2013

Relationship Between Trust and Perceived Value of Faculty Unionization Among Full-Time Faculty in Selected Michigan Community Colleges

Stacy L. Horner
Andrews University

Recommended Citation

Thank you for your interest in the

Andrews University Digital Library

of Dissertations and Theses.

ABSTRACT

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUST AND PERCEIVED VALUE OF
FACULTY UNIONIZATION AMONG FULL-TIME FACULTY
IN SELECTED MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Stacy L. Horner

Chair: Robson Marinho

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

School of Education

Title: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUST AND PERCEIVED VALUE OF
FACULTY UNIONIZATION AMONG FULL-TIME FACULTY IN
SELECTED MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Name of researcher: Stacy L. Horner

Name and degree of faculty chair: Robson Marinho, Ph.D.

Date completed: April 2013

Problem Statement

There are conflicting studies on the relationship between the union and nonunion

faculty and trust. Studies have shown that the union environment inherently produces a

distrustful atmosphere and, with a union, employees are actually more dissatisfied than

their nonunion counterparts. On the other hand, this has created a cycle where faculty

may not trust administration, and administration may not trust faculty. For example,

when doing negotiations, each party fights on behalf of itself, instead of fighting for the

betterment of the organization. However, unions can give faculty a voice with

administration and state and federal government, and may positively influence extrinsic

rewards such as salary and benefits. This study investigated the relationship between faculty trust towards administration, other faculty, and union membership—specifically how trust is related to the relationships of faculty, administration, and the union.

Method

This study used ex post facto or non-experimental research, which is a systematic inquiry where the researcher does not have control over the independent variables. It was used to determine if there is a relationship between faculty's level of trust and their desire to be unionized, or if already unionized their desire was to stay unionized. This type of research displays the relationships among the variables but does not assume cause or effect. The Omnibus T-Scale developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran in 2003 was used to measure trust with their colleagues (other faculty), trust with administration, and trust total. The trust survey was sent to the full-time faculty at five Michigan community colleges. Community colleges selected were similar in size, demographics, and setting. The main difference for all of the community colleges is their union membership. Three nonunionized community colleges in Michigan were selected along with two unionized community colleges similar to the non-unionized community colleges in demographics, socioeconomic status, student population, and full-time faculty.

Results

Based on these findings, this study led to the conclusion that there is a relationship between unionization and trust between faculty at unionized schools and administration. There is not a significant difference between trust at unionized and nonunionized schools and faculty. In fact, these findings are consistent with the literature

that says, "There is usually an inverse relationship between rules and trust: the more people depend on rules to regulate their interactions, the less they trust others, and vice versa." On the other hand, one important finding of this study that does not seem to be addressed in the literature is that there does not seem to be a relationship between trust and faculty and other faculty in regard to unionization status.

Conclusion

According to the findings of this study, trust tends to make a difference on faculty trust with administration in a unionized environment. Trust is foundational to all relationships; it may positively influence faculty job satisfaction, student retention, and student engagement, and improve organizational effectiveness. It is my expectation that this study will help community college administrators develop strategies to increase trust.

Andrews University

School of Education

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUST AND PERCEIVED VALUE OF
FACULTY UNIONIZATION AMONG FULL-TIME FACULTY IN
SELECTED MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Stacy L. Horner

April 2013

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUST AND PERCEIVED VALUE OF
FACULTY UNIONIZATION AMONG FULL-TIME FACULTY IN
SELECTED MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A dissertation
presented in partial fullfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Stacy L. Horner

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

_____	_____
Chair: Robson Marinho	Dean, School of Education
	James R. Jeffery
_____	
Member: Isadore Newman	
_____	
Member: Sylvia Gonzalez	
_____	_____
External: Naomi Ludman	Date approved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Almost one-third of the expenses for a college are faculty costs (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). Because faculty represent a significant resource and expense for colleges and universities, keeping them satisfied is important. Sixty percent of full-time faculty at public two-year institutions are members of a collective bargaining agreement (Berry & Savarese, 2012). A trusting relationship where real conversations happen is important in order to move forward in this economic environment. It is also important for faculty to be able to work with administration when they are faced with budget cuts and significant increases in costs that may affect faculty and the college. The faculty union adds another element that can play a part in the relationship between faculty and administration.

Adding to the challenges of faculty issues such as trust, job satisfaction, and union participation, community college enrollment has increased, during the past 5 years, in some cases, more than four times the rate of its 4-year university counterparts, or 45% of the U.S. college enrollment (Serwach, 2009; The Brookings Institution, 2013). The challenge for leaders will be how to keep trust in the relationship, continue positive job satisfaction while in many cases increasing faculty workloads, decreasing their net pay,

and dealing with demographic changes affecting student populations and changes in faculty.

Other companies face the same challenges as colleges and universities. For example, such entities as K-12 schools, manufacturing companies, government agencies, and healthcare can utilize this research and use it in their own organizations—especially those facing unionization or reviewing their collective bargaining agreements. It will be important for employees to understand the advantages and disadvantages of unionization and how it relates to their level of satisfaction and general relationship with administration.

Faculty have a significant role in colleges and are the direct link to the "customers" of the college, the students. It is vital to understand how trust impacts faculty, as their level of trust could significantly change the culture of the college with students, other faculty, and administration. Trust has been linked to positively affecting a person's attitude, performance, behavior, and perceptions, and may even lead to a more effective organization (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001; Kramer & Cook, 2004; Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Powell, 1996; Williamson, 1993). In addition, trust may reduce uncertainty (Luhmann, 1979) and enhance cooperation (Gambetta, 1988). Lack of trust within the employees of an organization can have indirect effects, including a vicious cycle that makes people blame one another for lack of success (Kanter, 1997).

Trust plays an important part in any relationship. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) said, "Trust is like air, if present, often it goes unnoticed. However, if it is not present, havoc ensues, and it is obvious that an organizational environment cannot be functioning at capacity without it present" (p. 185). Trust is a foundational component of

a relationship (Covey, 2006). This study evaluates the level of trust between community college faculty and faculty, and between faculty and administration, as perceived by faculty, and how this might differ in environments where faculty are unionized and where faculty are not unionized.

Throughout this research, it has become evident that trust is at the center or even may be foundational in the relationship cycle (Covey, 2006). It is not hard to imagine that when not present between administration and employees, a third part, unions, may come into the relationship to work on behalf of faculty with administration. Job satisfaction may change as well as the overall relationship between faculty and administration. Since unions represent 46% of community college faculty, understanding how faculty are different from their nonunion counterparts is important for administration and faculty to comprehend in terms of trust between faculty and administration (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

There are conflicting studies on the relationship between the union and nonunion faculty and trust. Studies have shown that the union environment inherently produces a distrustful atmosphere and, with a union, employees are actually more dissatisfied than their nonunion counterparts (Ormsby & Ormsby, 1988; Wickens, 2008). On the other hand, this has created a cycle where faculty may not trust administration, and administration may not trust faculty. For example, when doing negotiations, each party fights on its own behalf, instead of fighting for the betterment of the organization. However, unions can give faculty a voice with administration, state, and federal

government, and may positively impact such extrinsic rewards as salary and benefits (Steck & Zweig, 2000).

Purpose

This study investigated the relationship between faculty trust towards administration, other faculty, and union membership—specifically, how trust is related to the relationship of faculty, administration, and the union.

General Research Questions

One general research question was asked in this study: How does trust in administration and other faculty relate to the desire to be unionized?

Primary Research Questions

The following research questions have guided this study.

1. Is there a relationship between faculty trust in administration and unionization as perceived by faculty in unionized and nonunionized schools?

2. Is there a relationship between faculty trust in other faculty and unionization as perceived by faculty in unionized and nonunionized schools?

3. Is there a relationship between total trust and unionization as perceived by faculty in unionized and nonunionized schools?

Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses have guided this study.

1. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for number of years teaching held constant.

2. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for sex.

3. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for age.

4. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for ethnicity.

5. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for academic departments.

Assumptions Underlying the Study

Several assumptions underlie this study. First, it is assumed that the participants being investigated are representative of the full-time faculty. Second, it is assumed that the trustworthy scales are representative of their feelings of trust. Third, it is assumed that the self-reported demographic data given are accurate. Fourth, it is assumed that subjects answer honestly, and that they understand the questions asked.

Significance of Study

Leaders are faced with many challenges. The current economic climate is forcing many leaders to think differently than they have before in their careers (Schmidt, 2011). This study investigates the relationship between trust and the perceived value of the faculty union among full-time faculty members in community colleges. Understanding the relationship between administration and faculty is important. Do they trust one another? Trust has been linked to positively affecting a person's attitude, performance, behavior, and perceptions and may even lead to a more effective organization (Dirks &

Ferrin, 2001; Kramer & Cook, 2004; Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Powell, 1996; Williamson, 1993).

Faculty and their salaries represent a large part of the community college's human resources and their budget. They also come into contact with and have a huge impact on the "customers" of the community college: the students. Studying the differences between a union environment and nonunion environment will assist administration and faculty when making decisions about the union in the future. For example, should a school seek collective bargaining? Is collective bargaining in the best interest of the school, the faculty, and the students? Faculty working within a trusting environment may be more satisfied, which may lead to greater productivity, faculty retention, and reduction in absenteeism, and possibly improvements in teaching quality.

When community colleges were granted the right to collectively bargain, in the 1960s, many community college faculty unionized in order to get better pay, benefits, and working conditions (A.M. Cohen & Brawer, 2008). In addition, faculty were also concerned about ensuring academic freedom. Between 2008 and 2012, the issue seems to be centered on shared governance. Increasingly, faculty are professional educators; some states even call them managers, and they are concerned with curriculum design, shaping instructional budgets, and even in hiring new faculty. However, more and more often, administrators, with no experience or training in the academic world, are making decisions on academic issues instead of faculty. Some refer to this subtle change in education as the corporatization of education (White & Hauck, 2000).

This study may also stimulate more research in the field of employee satisfaction. Faculty job satisfaction at community colleges is important since faculty are often paid

less than their university counterparts, and the ability to recruit, reward, promote, and retain highly qualified faculty is critical to the success of the college (A.M. Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

Delimitations

The delimitations of this study include the following:

Study was delimited to full-time faculty at five community colleges in Michigan: three community colleges without a union and two community colleges with a union.

Definition of Terms

Trust: Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) define trust as "an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (p. 189).

Unionized Faculty: Faculty that have selected or were required to join a collective bargaining unit.

Tenured Faculty: Includes full-time faculty with an indefinite contract.

Non-tenured Faculty: Includes faculty that have appointments for a specified amount of time; at the end of that time they may be rehired or terminated.

Administration: Includes all levels of administration from the Chair and up. This may include Chairs, Deans, Academic Vice Presidents, Chief Academic Officers, Presidents, and Board members.

Full-time Faculty: Includes any faculty member who is considered full-time and has a contract for the stated 2011-2012 school year.

Perceived Value: Assumption of importance attributed to unionization by faculty members who belong to an institution that accepted faculty union and therefore became unionized.

Union: An organized group of wage earners joined together for mutual aid and protection and for dealing collectively with employers ("Union," 2012).

Trust A: Refers to the score related to trust with administration.

Trust F: Refers to the score related to trust among faculty.

Trust T: A trust total score; a combination of trust with administration and trust with faculty questions. See Chapter 3 for additional information regarding Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T.

Summary

In Chapter 1 we have considered the background of the problem, why it is important for community college administrators to understand how trust influences their faculty, whether or not they are a unionized school or not unionized. A statement of the problem and general research questions are also stated. In addition, assumptions of the study are included as well as the significance of the study. The delimitations of the study and the definition of terms are included as part of Chapter 1.

In upcoming chapters I will take an in-depth look at the literature surrounding trust and unions as well as the influence this may have on motivation and job satisfaction. Chapter 3 covers the methods of this study, while Chapter 4 reports the results. Look to Chapter 5 to understand how this study impacts the current research and what additional research can be conducted in this field.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This research focuses on trust within the community college environment and how trust affects faculty and their relationships with each other and administration. Trust is considered in two environments, on a unionized campus and on a nonunionized campus. Because trust has been linked to positively affecting a person's attitude, performance, behavior, and perceptions and may even lead to a more effective organization, it is an important element in the relationships on community college campuses (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001; Kramer & Cook, 2004; Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Powell, 1996; Williamson, 1993).

The theoretical framework for this study is that trust, as a foundational element to a relationship, can change the entire climate and culture of a school (Hoy, 2010). Lack of a trusting environment could lead to a third party introduced, a union, to help mediate the relationship. Vulnerability as well as benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness may be attributed to a more trusting culture (Hoy & Tschannon-Moran, 1999). A trusting environment within the school could positively impact faculty job satisfaction.

Trust and the Organization

An important part of this study is how faculty perceive trust in their organizations.

Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) defined trust as "an individual's or group's

willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party

is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (p. 189). Other definitions state that

it is a condition in which one is free from doubt, ability to count on, rely, depend on, or

be certain of others or organizations (MacNeil, Spuck, & Ceyanes, 1998). Cummings and

Bromiley (1996) defined trust

> as the expectation that another individual or group will (a) make a good faith
> effort to behave in accordance with commitments—both explicit or implicit, (b)
> be honest in whatever negotiations preceded those commitments, and (c) not take
> excessive advantage of others even when the opportunity exists. (pp. 304-305)

Five facets of trust have been identified, established, and measured by Hoy and

Tschannen-Moran (1999). They are benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and

openness. Benevolence is "confidence that one's well-being will be protected by another

trusted person" (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p. 187). In other words it is the reliance

on a trusted person's good will to act in one's best interest. "Reliability is the extent to

which one can count on another person through what is needed" (Hoy & Tschannen-

Moran, 1999, p. 187). Competence is when someone is dependent on another to fulfill an

expectation. Honesty, according to Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), is a person's

"character, integrity, and authenticity" (p. 188). The last facet of trust identified by Hoy

and Tschannen-Moran is openness. Openness is sharing relevant information with others

and making themselves vulernable to other people. "It is a sign of reciprocal trust" (p.

188).

