

Article

"Strike Activities and Post-Strike Perceptions Among University Faculty"

Ignace Ng

Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations, vol. 48, n° 2, 1993, p. 231-249.

Pour citer cet article, utiliser l'information suivante :

URI: <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/050852ar>

DOI: 10.7202/050852ar

Note : les règles d'écriture des références bibliographiques peuvent varier selon les différents domaines du savoir.

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter à l'URI <https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche. Érudit offre des services d'édition numérique de documents scientifiques depuis 1998.

Pour communiquer avec les responsables d'Érudit : info@erudit.org

Strike Activities and Post-Strike Perceptions Among University Faculty

Ignace Ng

Based upon the returned questionnaires of 415 striking faculty members from the University of Saskatchewan, this study shows that faculty members who have attended the study session, and those who have been active in past union meetings were more likely to get involved in picketing and in picket organizing during the course of the strike. Analysis of their post-strike perceptions shows that the faculty attitudes towards the effectiveness of the strike, strike length, and back-to-work legislation were closely related to the militancy of the faculty during the strike.

After a protracted negotiation that lasted 11 months, the faculty members at the University of Saskatchewan went on strike. This particular strike provided a unique opportunity to study the strike voting behaviour of faculty members, their militancy during the strike, and their post-strike perceptions. The voting pattern of the faculty members has been recently examined in Ng (1991), and the objective of this paper is to extend the Ng's study by analyzing the militancy of the faculty members *during* the strike and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the strike after it has ended. The proposed study differs from previous research in three dimensions.

First, in the majority of strike studies, the emphasis has been on identifying the causes or events that led the bargaining parties to a work stoppage (Maki and Strand 1984; Ng 1991; Reder and Neumann 1980; Shorey 1976). What happens during and after the strike is usually not researched. Some of the exceptions to the rule include Harris, Rausch, and Ryan (1982) and Gilson, Spencer, and Granville (1989).

Second, this paper deals with the behavioral aspect of militancy. A review of the literature on union militancy reveals that most studies have

* Ng, I., Associate Professor, School of Business, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C.

focused on attitudinal militancy (Dolan 1979; McShane 1985; Schutt 1982; Shirom 1977). Very little has been written on the behavior of union members, especially during a strike. The few studies that did examine behavioral militancy during a work stoppage (Harris *et al.* 1982) are based on strikes involving violence on the picket line, and their usual objective is to explain the violent nature of the strike. Most strikes are, however, violent-free, and there is to date no published study assessing the behavior of the actors during such strikes.

Third, since strikes by university faculty members are still rare, the results of this study should be of interest to students of faculty collective bargaining. As can be seen below, most of the research in this area deals with faculty attitudes towards unions and collective bargaining in general. Even among studies that examined faculty strikes (Aussieker 1977; Ng 1991), there were no attempt at explaining faculty attitudes or behaviours *during* and *after* the strike.

The next section of this paper presents a brief review of past research in faculty collective bargaining. This is then followed by a section on the conceptual model. The section after that explains the data collection process and provides a descriptive overview of the sample. The militancy of the faculty members during the strike are then analyzed in the next section. Following this, the post-strike perceptions of the respondents are discussed, and the last section presents the concluding remarks.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of the literature on the collective bargaining process in a university environment would indicate that the vast majority of studies have focused on the attitudes of faculty members towards collective bargaining and related aspects. The earlier studies (Bigoness 1976; Feuille 1974; Feuille and Blandin 1976; Walker 1974) attempted to identify those factors associated with faculty support for unionism. The general consensus was that dissatisfaction with how the university handles resource scarcities is a primary factor explaining the emergence of faculty support for unionization. The political persuasion of the faculty is also found to be a significant factor. Those voting for left-of-center parties have tended to be more supportive of union affiliation for university faculty (Driscoll 1977; Kelley and Edge 1976). In addition, several studies have shown that faculty in the hard sciences are less supportive of unionization than those faculty in other disciplines (Nixon II 1975; Seidman *et al.* 1974). Demographic characteristics (for example, gender and academic rank), on the other hand, have little predictive power in explaining the extent of faculty support for collective bargaining (Feuille and Blandin 1976).

The more recent attitudinal studies examined the perceptions of the faculty with respect to the scope of collective bargaining (Ponak and Thompson 1979), union militancy and the results of unionization (Ponak and Thompson 1984), and union commitment (Ng 1989). The first study shows that faculty members consider it appropriate for the union to raise issues related to pensions, fringes, salary, layoffs, grievance procedures, and sabbatical leaves at the bargaining table. However, issues related to teaching and research are perceived to be best left outside the domain of collective bargaining. Ponak and Thompson (1984), in a survey of faculty members across six Canadian universities, found that respondents who regularly participate in the Faculty Association meetings, and those who vote for the NDP are inclined to believe that collective bargaining for the faculty has resulted in more benefits than in drawbacks. On the other hand, research oriented, highly paid, and conservative faculty are more likely to perceive that the net benefits of collective bargaining have been negative. As expected, the study also found that faculty who believed that collective bargaining has been beneficial tend to have more militant attitudes than those who considered collective bargaining to have detrimental. In Ng (1989), the results indicate that dissatisfaction toward the university administration fosters commitment toward the Faculty Association, whereas general anti-union attitudes reduce it. Consistent with the earlier studies, Ng (1989) also found that demographic and work characteristics have minimal influences on union commitment.

