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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Nature and Importance of the Problem

There are growing demands upon colleges and universities to re-examine their administrative procedures and to adopt methods which will insure greater participation from the teaching ranks of these institutions. There is little research available, however, to lead higher education in the pursuit of the establishment of the "ideal" administrative procedure. While considerable research has been accomplished in the organizational characteristics of business, industry, government, and the military, little has been done in higher education. Generally, the organizational theorist has suggested that his research or theory would be equally applicable to educational institutions. There are, however, unique problems of administration in higher education which create serious doubt about the applicability of the theory.

Little attention has been given to the managerial and professional characteristics of leaders in higher education. While Stogdill, and others, have completed very worthwhile studies in identifying characteristics of leaders in the business, industrial, government, and military world, the educational world has been neglected.

The need for research in higher education administration has been voiced by a large number of persons. Among these are Russell M.
Cooper, who, in Baskin's book *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments*, said:

The field of college administration, like that of college teaching, needs much greater research than has so far been produced. Most books and conferences on the subject describe existing practice, but few can present well-validated evidence of what constitutes superior practice.

For example, the methods of dealing with faculty personnel are critically important in building a strong institution, and yet they are only moderately understood. . . .

T. R. McConnell has expressed his thoughts for the need of research in higher education in his article "Needed Research in College and University Organization and Administration."\(^1\) John W. Gardner has said that higher education had not studied itself systematically enough and that more facts were needed to solve its problems.\(^3\) Sharvy G. Umbeck, President of Knox College, has said: "Most colleges are very poorly managed, and the tragedy is that the administrators are not even aware that their practices are poor management."\(^4\) R. Louis Bright, Director of Research in the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has spoken of the need for research in higher education.

---


essentially studying the problems of administering the university.

...'' Also, a study committee, headed by Cornell University President James A. Perkins, has recommended the establishment of a center, at a major university, to study the problems of, and to train, academic administrators. Betsy Ann Olive, writing in the Administrative Science Quarterly, has said:

At first glance, the number of available references on college and university administration seems overwhelming. The reading of a very few articles, however, will soon produce a complaint which occurs again and again: little empirical research is being performed.

In the thorough bibliographic search undertaken here, it finally became apparent that failure to find published research was not due to difficulties in locating and identifying the material, but of the fact that few research studies exist. Compared to the coverage given to industry, business, government, and even to secondary and elementary education, the attention given college and university administration has been miniscule.7

Gross has said that the basic problems of academic administration are infrequently recognized, and that the lack of knowledge constitutes a major deficiency in their functioning:

I find little evidence that these basic organizational problems are recognized in most of the major American universities. In the few cases where there is an awareness of them by the administration I see few systematic efforts to deal with them. . . .

It is the fact that these basic problems of academic administration are so infrequently recognized or dealt with in their


functioning. Why is there so little attention given to the problems of coordination, control and appraisal in the universities? ... 8

Demerath, Stephens, and Taylor remark that:

... Though much is written and said about higher education and academic institutions, there have been few systematic empirical studies of university organization and management. It has been remarked more than once that university professors know more about everything else than they know about themselves and their habitat. ... 9

John Corson, in his book Governance of Colleges and Universities, wrote:

Much has been written about colleges and universities and the men and women who have made them run. Little has been written that measures up as an orderly and sophisticated analysis of why they are run the way they are run, and whether better ways can be found.10

Although Heimler's comments deal directly with only one administrative position, the departmental chairman, his comments are consistent with those of the previously quoted writers:

Unfortunately, up to this point, very little research has been done on the Chairman's place in management and administration. We need more data on the institutional role of the chairman. ... 

... Considering the major role that departmental chairmen play in college administration and faculty leadership, it is likely that systematic research in this area of higher education can contribute materially to improving the effectiveness of college programs and services.11


Rourke and Brooks have recognized and identified the most difficult problem of conducting research in higher education—obtaining the cooperation of both faculty and administration:

... Faculty members who constantly seek to break new ground in their own discipline may steadfastly resist any innovation in university management. Administrative officers themselves often find it difficult to accept departures from the traditional way of doing things. Somehow university personnel, whose lives are devoted to expanding knowledge about the most elusive processes of their environment, nonetheless find it extremely difficult to accept the idea of looking into the campus itself. ... 12

The growing complexity of higher education, including problems of (1) phenomenal growth, leading to the establishment of "multiversities" with enrollments of over 140,000 students, faculties of over 2,000 members, and a secretarial and maintenance staff which exceeds the size of the faculty; (2) the rapid development of government programs in research, student aid, and loans for capital improvements; (3) a growing diversity of programs; (4) a growing demand upon financial resources; (5) faculty and student "militancy"; and (6) a growing number of professors who hold terminal degrees, are highly specialized, and expect to make a contribution to administration particularly in the area of their specialization, all add to the need for higher education to study its needs and derive empirical evidence which will lead to resolving conflicts. Constantly increasing and shifting demands require a more scientific approach to administration in higher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is (1) to determine if the most successful administrators found in selected higher educational institutions are applying classical organizational procedures or are using the newer systems of management, (2) to determine the professional and personal characteristics of successful educational administrators in an effort to find tangible measures of leadership qualities, (3) to discover and examine variables (other than administrators' personal and professional characteristics) contributing to successful higher education administration, and (4) to develop an instrument which will make it possible for the upper-administration of higher educational institutions to determine if their departments are functioning in the desired manner and achieving the goals of the institution.

Research Hypothesis

Group participative management (shared authority, collegial government, etc.) will be found to be the most effective form of university management.

Null Hypotheses

Following are the major null hypothesis statements. See Chapter III for a complete listing of all null hypotheses.

I. There is no relationship between management styles and administrative success.

II. There is no relationship between management styles and personal-professional characteristics of administrators.
III. There is no difference between management styles as perceived by self, superordinates, and subordinates.

IV. There is no difference between perceived management style and preferred management style as measured by faculty ratings.

V. There is no difference among departments in preferred management style of department administrators.

VI. There is no difference among departments in perceived management style of department administrators.

VII. There is no relationship between the management style of the President and the management styles of other administrators within the same institution.

VIII. There is no difference among major academic areas (science-mathematics, humanities, professions, social science) in preferred management style.

IX. There is no difference among major academic areas in perceived management style.

Limitations and Scope of the Study

Out of the infinite universe of individuals who might be chosen and who might be affected by results of this study, the area of North Carolina was chosen as the geographical-political unit to serve for the finite investigation. Further limitation of the universe was to restrict the investigation only to senior colleges and universities. Junior and community colleges and technical-vocational institutions were not included in this investigation, although some persons include
part or all of these institutions in the realm of "higher" education.

The investigation includes six senior institutions which are representative of certain diverse characteristics such as both small and large institutions, private and public control, complex and simple organizations, undergraduate and graduate programs, and vertical and horizontal administrative organization.

The scope of the study includes all academic administrators within a single college or university; i.e., department heads (chairmen), directors of departments and schools, academic deans, vice-presidents for academic affairs, and the president. The study also includes the active participation of the entire faculty of the institution.

Assumptions

"Successful" administrators, departments, schools, colleges, and universities will reflect the following tangible measures:

I. The growth in numbers of student majors within a department will be equal to or greater than the percentage of growth in the number of students for the institution as a whole.

II. There will be a limited "turnover" of faculty within the department.

III. Among those administrators who have been in their position for several years, significant growth will be reflected in the physical facilities and other resources available to the department.

IV. The majority of the faculty will hold tenure (indicating little "turnover" and superior teaching/scholarship).
V. Students achieving undergraduate degrees in "successful" departments will obtain more graduate degrees, in either the same or other institutions, than students in less "successful" departments.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the various types of literature available in the field of management, administration, and organization, with the specific goal being to find what the early and present writers have had to say about the "human" element of management. In addition to discovering what individuals have said, it has also been the purpose here to determine what the various "schools" of management, organization, and administration have had to say about "human relations" and "participative" management.

A cursory review of books dealing with the early development of organizational theory clearly indicated that the emphasis was placed upon determining the "principles" of management which had been determined by these writers. The early theorists were frequently described as "mechanistic," and primarily concerned with "scientific" management. The review which follows, however, seeks to determine what, if anything, was discussed by these writers in relation to the human element of the organization.

The review also includes twelve basic books dealing with organization and representing the six academic areas of sociology, anthropology, management, economics, political science, and psychology. Again, the purpose here was to determine what these various disciplines
had to say concerning the human element of organizations. An additional nine books which have been considered "classics" in the area of management are also reviewed.

The current leaders in the development of management theory are from the area of the behavioral sciences. Within the past ten years (1958-1968) several publications have come from behavioral scientists who have suggested approaches and concepts to the field of management. The most significant publications will be reviewed for this chapter.

Books and articles dealing with administration in higher education will be reviewed for the purpose of determining what the present problems, controversies, and concepts are, and for the suggested patterns of management proposed by contemporary writers.

Research studies, theses, and dissertations will be reviewed for the purpose of determining what empirical evidence, if any, is available to support the various concepts of contemporary management thought.

Development of Management Theory

Historical Antecedents

Management as a field of study, or as a profession, is relatively new. It was not until the industrial revolution that the need arose for men who could "manage" an enterprise. With the rapid growth of organizations and the ensuing complexities of technological development, it became necessary to seek men who held certain skills--rather unique skills, to be sure--for the purpose of "controlling" all of the
variables in order to achieve an operation that could attain its goals.

Not only in industry and business, but as social institutions such as hospitals, schools, colleges and universities developed and grew rapidly in size and complexity of operation, men were needed to organize and lead these organizations as well.

A review of management literature indicates that the earliest efforts to study management occurred in industry and business. A general review of this literature will present the background from which educational administration accepted some of its models.

Charles Babbage has been called the "patron Saint" of operations research. As early as 1832 he was writing about management in which he recognized the value of motivation and discussed the use of incentive systems, profit sharing, and allowing employees to participate in establishing shop rules.¹ This may have been the first written attempt to show the value of participation for developing motivation. However, Babbage was ahead of his time and it was not until the middle of the twentieth century that he began to be truly recognized for his efforts.

Andrew Ure was also one of the early writers interested in management.² Both Ure and Babbage accepted the premise that wages were the most important motivating force for employees and that the greatest social good would result from each person operating in his own intelligent self-interest. Both of these men believed motivation

¹Charles Babbage, On the Economy of Machinery and Manufactures (London: Charles Knight, 1832).
²Andrew Ure, The Philosophy of Manufacturers (London: Charles Knight, 1835).
to be relatively simple—money and motivation were synonymous.

Ure recognized the mechanical and commercial aspects of manufacturing, but he also added a third factor, which was the human element. He illustrated how this factor was recognized by providing workers hot tea, medical treatment, "a fan apparatus" for ventilation, and sickness payments.

Although various persons and organizations were interested in the subject of management during the latter half of the nineteenth century, it was not until around the beginning of the twentieth century that significant writings once again began to appear. By this time, the problems of the expanding population, economy, industrial technology and complexity of operations had reached a point which demanded the attention of management. Concurrent with these problems "scientific" management began to arrive in management thought. Those who were concerned with these problems began to realize that greater cooperation, or collaboration, was needed between labor and management.

Frederick W. Taylor was the next writer to capture the attention and imagination of the industrial world. His major contributions can be found in "A Piece-Rate System" in 1895,^3 Shop Management in 1903,^4 and The Principles of Scientific Management in 1911.\(^\text{5}\) Much

---


emphasis has been placed upon Taylor's comments relative to wages, rate fixing, piece-rates, and paying the man rather than the position. Frequently overlooked, however, was his interest in the human element of management. In speaking of the causes of loss to employers and men, he pointed out that management was often ignorant and indifferent to the individual character, worth, and welfare of men.

In Taylor's attempt to define scientific management, he emphasized the intellectual component rather than the technical. He insisted it was not "efficiency," "piecework systems," "time and motion studies," and the usual things that people thought of when they spoke of scientific management. Rather, he called scientific management a complete "mental revolution" both for the worker and for management. He saw this revolution as a way to obtain a mutuality of interests.

Taylor supported the division of planning and clerical work from the operative aspect of work. And he carried this a step further by abandoning the military type organization. He said:

Throughout the whole field of management the military type of organization should be abandoned, and what may be called the "functional type" substituted in its place. "Functional management" consists in so dividing the work of management that each man from the assistant superintendent down shall have as few functions as possible to perform. If practicable the work of each man in management should be confined to the performance of a single leading function.6

Thus, as early as Taylor we find an interest in the human element of management and the breaking away from the military "hierarchical" type of management. Taylor expressed his four principles of scientific

management as follows: first, the development of a true science; second, the scientific selection of workmen; third, his scientific edu-
cation and development; fourth, intimate friendly cooperation between
management and the men.\(^7\)

Such writers as Emerson\(^8\) and Church\(^9\) concentrated upon the more
technical aspects of management. Emerson, however, did make reference
to the human element of organizations in five of his twelve "principles
of efficiency." These five were: (1) A clearly defined ideal: he be-
lieved that every principle of efficiency was based upon ideals of bene-
fiting humanity and not selfish motivations. (2) Common sense: problems
should be looked at objectively and without prejudice and ignorance.
(3) Competent counsel: one man was not to be held responsible for all,
but staff and consulting services were advocated. (4) Discipline: he
saw this as an outgrowth of the "spirit" of the organization and by
good examples set by managers. (5) The fair deal: this evolved from
sympathy, imagination, and a sense of justice in the manager.

Church emphasized that his "laws of effort" should be applied
to all management functions. Two of his laws, i.e., "effort must be
systematically accumulated, applied and standardized," and "personal
effectiveness must be promoted," appear to indicate clearly his con-
cern with motivation.

\(^7\)Taylor, The Principles . . . , p. 130.

\(^8\)Harrington Emerson, The Twelve Principles of Efficiency (New

\(^9\)A. Hamilton Church, The Science and Practice of Management
Emerson, as Taylor had done before him, pointed out that the human element of an organization was to be considered a part of the principles of management. Industry's primary interest in profit and the difficulty of applying these more altruistic goals, however, apparently caused the readers of these early writers to concentrate upon their technical contributions.

During these early years a significant work appeared from the pen of a woman--Lillian Gilbreth, a psychologist by training. In 1914 she published The Psychology of Management.\(^{10}\) Both before and after this publication, she and her husband, Frank, published a number of studies on management. He was most interested in the more technical aspects of management and in the laboratory process of determining a scientific "method" for the analysis of work. She was most interested in the psychological aspects of the worker.

A major concern of management during these early years was "standardization." The Gilbreths, along with the other writers, explored this facet of organization. They approached this problem through selection and training, believing that a standardized system of personnel techniques would produce a standardized man. As Scott has pointed out:

> From the human standpoint it is interesting to observe that the pioneers did not feel that standardization would result in less incentive or greater feelings of anonymity for employees. Indeed, their attitude was that standardization increased employee happiness and self-realization.\(^{11}\)

---

\(^{10}\) L. M. Gilbreth, The Psychology of Management (New York: Sturgis and Walton Co., 1914).

There was faith, however, that scientific management could also serve to improve the welfare of an organization's members as well as attain higher goals of productivity and profit. Lillian Gilbreth listed the following as being provided for:

1. Physical improvement of workers (increased health, better color and general appearance).
2. Mental development (wider interest, deeper interest, increased mental capabilities).
3. Moral development (personal responsibility, responsibility for others, appreciation of standing, self-control, "squareness").
4. Contentment, brotherhood, and the "will to do." (These developments are natural developments of item three—moral development).

Henri Fayol, who developed his ideas in France, independently of the Americans, is credited with Taylor as making the greatest contributions to the development of management as a science. Fayol, however, disagreed with Taylor on the concept of "functional organization." He thought this would hamper the unity of command, but he did support the concept of staff assistance to managers. He formulated fourteen principles of management. These were: (1) division of work, (2) authority, (3) discipline, (4) unity of command, (5) unity of management, (6) subordination of individual interests, (7) remuneration, (3) centralization, (9) scalar chain (line of authority), (10) order, (11) equity, (12) stability of tenure for personnel, (13) initiative.

---

12Gilbreth, Chapter 10.
and (14) esprit de corps.\textsuperscript{13} It is only in these last four principles that we see the human element entering into his thinking.

Among the most outstanding thinkers and writers about management appear to be H. L. Gantt, who wrote \textit{Work, Wages, and Profits},\textsuperscript{14} and E. D. Jones, who wrote \textit{Industrial Leadership and Executive Ability}.\textsuperscript{15} Of the two, Gantt appears to have made the greater contribution, particularly in the area of human relations. Although he supported the manager's authority to issue orders at that time, he predicted that a more democratic relationship would evolve between employers and employees. He also recognized incentives which influenced men in addition to the financial ones. He recognized labor problems as being paramount and said: "... you must study all the elements entering into it, of which the human element is the most important."\textsuperscript{16} He also believed strongly in replacing opinion with facts in the pursuit of good management. In his next book, \textit{Industrial Leadership},\textsuperscript{17} he placed much emphasis on the need for management to create favorable conditions.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14}H. L. Gantt, \textit{Work, Wages, and Profits} (New York: The Engineering Magazine Co., 1911).
\item \textsuperscript{15}E. D. Jones, \textit{Industrial Leadership and Executive Ability} (New York: The Engineering Magazine Co., 1921). (First ed. 1913).
\item \textsuperscript{16}Gantt, p. 62.
\item \textsuperscript{17}Henry L. Gantt, \textit{Industrial Leadership} (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1916), p. 1.
\end{itemize}
psychological conditions for workers. Jones also wrote two other books but neither deals with the problem of human element in management. His approach was basically to review the literature and summarize the thinking of earlier writers. He did, however, point out that there would be an increasing separation of ownership from control and that this would develop a "whole new race of executives." He also recognized that these new managers must be leaders of men and must understand the complexities of people and processes.

As mentioned earlier, Lillian Gilbreth wrote about management from a psychological point of view. Other writers who were also interested in this view were Hugo Munsterberg, who wrote the first textbook in industrial psychology in 1913, called Psychology and Industrial Efficiency, and Ordway Tead, who wrote Instincts in Industry in 1918. He based his explanation of working class conduct upon the usual human instincts, i.e., sex, possession, herd, etc.

Erwin H. Schell offered one of the first books dealing with executive behavior. He has been described as a pioneer in the area of executive behavior.

---


of human motivation, human relations, and the behavioral sciences. He left no fundamentals or principles to follow, but he placed an emphasis upon the art of dealing with people. He listed as tools of the executive such things as cheerfulness, receptiveness, firmness, tolerance and patience, friendliness, etc. He saw the executive as a leader who would inspire his workers to do their best.

The writings which appeared in the 1920's were, for the most part, reviews of previous theories, or at best an elaboration upon previous ideas. A new terminology was developed by some writers, but the basic concepts had not changed. The writings, for some unexplained reason, said less and less about the human element in management. The concentration was upon the technical—getting the job done. Possibly this was because a number of books were being written with a distinctly psychological orientation, and the cleavage in approaches to management began at this time. E. E. Hunt, the editor of *Scientific Management Since Taylor*,\(^2^3\) said that Taylor died a discouraged man after he saw many of his ideas deserted. As indicated previously, Taylor and other early writers had placed some emphasis upon the human element, but for some reason the later writers, and consequently the managers, placed little emphasis upon this aspect. Hunt's edition, however, gave emphasis once again to the human element. Although some saw scientific management as consisting of a set of techniques of management that required regimentation, Taylor had not intended this. Writers and managers had made a misinterpretation of his concepts.

Following the 1920's attention turned away from management for production and turned toward management functions. Among the most outstanding books to appear in the 1930's were those by Dennison, Dutton, David, Barnard, Mooney and Reiley, and Mayo.

Dennison and Dutton's books appeared in 1931. Dennison was much concerned with the human element in organization, and he discussed such things as social environment, leadership, teamwork, coordination, and mutuality of interests. Dennison's ideas might be abbreviated as follows:

1. The strength of an organization comes from its members.

2. Get men working in groups, which involves the factors of diversity, frictions, teamwork, leadership, and motivation.

3. Teamwork could be achieved as follows: (a) knowledge of common purpose; (b) a desire for a common purpose; (c) a desire to help each other; (d) some degree of functionalization of task; (e) a knowledge of what teammates are supposed to do; (f) a knowledge of what teammates are doing; and (g) a knowledge of how to help one's teammates.

4. Leadership is directing and helping.

5. Managing an organization had to be done through the wants of men (motivation) rather than upon their acts.

6. Man could not be expected to give of his powers unless the following are operating: (a) self-preservation; (b) liking the work; (c) self-respect; and (d) loyalty or respect for the purposes of the organization.

7. There must be direction to steer efforts.

8. It is through an organization structure that men's lives and efforts are channeled for success in group life.21

Dutton also attempted to show how the individual could learn to adjust to the organization. They both wrote of the difficulty in organizing; i.e., obtaining cooperation.

W. G. Scott pointed out the difficulty faced by the management writers at this time. He says:

Another aspect of the process route to a management philosophy was the study of organization. And to organize is to establish a cooperative system.

This statement has dual implications. The first is a notion of action—organizing; the second is the result of organizing action—organization. This duality created difficulties for a theory of organization. Organizing, as a management function, can be dehumanized. That is, the relationships among work, the work place, and the people who do the work can be established without reference to personality. However, the product of the organizing activity—organization—cannot be managed without considering the people involved.

Mooney and Reiley faced this duality problem by pointing out that organizing activities should precede administration of the organization. Mooney believed it essential to develop and define objectives rather than to assume them. He also believed the techniques of management to be the techniques of handling people, and that "the relation of management to organization is analogous to the relation of the psychic complex to the physical body."

Ralph C. Davis first published his ideas in a booklet in 1935 called *The Principles of Business Organization and Operation*. Later


26Scott, p. 33.


in 1940, this booklet was included in his publication Industrial Organization and Management. His publications were considered important and his efforts recognized for their high quality of thought and content, but he failed to speak of the human element in management.

Ordway Tead also wrote The Art of Leadership, which appeared in 1935. In this book he explored methods of leadership that led to achieving desired group actions. He represents one of the early behavioral science approaches. Tead was interested in showing how a leader could have power "with" people rather than power "over" people. He also discussed the process of establishing objectives and of decision-making. Concerning the establishment of objectives, Tead believed it important that the group understand the objectives and support them, in order for them to feel self important in helping to achieve these objectives.

Motivation was one of the most important factors found in Mary Parker Follett's management writings. In Metcalf and Urwick's book, Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett, they emphasize that her conceptions were in advance of her time and are still ahead of current thinking. They recommend her suggestions for establishing and maintaining human cooperation in the conduct of an enterprise.

Chester Barnard, in his book *The Functions of the Executive*, brought a new analytic approach to the investigation of management and leadership as opposed to those writers who had been descriptive. Barnard was much interested in the theory of cooperation and organization, and spoke often of the need for motivation. He believed an organized system of communication was essential for a coordination of efforts. He listed three essential executive functions: (1) to provide a system of communication; (2) to promote the securing of essential efforts; and (3) to formulate and define purpose.\(^{32}\) His description of the process of bringing persons into the organization and cooperative relationship reminds one of the "linking pin" theory of Rensis Likert. Barnard spoke of the need for a "coalescence" of executive personnel and executive positions. He saw "aggregate" action as being essential to the development of objectives. He conceived the executive functions as elements in an organic whole. These positions were not to be considered as parts of a process of, or in, organization. He subscribed to the mutuality of interests concept, believing it was this process which led to management by objectives. He also placed great emphasis upon executive capacity as a "stimulant." He believed that cooperation, not leadership, was the creative process in generating human effort; but that leadership was the indispensable stimulant for the forces of cooperation.\(^{33}\)

---


Barnard pointed out that it is possible for an organization to be either effective or efficient or both. The organization is effective if it achieves its goals. It is efficient if it satisfies the derived work motives of the individuals. However, in order to be both effective and efficient it must be a cooperative institution (and vice versa). (See page 31 of this work for a more complete review of Barnard's book.)

Charles P. McCormick advanced a new term if not a totally new concept with his book entitled *Multiple Management*. This could be translated into today's terminology as "shared authority" or "participative management." McCormick was interested in finding some means by which younger executives could become involved in the management of the enterprise. He originated the concept of a "junior board of directors" which would hopefully give these young men the opportunity to be creative and imaginative in a more meaningful way and to give these ideas immediate access to the senior board. He found his ideas successful in actual practice and expanded the concept to other areas of the organization; e.g., sales and factory.

William B. Given, Jr., assisted in the development of "participative management" by writing his book entitled *Bottom-up Management*. He was basically interested in increasing individual initiative under conditions of decentralization in management. Given described

---

35 Ibid., pp. 19-21, 82-83.

his concept by showing the difference of the two approaches to management; i.e., "top-down management" implies that all planning, thinking, and issuing of orders will come from the head of the organization, while "bottom-up management" implies the leader is to generate a flow of ideas and suggestions coming from the lowest ranks. The central concept was that a freedom of initiative and responsibility would spread throughout the organization.

This pattern of organization gives people all along the management line freedom to think, to plan, to fight for their plans, to take calculated risks, to make decisions, and—most important of all, says Given—freedom to fail. To him a manager who applies bottom-up management is as much a teacher as he is an order-giver. Bottom-up management does not completely oust traditional top-down management. Some of the latter is still used for such matters as determining broad policies and objectives, but even here the bottom-up flow of ideas is a significant influence on policy determination. The only time top-down management is really needed is when bottom-up management fails.

McCormick followed with another book in 1949 entitled The Power of People. He advanced the thesis that the head of an institution should be thought of as a trustee and that he has the responsibility of meeting the needs of the people who are working in the institution as well as making a profit. He had six principles for the conduct of

business. In abbreviated form they are: (1) Business concerns people; (2) Employees are thought of first as human beings, secondly as citizens, and thirdly as means for production; (3) The preservation of individual freedom and economic stability in the world depends upon the United States; (4) The government cannot legislate the welfare of people; (5) The "dignity of man" and the "freedom of choice" for individuals depends upon cooperation between management and workers; (6) Service to others determines the destiny of man. He wished for more study to determine what makes people enjoy work and suggested five basic factors that employees seek in their jobs. These are: (1) fair pay, (2) security, (3) opportunity, (4) recognition, and (5) participation.

E. Wight Bakke published two significant books early in the 1950's. These were Bonds of Organization in 1950, and The Fusion Process in 1953. The former was an appraisal of corporate human relations in which he explored the principles of cooperation among persons related to each other as members of groups. He proposed the idea that an organization was a small society of individuals bound together by a social system. The "bonds of organization" that Bakke recognized as being of prime importance to this social system, and which welded men together as partners were: (1) functional specifications, (2) status system, (3) communication system, (4) reward and recognition.  


penalty system, and (5) organization charter. In his next book he refined these concepts and added others. In this book he dropped the terminology of "bonds" and referred to activities or processes. To the first five "bonds" he added (6) evaluation activities or process, and (7) identification activities or process. The central concept Bakke advanced in this book, however, was the "fusion process." He saw this process as the interaction between the organization and the individual change as they interact upon each other; their separate values may be reconciled. He points out that the reconciliation of expectations brought by the fusion process acts "... to maintain the integrity of the organization in the face of divergent interests of individuals, groups, other organizations and the organization itself. ..."\textsuperscript{10}

At this point in the development of management thought, hundreds, if not thousands, of books had been written about management, leadership, and organizations. Those who continued to be interested in describing the functions of leaders or managers created new terminology and moved towards writing about a theory or philosophy of management.

The entire field was much aware of a new movement, however, which began with the Hawthorne experiments in 1929, but did not have a real effect upon the field of management until the 1930's. With these experiments it was obvious there were variables which had not yet been studied, variables concerned with sociological and psychological phenomena, and for which there were no adequate instruments with which to study these variables. An overview of this important movement begins on page 124.

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 60.
Before this new movement is explored, however, there are a number of books recognized as the most outstanding in the field of management which should be reviewed. A review of these books will also bring out the thinking of writers and researchers up through the late 1960's.