It is easy to see that trust is a foundational element of any relationship. Trust is complex and important to organizations (Van Maele & Van Houtte, 2009). Trust has been linked to positively affect a person's attitude, performance, behavior, and perceptions and may even lead to a more effective organization (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001; Kramer & Cook, 2004; Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Powell, 1996; Williamson, 1993). In addition, trust may reduce uncertainty (Luhmann, 1979) and enhance cooperation (Gambetta, 1988). If people in an organization do not trust each other, this lack of trust can have indirect effects including a vicious cycle that makes people blame one another for lack of success (Kanter, 1997). Leaders must work to establish and create an environment of trust. Without trust there will not be teamwork or collaboration (MacNeil et al., 1998).

If faculty trust administration, faculty rely on what administration is telling them (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). If trust is not part of the relationship, faculty may be more inclined to look for a union relationship to represent them. In essence, faculty "hire" unions and expect that the union has their best interest in mind. Openness is a facet of trust and to the "extent to which relevant information is not withheld; it is the process by which individuals make themselves vulnerable by sharing information with others" (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, pp. 187-188). In Fukuyama's (1995) book *Trust: The Social Virtues and Creation of Prosperity*, he indicates that if people do not trust, they rely on formal rules and regulations. Fukuyama also noted that low trust societies end up isolating their workers with bureaucratic rules.

Professionals, like college professors, are normally trusted at a higher level than nonprofessionals, therefore can operate in a less "rule-bound" environment (Fukuyama,

1995). Fukuyama stated, "There is usually an inverse relationship between rules and trust: the more people depend on rules to regulate their interactions, the less they trust others, and vice versa" (Fukuyama, 1995, p. 224).

Building trust at colleges makes sense for the *business* of the college. Trust between faculty and administration in community colleges is important since it has been called the backbone of a strong and sustainable professional learning community (Hargreaves, 2007). Teachers' trust in administration and each other may even affect the functioning of a school (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Kochanek, 2005; Louis, 2007; Troman, 2000; Uline, Miller, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998). Faculty who trust administration and each other will improve the school by working in a more collegial way. A trusting relationship may also increase job satisfaction and a faculty's relationships with students by increasing efficacy (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). An individual's collegial trust is "more likely to disclose more accurate, relevant, and complete data about problems" (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Another advantage for faculty is that a more trusting environment will also support conflict resolution. Therefore, conflict resolution will be "easier and more productive" (Lewicki & Wiethoff, 2000).

Adversarial relationships can lead to an environment that is not conducive to success (MacNeil et al., 1998). It has been said, "Building a trusting relationship is the backbone of community building in schools" (Lambert et al., 1995, p. 66). Three characteristics have been proven to produce teacher trust (Kupersmith & Hoy, 1989):

1. Administration must take responsibility for its behaviors.

2. Administration must first be perceived as a person and second as the administrator.

3. Administration cannot be perceived as manipulative.

If administration has these characteristics, it gives them authenticity, which leads to trust (Kupersmith & Hoy, 1989). It is more important for administrators to build a trusting relationship than to have great leadership skills or professional competence (MacNeil et al., 1998).

Administrators can show trust by being kind, considerate, principled, and competent, use power wisely, make sensible decisions, promote curriculum and professional growth, show confidence, and focus on empowering faculty (MacNeil & Blake, 1998). Teachers or faculty can demonstrate trust by showing commitment to students and student learning, and by being sincere, honest, loyal, supportive, rational, friendly, and even cheerful (MacNeil et al., 1998).

Faculty Unions

Unions were established during the Industrial Revolution, but not until the 1960s did they become part of the college and university scene. Most recently, most of the organizing has occurred among graduate students and adjunct or part-time faculty (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). Sixty percent of full-time faculty at public two-year institutions are members of a collective bargaining agreement (Berry & Savarese, 2012). Sixty percent of this group works in California, Illinois, Washington, New York, and Michigan (A.M. Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

Unions at colleges and universities have been used to help negotiate higher wages, benefits, academic items like class size and textbook selection, length of work

weeks, working conditions, and standardized pay scales rather than merit pay, and unions represent members if contract provisions are violated. In the past, the most important aspect of union representation may be the protection they provide faculty in regard to academic freedom. Quickly becoming the most important issue for faculty is having a voice with administration (Steck & Zweig, 2000).

Michigan is one of the states with the most number of people protected by collective bargaining. In fact, since the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics has collected the data on union membership, Michigan has always had a greater percentage of union membership than the national average. Currently 16.5% of workers are covered by collective bargaining; the national average is 11.9% (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). Because Michigan has a significant amount of manufacturing, specifically, auto manufacturers and their suppliers, it is no surprise that other governmental entities are unionized, including public colleges and universities. Therefore, Michigan's culture has a union mentality. In fact, only three of the 28 public community colleges in Michigan are not associated with a union (Michigan Community College Association, 2011).

Two organizations oversee unions. In the private sector it is the National Labor Relations Board. In the public sector, it is a state public employment relation's board. If an issue is elevated to this level, the hearing takes the form of a civil trial. Normally an issue at this level is a result of one of the parties involved claiming that they have breached the collective bargaining agreement (Kaplin & Lee, 2007).

Administrators in the 1960s and 1970s had mixed feelings on collective bargaining. Some reluctantly accepted them while others welcomed collective bargaining. Those that accepted collective bargaining felt it was another way to "control"

faculty. A downside to collective bargaining was the increased need for attorneys to interpret the collective bargaining contracts (A.M. Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

Unions cost a lot of money. The costs associated with the union range from time spent by administration, staff, attorneys, and other labor consultants (Munk, 1998). Additionally, actual costs, while small, of printing and distributing new contracts during a contract year can add up for schools already struggling financially. These costs are in addition to the newly negotiated contracts for salaries and benefits. The time, energy, and money spent trying to negotiate with a union is becoming difficult for educational institutions to handle financially (Schmidt, 2011).

There have been conflicting studies on the salary of faculty and the union's impact on extrinsic rewards such as wages and benefits. A national study on faculty salaries indicated that faculty have not gotten the benefit from collective bargaining that they thought they would get. In fact, studies indicate that the pay increases as a result of the union were statistically insignificant (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005). Studies done on community colleges did indicate potentially significant differences in wages and benefits, up to 32% (Maldonado, 2006). However the study did not take into account location of community colleges or cost of living differences; therefore it may be difficult to determine the actual benefit, if any, from collective bargaining (Schmidt, 2011). Some faculty do not feel they get benefits from their representation. They actually feel bogged down by the union and collective bargaining because often it limits their choices and opportunities for college committee membership and other college activities not part of their union contract (Vedder, Denhart, & Robe, 2011).

Reasons colleges and universities may not want a union is because collective

bargaining or unionization has an inherently adversarial and less cooperative relationship

with administration (Wickens, 2008). In addition, unionized faculty are less likely to

serve on a university committee or to volunteer (Wickens, 2008). Faculty may unionize,

trying to gain influence over college and university governance, but there is some support

for the argument that unions actually reduce faculty influence over university governance

(Wickens, 2008). Instead of faculty involvement in decisions, faculty find themselves

being represented more and more by the union. For example, a Faculty Rights Committee

may cease to exist after a union comes to campus. Decisions become more centralized

between the union and administration (Wickens, 2008).

Interestingly, administration feels that unions help make differences in such

monetary aspects of a faculty member's job as salaries, promotions, and working

conditions and less influence on academic issues such as curriculum and degree

requirements (Davis, 2011). Depending on the definition of unionization and governance,

unions tend to focus on economic factors while academic issues are a focus of faculty

senates (Davis, 2011).

Faculty Union and Job Satisfaction

One of the most important findings about union membership and job satisfaction

said that union workers express greater dissatisfaction with their jobs than nonunion

workers (Freeman & Medoff, 1984; Hersch & Stone, 1990). However, it seems that

unionized dissatisfied workers do not leave their jobs, while dissatisfied nonunion

workers leave their jobs (Bender & Sloane, 1998). This may be due to the exit-voice

hypothesis, which states that more workers are "heard" when represented by a union

16

because they "voice" their concerns to the union, thus reducing turnover and dissatisfaction among employees (Freeman & Medoff, 1984).

The question regarding satisfaction on monetary versus non-monetary factors is interestingly contradicting. In one study, faculty represented by a union were more satisfied with union influence on non-monetary aspects of their job than with union influence on monetary aspects (Dallinger & Beveridge, 1993; Elmuti & Kathawala, 1991). One-third of full-time faculty at a Midwestern university were satisfied with union influence on monetary aspects of their job while a third were dissatisfied (Elmuti & Kathawala, 1991). However, further research conducted again with full-time faculty at Midwestern universities indicated that a smaller percentage of respondents were satisfied with union influence on both monetary and non-monetary aspects (Dallinger & Beveridge, 1993). The non-monetary job satisfaction aspect they found that faculty were most satisfied with was sick leave. Another result found that longer employed, higher ranking, and higher paid faculty members were less satisfied with union influence than younger, newer faculty.

Faculty were more satisfied with non-monetary aspects of their jobs such as curriculum development and personnel decisions (Dallinger & Beveridge, 1993). Faculty were also satisfied with union influence on monthly salary, medical benefits, workload, and faculty representation in the legislature (Dallinger & Beveridge, 1993; Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1984). On the other hand, an increased satisfaction was found for faculty on nonunionized campuses in areas relating to governance, support, recognition, and workload (Finley, 1991).

The relationship between union membership and satisfaction is complex and not yet fully understood (Krieg, Wassell, Hedrick, & Henson, 2013). The evidence for collective bargaining and job satisfaction was mixed. Dissatisfaction may actually be a union issue, not an employer issue, and there were only indirect effects on job satisfaction and union benefits (Krieg et al., 2013). In a subsequent study, they found that there was no relationship between unionization, satisfaction, and work itself (Krieg et al., 2013).

Unionized workers hire professional union representatives to negotiate on their behalf (Bender & Sloane, 1998). If an employee is required to be part of the union and if the employer is the only type of employer in the area/field (monopoly), the employee may not have the ability to find another employer or choose if they want to be part of the union.

Three years after unionization at an American university in the Southeast, faculty did not report higher levels of satisfaction (Ormsby & Ormsby, 1988). Faculty were more satisfied with pay, benefits, and some aspects of job security, but were more dissatisfied with non-monetary aspects of their jobs (Lillydahl & Singell, 1993; Wickens, 2008). Therefore, overall satisfaction between unionized and nonunionized faculty was approximately equal (Wickens, 2008).

Faculty dissatisfaction may stem from their perceived loss or lack of control over their employment situation or career. Faculty may as a result seek to alleviate stress and restore a sense of control and seek unionization. Moreover, if faculty are involved in their jobs by working on college committees, and developing and maintaining curriculum, they are less likely to consider collective bargaining (Wickens, 2008).

In a study done using the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty to explore job satisfaction, union membership was a negative predictor of job satisfaction (Kim, Twombly, & Wolf-Wendel, 2008). The faculty belonging to a union were less satisfied in regard to instructional autonomy than those who did not belong to a union, although not statistically significant. Generally, nonunion members were more satisfied overall except in regard to salary and fringe benefits (Kim et al., 2008).

Unions and Corporatization of Schools

Faculty are difficult to unionize (Johnson, Kavanagh, & Mattson, 2003). They are experts in their fields, have good jobs, get paid a good salary, and typically do not see a need to unionize. In the past, they have been part of collegial relationships with administration working towards academic goals and helping to educate generations. Stephen Aby, a University of Akron union representative and expert on unions at colleges and universities, said that "faculty have a different view of their careers than blue-collar workers. Faculty consider themselves different than a blue-collar worker" (S. Aby, personal communication, June 11, 2012). Faculty, their view of a union, and how they can change the relationship with administration have changed.

Poor economic times, state and federal funding cuts, and changes in technology have forced a change on how faculty are treated and viewed at their institution. First, administration is being forced to determine new ways to handle budget gaps. State and federal funding is decreasing, and schools are forced to make tough decisions about increasing tuition; at the same time students are forced to borrow more and more in order to pay for college. In addition, administrators are becoming more and more corporate, many hired from business, not from the ranks of academia. Some might not have ever

19

taught in a traditional classroom or have limited experience teaching, but they bring skills to help guide the college, essentially a big business, through the tough times.

These changes have forced administration to act more quickly and nimbly when making decisions. They have had to be more resourceful, innovative, and at times, at a war with themselves and how to do this while keeping faculty in the "loop." Faculty are being cut out of decisions and, inevitably, feel like they do not have a voice at the table.

In the past unionization has come from lack of salary, benefits, or good working conditions, and perhaps the most important issue for faculty is protecting academic freedom. However, over the past 20 years, all of the challenges and changes have altered how faculty and administrators view one another. Now when issues of pay, benefits, or working conditions are brought up, they are more likely symptoms of a bigger problem: faculty not getting a voice with administrators on issues that affect faculty (Schmidt, 2011). Administration is caught in the middle. They are trying to make big decisions in a timely manner that affect the college, and even if they did not want to operate like a corporation, they are forced to by the states and federal government in order to be relevant in the future.

Some researchers have contended that colleges and universities are becoming corporatized (Steck & Zweig, 2000; White & Hauck, 2000). Education is being taken over by business people who look at results, not the means by which we get there. Since the 1980s, colleges and universities have been slowly changing. Slowly a "corporatization" of colleges and universities has occurred, blaming much of this change on financial pressures and the fact that American education is deficient compared to other countries (Taylor, 2009). Many of these changes have included the elimination of faculty

tenure positions and, in fact, hiring more and more adjunct instructors and graduate students (Berry, 2005). In fact, two-thirds of community college faculty are adjunct instructors. In addition, administration has slowly been taking authority away from faculty on curricular decisions, sometimes under the guise of standardization of courses for the online environment or even videotaping lectures and putting most of it online for students (Johnson et al., 2003). Faculty may increasingly need union representation to give them back a voice at the table with administration.

In the book, *Campus, Inc. Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, Steck and Zweig (2000) suggested that there should be a movement to take back the university. Their assertion is that unions are good for the faculty and the universities. Their main objective is to show that faculty must recover and restore universities that educate and provide learning to students. The argument is that in order to get control over universities, unions must be able to negotiate as equals with administration and have formal authority, thus providing shared governance. Unions can also speak on a national scale and have political leverage. For example, a union could help colleges and universities lobby state and federal government for more money (Steck & Zweig, 2000).