Aside from the attitudinal studies, there are a number of studies that examined the results of representation elections among faculty members (Schramm 1975; Walker and Lawler 1986). While the former analyzed these elections at a macro-level, attempting to uncover some underlying trends, Walker and Lawler (1986) specifically looked at the influence of union campaign activities on the voting behaviour of faculty members in the California State University System. The results show that the campaign activities had no influence on how the faculty members voted in the representation election. Rather, their voting behaviour was governed primarily by their prior expectations.

Last, the outcomes of collective bargaining have also been the subject of a number of research studies (Aussieker 1977; Begin 1978; Ng 1991). The evidence in Begin (1978) suggests that faculty unionism have had little impact on the collegial decision making processes. Aussieker (1977), in an analysis of 53 faculty strikes that occurred between 1966 and 1976, found that most of the strikes occurred during first contract negotiations. It was argued that these strikes were caused primarily by the inexperience of the negotiators. Ng (1991) examined the strike voting behaviour of faculty members, and found that married faculty, those from single-income households, and those satisfied with existing working conditions and the university administration were less likely

to vote in favour of the strike. On the other hand, those faculty satisfied with existing research facilities and/or loyal to the Faculty Association were more strike-prone.

Although the above studies have covered a wide range of issues related to faculty collective bargaining, one area that has received very little attention relates to the activities of faculty members *during* a strike. This gap is in fact not limited to the faculty collective bargaining literature. There exists only a handful of studies that have actually researched this particular area. In Harris *et al.* (1982), the focus was to identify the reasons why the strike in question failed to generate substantial concessions from management. Events during the strike were described, but there was no systematic attempt to distinguish the militant strikers from the non-militant ones. In Gilson *et al.* (1989), the emphasis was to assess the community responses and attitudes during and after a strike. While the present study has the same research objectives, it involves a different sample, consisting of the strikers and not members of the community at large.

THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL

The conceptual model developed in this study to explain the militancy of faculty members during a strike is based upon past studies of strike activity (Maki and Strand 1984; Ng 1991), and attitudinal union militancy (Donnenwerth and Cox 1978; McShane 1985; Shirom 1977).¹ These studies suggest that strike militancy is likely to be affected by 3 sets of factors — demographics, work characteristics, and participation in union activities. Since the rationale for the inclusion of these factors has been reviewed extensively in the above studies, our discussion of these variables will be therefore brief.

The demographic variables considered to have an impact on the militancy of faculty members during a strike include gender, age, marital status, working spouse, and whether the faculty member had a rural upbringing. The expected influence of gender on militancy is indeterminate because of conflicting evidence reported in past research. Maki and Strand (1984) found male employees to be more militant (that is, strike-prone) whereas McShane (1985) found them to be less militant. The impact of age on militancy is also an empirical issue because of opposing arguments as to how it influences militancy. Older employees are less likely to be militant because of better working conditions (Donnenwerth and Cox 1978). The counter argument is that because

¹ For an excellent review of this literature, see McShane (1985). It should however be pointed out that most of the existing studies deal with group of employees other than faculty members and may therefore not be appropriate in the present context.

older employees are less likely to quit, they are more inclined to resort to strikes to bring about changes in their organizations (Wheeler 1985).

It is anticipated that married faculty members are less militant because of greater financial responsibilities (Ng 1991). On the other hand, this financial burden would be reduced if the spouse is working. Hence, faculty members with a working spouse are expected to be more militant. Rural upbringing is hypothesized to be associated with reduced militancy because of the lack of exposure to unions.

The work characteristics include whether respondent was in a supervisory role (for example, Assistant Deans and Department Heads), salary levels, and academic ranks. Assuming that those faculty in a supervisory role are more understanding of the scarcity of resources faced by the university, it can therefore be hypothesized that they are less likely to be militant during the strike. Previous studies have shown that there is an inverse relationship between earnings and militancy (Reder and Neumann 1980; Shirom 1977). For this reason, it is anticipated that higher-paid faculty members are less likely to be militant. The relationship between academic rank and militancy is indeterminate because of conflicting influences from salary levels and age.

The two union participation variables are attendance to the pre-strike study session, and extent of participation in past union activities. The latter include activities such as raising motions at meetings, serving on committees, and running for Executive office. It is expected that both the attendance and the participation variables are positively related to militancy, since they tend to reflect pro-union attitudes.