Selected Basic Literature

In preparation for the publication of the Handbook of Organizations, James March conducted a search to determine the books which represented the "basic" and "most fashionable" literature available concerning organizations. He made the assumption that this could be discovered by counting the frequency with which books appeared in bibliographies and references. His findings indicate the most "fashionable" books to be as follows:

Barnard, C. K., The Functions of the Executive (1938)

Cartwright, D. and A. Zander (eds.), Group Dynamics: Research and Theory (1953)

Homans, G. C., The Human Group (1950)

Katz, D., N. Maccoby, and Nancy C. Morse, Productivity, Supervision, and Morale in an Office Situation (1950)

March, J. G., and H. A. Simon, Organizations (1958)

Roethlisberger, F. J., and W. J. Dickson, Management and the Worker (1939)

Simon, H. A., Administrative Behavior (1947)


When he looked for twelve basic books concerned with organization which would represent the six areas of sociology, anthropology, management, economics, political science, and psychology, he was able to develop the following list:

**Sociology:**

**Anthropology:**

**Management:**

**Economics:**
Dean, J., *Managerial Economics* (1951)

**Political Science:**

**Psychology:**

All of the above books have been given a thorough review for the purpose of this dissertation with the exception of *New Patterns of Management*. Likert's newest book, *The Human Organization*, an expansion and development of the concepts as reported in the earlier book, was chosen for review. The assumption is made that a complete review of the twenty-one books, plus the general review of related literature concerning historical antecedents, research in higher educational administration, and educational administration, will present the available
significant knowledge relating to administration in higher education.
The reviews follow.

CHESTER I. BARNARD

Barnard recognized the importance of cooperation in organizations and the social and psychological factors at work in this process. He advised that these social and psychological factors must be considered and understood by the successful executive. He was also aware of the need to motivate persons because "it is clear that willingness of persons to contribute efforts to the cooperative system is indispensable."\(^{12}\)

Barnard recognized a particular problem in management with those persons who were basically "negative." He said:

> The preponderance of persons in a modern society always lies on the negative side with reference to any particular existing or potential organization. Thus of the possible contributors only a small minority actually have a positive willingness.\(^{13}\)

This concept is possibly tied to his idea that competition for the contribution of individuals, which creates conflicts of loyalties, are inherent in complex organizations. He points out that this conflict exists in all ranks of the organization and not just among the "workers."

Barnard also supported the idea that material rewards were not sufficient, by themselves, to meet the needs of individuals for their continued cooperation and interest in the enterprise. He said:

> The unaided power of material incentives, when the minimum necessities are satisfied, in my opinion is exceedingly limited


\(^{13}\) *Ibid.*, p. 84.
as to most men, depending almost entirely for its development upon persuasion. Notwithstanding the great emphasis upon material incentives in modern times and especially in current affairs, there is no doubt in my mind that, unaided by other motives, they constitute weak incentives beyond the level of the bare physiological necessities.\(^4^4\)

In continuing the discussion of this problem he recognizes the other incentives which he believes are important:

Inducements of a personal, non-materialistic character are of great importance to secure cooperative effort above the minimum material rewards essential to subsistence. The opportunities for distinction, prestige, personal power, and the attainment of dominating position are much more important than material rewards in the development of all sorts of organizations. . . .\(^4^5\)

Two specific areas he emphasized as being very important in winning the cooperation of individuals were "ideal benefactions" and "associational attractiveness." He explains these concepts as follows:

By ideal benefaction I mean the capacity of organizations to satisfy personal ideals usually relating to non-material, future, or altruistic relations. They include pride of workmanship, sense of adequacy, altruistic service for family or others, loyalty to organization in patriotism, etc., aesthetic and religious feeling. They also include the opportunities for the satisfaction of the motives of hate and revenge, often the controlling factor in adherence to and intensity of effort in some organizations.

By associational attractiveness I mean social compatibility. It is in many cases obvious that racial hostility, class antagonism, and national enmities absolutely prevent cooperation, in others decrease its effectiveness, and in still others make it impossible to secure cooperation except by great strengthening of other incentives.\(^4^6\)

He made a special emphasis upon the need for the proper social situation, pointing out that men will frequently not work at all, or will rarely work well, "under other incentives if the social situation from their point of view is unsatisfactory."\(^4^7\)

\(^{4^4}\)Ibid., p. 143. \(^{4^5}\)Ibid., p. 145. \(^{4^6}\)Ibid., p. 146. \(^{4^7}\)Ibid., p. 147.
Barnard speaks often of the need for proper social relationships: "The most intangible and subtile of incentives is that which I have called the condition of communion." He defines the term of "condition of communion" as being essentially different from "social compatibility" but being related to this concept. Rather this "condition of communion" is the "feeling of personal comfort in social relations." Other terms which might be applied to this concept are solidarity, social integration, the gregarious instinct, or social security. He sees the "condition of communion" as "comradeship," and "for mutual support in personal attitudes." This concept he sees as being important to the informal organization which is "essential to the operation of every formal organization." 48

In order for a communication to be accepted as authoritative, Barnard believed there were four conditions which must exist simultaneously. These four conditions are:

(a) he can and does understand the communication;
(b) at the time of his decision he believes that it is not inconsistent with the purpose of the organization;
(c) at the time of his decision he believes it to be compatible with his personal interest as a whole; and
(d) he is able mentally and physically to comply with it. 49

Therefore, although he recognizes the necessity for a system of communication, and the necessity of maintaining formal channels for the proper flow of communication, he recognizes the importance of the individual and his desire to cooperate at all ranks within the hierarchy.

48 Ibid., p. 148. 49 Ibid., p. 165.
Barnard did not recognize the executive function as one of managing a group of persons. He believed this concept was "narrow," or "convenient," but erroneous. Rather he believed persons managed themselves and that the executive organization is but a part of the total cooperative effort.

Barnard believed the creative side of organization to be coordination. He saw the ability to successfully combine the elements to achieve coordination as being crucial to successful leadership. Other names or terms of this ability might be "all around management," "executive perspective," or "practical sense of the whole."

His description of the aspects of leadership are worthy of complete presentation in order to "feel" the impact of his ideas:

Leadership has two aspects. One is local, individual, particular, ephemeral. It is the aspect of individual superiority—in physique, in skill, in technology, in perception, in knowledge, in memory, in imagination. This is the immediate aspect, highly variable through time and in place; subject to specific development by conditioning, training, education; significant chiefly in conjunction with specific condition; relative; rather easily determinable; comparatively objective; essential to positive action; commanding admiration, emulation. This is the technical aspect of leadership.

Now we shall confine our thoughts to the second aspect of leadership—the more general; the more constant; the least subject to specific development; the more absolute; the subjective; that which reflects the attitudes and ideals of society and its general institutions. It is the aspect of individual superiority in determination, persistence, endurance, courage; that which determines the quality of action; which often is most inferred from what is not done, from abstention; which commands respect, reverence. It is the aspect of leadership we commonly imply in the word "responsibility," the quality which gives dependability and determination to human conduct, and foresight and ideality to purpose.50

50 Ibid., p. 260.
Barnard encouraged executives to think about the subjective aspects of authority and to consider the importance of the informal organization rather than to attempt to ignore it. Creative thinking or creativity in general was considered by him to be "the essence of leadership." And he called this ability the "highest test" of executive responsibility.

Barnard also accepted the need for a "thoroughly" scientific approach to organizations and cooperative systems. He believed that further progress in these arts would depend upon the development of such a scientific approach. He states:

The executive arts are highly developed in the fields called technological; they are well developed in the technical commercial fields; they are least developed in the techniques of human interactions and organization.\(^{51}\)

Barnard thus saw the need of the behavioral science approach which was to become so pronounced in the literature of management during the 1950's and 1960's. He suggested in this book that his ideas be put to the test:

I hope for a social anthropology, a sociology, a social psychology, an institutional economics, a treatise on management, etc., written with the concepts of a cooperative system and an organization which have been presented as a part of the working scheme.\(^{52}\)

Barnard's concluding statement is an eloquent "declaration of faith." In this "declaration" he clearly places himself in the position of those who support the dignity of each individual, and the need of management to consider the desires and ego needs of individuals. He states:

\(^{51}\)Ibid., p. 292. \(^{52}\)Ibid., p. 293.
I believe in the power of the cooperation of men of free will to make men free to cooperate; that only as they choose to work together can they achieve the fullness of personal development; that only as each accepts a responsibility for choice can they enter into that communion of men from which arise the higher purposes of individual and of cooperative behavior alike. I believe that the expansion of cooperation and the development of the individual are mutually dependent realities, and that a due proportion or balance between them is a necessary condition of human welfare. Because it is subjective with respect both to a society as a whole and to the individual, what this proportion is I believe science cannot say. It is a question for philosophy and religion.\textsuperscript{53}

BERNARD M. BASS

Bass accepts the six approaches to promoting group effectiveness which had been advanced by Gibb, Platts, and Miller.\textsuperscript{54} These are:

1. The systematic-theoretical approach: the setting up of systematic theories of small-group behavior which provide the basis for further empirical test.

2. The empirical approach: the experimental and field studies which are designed to find certain functional relationships between relevant variables in the small-group situations; the gathering of empirical data relevant to theoretical or technological questions.

3. The engineering approach: the various "engineering" attempts to change group behavior through group psychotherapy, social consulting, work-shop training, and other change-agent projects, where applications of the findings of science are used to change social behavior.

4. The philosophic approach: the speculative attempts to explore the social behavior of man, and to determine the bases for group behavior.

5. The practical approach: the various attempts of social and religious organizations to arrive at ways of working together

\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., p. 296.

in groups, usually with minimum regard for "scientific"
evidence for the principles used but with a concern for
practical results as shown by more effective groups and
by more effective meetings.

6. The "achieving-democracy" approach: the attempts on the part
of various members and groups in an emerging democratic
society to arrive at a "democratic" conception and practice
of group action that will comport with the ideals of demo-
cratic living.55

Bass appears to support the position that present social theory
of organizations is divorced from the empirical world, and that most
theories are held together with "far-fetched" analogies.

In his discussion of leadership he emphasizes that students of
this phenomena have concluded that any theory of leadership must take
into account the interaction between situation and individual. Numer-
ous studies have pointed out that some leaders can operate successfully
in one situation and cannot in another. One characteristic noted on
many of the studies of leaders was that of superior intelligence; par-
ticularly in small groups. However, as the group becomes larger this
characteristic becomes less important and "adjustment" becomes more
important.

Bass determines that any member of a group can take leadership
or at least exhibit some amount of it. Basically he defines leadership
as "an interaction between members of a group."56 He hastens to add
that while this is a "usual condition" it is not necessarily a condi-
tion of leadership.

55Bernard M. Bass, Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational
56Ibid., p. 89.
Bass discusses the problem of measuring and evaluating leadership, pointing out that a variety of methods have been used. He claims that most of the methods have been concerned with whether leadership was merely attempted rather than successful or effective. He suggests that objective procedures would be most desirable, where hypotheses could be tested.

His review of the literature on the effectiveness of communication suggests that free communication leads to increased effectiveness, leading to high confidence and amity. "Zero feedback" or negative feedback results in lack of confidence and hostility.

The following principle is stated in his discussion concerning leadership:

The further a group is from maximum effectiveness, the more leadership is possible and required; the closer to maximum effectiveness, the less leadership is necessary.57

Another characteristic frequently noted as being essential to good leadership is verbal aptitude. Those leaders who can think clearly, accurately, rapid, and exhibit analytical ability, tact and ease of expression, are seen to be in an advantageous position. This is possibly associated with the ability to solve the group's problems, if the leader has the ability to "understand, appreciate, and exhibit sensitivity to those problems."58

Authoritarian personalities appear to have difficulty in exhibiting successful leadership behavior in groups which are initially

57Ibid., p. 134.  
58Ibid., p. 167.
leaderless. Studies indicate that these personalities cannot benefit from short "coaching sessions" on leadership, but rather that they would need "long-range psychotherapy."

Other traits frequently found with some consistency among leaders are persistence, consistency, self-confidence, sociability, need for achievement, and dependability. It appears that the leader must be superior in at least one or more characteristics which confront the group. The needs of the enterprise dictate the "style" of leadership needed. In a new enterprise an "aggressive" leader may be needed to prod growth. In a well established enterprise a more conservative leader may be needed; one who spends more time on human and organizational relationships.

Bass emphasizes the following:

Our thesis is, of course, that both power and ability, both persuasive and coercive leadership, belong in the overall study of the way we interact and influence each other.

An able person successfully persuades others to follow him because they expect that following his suggestions will result in solving the problems facing the group. A powerful person successfully coerces others to follow him because the power from his position, or his power as a person, makes others expect that he will reward them for compliance, or punish them for rejection. An able person can indirectly reinforce the behavior of others.59

Bass' discussion of group decision making and group power is most interesting and should be considered carefully by the academic community. In speaking of the leader and his relationship to the group he says:

When the powerful member permits the group to decide, he avoids using his power to coerce, except to impose those restrictions necessary to aid the group to reach the decisions. By

59Ibid., p. 221.
doing this, he avoids the hostility, resentment, and apathy likely to be generated by his own attempt to coerce the group into complying with his already-made decision. By suitable interpositions, only when necessary, he usually can get it to reach the decision he desired prior to the interaction, or a decision which is acceptable to him. But such a decision now has behind it the power of the group to coerce its members as well as the members' regard for the group, as more able to reach a proper decision than each member alone.60

The phenomena of "group conformity" should be understood by leaders. There is a tendency for members of a group to move toward the center or to conform to a group norm, particularly if the group holds a position of prestige, or is attractive for any reason. The more the group values membership in the group, the more willing they are to conform.

Bass distinguishes between status and esteem in the following manner:

Status is the worth or value to the group of the occupant of a position, regardless of who he is personally. In contrast, esteem is his worth to the group because of his personal ability and personal control of any member, regardless of the position he occupies.61

Studies have indicated that personal ability and status are positively related. However, a status position imputes or ascribes abilities which the occupant of the position may not have.

Concerning the motivation of workers, Bass supports the position of other studies which indicate money is not the only key to motivation. Studies repeatedly indicate that other factors such as recognition, fair treatment, and considerate supervision contribute to worker satisfactions.

60 Ibid., p. 237.  
61 Ibid., p. 260.
Good communications is seen as an important means in developing group cohesion, intimacy, predictability, and security. Numerous studies support the fact that increased interactions among members, where communication is free, increases group effectiveness.

A number of problems arise when the homogeneity of groups are considered. Bass states the situation as follows:

Group performance may depend on the mean ability of subgroups. Group performance may depend on which members are assigned with operations. Group performance may depend on the way specific members cluster in their evaluations of each other. Complicating the matter even further is the relation between mean ability and variance in ability. Especially if a ceiling exists on ability, groups of highest mean ability must be homogeneous in ability—all members high. The same is true at the other end of the scale. Homogeneity in ability is least likely to occur naturally in the middle of the scale of the ability than at the ends. And it is important to know mean ability in order to study variance in ability. Thus, according to Eaton, the mean ability of a professional team determines whether homogeneity or heterogeneity will be conducive to effectiveness...

Apparently no single statement can be made to adequately describe the relation between homogeneity and heterogeneity and effectiveness under all conditions.

Bass believes that one solution to the problems of large organizations is to build in a system of periodic inspection and review of positions, goals, objectives, types of communications used, etc. Of extreme importance is maintaining or developing increased means of communication. It has been suggested by some authors that a truly effective system of communication could reduce the tendency to organize the

---

63 Ibid., p. 391.
large group into groups of smaller ones. The lack of communication will develop cliques and a highly active minority that could upset the organization.

Bass' descriptions of the various types of leaders are of interest and assist in giving a guide towards future study of leadership. These types are:

The self-oriented leader is more concerned with his success as a leader than the task of interaction effectiveness of his leadership. Therefore, the self-oriented leader is usually detrimental to group effectiveness. He is less likely to change his behavior to meet changing group needs. He may even try to divert the group from one goal to another. But the self-oriented member is less likely to persist in the face of failure to lead others.

The task-oriented leader will attempt leadership only when the group is attractive because of its tasks and the rewards for task success. He will more readily cease attempting leadership if his successes are ineffective.

The interaction-oriented leader will avoid attempting leadership likely to disrupt current patterns of interaction. He will attempt leadership mainly when interaction difficulties present themselves and he sees himself as able to cope with them.64

PETER M. BLAU and W. RICHARD SCOTT

Blau and Scott65 first define what they mean by "formal" organization and "social" organization. Social organization is seen as the ways in which human conduct becomes socially organized. Formal organization refers to an organization that has been formally established for the explicit purpose of achieving certain goals.

64Ibid., p. 451.

In these formal organizations administrators are typically unqualified to make expert technical decisions and judgements. Their expertise is in the area of administration. Therefore, they must frequently rely upon certain professional judgements made by the appropriate expert. Frequently the decisions of administrators conflict with those of the professional, who is concerned with technical problems.

Blau and Scott would call any organization over-bureaucratized if it becomes so preoccupied with procedures that it fails to serve the clients for which it was organized.

In their discussion of the value of participation among groups and of group apathy, they point out that several persons have written of the dangers of centralization which is developed in the guise of efficiency. They also point out that centralization of control and hierarchical organization is frequently developed by persons who wish to extend their power.

In their discussion of hierarchical differentiation it is asserted that explicit status distinctions tend to reduce interaction and social support. In hospitals, studies have shown that physicians prefer the social interaction of other physicians, and nurses most frequently have their social contacts with other nurses. Even under experimental conditions, where interaction is encouraged across the lines, it can only be successful if the person in the superior status position is not insecure. It is not unusual for lower-status persons to attempt interaction with upper-status persons, but they are frequently rebuffed.
In problem solving situations where there are persons of various status positions, there is a tendency for the discussion to be controlled by the high-status individuals, and for most comments to be directed upward to those holding the most prestige. There is also a tendency of the group to accept suggestions of high-status persons and reject those of low-status persons. Thus, the more pronounced the hierarchical differences in a group, the less effective it will perform.

They also refer to several experiments which, on the surface at least, appear to prove that hierarchical structure actually contributed to more efficiency. These must be explained, however. In the groups where no leader emerged, there was a majority and minority opinion, which often resulted in poor work, or almost a stalemate. In the groups where a leader emerged, there were better results if the leader was able to "open" or "free" the group to be creative or to become organized. If the leader was skilled he could bring all persons in the group into full participation, avoid a majority opinion and develop coordination. The authors state:

In sum, groups are superior to individuals, and groups in which there is a free flow of communication are superior to groups in which differentiation impedes communication, in solving problems which call for a single correct or best answer.

The authors point out that performance appears to be best when an individual professional has both a homophily and heterophily contact with colleagues. The social need is met through a colleague who has similar values (homophily), while the heterophilous associate is a

66 Ibid., p. 125.
critic, one with different values, and therefore may serve as a catalyst; one who provides challenges and an opportunity for correction of errors.

The dilemmas produced by social and status positions are summed up exceedingly well by Blau and Scott:

A hierarchical organization, in part precisely because it restricts the free flow of communication, improves coordination; indeed, it seems to be essential for effective coordination of group effort. This is the dilemma posed by hierarchical differentiation: while it is necessary for coordination, it blocks the communication processes that are vital for stimulating initiative and facilitating decision-making. Moreover, even if there were no formal hierarchy in the organization, communication among peers would be likely to give rise to informal differentiation of status, which also creates obstacles to communication.67

In their discussion of the various "styles of leadership" the authors point out that leaders normally have the ability to facilitate the flow of needed information, supplies, and services through his formal position. But the leader who resorts to formal status prerogatives in his relations with his subordinates will alienate them. Superiors who command the loyalty of the group will have more control than those who do not because the subordinates will have more confidence in their authority to issue directives.

The authors produce some data which indicates that a supervisor who expresses loyalty to his superior is less apt than another to command the loyalty of his own subordinates. Apparently the successful supervisor must convince both his superiors and subordinates that they have his loyalties.

67 Ibid., p. 139.
Blau and Scott believe it is possible for professionals and bureaucracy to exist side by side, if the administration can avoid direct supervision. It is when the administration attempts to supervise and control the actions of the professional that conflicts occur most often. They point out that more and more professionals are finding it necessary to join and exist in organizations.

The authors discuss the "iron law of oligarchy" and appear to agree with this premise. It appears inevitable, even among "mutual-benefit" associations that a hierarchical system develop for the purpose of order and coordination of effort. As those who are placed in position of leadership develop additional expertise in achieving the organizational objectives, they become more powerful and thus are in a strengthened position. Frequently the result is more centralization.

The authors emphasize three major dilemmas of formal organization: (1) coordination and communication; (2) bureaucratic discipline and professional expertness; (3) managerial planning and initiative.

In their discussion of coordination and communication they point out three ways in which decisions are improved by the unrestricted exchange of ideas, criticisms, and advice:

First, social support relieves the anxieties engendered by decision making. . . . Second, communication processes provide an error-correction mechanism. . . . Third, the competition for respect that occurs in the course of discussing problems furnishes incentives for making good suggestions and for criticizing the apparently poor suggestions of others.68

The dilemma, however, remains. The free flow of ideas impedes coordination while hierarchical differentiation impedes the free flow

68Ibid., pp. 242-43.
of ideas. Organizations, particularly large, formal, complex organizations, require some form of hierarchical arrangement for coordination. And even if we begin without a leader, one will eventually emerge because of his superior knowledge, and as the group begins to defer to this knowledge his prestige and power will grow and create a hierarchical position. The authors conclude their discussion as follows: 
"... but the fundamental dilemma posed by the need for unrestricted and for restricted communication cannot be resolved--it must be endured." 69

In their discussion of "bureaucratic discipline and professional expertise," they discuss the differences between the official and the professional. They find four which they choose to emphasize:

... first ... the professional is bound by a norm of service and a code of ethics to represent the welfare and interests of his clients, whereas the bureaucrat's foremost responsibility is to represent and promote the interests of his organization. ...

... second ... The bureaucratic official's authority rests on a legal contract backed by formal sanctions, but the professional's authority is rooted in his acknowledged technical expertise. ...

... third ... the bureaucrat's decisions are expected to be governed by disciplined compliance with directive from superiors, whereas the professional's are to be governed by internalized professional standards. ...

Finally, the differences between the two systems are reflected in the locus of the last court of appeal in case of disagreement. When a decision of a bureaucrat is questioned, the final judgment of whether he is right or not is a prerogative of management, but when a decision of a professional is questioned, the right of reviewing its correctness is reserved to this professional colleague group. 70

69 Ibid., p. 244.
70 Ibid., pp. 244-45.
In discussing their third area, "managerial planning and initiative," they state:

Notwithstanding the importance of free communication, freedom to follow one's best professional judgement, and conditions permitting the exercise of initiative, effective coordination in a large organization requires some centralized direction. But the assumption that managerial coordination necessitates control through a hierarchy of authority is questionable, since it can be and often is achieved by other methods, notably through various types of impersonal mechanisms of control designed by management.\(^{71}\)

In their concluding arguments they contrast the plight of complex organizations with those of the nation as a whole. We struggle for the maximum amount of freedom while we seek security and strength as a nation. "For we surely need to survive in order to preserve our democratic institutions, but we just as surely do not want to survive at the cost of losing our freedom."\(^{72}\) Apparently we must learn to live with conflict.

DORWIN CARTWRIGHT and ALVIN ZANDER

The authors give a rather succinct summary of the basic assumptions held by most group dynamicists. This summary consists of four "propositions," as follows:

1. Groups are inevitable and ubiquitous.

2. Groups mobilize powerful forces which produce effects of utmost importance to individuals.

3. Groups may produce both good and bad consequences.

4. A correct understanding of group dynamics (obtainable from research) permits the possibility that desirable consequences from groups can be deliberately enhanced.\(^{73}\)

\(^{71}\)Ibid., p. 247.  
\(^{72}\)Ibid., p. 253.  
Concerning proposition 1: the authors point out that it is almost inconceivable to imagine a collection of people living within some geographical proximity and not be organized into some kind of group. Further, they assert that even the most extreme non-conforming persons in our society (e.g., "Beatniks," "Hippies," etc.) have their own codes of conformity.

Concerning proposition 2: the authors emphasize that membership in a group can be either highly desirable or an oppressive burden, but that most people receive much of their ego satisfaction and status identification by belonging to a group. The person's church, family, profession, etc., and the members of these groups help to shape the very identity of the person. The social forces inherent in these groups become exceedingly powerful, and if a person is suddenly excluded from a prized group the results can be disastrous for him.

Concerning proposition 3: the authors state that sufficient research is available to prove that groups may produce either good or bad consequences, depending upon the bias of the investigator. However, if one attempts to look at both sides of the issue he will be much more able to assess reality.

Concerning proposition 4: the authors believe sufficient research is available to give us adequate knowledge in channelling the forces involved for groups to be made to serve better ends. Human behavior and social institutions can be modified with sufficient understandings of the factors and forces which are at work in these groups.

The group dynamicists place an emphasis upon coordination within groups. Through scientific study the means can be found to guide
groups toward meeting their objectives and goals, and this is done through cooperation. Studies must be continuous, however, because society is constantly changing. Without understanding the constantly shifting forces at work in society it is not possible to guide the group towards satisfactory fulfillment of the needs and goals of both individuals and groups.

Cartwright and Zander identify eight theoretical positions or orientations which have been taken by various persons studying groups. These are:

1. **Field theory** . . . "It derives this name from its basic thesis that behavior is the product of a field of interdependent determinants (known as 'life space' or 'social space')."

2. **Interaction theory** . . . "conceives of a group as a system of interacting individuals."

3. **System theories** . . . "The view that a group is a system.

Various systems include: systems of orientation, systems of interlocking positions and roles, communication system, and open system. Systems theories place major emphasis on various kinds of 'input' and 'output' of the system, and they share with field theory a fundamental interest in equilibrating processes."

4. **Sociometric orientation** . . . "concerned primarily with the interpersonal choices which bind groups of people together."

5. **Psychoanalytic theory** . . . "focuses upon certain motivational and defensive processes within the individual . . . concepts of identification, regression, defense mechanisms, and the unconscious."
6. **Cognitive theory** . . . "This is not, strictly speaking, a theory but a point of view which insists on the importance of understanding how individuals receive and integrate information about the social world and how this information affects their behavior."

7. **Empiricistic-statistical orientation** . . . "concepts of group dynamics should be discovered from statistical procedures, such as factor analysis. . . ."

8. **Formal models** . . . "the aid of mathematics in order to deal rigorously with some rather limited aspects of groups."\(^7\)

The authors state that leadership and the causes of group performance have been the two areas most often studied by the group dynamicists. Yet, these two problems have never been resolved and research continues. Most of the research thus far completed appears to support the general conclusions that supervisors (leaders) are most effective when they are supportive, spend more time in planning, delegate more authority, "check up" on workers less frequently, and develop group cohesiveness.

Many efforts have been made to discover the "traits" of leaders, but these have had disappointing results. When the various lists of traits were compared it was found that only 5% of the discovered traits were common to four or more studies. Among those few traits that appear to be most common are that leaders appear to excel in (1) intelligence, (2) scholarship, (3) dependability and responsibility, (4) activity,

\(^7\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 40-41.}\)
(5) social participation, and (6) socioeconomic status.

Various studies have shown, however, that a number of individuals within a group may have all of the above characteristics. Also, studies have shown that a successful leader in one situation may be unsuccessful in another. Thus, the leader must be viewed within the context of the situation and the forces which are explicit in that particular environment.

The authors believe another approach must be taken to leadership and they state their thesis as follows:

... A "new view" of leadership is emerging which stresses the performance of needed functions and adaptability to changing situations. According to this conception, groups are (or should be) flexible in assigning leadership functions to various members as conditions change. Effective leaders are sensitive to the changing conditions of their groups and flexible in adapting their behavior to new requirements. The improvement of leadership may be expected, not from improving leaders apart from the group, but by modifying the relations between leaders and the rest of the group.

Such acts may be termed group functions. More specifically, leadership consists of such actions by group members as those which aid in setting group goals, improving the quality of the interactions among the members, building to cohesiveness of the group, or making resources available to the group. In principle, leadership may be performed by one or many members of the group.75

A more comprehensive view of leadership may be gained by expanding the possibilities of leadership within a group. It has been suggested that leadership studies must include all members of the group. This proposition suggests that persons other than the "legal" or "official" leader can and do exert leadership. Looking at the problem in this manner, leadership can be seen as possessing "degrees" of

75Ibid., p. 492.
quantity and quality. In the past researchers have attempted to assess whether the appointed leader either completely has or does not have all the qualities of leadership. This proposition would infer that no one person should be considered the leader.

A number of researchers have attempted to list the activities and responsibilities of leaders. Their nomenclature is usually derived from their field of academic orientation. Thus, the psychologist refers to "group maintenance," "guilt reduction," "impulse control," etc. The managerial expert refers to planning, decision-making, control, etc. The academician refers to expertise, group representative, ideologist, etc. It appears, however, that more success may be obtained by studying specific group needs, actions, and functions, and relating these to the leadership characteristics which emerge to meet them. This would, of course, imply the approach previously mentioned, where leadership is recognized as being held at different times by any person within the group.

