AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department has located organizing centers in the south (Kistler, 1977).

White collar personnel included in the unionization attempts
are university faculty. The timing was obviously right for this group to become organized because the numbers are rapidly growing. In 1976, the number of newly organized institutions was 53 and the number of organized faculty members rose from about 9,000 to about 15,000. At the end of 1976, 450 institutions with 117,000 faculty and professional staff had established formal bargaining relationships. For this same year, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) won the largest victory for the year with Florida's state university system and its approximately 5,400 bargaining unit members (Garbino & Lawler, 1977). This being a Sun Belt state increases the importance of this election victory. However, Shapiro (1979) found public sector unions have not been successful in raising earnings of white collar workers within government, but have been successful with blue collar workers.

Historically, professors have enjoyed competition among colleges and universities for their scarce Ph.D.'s. This group's traditional non-union stance is changing along with who is doing the competing. Contributing factors include economic ones such as slowly changing tax revenues, rapid price increases, cuts in research budgets, flooding of the Ph.D. market, etc. Other factors are morale problems, external social and political factors, internal faculty weaknesses, lack of communication between faculty and administration relating to key issues and changes in patterns of attitudes and values (Allen, 1972; Hercus, 1978; Moore, 1978; Stanton, 1972a,b). Unions are
becoming more attractive for security and protection from arbitrary administrative decisions, as a means for airing complaints and as a method to enhance clout with the legislature. In fact, Walker and Lawler (1978) state that unions are seen as an advocate of employee rights and as a functioning hedge against threats. Negotiating salary increases was seen as secondary by this group.

The transition of unions onto campuses is as difficult as the transition into the South. Legal issues of collective bargaining laws have been discussed extensively in the literature and will not be repeated here (Bowles, 1978; Menard & Morrill, 1979; Miller, 1979). Collective bargaining contracts also have resulted in problems. Should distribution of wage increases include rank, merit, discretion of the dean and chairperson? The diversity of disciplines could create significant problems for negotiators under pressures of deadlines. The range of issues to be covered under bargaining contracts is highly debateable. Ponak and Thompson (1979) studied probable subjects for bargaining and found issues which were overwhelmingly wanted were fringe benefits, grievance procedures, salary scales, layoff procedures, and sabbatical leaves. Serious controversial issues were academic freedom, promotion/tenure procedures and promotion/tenure criteria. Questionable areas were preestablished within the multi-varied campus population. These areas included unit composition, department chairperson status, principle investigators, etc. (Walther, 1979). To confuse the issue
even further, Bowles (1978) believes that if public employees do not have the right to strike they should be provided greater protection through an expanded scope of bargaining. These numerous controversial areas will lead a faculty member to an awareness of the benefits of bargaining as well as the non-beneficial areas. This is likely to lead many faculty to become dissatisfied because of the controversies.

The university system in Florida is represented by an affiliate of the AFT. Traditionally this union has a much more militant view than either the American Association of University Professors or the National Education Association. The AFT began in 1916 with the American Federation of Labor and the intent to obtain for teachers all the rights to which they are entitled and to raise the standards of the teaching profession by securing the conditions essential to the best professional service (Brown, M.A., 1970).

Faculty on campuses choosing collective bargaining have preconceived attitudes as to the effects, although research results do not leave the faculty with a definitive base for the formation of these attitudes. Driscoll (1979) pointed out that rapidly changing issues cannot be accurately predicted in three year contracts. Many issues are routinely included in negotiations with experts assisting both sides in technical advise and forecasts. With the varying information and contract problems, how satisfied can faculty be with results obtained from the union? Without all
faculty knowing definitely what to expect, all faculty cannot be happy with the outcome. According to Brown (M.A., 1970) the essential element of the union bargaining model of decision making is the belief that a fundamental and permanent conflict of interest exists between managers and the managed. Hasle (1978) believed that conflict between faculty unions and administrators is normal and beneficial to the resolution of differences. Since the representation election there have been personnel changes at the upper levels of administration at the University of Central Florida (formerly Florida Technological University). How did this affect the fundamental conflict? If this conflict has improved, who was given credit - the administration or the union?