DATA COLLECTION AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Questionnaires were sent to all members of the Faculty Association² four weeks after the strike was over. The survey had several related objectives: to examine the strike voting behavior of the faculty members, to assess the respondents' participation in the strike activities, and to analyze the post-strike perceptions of the faculty members. Responses on demographic and work characteristics were also solicited.

Of the 954 faculty members that were approached, 456 returned the questionnaire. A total of 41 questionnaires were, however, deleted from the final analysis for reasons such as, incomplete answers and late returns. A

2 Of the 996 members of the Faculty Association, 954 were approached. The Faculty Association was not willing to give out the names of its members. The university list was used as an alternative, but it was unfortunately not up-to-date. This explains why not all faculty members were contacted.

comparison between the respondent group and the general population shows that the two groups are quite similar with respect to academic rank and gender. The respondent group has a marginally higher percentage of professors and female faculty members, and a lower percentage of assistant professors than the population group. The percentage of associate professors are about the same between the two groups.³

Since the focus of this paper is to examine the behavior of the faculty members throughout the strike, the questionnaire included questions on how the respondent voted during the conduct of the strike vote, and the extent to which the respondent participated in picketing duties. In addition, those who voted against the strike were asked to give a reason for their negative vote. The findings are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Frequencies of Voting and Participation in Strike Activities

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>% of Response</i>
Voting Pattern		
- Voted Against	201	48.4
- Voted For	186	44.8
- Did Not Vote	28	6.7
Picket Duty		
- None	247	59.7
- Once	14	3.4
- 2-3 times	36	8.7
- 4 times or more	117	28.3
Picket Organizing		
- Yes	31	7.5
- No	384	92.5
Reasons for Voting Against the Strike		
- Should not hurt the students	74	36.8
- Faculty should not strike	36	17.9
- A strike is ineffective	28	13.9
- Satisfied with current benefits	17	8.5
- University cannot afford demands	17	8.5
- Do not trust Faculty Association	12	6.0
- Miscellaneous	17	8.5

³ The estimated Z-values for gender, professors, associate professors, and assistant professors (and others) are 1.65, 3.2, 0.85, and -4.46 respectively. These figures therefore imply that there are no significant differences between the respondent group and the population with respect to gender and associate professors. The proportions of professors and assistant professors are however significantly different between the sample and the population.

The responses on the voting behavior show that 48.4% voted against the strike, 44.8% were in favour of the strike, and the remaining 6.7% did not vote. The corresponding figures for the general population are 41.4%, 42.6%, and 16.0%. The voting patterns between the sample and the population are therefore quite comparable, in that both show that the faculty members were almost evenly split over the strike issue.⁴

Another way of looking the above split is that in spite of declining salary scales, poorer working conditions, and efforts by the Executive canvassing for support, a high percentage of faculty members were opposed to the strike. That is, the Faculty Association never received an overwhelming mandate for the strike. To examine whether the union could have done a better canvassing job, the survey asked the strike opponents to explain their vote.

The most frequently cited reason for voting against the strike was the unwillingness to hurt the students. About 36.8% of those opposed to the strike gave this reason. The second most common reason (17.9%) was that faculty members should not strike because it would be unprofessional to do so. The next reason (13.9%) was that a strike would be ineffective in producing the desired results. Instead, faculty collegiality and cooperation between faculty members and the university administration would be more appropriate tools. The other major reasons for opposing the strike were satisfaction with existing benefits (8.5%), the inability of the university to meet our demands (8.5%), and distrust of the Faculty Association (6%). Some of the less frequent justifications included lack of public support, dislike of unions, and inability to forego pay. These were grouped under the miscellaneous category.

The three explanations that were most frequently mentioned — unwillingness to hurt the students, unprofessional to strike, and inappropriate bargaining tool — suggest that a large majority of the strike opponents were simply philosophically opposed to the strike. To convince them to vote otherwise would have required a profound change in their beliefs. In other words, given the time frame under which the Faculty Association was operating, there was not much it could have done to convince these faculty members to vote differently. Perhaps, the only groups the Faculty Association could have had an impact on were those who supported the university's claim that it could not afford the union's demand and those who distrusted the union. They were, however, a minority among the strike opponents. Thus, even if the Faculty Association were to have spent more time and resources in lobbying for their support and were successful in their endeavour, it would not have made a major difference in the overall strike vote.

⁴ The test of significance indicates that both the sample and the population contain the same proportion of faculty who voted in favor of the strike ($Z=0.02$). The population, however, contains significantly more non-voters ($Z=-6.74$), and less anti-strikers ($Z=3.78$) than the sample.

To determine the extent of participation in strike activities, the respondents were asked about the number of times they picketed. The majority of the respondents (59.7%) did not perform any picket duty. Of those who did, most have been on the picket lines over four times. Only 3.4% of the respondents picketed once, thus suggesting that those who provided token support to the union were in a very small minority.⁵ A corollary to this is that a large percentage of those carrying the picket signs took their job seriously and were highly supportive of the Faculty Association.