The authors state that several research studies have shown that:

... two factors represent 83 percent of the accountable common variance in leader behavior. These two factors have been labeled "consideration" and "initiating structure." Items with high positive loadings on "consideration" were associated with behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth between the leader and his group. Items with a high positive loading on "initiating structure" were associated with behavior on the part of the leader which tends to define the role which he expects each member to assume, and which seeks to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done. It is interesting to note, further, that the two minor factors identified by this research, "production emphasis" and "social sensitivity," appear also to reflect the two basic functions of goal achievement and group maintenance, respectively.76

76 Ibid., p. 497.
If leadership is recognized as the power to influence people, this "power" must be studied. The authors refer to this ability to influence as "social power." They also list other types of power as suggested by French and Raven.77

(a) **Reward power**, which derives from the belief on the part of the recipients of an influence attempt that they will be rewarded in some way for complying.

(b) **Coercive power** arises from the belief that noncompliance will result in punishment.

(c) **Expert power** results when a person is evaluated as possessing needed knowledge, information, or skills.

(d) **Referent power** is held by a person whom others like, admire, or with whom they "identify."

(e) **Legitimate power** derives from values held by the recipients of an influence attempt which give to the influencer the "right" to influence.78

To the knowledge of Cartwright and Zander little research has been conducted under experimental conditions where to ascertain the effects upon groups the leaders use one or another basis of power. Apparently the limited research in this area has been unproductive since the authors do not proceed to discuss the results.

The authors report that numerous empirical findings are available to show that leaders who delegate or distribute functions of leadership throughout the group, and who create a friendly atmosphere, develop groups which are more cohesive and more successful in attaining

---


78 Cartwright and Zander, p. 500.
those goals we have established as being "better" in our society.

ELIOT D. CHAPPLE and LEONARD R. SAYLES

The authors state early in their book that although much has been written about management, little reliable information is available for the administrator who is seeking tested and established principles upon which to base his judgment.

Those persons who have been advocates of formal organization theory or "classical" theory, have been seen as persons who are basically interested in preserving their position of authority and power. However, writers such as Mayo, Roethlisberger, Katz, Kahn, and Argyris, have convinced the industrial and business world of the value of human relations. These writers have emphasized the importance of the individual, the human element, to an enterprise. It has been pointed out by them that in addition to the economic organization the human organization must be considered; that the machine theory of organization pays little attention to the psychological needs of man. In the words of Chris Argyris: "Formal organizational principles make demands of relatively healthy individuals that are incongruent with their needs. Frustration, conflict, failure, and short time perspective are predicted as resultants of this basic incongruency." 80


Consequently, it is now common for leaders in the industrial and business world to be concerned about the welfare of the members of the organization.

According to the authors there are no objective criteria by which management or the researcher can evaluate decisions on management designs. Although there are persons with many years of experience in leadership position, they have no means of predicting success. Studies in both simple and complex organizations have indicated, however, that the administrative processes by which the work flow is controlled is fundamental to shaping the "realities" of the organization when viewed as a system of relationships. The authors take the following theoretical position:

In this view . . . organization is the resultant of the layout, techniques, processes, and controls, or technology in its broadest sense, of the formal structure of authority as represented in charts and manuals of standard operating practice, and of the individual personalities within it.\(^1\)

It is emphasized that organizations can only operate successfully through the coordinated activities and cooperation of people.

In discussing the qualities or uniqueness of leaders it is observed that although companies talk about the desirability of the "team" man, that it is the uncommon man who will get ahead and eventually obtain high positions of leadership.

Man is seen as finding groups, leaders, and organizations as being desirable. It is pointed out that some form of organization

\(^1\)Chapple and Sayles, p. 9.
exists in the most primitive tribes as well as in all other cultures. Apparently it is necessary for man to depend upon human relationship, and to have some structure to his group in order to survive psychologically.

The authors believe it is possible to develop a set of principles which will adequately predict patterns of interaction. They believe it is essential to develop an organization which will function with continuity before it is possible for the persons involved to utilize the full potential of their imagination and intelligence. If time must be spent dealing with recurring crises this will not be possible. Among the most crucial problems they see in any organization are the "development of predictable routines, frayed tempers, suppressed or open hostility, and individual frustration resulting from ineffective organization all destroy individual competence."\textsuperscript{82}

Both formal and informal organization is seen as an important aspect of any organization. The informal organization must receive the same attention from leaders as the formal organization and they must learn how to use it in accomplishing the goals of the organization. The informal organization should not be seen as something that happens to exist and people are going to fit into it naturally. In an effort to determine how to use both the formal and informal organizations the authors recommend that management study the work flow, including the people involved as well as the actual flow of materials, and set the boundaries of each unit of work flow under one supervisor.

\textsuperscript{82}Ibid., p. 11.
They believe it is best to establish the responsibility for the work flow at the lowest possible managerial level.

Personality and reactions of the individual to stress are seen as two important factors in adequately organizing the enterprise. They suggest that individuals be given measurements of interaction, and determine precisely where the individual can best be placed in the organization for maximum effectiveness.

In discussing the manager's job and human relations, the authors point out that "every aspect of organizational life is essentially human relations, or, more precisely, the interaction of its members that can be measured." And that: "The manager's job is neither elusive nor unmeasurable. Nor is it simply a matter of the 'right' attitudes toward people or the memorization of textbook principles. The manager's basic function is maintaining or stabilizing several interrelated work flows."

The authors point out that while some persons appear to hold the organizational chart sacred, others tend to believe that the organizational chart cannot be defined until the persons who are to hold the positions are named—that the man makes the job. They believe, however, that there is a middle ground in this dispute, and state their case as follows:

... To the administrator concerned with the problems of developing an organization, management is a constant process of tinkering with people, with the jobs, and with the structure of

---

\[83\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 66. \quad 84\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 67.\]
authority to create the teamwork necessary for improved performance.

"Tinkering" is an accurate description of what the executive has to do, because, apart from his own capacity and experience, he has had few tools to combine people and jobs. . . .85

Job descriptions of leadership positions do not include an analysis of the personality of the persons needed for a specific position. Yet, the personality will in many respects dictate the mode of operation of the leader and will consequently have a strong effect upon those persons under his supervision. In addition to the usual job description, which lists responsibilities, experience needed, and perhaps educational level, the human behaviors required for the position should be listed.

Top management usually has a limited understanding of the personality needs within the organization. It may be possible for top managers to begin to understand the needs of the organization through a more intensified examination of their own behavior, and the reasons they react as they do to various people and in varying circumstances.

After information is obtained concerning the personality of an individual, management can only use this information in relation to the persons actual behavior within the enterprise. Public evidence is needed, and this can come through actual observation of his acts in a variety of situations. By doing this his judgments can be isolated and evaluated.

Since no "perfect leader type" can be identified, there can be no perfect supervisory style which will guarantee success. The

85Ibid., p. 98.
of supervising required for any given situation will depend upon many factors within that situation. Of considerable importance in determining the correct supervision style will be the personalities of all persons with whom the supervisor must interact.

The authors emphasize that:

... the researchers or executive who wants to understand and control the organization must look at the behavior of people in the context of time. Put in another way, there must be a shift away from the concern with feeling and intentions to the same kind of objective measurement that has characterized the physical sciences.86

The problem of getting leaders to examine themselves is recognized by Chapple and Sayles. They point out that the human relationists place great faith in the ability of persons to change their behavior through insight and the understanding of such intangibles as:

... understanding himself ... and tolerance for himself ... to express their true feelings and to respond to others' feelings with a minimum of defensiveness ... sincerely want to improve ... face up squarely to his own inadequacies ... a permissive atmosphere ... when he exposes his weakness ... someone whom he trusts ... insight into why he believes what he does, he feels ... .87

Under these conditions it appears that great success could not be expected in seeking managers to change their behavior. Yet, many human relation experts are convinced it can occur under the proper conditions. The authors list three propositions gathered from Keith Davis88 which summarizes how human relation experts believe this conversion can take place:

---
86 Ibid., p. 190. 87 Ibid., p. 192.
1. One should try to persuade, not force changes on people.

2. One should get the other person's point of view and allow him to feel that he is contributing to the change.

3. If you know why the individual is resisting change, you can change him, particularly if he also understands your point of view.\(^{89}\)

The following paragraph appears to summarize the authors' thesis:

The basic assumption in the approach to human relations in industry outlined in this volume is that attitudes and emotional reactions, as well as productivity, are functions of the interactional situation, and this interactional situation represents the interplay of personality, methods, systems, and technology. Consequently, unlike the approach of the conversion school, facilitation of change should be primarily brought about by changing the technological patterns, meaning the structure, the work flow and control system and, secondarily, by the transfer of personalities to situations within which their interactional patterns make it possible for them to adjust. Much research has been done to illustrate the subtle dependence of human relations systems on environmental and technological patterns and the ways in which entire social organizations change as a result of changes in one of these patterns.\(^{90}\)

Although many positions are appearing in management where specialists are needed (data-processing, public relations, research, etc.), it appears that the top management must consist of generalists who have a sufficient understanding of all aspects of the operation of the enterprise. Adequate decisions cannot be made without this broad understanding.

In addition to this understanding of the total operation the manager must understand the arts of organization and administration.

\(^{89}\)Chapple and Sayles, p. 193.

\(^{90}\)Ibid., p. 201.
The word "arts" is used purposefully to emphasize that little information is now available upon which to establish a "science" of administration. Yet, the authors believe the manager of the future will have a solid understanding of the situation in which they will apply.

The term "organization" is much misunderstood and the authors seek to clarify the definition as follows:

In essence, it is a group of people whose relationships are mutually dependent, and thus it is a system. This basically means that what one individual does affects the other. Watching the give-and-take of individuals, and the interaction that goes on between them, the ways in which each personality acts and reacts can be seen. Each represents a force with varying interactional needs that must be taken into consideration.91

JOEL DEAN

Dean's book92 is given totally to a discussion of economics in the management of institutions. No mention is made of principles concerning management, leadership, participative management, etc. Administration is discussed only in economic terms. For the purposes of this study, the discussion of economic factors was found to be of no value.

AMITAI ETZIONI

Etzioni uses the term "normative organization" to denote those organizations where normative power is the major source of control over most participants in the organization. In these organizations he considers the use of leadership, rituals, manipulation of social and

prestige symbols, and re-socialization as being among the most important techniques used. Among these institutions he considers five as being highly normative. These five are religious organizations, political organizations, general hospitals, universities, and voluntary associations. Among those "less typical," because they have an important secondary role where coercion plays a part, are schools and therapeutic mental hospitals. And even less than these are professional organizations and "core" organizations of social movements.

He points out that in normative organizations leaders (even deviant ones) develop from organizational positions and rarely, if at all, from among lower participants. He also believes there is less stability among normative organizations than among others. He explains this instability as the result of an unusually high degree of consensus among the lower participants of these organizations concerning such things as "ultimate values, mores, and norms governing the behavior of elites, members, and the organization." In addition to this the members of such organizations tend to have a high commitment to the organization, and therefore desire greater participation than those in other organizations. Rather than participation producing a stigma upon participants, as occurs in other types of organizations, participation in the normative organization contributes to prestige, esteem, and favorable self-evaluation.

"Expressive" elites are seen as the dominating leaders, since they are the ones who initiate and direct good activities. "Instrumental" elites are found in positions of control in the recruitment of means and the management of facilities. His discussion of the application of these two forms of leadership in the educational environment is most interesting. In these institutions he discusses the fact that frequently the instrumental leader is the most dominant because the school and teachers are "task-oriented"; i.e., task-oriented in the sense that they are concerned with the task of inculcating subject matter to students. If the teacher changes his emphasis to "expressive" leadership the learning (or task accomplishment) suffers. Expressive leadership in the school frequently comes from the students themselves, or from some teachers such as football coaches, music teachers, counselors, etc. He also points out that teachers in the lower grades should probably be more expressive than those in the upper grades. The reason given is that in the lower grades the teachers are not as interested in developing high skills of specific knowledges, but spend much of their time teaching values to their students. In such a task-oriented environment he sees it as inevitable that the instrumental leader dominates.

He discusses the fact that in normative organizations there are few boundaries between lower and upper participants, and that control comes basically through cooperation of all participants. He lists the following six principles as covering the most relevant considerations in this compliance towards control:
1. Consensus on general values; that is, values that are not peculiar to the organization under study, such as societal or community values, often including ultimate values.

2. Consensus on the organizational goals; that is, on the state of affairs the organization endeavors to bring about.

3. Consensus on means, policy, or tactics.

4. Consensus on participation in the organization. Lower participants can be viewed as continuously deciding whether or not to participate in the organization.

5. Consensus on performance obligations. Once lower participants have "decided" to participate, there remains a question of the degree of consensus about the duties they are to carry out.

6. Consensus on cognitive perspectives. Concurrence about facts, it has often been pointed out, assumes a common language, a shared frame of reference, and an agreed-upon set of canons for empirical test.

Etzioni points out that one of the major problems in complex organizations is to obtain consensus between the upper and lower participants of the organization. Also, there is a cleavage between persons with different functions; e.g., staff and line, worker and supervisor, etc. Those organizations that appear to run most smoothly achieve a consensus on all norms relating to expressive activities.

He may be pointing to a dichotomy which exists in higher education when he discusses the fact that educational institutions appear to be oriented towards cognitive, participation and performance spheres rather than finding a need to gain consensus on ultimate values. This dichotomy would appear to be reinforced if his premise about the schools in the following quote is correct:

Educational organizations stress expressive socialization in lower grades; with the movement from grammar school to high

\cite{ibid., pp. 129-130.}
school and from high school to college and graduate school, expressive socialization decreases until, in the graduate school, instrumental socialization is markedly predominant.\textsuperscript{95}

Etzioni finds no correlation between peer-cohesion and involvement in the organization. He does, however, find that hierarchical cohesion (participation between management and staff) contributes to beneficial involvement in the organization. He issues the following warning:

\ldots Cohesion has an anchorage effect, but since it will "anchor" both alienation and commitment, our assertion that there is no correlation between peer cohesion and direction of involvement still holds.\textsuperscript{96}

He finds the need for charismatic leadership much more needed in normative organizations than among the other two (coercive and utilitarian organizations). This is because normative organizations require a higher degree of moral involvement and expressive performance than the other two. In his discussion of charisma he makes the following two observations:

1. \ldots people who have the psychological syndromes of generalists are more likely to be charismatics than segmentalists or specialists.

2. \ldots the more continuous and the closer the control elites have over their subordinates, the less likely they are to have charismatic power over them; the more intermittent and distant or lax the control, the more likely charisma is to develop and to be sustained.\textsuperscript{97}

Etzioni believes upper administrators in universities, who are, for the most part, lay administrators or nonpracticing professionals, are "means" oriented, while the middle management (department heads

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textsuperscript{95} & Ibid., p. 111. & \textsuperscript{96} & Ibid., p. 196. & \textsuperscript{97} & Ibid., p. 213.
\end{tabular}
\end{footnotesize}
and professors) are "ends" oriented. This produces another dichotomy in the university. He also points out that while it is common to believe that professionals, as peers, control each other, that in actuality their division into ranks (professor, associate professor, etc.) creates a situation that automatically presents those with the higher ranks additional power. Also, tenured positions hold more power than non-tenured positions.

GEORGE C. HOMANS

In the Foreword of this book, Bernard DeVoto writes of the need for a way of investigating groups that will lead us to discovering information that will result in a group of significant hypotheses for further studies. He is clearly calling for empirical research.

He also writes of the importance of considering the social equilibrium of the group. He places great emphasis on this aspect of management and points out that groups will accept leadership or direction only if it sees that this leadership fulfills its own conception of what is proper "in its own terms." 98

Homans discusses the need for studying organizations from all viewpoints; considering all factors possible. In addition to all factors, individually, he stresses the need to consider the study of the relationships of the various factors. This, admittedly, is almost impossible, but seen as the only way to work towards a complete understanding of group actions. He attempts to demonstrate that since

social relationships are determined by many factors impinging upon them, there is unlikely to be just one scheme of organization possible in order for a group to survive.

Homans establishes many of his concepts upon the work of such persons as Mayo and Follett. Basically, he accepts the proposition that as individuals work together to achieve a common purpose they will develop a sense of harmony as a group and self-interests will become increasingly less important.

Homans points out that coordination is impossible without interaction. He suggests that increased interaction, based upon mutual respect, will increase and enhance coordination. Not only is coordination enhanced but the persons involved in the group grow to like each other better. One of his principles is stated as follows: "... persons who interact frequently with one another tend to like one another."\(^99\)

A situation which might present a problem, however, between groups of the same enterprise, is the following principle proposed by Homans:

\[\ldots\ \text{the liking of friends within a group carries with it some dislike of outsiders. The greater the inward solidarity, the greater the outward hostility.}\] \(^{100}\)

Homans discusses the fact that "authority" can disrupt the principle of interactions developing friendliness. The interactions must be on a mutual basis if friendliness is to develop. An authoritarian will have difficulty establishing a climate of friendliness.

\(^{99}\)Ibid, p. 111. \(^{100}\)Ibid, p. 112.
regardless of the number of interactions.

True leadership, to Homans, is gained from the support of followers and that a group tends to create its own leaders. Also, he points out that a leader gains his power by maintaining the norms of the group more closely than anyone else. "The leader is the man who, on the whole, best lives up to the standard of behavior that the group values." 101

Through his study of social control he was able to evolve the following principles:

1. Control is the process by which, if a man departs from his existing degree of obedience to a norm, his behavior is brought back toward that degree, or would be brought back if he did depart.

2. There is nothing new about control, no separate element that we have not already found coming into social organization.

3. The separate controls are nothing more than the old relations of mutual dependence taken differentially.

4. Control as a whole is effective in so far as an individual's departure from an existing degree of obedience to a norm activates not one but many separate controls.

5. That is, any departure activates the system of relations so as to reduce future departures.

6. Punishment does not necessarily produce control. The state of a social system in which control is effective we shall call a state of equilibrium of the system. 102

Concluding his study of leadership, he arrived at the following set of "rules of leadership."

101 Ibid., p. 169. 102 Ibid., p. 301.
1. The leader will maintain his own position. A leader will be able to do nothing to lead his group unless he is established as a person from whom authoritative orders will come.

2. The leader will live up to the norms of his group. Any failure on the part of the leader to live up to the group norms undermines his social rank and hence the presumption that his orders are to be obeyed.

3. The leader will lead. When a choice about the next move to make lies before a group, the members will expect the leader to consult them, but they certainly expect him to take action.

4. The leader will not give orders that will not be obeyed. When he gives orders that are not obeyed, he has by that fact undermined his rank and hence the presumption on the part of the members of his group that his future orders are to be obeyed.

5. In giving orders, the leader will use established channels.

6. The leader will not thrust himself upon his followers on social occasions. This does not mean that any one particular line should be drawn between classes in an organization. The fact is that, as we have seen, persons who are equal in social rank tend to interact frequently with one another in a "social" context, that is, in the internal system, and our present contention is simply that there are good reasons why this condition should exist. Although it may seem to run counter to the democratic creed, our contention is that the age-old experience of humanity with social units like armies and ships is not to be lightly dismissed as hidebound conservatism. Authority is a weighty thing and has inescapable consequences. But the rule can be, and obviously is, relaxed as the group becomes smaller and more nearly "autonomous."

7. The leader will neither blame nor, in general, praise a member of his group before other members.

8. The leader will take into consideration the total situation.

9. In maintaining discipline, the leader will be less concerned with inflicting punishment than with creating the conditions in which the group will discipline itself.

10. The leader will listen. The leader must be informed about the whole situation, and many facts and feelings in the whole situation, particularly personal problems and social relationships, are inherently hard to communicate.
11. The leader will know himself. . . . It should be obvious that the leader himself is the greatest threat to the moving equilibrium of the group. He can do most to put it in jeopardy.\textsuperscript{103}

Homans believes societies modern large complex organizations will require more centralization rather than less; e.g., the government. He sees the real problem of being not how to keep social groups wholly independent and autonomous but how to avoid destroying life in the periphery of a strong centralized center of society, while all elements continue to contribute to the life of organized society. Or, as he puts it: "How can we centralize without stagnating?"\textsuperscript{104}

Although Homans is here talking about society as a whole it would appear that his comments might apply equally well to any large complex enterprise:

At the level of the small group, society has always been able to cohere. We infer, therefore, that if civilization is to stand, it must maintain, in the relation between the groups that make up society and the central direction of society, some of the features of the small group itself. If we do not solve this problem, the effort to achieve our most high-minded purposes may lead us not to Utopia but to Byzantium. The problem will not be easily solved, but one step we can take in the beginning is to learn the characteristics of the human group.\textsuperscript{105}

DANIEL KATZ, NATHAN MACCOBY, and NANCY C. MORSE

The three authors conducted a research project in an effort to determine the characteristics of leadership, office morale, and how these correlated with productivity. Their findings indicate that heads of high-producing sections are significantly more likely:

\begin{align*}
\textsuperscript{103}\textit{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 425-440.} & \quad \textsuperscript{104}\textit{Ibid.}, \text{p. 467.} \\
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1. to receive general rather than close supervision from their superiors.
2. to like the amount of authority and responsibility they have in their jobs.
3. to spend more time in supervision.
4. to give general rather than close supervision to their employees.
5. to be employee-oriented rather than production-oriented.\textsuperscript{106}

The authors stated that the supervisors of high producing sections appeared to think and act differently with respect to their supervisory functions than do the supervisors of low producing sections. They were inclined to give the employee more freedom to make his own decisions about how to proceed with his work; they did not feel it necessary to check at every point, but relied upon their employees to fulfill their responsibilities; their attitudes were consistent. "They appear to look at the employees as people not essentially different from themselves, people capable of taking some responsibility, people with many different interests and needs."\textsuperscript{107}

The authors found few differences in the employees themselves. The most outstanding finding was that the persons in the high producing sections had more pride in their work. A second finding was the inclination of the high producing sections to be more critical of some aspects of company policy. An additional finding was that the low


\textsuperscript{107}Ibid., p. 35.
producing sections were more inclined to participate in company recre-
ational and athletic programs.

Additional findings were that neither intrinsic job satisfac-
tion, satisfaction with the company, nor financial and status satisfac-
tion was found to be directly related to productivity. The authors
cautions, however, that since all employees were under the same company
policy with respect to wages, benefits, etc., that this may have con-
tributed to the lack of relationships with these variables. 108

HAROLD KOONTZ and CYRIL O'DONNELL

The authors state that they believe that perhaps there is no
more important area of human activity than management and that our
modern civilization continues to become one of cooperative endeavor.
They further postulate that the most important factor in the effective-
ness with which people work together is largely that of the ability
of those in managerial positions. 109

The principles as stated in this book are believed by the
authors to apply equally well in any level of management and to any
kind of enterprise. However, they point out that although a science
of management may be developed, that they believe the "managerial
job will ever be to a great extent an art." 110

108 Ibid., p. 63.

109 Harold Koontz and Cyril O'Donnell, Principles of Manage-
ment: An Analysis of Managerial Functions (New York: McGraw-Hill

110 Ibid., p. ix.
In discussing their position that management is an art, they refer to Chester Barnard who has called this "behavioral knowledge." The authors use the term "know-how," and "the use of skill or ingenuity, and the systematic application of knowledge in the accomplishment of a desired result."\(^{111}\)

In supporting their position that all managerial positions, regardless of the enterprise, use the same principles, they place their argument upon the fact that they are all engaged in the task of getting things done through people.

Their reason for organization is stated as follows:

The reason for organization must be found in the need for effective and efficient cooperation. As Barnard emphasized, human beings are forced to cooperate in order to achieve their personal goals because of their inherent biological, or physical, limitations. Given cooperation based on these essential limitations, there arise, in addition, social and psychological factors that tend to limit individual abilities for self-satisfaction and make cooperation desirable. Since cooperation can be more productive and less costly in most instances with some kind of organization, the basic reason for organization lies in the economy of attainment of objectives deemed by a group to be desirable.\(^{112}\)

Koontz and O'Donnell express their concern over "spans of control," and "layering" of hierarchical levels by placing the emphasis on loss of morale. They point out that in an organization which has an extended vertical chain of command that the workers are separated from the decision makers, which in turn causes the individual to feel he is just a cog in a wheel. Individuals wish to feel needed, important, and belonging. It is not very likely that individuals who are submerged

\(^{111}\)Tbid., pp. 10-11. \(^{112}\)Tbid., p. 66.
under such a "layering" will be able to develop a capacity for self-reliance and initiative. 113

In the final analyses, however, such factors as span of control and "layerings" must be considered in the context of the institution and its goals and objectives. There appears to be no established principle, except perhaps in the military.

Koontz and O'Donnell place considerable emphasis upon the position of the department head in the following words:

"Without coordinated allocation of authority to department heads throughout the enterprise, the various departments cannot become a smoothly working team properly harmonized for the accomplishment of enterprise objectives." 114

In speaking of the decentralization of authority the authors point out that "it is a question, not of what kind of authority, but of how much authority is delegated to subordinates in an organization. . . . The propositions are always in terms of "more or less"--in terms of "how much" and not "whether." Their discussion also contains the following:

"... it can be said that some decentralization is a characteristic of all organization. There cannot be absolute decentralization of authority, for if a manager should delegate all his authority, his status as a manager would cease to exist and his position in the organization structure would, in fact, be eliminated. In this event, too, there would be no organization. Centralization and decentralization are, therefore, tendencies; they are qualities like "hot" and "cold."" 116

Further, the authors point out that decentralization leads to fulfilling various desires of man such as innate desire to create, to

be free, and to have status. In addition to these intangibles, some executives see the use of this desire for freedom leading to economic efficiency.

Koontz and O'Donnell point out that the use of organizational charts have both advantages and disadvantages. However, it is their conclusion that all institutions should have an organizational chart, stating that it is hardly surprising to find that those firms which had well defined organizational charts also appear to have the soundest organization plans. And in putting other principles of good organization to work they suggest the following:

1. **Principle of Unity of Objective:** The organization as a whole and every part of it must contribute to the attainment of the enterprise objectives.

2. **Principle of Efficiency:** An organization should attain its objectives with a minimum of unsought consequences, or costs.

3. **Span of Management Principle:** There is a limit to the number of persons an individual can effectively manage, even though that limit is not finite for every case will vary with the complexity of the relationships supervised and the ability of managers and subordinates.

4. **The Scalar Principle:** In every enterprise, the ultimate authority must rest somewhere, and there must be a clear line from this point to every subordinate position in the organization.

5. **Principle of Responsibility:** The responsibility of the subordinate to his superior for authority received by delegation is absolute, and no superior can escape responsibility for the authorized activities of his subordinates.

6. **Principle of Parity of Authority and Responsibility:** The responsibility exacted for actions taken under authority delegated cannot be greater than that implied by the authority delegated, nor should it be less.

7. **Principle of Unity of Command:** Since responsibility is a personal matter and the superior-subordinate relationship
an eminently personal thing, each subordinate should have only one superior.

8. **The Authority-level Principle**: At some level in an organization, authority exists for making any decision within the competence of the enterprise, and only decisions that cannot be made at a given level should be referred upward in an organization.

9. **Principle of Division of Work**: The structure of an organization should so divide and group the activities of the enterprise that they contribute most effectively and efficiently to enterprise objectives.

10. **Principle of Functional Definition**: The content of every position and department must be clearly defined with regard to the activities expected, with respect to the authority delegations made, and with respect to the authority relationships involved within it and between it and other positions.

11. **Principle of Balance**: The application of principles or techniques must be balanced in the light of the over-all effectiveness of the organization in meeting enterprise objectives.

12. **Principle of Flexibility**: It being the task of managers to provide for attaining objectives in the face of changing environments, provisions must be made for building in organizational flexibility.

13. **Principle of Continuity**: The organization must provide means for its own continuity.

14. **Principle of Leadership Facilitation**: The structure and authority delegations of the organization must be so designed as to facilitate the leadership position of the manager.\(^{117}\)

In discussing the problem of university instruction in management the authors point out that management cannot be taught in the same way that, say, chemical research is taught.