Extensive research has been conducted on collective bargaining effects (Aussieker, 1977; Bain, 1975; Bogananno, Estenso & Suntrup, 1978; Means & Seamas, 1976; Nemeth, 1978; Staudohar, 1978). These authors did not reach the same conclusions about the possible benefits or non-benefits of collective bargaining to faculty. All contracts were not the same, and even ones slightly similar did not have the same results. This is not a solid foundation on which faculty can base any judgements or attitudes regarding the results of unions. Faculty frustrations may be enhanced as contract negotiations run into continued trouble.

On the basis of attitudes formed regarding the union effects, a faculty member must decide whether or not joining the union is
necessary to receive desired outcomes. Pencavel (1971) suggested that membership be viewed as a result of utility-maximizing decisions on the part of the individual worker. He views the decision as a consumer choice for a particular form of wealth. Central in his theme is that the act of joining an organization like a labor union is akin to the purchase of a capital asset. Collective goods provided are higher wages and/or shorter hours (obtained by a worker in a unionized firm whether he joins or not), semi-collective goods are processing worker grievances, securing seniority rights (vigor with which unions affect these is likely to depend on membership status), and private services are financial support when on strike, payments for accidents, illness, etc. Persons who value the first product are likely to be non-unionists - "free-riders". A person who enjoys the last two is probably one who joins and does not conceal his enjoyment of these services. Therefore, the number of union members would underestimate the number of workers benefiting from the services provided. This becomes especially important in right-to-work states with more non-union personnel.

Several authors (Carr & Vanevch, 1973; Cole, 1969; Driscoll, 1975; Walker & Lawler, 1979) name dissatisfaction as a prime condition necessary for faculty to be favorable to the idea of collective bargaining. This dissatisfaction may be with their salary, the administration, work conditions, etc. Along with this
must go the belief that collective bargaining will decrease their frustration. Since research has shown that faculty did not always get everything they want in contracts, it is expected there will still be a certain level of dissatisfaction in some areas, after unionization.

A low degree of trust with the decision making process will also favor collective bargaining (Driscoll, 1975). It is just as important in universities as in industries to maintain a high level of trust and communication between management and non-management personnel. The administration is quite capable of accurately assessing the environment and knowing problems exist which should be corrected. Hartnett and Centra (1976) found that similar impressions of the prevailing climate with an institution were expressed by faculty, students and administrators. Walker and Lawler (1979) believed that unions forming as a reaction to political estrangement are "aggressive" and reflect member orientation toward authority changes and a readiness to employ militant and aggressive tactics. On this basis, the faculty at U.C.F. were extremely estranged from the administration and voted in favor of an aggressive union. Cline (1974) found a significant inverse relationship between faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations and perceptions of their institutional management style. Administration policies can then be seen to directly affect union membership in certain faculty. Brown, Boleman, Coleman, Dzuiban, Gallagher, Kallian,
Thomas, and Ventee (1976) found the faculty at U.C.F. very dissatisfied with the administrative policies in many areas under study prior to the representation election. Have union tactics been aggressive enough to satisfy this political estrangement? Have the subsequent changes in the administration been just as successful in satisfying the estrangement in certain areas?

Bigoness (1978) sought to explore the relationship between various facets of job satisfaction and personality differences. Persons perceiving events largely beyond their control were hypothesized as being favorable toward collective bargaining more so than individuals who feel in control of their lives and events. This belief was supported in testing results. Walker and Lawler (1979) hypothesized that social control sources would affect an individual's decision to join a union independently of job dissatisfaction or perceived power inequites. Those individuals with a strong organizational commitment are less likely to act in ways that threaten the integrity of the existing social structure. Research on non-union and union faculty found no overall differences in morale between these two groups (Hasle, 1978). However, the study did find significant differences on several individual factors including rapport with administration, satisfaction with teaching and teacher salary. Cangemi, Clark and Harryman (1976) found distinct differences in pro-union and pro-company personnel. Even though these authors used different predictors, they found a
distinct group of attitudes toward unions and management.