The respondents were also asked whether they were involved in organizing the picket lines. This may involve phoning and encouraging colleagues to walk the picket lines, delivering drinks, snacks and leaflets to those on picket duty, and assigning pickets to one of the five university entrances. At another level, the faculty member may be responsible for issuing press releases, drafting communication leaflets, and planning the next day's strategies. The responses show that very few faculty members were this active. Only 7.5% of the respondents reported that they did help organize the pickets. This low figure is somewhat consistent with union participation studies (Anderson 1979; Huszycz 1983) which found that active participation in union activities typically involve a very small group of individuals. Whether these same individuals would turn out to be the activists in a strike is one of the issues investigated in the next section.

MILITANCY DURING THE STRIKE

Measuring Militancy

During the course of the strike, the behavior of the faculty members ranged from complete indifference to picketing and to helping organize the pickets. These activities together with the voting pattern of the faculty members mean that there are 12 possible combinations of behaviors relating to the strike (See Table 2). However, because some of these combinations involved very few faculty members, it was decided to group the 12 sets of behaviors into four categories, each reflecting a particular level of militancy.

The "nonmilitant" group (top left hand cell of Table 2) consists of faculty members who voted against the strike and were not involved in any of the strike activities. The "organizer" group (last row, second column of Table 2) is considered to be the most militant of the four groups, and it consists of strike proponents who were involved in both picketing *and* picket organizing. The

⁵ For convenience, the remainder of this paper will treat all faculty members who picketed as belonging to one group, irrespective of the number of times they were on picket duties.

TABLE 2
Behavior During the Strike by Voting Pattern

	<i>Voted Against</i>	<i>Voted For</i>	<i>Did Not Vote</i>
Did not picket and was not involved in picket organizing	185 (92%)	39 (21%)	23 (82.1%)
Did picket but was not involved in picket organizing	15 (7.5%)	117 (62.9%)	5 (17.9%)
Did not picket but was involved in picket organizing	—	1 (0.5%)	—
Did picket and was involved in picket organizing	1 (0.5%)	29 (15.6%)	—

“picketer” group includes those pro-strike voters who picketed but did not help organize the pickets. Last, the “undecided” category consists of faculty members from all other cells, except for the non-voters and the one faculty member who was involved in picket organizing but not in picketing.⁶ Hence, the undecided group contains the pro-strike voters who did not picket and the anti-strike voters who participated in the strike activities. From this classification, there are 185 non-militant faculty members, 55 undecided members, 117 picketers, and 29 organizers.⁷

To ascertain whether there is any significant difference between our four categories of faculty militancy, regression analysis was chosen as the method of analysis. The dependent variable is measured on a 4-point scale, with “1” representing the non-militant group, and “4” the organizer group.⁸ The

⁶ They were excluded from the analysis because of the difficulty in assigning them to the appropriate categories. In a pretest experiment, they were included in the undecided category, and it did not make any difference to the basic results of this paper.

⁷ When compared to previous studies of militancy, this particular topology of militancy is closest to the one developed by Gilson *et al.* (1989). In the latter study, militancy is divided into hard-core activists, passive supporters, and neutrals (and detractors). These would respectively (almost) correspond to our measures of picketers and organizers, the undecided group, and the non-militant group.

⁸ While the 4-point scale for the militancy measure has no theoretical foundation, it has been adopted mainly because the responses indicate that there are four distinctive levels of militancy among the faculty.

independent variables consist of a number of demographic and work characteristics, and union participation variables.

Empirical Results

Table 3 presents the regression results of two specifications. In the first specification, the independent variables include only the demographic and the work characteristics of the faculty. The independent variables for the second estimating equation include the demographics, work characteristics, and the union participation variables.

The results from the first set of estimates indicate that of the five demographic variables under consideration, only age and rural upbringing are statistically significant. Faculty less than 30 years old are less militant than those who are 61 years and over (the control group). There is however no significant difference between the control group and the faculty from the other age brackets. Given that only about 2 percent of the faculty are less than 30 years old, one could therefore argue that for the large majority of faculty, age has no bearing on how militant one has been during the strike.

The estimated negative sign for rural upbringing suggests that faculty who grew up in rural areas were less likely to participate in the strike activities. Another way of looking at this is in terms of the percentage of faculty members with rural upbringing in each of the four categories of militancy. The non-militant group has the highest percentage of faculty members brought up in a rural area (37.0%), and this figure declines as one moves to the more militant faculty members. The figures for the undecided group, the picketers, and the organizers are 25.5, 24.6, and 20.7% respectively. This pattern is consistent with the regression results that rural upbringing reduces participation in strike activities.