... the manager must work through people, and the ability of the potential manager to do this cannot be discerned with on-the-job experience. However, there is one thing that can be done

\(^{117}\)Ibid., pp. 296-299.
by the universities. This is to transmit to the student an understanding of the managerial functions and the principles underlying them and to provide him with a background of knowledge and skill in the application of scientific methodology. From this point on, it is largely the responsibility of the employer to give managerial candidates an opportunity to learn through experience.\textsuperscript{118}

In their discussion of the most important factor of leadership, the authors believe powers of persuasion to be the most important. They state: "The . . . executive is quite helpless unless he can persuade his subordinates to carry out efficiently the operational steps essential to achieving the enterprise purpose."\textsuperscript{119}

Their discussion of ego satisfaction which is derived from work revolves around their principle of "harmony of objective." They believe it is the manager's position to "harness" the individuals personal drives and fuse these with the objectives of the organization. They further state that managers should not insist that all subordinates have the same objectives; that each individual should seek goals that will lead to personal satisfaction. "Indeed, the alert manager will go one step further. He will suggest the goals and attach to them the rewards for which men strive."\textsuperscript{120}

The activities of the manager are seen as being extremely diverse, but the need is pointed out repeatedly that it is the responsibility of the manager to motivate people, and to "personalize his contacts with subordinates."\textsuperscript{121} Further, they believe autocratic directional techniques should be shunned as much as possible; that

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{118}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 309.
  \item \textsuperscript{119}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 312.
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only in cases where the workers actually prefer autocratic direction, should it be utilized. "This conclusion rests upon the acknowledge-
ment of our high standards of literacy, mobility of personnel, and our
commitment to democratic methods." They emphasize the point by com-
menting that it is "essential," in a democratic society, for persons
in places of responsibility to know how to get along with people and
respect each individual's personal dignity.

In discussing the qualities of leadership the authors are led
to support conclusions which were arrived at by F. H. Sanford. These
conclusions are that leadership cannot be studied except in the total
context of the situation. "Characteristics" of leaders are insuffi-
cient if not considered in this total context. The three areas de-
lineated as facets of leadership are: (1) the leader and his psycho-
logical attributes, (2) the follower with his problems, attitudes,
and needs, and (3) the group situation in which followers and leaders
relate with one another. According to the authors there are a few
characteristics of leaders that appear to be common to all situations.
These are:

1. There is general agreement among psychologists that leaders
possess an intelligence somewhat above the average of their
followers. The chief difficulty the highly intelligent person has seems to be that of communication.

122 Ibid., p. 417.
45-49.
2. Successful leaders tend to have broad and well-rounded interests, a reflection, perhaps, of an extensive curiosity and good instruction.

3. Since language is necessary for communication, it is not surprising that leaders ordinarily possess unusual verbal facility.

4. Leaders are usually mentally and emotionally mature. Mental maturity, frequently though incorrectly referred to as common sense or good judgment, includes habits of scientific methodology and understanding. The possession of emotional balance is even more important.

5. Leaders are possessed, too, by a powerful inner drive. They feel, or at least act as though they feel, an extreme urgency to satisfy their personal drives. In leadership they see the best way of achieving these ends and, as a consequence, want to lead, actively seeking out leadership opportunities.

6. A leader, finally, understands the importance of cooperation. Those who have been successful in leadership roles are, by definition, those who have persuaded followers to cooperate. However, researchers may not conclude from this situation that leaders actively practice the social skills. There is no proved relationship between these variables.

The authors conclude that a "statement of some general truths can be developed" from the study of leadership and that these relevant principles may be stated as follows:

1. **Principle of Individual Contribution to Objective:** In guiding and overseeing subordinates, the manager must so communicate the requirements for job performance to subordinates and so motivate them to perform as to assure the most effective contribution possible to the group objectives sought.

2. **Principle of Harmony of Objectives:** In guiding and overseeing subordinates, the manager must make the attainment of individual subordinates' objectives harmonize with the attainment of group objectives.

3. **Principle of Efficiency of Direction:** Direction is efficient if the techniques, communications, and activities involved

---

result in the attainment of group objectives with a minimum of dissatisfactions, costs, and or other unsought consequences.

4. **Principle of Unity of Command**: Direction is most effective when subordinates are responsible to one superior.

5. **Principle of Direct Supervision**: The interpersonal nature of the superior-subordinate relationship requires that the manager supplement objective methods of supervision and control with direct personal contact in guiding the efforts of subordinates and over-seeing their accomplishment of tasks.

6. **Principle of Appropriateness of Direction Technique**: Effective direction requires that the technique used to appropriate to the person supervised and the task to be accomplished.

7. **Principle of Managerial Communication**: Managerial positions are the communication centers in organization and the manager the principal communication medium in organized enterprise.

8. **Principle of Comprehension**: Effective communication requires that recipients actually comprehend information intended to be conveyed.

9. **Principle of Information**: the direct flow of information is most effective for communication.

10. **Principle of Strategic Use of Informal Organization**: It is incumbent upon managers to recognize and utilize informal organization constructively.

11. **Principle of Leadership**: Ability to lead effectively is essential to effective direction.\(^\text{126}\)

The authors believe that if these principles are followed then those who are in management positions will truly be leaders.

One of their concluding statements on the discussion of leadership is:

... reliance upon the authority of position is not enough. For maximum results men need to be led, not driven. Consequently, managers will be most effective if they have the qualities and take those courses of action which will make their subordinates see in them the best opportunities of realizing personal objectives.\(^\text{127}\)

Leibenstein has practically nothing to say about leadership and administration in his book *Economic Theory and Organizational Analysis*. He does support the concept of team or group effort, when the economic needs are best satisfied in this fashion. "Many tasks are beyond the strength and capacities of a single individual; many others it would be uneconomic for one person to undertake."\(^{128}\)

**RENSIS LIKERT**

Likert believes the central and most important task of management is to learn how to manage the human component in an enterprise because humans are inevitably the source which initiates action. All of the equipment which the enterprise may own is of no use without qualified personnel to operate this equipment. "Every aspect of a firm's activities is determined by the competence, motivation, and general effectiveness of its human organization."\(^{129}\)

In discussing his System 4 management (Participative Group), he emphasizes the supportive and ego-building role of the manager. His principle is stated as follows:

The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and in all relationships within the organization, each member, in the light of his background, values, desires, and expectations, will view the experience as supportive and one

---


which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance.\textsuperscript{130}

Rather than the traditional "line and staff" flow chart, System 4 uses Likert's "linking pin" theory. This is an overlapping group form of structure where each group is linked to the rest of the organization or other groups by means of a person who is a member of two groups; this person is the "linking pin." The concept relies heavily upon maximum participation from all members of the group; communication is free and open in all directions—down, up, and sideways. The supervisor is held responsible, however, for all decisions made by the group; it is his responsibility to fuse his group into an efficient organization which can make proper decisions. "The superior is accountable for all decisions, for their execution, and for the results."\textsuperscript{131}

High performance aspirations are essential to the development of System 4. These goals must be held by all members of the group and not just by the leaders. A number of research studies have shown that all employees of an organization desire to be proud of their job and organization. The application of the principles of System 4 give them this opportunity. The successful organization not only meets the need of the worker in giving him security and economic rewards, but also gives him psychological rewards; thus developing high performance aspirations.

Likert emphasizes that the use of group methods of supervision does not mean that there is not a place for leadership. Leadership is

\textsuperscript{130}Ibid., p. 47. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{131}Ibid., p. 51.
just as crucial in this situation as in any other. He states:

... The leader has many essential tasks in a System 4 organization. He sees that all members of the group are well trained in group decision making and in group interaction processes as well as in the technical aspects of their work. He seeks through both group and individual supervision to help each salesman set high and realistic goals for himself and strive to reach them. He is an important source of technical knowledge, is responsible for seeing that the unit is efficiently organized and that planning, scheduling, and related activities are done well. He sees that the principle of supportive relationship is applied. He links the unit to the rest of the enterprise. He is a source of restless dissatisfaction with present accomplishments and a stimulus to innovation. 132

Building peer-group loyalty is one of the important tasks of the manager. Numerous research studies have indicated that those groups which have such loyalty are among the most efficient. Likert's findings suggest that those managers who are applying the principle of supportive relationships and group methods of supervision are succeeding in developing peer-group loyalty.

Likert's research findings also indicate that coordination is improved by using System 4:

The results ... show that the more extensively a manager applies the principle of supportive relationships and uses group methods of decision making and supervision, the greater is the amount of his influence and the greater is the amount of influence the men in these offices are able to exert on matters affecting the performance of the sales office. The men's ability to exercise influence, however, is not obtained at the expense of the manager's capacity to exert influence. In the high-influence offices all hierarchical levels can exert more influence: the national headquarters, the managers, and the men. 133

Peer leadership, as mentioned earlier, can become potent in the application of System 4 management. Research has shown that groups

132 Ibid., p. 58.  
133 Ibid., p. 69.
which allow and encourage peer leadership show more success than other groups. Peer leadership allows the individuals to gain in status and recognition, creating a greater peer-loyalty. Likert's research findings indicate that these groups will be more successful than other groups which may rely upon "contests," "economic rewards," or peer competition. He points out that contests and economic rewards to the winners of contests result in the winner keeping what he knows to himself.

Likert reports that his studies indicate that "time" is an important variable in evaluating the results after applying System 4 management. Originally he and other researchers expected to find morale and productivity positively related. The findings, however, were inconsistent. Several factors were found to be involved. These were:

. . . (1) the difference between the leader's report of his behavior and his actual behavior; (2) inaccurate or inadequate measurements of productivity; (3) the influence of the subordinate's values, expectations, and skills upon his perception of his superior's behavior and his response to it; (4) the effect of the manager's capacity to exercise influence upward, and (5) time.134

Of these factors Likert believes time is the most important. The findings indicate that much longer time-span is needed between the initiation of the causal variables and the final end-result variables. He states that an "appreciable" period of time is needed before improvement may be noted. In another statement he says: "All the variables need to be measured for at least three years and preferably five."135

134 Ibid., p. 79. 135 Ibid., p. 95.
Additional findings show that it is necessary for the various components of an enterprise to work together if it is to succeed. The operations of any organization are inter-related and must, therefore, work in harmony with each other.

Likert states that the human-relation approach has not been very successful since it has not recognized the real problem. The employee will only be adequately motivated when a truly basic change occurs in management moving towards System 4. True participation is essential. Accurate measurements must be taken of the causal and intervening variables and management must understand this measurement and understand how to use it in applying System 4 management.

Likert does not see decentralization as the answer to the problems of modern complex organizations. He points out that this does not eliminate differences between positions or departments, but that it merely changes the relationships. He sees the answer in or through coordination, both horizontally as well as vertically. He believes this approach will call for a new type of organization where decisions are made through two or more channels as opposed to the older hierarchical system. He lists four conditions which must exist in an organization for it to develop proper coordination and find solutions to its problems. These are:

1. It must provide high levels of cooperative behavior between superiors and subordinates and especially among peers. Favorable attitudes and confidence and trust are needed among its members.

2. It must have the organizational structure and the interaction skills required to solve differences and conflicts and to attain creative solutions.
3. It must possess the capacity to exert influence and to create motivation and coordination without traditional forms of line authority.

4. Its decision-making processes and superior-subordinate relationships must be such as to enable a person to perform his job well and without hazard when he has two or more superiors.\textsuperscript{136}

This approach can only be taken under a System 4 type management.

One of the major problems in the old line-authority system of management in relation to the above four points, is that it recognizes the rule of only one boss or superior for each person. Likert points out that this idea is a carry over from the old concept of line authority and "hire-and-fire" authority. This, of course, is based purely upon the idea that man is going to continue to cooperate because he cannot afford the economic punishment of being "fired." This is an unrealistic concept in the present society, however. Also, sufficient research is available to show that economic motivation is not the strongest motivation available. The individual who is serving under two immediate superiors in this new system, is seen as a person who can add information to both superiors and groups and thus enhance coordination and improved decisions.

Likert states that impressive evidence is available to show that a leader gains considerably more information from participative groups than from the older man-to-man interaction. However, he must be prepared for such groups to offer criticisms of him from time to time, and for the group to occasionally have a different opinion or

\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 158.
make a decision he does not at first agree to. Obviously, group leaders need skill in dealing with groups. They must understand group interaction processes in order to deal with conflict and differences.

In discussing his "linking-pin" concept, he emphasizes that it is essential for every group or department within the enterprise to function in this coordinated manner. Group decision making must operate on all levels. The system creates cross-functional work groups which enhance coordination. A distinct advantage is that it provides both horizontal and vertical coordination within the organization.

The four Systems as used by Likert might be briefly summarized as follows:

System I: Exploitive Authoritative -
Orders are issued
Information flow downward
Bulk of decisions made at top of management
Superior has no confidence and trust in subordinates

System II: Benevolent Authoritative -
Orders issued, opportunity to comment may or may not exist
Information flow mostly downward
Policy decisions made at top, many decisions within prescribed framework made at lower levels
Superior has condescending confidence and trust in subordinates

System III: Consultative -
Orders issued after discussion with subordinates
Information flow both down and up
Broad policy and general decisions made at top, more specific decisions at lower levels
Superior has substantial but not complete trust and confidence in subordinates

\(^{137}\)Ibid., pp. 174-75.
System IV: Participative Group -
Avoids issuing orders except in emergencies, goals established
through group participation
Information flow down, up, and with peers
Subordinates involved in decision making
Superior has complete confidence and trust in subordinates

His research findings, which have been gathered over a period
of several years and in various types of organizations, indicates that
System IV management is consistently judged to be the best management
practice.

JAMES G. MARCH and HERBERT A. SIMON

Early in their book the authors speak of the deficiency of the
"classical administrative science." They hope to show that the clas-
sical organization theories present only a small portion of the total
problem and theory relevant to organizational behavior. In discussing
the limitations of the classical approach they mention the following:

1. The motivational assumptions underlying the theories are
incomplete and consequently inaccurate.

2. There is little appreciation of the role of intraorganiza-
tional conflict of interests in defining limits of organiza-
tional behavior.

3. The constraints placed on the human being by his limitations
as a complex information-processing system are given little
consideration.

4. Little attention is given to the role of cognition in task
identification and classification as well as in decision.

5. The phenomenon of program elaboration receives little
emphasis.138
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They have stated that the traditional organization theory views the individual as a "simple machine." Under this system, therefore, the leaders are forced to think of individuals and their relation to the organization through the constraints imposed by the capacities, speeds, durabilities, and costs of these "simple machines." They also accuse the traditional approach of having a very limited view of the individual in the organization. They say this theory makes rather severe assumptions about the environment of an individual, the impact of the environment upon him, and his response to it.

March and Simon refer to several recent students of bureaucracy and to their writings to emphasize how these writers have changed the Weberian concept of bureaucracy to include some of the more recent findings. Specifically, they have observed how the use of traditional theories have resulted in unanticipated outcomes. They have come to the conclusion that other factors must be considered.

The authors point out that individuals make their own decisions and choose their own goals. In addition, they come to the organization with prior sets of values on the basis of which they make their decisions while in the organization.

In an effort to create in the individual an identification with the group and thus develop group cohesion, March and Simon propose the following five hypotheses:

1. The greater the perceived prestige of the group, the stronger the propensity of an individual to identify with it and vice versa.

139 Ibid., p. 34.
2. The greater the extent to which goals are perceived as shared among members of a group, the stronger the propensity of the individual to identify with the group and vice versa.

3. The more frequent the interaction between an individual and the members of a group, the stronger the propensity of the individual to identify with the group; and vice versa.

4. The greater the number of individual needs satisfied in the group, the stronger the propensity of the individual to identify with the group; and vice versa.

5. The less the amount of competition between the members of a group and an individual, the stronger the propensity of the individual to identify with the group; and vice versa.\(^{140}\)

The authors refer to earlier works by Barnard and Simon to make their point about "organizational equilibrium." The term is used to indicate the organization's success in satisfying the participants and therefore motivating them for continued participation. The central principles of this concept was stated by Simon, Smithburg, and Thompson.\(^{141}\)

1. An organization is a system of interrelated social behaviors of a number of persons whom we shall call the participants in the organization.

2. Each participant and each group of participants receives from the organization inducements in return for which he makes to the organization contributions.

3. Each participant will continue his participation in an organization only as long as the inducements offered him are as great or greater (measured in terms of his values and in terms of the alternatives open to him) than the contributions he is asked to make.

4. The contributions provided by the various groups of participants are the source from which the organization manufactures

\(^{140}\)Ibid., p. 65.

the inducements offered to participants.

5. Hence, an organization is "solvent"--and will continue in existence--only so long as the contributions are sufficient to provide inducements in large enough measure to draw forth these contributions.\textsuperscript{112}

The authors conclude that there must be an underlying structure in the organization that permits this equilibrium. By this they mean a social system which involves the participants in a high degree of "interrelationship and substantial differentiation from other systems within the total social milieu."\textsuperscript{113}

March and Simon believe there are three factors which contribute to intergroup conflict. Excluding individual conflict these three are "a positive\textit{ felt need for joint decision-making} and of either a difference in goals or a difference in perceptions. \dots \textsuperscript{114} They stress that where there is joint decision making, it is important that information be shared. If information is not adequately shared the result will be intra-organizational disagreement.

JOHN M. PFIFFNER and FRANK P. SHERWOOD

In the Foreword to their book\textsuperscript{115} the authors state that it is their intention to present "introductory materials" which seek a middle ground between the two extremes of administrative organization literature. The two extremes they see are that on one end we find the traditional framework of job content, a rather mechanistic

\textsuperscript{112}March and Simon, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{113}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 89.  \textsuperscript{114}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 127.
approach to the problem. On the other end they find the human behavior approach.

The authors state that out of the last 2,000 years man has gradually moved to the point where we now consider the rights of the individual in the group. Actually, they conclude that this has only taken place within the last two hundred years, after man begin to find that it was not necessary for him to belong to a group for protection.

Also, during the last twenty-five years sufficient research has been done to show that the old concept of national-legal authority and/or straight-line authority are the least successful way to obtain long term benefits and maximum effort from individuals in the organization. The new styles of management must be supportive and positive, leading to relationships that are coordinative in nature.

Pfiffner and Sherwood point out that the same factors which have complicated our organizations are the same forces which have contributed to complicate the entire social fabric. They include:

(1) the liberation of the individual in our social philosophy and policies;
(2) the development of new understandings of the nature of human cooperation;
(3) the broadening range of organization goals; and
(4) the movement toward task specialization.\footnote{Ibid., p. 14.}

Because organizations are subject to the same forces which impinge upon society as a whole, these factors must be considered in
any serious study of organizations. It also indicates that a narrow mechanistic view of an organization is inadequate.

The following represents the authors' basic position about the complexity of organizations:

The organization is really an uneasy holding company of individuals reacting as individuals; individuals reacting as parts of small face-to-face groups, and individuals reacting also as parts of smaller organizations. Always there is the individual as an adaptive organism at one end of the scale—and the organization at the other. In between there may be an infinite number of constellations which influence the total behavior of an organization. The point deserves to be emphasized. Individuals do not divorce themselves from their own norms, attitudes, and personality needs simply because they join an organization; neither do they necessarily sacrifice their own dependence on various types of group and associational memberships. Only if we understand the full range of loyalty options open to an individual in the average situation do we begin to sample the complexity of organization and the patterns of behavior within it.147

Conflicts develop because people have different goals, perceptions, and needs. There will not only be differences of goals between individuals, but also between individuals and groups, groups and groups, and groups and the organization. The possibilities of conflicts under such an arrangement are infinite.

There are just as many possibilities for conflict when perceptions of individuals are considered. "Decisions are taken and attitudes are formed on the basis of perceptions of reality that are shaped by experience, the environment, and indeed by the goals and expectations one holds consciously or unconsciously."148

The authors maintain that individuals in organizations are not only concerned about goals and satisfactions in the organization but

147 Ibid., p. 34.  
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are also concerned about the processes by which decisions are made. As scarce resources are allotted in the organization, they wish to be involved in the process of determining how to obtain their share. In addition they wish to participate in making any decision which affects their life.

Of importance to university management is the realization that the university is more open to change by the social forces of the time because its goals are less clearly defined than those of the business world.

The authors have included in their book a "Quick View" of trends in organization theory. This chart shows the changes that have occurred within the past twenty-five years (see Table 1).

The discussion of span of control, although concerned with government organization, may also have applicability to the university setting. They claim that the span of control is large in most government affairs because there are certain and almost "irresistible" forces which make it so:

1. There is a tendency toward a large number of separate departments because the "empire builder" type of department head wants to be answerable, if at all, only to the chief executive or governing body.

2. Each pressure group desires its own pet administrative activity to be set up in an independent department rather than embodied as a bureau or division in another department.

3. Every functional chief desires access to the seat of authority without going through intervening hierarchical steps.

4. Each functional chief desires such access to the legislature or governing body as may pertain to the position of department head.
TABLE 1

TRENDS IN ORGANIZATION THEORY
A QUICK VIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>Social Dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Task Hierarchy</td>
<td>Social Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency as a Mechanical Process</td>
<td>Efficiency as a Human Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization as a Bureaucratic Structure</td>
<td>Organization as a Social Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control through Command</td>
<td>Control through Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority from the Top Down</td>
<td>Authority from the Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership by Authority</td>
<td>Leadership by Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision as an Individual, Highly Centralized Act</td>
<td>Decisions as Collegial, Situational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regimented Work Environment</td>
<td>Democratic Work Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Change by Fiat</td>
<td>Technological Change by Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social or Financial Incentive</td>
<td>Social and Financial Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job as Subsistence</td>
<td>Job as Satisfying Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning as Crisis Technique</td>
<td>Planning as Formalized Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete and Delayed Information</td>
<td>Complete and Current Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Administration Dichotomy</td>
<td>Policy and Administration Continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit with Buccaneering</td>
<td>Profit with Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1lb9 Ibid., p. 108.
5. Those interested in particular governmental activities fear that inept and dilatory handling of functional affairs may result if they are placed in what is merely one of the many units in a large department. They are apprehensive of possible frustration and of lack of enthusiasm of departmental officials.

6. The sponsors of new administrative activities do not want to become units in an old department because they imagine that they will become stifled in the red tape of an organization which they believe already too large for effective action.\textsuperscript{150}

In their discussion of "Coordination at the Top" the authors point to findings by the Laboratory of Social Relations at Harvard University as a guide to conducting successful committee meetings. These suggestions appeared in "how to" terms in \textit{The Management Review} in 1954. They are here in an abbreviated form:

1. Avoid appointing committees larger than seven members unless necessary to obtain representation of all relevant points of view.

2. Avoid appointing committees as small as two or three members if the power problem between members is likely to be critical.

3. Choose members who will tend to fall naturally into a moderate gradient of participation.

4. Avoid the assumption that a good committee is made up of one leader and several followers.

5. In actual procedure, start with facts if possible.

6. Solicit the opinion and experiences of others, especially when disagreements begin to crop up.

7. When somebody else is talking, listen, and keep indicating your reactions actively.

8. Keep your eyes on the group.

\textsuperscript{150} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 158-59.
9. When you scent trouble coming, break off the argument and backtrack to further work on the facts and direct experience.

10. Keep your ear to the ground. No recipe or set of rules can substitute for constant, sensitive and sympathetic attention to what is going on. . . .

ROBERT PRESTHUS

Presthus makes a basic assumption that social values and institutions mold individual personality and behavior. Thus, an individual's views, beliefs, biases, etc., are developed by the interacting forces of the environment in which he lives. Large organizations are seen as "educational" in that they are constantly attempting to inculcate the individual with the organization's accepted positions and policies. This inevitably creates tensions between the individual and the organization which are much sharper than the tensions in the larger society because the larger society is more fluid or transitory.

In discussing the official in the bureaucratic organization, Presthus identifies these positions as "a permanent vocation, a career for which he has been specifically trained. In most societies its conditions include a certain social esteem."

In discussing the bureaucratic organization Presthus refers to Weber's definition or characteristics of such organizations:

1. Fixed and official jurisdictional areas, which are regularly ordered by rules, that is, by laws or administrative regulations.


2. Principles of hierarchy and levels of graded authority that ensure a firmly ordered system of super- and sub-ordination in which higher offices supervise lower ones.

3. Administration based upon written documents; the body of officials engaged in handling these documents and files, along with other material apparatus, make up a "bureau" or "office."

4. Administration by full-time officials who are thoroughly and expertly trained.

5. Administration by general rules which are quite stable and comprehensive. The discusson of bureaucratic organizations Presthus defines "big organizations" as:

... systems large enough to prevent face-to-face interpersonal relations among most of their members. Regardless of their product, such organizations tend to operate similarly. They all arrange individual skills and relationships in order to secure continuity and stability. They all develop standardized methods to handle their major activities. They all exhibit a built-in-conflict between authority based upon position and authority based upon skill. They are consciously designed to achieve a major purpose, i.e., to produce steel, automobiles, public service, news, educated men, entertainment, etc.

One difficulty in studying organizations is that several disciplines are needed in order to understand all aspects of the enterprise. In particular the disciplines needed are: cultural psychology, sociology, and political science. Each of these areas study organizations from its own frame of reference and makes no attempt, or very little, to make a cross discipline approach to the problem. Presthus believes, however, that if one can avoid the pitfalls of narrow specialization and has had experience in graduate training and an apprenticeship in higher education that he could study the subject properly.

153 Ibid., p. 5.  
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The organizational conditions of a bureaucracy tend to develop three types of personalities according to this author. These are:

The *upward-mobiles* are those who react positively to the bureaucratic situation and succeed in it. The *indifferents* are the uncommitted majority who see these jobs as mere instruments to obtain off-work satisfactions. The *ambivalents* are a small, perpetually disturbed minority who can neither renounce their claims for status and power nor play the disciplined role that would enable them to cash in such claims.155

Pres thus also points out that many other writers have developed names for varying personality types in organizations. He lists the following after cautioning the reader that all of the terms lend themselves to "oversimplification and misinterpretation":

... such types have a long and distinguished intellectual history, beginning in the Western work with Plato's "philosopher-kings," "guardians," and "workers," and Aristotle's "democratic" and "oligarchic" types of political states. More recent examples (cited throughout the analysis) include Pareto's "lions" and "foxes," Mosca's "ruling class," Tommis' "Gemeinschaft" and "Gesellschaft," Weber's "charismatic" and "bureaucratic" leaders, Veblen's "financiers" and "engineers," Lasswell's "political administrators," and "political agitators," Riesman's "inner and other-directed" men, Merton's "locals," and "cosmopolitans," and Mills' "abstracted empiricists" and "grand theorists." Psychology of course is replete with typologies, including Jung's "introverts" and "extroverts," James' "tender-minded" and "tough-minded." ... Used judiciously, such types have the good virtue of helping one order the infinite complexity of the real world. Indeed, it is hard to see how conceptualization in any field can proceed without such generalizations.156

In such organizations it is difficult for the individual to maintain a secure identity and a feeling of autonomy. As the values of the organization become all-important he is frequently left with a feeling that his identity has been submerged and he is thus led to frustration.

155 Ibid., p. 15. 156 Ibid., p. 9.
Organizations such as educational institutions have gradually accepted the bureaucratic characteristics in the belief that bigness will bring efficiency to its operations. This, however, has created an adverse effect among the professionals who work in the educational environment. Prest thus states his reasoning on this issue as follows:

Such changes in the character of the work place tend to change the character of work. Here, the altered role and status of the professional man is of particular interest. Professional standing becomes precarious in big organizations where power, loyalty, and status rather than skill are the source of influence. It seems clear that the professional's traditional independence and his style of work are being undercut. Increasingly he has become an employee in a huge organization which alone can provide the capital plant, the laboratory, and the instruments necessary for the use of his skill. He becomes part of an intensely pragmatic bureaucratic structure. Since he no longer works for himself, it becomes increasing difficult for him to set his own pace, to decide how his energy will be spent, and to work in terms of knowledge rather than of time.  

Prest thus continues to point out that the professional believes knowledge in his specialty is more important than a hierarchical position. In the bureaucratic organization, however, it is the official who holds the power and allocates resources. He sees this conflict as being "built-in" and thus an inherent characteristic of the bureaucratic organization.

Before going into a lengthy discussion concerning authoritarianism Prest thus makes the following statement:

Research shows that both the amount of influence that a leader exerts and the amount he attempts to exert increase with group acceptance of him as a person. There is some evidence, moreover, that executives rarely fail because of lack of substantive knowledge; inadequate personal relations are more often the cause.  

\[157\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp.} \ 20-21.\]  
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He believes that the upward-mobiles and the indifferents encourage bureaucracy with their attitudes while the ambivalent is the only one who finds authority threatening. This leads him to a major proposition: "Reactions to authority constitute the most critical variable in organizational accommodation."159 It is through the reactions to authority that each of these categories obtain their names.