Attitudes toward the unions and the administration will affect a person's choice in membership behavior. Administrative attitudes can be based upon personal experience, hearsay, or some other source. Union attitudes can be based on the same sources. Each faculty member will have a different attitude set and different type of expectations of the results. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) believe that an attitude toward an object is related to the totality of a person's intentions with respect to the object. The act of joining or not joining the union will be the behavioral result of attitude formation and expected results. This act will result in a degree of commitment toward being a union member or nonmember.

Expectancy theories deal with object valence and likelihood of certain actions leading to a desired outcome. Joining or not joining will be based on the probability of this action leading to desired benefits. It is highly unlikely that faculty will have all their expectations met. This will lead to satisfaction in some areas and dissatisfaction in other areas, based on the degree of expectations. Based on informal faculty interviews at U.C.F. by the author, it seems there is a general level of faculty dissatisfaction with the present state of collective bargaining issues. Walker and Lawler (1978) examined the effects of efficacy, commitment and expectations on faculty collective bargaining attitudes, prior to a union representation election. They found high
organizational commitment led to greater weight being placed on the impacts collective bargaining would have on organizational goal attainment, organizational integrity and intrinsic factors. Faculty low in commitment placed greater weight on extrinsic factors. If commitment affects expectations and attitude formation prior to the election, how will commitment affect subsequent satisfaction with election results? To whom will faculty attribute their satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

Cognitive consistency theory implies that imbalanced assertions between two related objects are not likely to be believed, but balanced ones are. Dissonance theory is based on the belief that a person will strive to achieve consonance and reduce the magnitude of dissonance (Hollander & Hunt, 1963; Kagan & Havemann, 1968). For example, if a faculty member joined the union to achieve certain goals which were not obtained, this outcome would lead to dissatisfaction in these areas. The result will not be consistent with expectations. The construction of expectancies requires an involvement of attention demanding processes, as with the union election. However, once the expectancy has been constructed, it can persist for brief periods of time independent of the direction of attention (McLean & Shulman, 1978). It is projected here that a faculty member will direct much attention to the union issue, make a decision to join or not join and then assume the decision resulted in the desired outcomes. If these expectations are not
met, the decision made will not be faulted in an effort to avoid creating dissonance.

Based on research cited, the following hypotheses relevant to contract issues were made:

1. Due to a commitment to the union, a member will
   (a) attribute dissatisfaction to the administration and
   (b) attribute satisfaction to the union.

2. Due to a decision not to join the union, a nonmember will
   (a) attribute dissatisfaction to the union and
   (b) attribute satisfaction to the administration.

Tucker and Rowe (1979) found that different expectancies can indeed result in the same information being perceived and interpreted in a different manner. The authors found unfavorable expectations to be more influential than favorable ones. An additional hypothesis was developed based on this:

3. Nonmembers will be generally more satisfied than members. This results from nonmembers not being favorable to the union and thus not anticipating large employment improvements. Since right-to-work states have more nonmembers than states without such laws, there will be more non-union commitment here.

A questionnaire to U.C.F. faculty was used to discover faculty level of satisfaction and where this level is attributed. Four succinct issues were used to obtain present satisfaction level. These issues (salary, promotion, tenure and grievance) were
based on research showing them to be common contract issues. A discrepancy score was obtained for each respondent to measure the degree of attribution relative to the level of satisfaction. This discrepancy score was obtained from the absolute difference of the satisfaction scale minus the attribution scale. Additional analysis examined the raw data between member versus nonmember groups without changing the data to discrepancy scores.
Method

Subjects. The subjects used in this research were full time faculty members from the University of Central Florida. Past research tends to use full time faculty to avoid confounding data (Franklin & Li, 1972; Hemphill, 1955; Walker & Lawler, 1978). Faculty members were randomly polled from all colleges on campus. Every other name from an alphabetized list of relevant faculty was used to obtain a sampling of 185 members. Of this sample, 111 faculty returned questionnaires for a response rate of 60%. One questionnaire could not be used because the respondent failed to complete the attribution scale.

Of those subjects responding, 65 were non-union and 45 were union members. Fifty-six non-union members were males and 9 were females. The union members consisted of 33 males and 12 females. The nonmembers had a mean age of 43.6 years and a mean tenure of 7.64 years. Union members responding to the questionnaire had an age mean of 42 years and 7.88 years at the University. Forty-two non-union members (65%) were tenured while 31 members (68%) were tenured.

Questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to examine the hypothesized relationship between membership status, satisfaction and union/administration attribution. According to Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) bipolar scales of attitudes are evaluative in nature
to the dimension. The questionnaire attempted to evaluate four dimensions relevant to campus union negotiations, based on contract research. It was decided that the addition of more issues would lead to areas not readily in control of either the union or the administration. The questionnaire looked at belief strength and belief content of the dimensions, as defined by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). These authors defined belief strength as a measure of the subjective probability that the object is associated with a given attribute, i.e. satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In addition, belief content identifies the attribute associated with the concept, i.e. the union or administration. The belief dimensions were also chosen on the basis of research by Brown, W.R. et al. (1976) on faculty attitudes at the University of Central Florida prior to the union representation election.

Biographical data included in the questionnaire were based on prior research showing the relevance of such data to faculty attitudes (Cline, 1974; Hemphill, 1955; Nixon, 1975). This past research has attempted to develop a sketch of the type of faculty prone to join a union. Biographical data from the questionnaire was used to discover any consistent differences between the groups and if faculty at U.C.F. are similar to faculty used in prior research. (See Appendix for the questionnaire.)

Procedure. The subjects were asked to answer a questionnaire regarding their attitudes on four collective bargaining issues.
The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and assuring the confidentiality of each participant. The cover letter also clarified the study's independence from the administration and the union. The questionnaire asked a minimum of biographical data on each subject.

The questionnaire, cover letter and return envelope were placed in envelopes addressed to each subject. The questionnaires were returned to the author through campus mail. All responses were received within two weeks.

Respondents' questionnaires were separated using the criterion of union versus non-union membership. A discrepancy score was obtained for each subject on each of the four items by subtracting the scaled response on satisfaction from the scaled response on attribution and taking the absolute value of this figure. This is a discrepancy score for predicted direction. For union members the scale was unchanged from the actual questionnaire (i.e., highly satisfied = 1 to highly dissatisfied = 7 and total administration = 1 to total union = 7). For non-union members the satisfaction scale remained the same, but the attribution scale was reversed (i.e., total administration = 7 to total union = 1). This resulted in high scores for both groups indicating a response in the predicted direction. For example, a union member with a rating of 7 on satisfaction and a rating of 1 on the attribution scale would have a maximum discrepancy score of 6. This would indicate that this union member was highly dissatisfied.
on the contract issue and attributed this dissatisfaction totally to the administration. A nonmember with a satisfaction rating of 7 and a rating of 1 on the attribution scale would also have a maximum discrepancy rating of 6. However, for the nonmember this would indicate a high dissatisfaction on the issue with total union attribution since the attribution scale is reversed. For both groups a rating of 4 on satisfaction and 4 on the attribution scale would result in a discrepancy score of 0. This is because an equal attribution of satisfaction does not support the hypotheses. A union member with a satisfaction rating of 2 and an attribution rating of 5 would have a discrepancy score of 3. This would show a tendency to support the hypothesis, i.e. a tendency toward satisfaction and a tendency to attribute this to the union. For nonmembers these same ratings and discrepancy score would indicate a tendency toward satisfaction and a tendency to attribute this to the administration. In other words, changing the scale for nonmembers, allows interpreting discrepancy scores equally for both groups (i.e., 6 is maximum hypotheses support and 0 is no support for the hypotheses). The discrepancy score calculations allowed subjects with different questionnaire responses to obtain the same score. This score was an indication only of responses in the predicted direction, not an indication of response equality.
Results

To test the overall theory of attribution relative to membership status, a group mean was obtained for each item on the discrepancy scores. It should be kept in mind that the hypotheses predict that members will attribute satisfaction to the union and dissatisfaction to the administration. Non-members will conversely attribute satisfaction to the administration and dissatisfaction to the union. Table 1 contains the mean discrepancy scores for each group.