Faculty represent a special type of employee and labor boards, and courts have had to interpret labor law in unique ways (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). Federal law does not specify special provisions or exceptions for college faculty. However, state law, which regulates collective bargaining for its public employees, may include higher education as part of their other public school teachers or public employees. In the 1970s the National Labor Relations Board, ruled that college faculty were employees and could collectively bargain. In another case, a private university, Yeshiva University, fought against the

National Labor Relations Board arguing that faculty were *managers* and should not be able to collectively bargain. The U.S. Supreme Court agreed that faculty at Yeshiva and Yeshiva-like universities (well established and private) were managers as they have absolute authority over academic matters, determination of teaching matters, grading policies, admissions standards, retention, and graduation decisions (*NLRB v. Yeshiva University*, 1980). Specifically the court said that if using the industrial analogy, faculty get to determine what the product is, when it will be produced, and which customers are served (*NLRB v. Yeshiva University*, 1980). Faculty are a special type of employee; depending on the type of school for which they teach, they may or may not have the right to bargain collectively.

The Yeshiva case is important, as it gave well-established and private schools the right to abolish faculty unions because that case established that faculty were managers with a lot of decision-making authority at their schools (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). However, with higher education becoming more and more corporatized, faculty have less authority over academic matters, teaching, grading policies, admissions, retention, and graduation decisions. Yeshiva University is a private school and may not be as affected by the corporate model of education as public community colleges. Therefore, while faculty at private schools may continue to have more authority like a manager, community college faculty at public institutions may continue to need collective bargaining to represent them with administration.

It is important to understand that as colleges have become corporatized, the roles of the people who are part of the college campus have changed, which is what unions are fighting against (Steck & Zweig, 2000). Presidents are now chief executive officers;

22

administrators are now vice presidents, managers, or bosses; and students are the customers. Some colleges and universities recommend students should be thought of as health club members, not customers in the retail sense. (Health club members have to pay to belong in order to work hard to see results.) Some wonder if this new corporatization is forcing colleges to do things they might not have otherwise just to get more "customers" in order to make more money (Clay, 2008). Unions are fighting to keep colleges out of this business model. They want to restore the idea of college and universities as an academic entity where learning takes place (Steck & Zweig, 2000).

Unions may also protect faculty from making decisions that are good for the bottom line, but may be bad for students. For example, making class sizes larger may be better for the college's overall revenue stream but may negatively affect a student's ability to connect with the faculty, decrease their emotional connection, and may even lead to poorer performance (Adler, 2010).

Unions were originally brought in by faculty to help fight for wages, benefits, and class load, and even working conditions. Now, faculty wants the union to help bring their voices to the table with administration. Through standardization, funding cuts, and more adjuncts working in place of full-time tenured employees, faculty see that colleges are run more like a business and their value to the organization is limited. However, the academic environment has changed and will continue to change with improvements and changes in technology, continued funding cuts, more emphasis on outcomes, and completers (Clay, 2008).

Faculty Job Satisfaction and Motivational Theories

Job satisfaction is defined as a "pleasurable emotional state resulting from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's important job values" (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). Research suggests that people who are satisfied will work with efficiency and enthusiasm, whereas a dissatisfied worker will not show these attributes (Frankel, 1973). An article written in 2000, regarding community college faculty recruitment, indicated that many faculty pick community college positions because of intrinsic motivation factors (Winter & Kjorlien, 2000). Intrinsic rewards include giving people new responsibilities, providing interesting work, and giving them the opportunity to work autonomously. Extrinsic rewards may be paying people more money, more vacation time, or better health benefits. Many faculty transition from the private sector business community, where they are paid higher wages, to a community college as adjuncts and then full-time faculty members. Therefore, some researchers suggest that community colleges should focus on the intrinsic rewards associated with teaching (Winter & Kjorlien, 2000). Intrinsic attributes were defined as factors that internally satisfy higher level needs such as self-actualization. Extrinsic factors are those that satisfy lower level needs such as salary, which would provide such basic necessities as food, shelter, and clothing (Winter, 1996).

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) distinguished between intrinsic and extrinsic facets of job satisfaction. Their theory says that people are satisfied and motivated by rewards that are *different* from the things that make them dissatisfied. Herzberg et al.'s theory maintains that improving the things that make employees dissatisfied will never make them more satisfied. In other words, if environmental factors

such as a bad office location are making an employee dissatisfied, they will not be more

satisfied if they get a new office. Instead, the only thing to make them more satisfied

would be intrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors include achievement, recognition,

advancement, growth responsibility, and work itself; extrinsic factors may be:

organizational policies and administration, interpersonal relationships with supervisors,

peers, and students, working conditions; salary; supervision; status; and job security

(Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 2003; Schroeder, 2008).

According to Maslow (1943), Alderfer (1972), and McClelland (1976), people are

motivated by unmet needs (Williams, 2011). When those needs are met, people are

satisfied. Three theories exist regarding motivation and satisfaction. Maslow said people

have a Hierarchy of Needs; Alderfer suggested the ERG Theory; and McClelland

theorized the Learned Needs Theory (Williams, 2011).

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs suggests people are motivated by five levels of

motivation, starting with physiological (food and water), safety (physical and economic),

belongingness (friendship, love, and social interaction), esteem (achievement and

recognition), and self-actualization (realizing one's full potential) (Maslow, 1943).

Maslow believed that if all other needs are met, self-actualization could occur. If you can

achieve this level of motivation, you reach or achieve your own motives, which in turn

are your only motives (Maslow, 1943). Benefits and pay, both extrinsic rewards, help

satisfy people's need to help feed themselves and their family and provide shelter (the

first two basic levels of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs).

The second theory is Alderfer's ERG Theory, which summarized Maslow's

Hierarchy of Needs into three categories: existence (safety and physiological needs),

relatedness (belongingness), and growth (esteem and self-actualization) (Alderfer, 1972). McClelland's Learned Needs Theory suggests that people are motivated by the need for affiliation, achievement, and power (McClelland, 1965).

All three theories highlight components of motivation, which range from physiological to self-actualization (Williams, 2011). The Hierarchy of Needs theorizes that people move up from the lowest unsatisfied need, whereas the ERG Theory says that people can be motivated by more than one need at a time (Alderfer, 1972; Maslow, 1943). Conversely, the Learned Needs Theory says that people's needs vary from person to person, and motivation is driven by achievement and power affiliation (McClelland, 1976). In addition, the Learned Needs Theory says that needs are learned, not innate. Therefore, it is difficult to understand which needs are most important to each person. However, it is generally understood that people are motivated by lower order needs first such as the extrinsic need for money to provide basics for yourself and family and then higher level needs such as the intrinsic rewards for a job well done (Williams, 2011).

Another similarity between the theories/models of Maslow, Alderfer, and McClelland is that they all have needs that are basic. Therefore, if employees cannot feed, house, or clothe themselves or their families, they will not be able to even consider job satisfaction at higher levels where intrinsic rewards outweigh their "needed" extrinsic rewards. This is important for administration to realize that pay is an important factor and faculty pay must be at a level in which people can support themselves and families.

Job satisfaction and motivation may also have a relationship between how people perceive they are being treated. The Equity Theory says that people will be motivated if they *perceive* that they are being treated fairly. No matter what reward is given, if

subordinates perceive inequity, they will not be motivated (Adams, 1965). Interestingly, the part of Adam's Equity Theory that is important in this study is that a union brings more equality among faculty. Faculty salaries are typically paid on a scale, which considers years of experience as well as educational level. Furthermore, the union negotiates, and faculty approve the pay scale. The union levels the feelings of inequality because unions have negotiated, and faculty accept their negotiated salaries by a vote. It should be noted that the union may bring a *perception* of equality, but the pay scale in a non-union college may be as equitable.

The Expectancy Theory says that people will be motivated when they *think* that their efforts will lead to positive performance and that positive performance will be satisfied with rewards (Williams, 2011). The expectancy theory can be tied to trust. If faculty are trusting administrators, they think that their efforts are perceived positively and will lead to more rewards.

Both the Expectancy Theory and Equity Theory have a lot to do with *perception* (Williams, 2011). When applied to community college faculty, their motivation could be tied to what they perceive is happening. In this study, unionized and nonunionized faculty were asked if they perceive a level of trust between administration, peers, and students. This *perception* of a trustful or distrustful environment may or may not lead to higher or lower levels of job satisfaction.

Positive student relationships may increase faculty job satisfaction (Wilson & Taylor, 2001). Student outcomes go up as a result of their relationships with faculty (Wilson & Taylor, 2001). Although student relationships may add stress, building a relationship with students will increase job satisfaction and improve student retention and

student motivation, especially at community colleges where there is a large number of first-time college students who need faculty and count on them for a major part of their support system (Wilson & Taylor, 2001). It makes sense that faculty would intrinsically be more happy if their students performed well and would improve their standing within the college community with students who were satisfied and happy. Intrinsic motivation, according to Herzberg et al. (1959), is what satisfies people.

Faculty Autonomy and Job Satisfaction

Faculty are unique. Often they take large pay cuts to teach, their jobs are their lives, and at community colleges they are asked to be active as mentors and advisors to students. These relationships are important as they may help faculty have greater job satisfaction. Because a typical community college faculty member wants to be at the school in which they teach, it is no surprise that the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty determined faculty at community colleges are generally satisfied with their job (Kim et al., 2008). As administrators face challenges and faculty struggle to adapt to their new way of doing business, administrators must pay attention to faculty job satisfaction. Higher levels of job satisfaction lead to longer tenures, better performance, more commitment to their job, less job stress, and greater career success (Bertz & Judge, 1994; Blau, 1987; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Schneider, 1987; Smart, Elton, & McLaughlin, 1986).

Since community college faculty are generally satisfied (Kim et al., 2008), the question of autonomy is very important and in some cases the reason faculty consider collective bargaining. They want to have a voice with administration and how the college is run and what is taught. Studies indicated that community college faculty do not have a

choice on what to teach or which students to teach (A.M. Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Grubb & Associates, 1999). This may come from the fact that many community colleges are unionized, therefore creating rules and a bureaucratic organization, which does not lend itself to faculty getting to assist administration on institutional decision-making (Birnbaum, 1987). However, a study done by Kim et al. (2008) among full-time and part-time faculty showed that faculty were satisfied in general with instructional autonomy regardless of their employment at a 2- or 4-year university.

A 2004 national survey done on job satisfaction to compare post-secondary faculty concluded that more than 95% of the faculty were satisfied or very satisfied with their job (Cataldi, et al., 2005). The distribution between full- and part-time instructors was almost identical (Kim et al., 2008). However, the means of community college faculty showed that they were significantly less satisfied with instructional autonomy than other 4-year university faculty members. Nevertheless, these same community college faculty were more satisfied overall with their jobs than 4-year university faculty members.

Conclusion

Chapter 2 covered research on trust within organizations and how it is foundational in any relationship (Covey, 2006). In addition, Chapter 2 included an overview of how unions have impacted community colleges since the 1960s. A link is drawn between trust and job satisfaction and how trust can impact faculty job satisfaction.

This research will help community college administrators and faculty determine if unions enhance the trust relationships on campus. Without trust, day-to-day business,

projects, and interactions with students, other faculty, and administrators may be more

difficult.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter includes the research design, the derivation of hypotheses, the

sample, instrument used for the survey, and the variable list. In addition, to the data

collection and statistical analysis, the limitations are identified.

Research Design

This study used ex post facto or non-experimental research, which is a systematic

inquiry where the researcher does not have control over the independent variables. It

determined if there is a relationship between faculty's level of trust and their desire to be

unionized or, if already unionized, their desire to stay unionized. This type of research

displays the relationships among the variables but does not assume cause or effect

(Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). According to Kerlinger and Lee (2000):

> Non-experimental research is systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does
> not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have
> already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable. Inferences about
> relations among variables are made, without direct intervention, from concomitant
> variation of independent and dependent variables. (p. 558)

Another important point about non-experimental research is that it can only

indicate relationships between two or more variables, and does not indicate that one

variable causes the other (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000; Pallant, 2007).

According to Isaac and Michael (1971), the following are major strengths of the ex post facto research when another experimental method is not possible. Since it is sometimes not possible to select, control, and manipulate the factors necessary to study the direction of cause-and-effect relationships, the ability to control all variations except a single independent variable may be unrealistic and artificial, and it prevents the normal interaction with other influential variables. Laboratory controls for many research purposes are impractical, costly, and ethically questionable. In addition, it yields useful information concerning the nature of a phenomenon (including sequencing and patterns). Additionally the last major strength of non-experimental research is that technique, statistical methods, and designs with some control features have improved in recent years, making it a more defensible method of research.

According to Kerlinger and Lee (2000), there are three major weaknesses in conducting a study using non-experimental research. They include the inability to manipulate or control independent variables, lack of power to randomize, and the risk of improper interpretation, which is due to the lack of control.

Non-experimental or causal comparative research has limitations; however, the knowledge that they produce and their ability to provide a means of dealing with problems that cannot be tackled in any other way are valuable to researchers (Lord, 1973).

The way this research controlled for age and sex was through analysis of covariance. This was done through regression models that looked at the effect of unionization, while co-varying age and sex. For example, when testing for unionization co-varying age, this research looked at the unique variance of unionization independent

of the variance accounted for by age.   When testing for sex, this research looked at the unique variance accounted for by unionization independent of the unique variance accounted for by sex.

Derivation of Hypotheses

The derivation of general research hypotheses and specific research hypotheses is that faculty's and administration's trust will be related to the union environment. Another hypothesis is that tenure or years on the job will have a relationship to the desire to want a union or keep their existing union. Faculty protected by tenure may not concern themselves with administration and what is happening at administrative levels.

Trust has been linked to positively affecting a person's attitude, performance, behavior, and perceptions and may even lead to a more effective organization (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001; Kramer & Cook, 2004; Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Powell, 1996; Williamson, 1993). Little trust in an organization can have indirect effects, including a vicious cycle that makes people blame one another for lack of success (Kanter, 1997). Leaders must work to establish and create an environment of trust. Without trust, there will not be teamwork or collaboration (MacNeil et al., 1998).

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses were tested using multiple linear regression. Each research hypothesis was put into a model and tested; therefore 15 linear regression models were tested. The general hypotheses of the study were stated in Chapter 1. Now the hypotheses are restated with specific research hypotheses.

Regression Equations

General Research Hypothesis 1

There is a mean difference in trust between union and nonunion members when controlling for the number of years teaching.