Authoritarians normally attempt to justify their position of authority by rationalizing in terms of ethical and ideological principles. If these fail, they fall back upon legal authority. Neither traditional nor charismatic authority can usually serve the authoritarian, although it is possible. And Presthus points out that even when traditional and charismatic leadership exists there is a tendency for it to slowly gravitate towards legal authority.

Presthus differentiates between status and prestige, by pointing out that status is a position that one holds and prestige as the deference attached to the position. In a bureaucracy the status and prestige symbols are readily observed and it is apparent the official and not the professional receive the greatest rewards. Presthus says: 
"... differential status allocations reinforce the authority of organizational leaders."160 And that "... Essentially, the status system reinforces authority by structuring interpersonal relations in terms of the relative prestige of the actors."161

It is possible for this differentiation to create an effective organization if all are willing to play the proper roles. "Gamemanship"

can be forgotten as each person pursues his assigned role. According to Presthus:

Interpersonal relations can be smoothly negotiated if both parties play their roles skillfully, the senior by masking his dominance, the junior by discreet validation of the superior's prestige and wisdom. The interplay of staging and learned deference attitudes makes manipulation rather than command the common organizational currency.\[162\]

Returning to the individual, Presthus states: "It is known that most individuals need recognition and a sense of belonging; the strength of this need is shown by the fact that exclusion is among the most painful of group sanctions."\[163\] Thus, some upward-mobiles strive for research grants which will give them personal and institutional prestige while other upward-mobiles will strive for official positions. Each, however, will be accepting the bureaucratic system as it is presently structured.

In his discussion of the professional's role and problems in bureaucratic organizations, Presthus emphasizes the following points:

When one turns to professional work . . . psychological factors become even more significant. Not only are professionals unusually sensitive to status symbols, but there is a public expectation that they will enjoy their work . . . the professional, who appears at the top of every job satisfaction scale, has long enjoyed a maximum of control over the conditions of his work.\[164\]

Presthus feels that organizational methods have been inappropriately applied to the university setting. In an area where intellectual attainments are, or should be, of the greatest value, other goals have been substituted more in keeping with bureaucratic organizations.

\[162\] Ibid., p. 154.

\[163\] Ibid., p. 156.

\[164\] Ibid., pp. 236-38.
There is an inevitable irritation among the faculty. The basic conflict appears to be that professors are people-oriented while administrators are concerned with financial and functional problems. Thus, the author believes many faculties consist of indifferents who cannot honor the status system of the bureaucratic organization but can honor the system of their profession. They become "cosmopolitans."

The ambivalent appears to be the person with characteristics that are uniquely unsuited to the bureaucratic organization. He cannot accept the goals of the organization and he finds it almost impossible to accept conditions of participation in his own group. His chief benefit to the organization is seen as an agent of change.

An organization appears to gain strength as it is able to change and adapt. Thus, conflict is seen by some to be an advantage rather than a disadvantage. It is only through a thorough discussion of the merits of a proposal that the ultimate value can be ascertained. Participation in this respect is seen to be central to a healthy organization.

Presthus speaks of the possibilities of the future role of organizations in the following manner:

Organization's role must indeed be an auxiliary one of providing the conditions that will encourage individual creativity.165

In sum, there is apparently some recognition that individual growth and creativity are often at odds with organizational logic. Even if this perspective has been forced upon us by the Russian economic and military thrust, its results may prove generally desirable. Although too much attention is undoubtedly being given to physical science, greater discrimination in our use of
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bureaucratic structure and norms may result. Perhaps we can retain them in mass production and applied spheres to which they are nicely suited, while sharply modifying them in art, education, and scientific research. If we can also abandon some of our pragmatic notions about "efficiency," humanistic values will benefit, and the need for a permissive work climate in creative areas may become clearer. Certainly, the first step in such a reorientation is an awareness of organizational dysfunctions.166

F. J. ROETHLISBERGER and W. J. DICKSON

The authors discuss the inadequacies of considering the organization only in its technical aspects. This formal approach does not allow many important aspects of an organization to be considered, particularly if one is attempting to understand the behavior of the worker.

One important use they found of the informal organization among workers was that it protected them from change or threat of change in interactions which they prefer; e.g., established routines of work or personal interrelations. They discuss the element of change, pointing out that since the worker is at the bottom of the hierarchy, "He is always in the position of having to accommodate himself to changes which he does not initiate."167 Because of his position he has little, if anything, to say about decisions which affect his daily interactions. This presents a real threat to him.

The authors point out that the worker is not prepared for rapid change because his life style is developed over a long period of time

166Ibid., p. 323.

and is based upon sentiment; not upon rationalization or logic. Demanding constant change interferes with those social values which are most important to him and therefore lead to frustrations, which eventually take the form of anti-establishment or some form of opposition to the technical organization. The study led the authors to the following conclusion:

If this analysis is correct, the moral is apparent. If human collaboration is based on social codes which regulate the behavior and attitudes of individuals to each other, no logical contrivances by themselves can substitute for them. Technological advance must presuppose and make use of such codes. Any plan to promote collaboration among the workers, therefore, has to be thought of in relation to its effect on the actual social organization of the workers and not merely from a logical viewpoint alone. Successful management of any human enterprise depends largely on the ability to introduce more efficient methods without disrupting in the process the social foundations on which collaboration is based.168

HERBERT A. SIMON

Simon appears to believe that too much attention has been given to the aspect of "action" in management literature. He proposes that "decision-making" is equally important if not more so. He says:

If any "theory" is involved, it is that decision-making is the heart of administration, and that the vocabulary of administrative theory must be derived from the logic and psychology of human choice.169

A general theory of administration must include principles of organization that will insure correct decision-making, just as it must include principles that will insure effective action.170

168 Ibid., p. 17.
170 Ibid., p. 1.
In the development of principles he cautions that one should avoid placing particular "weights" to specific factors. Organizations are far too complex and each factor has far too many influences impinging upon it to permit such a rigid approach. Simon believes research in administration will, for some time to come, be interested in attempting to identify and understand the "mechanisms" that are seen in organizational behavior.

In this book he identifies an organization as a:

... complex pattern of communications and other relations in a group of human beings. This pattern provided to each member of the group much of the information, assumptions, goals, and attitudes that enter into his decisions, and provides him also with a set of stable and comprehensible expectations as to what the other members of the group are doing and how they will react to what he says and does. ... 171

Simon proposes that since there are several layers of supervisors in large organizations, there is inevitably a series of modifications due to influences from persons both above and below, which affect decisions before they reach the "operatives." Further, he postulates that if this is true, then the development of an efficient organization is a problem in social psychology. Since the operative is the person who actually produces something within the organization, the focus of attention must be on this person. It thus becomes the responsibility of management to understand how to influence these operatives. Simon uses the word influence purposefully. Other methods, such as "directing," is seen by him as only one way of influencing.
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He emphasizes that decisions are necessarily a compromise since the "ideal" can never be attained. We are constantly looking for solutions which will be the best under the given circumstances.

In his attack upon the literature of administration he points out that it suffers from superficiality, oversimplification, and a lack of realism. In his opinion it has concerned itself too much with "authority," "centralization," "span of control," "function," etc., without adequately exploring the operational functions of each. When principles are stated he maintains that another principle can be found to contradict the first principle. In regards to authority, he points out that in actual practice "authority is usually liberally admixed with suggestion and persuasion."\(^{172}\)

Simon believes an emphasis must be placed upon studies dealing with the social and human aspects of administration. The literature is mainly concerned with mechanistic or technological studies. The human element of "teamwork," "cooperation," and "coordination" are seen as essential to the development of efficient organizations. He emphasizes the importance of understanding that cooperation will not necessarily attain the goals of the organization, regardless of how willing the participants may be, in the absence of coordination of activities. He says:

Administrative organizations are systems of cooperative behavior. The members of the organization are expected to orient their behavior with respect to certain goals that are taken as "organization objectives." This leaves the problem of coordinating their behavior--of providing each one with knowledge of

\(^{172}\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 11.\)
the behaviors of the others upon which he can base his own decisions. In cooperative systems, even though all participants are agreed on the objectives to be attained, they cannot ordinarily be left to themselves in selecting the strategies that will lead to these objectives; for the selection of a correct strategy involves a knowledge of each as to the strategies selected by the other.173

Simon sees five methods by which the organization attempts to influence members of the group. These are:

1. The organization divides work among its members. By giving each a particular task to accomplish, it directs and limits his attention to that task. . . .

2. The organization establishes standard practices.

3. The organization transmits decisions downward (and laterally or even upward) through its ranks by establishing systems of authority and influence. . . . (He recognizes both formal and informal organization in this section.)

4. The organization provides channels of communication running in all directions through which information for decision-making flows. Again these channels are both formal and informal. . . .

5. The organization trains and indoctrinates its members. This might be called the "internalization" of influence, because it injects into the very nervous systems of the organization members the criteria of decision that the organization wishes to employ. . . .174

Within these five influences the organization should emphasize the coordination of the activities of its members.

Simon believes the "criterion of efficiency" to be one of the most important elements in decision-making. He defines this criterion as follows:

The criterion of efficiency demands that, of two alternatives having the same cost, that one be chosen which will lead to the
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greater attainment of the organization objectives; and that, of
two alternatives leading to the same degree of attainment, that
one be chosen which entails the lesser cost.\textsuperscript{175}

The author believes it is essential that each member of the
organization become identified with the organization and that their
objectives become the same. At first the goals are imposed upon him
through authority, but gradually it is expected that the organization
will inculcate him with the values of the organization and these values
will then be "internalized."

The understanding of decision-making requires the observer to
examine many different influences which impinge upon the person making
the decision. It is particularly necessary to understand the sub-
ordinate and his reactions to the decision that has been made. Simon:
emphasizes:

Administrators have increasingly recognized in recent years
that authority, unless buttressed by other forms of influence,
is relatively impotent to control decision in any but a nega-
tive way. The elements entering into all but the most routine
decisions are so numerous and so complex that it is impossible
to control positively more than a few. Unless the subordinate
is himself able to supply most of the premises of decisions,
and to synthesize them adequately, the task of supervision be-
comes hopelessly burdensome.\textsuperscript{176}

The function of review and control processes is an important
factor to Simon. He points out that it is only through this review
that inadequacies can be identified in the decision-making process and
subsequently corrected. As the processes of decision-making are
improved, increased decentralization is possible.

\textsuperscript{175}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 122. \textsuperscript{176}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 227.
Thompson formulates his thesis for the book in the following succinct sentence: "... the most symptomatic characteristic of modern bureaucracy is the growing imbalance between ability and authority." His reasoning is based upon the belief that technology has developed more rapidly than the cultural definitions of hierarchical roles. Technology continues to develop highly specialized individuals who consequently hold powerful positions through their expertise, but do not have legal authority or power. The gap between the specialist and the hierarchical position continues to widen.

Thompson's definition of an organization is also succinct. He states: "A Bureaucratic organization is a structure composed of authority, status, technical, and social relationships. This structure can tolerate considerable variation in personalities." The author attacks those persons who have been unable to accept or adapt to the bureaucratic structure. He says:

... Theirs is a kind of social disease which we might call bureausis. "Bureautics" find the rationalism, orderliness, impartiality, and impersonality of the bureaucratic organization intolerable. They crave an immediate and tender response to their unique problems, whatever they may be. Bureautics are immature. They have never been weaned from the habits of childhood indulgence. Bureautic behavior is not an organizational phenomenon. It is a function of the individual personality.

He argues that cohesion is an organizational need because specialization has created interdependence, but that as specialization

---
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continues and becomes even more intense than it is now, cohesion through cooperation and coordination will be more difficult.

He determines that specialization is of much benefit in meeting the needs of the individual through prestige. However, when the individual is not satisfied with the social role he finds himself in (lack of status or power) he becomes frustrated. The result is that specialists create their own organizations (professional groups) in which they can obtain positions of high status. As seen by Thompson, specialization and socialization are entwined.

Thompson emphasizes that the hierarchical organization discourages innovation since the hierarchical position has the power to veto an idea. Hierarchical organizations, therefore, usually favors the status quo. The advantage is always held by the party who holds the veto power.

The author recognizes that in our modern democratic society that the individual seeks and expects certain "rights." These, he says, are not being granted because of the continuing recognition of the hierarchical structure in our organizations. He recognizes that many of the more "scientifically-oriented students of organization" continue to show a lack of interest in this factor.

Certain dichotomies develop in organizations even when group decisions are sought. Group decisions are usually sought among highly specialized people. Yet, these people frequently disagree. When this occurs the immediate superior is called upon to resolve the dispute, and in doing so he enhances his own position resulting in increased
power for that position. Frequently group decisions are sought when they are not actually needed. This appears to come from the desire to let all persons who have a "legitimate" interest be involved and also because of the basic insecurity of the leader when he is dealing with specialties of which he is not competent.

Group problem solving should be superior to the individual approach to problem solving. Through the group's analyses of a proposal, weakness, if any, should be more readily discovered. Thompson refers to Kelly and Thibaut for reasons which support group decision making:

(1) errors are scattered, therefore their influence is reduced;
(2) considered opinions have greater influence on group members than offhand judgments;
(3) opinions expressed confidently will have more influence, and they are more likely to be correct;
(4) group members can specialize in aspects of the problem;
(5) the group as a whole will have more possible solutions;
(6) the need to communicate forces group members to sharpen and clarify their ideas. In addition, the group environment may increase (or decrease) motivation toward task completion, and it will motivate toward an eventual consensus.180

Thompson supports the conclusion of others that frequently an autocratic leader will resent his superiors being autocratic. His resentment builds hostility which is then expressed in his own autocratic leadership. However, in an environment which expects democratic procedures: "... many studies testify to the deleterious

effect of autocratic supervision on the personal satisfactions and
goals of subordinates. 181

Through the control of communications the superior is able to
maintain his position. Lacking sufficient information the subordinates
are unable to make decisions. However, this inability to obtain in-
formation creates hostility, particularly among specialists who feel
they should have access to information. The competitive hierarchical
system which now predominates, however, causes some superiors to hold
information for self protection. Thus, the competition for positions
might eliminate the possibility of a truly democratic process.

Another problem for the specialist is the definition of success
in our culture. Wealth, status, position, and social prestige have
long been recognized as the symbols of success in our society. The
specialist, although highly successful in his chosen area may not be
able to obtain these symbols. It is necessary for him to join the
hierarchy to obtain them. The devoted specialist frequently rebels
at both leaving his specialty and of accepting these symbols of suc-
cess. It is incompatible to his value system. He frequently becomes
hostile towards the organization and the "establishment."

An additional problem for the specialist concerns promotions.
He expects to be recognized for his expertise and to receive proper
promotions and remuneration for his effort. However, the highest posi-
tions of the organization are reserved for those in the hierarchy.

181 Ibid., p. 95.
Thompson views intraorganizational conflict as arising from the following interactions between behavior systems:

...the system of rights, or authority; the system of deference, or status; the system of specialization, or the distribution of abilities, which governs the pattern of technical interdependence; and the system of communicative interaction which governs the pattern of identifications.\(^{182}\)

In pursuing the problem of innovation or change in bureaucratic organizations the author emphasizes the fact that change is not necessarily difficult to make in these organizations under certain conditions. Change is feared when the superior is an insecure person. If the superior is a secure individual who holds a professional view and is non-competitive, innovation can be encouraged. Basically, the insecure administrator cannot allow a subordinate to be innovative since this will threaten his position of "supremacy."

Thompson likens his "bureaucrat" to an immature child. He cannot identify with the impersonal world of bureaucracy. His relationships must be personal, and he sees people as either "friends" or "enemies." He sees no reason for all of the "red-tape" and dislikes his environment because he feels it does not respond to him. He wants to be the center of attention, and thus finds it difficult to share attention in the large complex bureaucratic organization. His conversation is sprinkled with phrases such as "the establishment," "you have to have pull," "the system," "special favors," "bribes," "...they' are trying to put something over," and "...they' are out to get me."\(^{183}\)

\(^{182}\)Ibid., p. 100. \(^{183}\)Ibid., pp. 174-75.
Thompson has identified three kinds of behavior patterns which are frequently confused. These are explained in a succinct summary which follows:

... First are patterns characteristic of large, complex organizations based upon advanced specialization. These are bureaucratic patterns of behavior; specialization determines their nature.

A second kind consists essentially of exaggerations of bureaucratic behavior by insecure persons in hierarchical and nonhierarchical authority positions. These behaviors are oriented to personal needs rather than to organizational goals. They interfere with goal accomplishment and are, therefore, pathological from the standpoint of the organization. Consequently, we have called them bureaucratic behaviors; they arise from personal insecurity.

Finally, we have described a pattern of behavior which is a reaction to modern organizations by people (including both employees and clients) who are unable to adjust to the complexity, impersonality, and impartiality of these organizations. We have argued that the basis of this non-adjustive reaction is personal immaturity. We have called this pattern of behavior bureaucratic. Bureaucratic behavior is associated with specialization, bureaucratic behavior with personal insecurity, and bureaucratic behavior with personal immaturity.\[184\]

In the effort to develop cooperation and coordination organizations must evolve a system where the specialist is given adequate rewards for his involvement. In particular, the organization must satisfy the specialist's personal needs. One of the quickest means of developing this is to allow a democratic atmosphere to prevail. Autocratic leadership does not develop group cohesion. Various research studies have shown that groups which operate in a democratic fashion develop similar goals and values.

\[184\] Ibid., p. 177.
Modern management attempts to combine the group-identification plan and that of the individualistic command, according to Thompson. This approach has chiefly been encouraged through the "human-relations" advocates. They have placed an emphasis on "teamwork," "organization loyalty," and "morale building." The approach is limited, however, unless the individual is brought into the actual management of the organization.

Thompson makes several specific recommendations to overcome some of our organizational problems. Among these he suggests that in order to overcome strict supervision, which has repeatedly been shown to be detrimental to efficiency and cooperation, that the supervisors be given some specific instrumental functions in addition to the exercise of authority. Next he recommends that we attempt to move towards redefining our values and concept of "success." He specifically mentions the following possibility:

... Some academic departments are "managed" by "executive officers" from lower ranks rather than by "chairmen" from the upper ranks. Such a dual salary schedule would occasionally result in a situation (demolishing to status!) where the superior earns less than the subordinate.185

Next he recommends that decentralization should occur in all cases where centralization is clearly not necessary. The specialist should have the opportunity to make decisions in the areas of his concern, and decentralization should enhance this. Also, "staff specialties" should be reviewed, and where they are found not to have

185 Ibid., p. 196.
a sufficient body of knowledge or technique they should be eliminated.

Finally, he recommends that

... cooperation [be] based upon the mutual recognition and acceptance of interdependence, which is the only possible foundation. Some mutual recognition, in turn, will depend upon the achievement of status and function for all. 186

CHARLES R. WALKER and ROBERT H. GUEST

This book is the result of research undertaken by the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University. They were interested in identifying the kinds of behavior and other factors which were operational in the mass-production line. The major research tool was the interview program.

The study has a very limited application to the study presently underway by this author. However, certain findings support findings by other researchers and are, therefore, of interest and significance. These findings were as follows:

1. Approximately 90 percent of the workers interviewed expressed, in varying degrees, a dislike for mass-production work.

2. Relations with other workers and reported social interaction ... [were] mentioned ... chiefly as a fortunate counterbalance and compensation for the disliked features of immediate job content.

3. Play and security were strong like factors. What is here significant is that the worker himself frequently juxtaposed these likes with the strongest of his dislikes, that is, unpleasant features of the immediate job.

186 Ibid., p. 197.
4. As to relations with supervision, a large majority of workers rated their foremen high. . . . Blame for what was disliked was shifted to the company or the corporation as such.

5. Regarding promotion and transfer, a very large number of workers aspired to other jobs. . . .

6. Workers themselves suggested that job rotation or job enlargement might provide answers to the problem of continually diminished job satisfaction.

7. The effect of mass-production technology on social organization of the plant is one of depersonalization, i.e., increasing the worker's sense of anonymity.

8. The union, in addition to its bargaining function, tends to become a personalizing agent, relieving the worker of his anonymity.187

MAX WEBER

For the purpose of this review only that section of Weber dealing with "Collegiality and the Separation of Powers" will be reviewed. Weber's purpose in discussing collegiality was to show either on a traditional or a rational basis that authority may be limited and/or controlled. The emphasis, however, is placed upon how social relationships and groups have the function of limiting authority. Following are selected portions from Weber:

2. A bureaucratic organization may be limited and indeed must be by agencies which act on their own authority alongside the bureaucratic hierarchy. Such limiting agencies have the following principal functions: (a) control and possibly a subsequent test of adherence to rules; (b) a monopoly of creation of the rules which govern the action of officials completely, or at least of those which define the limits of their independent authority; (c) above all a monopoly of the granting

of the means which are necessary for the administrative function.\textsuperscript{188}

3. It is possible for any type of authority to be deprived of its monocratic character, which binds it to a single person, by the principle of collegiality. This may however, occur in a variety of ways with widely varying significance. The following are the principal types: (a) It may be that alongside the monocratic holders of governing powers there are other monocratic authorities which, by tradition or legislation, are in a position to delay or to veto acts of the first authority . . . (b) The second type is precisely the opposite of this, namely the arrangement that the acts of an authority which is not monocratic must be carried out only after previous consultation and a vote . . . (3) In effect closely related to case (a) is that in which, in order to weaken monocratic power, a plurality of monocratic officials exists, each of whom has equal authority, without specification of function . . . (d) A type which is closely related to case (b) is that in which, although there is an actually monocratic primus inter pares, his acts are normally subject to consultation with formally equal members, and disagreement in important matters may lead to breaking up the collegial body by resignation, thus endangering the position of the monocratic chief . . . Advisory collegial bodies do not necessarily involve a weakening of the power of an autocratic chief but may well lead to a tempering of the exercise of authority in the direction of rationalization. It is, however, also possible that in effect they should gain the upper hand over the chief. This is particularly true if they are representative of well-established social classes. The following are the more important types: (e) . . . Even though he is not formally bound to follow their advice [the collegial group] but only to listen to it, the failure of his policies if this occurs may be attributed to neglect of this advice . . . (f) A somewhat different type is found in the case where a collegial body is made up of individuals with specified functions. In such a case the preparation and presentation of a subject is assigned to the individual technical expert who is competent in that field or possibly to several experts, each in a different aspect of the field. Decisions, however, are taken by a vote of the body as a whole. (g) A collegial body, the members of which have specified functions, may be a purely advisory body. In this case it is open to the chief to accept or reject their recommendations, according to his own free decision. This situation is favourable to a high development

of the specialization of functions. (h) The direct anti-
thesis of rationally specialized collegiality is a tradi-
tional collegial body consisting of "elders." . . . (i) One
way of weakening the power of supreme authorities is by apply-
ing the collegial principle to the highest authority whether
the supremacy be formal or substantive. . . . Such bodies are
collegial so long as there is a formal requirement that legit-
imate acts require the participation of all the members. . . .
(j) Where there is a conflict of interests of socially estab-
lished groups it may work out to the advantage of a chief
through a process of negotiation and struggle with the various
groups. . . . (k) A . . . case is that where collegial bodies
which decide things by vote have been formed out of a plurality
or organized groups which were previously autocephalous and
autonomous. . . . (l) A rather special case is that of the col-
legial character of elected parliamentary bodies which is hence
in need of separate treatment. . . . It is either based on lead-
ership, in which case the particular members constitute the
following of leaders, or it is composed of collegial party
groups without subordination to a specific leader. . . .189

Weber discusses both the weaknesses and strengths of the col-
legial system, pointing out that such a system sometimes involves ob-
stances to precise, clear, and above all, rapid decision. Also, even
where collegial government may exist, he says there is a tendency for
one leader to emerge within this collegial group and for his position
to become substantively and even formally pre-eminent. When collegial
government is sought it is usually because of the desire to limit the
power and authority of the executive. Weber hastens to show, however,
that this desire usually does not come from the followers, who are more
likely to want a "leader," but from other members of the administra-
tive staff who are jealous or who mistrust the person who is in the
top position of authority.

Weber states that "Collegiality is in no sense specifically
democratic."190 He points out that collegial bodies, which represent

189Ibid., pp. 392-397.  
190Ibid., p. 398.
a privileged group, will tend to protect themselves from the underprivileged; i.e., while on the one hand they tend to enforce strict equality among the collegial group they also tend to set up barriers to protect themselves and maintain power.

Collegiality is advantageous in several ways. It offers the opportunity for greater thoroughness in the consideration of administrative affairs; it divides personal responsibility; it avoids the development of monocratic "dictators."

In summarizing his thoughts on collegial governments, Weber says:

From a historical point of view, collegiality has had two principal kinds of significance. On the one hand it has involved a plurality of incumbents of the same office, or a number of persons in offices whose spheres of authority were directly competing, each with a mutual power of veto. This is primarily a matter of a technical separation of powers in order to minimize authority.

The second main type has been that involving collegial decision. In such cases an administrative act is only legitimate when it has been produced by the co-operation of a plurality of people according to the principle of unanimity or of majority.¹⁹¹

Weber cautions, through several examples, that it is not unusual for a government or institution to begin with a collegial form of government and then for those who seek power to gradually turn this form into the usual monocratic structure, perhaps using the collegial body only in an advisory capacity with very little actual power.

¹⁹¹Ibid., p. 399.
Whyte began with the assumption that if management had an adequate understanding of "human relations" techniques that cooperation could be developed and maintained among the members of an enterprise. However, he was unable to reply when first asked why there were conflicts in some organizations and none in others when both types of organizations appear to have the same amount of, or degree of expertise in "human relations." This forced a realization that there are certain forces operating which are more powerful than the human relations techniques of management. Furthermore, management had to recognize that some management supervisor training programs in the field of human relations were unsuccessful. The findings indicated that supervisors could be successful with human relations programs only when they are fully supported in their efforts by upper management.¹⁹²

Whyte recognizes that the worker is influenced by many factors, such as money, technology and workflow, organization structure, and social environment. He hastens to add that this does not mean that the individual is a "pawn" of these forces, but that he is seriously limited in his ability to change the situation imposed by these forces.

Cohesion of the group can be seen as both beneficial and unbeneficial according to Whyte, depending upon the ability of management to use this factor. If management can become adept at controlling the

forces of group cohesion so that these forces are used in meeting the objectives and goals of the organization they are found to be useful. He emphasizes that while in our democratic society we like to think "happy workers" are the best producers, that the problem is not so simple.

His review of literature concerning participative groups led him to conclude that this form of operation is successful only in those cases where the group prefers participative action. In those groups where the individuals actually preferred to have one person with authority, participation was not found to be conducive to success. An additional finding was that employee satisfaction was found to be related to the supervisors "high power" in relation to his superiors.

In the study of participative groups it was also discovered that in addition to personality the cultural milieu of the individual is a contributing factor to his adaptation to this process. In societies or social classes where one has not had the opportunity to experience democratic action, there is difficulty adjusting to participative activity.

Influence of the Behavioral Sciences

Some of the earliest "sociological" studies were conducted by Whiting Williams and reported in his book What's on the Worker's Mind. His conclusions were that the workers of that time had three basic fears and frustrations in connection with their work: (1) the insecurity of jobs; (2) fatigue and stretching out work assignments;
and (3) feelings of uncertainty about the future plans and intents of employers. 193

It was not until the late 1940's and particularly into the 1950's that behavioral scientists became more interested in management and began to make research studies in leadership, organizational relationships, human motivation, administration, and management. The well known Hawthorne experiments194 are recognized as the true beginning of the present movement in this area.

One of the most prolific writers in this field is Chris Argyris. His book *Executive Leadership* was published in 1953, and in this work he attempted to improve the understanding and the interpretation of individual and group behavior in organizations. He has pointed out that there is a "built in" sense of dependence in organizations:

... the supervisors are dependent upon the leaders. The dependence, in turn, leads to the supervisors becoming leader-centered. It also leads to inter-supervisory competition and conflict.195

Argyris further comments that we must look at two sides of each case and that while both superiors and subordinates may consider an executive leader successful, we must also look at the "human costs" created by the executive in terms of tensions, frustrations, and conflicts. He also believes that leadership characteristics are related to the


personality of the leader and that out of this grows his principles of leadership that have, for the most part, evolved from experience. He believes that undesirable personality traits and leadership principles can be changed when the executive understands the "high human costs" that result from them.

In his book Personality and Organization Argyris was interested in studying the behavior of the individual in relation to the formal organization and the impact of management upon employees. The following represents his propositions which might be used as a beginning to the development of a theory of organizational behavior:

Proposition I: There is lack of congruency between the needs of healthy individuals and the demands of the formal organization.