Regarding the work characteristics,⁹ supervisory roles do not matter. An examination of the distribution of faculty members in supervisory roles (that is, Assistant Deans, and Department Heads) across the militancy categories would reveal why this factor failed to achieve statistical significance. Both the organizers and the non-militants have a high percentage of department heads and assistant deans when compared to the two middle groups. The percentages of faculty with supervisory roles, from the non-militant to the organizer, are 24.5, 5.5, 14.4, and 27.6% respectively. Thus, compared to the other faculty members, department heads and assistant deans were likely to be non-participant or be full participant in the strike activities. In other words, these

⁹ Because of the high correlation between salary and rank (Salary levels are closely tied to the academic ranks), the latter has therefore been excluded from the analysis to avoid the problem of multicollinearity.

TABLE 3
Determinants of Militancy
 (Absolute t-values in Parenthesis)

<i>Independent Variables</i>	<i>Specification 1</i>	<i>Specification 2</i>
Male	0.04 (0.26)	0.10 (0.50)
Age		
- Less than 30	-1.15** (2.61)	-0.14 (0.43)
- 31 to 40	-0.34 (1.46)	0.01 (0.01)
- 41 to 50	-0.08 (0.39)	0.07 (0.48)
- 51 to 60	-0.09 (0.46)	0.04 (0.27)
Married	-0.28 (1.85)	-0.15 (1.29)
Dual-Income	0.16 (1.50)	0.06 (0.68)
Rural Upbringing	-0.24** (2.09)	-0.04 (0.45)
Supervisory Roles	-0.11 (0.81)	0.09 (0.88)
Salary		
- \$35,000: \$45,000	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.18)
- \$45,000: \$55,000	0.11 (0.43)	-0.01 (0.05)
- \$55,000: \$65,000	-0.39 (1.50)	-0.34 (1.72)
- \$65,000: \$70,000	-0.49 (1.79)	-0.33 (1.61)
- Over \$70,000	-0.73** (2.69)	-0.27 (1.35)
Study Session	—	1.28** (14.57)
Union Participation	—	0.10** (3.27)
Intercept	2.63 (8.30)	1.28 (5.06)
Corrected R ²	0.08	0.49

The sample size is 387 observations. Significance is denoted by * at the .05 level and ** at the .01 level.

faculty members were more inclined to take extreme positions during the strike. Because of this opposing effect, it is therefore not surprising why supervisory roles turned out to be not significant in the regression analysis.

The results however show salary levels do have an impact on militancy. The estimates indicate that in comparison to faculty members making less than \$35,000, those faculty in income bracket of over \$70,000 are less likely to participate in the strike activities. This is consistent with the distribution of non-militant faculty across the income categories. Those making over \$70,000 form the largest group (24.6%) among the non-militant faculty. Put differently, this implies that there are proportionately more highly paid faculty members among the non-militant group.

When the two union participation variables are added to the estimating equation (specification 2), the results show a complete loss of statistical significance for the demographics and work characteristics. Both participation variables, however, are statistically significant. The estimated coefficient for attendance to the study session suggests that it is positively related to the degree of militancy. This is also reflected in the fact that only 16.2% of the non-militant group attended the session whereas all organizers attended the session. There are two possible explanations for the positive relationship between the study session and strike militancy. It may be that the study session was instrumental in generating support for the strike. It is therefore not surprising to find that the more militant groups have a higher proportion of faculty members who have attended the session. Alternatively, it may be argued that those attending the study session already had strong pro-union sentiments. This same attitude may also have driven them to participate in the strike activities, thus explaining the strong relationship between attending the study session and participation in pickets and picket organizing. On the other hand, those who did not attend the pre-strike study session may have been anti-union in the first place. As such, they would not have participated in any of the strike activities either.

The results also indicate that there is a close relationship between the extent of participation in past union activities (Operationally, this variable is measured on a 0 to 5 scale, with 5 denoting the highest degree of participation) and the degree of militancy. To further investigate this particular finding, consider the percentage of faculty members who had a score of 3 or more in union participation in each of the militancy categories. At the non-militant level, they made up 8.6% of the population. Among the undecided and the picketers, the percentages were 5.7% and 14.6% respectively. Among the organizers, they accounted for 46.4% of the population. Thus, the Faculty Association did get the necessary support and participation from faculty members who have been active in past union matters.

POST-STRIKE PERCEPTIONS

Twelve days after the strike, or a week before the start of the final examinations, the faculty members were legislated back to work.¹⁰ In the questionnaire sent to the faculty members, there were three items dealing with their perceptions of the strike. Specifically, they were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement on a seven-point Likert-type scale (from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) on three statements.¹¹ Table 4 provides a breakdown of the responses on these statements. 54.4% of the respondents agreed that the strike improved the bargaining position of the faculty members (as opposed to the 33.1% who disagreed with the statement). It is interesting to note that at the time the survey was conducted, there were still no negotiations between the Faculty Association and the University, and hence no better offers on the table. Thus, a possible explanation for the faculty’s optimism is the view that the administration was surprised by the strike and that in future negotiations, it would be more responsive to the union’s demands to avoid further job actions.