Model 1. TrustF= $a0U+a_1(union)+a_2(nonunion)+a_3(numyr)+E_1$

Model 2. TrustA= $a0U+a_4(union)+a_5(nonunion)+a_6(numyr)+E_2$

Model 3. TrustT= $a0U+a_7(union)+a_8(nonunion)+a_9(numyr)+E_3$

General Research Hypothesis 2

There is a mean difference in trust between union and nonunion members when controlling for sex.

Model 4. TrustF= $a0U+a_{10}(union)+a_{11}(nonunion)+a_{12}(sexm)+a_{13}(sexf)+E_4$

Model 5. TrustA= $a0U+a_{14}(union)+a_{15}(nonunion)+a_{16}(sexm)+a_{17}(sexf)+E_5$

Model 6. TrustT= $a0U+a_{18}(union)+a_{19}(nonunion)+a_{20}(sexm)+a_{21}(sexf)+E_6$

General Research Hypothesis 3

There is a mean difference in trust between union and nonunion members when controlling for the number of years teaching age.

Model 7. TrustF= $a0U+a_{22}(union)+a_{23}(nonunion)+a_{24}(age)+E_7$

Model 8. TrustA= $a0U+a_{25}(union)+a_{26}(nonunion)+a_{27}(age)+E_8$

Model 9. TrustT= $a0U+a_{28}(union)+a_{29}(nonunion)+a_{30}(age)+E_9$

General Research Hypothesis 4

There is a mean difference in trust between union and nonunion members when controlling for the number of years teaching ethnicity?

Model 10. TrustF= a0U+ a_{31}(union)+a_{32}(nonunion)+ a_{33}(ethwhite)+a_{34}(ethblack)+a_{35}(ethother)+E_{10}

Model 11. TrustA= a0U + a_{36}(union)+a_{37}(nonunion) + a_{38}(ethwhite)+a_{39}(ethblack)+a_{40}(ethother)+E_{11}

Model 12. TrustT= a0U + a_{41}(union)+a_{42}(nonunion) + a_{45}(ethwhite)+a_{44}(ethblack)+a_{45}(ethother)+$_{E12}$

General Research Hypothesis 5

There is a mean difference in trust between union and nonunion members when controlling for the number of years teaching academic departments (Business—BUSI, Developmental Studies—DS, Fine and Performing Arts—FAPA, Health Services—HS, Humanities—HUMA, Math/Science—MASC, Social Sciences—SS, Technology—TECH, and Other—OTHER).

Model 13. TrustF= a0U + a46(union)+a47(nonunion) + a48(busi)+a49(ds)+a50(fapa)+ a51(hs)+ a52(huma)+ a53(masc)+ a54(ss)+ a55(tech)+ a56(other)+E13

Model 14. TrustA= a0U + a_{57}(union)+a_{58} (nonunion) + a_{59}(busi)+a_{60}(ds)+a_{61}(fapa)+ a_{62}(hs)+ a_{63}(huma)+ a_{64}(masc)+ a_{65}(ss)+ a_{66}(tech)+ a_{67}(other)+$_{E14}$

Model 15. TrustT= a0U+ a_{68}(union)+a_{69}(nonunion)+ a_{70}(busi)+a_{71}(ds)+a_{72}(fapa)+ a_{73}(hs)+ a_{74}(huma)+ a_{75}(masc)+ a_{76}(ss)+ a_{77}(tech)+ a_{78}(other)+E_{15}

Key

The following is the key to the Models and the Variable List.

E_{1-15} = Error vectors

U = Unit vector (constant)

Trust F = Trust Faculty

Trust A = Trust Administration

Trust T = Total

Union = 1 if came from unionized school, 0 otherwise

Nonunion = 1 if came from nonunionized school, 0 otherwise

NumYR = Number of years teaching

Ethwhite = Ethnicity White, 1 if white, 0 otherwise

Ethblack = Ethnicity Black, 1 if black, 0 otherwise

Ethother = Ethnicity Other, 1 if other

Sexm = Sex Male, 1 if male, 0 otherwise

Sexf = Sex Female, 1 if female, 0 otherwise

BUSI = Business Faculty, 1 if Business Faculty, 0 otherwise

DS = Developmental Studies Faculty, 1 if Developmental Studies, 0 otherwise

FAPA = Fine and Performing Arts Faculty, 1 if Fine or Performing Arts Faculty,

0 otherwise

HS = Health Sciences Faculty, 1 if Health Science Faculty, 0 otherwise

HUMA = Humanities Faculty, 1 if Humanities Faculty, 0 otherwise

MASC = Math or Science Faculty, 1 if Math or Science Faculty, 0 otherwise

SS = Social Science Faculty, 1 if Social Science Faculty, 0 otherwise

TECH = Technology Faculty, 1 if Technology Faculty, 0 otherwise

OTHER = Other Faculty, 1 if Other

Age = Age in Years, 1 if age 20-30, 0 otherwise

Age3140 = Age in Years, 2 if age 31-40, 0 otherwise

Age4150 = Age in Years, 3 if age 41-50, 0 otherwise

Age5160 = Age in Years, 4 if age 51-60, 0 otherwise

Age6170 = Age in Years, 5 if age 61-70, 0 otherwise

Sample

The participants in this study came from five public Michigan community colleges. Community colleges selected were similar in size, demographics, and setting. The main difference for all of the community colleges is their union membership. Three nonunionized community colleges in Michigan were selected along with two unionized community colleges similar to the nonunionized community colleges in demographics, socioeconomic status, student population, and full-time faculty. All full-time faculty were sent a survey; some did not respond. All of the community colleges are accredited by the Higher Learning Commission, a commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Community College Samples

Created in 1961, after Michigan allowed community colleges to form, School A (nonunionized) enrolls approximately 11,500 students annually. Serving three counties, it

has three campuses. More than 60% of School A's students receive financial aid. Forty-three percent of the students are considered full-time with more than 12 credit hours per semester. The remainder of the students, or 57%, are part-time. More than one-half of the students, or 54%, are female, and the rest, 46%, are male. Thirty-eight percent of the student population is over the age of 25. Sixty-two percent are considered traditional-aged college students below the age of 25. Almost 81% of the students are Caucasian, 9% are African American, and the remainder of the students are Hispanic, multi-racial, Native American, Asian, International, or not coded. A majority of the students who attend School A are considered freshmen, or 65%. Faculty make up 41% of the full-time employees at School A (Note: This includes 9 two-semester full-time faculty and 207 faculty). Located on 640 rural acres, School A is considered central for the three counties it serves.

School B (unionized) started as a junior college in 1928, later changing to a community college in 1962. Its main campus is made up of 500 acres with two other campus locations nearby. Serving more than 8,000 students, most students study on the main campus while 15% are educated online. Forty-four percent of students are full-time, with 61% women. Forty percent of the students are traditional aged, under 22 years of age. Minority students account for 15% of the student population. Ninety-five faculty are full-time.

School C (unionized) was established in 1958 and sits on 10 rural acres with an additional 120 acres of natural land. Most of School C's campus was built in the 1960s. Over 3,189 students are part of the college. Of those, 38% of the students are full-time, while 36% are men. Twenty percent of the students are first-time college students.

Established in 1951, School D (nonunionized) sits on 100 acres with four additional campuses serving over 5,000 students. It is considered a suburban school with an enrollment of 5,433 students. Fifty-four percent of the students are women and 45% of the students are men. Forty-seven percent of the students are full-time. Almost 20% of the students are first-time college students.

Founded in 1964, School E (nonunionized) sits on 247 rural acres with two on-campus residence halls for students. School E is known for its academic integrity. School E boasts its transfer rates for their students, which are among the top in the nation for transfer students. The average age of students was 28 in the 2008-2009 school year. Fifty-four percent of the students were 24 years old or younger, while the remaining 46% were 25 years or older. Of the 3,262 students, 53% were full-time students. Twenty-five percent of the students are first-time college students, and 60% of the students are women.

Instruments

The Omnibus T-Scale developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran in 2003 was used to measure faculty's trust with their colleagues (other faculty), trust with administration, and trust total. Trust total is a sum of total faculty and total administration scores. It has also been referred to as the Omnibus Trust Scale. It was adapted to college faculty, as it was originally developed for K-12 teachers. The original survey was developed by Hoy and Kupersmith (1985). The original Hoy survey measured three subscales related to trust. They are faculty trust in principals, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in clients (Hoy, 2010, Reliability Section, para. 1).

A 6-point Likert scale was used for the responses ranging from *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (6). Lower numbers mean agreement and higher numbers mean disagreement. The adapted survey has 22 questions, but, in addition, I asked general demographic data of participants including age, sex, number of years at current school, union membership status, number of total years teaching, and the discipline in which they teach. See appendix for letter of permission to modify the Trust Scale.

According to Hoy (2010),

> The Omnibus T-Scale is a short operational measure of these three dimensions of trust, which can be used for either elementary or secondary schools. The reliabilities of the three subscales typically range from .90 to .98. Factor analytic studies of the Omnibus T-Scale support the construct and discriminate validity of the concept. (para. 3)

The reliability of this study was calculated using SPSS and the data from the survey. The reliability of this study was consistent with Hoy's, ranging from .899 to .939.

The Omnibus T-Scale was slightly changed. Administration was used instead of principal. Similarly, faculty were used instead of teachers. Parental questions were left off of the survey. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran gave permission for the Omnibus T-Scale to be used as well as modified in this way (W.K. Hoy, personal communication, June 8, 2011).

Some questions were recoded for use in the data analysis in SPSS.

Recoded Questions

Question 25. What is your ethnicity?

Question 30. In what discipline do you teach?

Question 31. Are you a member of a union?

Five questions were reverse-scored and had to be recoded accordingly.

Question 5. The faculty in this school are suspicious of most of administration's actions.

Question 9. Faculty in this school are suspicious of each other.

Question 11. Students in this school care about each other.

Question 22. Administration doesn't tell teachers what is really going on.

Question 23. Students here are secretive.

The three main questions regarding trust and administration, trust and faculty, and trust total were calculated by adding questions from the original survey and dividing by the number of questions included. The trust and administration questions were added and then divided by eight. The trust and faculty questions were added and then divided by eight. The trust total score (TRUSTT) was the total of the trust and administration score and the trust and faculty score. These questions are listed below individually.

Trust and Administration Questions Included (TRUSTA)

Question 2. Faculty in this school trust administration.

Question 5. The faculty in this school are suspicious of most administration's actions.

Question 8. The faculty in this school have faith in the integrity of administration.

Question 10. Administration in this school typically acts in the best interests of faculty.

Question 12. Administration of this school does not show concern for the faculty.

Question 15. Faculty in this school can rely on administration.

Question 18. Administration in this school is competent in doing his or her job.

Question 22. Administration doesn't tell teachers what is really going on.

Trust and Faculty Questions Included (TRUSTF)

Question 3. Faculty in this school trust each other.

Question 6. Faculty in this school typically look out for each other.

Question 9. Faculty in this school are suspicious of each other.

Question 13. Even in difficult situations, faculty in this school can depend on each other.

Question 14. Faculty in this school do their jobs well.

Question 16. Faculty in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.

Question 19. The faculty in this school are open with each other.

Question 20. When faculty in this school tell you something, you can believe it.

Variable List

Table 1 indicates the variables that are associated with the study and how they have been coded for the data analysis. Some of the categories (Age, Years on Teaching, Years at Current Community College, and Discipline Taught) were grouped together at my discretion. While race was a variable, the result was that less than 1% of the respondents were non-White.

Dependent Variables

The independent variable for this survey was full-time faculty membership in a union. Unionized faculty were documented as well as nonunionized members. The three different trust scores that are calculated were dependent variables. The three trust scores

Table 1

Variable List

Variables	Variable Coding for Data Analysis
Sex—Male Teacher (MT)	If MT=1; Other=0
Sex—Female Teacher (FT)	If FT=1; Other=0
Race—Black (B)	If B=1; Other=0
Race—White (W)	If W=1; Other=0
Race—Hispanic (H)	If H=1; Other=0
Race—Other (O)	If O=1; Other=0
Age (in years)	20-30 years old = 1
	31-40 years old = 2
	41-50 years old = 3
	51-60 years old = 4
	61-70 years old = 5
Years at current community college	0-5 years = 1
	6-10 years = 2
	11-15 years = 3
	16-20 years = 4
	21 plus years = 5
Total years teaching	0-10 years = 1
	11-20 years = 2
	21-30 years = 3
	31-40 years =4
	41 plus years = 5
Tenure (T)	If T=1; Other=0
Nontenure (NT)	If NT=1; Other=0
Discipline taught	Business Field = 1
	Developmental Studies = 2
	Fine and Performing Arts = 3
	Health Sciences = 4
	Humanities = 5
	Math/Science = 6
	Social Science = 7
	Technology = 8
	Other = 9
Trust Faculty (Trust F)	Trust F includes survey questions: 3, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16, 19, and 20.
Trust Administration (Trust A)	Trust A includes survey questions: 2, 5, 8, 10, 12, 15, 18, and 22.
Trust Total Score (Trust T)	Trust total is made up of Trust F and Trust A Scores added together.
Union Member	1=Union Member
	0=Non Union Member
Ethnicity—White	ETHWHITE = 1
Ethnicity—Black	ETHBLACK = 0

include faculty trust with administration, faculty trust with colleagues (other faculty), and a trust total score.

Data Collection

Five Michigan community colleges were surveyed. All full-time faculty were sent a survey. Each community college was issued approval through its Institutional Review Board and president to take part in the study. In addition, if relevant, the union presidents were made aware that a study was being conducted on its members. Nonprobablistic sampling procedures (Newman, Benz, Weis, & McNeil, 1997) were employed in this investigation. This was a purposeful sampling based on the community colleges that met the union/non-union criteria established for the study (Creswell, 2008). Community colleges were selected based on their union or nonunion status. In addition, I used easily identifiable demographic data, such as student enrollment, to select the community colleges most similar to one another for the study. Each community college provided a list of all of its full-time faculty for the 2011-2012 school year. Demographic data were collected directly from participants.

A 22-question survey was emailed to all full-time faculty (*N*=489). Follow-up emails were sent after 10 days. Additional email reminders were sent at the 30-day mark. Survey Monkey was used to email and collect data. Communication was sent via email to full-time faculty. An attempt was made to get access to the faculty through their Chief Academic Officers and/or presidents. Case-wise deletion was used to eliminate those surveys that were only partially completed (J. Cohen, 1988). In other words, incomplete surveys were eliminated from the study.