Proposition II: The resultants of this disturbance are frustration, failure, short time perspective and conflict.

Proposition III: Under certain conditions, the degree of frustration, failure, short time perspective, and conflict will tend to increase.

Proposition IV: The nature of the formal principles of organization cause the subordinate, at any given level, to experience competition, rivalry, inter-subordinate hostility, and to develop a focus toward the parts rather than the whole.

Proposition V: The employee adaptive behavior maintains self-integration and impedes integration with the formal organization.

Proposition VI: The adaptive behavior of the employees has a cumulative effect, feedbacks into the organization, and reinforces itself.

Proposition VII: Other management actions can decrease the degree of incongruency between the individual and formal organizations.

Proposition VIII: Certain management reactions tend to increase the antagonisms underlying the adaptive behavior.
Proposition IX: Job or role enlargement and employee-centered leadership will not tend to work to the extent that the adaptive behavior (propositions III, IV, V, and VI) has become imbedded in the organizational culture and the self-concept of the individuals.

Proposition X: The difficulties involved in proposition IX may be minimized by the use of reality-oriented leadership.\(^{196}\)

Argyris believes each person brings into the organization a variety of needs which he hopes to have fulfilled in the organization. He concludes, therefore, that in scientific management there is a basic incongruity between the demands of the mature personality and the demands made by the classical organization. When this mature person is issued orders by the classical organization he is not expected to question them but simply to act. He suggests, therefore, that in such an environment the individual is expected to act in a situation where

\[(1) \text{they are provided minimal control over their workday world; (2) they are expected to be passive, dependent, and subordinate; (3) they are expected to have a short time perspective; (4) they are induced to perfect and value the frequent use of a few shallow abilities; and (5) they are expected to produce under conditions leading to psychological failure.}\(^{197}\)

In an effort to overcome negative effects upon the personality he supports and recommends participation by subordinates in decision making. In an effort to overcome job apathy and boredom, he suggests job enlargement and participation.\(^{198}\)


\(^{197}\)Ibid., p. 66.

\(^{198}\)Ibid., pp. 187-200.
William F. Whyte, in his book *Money and Motivation*, contributed further to the concept that money, *per se*, is not an adequate motivation for workers. He has pointed out that this is only one of the incentives that must be used. He notes that an incentive system could lead to both integration and disintegration of the workers. Both, however, might have an adverse or negative effect in that one could result in an integrated intergroup cooperation in opposition to management; and the other could result in intergroup conflicts among the workers contributing to disintegration. In his opinion the worker reacts to management as a member of a group.

Whyte further points out that executives may have "out-moded theories of causation:"

Many executives are handicapped because they seek to solve problems in terms of outmoded theories of causation. They try to find the cause for a particular problem. When they think they have found the cause they seek to provide the solution. He also stressed that there were no "cure-alls" or "packaged solutions" for human relations problems.

Peter Drucker writes about teamwork in his book *The Practice of Management*. He does not believe the chief executive's job should be attempted by one person; but by a team. He states:

Indeed, 90 percent of the trouble we are having with the chief executive's job is rooted in our superstition of the one-man chief. We still, as did Henry Ford, model the chief

---

executive of the modern business after the single proprietor of yesterday's economy. 200

He points out that the activities of the job are too diverse and too many for one man to undertake. "It must be the job of a team of several men acting together." 201

As an example of successful use of this process he quotes Ralph J. Cordiner, President of General Electric, who made the following statement in a speech in 1953 to the Harvard Business School in a talk entitled "Efficient Organizational Structure." Cordiner said:

The chief executive officer, if he is discharging his responsibility . . . should, within a period of not longer than three years after he has accepted his assignment, have at least three officers equal to or better than himself in performance who could succeed to his position. . . . We [therefore] think it is very important that there be a number of positions at top level that are virtually as important, are compensated almost on the same level, and carry the same dignity as the position of chief executive officer. Thus, we have created a number of executive vice-presidents who act as group executives. 202

In discussing motivation, Drucker points out that "employee satisfaction" is not enough, or at least is an erroneous or limiting concept. He stresses that . . .

Responsibility--not satisfaction--is the only thing that will serve. . . . One can be satisfied with what somebody else is doing; but to perform one has to take responsibility for one's own actions and their impact. 203

He determines four ways in which the goal of a responsible worker may be reached:


201 Ibid., p. 168.

202 Ibid., p. 170.

203 Ibid., p. 303.
They are careful placement, high standards of performance, providing the worker with the information needed to control himself, and with opportunities for participation that will give him a managerial vision.\textsuperscript{204}

Drucker holds limitations on the workers ability to participate in managerial decisions, however, and suggests that their participation should be in such things as "the Red Cross Blood Bank or the Christmas Party, shift schedule or safety programs, [and] the cafeteria or the employee publications."\textsuperscript{205} He makes this point even more explicit in the following statement:

Let me make one point clear: I am convinced that in managing the business employees as such cannot participate. . . . I advocate only that those things which are desirable anyhow, be done sensibly--with less staff and by the plant community itself.\textsuperscript{206}

The research conducted by Nancy Morse has made a significant contribution to the world of management. In her book \textit{Satisfactions in the White-Collar Job},\textsuperscript{207} she classified the work satisfaction determinants into six categories: (1) financial returns, (2) job prestige, (3) intrinsic job satisfactions, (4) involvement in the company, (5) pride in the work group, and (6) character of supervision. The major findings of the study might be summarized as follows:

1. In white-collar populations, the need for variety and opportunity of exercise skill is generally high, i.e., important determinant of job satisfaction.

\textsuperscript{204}Ibid., p. 304. 
\textsuperscript{205}Ibid., p. 310. 
\textsuperscript{206}Ibid., pp. 310-311. 
\textsuperscript{207}Nancy Morse, \textit{Satisfactions in the White-Collar Job} (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, 1953).
2. Absolute salary and job status appear to be less significant
determinants of satisfaction than do the relationships be-
tween the levels of these factors and the individual's aspir-
ations.

3. Employees who do receive satisfaction from the basic factors
postulated appear to be better disposed to company policies
and less likely to leave the company.

4. There is a tendency for groups operating under "general
supervision" to be, in productivity and pride, superior to
closely supervised groups.\(^{208}\)

Kahn and Katz discovered similar findings in their research
on "Leadership, Productivity, and Morale." In this study their purpose
was to discover what relationships existed between four variables:
(1) The nonoperative nature of supervisory work, (2) closeness of
supervision, (3) degree of employee-oriented supervision, and (4)
group cohesiveness. Following are their findings:

1. High-performance work groups most commonly appeared to have
supervisors who did management work, e.g., planning, leading,
as opposed to operative work.

2. High-performance work groups were not supervised so closely
as low-performance groups. The degree of close supervision
exercised by the supervisor seemed to be closely associated
with the kind of supervision present in levels above him.

3. High-performance work groups appeared to be supervised by
"employee-oriented" supervisors--those supervisors who gave
their primary attention to motivating their subordinates.

4. High-performance work groups were found to exhibit generally
greater team spirit and cohesiveness than low-performance
groups. The researchers consider it possible that group co-
hesiveness and productivity are interacting variables, so
that an increase in one brings about an increase in the
other.\(^{209}\)

\(^{208}\)Cyril Curtis Ling, The Management of Personnel Relations:

\(^{209}\)Robert Kahn and Daniel Katz, "Leadership Practices in Re-
lation to Productivity and Morale," Group Dynamics: Research and
Theory, D. Cartwright and A. Zander, eds. (Evanston, Ill.: Row,
Douglas McGregor has been recognized as one of the most outstanding writers in the behavioral sciences. His book, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, has been widely circulated and quoted. Of particular interest to readers of this book is McGregor's "Theory X" and "Theory Y." He defines "Theory X" as the traditional or classical approach to management, and asserts this management assumes the following regarding the adult personality:

1. The average person has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if he can.

2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike for work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organization objectives.

3. The average person prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all.

He believes the following is a more realistic assessment of people and calls this his "Theory Y:"

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as play or rest.

2. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with achievement.

4. The average person learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.

5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.


211 Ibid., pp. 47-48.
Obviously, he believes in participative management. He suggests management by "integration and self-control," and recommends that when orders must be given that only the objectives be communicated, thus allowing the subordinate to exercise self-direction and self-control. He is aware that this approach cannot be used at all times since varying circumstances and people call for various attitudes by leaders. In considering a situation like the Scanlon Plan, where all workers are encouraged to participate in decision making, creating, evaluations, etc., he states:

In this fashion the concept of participation is given a meaning which everyone can understand. The fact of interdependence is accepted; reliance is placed on the know-how, the ingenuity, the innovativeness of all the human resources of the organization. The mechanics of the participation are relatively unimportant; the underlying assumptions about human beings which are reflected are crucial.212

Rensis Likert, Director of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, has now written two books and many articles supporting his "linking pin" theory. The first book supporting this theory appeared in 1961 and is called New Patterns of Management. In this book Likert refers to what is now known as the "linking pin" theory as a Modified Formal Organizational Structure. Likert was attempting to emphasize that for certain purposes, such as crucial decisions concerning salaries, promotions, demotions, transfers, etc., the traditional chain of command is maintained. The differences, however, comes in considering each superior as a link between two groups.

212Ibid., p. 115.
The "link" is, therefore, a representative of his group's point of view to the group which contains his peers and superior.

Likert summarizes his findings about "influence" by suggesting the more multiple linkages among groups, the more influence the participants may have. The greater the influence, the stronger the group cohesiveness, the loyalty, the commitment, the identification, the cooperation within the organization.

Likert is one of the most ardent supporters of participative management. His research has consistently shown that this type of management is the most productive. Those groups which have the most meetings and do carry out participative policies are more productive. Groups which have no meetings and make no attempts to participate are second in production. Groups which do have meetings and make some attempt at participation, but leave the personnel with the feeling that the meeting is worthless since the management is not really interested in their ideas anyway, are the lowest in production.

Communication is usually viewed as a major problem in all organizations; there are few organizations that claim they receive an adequate amount of information. Likert's findings indicate that it is common for the higher level of management to assume it is communicating more successfully than the subordinates for those positions indicate. Also, similar results are discovered in interaction analyses.
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As with many other studies, Likert also finds that superiors consistently over-emphasize the importance of economic factors in relation to subordinates and under-estimate the importance of human variables.\(^{216}\)

A concept which is becoming increasing popular in management is that of "human assets," and Likert's approach is highly significant in this respect. He emphasizes the concept of a "liquidation of human assets." By this he means that when the classical orientation is used the personnel become hostile, apathetic, etc., and thus human assets are lost. Particularly, since this type of management results in increased "turn-over" of personnel, resulting in a loss of human assets. Participative management reflects less turn-over. He points out that his research findings indicate that it is possible for autocratic management to produce more "short-run" production or profits, but the loss in human assets will reduce the long-run effects. Participative management shows the long-run effects to be much better. The problem is that it takes more time and more expertise to operate an enterprise with participation of all personnel and it takes longer to show good results, but the results are more impressive in the long-run, particularly if human assets are included.

Keith Davis has pointed out several advantages in the use of participative management in his book *Human Relations at Work*. He describes a participative leader as one who "consults" with his followers, introducing them to the problems and permitting them to help

\(^{216}\) Ibid., pp. 46-52.
make decisions so that "the group acts as a social unit in the performance of its work." He emphasizes that the participative leader is neither an autocrat nor a free-rein leader, but that he is a responsible leader who must retain ultimate responsibility for the operation of his unit. "Participation is defined as mental and emotional involvement of a person in a group situation which encourages him to contribute to group goals and share responsibility in them." He identifies three important ideas inherent in this definition. These are:

First, and probably foremost, participation means mental and emotional involvement, rather than mere muscular activity. A person's self is involved rather than just his body. This involvement in the situation is a product of his mind and his emotions. It is psychological, rather than physical. Allport states that the person who participates is ego-involved instead of merely task-involved.

A second important idea in participation is that it motivates persons to contribute to the situation. They are given an opportunity to release their own resources of initiative and creativity toward the objectives of the organization. In this way participation differs from "consent." It is a two-way psychological and social relationship among people, rather than a procedure for imposing ideas from above. Its great value is that it uses the creativity of all employees.

A third idea in participation is that it encourages people to accept responsibility in an activity.

Davis points out that participation is not just a new idea that is being used by people in human relations as an idea to get attention, but that there is ample evidence to show that it truly works in practice.

218 Ibid., p. 427.
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He outlines the following as "prerequisites for effective participation:"

1. There must be time to participate before action is required. Participation is hardly appropriate in emergency situations.

2. The financial cost of participation should not exceed the values, economic and otherwise, that come from it.

3. The subject of participation must be relevant to the participant's organization or something in which he is interested, else he will look upon it merely as busy work.

4. The participant should have the ability, such as intelligence and knowledge, to participate.

5. The participants must be able mutually to communicate--to talk each other's language--in order to be able to exchange ideas.

6. Neither party should feel that his position is threatened by participation.

7. Participation for deciding a course of action in an organization can take place only within the group's area of job freedom.

Argyris produced another book in 1964 which was entitled Integrating the Individual and the Organization. In this book he continues to develop his earlier premise concerning the need of the individual for a feeling of psychological success, and for a feeling of congruency between the needs of the individual and the needs of the organization. Early in this book he points out that:

The potential energy an individual has available to him will be a function of the degree of self-esteem: the higher the self-esteem, the greater the potential energy. The actual energy an individual has will be a function of the degree to which he can experience psychological success.

---

220 Ibid., p. 432.

The directive or autocratic manager is not able to meet the needs of the subordinates in the organization because he is unable to create opportunities for these subordinates to experience psychological success.

The following three "propositions" appear to summarize the essence of thought in this new book by Argyris:

Proposition I. There is a lack of congruency between the needs of individuals aspiring for psychological success and the demands of the (initial) formal organization.

Proposition II. The resultant of this disturbance are frustration, failure, short-time perspective, and conflict.

If the participants in the organization desire psychological success:

1. They will tend to experience frustration because their self-expression will be blocked.

2. They will tend to experience failure because they will not be permitted to define their own goals in relation to central needs, the paths to these goals, and so on.

3. They will tend to experience short-time perspective because they will have no control over the clarity and stability of their future.

4. They will tend to experience conflict because, as healthy agents, they will dislike frustration, failure, and short-time perspective which is characteristic of the present job.

Proposition III: Under certain conditions the degree of frustration, failure, short-time perspective, and conflict will tend to increase.

The resultant of the disturbance in the organization will tend to increase in degree:

1. As the individual agents increase in degree of desire for psychological success.

2. As the degree of dependence, subordination, passivity, and so on, increases. This tends to occur (a) as one goes down
the chain of command; (b) as directive leadership increases; (c) as management controls are increased; and (d) as human relations programs are undertaken but improperly implemented.

3. As the jobs become more specialized.

4. As the exactness with which the traditional formal principles are used increases.222

Argyris concludes that there are two factors which must be met in order for the individual to be properly integrated into the organization. First, the individual must aspire toward positive mental health. Second, the organization must be modified to allow it to approximate more closely the right ends of the continua of his "mix" model.223 In this model the left side of the continua represents the traditional forms of management and the right side represents the new "integrative" management. The model follows (Table 2).

Higher Education Administration

During the past ten years, from 1958-1968, there has probably been more written about the administration of higher educational institutions than in all of the previous years combined. In the course of preparing for his book, Woodburne scanned all of the book titles listed by the Cumulative Book Index which had been published up to that time in the English language on administration or organization of colleges and universities. He found only twenty-five publications over a forty-five year span, 1908-1953.

222 Ibid., p. 40.
223 Ibid., p. 162.
TABLE 2

THE "MIX" MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Away from the Essential Properties</th>
<th>Toward the Essential Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One part (subset of parts) controls the whole.</td>
<td>The whole is created and controlled through interrelationships of all parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Achieving objective related to the parts.</td>
<td>Achieving objectives related to the whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unable to influence its internally oriented core activities.</td>
<td>Able to influence internally oriented core activities as &quot;it&quot; desires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unable to influence its externally oriented core activities.</td>
<td>Able to influence externally oriented activities as &quot;it&quot; desires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nature of core activities influenced by the present.</td>
<td>Nature of core activities influenced by the past, present, and future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22Ibid., p. 150.
For the purpose of this review sixteen books have been chosen which deal directly or indirectly with the management, administration and organization of colleges and universities. These sixteen books were all published within a ten year period, 1958-1968. The purpose in limiting the review to books published within the last ten years was to concentrate upon the contemporary university.

LLOYD S. WOODBURNE

Woodburne's book, Principles of College and University Administration, appeared in 1958. In the first few pages of the book Woodburne establishes the fact that he believes in participative management. Typical statements supporting his views are as follows:

In most large and complex institutions the chief administrator must, of necessity, leave everything except major policy decision to subordinates. Colleagues at the department level know how these policies must be implemented.225

A teaching institution is not a hierarchy for giving and receiving orders. . . .

The smooth functioning of administrative procedure at the college or university level is based upon mutual confidence and respect. A presidential order cannot establish this. . . .226

. . . One of the first conditions of effective university or college administration is the existence of two-way communication between the various officers and staff members. . . .227

Woodburne, however, is also a realist. He is aware that not all faculty members will accept their responsibilities as true participants, and he is aware that merely having a faculty senate structure

226Ibid., pp. 11-12.
227Ibid., p. 16.
will not inevitably lead to faculty participation in the adminis-
tative affairs of the institution. Further, he asserts that the faculty
should not be involved in the implementation of policies:

... It is important that faculty be used in policy deter-
mination, but from that point on their continued use becomes in-
efficient, since, once established, policies can be more ably
implemented by trained administrative officers. ... 228

The two vital factors which enhance participation and coopera-
tion between faculty and administration, as seen by Woodburne, is "in-
formation by the administration and impartiality by the faculty and
administration. ... " 229 He observed that although this contention
is readily subscribed to by faculty and administration, that it is as
frequently violated as it is observed. He believes the chief reasons
for differences develop from misconceptions of either the faculty or
administrative function, or tactlessness and vanity.

Woodburne blames the lack of effective two-way communication
for most of the internal problems in the college or university. With
faculty too busy with teaching responsibilities to carry heavy admin-
istrative duties, and administrators too busy with their duties to
carry on teaching duties, he believes it is only through adequate two-
way communication and effective consultation that the two parties can
develop a consensus on major policies.

It is essential, in his opinion, to have consultation with
persons at the operating level before major policy is established. It
will only be through cooperation that the policy will be carried out,

228 Ibid., p. 18.  
229 Ibid., p. 19.
thus the participation of the persons at the operational level, in helping to frame the policy, will be essential in the successful completion of implementation of the policy. 230

ALDO D. HENDERSON

Henderson believes the qualifications needed by administrators in higher education are:

1. The individual clearly needs to be an educator, because that is the job the institution has to do. . . .

2. He needs to be an organizer in the sense that he understands the principles pertaining to the delegation of responsibility and authority, how to define the functions of particular jobs, the interrelationships among jobs and the lines of communications and how to synthesize the results flowing from the subdivided efforts into an organized whole. In this organizing for effective action, it is essential that he understand the nature of the role of a group leader.

3. The administrator needs to be a keen judge of people and know how to recruit and maintain a staff of high quality and morale. . . .

4. This administrator should also possess some understanding of finances and especially of the preparation and administration of a budget. . . .

5. Finally, the administrator needs to have an understanding of public relations. . . .231

Thus, the only difference Henderson recognizes in this list from those one might find for any administrative job in business and industry, is that the leader in higher education needs to be an educator. He believes higher education needs better leadership than it

230 Ibid., pp. 104-105.

has had, yet he gives no real suggestions for identifying leaders in higher education, although he contributes "intangible qualities of personality" to the gifted leader. He makes no effort to describe the personality characteristics to which he alludes.

In his discussion of the administrator as a group leader he points out that it is necessary for the leader to assume different roles, depending upon the demands of the situation and the degree of direction that the leader is in a position to give. He underscores the need to bring the faculty into full participation in the determination of programs and policy. He recognizes that the faculty is too infrequently brought into a participative environment and, thus, there exists suspicion and apprehension, if not a feeling of antagonism from the faculty towards the administration.

Henderson assumes that one of the greatest problems in present-day institutions is that of size. The increasing size of institutions leads to a separation of upper-administration and faculty. He believes this is potentially dangerous to the educational environment. However, he defines three specific problems in administration of higher education and these are (1) the lack of adequate organization, (2) the failure to provide for adequate intercommunication, and (3) college presidents have a high degree of insecurity in their positions.\(^{232}\)

\(^{232}\)Ibid., pp. 237-239.
Corson attributes the uniqueness of higher education administration to academic tradition and the nature of the functions performed by the educational enterprise. He adds: "... they are different functions requiring a different organization and different practices than are common in business or governmental enterprises." There is reservation in his mind, however, concerning the appropriateness of the present structure of organization in higher education. The rapid growth in enrollments plus many growing demands upon the university make it essential that we re-evaluate the administrative process and management characteristics among other factors.

In his analysis of the university and its characteristics as they relate to other human organizations, he finds the following similar and dissimilar characteristics. Those held in common are:

1. It exists to accomplish something; it has a purpose or purposes.

2. It must have resources. These may, in oversimplified terms, be described as men, money, and materials. . . .

3. It must have process that facilitate men and women working together to accomplish a purpose. . . .

4. The enterprise moves on— it grows or it retrogresses. Change is a common characteristic of large enterprises. . . .

He finds that universities differ in three important respects:

1. . . . universities exist to serve a multiplicity of purposes. (i.e., it serves students, parents, alumni, industry, business, government, etc. for different reasons.)
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2. The college, and to a lesser degree the university, is more dispersed as an enterprise than the typical business enterprise or governmental agency.

3. The responsibility for making decisions is more widely diffused.

Added to the problems which these differences present is the collection of a large body of professional personnel who reject the bureaucratic organization. Corson describes this professional as a person who:

1. . . . has a self-contained logic; that is, he persists in the application of intellectual processes that are different from those of the administrator or the businessman.

2. . . . has ingrained working habits. Because he has been training to work on his own, he is apt to insist on having complete control of the way he shall do the job.

3. . . . applies objective standards of performance to his own work instead of accepting the evaluation of a superior.

4. . . . regards the imposition of conventional personnel practices . . . as the very antithesis of professional status; and there is nothing that he resents more deeply.

Coupled with these differences in organization is a lack of information about the university as an administrative enterprise:

. . . In spite of the fact that universities have existed for centuries, little has been written that aids the administrator or the student to identify the respects in which the university differs from the business firm, the military, or the public organization as an administrative enterprise.

Corson recognizes the importance of the departmental chairman in university organization and comments:

\[235\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. } 9-10.\]

\[236\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. } 29.\]

\[237\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. l.l.}\]
The departmental chairman in the typical American university is a (if not the) key administrative officer. Hence, there is need for much more thoughtful analysis of what he does and what he might do than yet exists. Scholars who will focus their research on the manner of selection of chairmen (e.g., Can you get "good" chairmen by election? Will the faculty permit their appointment by dean or president?), on their tenure, on the qualifications of individuals who serve, on the functions the chairman is expected—and permitted—to perform, and on the techniques successful chairmen use, can make a large contribution.238

Corson is unsure of the part faculties can and should play in helping to make institutional decisions. He points out that while some faculty members claim competence to make institutional decisions and are willing to spend the time and effort necessary for the decision making process, that there are many others who will not make this effort. He states:

The central question is: Should the faculty's traditional right to decide educational issues be so comprehensive "that every matter involving educational policy is to be decided only by and with the consent of the faculty?"

Observation of the government of colleges and universities suggests that the answer should be no. . . .239

In his summary of the faculty role in governance Corson emphasizes the importance of the following:

1. Faculty influence on institutional government is greatest in the realm of educational policy. Their effectiveness in contributing to such decisions is limited by the lack of analytical data on which to base objective and considered decisions. The limited interest of many faculty members in higher education, their tendency to think about and act upon specific courses or requirements rather than policies, and their primary concern with their individual subject-matter fields.

2. The attitudes of trustees, and especially presidents, toward faculty participation in decisions on other than narrowly defined "educational" questions vary from institution to institution, and within institutions from one regime to the next. . . .

238Ibid., p. 94. 239Ibid., p. 105.
3. The organizational arrangements through which faculty members are enabled to voice their views on university-wide policy questions are seldom able to bring about the participation of most members. The result, especially in the larger institutions, is a widening gap in understanding between the university officers and trustees and the "working faculty."

4. The proportion of the total faculty that participates through these organizational arrangements in decision making is further limited by (a) the limitation of voting rights to "tenure faculty members" or to those with the rank of assistant professor and above, (b) the denial of voting rights to relatively large numbers of part-time faculty members, and (c) the failure of many faculty members to attend university-wide faculty or senate meetings when faculty discussion or approval is required.\^\textsuperscript{240}

Among the items Corson finds which contributes to faculty-administration friction are faculty allegiance to their discipline rather than the organization; differing concerns with higher education; the "in-between" position of the president and the dean (between the faculty and the board of trustees); complexity of purpose in the modern university; increasing size of the university; poor communication; and "lack of operational and administrative research that would provide the factual data which would make for more objective as well as more thorough, consideration."\^\textsuperscript{241}

In conclusion, Corson suggests the following areas are in need of research:

The achievement of a better understanding of the governance of colleges and universities requires the study of each of the questions on organizational structure, on the distribution of responsibilities among participants, and on the mechanistic functioning of institutions that have been suggested in previous chapters. In addition, there is urgent need for the orderly, logical analysis of: (1) The character of a number of contrasting—great and poor—colleges and universities. (2) The nature of leadership (by presidents, but also by trustees, deans, faculty members, donors, and

\^\textsuperscript{240} Ibid., pp. 113-114.
\^\textsuperscript{241} Ibid., pp. 115-116.
alumni) that has brought about greatness or has caused the decline of colleges and universities.\(^2\)

JOHN D. MILLETT

In the Preface to his book, Millett charges that "In the writing on organization and management, scholars of public administration have never seen fit to look at the peculiar characteristics of higher education, even in its public setting."\(^3\)

Following a short reference to early writers who were concerned with management, Millett says "Yet in all the years since these beginnings, our practice has far outrun our theory or science. The art of organization has much more to its credit in our country than has the science of organization."\(^4\) Further, in reflecting on the value of business and public management concepts as they are applied to the college and university, he says "I believe ideas drawn from business and public administration have only a very limited applicability to colleges and universities."\(^5\)

Millett is convinced that the present knowledge about theories of organization is insufficient. In making reference to our limited understandings of organizational phenomena he is clearly implying that additional research is needed.

In his discussion of the basic elements of structural theory he develops four basic concepts and summarizes them as follows:

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 183.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 3.
\(^5\)Ibid., p. 4.
1. Organization is purposive, designed to bring together a number and variety of persons who working with one another undertake to accomplish a defined purpose (a product or service).

2. Organization is built upon the basis of individual and group specialization, individuals and aggregations of individuals contributing a particular skill or process to the realization of the desired purpose.

3. Organization requires integration of specialized efforts, in order that the least possible input of personnel, plant, materials, and other resources may be utilized in accomplishing the desired output.

4. Organization provides a structure of leadership in which techniques of planning, direction, and supervision communicate a sense of shared purpose, build a common objective and allegiance, and recognize achievement.²⁴⁶

In his discussion of the behavioral theories he finds eight concepts which he believes will summarize the ideas these theorists have attempted to develop. These concepts are relevant to this study and are repeated here:

1. Organization involves elements of work specialization and of integration that are to be observed primarily in terms of authority, decision making, and patterns of group behavior.

2. No one system of cooperative effort can be said with scientific accuracy to be superior to another in terms of efficiency (utilization of resources). The basic criterion of organizational effectiveness is leadership which succeeds in developing a favorable response from external power groups and in promoting a continuing commitment to a high level of productive effort on the part of the internal staff.

3. Individuals who make up a system of cooperative effort respond to their organizational environment in terms of certain felt needs, which include the need for physical and economic security, the need for a sense of personal worth, the need for acceptance (love) as a person, and the need to realize meaning from their activity and experience.

²⁴⁶Tbid., pp. 11-12.
4. Decision making in an organization seeks to evoke motivations and inducements on the part of individuals and groups to participate in a common enterprise: to accept the goals of the enterprise, to identify themselves with these goals, and to seek their achievement.

5. Organization as a pattern of status subordination for various individuals and groups may promote frustration which finds outlet in turnover, unionism, excessive ambition to rise in the hierarchy, criticism of and hostility toward superiors, a primary concern for monetary rewards, and apathy.