Table 1
Mean Discrepancy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonMembers</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the significance of the differences between the means of member versus nonmember groups, t tests were performed. The obtained values for t(108) of 30.3 (salary), 3.03 (promotion), 3.71 (tenure) and 29.4 (grievance), were significant at p < .01. Union members showed a significantly higher mean discrepancy score on salary, promotion and grievance, than nonmembers. The nonmember group had a significantly higher score on tenure.
The highest mean discrepancy score (3.75), and thus the best support of the attribution hypotheses was for union members with respect to salary. In terms of this hypothesis, union members were dissatisfied with salary and attribute this to the administration more than any other variable. The \( t \) tests showed significant differences between the two groups in their degree of support of the hypotheses.

In order to estimate the amount of statistical association implied by the obtained mean differences, an omega square (est. \( \omega^2 \)) was used. The test resulted in omega squares as follows: salary .89; promotion .069; tenure .109; grievance .887. Again the relationship between being a union member and predicted attribution was the highest for salary, closely followed by grievance.

To discover the degree of relationship between the items within the two groups, intercorrelations, using discrepancy scores, were obtained. These intercorrelations represent all combinations possible between the four contract issues. The Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was the formula used. All correlation combinations between salary, promotion, tenure and grievance are represented in Tables 2 and 3. Table 2 contains the intercorrelations for non-union members and Table 3 contains the same data for union members.

Fisher's \( r \) to \( Z \) transformation was used to test for any significant differences between the intercorrelations of nonmembers
versus members. The intercorrelation between promotion and tenure for nonmembers is significantly higher than for members ($Z = 2.92, p < .01$). The remaining differences were not significant ($p < .01$).

Table 2
Item Intercorrelations - NonMembers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.538*</td>
<td>.418*</td>
<td>.500*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.745*</td>
<td>.537*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.520*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01, df=63

Table 3
Item Intercorrelations - Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.556*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.364*</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.401*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01, df=43

In an effort to further clarify the differences between members
and nonmembers, the actual scaled responses were examined without changing them to discrepancy scores (i.e., raw scaled responses). The faculty responses were taken directly from the questionnaires to obtain the data shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Mean Scaled Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction(^a)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution(^b)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NonMembers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Scale = 1 (highly satisfied) to 7 (highly dissatisfied)

\(^b\)Scale = 1 (total administration) to 7 (total union)

Eight t tests were used to test the significance of the differences between the means of the two groups on each issue for both the satisfaction scale and the attribution scale. The obtained t's are shown in Table 5. This Table is based on the raw scaled responses shown in Table 4.
Table 5

Obtained t's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member vs. NonMember Mean Scaled Responses</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>24.66*</td>
<td>31.56*</td>
<td>17.87*</td>
<td>7.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>33.12*</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>13.75*</td>
<td>40.29*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01, df = 108

This data showed that the two groups are different on all items for their degree of satisfaction and attribution. Table 4 shows the trends in the predicted direction for the scaled responses. Union members were consistently more dissatisfied than nonmembers on all contract issues. The attribution level of members was consistent with their dissatisfaction level (i.e., the stronger their dissatisfaction, the stronger their administration attribution). Members showed a tendency toward satisfaction on grievance and this is attributed to the union. The members showed support of the attribution hypothesis. Nonmembers, in agreement with the hypothesis, give the administration credit for their degree of satisfaction on promotion and tenure and to a lesser degree on grievance. However, nonmembers showed a tendency to attribute their dissatisfaction on salary to the administration, in disagreement with the hypothesis.

To discover the degree of relationship between the items within the two groups, raw score intercorrelations were obtained.
All correlation combinations between salary, promotion, tenure and grievance on the satisfaction scale are represented in Tables 6 and 7. Table 6 contains the intercorrelations for nonmembers and Table 7 contains the same data for union members. It should be noted that intercorrelations for the attribution scale were not calculated. The attribution scale is dependent upon the satisfaction scale and was not studied separately.