TABLE 4
Extent of Agreement on Post-Strike Perceptions

	<i>Strike Improved Barg. Position</i> (n=386)	<i>Strike Lasted Longer Than Expected</i> (n=386)	<i>Disappointed With Back-to-Work Legislation</i> (n=386)
Disagree	33.1	26.0	28.4
Neutral	12.5	20.2	15.4
Agree	54.4	53.8	56.1

Over half of the faculty members (53.8%) indicated that they did not expect the strike to have lasted 12 days. While a large percentage of faculty members were caught off-guard by the strike duration, an even larger percentage (56.1%) noted that they were disappointed with the back-to-work legislation. In other words, the majority of the faculty members must have thought

¹⁰ In passing the legislation, the government noted that it did not want to intervene in the negotiation process but at the same time was concerned with the welfare of the students. As a compromise, the back-to-work legislation was therefore in effect for only two months. In other words, the compromise was that the faculty members could go back on strike in June, after the exams had been held and the grades handed in.

¹¹ They were: “The strike improved our bargaining position,” “The strike lasted longer than expected,” and “I am disappointed with the back-to-work legislation.”

that with the upcoming exams, the strike was adding to the bargaining power of the Faculty Association. However, with the back-to-work legislation, this bargaining advantage was lost.

To investigate whether there is a relationship between the post-strike perceptions and the militancy during the strike, three regression equations were estimated, each representing a particular post-strike perception. The same independent variables are used for all three equations, and they include the militancy variables (the non-militant group is the control (variable), and a number of demographic and work variables as control dummies.¹²

The regression results are presented in Table 5, and they suggest that the post-strike perceptions did vary significantly across the militancy levels. With regard to whether the strike improved the bargaining position of the faculty, the results indicate that the more militant faculty members were more inclined to view the strike as being beneficial to the Association. This is further supported by a breakdown of the responses to this item by the four militancy categories. 29.7% of the non-militant faculty agreed that the strike was beneficial. This figure jumped to 65.5% among the undecided, 83.1% among the picketers, and 86.2% among the organizers.

With regard to the perception toward the back-to-work legislation, the regression results suggest that the more militant faculty members were disappointed with the legislation. This is consistent with the results from a breakdown of the responses by militancy. An overwhelming majority (85.8%) of the organizers indicated that they were disappointed with the legislation whereas only 33% of the non-militants noted their disappointment.

Turning to the strike duration, the results indicate that when compared to the non-militant group (the control group), the more militant faculty were surprised by the duration of the strike. In other words, they had expected the strike to be short and swift. This is therefore suggesting that these faculty members must have overestimated the impact of the strike in getting the university to make concessions or underestimated the willingness of the university to endure the strike.

Overall, it is very difficult to ascertain the full impact of the strike on the faculty members. From a strictly cost-benefit analysis, there is no doubt that most faculty members lost financially. When the contract was finally settled, there was still no pay increase for the first year of the contract and this was basically the position of the university prior to the strike.¹³ The post-strike

¹² The variables chosen here are either not used to estimate the militancy equations or not found to be statistically significant in the militancy equations (for example, marital status).

¹³ The pre-strike offer was for a one-year contract whereas the post-strike settlement was for a four-year contract. Strictly speaking the pre- and post-strike contracts are not comparable.

TABLE 5
 Determination of Post-Strike Attitudes
 (Absolute t-values in Parenthesis)

<i>Independent Variables</i>	<i>Dependent Variables</i>		
	<i>Improved</i>	<i>Length</i>	<i>Legislation</i>
Undecided	1.42** (5.96)	0.82** (3.16)	1.58** (5.54)
Picketeer	2.11** (11.59)	0.92** (4.60)	2.23** (10.23)
Organizer	2.43** (7.95)	0.77* (2.29)	2.23** (6.07)
Dual-Income	-0.04 (0.24)	-0.04 (0.22)	0.16 (0.85)
Supervisory Roles	-0.33 (1.63)	0.20 (0.93)	-0.02 (0.10)
Male	0.22 (0.96)	-0.18 (0.72)	-0.16 (0.59)
Professor	-0.06 (0.35)	-0.23 (1.15)	-0.22 (0.99)
Assistant Professor	0.15 (0.68)	0.18 (0.70)	-0.36 (1.32)
Constant	3.14** (12.22)	4.33** (15.38)	3.99** (12.96)
Adjusted R ²	0.30	0.06	0.24

Significance is denoted by * at the .05 level and ** at the .01 level.

settlement did include a signing bonus of \$1800 that was not on the table before the strike. This bonus is unfortunately less than the \$2500 the average faculty member lost in pay during the strike. It has brought to attention the problems of the university and as a result, more funds for post-secondary education may become available. Furthermore, in future negotiations, strike threats by the Association may be more credible (Hicks 1963) and this should add to the bargaining power of the faculty members.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper examined the behavior of faculty members during a strike together with their post-strike perceptions. The results show that a majority of the respondents did not participate in any of the strike activities. However, for those who did, their participation at the picket lines were taken seriously in the

sense that most of them picketed at least four times. It also appears that only a very small minority (7.5%) helped organize the pickets. Those who voted against the strike have tended to stay away from the strike activities whereas most faculty who voted for the strike did participate in the activities. A surprisingly high percentage of non-voters (82%) indicated that they did not participate in any of the activities.