6. Conflict arises among individuals and groups within an organization when decisions threaten the satisfaction derived from participation in the work of the organization or when decisions suggest an uncertain future.

7. By the very fact of their existence, organizations as entities develop certain behavioral characteristics: They seek to perpetuate themselves, to preserve their internal harmony and well-being, and to achieve growth.

8. Conflict arises among organizational entities when the goals or activities of one appear to threaten the security or growth of another.247

Millett fails to define the procedures for including the active participation of faculty in the government of the university—particularly the large university, where he points out that it is impractical to gather the large faculty together for deliberative sessions. He finds one major problem to be that of the necessary day-to-day decisions that must be made quickly, without inviting participation, but which may have profound effects upon the faculty as a whole.

After a discussion of the usual reasons why faculty wish to be involved in the governance of the university, Millett concludes with a reservation in allowing the faculty too much power: "Nonetheless, by the nature of the academic community, the faculty cannot be

247 Ibid., pp. 18-20.
all-powerful. There are other constituent groups to be considered. These too have an important role in the affairs of higher education.\(^2\)\(^\text{48}\)

Millett's personal ideas of university governance can best be found in the final chapter of the book, entitled "Conflict and Consensus." Millett sees conflict between individuals not only as inevitable but of significant value: "The dynamic society experiences growth because struggle is an essential part of its existence."\(^2\)\(^\text{49}\) He recognizes that the majority of conflicts which erupt in the university are concerned with the hierarchy. And although this is the major problem, he is prepared to encourage another concept of organization for analysis which may be of more use as a generalized observation of group and interpersonal behavior. This, he believes, to be the concept of "community." His concept is succinctly summarized in the following paragraph:

The concept of community presupposes an organization in which functions are differentiated and in which specialization must be brought together in a harmonious whole. But this process of bringing together, or coordination if you will, is achieved not through a structure of superordination and subordination of persons and groups but through a dynamic of consensus.\(^2\)\(^\text{50}\)

Millett believes consensus must be obtained between the various factions on the university campus. He does not, however, offer suggestions other than the concept of "community" to achieve consensus. He states:

But the concept of community is not an automatic guarantee that there will be consensus rather than conflict. I am disposed to believe that conflict may be less bitter when it is confined to the merits of a particular issue rather than when it embraces

\(^2\)\(^\text{48}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 105.  \(^2\)\(^\text{49}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 224.  \(^2\)\(^\text{50}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 235.
far-reaching questions of power as well as substance. Yet it is naive indeed to suppose that conflict within the academic community can be eliminated by some magic organizational formula. Conflict may always be expected when individuals work together.251

In order to overcome conflict and gain consensus, Millett suggests all factions of the university should work in a spirit of "good will" and "shared respect."

Millett's most recent book, entitled Decision Making and Administration in Higher Education, properly places a focus on one of the contemporary problems of the college and university:

... Internally, a new pattern of decision-making procedure is emerging. Externally, more and more authority affecting the activities and operations of colleges and universities is being exercised by agencies of government. The full extent and impact of these changes are at best but dimly perceived at the present time.252

Millett supports the concept of "shared authority" between administration and faculty, but does not believe it has been adequately defined at this point in time. Further, he believes it is essential that the faculty become fully cognizant of the external forces which play upon the university, if they are to be truly effective in participative management.

E. D. DURYEA

Duryea is the author of Chapter 3 in the book Administrators in Higher Education, edited by Gerald P. Burns.253

251 Ibid., p. 243.


his chapter "The Theory and Practice of Administration" and advances
"three fundamental facets" which he believes are essential for organi-
zational effectiveness. If the academic leader is to be effective:

First, he will serve better to the degree that he recognizes
realistically the role of authority in the academic setting.
Authority serves as the fuel by which all formal organizations
are maintained, of course. But, authority is far more sophis-
ticated than a simple command and obey situation or relationship,
and the role of authority in the academic organization is even
more discreet than it is in other enterprises.

Second, this chapter suggests that effective leadership re-
lates closely to the administrator's ability to draw together
those persons affected by a decision into the decision-making
councils of his organization. This does not necessarily imply
staff decision-making only. Rather, it means collaboration with
academic and administrative associates on institutional policy
making, whether their opinions establish decisions or not. Such
collaborative effort tends to develop logical procedures, what
is called herein a rational process for administration. A rational
process will encourage decision-making based primarily upon the
welfare of the institution and upon the basis of available and per-
tinent data.

Third, the administrator works within the context of a specific
college or university. The character of this college or univer-
sity sets limits upon what policies can be meaningfully implemented
and also identifies opportunities for imaginative leadership.

As seen above, in the second "facet," Duryea is a strong sup-
porter of collaboration between administration and faculty.

GERALD P. BURNS

Burns was responsible, as editor, to write the summary and
evaluation of the first thirteen chapters in the book Administrators
in Higher Education. In this summary he strongly supports the concept
of collaboration and participation:

\[25^4\text{ibid.}, p. 30.\]
The concluding, yet most vital, area of consideration for the future is the one concerned with personnel. Administrators work as much with people as with things. Moreover, the people in colleges and universities--especially the faculty and students--are not always the easiest kind of people with whom to deal. . . . Nearly every author herein describing an administrative office has indicated that personal and professional attributes are most necessary and desirable. . . .

HAROLD W. DODDS

Dodds collaborated with Felix C. Robb and R. Robb Taylor in writing the book The Academic President: Educator or Caretaker? These authors studied several institutions in preparation for the writing of this work. Among other things, one of their findings was that of the institutions of

accepted educational eminence were characterized by a large measure of faculty self-government, although in varying degrees and forms, and that in each the trend in recent years has been to draw the faculty more and more into advance consultation on broad institutional policies. . . .

In addition to formal patterns of communication, they believe it is essential that the administrators be guided by a "pervasive atmosphere of good will." They conclude that their "evidence supports the well-known fact that there is a positive correlation between good will among their members and the university's success. . . ."

A by-product of participation, according to the authors, is a feeling of trust which the faculty will develop for administrators.
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However, more important, is the fact that through participation the institution will gain the benefit of the intellectual application and imaginative thinking of many persons.\textsuperscript{258}

The authors recognize certain problems which appear to be common in colleges and universities. Among these they recognize the following problem:

\ldots Are faculties exercising their governing powers as well as they should? We discovered little evidence that they are giving any systematic thought to a general theory of the optimum scope and nature of their part in government and what in their own interest can better be left to the administration in this day of growth in size and diversity. The truth is that they have paid more attention to their rights than to their own internal problems of government. Faculties find the same difficulty in drawing the line between policy framing and administrative execution that trustees do. Too many individuals nourish the erroneous idea that the only way to keep control is to have a finger in every issue, to control the details and perhaps administer them as well.\textsuperscript{259}

Other problems recognized are "the love of direct democracy, town-meeting style," and "the questionable standing attached to participation in the organizational process."\textsuperscript{260} Their survey indicated, as many other studies have also found, that many faculty do not find committee work interesting, or sufficiently prestigious to maintain their activity or membership. Thus, in many cases, the faculty committees consist of the "mediocre" faculty members who are "politically" ambitious. The authors believe it is essential for the faculty to recognize the necessity for representative government, particularly on the modern and large complex campus.

\textsuperscript{258}Ibid., p. 99. \hfill \textsuperscript{259}Ibid., p. 99.
\textsuperscript{260}Ibid., pp. 99-104.
CLARK KERR

Kerr accepts the growth of administrative duties at universities as a necessity from the pressures of growth and specialization:

... As the institution becomes larger, administration becomes more formalized and separated as a distinct function; as the institution becomes more complex, the role of administration becomes more central in integrating it; as it becomes more related to the once external world, the administration assumes the burdens of these relationships. The managerial revolutions have been going on also in the university.261

Kerr also holds reservations about the ability of the faculty to exert leadership in the modern complex university. He writes:

... Faculty government has become more cumbersome, more the avocation of active minorities; and there are real questions whether it can work effectively on a large scale, whether it can agree on more than preservation of the status quo. Faculty members are less members of the particular university and more colleagues within their national academic discipline groups.262

The influence of government and foundation contracts have, in Kerr's view, reduced the authority of the administrator—from the department chairman to the president; it has also reduced the power of faculty government, as he sees it. There may be, however, advantages since the modern-day professor is increasingly interested in research and outside agencies hold his primary allegiance anyway.

Kerr may have identified the problem and explained the reason for "militant" faculties in the following paragraph:

The faculty world seems to sense a loss of unity--intellectual and communal unity. In large measure this can be attributed to "the overwhelming predominance of things that are new over
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things that are old" and to what Robert Oppenheimer calls "a thinning of common knowledge." Knowledge is now in so many bits and pieces and administration so distant that faculty members are increasingly figures in a "lonely crowd," intellectually and institutionally. It is a sad commentary on the "community of masters" when its elements come together in interchange only when they coalesce feverishly over a grievance about some episode related to a change of the calendar or a parking fee.263

There are three major problems of change still to come to the university in Kerr's view. These are (1) the improvement of undergraduate instruction, (2) to create a more unified intellectual world, and (3) to relate administration more directly to individual faculty and students in the modern complex institutions. 264

THAD L. HUNGATE

Hungate defines the four major areas of management responsibility as: (1) the delegating and organizing function, (2) the directive function, (3) the operative function, and (4) the evaluative function. With these four areas defined, he then proceeds to establish six "guiding principles of management." He believes these six principles are basic but not comprehensive:

1. Institutional government by consensus is essential. ... This conception of what is desirable in management will be found a demanding one, yet no other course holds the promise of enlisting as widely spread commitment and application of energy to the fulfillment of the purposes of the institution. The fundamental importance in management of consensus of trustees, administration, and faculty is widely recognized.

2. In the delegation of responsibility and authority to institutional personnel, reserved control should be retained by the board, and the organization of the institution should be designed to promote and facilitate government by consensus.
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3. In setting and guiding the course of the institution, the long-term view with respect to objectives and plans is essential.

4. In the conduct of institutional programs, effective use of personnel and facilities should be achieved.

5. The personnel policies and practices should provide to personnel satisfaction in work, motivation to perform the work well and efficiently, and opportunity for growth—personal and professional.

6. Assessment of values with respect to all aspects of the institution is an important basis for institutional improvement—whether of objectives, plans, policies, programs, operations, or resources.265

The author supports the concept of decentralization and sees it as being essential towards obtaining consensus between administration and faculty. He stresses the point that an institution can only achieve a democratic climate by practicing democracy. He states that faculty participation will, for the most part, be obtained through committee work. In seeking consensus through this committee work, he stresses the importance of communications—the most important kind being face-to-face. Further he states:

The channels and practices of communication importantly condition achievement of governance by consensus. This is a matter worthy of serious study, for in addition to achieving the primary purposes, it can have important effects on personnel attitudes.266

Hungate echoes Millett in the statement that "participation in management must be in an atmosphere of mutual respect..."267
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Williams spends little time in his book discussing the relationships between faculty and administration. For the most part his book is concerned with a description of the duties of administrative officers, and of such items as space analysis, personnel records, promotions, salaries, etc. His most complete statement concerning governance of the university is as follows:

Authority in academic circles rests largely upon the consent of the governed. Effective administration cannot take place without the wholehearted respect and admiration of the faculty, individually and as a group. This spirit is fostered by decentralization, which is a mark of trust as well as a recognition that each group has varying needs. Instead of one standard, uniform policy for the entire institution, there can be a diversity of practice in academic matters.268

Later he admits that little is known about the value of decentralization, but makes the statement that if the ten best universities were examined, he believed these same universities would show the most decentralization in administrative affairs. "The greater the degree of faculty control, the greater is likely to be the intellectual superiority and distinction on the part of the whole university."269 He does not, however, discuss the possibility of other factors (e.g., greater training of the faculty, higher salaries, larger budgets, etc.) nor does he explain whether intellectual superiority and distinction follow or precede decentralization. He implies, however, that superiority will result if decentralization is in fact established.
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The authors conclude that resistance to innovation in the management of the university comes both from the faculty and the administration. They add that sometimes the greatest resistance comes from the administrators who do not wish to alter well established patterns of behavior.

Rourke and Brooks recognize the tenuous relationships between faculty and administrators and believe this relationship is the result of a confusion of roles, or even if roles are correctly identified, it is the administration which controls the flow of financial and other resources, which, in the long run, dictate the ultimate policy. They are hopeful that tensions between these two groups can be relieved if higher education continues to grow in affluence. When resources are limited there is an inevitable conflict in the disposition of these resources. Thus, the authors believe, as the university becomes more affluent and as it also gains in power, it is possible to establish better relations between faculty and administration.

These authors find four areas of change in the managerial style of higher education which they believe significant. They are:

1. The first is the shift from secrecy to publicity in the general conduct of administrative and academic affairs.

2. The second is the development, sometimes institutionalized and sometimes highly informal, of a cabinet style of government in place of the presidential system of executive leadership that has traditionally characterized university administration.

3. The third is the introduction of new forms of decision making which, if not entirely as rational as their advocates might suggest, are nonetheless considerably less subjective than the purely intuitive styles of the past.
l. Fourth, and finally, the multi-campus network that has been created in many state systems of higher education has generated both novel administrative forms and new difficulties as the world of higher education seeks to adjust to the demands of the modern age.270

The authors have noted that the new "open" management in higher education has by no means been alone in this development, but that it is similar to changes which are occurring in other forms of organization. The new approach of a "cabinet" administration and more "openness" in management is seen as a necessity, since it is now impossible for one man to administer the modern complex university. The authors caution, however, that the "cabinet" should not be allowed to cut the President off from the Deans, Chairmen, Heads of Department, and faculty.

The authors conclude their book with a short discourse on "The Managerial Revolution and University Government." In this section they attempt to point out some of the new problems which the managerial revolution presents to the question of participation of the academic staff in the decision-making processes of the university. Due to an increase in the size of universities, and as disciplines have multiplied, it has become increasingly difficult for the faculty to have direct participation in decision making on the university level. The authors believe it is necessary for the academic community to move towards and accept a representative rather than a direct democracy. Because many decisions in the modern university must be made rapidly, they believe the faculty must appoint its own committees and give them

the authority to respond to immediate needs, thus representing the faculty at all times in almost all decisions.

JAMES A. PERKINS

In writing of the complex problems which face higher education today, Perkins asserts that the time has come for us to turn our thoughts to the practical problems of management and direction. "We must, after all, find a way to run this extraordinary institution."²⁷¹

Perkins finds four areas of concern or "fears" which he believes is facing higher education today. These are (1) the fear of uncontrolled growth, (2) the fear of loss of principle, (3) the fear of loss of direction, and (4) the fear that the university will be too rigid in an era of rapid change. Further, he decides these can be expressed in two primary concerns: "The first has to do with the external relations of the university--that it may lose its identity. The second has to do with the internal cohesion of the university--that it may lose its capacity to manage its own affairs."²⁷²

Perkins expresses his concern about the management of the university as follows:

"... management is not just a matter of deciding what would be good to do. Most importantly, it involves what is timely and what is possible. It involves what is wise. And wisdom requires, among other things, an understanding of the spirit of a particular institution, the interests of its campus leaders, its financial prospects, and the priorities it gives to various academic ventures. There is no substitute for careful observation of people and events over time. ..."²⁷³

²⁷²Ibid., p. 27. ²⁷³Ibid., p. 51.
He is convinced that both students and faculty can participate in decision making only in a limited fashion. He is careful to point out, however, that these limitations arise from quite different circumstances. In the case of the faculty he mentions the problems of the large and unwieldy faculty, and intensive specialization which leads to a narrow view, of the total university. He recognizes, however, that there are individual faculty who are indispensable to the management process:

Indeed, I would put high on any university priority list the identification and support of those members of the faculty whose viewpoint is broad, who have that rare quality of seeing problems in operational terms, and whose faculty standing is solidly based on a specialized competence.274

He also recognizes that the faculty must always exert leadership in determining educational standards and policy, but he asserts that "someone must be concerned with the institution as a whole, the activities it supports, the public face it presents, and the private concerns with which it is occupied."275

As does Millett, Henderson et al., Perkins believes the faculty, administration, and students must achieve a general consensus in the affairs of the university. "But it will be, I suggest, those who spend full time at the business of direction and management who must assure this consensus--who must see to it that educational purpose and institutional interests develop in harmony.276

Perkins concludes his book with an admonition to both faculty and administrators:
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For all of us in the university there are new rules of the
game. One of the most important is that the old pitting of
faculty against administration must be recognized as a quaint
reflection of an outmoded idea of the university. The lines be-
tween teacher and administrator will be increasingly blurred, and
status will be less important than the possession of vision,
range, and the creative imagination to understand how the univer-
sity must change and grow if it is to play its proper part.²⁷⁷

HERBERT H. STROUP

Stroup contends that "drift was a hallmark of the earlier
periods in higher education." This "drift," in his opinion, is now
giving way to "planned and centralized management."²⁷⁸ Yet he sees
centralization and decentralization as both being unreal in absolute
terms. An "equilibrium" must be maintained between the two. The prob-
lems he sees in both of these facets are:

... Excessive decentralization tends to excessive over-
lapping which in its turn calls for some degree of coordination
and elimination of waste. Excessive central authority leads to
the stultification of spontaneous impulses within an organiza-
tion which in turn leads to a closure on the incentives of the
personnel. It also may lead to deeper resentment and even to
forms of rebellion.²⁷⁹

Stroup observes that as an institution becomes more rigid and
bureaucratic, informal and spontaneous lines of communication will de-
velop, and further, that informality appears to be an increasingly
prevalent "ingredient" in complex institutions. However, he sees this

²⁷⁷Ibid., p. 89.
²⁷⁸Herbert H. Stroup, Bureaucracy in Higher Education (New
²⁷⁹Ibid., p. 93.
as desirable and to be encouraged, and refers to John W. Gardner's support of the same idea. 280

As a realist, Stroup recognizes that the faculty frequently forms "power blocks," much on the same order of David Riesman's "veto groups" which block or frustrate the actions of others. 281

Stroup supports the concept of decentralization in an effort to reduce "red tape." This, however, is only one of his suggestions. He also emphasizes "personal decision-making rather than the efficacy of rules," and "effective communication." 282

Stroup also advances the concept that bureaucracy is a strong support to democracy:

... The very existence of bureaucracy tends to stave off haphazard, quixotic and even irrational effort on the part of powerful minorities. Bureaucracy is a stabilizing and regularizing influence on the social body. Its reasonable fulfillment may be a condition for the realization of a more perfect democracy. 283

Thus, if the administration and faculty can learn to use bureaucracy, it may offer the best possible means of achieving representative democracy.

NICHOLAS J. DEMERATH, RICHARD W. STEPHENS, and R. ROBB TAYLOR

The authors attribute the faculty's anti-administration and anti-organization feelings to their objection of increasing size through

281 David Riesman, Constraint and Variety in American Education (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1956), p. 94.
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enrollments, and the decrease in the university as a "community of scholars" in the classical sense. In essence the authors are saying the present-day faculty member is becoming anonymous.

They identify the following characteristics of the university which contributes to its unique need for collegial government:

. . . Specialization, the freedom of inquiry and communication, the external and disciplinary orientation of participants, and the influence potential of the academic professional all make for the dispersal and decentralization of decision-making.284

They also see the personal characteristics of scientists and scholars being formed during graduate training. These characteristics present unique problems to the university as an organization. These characteristics are:

1. Full opportunity to express, review, and debate ideas and facts.
2. Independence of thought, inquiry, and creativity.
3. Respect for the authority of scientific fact and not social power.
4. Freedom to set one's own tasks and objectives, and then to change them.
5. Dictation of "decisions of breadth" by the weight of scientific opinion.
6. Secrecy as anathema to the scientific community.
7. Confidence and trust, and not intrigue, as implicit in scientific method.
8. Personal development through colleague relations at work.

9. The concept of management as alien.\textsuperscript{285}

The authors support the conclusion of Bernard Barber concerning the possible modes of accommodation which might be applied to organizations which include the scientist and scholar and which might contribute to a lessening of tensions between the professional and the administrator. Barnard's suggestions were:

1. to segregate the professionals from the administrators and line operatives (e.g., corporations create special departments for their lawyers or medical personnel);

2. to establish different rewards and incentives that appeal to professionals (e.g., opportunities to publish, to take part in professional meetings, to advance to salary and prestige by strictly professional achievement);

3. to create differentiated authority structures.\textsuperscript{286}

The authors report several interesting findings in research conducted by R. Robb Taylor. Taylor was interested in assessing the equalitarian character of the power structure in thirty university departments. The study indicated:

\ldots Lower scores meant more equalitarian or more nearly flat structures, and the theoretical range was from zero to unity. The academic departments were not the groups of equals one might suppose. \ldots

The people of power in these departments were also people of esteem; that is, those who contributed more than their share to their departments' intellectual climates. However, the department chairman, clearly the most powerful individuals in their departments, by no means enjoyed the highest esteem. Yet, almost two thirds of them were rated above the median in esteem.

Although these departments were anything but perfect "communities of equals" that academic departments are sometimes thought

\begin{align*}
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to be, their policy and administrative power was quite widely
distributed.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 200-201.}

In their argument for faculty participation in the affairs of
the university, the authors make themselves clear in stating that pro-
fessors should not perform executive tasks, but that their participation
should be confined to matters of policy. They caution that evidence of
heavy committee involvement on the part of professors is not necessarily
evidence of collegialization. Rather, they suspect, heavy committee
work reflects a lack of sophistication in such matters.

The authors recognize that most of the important writers such
as Max Weber and Talcott Parsons have placed the bureaucratic and col-
legial styles of management in direct opposition to each other. Fur-
ther, they know of no studies which indicate it is possible for the
two styles to work harmoniously together. They believe, however, that
these views are extreme and that it is possible for the two to work
simultaneously. They refer to reorganization of the administration
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as an example of
how this combined system can work. They do, however, point out that
the bureaucratic organization at U. N. C.-Chapel Hill is not the kind
of routinization and formalization that one generally thinks of, but
that the bureaucratization was a "creative response to collegial
needs." The characteristics of this administration were identified
as follows:

1. Known and regularized channels of communication and authority,
open and used, between faculty and officials.
2. Chancellor and team of top deans composed of comparatively youthful, socially skilled former professors whose objectives were those of the faculty, on the whole—"professor administrators," to use a term.

3. Orderliness of procedures for policy-making and execution, especially through strengthened departments and hard-working officials.

4. Collegial power facilitated by appropriate bureaucratic authority and process, superseding patrimonial relations and the authority of tradition. 288

In several places throughout the book reference is made to the importance of the academic departments within the university, and the important part the departments play in the management of university affairs. Yet, the authors admit that little is known about these departments. "Their organizational structures and administrative processes are variable and unstandardized, and the culture of collegia are little known as yet to either analysts or administrators." 289 It appears that the majority of the research conducted in higher education, including that reported in this book, is most concerned with the upper-administration of the university.

The authors are obviously disturbed by a lack of empirical research in university administration. Throughout the book they refer to needs for research. In a discussion of "the collegialized manager" they assert "no administrative scientist has portrayed verbally a collegialized president or top management. Nor have we the factual materials with which to draw a definitive verbal portrait." 290
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It may be that they correctly assess the needs of university managers in a section near the end of their book:

Collegiality begins at home with the daily encounters in the departments, the executive offices, the committee rooms, and faculty meetings. It is here that the executive, if collegialized, will develop an administrative style not unlike that observed in our study of succession at the top...291

In this instance they appear to be talking about the same problems that scientists and researchers, such as Rensis Likert, are investigating and finding to hold great potential for participative governance.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The purpose of this study was to determine the reasons for faculty unrest and to recommend procedures for increased faculty participation in the governance of higher education. The task force visited thirty-four institutions in their quest to learn about the problems of institutions from junior colleges to the largest universities. In their words: "The data collected did not always confirm our presumption that conflicts existed between faculty and administration. Nonetheless, we discovered enough problems to occupy generations of chancellors yet unborn."292 Their findings and recommendations, much abbreviated, are as follows:

1. The main sources of discontent are the faculty's desire to participate in the determination of those policies that affect
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its professional status and performance and in the establishment of complex, statewide systems of higher education that have decreased local control over important campus issues.

2. An evaluation of the essential functions of administrators and faculty leads to the judgement that an effective system of campus governance should be built on the concept of "shared authority" between the faculty and the administration.

3. A meaningful application of the concept of "shared authority" should involve a wide variety of issues. (e.g., educational and administrative policies; personnel administration; economic matters; public questions; faculty participation.)

4. Arrangements for faculty representation in campus governance must be related to the locus of decision-making in the institution and the system.

5. Several types of organizations can provide for faculty representation in campus governance. (e.g., academic senate, AAUP, AFT, and NEA.)

6. There are three alternative approaches to faculty-administration decision-making in campus governance. These include information-sharing and appeals to reason, the use of neutral third parties, and the application of political, educational, or economic sanctions. The greatest reliance should be placed on information-sharing and appeals to reason.

7. The concept of "shared authority" can best be implemented through the establishment of an internal organization, preferably an academic senate.

8. A formal appeals procedure should be established to resolve disputes involving individual faculty members and the administration.

9. External associations such as the AAUP and AAHE can act as a constructive implement to the academic senate by providing information and technical services, and by supporting educational sanctions if they should become necessary.

10. Formal bargaining relationships between the faculty and the administration are most likely to develop if the administration has failed to establish or support effective internal organizations for faculty representation. In such institutions, the faculty should have the right to choose a bargaining representative.
11. Some system of faculty representation is likely to emerge in most institutions. The pattern of campus governance that prevails in the future will be determined by the measures that governing boards and administrators take to deal with faculty aspirations now.293

In addition to these findings and recommendations, the task force also delineated the role of administration and faculty in conducting the affairs of the university. They enumerate six major responsibilities for the administration. These are (1) to provide overall leadership, (2) promote the coordination of the activities of the component parts of the institution, (3) to plan and innovate, (4) help assure that particular departments or divisions meet the general quality standards of the institution, (5) serve as a mediator or buffer between the board of trustees and the faculty, and (6) the administration clearly has a major responsibility for carrying out the functions of business management.

The task force does not enumerate the responsibilities of the faculty in governance, but prefers to talk in generalities about their duties. The most explicit statements to be found in this section are: Clearly, the faculty should have wide discretion in the conduct of its professional activities; the content of curricula and particular courses should reflect the professional judgements of the faculty; the faculty can help to assess the relative contribution of (new facilities); faculty must bear the main responsibility for determining their own standards of performance.
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Concerning the proper "mix" of administration and faculty authority, they imply that this must rest upon the purposes and philosophy of the institution. They add, however, the following:

One additional comment is in order concerning the application of the concept of shared authority. Endorsement of this concept does not mean that authority should be shared equally between the faculty and the administration on all issues. On some issues, such as grades and the content of particular courses, faculty views should prevail. On other issues, such as those associated with the business management of the institution, the administration should play the preeminent role. However, on a wide range of educational and economic questions decision-making should be a joint process. Shared authority is thus a model concept which establishes the right of faculty participation while recognizing that in some substantive areas one part or the other may assume the major burden of decision-making.294

Although they are fully in favor of a faculty senate to represent the faculty, they are quick to point out that the formal establishment of such a senate does not necessarily assure the actual implementation of the concept of shared authority. The concept of shared authority, in order to work, must become a mental attitude which is implicit in day-to-day operations. The formal structure by which shared authority is to be achieved is only part of the process.

DAVID G. BROWN

Brown's research indicates that there is a definite distinction in the perceptions of faculty between the "better" and "poorer" institutions concerning administrators. The faculty in the "better" institutions assume (underlining added) administrative competency. But at the "poorer" institutions "where administrators are more prone
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to interfere with faculty independence," faculty concerns are greater. These concerns are instrumental in decision-making by the faculty concerning new jobs. Brown discovered that while administrators and administration was only ninth in importance in the final stages of decision-making in considering the reasons to leave a job, that the attitudes and abilities of top management are by far the most important factor in defining the minimally acceptable job.  

Brown insists that the attitude and ability of administrators is by far the most important factor in job choice of faculty members.

ARCHIE R. DYKES

The general conclusions about faculty attitudes toward, and perceptions of, faculty participation in academic decision-making, which Dykes was able to develop through his study, are as follows:

1. One of the most noticeable and best documented findings of the investigation is the existence of a pervasive ambivalence in faculty attitudes toward participation in decision making. . . . Asserting that faculty participation is essential, they placed participation at the bottom of their professional priority list and deprecated their colleagues who do participate.