Table 6
Raw Satisfaction Score Intercorrelations - NonMembers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.536*</td>
<td>.526*</td>
<td>.386*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.701*</td>
<td>.857*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.627*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01, df=63
Table 7
Raw Satisfaction Score Intercorrelations - Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.430*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.420*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01, df=43
Discussion

In general, the results supported the hypotheses. There were definite tendencies in the direction predicted by the hypotheses of attribution directed by membership status. However, on the basis of the discrepancy scores, significantly more union members attributed satisfaction/dissatisfaction in the predicted direction than did nonmembers on all issues except tenure. Data from non-union members supported the hypotheses significantly more than member on tenure. High discrepancy scores indicated attribution of satisfaction in the predicted direction. The discrepancy scores for members were significantly higher than nonmembers on all contract issues except tenure. The omega square results showed that there is a strong relationship between union members and the predicted attribution for salary and grievance. For these issues, union membership accounted for approximately 89% of the predicted attribution. The membership relationship for promotion is weaker, accounting for about 7% of the predicted attribution. In other words, union members were dissatisfied on the issue of salary and attributed this to the administration. They were satisfied on grievances and attributed this satisfaction to the union.

The other issues of tenure and promotion were supported to a lesser degree. Union members have made a conscious commitment to the union with certain anticipated results. Their need to
justify this decision strongly supported the predicted relationship for salary and grievance. Promotion and tenure were attributed in the predicted direction, but not as strongly as grievance and salary. The non-union members, while showing a tendency in the predicted direction, were not consistent in their attribution relative to the nonmember attribution hypothesis. The nonmembers did not appear to be as committed to their decision as the members. Since they are covered by right-to-work laws, they can view their level of satisfaction and objectively attribute this to either the union or the administration. However, since all nonmember discrepancy score means were larger than zero, attribution of satisfaction to the administration and dissatisfaction to the union is indicated.

The intercorrelations of discrepancy scores across contract issues indicated that there is little differentiation by nonmembers. The contract issues are significantly intercorrelated to the extent that distinguishing between them may not be possible, when interpreting nonmember discrepancy scores. These issues were chosen for their relatedness to contract issues, therefore, the significant intercorrelations were not startling. It must be kept in mind that the intercorrelations presented were between discrepancy scores. Nonmembers had a general level of satisfaction with all contract issues, except for dissatisfaction on salary, and when combined with their attribution, they did not distinguish between the issues.
For union members, the interpretation became less consistent. For this group, salary-grievance, promotion-tenure and tenure-grievance were significantly related. The significant correlation between discrepancy scores for tenure and promotion for both groups was not surprising since past research has combined these as one issue (Ponak & Thompson, 1979). However, while these two issues were significantly related within the two groups, union members discriminated between them significantly more than nonmembers. Because members were consistent in their level of satisfaction and attribution on these two issues, there was a significant correlation.

The inconsistency of intercorrelations for members was probably a result of their viewing certain issues stronger in terms of satisfaction and attribution than the other issues. For example, the strong relationship between salary and grievance for members was most likely related to the importance of these issues and the member's strong support of the attribution hypothesis. Consistent levels of satisfaction and attribution resulted in consistent discrepancy scores and thus a significant intercorrelation. Members distinguished between contract issues at different levels while nonmembers did not. The nonmembers apparently did not have a need to separate these issues in order to form an opinion regarding their satisfaction and attribution.

The intercorrelations of raw satisfaction scores showed again
that nonmembers are not discriminating between the issues. For nonmembers, the level of satisfaction on all issues was significantly related. Union members again showed their ability to discriminate the issues. The raw score intercorrelation between salary and grievance was the only combination that had different results from the discrepancy score intercorrelations. This is due to dissatisfaction on salary and satisfaction on grievance by members resulting in a nonsignificant correlation. On the discrepancy score both of these issues were attributed as predicted resulting in high discrepancy scores and a significant correlation.

The raw scaled responses, in Table 4, showed significant differences between members and nonmembers for all issues on both satisfaction and attribution. Examination of the raw data showed that these two groups have different perceptions regarding responsibility for levels of satisfaction. The farther the scaled response was from the middle of the scale, the stronger the attitude on that issue. It can again be seen from Table 4 that salary elicited the strongest response from members in support of the hypothesis. Salary was also the item on which both groups were most dissatisfied. The differences between satisfaction and attribution on the issues indicated that members were consistently more supportive of the hypotheses than nonmembers. The raw data showed tendencies to support the hypotheses for both groups, however, different issues elicited different degrees of support. The union
appeared to play an important role in grievances. This was the only item on which the members show any satisfaction (less than 4 on the attribution scale). This same issue was the only one on which nonmembers came close to giving equal attribution for their level of satisfaction. It was the issue both groups were most satisfied with.