Statistical Analysis

According to Newman, Newman, Brown, and McNeeley (2006),

the F test was used to test statistical significance of the proposed
relationships in the hypothesis. The F test was chosen because it is
robust. The assumptions of random selection of subjects and normal
distribution of the variables can be violated without doing serious
harm to the procedure. (p. 64)

Multiple regression was used to help predict the outcome given a set of variables.
It is a good test for complex, real-life research questions. Multiple regression can be used
to discover the relationships between variables (Pallant, 2007).

Multiple linear regression was chosen because it allows for the exploration
between the interrelationships between multiple variables in real-life situations. It can
also predict outcomes. In addition, multiple linear regression can test relationships
between categorical variables, between categorical and continuous variables, or between
continuous variables (McNeil, Newman, & Fraas, 2012).

The research hypothesis was tested using a non-directional test. If certain about
the direction of the correlation, based on my experience and research in the field, a one-
tailed test was used.

A .05 level of significance was used since it is a frequently used level of
significance. I accepted this level of risk and understand that the null hypothesis is
rejected at the .05 level of significance (Newman et al., 2006).

A power analysis was done based upon the median to calculate the median sample
size and determine the effect size and efficiently set the alpha level. However, it was not
needed since I estimated that the ratio of variables sample size was greater than 100
(McNeil, Newman, & Kelly, 1996). Two power analyses were conducted using Cohen's

small- and medium-size effects (Small $f^2 = .02$ and Medium $f^2 = .15$) for an alpha level of .05 when $N=164$ (J. Cohen, 1988). The ability to detect when a difference exists when the effect size is small (.02) was 23%; if the effect size was medium (.15), the ability to detect the difference in the power was .99.

Limitations

Some items were not controlled for, which could impact the outcome of the study. For example, if any of these community colleges are facing budgetary cuts with a potential of faculty layoffs, the attitudes of employees may change. Also, if a community college had just finished with a union election, the faculty might have experienced a change of attitude, which could be positive or negative. Other limitations include the 34% return rate as well as the fact that only 1% of my respondents were non-White.

I have studied this question through my lens of the situation and my worldview. I generally am not in favor of union representation. Because of that paradigm, some of the data may seem to favor an anti-union sentiment. However, because a third-party survey was used, a sound research study was conducted with quality empirical data with an attempt to have the data speak for itself. Therefore I feel confident that the findings are quantitatively accurate.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Demographic Descriptive Statistics

This study investigated the relationship between full-time faculty and college

administrators at five community colleges in Michigan. Another variable was a faculty's

membership or lack of membership in a union.

Response Rates and Data Collection

A survey was sent to 489 full-time community college faculty at five community

colleges in Michigan, three without union membership and two with union membership.

Emails were sent to survey participates from senior administrators at their organizations

with instructions on how to complete the online survey through Survey Monkey. A

second email was sent after approximately 2 weeks, thanking those who had responded

and asking for the remaining full-time faculty to respond as soon as possible.

There was a 34% response rate as 166 faculty responded to the survey. One

survey was not used because it was not completed. Sex was revealed by 153 respondents,

while 14 people chose not to respond to this question. Of the 166 respondents, 80 were

female and 73 were male.

Through analysis, it was determined that almost all respondents (99% or 149

respondents out of 151 respondents) identified themselves as White, while two

respondents identified themselves as "other." Therefore, while ethnicity was one of the five hypotheses, it was not possible, based on this response, to study it in any meaningful way.

Results of Testing the Research Hypotheses

Results of this study are presented below. Each of the five research hypotheses is presented below, first with its regression tables and next with its coefficient tables. The coefficient tables measured the relationship between three trust factors (with administration, faculty, and a trust total score), union membership of faculty, and five questions. The five general questions are related to ethnicity, age, total number of years teaching, sex, and department in which the instructors teach. The first of the two tables gives the overall F of how well the predictor variable and covariant predict the criterion variable (Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T). The second table breaks down the analysis of how much each variable accounts for a unique variance of the criterion variables (Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T).

Table 2 shows the relationship between the independent variables of unionization (unionized and nonunionized) and the three dependent variables of Trust of Administrators, Trust of Faculty, and Trust Total when controlling for the total number of years teaching. The predictor variable of unionization and the number of total years teaching accounted for 15.9% of variance of trust with administration ($p \leq .0009$), 1.4% of the variance of trust with faculty ($p \leq. 391$), and 9% of the variance of trust total ($p \leq .0009$).

Table 3 shows how the variables contribute to the prediction of the dependent variables trust with administration, faculty, and trust total. When predicting trust of

administration, union membership accounted for a significant amount of unique variance

Table 2

Hypothesis 1: Regression Table

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	R^2 Change	F Change	$df1$	$df2$	Sig. F Change
TRUSTA	0.399	0.159	0.147	0.159	12.773	2	135	0.000
TRUSTF	0.117	0.014	-0.001	0.014	0.945	2	136	0.391
TRUSTT	0.300	0.090	0.076	0.090	6.511	2	132	0.002

Note. The amount of variance accounted for by unionization and the number of years teaching.

$(p \le .0009)$ when controlling for total years of teaching. Similar results were found with

the trust total scores for union membership (p less than or equal to .0009). The dependent

variable of faculty trust in other faculty was not statistically significant (.294) related to

union membership when controlling for years of experience. Years of teaching

experience did not account for a significant amount of unique variance in predicting the

three dependent variables: Trust of Administrators (p=.827), Faculty (p=.291), and Total

(p=.634). Note that trust scores were adjusted for total number of years teaching.

Table 2 and 3 are asking related but different questions. Table 2 is asking how

well both predictors (union / number of years teaching) together predict Trust A, Trust F,

and Trust T. Table 3 breaks down the amount of unique variance in Trust A, Trust F,

and Trust T when controlling for number of years teaching due to unionization and how

much unique variance is accounted for in number of years teaching in Trust A, Trust F,

and Trust T when controlling for unionization.

Table 4 shows the relationship between the independent variables of unionization (unionized and nonunionized) and the three dependent variables of trust with administration, faculty, and a trust total when controlling for sex. The predictor variable of unionization and sex accounted for 15.1% of variance of trust with administration ($p \leq$ .0009), .7% of variance of trust with faculty ($p \leq$ .582), and 8.5% of variance of trust total ($p \leq$ .002).

Table 3

Hypothesis 1: Coefficients Table for the Independent Variable, Unionization, and the Covariate Years of Teaching in Predicting the Three Dependent Variables

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	*SE*	Beta	*t*	Sig.
TRUSTA					
Constant	2.768	0.197		14.037	0.000
UNION	1.014	0.207	0.395	4.905	0.000
How many total years have you been teaching?	0.002	0.009	0.018	0.218	0.827
TRUSTF					
Constant	2.358	0.141		16.709	0.000
UNION	0.155	0.147	0.091	1.053	0.294
How many total years have you been teaching?	-0.006	0.006	-0.092	-1.061	0.291
TRUSTT					
Constant	5.158	0.310		16.626	0.000
UNION	1.172	0.325	0.305	3.602	0.000
How many total years have you been teaching?	-0.006	0.013	-0.040	-0.477	0.634

Note. The surveys used a scoring system of *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (6). However, the higher the score on the trust scale, the lower the trust score.

Table 4

Hypothesis 2: Regression Table

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	R^2 Change	F Change	$df1$	$df2$	Sig. F Change
TRUSTA	0.388	0.151	0.139	0.151	12.857	2	145	0.000
TRUSTF	0.086	0.007	-0.006	0.007	0.543	2	147	0.582
TRUSTT	0.291	0.085	0.072	0.085	6.591	2	142	0.002

Note. The amount of variance accounted for by unionization and sex.

Table 5 shows how the variables contribute to the prediction of the dependent variables Trust with Administration, Faculty, and Trust Total. When predicting Trust of Administration, union membership accounted for a significant amount of unique variance (*p* less than or equal to .0009) when controlling for sex. Similar results were found with the trust total scores for union membership (*p* less than or equal to .0009). The dependent variable of faculty trust of other faculty did not make a statistically significant contribution (.305) related to union membership, when controlling for sex. Sex did not account for a significant amount of unique variance in predicting Trust of Administrators (*p*=.160), Faculty (*p*=.763), or Total (.330). Note that trust scores were adjusted for knowledge of sex.

Tables 4 and 5 are asking related but different questions. Table 4 is asking how well both predictors (union / sex) together predict Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T. Table 5 breaks down the amount of unique variance in Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T when controlling for sex due to unionization and how much unique variance is accounted for in sex in Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T when controlling for unionization.

Table 6 shows the relationship between the independent variables of unionization (unionized and nonunionized) and the three dependent variables of Trust with

Administration, Faculty, and a Trust Total when controlling for age of faculty. The

predictor variable of unionization and age of faculty accounted for 16.4% of variance of

Table 5

Hypothesis 2: Coefficient Table for the Independent Variable, Unionization, and the
Covariate Sex in Predicting the Three Dependent Variables

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	*SE*	Beta		
		TRUSTA			
Constant	3.173	0.282		11.266	0.000
UNION	0.981	0.196	0.386	5.008	0.000
What is your sex?	-0.250	0.177	-0.109	-1.412	0.160
		TRUSTF			
Constant	2.245	0.201		11.152	0.000
UNION	0.145	0.141	0.086	1.030	0.305
What is your sex?	-0.038	0.126	-0.025	-0.302	0.763
		TRUSTT			
Constant	5.397	0.438		12.311	0.000
UNION	1.102	0.307	0.291	3.591	0.000
What is your sex?	-0.269	0.275	-0.079	-0.978	0.330

Note. The surveys used a scoring system of *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (6).
However, the higher the score on the trust scale, the lower the trust score.

Table 6

Hypothesis 3: Regression Table

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	R^2 Change	F Change	$df1$	$df2$	Sig. F Change
TRUSTA	.405	.164	.152	.164	13.246	2	135	.000
TRUSTF	.192	.037	.022	.037	2.575	2	135	.080
TRUSTT	.328	.107	.094	.107	7.937	2	132	.001

Note: The amount of variance accounted for by unionization and age of faculty.

Trust with Administration ($p \leq .0009$), 3.7% of variance of Trust with Faculty ($p \leq .080$), and 10.7% of variance of Trust Total ($p \leq .001$).

Table 7 shows how the variables that contribute to the prediction of the dependent variables Trust with Administration, Faculty, and Trust Total. When predicting Trust of Administration, union membership accounted for a significant amount of unique variance (p less than or equal to .0009) when controlling for age of faculty. Similar results were found with the Trust Total scores for union membership (p less than or equal to .0009). The dependent variable of faculty trust of other faculty was not statistically significant ($p=.470$) related to union membership when controlling for age of faculty. Unionization was significant in predicting Trust Faculty ($p=.028$) and Trust Total ($p=.039$) when controlling for age of faculty. However, age of faculty did not account for a significant amount of unique variance in predicting the dependent variable Trust Administration ($p=.174$). Note that trust scores were adjusted for age of faculty.

Table 6 and 7 are asking related but different questions. Table 6 is asking how well both predictors (union / age of faculty) together predict Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T. Table 7 breaks down the amount of unique variance in Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T when controlling for age of faculty due to unionization and how much unique variance is accounted for in age of faculty in Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T when controlling for unionization.

Table 8 shows the relationship between the independent variables of unionization (unionized and nonunionized) and the three dependent variables of Trust with Administration, Faculty, and a Trust Total when controlling for White ethnicity. The predictor variable of unionization and White ethnicity accounted for 14.1% of variance of

Trust with Administration ($p \le .0009$), .9% of variance of Trust with Faculty ($p \le .494$),

and 8.1% of variance Trust Total ($p \le .002$).

Table 7

Hypothesis 3: Coefficients Table for the Independent Variable, Unionization, and the Covariate Age in Predicting the Three Dependent Variables

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	*SE*	Beta	*t*	Sig.
	TRUSTA				
Constant	3.432	0.486		7.058	0.000
UNION	1.010	0.200	0.400	5.060	0.000
What is your age?	-0.013	0.009	-0.108	-1.368	0.174
	TRUSTF				
Constant	2.935	0.329		8.934	0.000
UNION	0.102	0.141	0.062	0.725	0.470
What is your age?	-0.014	0.006	-0.188	-2.216	0.028
	TRUSTT				
Constant					
UNION	6.503	0.737		8.826	0.000
What is your age?	1.100	0.308	0.295	3.572	0.000
	-0.030	0.014	-0.172	-2.083	0.039

Note. The surveys used a scoring system of *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (6). However, the higher the score on the trust scale, the lower the trust score.

Table 8

Hypothesis 4: Regression Table

Model	*R*	R^2	Adjusted R^2	R^2 Change	*F* Change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* Change
TRUSTA	0.376	0.141	0.130	0.141	12.111	2	147	0.000
TRUSTF	0.097	0.009	-0.004	0.009	0.709	2	149	0.494
TRUSTT	0.285	0.081	0.068	0.081	6.348	2	144	0.002

Note. The amount of variance accounted for by unionization and White Ethnicity.

Table 9 shows how the variables contribute to the prediction of the dependent variables Trust with Administration, Faculty, and Trust Total. When predicting Trust of Administration, union membership accounted for a significant amount of unique variance (p less than or equal to .0009) when controlling for White ethnicity. Similar results were found with the Trust Total scores for union membership (p less than or equal to .0009). The dependent variable of faculty trust with other faculty was not statistically significant (.327) related to union membership when controlling for White ethnicity. White ethnicity did not account for a significant amount of unique variance in predicting Trust of Administrators (.557), Faculty (.473), or Trust Total (.476). Note that trust scores were adjusted for White ethnicity.

Table 8 and 9 are asking related but different questions. Table 8 is asking how well both predictors (union / ethnicity) together predict Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T. Table 9 breaks down the amount of unique variance in Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T when controlling for ethnicity due to unionization and how much unique variance is accounted for in ethnicity in Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T when controlling for unionization.

Table 10 shows the relationship between the independent variables of unionization (unionized and nonunionized) and the three dependent variables of Trust with Administration, Faculty, and a Trust Total when controlling for department in which faculty teach. The predictor variable of unionization and the department in which faculty teach accounted for 21.7% of variance of Trust with Administration ($p \le .0009$), 15.9% of the variance of Trust with Faculty ($p \le .005$), and 18.3% of variance of Trust Total ($p \le .002$).