Higher level of involvement in picketing and in picket organizing is expected among faculty members who have attended the study session, and those who have been active in past union meetings. The survey also shows that the more militant faculty members thought that the strike improved the bargaining power of the union, and were disappointed with the back-to-work legislation. They however did not anticipate the ability of the university administration to take the strike and were therefore surprised by the duration of the strike. Their disappointment with the back-to-work legislation suggests that their militancy were unaffected by the strike length.

Given the paucity of research in picketing and post-strike perceptions, much work remains to be done in this area. For example, in the preceding paragraph, it was argued that the faculty militancy was unaffected by the strike length. Does this hold for other types of workers who may be less able to afford the strike? It is also possible that a 12-day strike may not be long enough to affect the degree of militancy. If so, how long does a strike need to be before support for the strike starts to waiver. These are certainly important questions to the union. Where there is a steep trade-off between militancy and strike duration, it may be more appropriate for the union to call for partial strikes (such as, rotating strikes) instead of full scale strikes.

Another issue not covered in this study is the nature of the strategies adopted by the picket organizers. What kind of public relations activities were involved? What did the Faculty Association do to seek the students' and public support for the strike? For example, aside from handling pamphlets to the students, how often did the Association meet with the students to discuss their concerns? In most public sector strikes, these political dimensions are of utmost importance, especially since the financial burden of a strike on the public sector organization is negligible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANDERSON, J.C. 1979. "Local Union Participation: A Re-Examination." *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 18, 18-31.
- AUSSIEKER, B. 1977. "The Incidence and Impact of Faculty Union Strikes." *Labor Law Journal*, Vol. 28, 777-784.

- BEATTY, D. 1975. "Collective Bargaining in the University Faculties, Pros and Cons." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol. 30, 707-726.
- BEGIN, J.P. 1978. "Grievance Mechanisms and Faculty Collegiality: The Rutgers Case." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 31, 295-309.
- BIGONESS, W. 1978. "Correlates of Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. LXIII, 228-233.
- DOLAN, S. 1979. "Determinants of Officers' Militancy: The Case of the National Union of Teachers in Israel." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol. 34, 287-311.
- DONNENWERTH, G.V., and H. G. COX. 1978. "Attitudinal Militancy Among Teachers." *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 19, 459-468.
- DRISCOLL, J. 1977. "Analyzing Attitudes Towards Unions: Two Case Studies in Higher Education." *Proceedings of the Industrial Relations Research Association*, Vol. 30, 366-377.
- FEUILLE, P. 1974. "Faculty Unionism Among Fir Trees." *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 13, 50-68.
- FEUILLE, P., and BLANDIN, J. 1976. "Determinants of Attitudinal Militancy Among University Faculty." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 12, 54-66.
- GILSON, G.H.J., I.S. SPENCER, and S. GRANVILLE. 1989. "The Impact of a Strike on the Attitudes and Behavior of a Rural Community." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol. 44, 785-804.
- HARRIS, P., P. RAUSCH, and S.G. RYAN. 1982. "Ineffectiveness in Teacher Bargaining: The Anatomy of a First Strike." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol. 37, 905-926.
- HICKS, J.R. 1963. *The Theory of Wages*. London: MacMillan Press.
- HUSZCZO, G. 1983. "Attitudinal and Behavioral Variables Related to Participation in Union Activities." *Journal of Labor Research*, Vol. IV, 289-297.
- KELLEY, L., and A. EDGE. 1976. "An Assessment of Attitudinal Change Toward Collective Bargaining of the University of Hawaii Faculty: 1972-1973." *Journal of Collective Negotiations*, Vol. 5, 249-259.
- KERR, D. 1988. "The Best Tanned Faculty in Canada: Life on the Line at the U of S." *Our Schools/Ourselves*, Vol. 1, 85-95.
- MAKI, D., and K. STRAND. 1984. "The Determinants of Strike Activity." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol. 39, 77-91.
- MC SHANE, S.L. 1985. "Sources of Attitudinal Union Militancy." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol. 40, 285-301.
- NG, I. 1989. "Determinants of Union Commitment Among University Faculty." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol. 44, 769-784.
- NG, I. 1991. "Predictors of Strike Voting Behavior: The Case of University Faculty." *Journal of Labor Research*, Vol. 12, 123-134.
- NIXON II, H. 1975. "Faculty Support of Traditional Labor Tactics on Campus." *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 48, 276-286.
- PONAK, A.M., and M. THOMPSON. 1979. "Faculty Attitudes and the Scope of Bargaining." *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 18, 97-102.