The hypothesis of nonmembers being generally more satisfied was supported across all contract issues. Nonmembers showed significantly greater satisfaction than members. The union members were anticipating large employment improvements and thus became dissatisfied at the results. Nonmembers expected little and thus were not as quick to become dissatisfied with the unionization results. An alternative explanation is that nonmembers were less dissatisfied than members at the time of the joining process, and thus did not join the union.

Comments on several of the questionnaires indicated that some faculty felt that these issues are legislated and not under negotiable control. This may account in part for the nonmember's unconformity on salary attribution and the strong support for the hypothesis by members on this issue. If it is assumed that an issue is beyond direct control of the union organization, the union cannot be blamed for the level of dissatisfaction. The nonmembers to a lesser extent, also felt the administration was responsible for salary dissatisfaction. The idea of certain issues being
negotiable may have also affected the intercorrelations. This would show again that these two groups perceived issues differently since the significance levels were not consistent between groups. In attributing causality, the groups were different.

There was little difference in the biographical data between union members and nonmembers. Respondents also appeared to be evenly distributed among colleges on campus. Nixon (1975) found junior faculty in less technical fields most supportive of unions. This was not supported in the present research. The population at the University of Central Florida was older than that used in Nixon's research. Hemphill (1955) found older more mature faculty provided a large portion of administrative reputation. This could have added to the general biographical equality of the two groups. Older faculty distributed varied information to the younger faculty, who in turn listened to those with whom they tended to agree. The result was two groups who have an equal chance of obtaining the same type of participants.

Because this study was concerned with attribution relative to the level of satisfaction, these two issues were combined on one scale. Although the author attempted to make the questionnaire clear, several respondents expressed concern over confusion with the form and directions. Any additional research of this nature should consider redesigning the scales.
Conclusions

The union on the campus of U.C.F. may be able to sustain its present membership, but will most likely have difficulty convincing nonmembers to join. The nonmembers were generally more satisfied than members, on the issues studied and attributed this to the administration. Nonmembers would probably not be induced to join since the members' satisfaction level is significantly lower than their own. On the basis of this research, the union's strategy to get this group to join should emphasize any gains made in grievance procedures. This was the issue on which nonmembers came the closest to attributing the union with their level of satisfaction.

On the involvement scale, union members showed only moderate union involvement with a mean of 3.4 on scale of 1 (extremely involved) to 5 (not involved). Regardless of their level of involvement these members pay dues to sustain the union. They may continue to attribute their dissatisfaction to the administration in an effort to justify their expenditure. Members may become locked into this dissonance reducing behavior as they pay dues for a longer period of time. While this could sustain the union, it will not likely lead to new members.

Salary is usually the issue emphasized by the union as a reason to join their organization. If the faculty believe this issue to be in the hands of a third party, a new recruiting issue
will have to be emphasized.

Members and nonmembers have viewed the four contract issues studied with different discriminating abilities. The union should examine the differential importance of these issues to the two groups. The cause and effect relationship between membership status and discrimination of issues may be important to both the union and the administration. The present research found group differences in consistency of satisfaction and attribution. Future research should examine the importance of this to union membership status, and how this affects the faculty members' commitment to one group or another.
APPENDIX A
FACULTY SURVEY

1. Sex: Male _______ Female _______

2. Age: ________________

3. College Affiliation ____________________________

4. Length of time at the University of Central Florida ________________

5. Tenure Status: Tenured _______ Non-Tenured _______

6. Union Membership Status: Member _______ Non-Member _______

(a) If you are a member, how would you rate your degree of involvement in the union?

Extremely Involved __________ Not Involved __________

7. Please respond to the four items listed below as follows:

Part I: Indicate your degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale: Highly Satisfied (HS)</th>
<th>Neutral (N)</th>
<th>Highly Dissatisfied (HD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II: Indicate the degree to which you attribute your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the item to either the union or the administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale: Totally Administration (TA)</th>
<th>Equal Attribution (EA)</th>
<th>Totally Union (TU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PART I</th>
<th>PART II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Status</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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