Table 9

Hypothesis 4: Coefficients Table for the Independent Variable, Unionization, and the Covariate White Ethnicity in Predicting the Three Dependent Variables

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	*SE*	Beta	*t*	Sig.
TRUSTA					
Constant	3.049	0.439		6.947	0.000
UNION	0.958	0.195	0.376	4.910	0.000
ETHWHITE	-0.263	0.447	-0.045	-0.589	0.557
TRUSTF					
Constant	2.415	0.314		7.700	0.000
UNION	0.137	0.139	0.080	0.984	0.327
ETHWHITE	-0.230	0.319	-0.059	-0.719	0.473
TRUSTT					
Constant	5.467	0.673		8.121	0.000
UNION	1.074	0.305	0.282	3.522	0.001
ETHWHITE	-0.491	0.686	-0.057	-0.715	0.476

Note. The surveys used a scoring system of *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (6). However, the higher the score on the trust scale, the lower the trust score.

Table 11 shows how the variables contribute to the prediction of the dependent variables Trust with Administration, Faculty, and Trust Total. When predicting Trust of Administration, union membership accounted for a significant amount of unique variance (*p* less than or equal to .0009) when controlling for the department in which faculty teach. Similar results were found with the Trust Total scores for union membership (*p* less than or equal to .0009). The dependent variable of faculty trust of other faculty was not statistically significant contribution (.351) related to union membership when controlling for department in which faculty teach.

The department in which faculty teach does not account for unique variance in Trust with Administration for any departments including Business (.861), Developmental Studies (.173), Fine and Performing Arts (.282), Human Services (.599), Humanities

(.401), Math and Science (.429), Social Sciences (.566), Technology (.327), and Other

(.449).

Table 10

Hypothesis 5: Regression Table

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	R^2 Change	F Change	$df1$	$df2$	Sig. F Change
TRUSTA	0.466	0.217	0.161	0.217	3.861	10	139	0.000
TRUSTF	0.398	0.159	0.099	0.159	2.656	10	141	0.005
TRUSTT	0.428	0.183	0.123	0.183	3.050	10	136	0.002

Note. The amount of variance accounted for by unionization and department in which faculty teach.

Table 11 shows that the department in which faculty teach does not account for a

unique variance in trust with faculty for any departments except Fine and Performing

Arts (*p* is less than or equal to .0009), Humanities (.004), and Other (.020). The

departments in which faculty teach that there is not a unique variance include Business

(.515), Developmental Studies (.430), Human Services (.278), Math and Science (.057),

Social Sciences (.396), and Technology (.186).

For all departments except Fine and Performing Arts (.028), the department in

which faculty teach does not significantly contribute to Trust Total. This includes the

following departments: Business (.947), Developmental Studies (.511), Human Services

(.978), Humanities (.107), Math and Science (.208), Social Sciences (.483), Technology

(.254), and Other (.148). Note that trust scores were adjusted for department in which

faculty teach.

Table 10 and 11 are asking related but different questions. Table 10 is asking how well both predictors (union / department in which faculty teach) together predict Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T.   Table 11 breaks down the amount of unique variance in Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T when controlling for department in which faculty teach due to unionization and how much unique variance is accounted for in department in which faculty teach in Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T when controlling for unionization.

Table 12 contrasts union membership with nonunion membership with total years teaching. It should be noted that the trust survey used scored *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (6). When comparing total years teaching to Trust with Administration Table 12 displays 42 union respondents with a mean of 3.75 and a 1.14897 standard deviation, while 108 nonunion respondents had a mean of 2.7975 and a 1.03766 standard deviation. The total number of years teaching had a mean of 23.95, and a 10.366 standard deviation for union members, whereas nonunion members responded with a mean of 19.35 and a 10.982 standard deviation.

When comparing total years teaching to Trust with Faculty, Table 12 shows 42 union member respondents with a mean of 2.3274 and a .83828 standard deviation, while 110 nonunion members responded with a mean of 2.1955 and a .73524 standard deviation. The total number of years teaching for 41 union members had a mean of 23.95 and a 10.366 standard deviation, while 101 nonunion members reported a mean of 19.35 with a 10.982 standard deviation.

When contrasting total years teaching to Trust Total, Table 12 shows 40 union respondents with an adjusted mean for number of years taught of 6.0625 and a 1.66771 standard deviation, while 107 nonunion members had a mean of 4.988 and a 1.63165

Table 11

Hypothesis 5: Coefficients Table for the Independent Variable, Unionization, and the Covariate Department in Which Faculty Teach in Predicting the Three Dependent Variables

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	SE	Beta		
TRUSTA					
Constant	2.672	0.354		7.557	0.000
UNION	0.913	0.197	0.358	4.626	0.000
BUSI	-0.076	0.434	-0.021	-0.175	0.861
DS	-0.663	0.484	-0.144	-1.370	0.173
FAPA	0.553	0.511	0.108	1.081	0.282
HS	-0.220	0.417	-0.068	-0.527	0.599
HUMA	0.349	0.414	0.110	0.843	0.401
MASC	0.331	0.416	0.102	0.794	0.429
SS	0.254	0.442	0.069	0.575	0.566
TECH	0.457	0.464	0.108	0.984	0.327
OTHER	0.360	0.474	0.082	0.759	0.449
TRUSTF					
Constant	1.737	0.231		7.519	0.000
UNION	0.126	0.134	0.074	0.936	0.351
BUSI	0.189	0.289	0.078	0.653	0.515
DS	0.251	0.317	0.085	0.792	0.430
FAPA	1.231	0.344	0.361	3.576	0.000
HS	0.300	0.276	-0.141	1.090	0.278
HUMA	0.795	0.275	0.374	2.891	0.004
MASC	0.529	0.275	0.249	1.923	0.057
SS	0.254	0.298	0.099	0.851	0.396
TECH	0.422	0.317	0.143	1.329	0.186
OTHER	0.751	0.318	0.255	2.363	0.020
TRUSTT					
Constant	4.482	0.536		8.363	0.000
UNION	1.017	0.303	0.267	3.355	0.001
BUSI	0.044	0.658	0.008	0.067	0.947
DS	-0.484	0.734	-0.072	-0.660	0.511
FAPA	1.717	0.775	0.229	2.215	0.028
HS	0.017	0.633	0.004	0.027	0.978
HUMA	1.024	0.631	0.215	1.623	0.107
MASC	0.798	0.631	0.168	1.264	0.208
SS	0.476	0.677	0.085	0.704	0.483
TECH	0.821	0.717	0.127	1.146	0.254
OTHER	1.046	0.718	0.162	1.456	0.148

standard deviation. The total number of years teaching for 41 union faculty had a mean of

23.95 and a 10.366 standard deviation, while 101 nonunion members had a mean of

19.35 and a standard deviation of 10.982.

When contrasting union membership and nonunion membership with ethnicity, it

should be noted that the trust survey used scored *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree*

(6). When comparing ethnicity to Trust with Administration, Trust with Faculty, and

Trust Total there were 44 union respondents reporting 97.73% White ethnicity. Similarly

almost 95.50% of the 111 nonunion respondents were White. The *N* for union Trust A

faculty was 42. The *N* for nonunion faculty was 108. The number of Trust F faculty was

42 for union members and 110 for nonunion faculty. Trust T faculty was 40 and 107 for

nonunion faculty.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for the Question, How Many Total Years Have You Been Teaching?

	Mean Union	Mean Nonunion	SD Union	SD Nonunion	N Union	N Nonunion
TRUST A	3.750	2.7975	1.14897	1.03766	42	108
UNION/NON	1.00	1.00	.000	.000	44	111
How many total years have you been teaching?	23.95	19.35	10.366	10.982	41	101
TRUST F	2.3274	2.1955	.83828	.73524	42	110
UNION/NON	1.00	1.00	.000	.000	44	111
How many total years have you been teaching?	23.95	19.35	10.366	10.982	41	101
TRUST T	6.0625	4.988	1.66771	1.63165	40	107
UNION/NON	1.00	1.00	.000	.000	44	111
How many total years have you been teaching?	23.95	19.35	10.366	10.982	41	101

When contrasting union membership and nonunion membership with sex, it should be noted that the trust survey used scored *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (6). When adjusted for sex to Trust with Administration, Trust with Faculty, and Trust Total this table displays 44 union respondents reporting 36.36% males and 109 male nonunion respondents 52.29%. Note that trust scores were adjusted for sex. The *N* for union Trust A faculty was 42. The *N* for nonunion faculty was 108. The number of Trust F faculty was 42 for union members and 110 for nonunion faculty. Trust T faculty was 40 and 107 for nonunion faculty.

Table 13 contrasts union membership with nonunion membership with participants' age. It should be noted that the trust survey used scored *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (6). When comparing age to Trust with Administration, this table displays 42 union respondents with a mean of 3.75 and a 1.14897 standard deviation, while 108 nonunion respondents had a mean of 2.7975 and a 1.03766 standard deviation. The mean age reported by 39 union members was 52.46, with an 8.91 standard deviation, while 102 nonunion members responded with a mean of 50.27 and a standard deviation of 10.010.

When comparing age and Trust with Faculty, Table 13 shows 42 union member respondents with a mean of 2.3274 and a .83828 standard deviation, while 110 nonunion members responded with a mean of 2.1955 and a .73524 standard deviation. The mean age for 39 union members was 52.46 with an 8.941 standard deviation, while 102 nonunion members reported a mean age of 50.27 with a 10.010 standard deviation.

When contrasting age with Trust Total, Table 13 shows 40 union respondents with a mean of 6.0625 and a 1.66771 standard deviation, while 107 nonunion members

had a mean of 4.988 and a 1.63165 standard deviation. The mean age for 39 union faculty

was 52.46 with an 8.941 standard deviation, while 102 nonunion members had a mean

age of 50.27 with a 10.010 standard deviation. Note that trust scores were adjusted for

age.

Table 14 contrasts union membership with nonunion membership with

participant's department in which they teach. It should be noted that the trust survey used

scored *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (6). When comparing department in which

faculty teach to Trust with Administration Table 14 displays 42 union respondents with a

mean of 3.75, while 108 nonunion respondents had a mean of 2.7975. The means by

department range between 4.55% and 18.18% and were reported by 44 union and 111

nonunion faculty members.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for the Question, What Is Your Age?

	Mean Union	Mean Nonunion	*SD* Union	*SD* Nonunion	*N* Union	*N* Nonunion
TRUST A	3.7500	2.7975	1.14897	1.03766	42	108
UNION	1.00	1.00	0.000	0.000	44	111
What is your age?	52.46	50.27	8.941	10.010	39	102
TRUST F	2.3274	2.1955	.83828	0.73524	42	110
UNION	1.00	1.00	0.000	0.000	44	111
What is your age?	52.46	50.27	8.941	10.010	39	102
TRUST T	6.0625	4.9988	1.66771	1.63165	40	107
UNION	1.00	1.00	0.000	0.000	44	111
What is your age?	52.46	50.27	8.941	10.010	39	102

When comparing department in which faculty teach to Trust with Faculty, Table 14 displays 42 union respondents with a mean of 2.3274, while 110 nonunion respondents had a mean of 2.1955. The means by department range between 4.55% and 18.18% and were reported by 44 union and 111 nonunion faculty members.

When comparing department in which faculty teach to Trust Total, Table 14 displays 40 union respondents with a mean of 6.0625, while 107 nonunion respondents had a mean of 4.9988. The means by department range between 4.55% and 18.18% and were reported by 44 union and 111 nonunion faculty members.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics for the Question, In Which Department Do You Teach?

	Percentage Union	Percentage Nonunion	*N* Union	*N* Nonunion
TRUST A	3.7500	2.7975	42	108
TRUST F	2.3274	2.1955	42	110
TRUST T	6.0625	4.9988	40	107
UNION	1.00	1.00	44	111
BUSI	6.82	12.61	44	111
DS	4.55	8.11	44	111
FAPA	4.55	5.41	44	111
HS	18.18	13.51	44	111
HUMA	15.91	15.32	44	111
MASC	13.64	15.32	44	111
SS	18.18	7.21	44	111
TECH	4.55	9.01	44	111
OTHER	9.09	6.31	44	111

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100% because some respondents did not answer this question. Answering this question, 145 faculty. Skipping this question, 23 faculty. Trust scores were adjusted for the department for which they are teaching.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the Study

The research investigated the relationship between union membership and trust. Specifically it examined how trust relates to unions on a community college campus for full-time faculty members. Job satisfaction is also included in the discussion as it is connected to trust and unions. A survey was given to the full-time faculty of five selected community colleges in Michigan. The full-time faculty were surveyed and asked questions about their trust with administration, faculty, and students. Three of the five schools had no union representation and the remaining schools were selected due to their similarities with the nonunion schools. The survey instrument, a trust survey, developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003) measured trust between faculty, administrators, and trust total.

Research questions included asking about perceived value of unionization and nonunionization and if trust is different at union schools compared to not unionized schools. Additional research questions considered sex, age, ethnicity, tenure, departments, and perceived value of unionization.

Methodology

Five Michigan community college faculty were surveyed. All full-time faculty were asked to respond; there was a 34% response rate. Community colleges were selected based on their union status. First, the only three community colleges without a union

were selected and then similar community colleges were found based on demographic data such as student enrollment.

The survey was 22 questions long and was emailed to 489 full-time faculty. Follow-up emails were sent to remind faculty to respond. Survey Monkey was used to distribute and collect survey results.

Research Hypotheses

Each of the five research hypotheses was presented with regression and coefficient tables. The coefficient tables measured the relationship between three trust factors (with administration, faculty, and trust total scores), union membership, and five questions relating to ethnicity, age, total number of years teaching, sex, and departments in which faculty teach.

The five specific research hypotheses were:

1. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for number of years teaching held constant.

2. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for sex.

3. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for age.

4. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for ethnicity.

5. Trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for academic departments.

Discussion of Findings

This section is organized by the research hypotheses and concludes with a general discussion of the hypotheses. Each of the next five hypotheses was based on two tables. The first of the two tables (Tables 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10) gave the overall F of how well the predictor variable and covariant predict the criterion variable (Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T.) The second table (Tables 3, 5, 7, and 9) broke down the analysis of how much each variable accounted for a unique variance of the criterion variables (Trust A, Trust F, and Trust T).