- PONAK, A.M., and M. THOMPSON. 1984. "Faculty Collective Bargaining: The Voice of Experience." *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol. 39, 449-463.
- REDER, M.W., and G.R. NEUMANN. 1980. "Conflict and Contract: The Case of Strikes." *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 88, 867-886.
- SCHRAMM, C.J. 1975. "Union Organizing at Private Colleges and Universities." *Labor Law Journal*, Vol. 26, 724-731.
- SCHUTT, R.K. 1982. "Models of Militancy: Support for Strikes and Work Actions among Public Employees." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 35, 406-422.
- SEIDMAN, J., A. EDGE, and L. KELLEY. 1974. "Attitudes of Hawaiian Higher Education Faculty Toward Unionism and Collective Bargaining." *Journal of Collective Negotiations*, Vol. 3, 91-119.
- SHIROM, A. 1977. "Union Militancy: Structural and Personal Determinants." *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 16, 152-162.
- SHOREY, J. 1976. "An Inter-Industry Analysis of Strike Frequency." *Economica*, Vol. 43, 349-365.
- WALKER, M.J. 1974. "Transition to Bargaining in a Multicampus System." *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 13, 23-39.
- WALKER, M.J., and J.J. LAWLER. 1986. "Union Campaign Activities and Voter Preferences." *Journal of Labor Research*, Vol. 12, 19-40.
- WHEELER, H.N. 1985. *Industrial Conflict: An Integrative Theory*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.
- WOODS, H.D. 1975. "Collective Bargaining and Academic Freedom: Are They Compatible?" *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, Vol.30, 643-661.

Activités de grève et perceptions d'après-grève chez les professeurs d'université

Après une longue négociation de onze mois, les professeurs de l'Université de Saskatchewan ont fait la grève. Cela nous a fourni une occasion unique pour étudier la négociation collective chez les professeurs d'université pendant une période de conflit. L'objectif de cette étude est d'examiner si le militantisme des professeurs d'université pendant la grève est relié ou non aux caractéristiques démographiques et du travail, ainsi qu'à la participation aux activités syndicales. Nous avons aussi examiné la relation entre les perceptions postgrève et le militantisme pendant la grève.

Cette étude ajoute à la recherche sur les grèves et le militantisme de trois façons. D'abord, elle traite de l'aspect comportemental du militantisme alors que la plupart des autres recherches sur le militantisme syndical se sont concentrées sur les attitudes à l'égard du militantisme (Dolan 1979 ; McShane 1985 ; Shirom 1977). Ensuite, dans la majorité des études sur le phénomène de la grève (Maki et Strand 1984 ; Ng 1991), on

a surtout tenté d'expliquer les événements qui ont mené à la grève, ce qui arrive durant et après la grève a rarement fait l'objet d'examen. Finalement, vu que les grèves de professeurs d'université sont rares, la présente recherche devrait intéresser les chercheurs dans ce domaine.

Quatre semaines après la fin de la grève, des questionnaires ont été envoyés à tous les membres du syndicat des professeurs. L'enquête avait plusieurs objectifs : examiner le comportement des professeurs eu égard au vote de grève, évaluer la participation des répondants aux activités de grève et analyser les perceptions postgrève des professeurs. Nous avons également colligé des données sur les caractéristiques démographiques et du travail. Nous avons reçu 456 des 954 questionnaires envoyés dont 41 questionnaires ont été éliminés pour réponses incomplètes ou tardives. L'échantillon final comprend donc 415 questionnaires.

L'analyse de cet échantillon final révèle que la majorité des répondants n'ont participé à aucune activité de grève. Cependant, la majorité de ceux qui y ont participé ont fait du piquetage à au moins quatre reprises. Il semble également qu'une très faible minorité (7,5 %) ait aidé à organiser le piquetage. Ceux qui ont voté contre la grève ont eu tendance à ne pas s'impliquer dans les activités de grève, alors que le contraire est vrai pour ceux qui ont voté pour la grève. Un pourcentage étonnamment élevé de non-votants (82 %) n'ont participé à aucune des activités.

Nous nous attendions à ce que le degré d'implication dans le piquetage et dans son organisation soit plus élevé chez les professeurs qui ont participé à la session d'étude et qui avaient été actifs dans les assemblées syndicales. Lorsque ces deux facteurs ne sont pas contrôlés, les résultats de la régression suggèrent que les professeurs d'origine rurale, ceux de moins de trente ans et ceux gagnant plus de 70 000 \$ par année sont moins enclins à participer aux activités de grève. L'analyse démontre également que lorsque comparés au groupe de non-militants, la plupart des professeurs pensent que la grève a accru le pouvoir de négociation du syndicat et sont déçus de la loi de retour au travail. Ils n'avaient cependant pas prévu l'habileté de l'Université à faire face à la grève et, partant, ont été surpris par la durée de cette grève.