The first research hypothesis states that trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for number of years teaching. Unionization was significant in predicting Trust Total when controlling for number of years taught. Years of teaching experience did not account for a significant amount of unique variance ($p \leq .0009$) in predicting together the three dependent variables of Trust with Administrators, Faculty, and Trust Total. However, when predicting Trust of Administration and Trust Total separately from each other, union membership accounted for a unique variance when controlling for total years teaching. On the other hand, Faculty Trust with other faculty was not statistically significant related to union membership when controlling for years of experience. This study found that there is a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust administrators when controlling for number of years teaching. However, this study also found that there is not a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust other faculty when controlling for number of years teaching.

The second research hypothesis states that trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for sex. Table 5 shows that union status accounted for a significant amount of unique variance ($p \leq .0009$) in predicting unique variance for Trust with Administrators, Faculty, and Trust Total when controlling for sex. However, sex did not account for a significant amount of unique variance when predicting Trust with Administrators, Faculty, and Trust Total. This study found that there is a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust administrators when controlling for sex. However, this study also found that there is not a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust other faculty when controlling for sex.

The third research hypothesis states that trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for age of faculty. Table 7 shows that union status accounted for a significant amount of unique variance ($p \leq .0009$) in predicting unique variance for Trust with Faculty and Trust Total when controlling for age. Age of faculty did not account for a significant amount of unique variance in predicting Trust with Administrators. This study found that there is a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust administrators when controlling for age of faculty. However, this study also found that there is not a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust other faculty when controlling for age of faculty.

The fourth research hypothesis states that trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for ethnicity of faculty. Table 9 shows that union status accounted for a significant amount of unique variance ($p \leq .0009$)

67

in predicting unique variance for Trust with Administrators, Faculty, and Trust Total when controlling for White ethnicity. White ethnicity did not account for a significant amount of unique variance in predicting Trust with Administrators, Faculty, and Trust Total. This study found that there is a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust administrators when controlling for ethnicity. However, this study also found that there is not a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust other faculty when controlling for ethnicity.

The fifth research hypothesis states that trust significantly differentiates between unionized and nonunionized members when controlling for department in which faculty teach. Table 11 shows that union status accounted for a significant amount of unique variance ($p \leq .0009$) in predicting unique variance for Trust with Administrators, Faculty, and Trust Total when controlling for department in which faculty teach. The department in which faculty teach does not account for unique variance in Trust with Administrators for any departments including Business (.861), Developmental Studies (.173), Fine and Performing Arts (.282), Human Services (.599), Humanities (.401), Math and Science (.429), Social Sciences (.566), Technology (.327), and Other (.449). This study found that there is a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust administrators when controlling for department in which faculty teach. However, this study also found that there is not a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust other faculty when controlling for department in which faculty teach.

Implications and Conclusions

This section discusses the conclusions of this study with a focus on the three research questions and their implications for community college administration.

The first question asked if there is a relationship between faculty Trust in Administrators between unionized and nonunionized schools. Based on the participants' responses, this study found that there is a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust administrators when controlling for number of years teaching, sex, ethnicity, age, and department for which they teach.

The second question asked if there is a relationship between Faculty Trust in faculty between unionized and nonunionized schools. Based on the participants' responses, this study found that there is not a significant difference in how much unionized faculty, compared to nonunionized faculty, trust faculty when controlling for number of years teaching, sex, ethnicity, age, or department for which they teach.

The third question asked if there is a significant difference between predicting Trust Total between schools that are unionized and not unionized. Based on the participants' responses, this study found that there is a significant difference between faculty trust in unionized and nonunionized schools.

Based on these findings, this study leads to the conclusion that there is a relationship between unionization and trust with faculty at unionized schools and administrators. In other words, at unionized schools faculty trust administrators less. There is not a significant difference between trust in other faculty at unionized and nonunionized schools. In other words, at unionized schools faculty trust other faculty the same as they would at nonunionized schools. In fact, these findings are consistent with

the literature that says, "There is usually an inverse relationship between rules and trust: the more people depend on rules to regulate their interactions, the less they trust others, and vice versa" (Fukuyama, 1995, p. 224). On the other hand, one important finding of this study that does not seem to be addressed in the literature is that there does not seem to be a relationship between trust and faculty and other faculty in regard to unionization status.

One of the major implications of this study is that if faculty do not trust administrators, there is a greater likelihood of support of unionization. If faculty do not trust administrators, it is likely that there will greater friction between administrators and faculty and therefore administrators will not trust faculty. Therefore, the organization will not run well. It is logical to expect that if this mistrust exists, a variety of things could happen. Administrators may not trust faculty, and faculty may not trust administrators, therefore, faculty may be more likely to look for a third party, the union. If these issues exist, it is more likely that students may be hurt as well. A number of these implications are discussed in more detail below in the Practical Recommendations section.

<center>**Practical Recommendations**</center>

According to the conclusions of this study, the following practical recommendations seem to be pertinent to help administrators improve trust at their organization. Community college administrators try to improve trust in the workplace by implementing a culture of trust. This may include providing an environment where faculty feel that they can experiment and take risks to improve the quality of their work (Hoffman, Sabo, & Hoy, 1994). Administrators should support faculty during difficult

times with students as well as provide collegial leadership and a high academic emphasis (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995). In fact, administrators should gauge trust in their organizations and attempt to measure trust in their organization. Depending on the measurement of trust, changes should be made when necessary to improve trust in the organization.

Administrators can show trust by being kind and considerate; they might show this by being aware of what is going on in the lives of their faculty. Administrators can show trust by being principled and having high ethical standards. In addition, administrators should be competent in their jobs by making sure they know their job well. Administrators can show trust by using power wisely. For example, administrators could use their power to help mediate difficult situations. In addition, administrators can show trust by making sensible decisions, promoting curriculum and professional growth, showing confidence, and focusing on empowering faculty (MacNeil & Blake, 1998). Faculty can demonstrate trust by showing commitment to students and student learning, and by being sincere, honest, loyal, supportive, rational, friendly, and even cheerful (MacNeil et al., 1998).

Faculty are just one element of the community college environment, but they are a direct link between the customers of the community college—the students—and administration. Therefore, this study is important as it could bridge the gap between students, faculty, and administration. If faculty are satisfied, they are more likely to have a better attitude, and this is likely to improve student satisfaction. Student satisfaction is related to retention and grades (Wilson, 2008). Happier faculty and improved student

satisfaction will lead to a more positive environment at the college. Leaders have the opportunity to change the culture of trust.

The reality for administrators is that distrust is costly (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Faculty may be unwilling to take risks and may even demand greater protection and try to defend their interest (Tyler & Kramer, 1996). In fact, distrust undermines a trusting cooperative relationship (Dawes, Van de Kragt, & Orbell, 1990; Deutsch, 1958). Therefore it is incumbent on administrators to make sure their faculty feel trust in them, therefore increasing organizational effectiveness.

Suggested Further Research

The collegial relationship between faculty and administration has declined (A.M. Cohen & Brawer, 2008). These effects on morale and salaries have been examined; however, the salary differences between a unionized and nonunionized school are minimal (Wiley, 1993). Still, two-thirds of faculty feel that the unionized environment is good for community colleges (Outcault, 2002). Answering the question regarding why faculty are still happy with union representation, given the current research, could be important. In addition, more research could be done with job satisfaction and how the continued impact of business people (as opposed to academics) running colleges and universities affects faculty attitudes towards administrators. While more research should be done on job satisfaction, it will be important to establish a study that can take some of the subjectivity out of this topic since job satisfaction is highly subjective.

In addition, faculty perception and a positive feeling of job satisfaction can be different depending on the number of years they have worked for the institution, their field of study and education, as well as their age. Also important are the other issues at

the college at a specific point in time. For example, the firing of a well-liked faculty, a brand-new college president, a significant policy change, etc., could impact a faculty member's response during a study.

When studies are conducted at community colleges or universities, they often include adjunct faculty. Because adjunct faculty do not have the same requirements and responsibilities as full-time faculty do, their perceptions of the community college and subjectivity to the situation may not be the same as that of a full-time faculty member. In addition, often adjunct faculty do not belong to the unions on campus that serve full-time faculty. Studying only full-time faculty and only adjunct faculty may produce different results. This is an important distinction with more and more community colleges relying on adjunct faculty to teach their courses. Therefore studying how trust impacts adjunct faculty is another potential research opportunity.

A possible follow-up study could be done on a college campus after a few years of a union coming to campus to determine if faculty received the benefits that they had hoped to receive from their membership. In addition, faculty could be asked, If you could do it all over again, would you vote for collective bargaining?

Another suggestion for further study would be for any organization to look at their internal relationships between faculty, administration, and students. If trust is foundational to their relationships within the organization, administrators could find that by making changes to increase trust, they may be able to improve internal employee relationships as well as their relationships with external parties such as their customers (students), suppliers, creditors, and other important stakeholders to the organization.

Since almost all participants of this study were White, it could be interesting to see if trust changes if more faculty were ethnically diverse. It is not difficult to see how people with different worldviews and paradigms might answer certain questions in this study differently.

Conclusion

Based on the above research findings, one of the unique contributions of this study to the literature seems to be the exploration of trust in the context of unionization. According to the findings of this study, trust tends to make a difference with the trust faculty have with administration in a unionized environment. In closing, this study was very rewarding in the sense that it can help administrators take a closer look at trust in their organization. It is my expectation that this study will help community college administrators develop strategies to increase trust.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY

This survey was originally created and copyrighted by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran in 2003. With permission from the authors, researcher is adapting it to college faculty. In its original form, it dealt with teachers, the principal, and parents. Researcher is simply changing "teachers" out for "faculty" and "principals" out for "administration." Four questions related to parents have been deleted since in a college environment, parents do not have as much of a relationship with faculty and administration (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your school from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). Your answers are confidential.

1. Faculty in this school trust administration.
2. Faculty in this school trust each other.
3. Faculty in this school trust their students.
4. The faculty in this school are suspicious of most of administrations actions.
5. Faculty in this school typically look out for each other.
6. Faculty in this school trust the parents.
7. The faculty in this school have faith in the integrity of administration.
8. Faculty in this school are suspicious of each other.
9. Administration in this school typically acts in the best interests of faculty.
10. Students in this school care about each other.
11. Administration of this school does not show concern for the faculty.
12. Even in difficult situations, faculty in this school can depend on each other.
13. Faculty in this school do their jobs well.
14. Faculty in this school can rely on administration.
15. Faculty in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.
16. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.
17. Administration in this school is competent in doing his or her job.
18. The faculty in this school are open with each other.
19. When faculty in this school tell you something, you can believe it.
20. Faculty here believe students are competent learners.
21. Administration doesn't tell teachers what is really going on.
22. Students here are secretive.

Additional Survey Questions

1. Sex of participant
2. Age of participant
3. Number of years at current school (for which survey is being conducted)
4. Number of years teaching (total)
5. Are you a tenured or non-tenured faculty member?
6. What discipline do you teach?
7. Are you a member of the union? If yes, does your union require you to be a member?
8. Do you think it is healthy to be a member of the union?
9. Do you think it is valuable for faculty to be part of the union?
10. Do you feel that the union helps to support the academic environment in a positive way?

APPENDIX B

LETTERS

Andrews ◊ University

School of Education
Leadership Department

Informed Consent Letter

Title: Relationships between job satisfaction, trust, and perceived value of faculty unionization: A within and between group study.

Purpose of Study: I understand that the purpose of this study is to analyze community college faculty and their relationship with administration at five Michigan community colleges. Specifically how trust affects faculty job satisfaction.

Inclusion Criteria: In order to participate, I recognize that I must be an adult at least 18 years old and be a full time faculty member at one of the five community colleges chosen for this survey.

Benefits/Results: I accept that I will receive no remuneration for my participation, but that by participating, I will help the researcher and leaders of community colleges in the on-going discussion about how to best enhance the trust and levels of job satisfaction for community college faculty.

Voluntary Participation: I understand that participation in this project is completely voluntary. If I agree to participate, I may refuse to answer any question. In addition, my responses will be completely anonymous and done electronically through Survey Monkey. There will be no individual identity necessary for aggregating the data. While my administrator sent this survey to me, they will not have any access to the data collected. In addition, there is no way to identify respondent data and all data will be destroyed at the completion of this project.

Contact Information: In the event that I have any questions or concerns with regard to my participation in this research project, I understand that I may contact either the researcher, Stacy Horner, Chair, School of Business at Southwestern Michigan College and PhD student at Andrews University at shorner@swmich.edu or 269.782.1220 or her committee chairperson, Dr. Robson Marinho, professor in Leadership at Andrews University at marinho@andrews.edu or 269.471.3200.

Consent: I have read the Informed Consent Letter and recognize that by completing and returning this survey that I am giving my informed consent to participate. I also understand that my answers are anonymous.

Stacy L. Horner
Southwestern Michigan College
58900 Cherry Grove Road
Dowagiac, MI 49047

September 5, 2011

Administrator Name
School
School Address
City, State, Zip

Dear XXX:

My name is Stacy Horner; I am the Chair of the School of Business at Southwestern Michigan College. In addition, I am a PhD student at Andrews University and my doctorate is in Leadership with an emphasis in Higher Education Administration. I am writing for your assistance in completing my dissertation.

My dissertation is concentrated on Michigan community college faculty and their relationship with administration; specifically how trust affects faculty job satisfaction. I am planning to survey six community colleges in Michigan – three with unions and three without union membership.

I would like permission to survey the full-time faculty at your school. The survey I will be using is a Trust survey developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran in 2003. It will be administered through Survey Monkey. With your assistance I will send the survey to all of the full-time faculty via email this fall.

If you are willing to participate, I have attached a preformatted letter for you with the information required by Andrews University. Please note it **must be on your letterhead** for my application to the Andrews University Institutional Review Board.

Thank you very much for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns you may have at my office (269.782.1220), my cell (574.596.2781), or via email at shorner@swmich.edu.

Sincerely,

Stacy L. Horner

DETAILS ON CONSENT REQUIRED BY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

- It should be addressed to:

Institutional Review Board

Andrews University

4150 Administrative Drive, Room 210

Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0355

Or faxed to attention IRB : (269) 471-6246

E-mail Letters: Letters may be sent as scanned email attachments to irb@andrews.edu.

NOTE: PREFORMATTED LETTER BELOW

Institutional Review Board
Andrews University
4150 Administrative Drive, Room 210
Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0355

DATE

Dear Institutional Review Board:

On behalf of our community college, INSERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE NAME, we grant Stacy L. Horner permission to study our full time faculty for her dissertation. The title of her study is "Relationships between job satisfaction, trust, and perceived value of faculty unionization: A within and between group study".

Sincerely,

NAME, TITLE, AND SCHOOL NAME

REFERENCE LIST

REFERENCE LIST

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *62*, 335-343.

Adler, J. (2010, March 18). Debate: Are teachers' unions the problem—or the answer? *Newsweek*, 1-2. Retrieved May 13, 2012, from http://www.thedailybeast.com /newsweek/2010/03/18/debate-are-teachers-unions-the-problem-or-the-answer.html

Alderfer, C. P. (1972). *Existence, relatedness, and growth: Human needs in organizational settings.* New York: Free Press.

Bender, K. A., & Sloane, P. J. (1998). Job satisfaction, trade unions, and exit-voice revisited. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, *51*, 222-240.

Berger, C. J., Olson, C. A., & Boudreau, J. W. (1983). Effects of unions on job satisfaction: The role of work-related values and perceived rewards. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *32*(3), 289-324.

Berry, J. (2005). *Reclaiming the ivory tower*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Berry, J., & Savarese, M. (2012). *Directory of U.S. faculty contracts and bargaining agents in institutions of higher education* (R. Boris, Series Ed.).   New York, NY: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions.

Bertz, R. D., Jr., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *44*(1), 32-54.

Blau, D. M. (1987). A time series analysis of self-employment in the United States. *Journal of Political Economy*, *95*(3), 445-467.

The Brookings Institution. (2013). *Community colleges*. Retrieved March 3, 2013, from http://www.brookings.edu/research/topics/community-colleges.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership*, *60*, 40-44.

Birnbaum, R. (1987). *How colleges work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cataldi, E. F., Fahimi, M., & Bradburn, E. M. (2005). *2004 national study of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF:04)*: *Report on faculty and instructional staff in Fall 2003*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Clay, R. (2008, December). The corporatization of higher education. *American Psychological Assoication*, *39*(11), 50.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college* (5th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

College and University Professional Association for Human Resources. (2008). *2007-08 community college faculty salary survey*. Retrieved March 3, 2013, from http://www.cupahr.org/surveys/files/salary0708/ccfss08execsummary.pdf

Covey, S. (2006). *The speed of trust*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Cummings, L. L., & Bromiley, P. (1996). The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory* (pp. 304-305). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dallinger, J. M., & Beveridge, D. M. (1993, May). *Faculty satisfaction with the influence of a union and the administration on aspects of academic jobs*. Annual Meeting of the Association for Institutional Research, Chicago, IL.

Davis, L. (2011, July 24). The future of faculty unions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Forum-The-Future-of-Faculty/128305/

Dawes, R. M., Van de Kragt, A. J., & Orbell, J. M. (1990). *Cooperation for the benefit of us—not me or my conscience.* In J. Mansbridge (Ed.), *Beyond self-interest* (pp. 16-55). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *2*, 265-279.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science*, *12*, 450-467.

Elmuti, D., & Kathawala, Y. (1991). Full-time university faculty members' perceptions of unionization impact on overall compensation dimensions. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *24*(2), 9-15.

Evans, M. G., & Ondrack, D. A. (1990). The role of job outcomes and values in understanding the union's impact on job satisfaction: A replication. *Human Relations*, *43*(5), 401-417.

Finley, C. E. (1991). The relationship between unionization and job satisfaction among two-year college faculty. *Community College Review*, *19*(2), 53-60.

Frankel, J. (1973). *Junior college faculty job satisfaction*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Freeman, R. B., & Medoff, J. L. (1984). *What do unions do?* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations* (pp. 213-237). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *37*, 479-507.

Gomez-Mejia, L., & Balkin, D. (1984). Faculty satisfaction with pay and other job dimensions under union and nonunion conditions. *Academy of Management Journal*, *27*(3), 591-602.

Grubb, W.N., & Associates. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York: Routledge.

Hargreaves, A. (2007). Sustainable professional learning communities. In L. Stoll & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas* (pp. 181-195). London: Open University.

Hersch, J., & Stone, J.A. (1990). Is union job dissatisfaction real? *The Journal of Human Resources, 25*, 736-751.

Herzberg, F. (2003, January). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*. doi:http://hbr.org/2003/01/one-more-time-how-do-you-motivate-employees/ar/1

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley.

Hoffman, J., Sabo, D., & Hoy, W. (1994). Building a culture of trust. *Journal of School Leadership*, *3*, 484-501.

Hoy, W. K. (2012). The Omnibus T-Scale. In W. K. Hoy, *Faculty trust*. Retrieved March 4, 2012, from http://www.waynekhoy.com/faculty_trust.html

Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, *9*, 184-208.

Hoy, W.K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). *The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The Omnibus T-Scale*. In W. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing* schools (pp. 181-208). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W. J. (1985). The meaning and measure of faculty trust. *Educational and Psychological Research*, *5*, 1-10.

Hoy, W., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Huber, M. T. (1998). *Community college faculty attitudes and trends, 1997*. Stanford, CA: National Center for Postsecondary Improvement. (ERIC Document No. ED428796)

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1971). *Handbook in research and evaluation*. San Diego, CA: Robert R. Knapp.

Johnson, B., Kavanagh, P., & Mattson, K. (Eds.). (2003). *Steal this university*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Julius, D. J., & Gumport, P. J. (2002). Graduate student unionization: Catalysts and consequences. *Review of Higher Education*, *26*, 187-216.

Kanter, R. M. (1997). *On the frontiers of management*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B.A. (2007). *The law of higher education* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th ed.). San Diego: Harcourt.

Kim, D., Twombly, S., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2008). Factors predicting community college faculty satisfaction with instructional autonomy. *Community College Review*, *35*(3), 159-180.

Kochanek, J. R. (2005). *Building trust for better schools: Research-based practices.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kramer, R. M., & Cook, K. S. (2004). Trust and distrust in organizations: Dilemmas and approaches. In R. M. Kramer & K. S. Cook (Eds.), *Trust and distrust in organizations: Dilemmas and approaches* (pp. 1-18). New York: Russell Sage.

Krieg, J. M., Wassell, C. S., Jr., Hedrick, D. W., & Henson, S. E. (2013). *Collective bargaining and faculty job satisfaction*. From http://faculty.wwu.edu/kriegj/Econ.%20Documents/Satisfaction%20IR.pdf

Kupersmith, W. J., & Hoy, W. (1989). *The concept of trust: An empirical assessment*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D. P., Cooper, J. E., Lambert, M. D., Gardner, M. E., & Slack, P. J. (1995). *The constructivist leader* (2nd ed.; p. 66). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Leana, C. R., & Van Buren, H. J. (1999). Organizational social capital and employment practices. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*, 538-555.

Lewicki, R.J., & Wiethoff, C. (2000). *Trust, trust development, and trust repair.* In M. Deutsch & P.T. Coleman (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (pp. 86-107). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lillydahl, J., & Singell, L. (1993). Job satisfaction, salaries and unions: The determination of university faculty compensation. *Economics of Education Review, 12*(3), 233-243.

Locke, A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lord, H. G. (1973, July). *Ex post facto studies as a research method* (Special Report No. 7320). Washington, DC: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

Louis, K.S. (2007). Trust and improvement in school. *Journal of Educational Change, 8*, 1-24.

Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and power.* New York: John Wiley.

MacNeil, A. J., & Blake, M. (1998). Trust: The quality required for successful management. In Y. Cano, F. H. Wood, & J. C. Simmons (Eds.), *Creating high functioning schools* (pp. 29-39). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

MacNeil, A. J., Spuck, D. W., & Ceyanes, J. W. (1998). *Developing trust between principal and teachers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Houston—Clear Lake, Houston, TX.

Maldonado, J. F. (2006). *A national analysis of faculty salary and benefits in public community colleges academic year 2003-2004*. Denton, TX: University of North Texas.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*, 370-396.

McNeil, K. A., Newman, I., & Kelly, F. J. (1996). *Testing research hypotheses with the general linear model*. Board of Trustees, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.

McNeil, K., Newman, I., & Fraas, J. (2012). *Designing general linear models to test research hypotheses*. Lanham, MD: University Press.

McClelland, D. C. (1965). Toward a theory of motive acquisition. *American Psychologist*, *20*, 321-333.

McClelland, D. C. (1976). *The achieving society*. New York, NY: Irvington Publishers.

Meglino, B.M., Ravlin, E.C., & Adkins, C.L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 424-432.

Michigan Community College Association. (2011). *Fast facts.* http://www.mcca.org/content.cfm?m=87&id=87&startRow=1&mm=0

Munk, L. G. (1998, August 1). *Collective bargaining and contract administration*. Midland, MI: Mackinac Center for Public Policy.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *Current-fund expenditures of public degree-granting institutions, by purpose and type of institution*. Retrieved September 19, 2010, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d05/tables/dt05_341.asp

National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions. (1974-1994). *Directory of faculty contracts and bargaining agents in institutions of higher education.* New York, NY: Author.

Newman, I., Benz, C.R., Weis, D., & McNeil, K. (1997). *Theses and dissertations: A guide to writing in the social and physical sciences.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Newman, I., Newman, C., Brown, R., & McNeely, S. (2006). *Conceptual statistics for beginners* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

NLRB v. Yeshiva University, 444 U.S. 672 (1980).

Olsen, D., & Crawford, L. (1998). A five-year study of junior faculty expectations about their work. *Review of Higher Education, 22*, 39-54.

Ormsby, J. G., & Ormsby, S. Y. (1988). The effect of unionization on organizational commitment: A longitudinal study of a university faculty. *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector*, *17*, 153-160.

Outcault, C. L. (Ed.). (2002). Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges. In *New directions for community colleges* (p. 118). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Powell, W. W. (1996). Trust-based forms of governance. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 51-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schmidt, P. (2011, October 9). Faculty unions in Ohio and Wisconsin hunker down. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Faculty-Unions-in-Ohio-and/129302/

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, *40*, 437–453.

Schroeder, M. (2008). *Being for: Evaluating the semantic program of expressivism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Serwach, J. (2009, December 23). *Community college enrollments soar: What's next?* Retrieved February 25, 2010, from http://www.ns.umich.edu/htdocs/releases/story.php?id=7469Syracuse City

Smart, J. C., Elton, C. F., & McLaughlin, G. W. (1986). Person-environment congruence and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 29,* 216-225.

Steck, H., & Zweig, M. (2000). Take back the university: Only unions can save academic life. In G. D. White & F. C. Hauck (Eds.), *Campus, Inc.* (p. 303). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Tarter, C. J., Sabo, D., & Hoy, W. (1995). Middle school climate, faculty trust, and effectiveness: A path analysis. *Journal of Reseach and Development in Education*, *29*, 41-49.

Taylor, M. C. (2009, April 26). End the university as we know it. *New York Times*, p. A23, Opinion Editorial.

Troman, G. (2000). Teacher stress in the low-trust society. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *21*, 331-353.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, *71*, 547-593.

Tyler, T., & Kramer, R. (1996). *Whiter trust?* In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.)*, Trust in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Uline, C. L., Miller, D. M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). School effectiveness: The underlying dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *34*, 462-483.

Union. (n.d.). In *Dictionary.com*. Retrieved November 4, 2012, from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/labor+union

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Office of Labor-Management Standards. (2012). *Collective bargaining agreements file.* Retrieved from http://www.dol.gov/olms/regs/compliance/cba/index.htm

Van Maele, D., & Van Houtte, M. (2009, June 15). Faculty trust and organizational school characteristics: An exploration across secondary schools in Flanders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *45*, 556.

Vedder, R., Denhart, M., & Robe, J. (2011, January 27). Right-to-Work and Indiana's economic future. In *Indianachamber.com*. Retrieved September 23, 2012, from http://www.indianachamber.com/media/pdf/studies/IndianaRightToWork -1-27-11.pdf

White, G. D., & Hauck, F. C. (Eds.). (2000). *Corporate power in the ivory tower.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

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

Wiley, C. (1993). The effect of unionization on community college faculty remuneration: An overview. *Community College Review*, *21*(1), 48-57.

Williams, C. (2011). *MGMT* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Southwestern Cengage Learning.

Williamson, O. E. (1993). Calculativeness, trust, and economic organization. *Journal of Law and Economics*, *36*, 453-486.

Wilson, J. H. (2008). Instructor attitudes toward students: Job satisfaction and student outcomes. *College Teaching*, *56*(4), 225-229.

Wilson, J. H., & Taylor, K. W. (2001). Professor immediacy as behaviors associated with liking students. *Teaching of Psychology*, *28*, 136-138.

Winter, P. A. (1996). The application of marketing theory to community college faculty recruitment: An empirical test. *Community College Review*, *24*, 3-16.

Winter, P.A., & Kjorlien, C. L. (2000). Community college faculty recruitment: Predictors of applicant attraction to faculty positions. *Community College Review*, *28*(1), 23-40.

VITA

<div align="center">

Stacy L. Horner
57185 County Road 27
Goshen, IN 46528
574.596.2781
shorner@swmich.edu

</div>

Education:

2013	**Doctor of Philosophy, Leadership, Higher Education Administration**
	Anticipated May 2013
	Andrew's University, Berrien Springs, Michigan
1998	**Master of Business Administration**
	Bethel College, Mishawaka, Indiana
1996	**Bachelor of Science, Accounting**
	Manchester College, North Manchester, Indiana

Experience:

2013-Present	**Dean, School of Business**
	Dean, Niles Area Campus
	Southwestern Michigan College, Dowagiac, Michigan
2007-2013	**Chair, School of Business**
	Southwestern Michigan College, Dowagiac, Michigan
2005-2007	**Business and Accounting Instructor**
	Southwestern Michigan College, Dowagiac, Michigan
2001-2005	**Corporate Manager**
	Loren A. Weaver, DVM, Constantine, Michigan
1998-2001	**Auditor**
	CTB, Inc., Milford, Indiana
1996-1998	**Auditor**
	National Standard Company, Niles, Michigan