2. A reluctance to recognize or accept the new realities of participation was documented repeatedly throughout the study. . . . The devices of direct democracy are now cumbersome and impractical, and faculties must increasingly turn to representative techniques if they are to speak with an effective voice.

3. Respondents to the study showed a strong tendency to dichotomize decisions into "educational" and "noneducational" categories and to ascribe degree of faculty influence accordingly.

It is impossible to separate decisions into simplistic categories like "educational" and "noneducational." If the faculty's influence is to be truly effective, surely it must be manifested in all areas.

4. The study findings suggest that the source of much of the tension between faculty and administration is a conviction held by many faculty members that any increase in administrative power and influence must necessarily result in a decrease in their own.

5. The study revealed a disturbing discrepancy between what the faculty perceived its role in decision making to be on the campus under study and what its role is in reality. Clearly, there is a serious communications deficiency, accentuated by the nature of the campus, not only between the faculty and the administration but among faculty members themselves.

6. Finally, the study revealed that academicians hold an exceedingly simplistic view of the distribution of influence and power in their own community.

Dykes, however, does not see the process of accommodation between faculty and administration as the basic problem. Rather the problem is "that the misunderstanding of administrative authority and the consequent separation of powers forestalls effective leadership." Strong leadership is needed to unify the efforts of faculty and administration to achieve common institutional goals.

ROGER W. HEYNS

Heyns identifies one of the university's problems as being the many demands which administrators, faculty and students place upon each other. These demands, in his opinions, are a reflection of the demands
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which society is placing upon the institution as a whole.

... External stress thus becomes converted into internal stress, and the result is a heightened tension and ambivalence in the relations among constituent groups in institutions of higher education.298

An additional problem he recognizes is that the traditional view of administration and policy making are activities that the academician could do in his spare time. Thus, the motivation and recruitment of full-time, qualified and skilled administrators is difficult.299

Heyns would give additional power to all administrators. He does not view this move as centralization of power since it is diversified throughout the institution in all administrators. He is desirous, however, of identifying the centers where decision must be made, and then giving that person the opportunity to make the necessary decisions, with a system of post-audit to appraise the results and actions of the administrator.300

This posture also calls for streamlining and improving the devices for faculty consultation and advice. These must be more specifically representative, more committed to homework and preparation. Out-town meetings are archaic, altogether too subject to the whims and tension of the moment, and too subject to political manipulation.301

Heyns believes the post-audit should also include an evaluation of the techniques used for obtaining faculty advice and participation, and that this process will result in increased faculty participation in the affairs of the university.
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BURTON R. CLARK

Clark recognizes three causes of current problems in university governance. These are:

... first of all because the rapidity of growth keeps problems ahead of the coping mechanism, formal and informal, that a campus traditionally possesses or can create and make effective in a few months or years.

... we must secondly turn to the limitations on individual involvement in policy formation that obtain in large society systems. We have long understood that we cannot run cities and nations by town hall assembly but must engage in representative government...

The third cause of current troubles in governance lies in the part-whole relationships among campus organizational structures. ... The department and the professional school are the basic operating units of the campus. They are also the natural points of identification for faculty members. Faculty interests in the running of campus affairs are expressed primarily in these units...

Clark believes it is essential to design an organizational structure which will involve the average faculty member; i.e., to bring governance down to where the faculty and students are. This may require subunits of large departments. The assumption here is that when the average faculty member truly feels involved he is likely to enter into participation much more willingly and on a higher level. "Government is where he is." (underlining added).

Research Literature

The following represents the pertinent research literature available to this researcher. A number of additional studies were
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examined for relevant data, but little of significance could be found. In addition to a personal search through the Dissertation Abstracts, published by the University of Michigan, the DATRIX service (Direct Access to Reference Information: a Xerox service) was used in an effort to locate the titles of all dissertations concerning administration, management, and leadership in higher education. The purpose in reviewing this literature was to discover data which would help this researcher to support or refute the findings in the present study and to assist in understanding the variables and factors which influence management in higher education.

EDWARD A. DOYLE

Doyle was interested in studying the operation of the department chairman in private liberal arts colleges. Although each of his thirty-three institutions studied had enrollments of 500 students or more, he purposefully avoided the liberal arts colleges of universities, since he believed the policies and practices of chairmen in the university setting, with the attendant pressures of professional and graduate schools, would likely be different. The majority of the institutions studied (24) were church-related.304

Doyle concluded that the status of the chairman is strongly influenced by several factors which are determined by administration policies. These factors were: the method of selecting the chairman;

---

his qualifications; the scope of the chairman's participation in committees, administrative and advisory boards, and in the faculty senate.

He discovered from his data that department chairmen were principally selected on the bases of three criteria: (1) previous teaching experience, (2) outstanding teaching ability, and (3) administrative talent. Although the following factors were considered in making the appointment, they were of less importance: productive scholarship, national reputation, ability to deal harmoniously with others, evidence of published research, and church activity in the church-related colleges.

The data also revealed that these chairmen devoted more of their time to teaching, counseling, and sponsoring student activities than to administration.

JOHN K. HEMPHILL

Hemphill was interested in discovering the relationship, if any, between leader behavior of departmental chairmen and the reputation of the chairman for a well administered department. He was also interested in determining the usefulness of "reputational data" as criteria of administrative quality. His study group consisted of twenty-two departments in the liberal arts college of a university. Among the most important findings to emerge from this study were:
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1. There is some relationship between the style of leadership of the department chairman as this is viewed by department members and the department reputation on the campus for being well or poorly administered. This conclusion seemed to be especially true if the actual behavior of the department chairman is viewed from the standpoint of what is held to be "ideal" behavior by members of his department.

2. Departments that achieve a reputation for good administration are those led by chairmen who attend to two facets of leadership concerned with (a) organizing departmental activities and initiating new ways of solving department problems and (b) at the same time developing warm considerate relationships with members of the department.

3. There was a lack of significant relationship between the faculty members' general impression of various characteristics of their departments and the campus reputation of the department's administration. This finding enhances the earlier reported finding of relationship between the behavior of the department chairman and administrative reputation and makes it more significant. Also, it points to chairman behavior specifically, rather than to a general impression about the department, as the more likely determiner of "reputation."

4. The significance of administration in large (compared with smaller) departments is well recognized by deans and other central officials of the college administration, and that in selecting department heads for larger departments more care was used. Therefore, chairmen of very small departments might be appointed on the basis of seniority with little regard for other qualifications, but in large departments demonstrated ability to assume administrative responsibility would be a prerequisite to appointment.

HOWARD F. ALDMON

Aldmon was interested in studying the "critical behavioral requirements" of departmental chairmen through the means of a modified version of the Flanagan's Critical Incident Technique. Included in his study were two universities and one college. 306

Upon evaluating effective incidents of thirty-one tasks performed by department chairmen, Aldmon discovered the most frequent to be "establishing and maintaining working relationships with staff members." Upon examining thirty-nine critical tasks which departmental chairmen performed least effectively, he discovered the same item appeared most frequently—"establishing and maintaining working relationships with staff members." When these lists were combined, he developed a list of forty distinct critical tasks of the department chairman. He found the following ten of these critical tasks to be significant: curriculum, instruction, institutional operation, public relations, staff personnel, student personnel, finance and business management, physical facilities, evaluation, and department operation. Further analysis indicated the area of "staff personnel" to be the most significant.

He discovered seven positive, significant, or "critical," behavioral requirements were indicated for the department chairman. These were: (1) he acts with personal integrity and displays emotional stability in administrative performances; (2) he shows consideration for others; (3) he provides for cooperative planning; (4) he seeks the resolution of problems through scientific procedures of problem solving; (5) he realizes that change is inevitable, that it should be evolutionary, and that change should be tailored to the established needs within the department; (6) he communicates freely and effectively with personnel at various levels; (7) he provides for proper management of the department.
EUGENE HAAS and LINDA COLLEN

Haas and Collen were interested in assessing administrative practices in a large university. They obtained their data primarily through the interview technique and interviewed a total of eight departmental chairmen. Among their findings were the following:

1. In the processes of hiring and evaluation, procedural formalization was found to increase as both the size of the department and frequency of decision-making increase, but repetitiveness of decision-making is the factor which tends to produce increased formalization rather than size per se;
2. Formalization of procedures for dealing with incompetent personnel is not as intimately related to departmental size as are the practices in hiring and evaluation;
3. High-prestige departments rely more consistently on formalized methods of assaying the performance of staff members;
4. High-prestige departments do not differ from those on the other extreme in the extent of formalization of procedures involving the disposition of the cases of tenured but unsatisfactory personnel;
5. Departments of the social sciences and humanities employ more humanistic methods in handling unsatisfactory performers than those used in the administration of staff relations in other departments.

HAL R. RAMER

Ramer used the interview technique in acquiring his data to observe personnel views about academic departments in colleges and universities.

---

universities. The study involves no statistical analysis, and all conclusions are drawn from his observations. The questions asked in the interview were "highly subjective" and "open-ended." He found the following characteristics to be most important in the "able" chairman's qualifications. An able chairman

1. is reasonably accomplished in the elements of academic scholarship,
2. possesses a genuine interest in and an aptitude for effective administration,
3. is committed to democratic values and procedures,
4. is humane and is sensitive to the needs and desires of his associates,
5. possesses those traits and abilities that inspire confidence and that motivate personnel to high levels of personal performance and professional achievement,
6. is loyal to his discipline, his department, and the supporting institution,
7. enjoys vibrant physical and mental health sufficient to the arduous schedule and demanding nature of the duties and tasks residing in the chairmanship,
8. is sensitive to the educational needs and personal welfare of students,
9. will seek to rise above the parochial and provincial in his personal and professional commitments.

Ramer also advances the idea that a "perceptual profile" can be developed and found useful in the process of selecting department chairmen.

Hunter wishes to discover in her study what the formal role of the faculty was in educational policy making. Specifically, she was interested in what the faculty actually did in committee work. Three main questions were asked: (1) Did the faculty want to participate in educational policy making? (2) Did practices, as they existed, offer the faculty opportunity to participate? (3) In what areas of college government did the faculty feel they should participate?

The answers to the above questions were sought in two colleges. To the first question she concluded that the faculty "seemed narrowly content" with their position in the governance of the institution and that their complacency contributes to the formalization of roles. To the second question she concluded that the faculty at neither institution actually planned educational policy. Time spent in committee meetings was frequently spent on routine matters rather than in making educational policy. To the third question she concluded that the faculty in these two institutions viewed their proper role in planning to be concerned with curriculum, admissions, and advising on employment practices. They did not believe that they should be involved in making decisions about budgets, planning new buildings, and other matters dealing with finances.

Her recommendations include the following: (1) change in the internal organization and procedures is needed if the faculty is going

---

to be involved in meaningful participation in policy making; (2) a change in customary practices and beliefs is needed if the faculty is to continue to have a role in college government; (3) studies of college government at work are necessary before change in procedures and organization can be effected.

CRAIG G. GUNTER

Gunter was interested in analyzing the responsibilities of governance exercised by departmental chairmen in five small and five large state universities in ten western states. His purposes in this analyses were twofold: 310

1. To determine the nature of responsibility allowed to departmental chairmen in the small state universities and the nature of responsibility allowed to departmental chairmen in the large state universities.

2. To make a comparison between the chairmanship in the small universities and the chairmanship in the large universities in order to establish areas where there may be an increased authority and initiative as institutions may grow and become more specialized.

Gunter used the questionnaire technique to acquire his data and these were mailed to 167 small state university chairmen and 268 large state university chairmen. The percentage of returns was 89 and 76, respectively. Significant differences between these two groups were discovered as follows:

1. In the category of chairmanship qualifications, selection, and tenure, there were differences in the areas of nominating chairmen, source of final recommendation for selection as

chairmen, specified terms of office, and in previous teaching experience and research and scholarship as believed important in selection as chairmen.

2. In the category of general functions of departmental chairmen, there were differences in the areas of final responsibility for budget administration and control, supervision of student curriculum advisement, importance of personal research and scholarship, maintenance of departmental faculty records, hours spent on teaching, undergraduate student conferences, standing committee and/or administrative board meetings, student activities sponsorship, graduate student advising and consultation, and departmental student population differences.

3. In the category of chairmanship personnel administration, there was a difference in the area of liberty in the actual procedure or policy governing faculty tenure.

4. In the category of chairmanship curriculum administration, there was a difference in the area of allocation and supervision of departmental instructional equipment.

5. In the category of chairmanship relations with faculty committees, there was a difference in the area of nominations for departmental representation on curricular committees.

6. In the category of chairmanship relations with students there were differences in the areas of time devoted to students (see 2) and the advising or guidance of undergraduates.

7. In the category of chairmanship departmental office administration, there was a difference in the area of final responsibility for hiring, supervision, and allocation of secretarial aid.

JAMES M. SHUART

Shuart's investigation sought to compare the orientations of college and university arts and science department chairmen toward selected value items with the orientations of top management and the general faculty toward these value items. Additionally, he examined the relationships between individual value-orientations of chairmen
and their immediate superordinate ratings of their administrative effectiveness.

Using a modified George Social and Economic Value Scale and the Generalized Effectiveness Rating Form, he learned that the orientations of upper administrators differed from the orientations of the faculty with respect to Perceived Mobility, Security, Group Membership, Management Controls, Enterprise and Government Control. The chairmen orientations, as a group, did not emerge as a separate grouping with regard to any of the nine value objects. However, the chairmen showed a tendency to group with the faculty and differ with the upper administration. Group Membership was the only item where chairmen were similar to upper administration.

The hypothesis that there is a relationship between the individual orientations of chairmen and immediate superior ratings of their effectiveness was not supported.

GARY LEE HARMON

Harmon was interested in studying the working relationships of individuals and organizations in the making of academic policies at a liberal arts college. He examined sources of influence and gathered individual opinions concerning the nature of policy making and their involvement in it at their institution. The institution was examined over a two-year period, during which time the faculty and administration

---

was involved in an intensive review of curricula offerings and proposed changes. His basic findings were as follows:

1. The faculty was generally unprepared for the task given it.
2. The policy issues which arose at Longview were significant issues for this period in the history of higher education.
3. The use of college catalogs for planning purposes is a questionable practice.
4. Most of the faculty appeared to rely on the representatives of their interests to originate or block policy recommendations.
5. The administration of academic policy as it involved faculty seemed to need a close assessment and a plan for change.
6. Persons in some disciplines were markedly more influential than those in others.
7. Other kinds of persons should also have been more involved in educational policy making.
8. The question of who is influential in the making of policy is at least as important as the question of how it is made or of what is the substance of the policy under scrutiny.
9. A few persons in the academic community were very influential in the making of policy at Longview; influences from outside were only occasional.
10. Leaders in the Longview community generally had a long-range vision. Also, they did not associate closely with one another.
11. Top influential persons were not necessarily perceived by the academic community as a whole.
12. The Longview community seemed to be organized around types of ideas.

---

MAURICE G. VERBEKE

Verbeke was interested in assessing two dimensions of leadership. These were called "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration."\textsuperscript{313} Initiating Structure is defined as "the leaders' behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work-group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organizations, channels of communication, and methods or procedures." Consideration is defined as "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the group." These definitions were taken from The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents by Andrew W. Halpin.\textsuperscript{314}

Verbeke sought the perceptions and expectations for leader behavior of the academic dean from three sources, the president, the dean himself and the faculty. The instrument used for this study was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire which was developed by the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University. The instrument assesses a "description" of the leaders behavior rather than an "evaluation" of his behavior.

Among the twenty-two two-year colleges Verbeke studies, he received responses from twenty-two presidents, twenty-two deans, and 175 faculty members.


\textsuperscript{314}Andrew W. Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1956), p. 4.
He reached the following conclusions based upon the findings in his study:

1. Presidents, as a total group, did not agree as to the perceived and expected leader behavior of the academic dean on both dimensions.

2. Faculty members, as a total group, did not agree as to the "Real" and "Ideal" leader behavior of the academic dean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

3. Presidents and faculty members did not agree with each other in reference to the "Real" leader behavior of the academic dean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, there were no significant differences between the expectations of these two reference groups on both dimensions of leader behavior.

4. The faculty members' perceptions and expectations of the academic dean's leader behavior differ significantly from those of the dean himself.

5. The presidents' perceptions and expectations of the academic deans' leader behavior were not significantly different from those of the dean himself.

6. The faculty members both perceived and expected more Consideration than Initiating Structure in the dean's leader behavior.

7. The presidents perceived more Consideration than Initiating Structure in the deans' leader behavior. On the other hand, amounts of each dimension desired by the presidents in the leader behavior of the academic deans did not differ significantly.

Summary

As the above literature indicates, the early writers such as Babbage, Ure, and Taylor were interested in the human aspects of management as well as in finding a "scientific" management process. While they did place the emphasis upon technicalities and management "principles," they were not unaware of human needs. Taylor, for example,
who is credited with developing the "scientific management" approach, expressed the necessity of considering the "welfare" of the worker and encouraged a breaking away from the hierarchical type of management. It appears that many writers, in reviewing Taylor's suppositions, have concentrated too heavily upon his "scientific principles" and have neglected his other expressed concerns. The "human element" was discussed by such writers as Lillian Gilbreth and E. D. Jones as early as 1914. It appears that many persons have sought a list of "guidelines" or "principles" from these early writers which would give them quick success.

The now famous Hawthorne experiments added new interest to human interactions which occur in organizations. The Hawthorne experiments opened the doors to many studies concerned with social environment, peer-influence, and informal leadership. New dimensions of leadership emerged as new understandings developed concerning the individuals working conditions, happiness, and self-esteem.

The literature in the behavioral sciences has placed increasing emphasis upon the worker managing himself. The behavioral scientist is not as concerned with the mechanics of participation as with the actual human interaction. They believe leaders must be psychologically secure, friendly and open. Participation, to them, means mental and emotional involvement—that the person must become ego-involved.

Literature dealing with administration in higher education is basically concerned with the need for increased participation among the
"community of scholars." Woodburne writes that "a teaching institution is not a hierarchy for giving and receiving orders..." and that it is important to have "mutual confidence and respect." Corson has some reservations about the faculty being involved in institution-wide decisions since it is important to have a great deal of information and to understand the various forces impinging upon the organization before making important decisions. Millett supports the concept of "community" which is a process of "bringing together, or cooperation . . . a dynamic of consensus." He further states that all factions of the university must work in a "spirit of good will" and "shared respect." Burns concludes that the most vital area of consideration for the future administrator is learning how to help people work harmoniously together. Dodds claims there is a positive correlation between good will among the university's staff and the university's success. Kerr expresses doubts that the faculty can exert leadership in the modern university because of its size and complexity. He believes we must decentralize to the "operating level." Williams supports the hypothesis that the greater the degree of faculty control, the greater the success of the university. Also, he is convinced that superiority will develop if decentralization is established. Perkins believes faculty decision-making must necessarily be limited due to the size of most institutions. He does, however, find selected faculty members important to the management process. Other writers express many of the same sentiments as those expressed above, but few produce evidence to substantiate their beliefs.
Research in higher education has been limited. Most of the research reviewed for this study has been primarily concerned with departmental chairmen. Doyle concluded that chairmen were selected on the bases of three criteria: (1) teaching experience, (2) teaching ability, and (3) administrative talent. Hemphill discovered that "good" administrators were concerned with organizing departmental activities, solving departmental problems, and "developing warm considerate relationships with members of the department." Aldmon discovered the most important facet of leadership to the faculty to be "establishing and maintaining working relationships with staff members." Among other findings Ramer found that an able chairman is committed to democratic values and procedures and is humane and sensitive to the needs and desires of his associates. Hunter concluded that considerable change must take place in internal procedures and organization if the faculty is to become truly involved in participative management.

A review of the literature suggests to this researcher that the complexities of academic governance, and the complexities of the professional-educator's ego and motives, must be analyzed in more detail before research in higher education becomes truly beneficial.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Theoretical Framework

The assumptions underlying the basis for this research are that personal and professional characteristics of administrators will correlate with management styles and that these characteristics and management styles will result in producing predictable organizational outputs. The framework might be presented in a graphic form as follows:

| Personal and Professional Characteristics of Administrators | Management Style | Organizational Output |

Selection of Applicable Concepts

The present investigation may be classified as "descriptive research" as defined in Research in Education by John W. Best:

Descriptive research describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions and relationships that exist; practices that prevail; beliefs, points of view, or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt; or trends that are developing.¹

The survey method rather than the case method was chosen for this investigation in an effort to gain a cross-sectional and extensive view of administration in senior colleges and universities. It

is believed that the case method would be a next logical step in follow-up research with intensive and longitudinal studies using the findings of the survey research.

This investigation sought to measure the effectiveness of administrators in higher education by eliciting an evaluation of each administrator by his subordinates, superordinates, and himself, and correlating these evaluations with personal and professional characteristics.

The original impetus for the development of this research came from Rensis Likert's book *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. In this book Likert explains how his questionnaires were used to assess the management characteristics of managers in the business and industrial world. The concepts of both questionnaire evaluation of managers and of management styles as expressed by Likert were accepted for application in this investigation. Likert defines his four management styles as follows:

**System I. Exploitive Authoritative:**
- Faculty does not feel free to discuss things with leader
- Leader has no confidence and trust in faculty
- Leader seldom gets ideas and opinions of faculty
- Information flow downward
- Leader has no knowledge or understanding of problems of faculty
- Bulk of decisions made at top of management
- Faculty are not involved in decision making
- Orders are issued

**System II. Benevolent Authoritative:**
- Leader has condescending confidence and trust in faculty

---

Faculty does not feel free to discuss things with leader
Leader sometimes gets ideas and opinions of faculty
Some communication between leader and faculty
Information flow mostly downward
Leader has some knowledge and understanding of problems
of faculty
Relatively little cooperative teamwork present
Policy decisions made at top, many decisions within pre-
scribed framework made at lower levels
Faculty is never involved in decision making; occasionally
consulted
Orders issued; opportunity to comment may or may not exist

System III: Consultative:

Leader has substantial but not complete trust and confi-
dence in faculty; still wishes to keep control of de-
cisions
Faculty feel rather free to discuss things with leader
Leader usually gets ideas and opinions and usually tries
to make constructive use of them
Quite a bit of communication between leader and faculty
Information flow both down and up
A moderate amount of teamwork is present in department
Broad policy and general decisions made at top; more
specific decisions at lower levels
Faculty is usually consulted but ordinarily not involved
in the decision making
Orders issued after discussion with faculty

System IV: Participative Group:

Leader has complete confidence and trust in faculty in
all matters
Faculty feels completely free to discuss things with
leader
Leader always gets ideas and opinions and always tries
to make constructive use of them
Much communication with both individuals and groups
Information flow down, up, and with peers
Very substantial amount of teamwork present
Faculty is involved fully in all decisions related to
their work
Except in emergencies, goals are usually established by
means of group participation; thus avoiding issuing
orders

The questionnaire "Profile of Organizational Characteristics,"
as used by Likert in his research for the book The Human
Organization was adapted for use in colleges and universities for the purposes of this study. Additional questionnaires were created for this research, but all are basically the Likert instrument. Each of the questionnaires developed for this research may be seen in Appendix A, Tables 3-8. A brief explanation of each questionnaire follows:

Form I: "Basic Management Characteristics of Administrators"

This form was used by the upper-administration (presidents and vice-presidents) to evaluate the management characteristics of each of their administrative subordinates (deans, division chairmen, and departmental chairmen), using the same continuum as used in all other evaluation questionnaires in the study. The names of all subordinates were entered in the column under "Administrator" and the respondent to the questionnaire was instructed to place an X at the point which, in their experience, described the management characteristics of that person at the time. An attachment was made to each of these forms which described the management characteristics of each of the four management styles. (See Appendix A, Table 4.)

Form 2: "Leadership Characteristics"

This form was used to obtain the personal and professional characteristics of each academic administrator in the college or university. The respondent was asked for numbers rather than percentages in responding to the question since it was believed numbers would be easier and quicker for the administrator to recall. Most numbers were

Ibid., pp. 197-211.
turned into percentages by this researcher for his purposes of statistical analysis. (See Appendix A, Table 5.)

Form 3: "Self Perception Profile of Management Characteristics"

Form 3, along with forms 4 and 5, were the basic Likert questionnaire adapted for this study. All three forms asked the same questions, but were directed towards different people. Form 3 sought a self-evaluation for the purposes of ascertaining if the individual had a significantly different opinion of his management style from the evaluation of him by his subordinates and superordinates. (See Appendix A, Table 6.)

Form 4: "Profile of Managerial Characteristics"

Form 4 was issued to the faculty for their evaluation of their department chairman or head. (See Appendix A, Table 7.)

Form 5: "Profile of Managerial Characteristics"

This form was issued to all administrators for the purpose of evaluating their immediate administrative superior; i.e., department chairmen evaluated their deans, deans evaluated the vice-president, the vice-president evaluated the president. The president of the college or university did not receive this form. (See Appendix A, Table 8.)

The respondents to the evaluation forms were able to choose a ranking along the continuum from one to twenty, with number one representing the most autocratic type of management possible and number twenty the most participative type of management possible (numbers 1-5 represent the "Exploitive Authoritative" style; numbers 6-10 the
"Benevolent Authoritative" style; numbers 11-15 the "Consultative" style; and numbers 16-20 the "Participative Group" style). Each of the four management styles used offer a choice of five numbers to the respondent; thus he is able not only to assess the subject according to the four classifications but can also assess the subject on a continuum within the system selected. For each subject, both an individual score for each item and a summation score (mean score) of all items will be obtained.

Thus, through the use of these instruments, the researcher expected to be able to measure (1) the perceptions of subordinates, self, and superordinates concerning the management style of a specific individual; (2) the styles of management with professional-personal characteristics; (3) the differences of management styles as they may appear in various academic disciplines, and major academic areas, as well as differences which may exist between types of institutions (e.g., church supported vs. public supported colleges and universities).

Pre-Test of Instruments

A pre-test was conducted in January and February of 1968 at the investigator's institution, a state-supported six-year university with approximately 200 faculty and administrators. Cover letters were included with each questionnaire stating the permission given for the investigation and by whom, the original source of the questionnaire, the purposes for seeking their assistance, and explanation of certain terms. Approximately 60% of the questionnaires were returned. The major problems encountered were with the evaluation forms. The
respondents indicated they had some difficulty (1) understanding some of the terminology used, (2) the concept of the instrument, (3) finding time to complete the instrument (the original instrument contained 49 items), (4) coping with terms they resented (e.g., "superior," "subordinates," "job," and "work"), (5) with disinterest in this type of research, (6) doubts about the relevance of some of the items to higher education, and (7) doubts that anonymity would be secure. Only minor difficulties arose with the other instruments used in this study.

The instruments were revised in an effort to eliminate the above problems. Dr. Likert was contacted again and asked to review the second adaptation. With his assistance, the revisions were made in April and May of 1968. Changes included: Forms 3, 4, and 5 (all evaluation forms) were reduced to 18 items each; all objectionable terms were considered for elimination; each item was reconstructed in an effort to simplify the statement and make it as short as possible; the request for academic rank and date of appointment was eliminated; common terminology was sought; Form 2 (personal and professional characteristics) was revised to eliminate the request for titles of theses and publications and seek only the number of publications.

Another pre-test was run in May of 1968. This pre-test was made among selected members of the faculty whom the investigator recognized as having the ability to analyze the instruments in an objective and scholarly fashion, and who would offer constructive criticism. All believed the instruments to be much improved and had no objections or criticisms.
During the following summer months of 1968 the investigator and his major adviser visited Dr. Likert at the Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, for the purpose of discussing the instruments, hypotheses of the study, and the statistical concepts to be employed in the study. Dr. Likert was helpful in improving the hypotheses and in clarifying certain statistical concepts. He continued to give his complete support to the investigation.

Obtaining Sampling Groups

In early August of 1968 the investigator contacted the North Carolina Board of Higher Education to ascertain their interest, if any, in supporting or recommending the study to North Carolina senior colleges and universities. The Board was willing to recommend the study to these institutions and invited the investigator to attend a meeting to be held in late August at the offices of the Board where most of the senior institutions would be represented. The investigator attended the meeting, gave all representatives copies of the study, and solicited their assistance in the study.

During September, 1968, each senior institution was contacted by mail once again to invite them to participate in the study. Included in the package were the prospectus of the study, all instruments, and a cover letter. Thirty-seven colleges and universities were contacted through the Director of Institutional Research, if there was one, or to the president of the institution if there was not. Of the thirty-seven institutions contacted the presidents of eight institutions agreed to cooperate in the study. One of these eight presidents
eventually decided not to conduct the study in his institution. The faculty and administration of another institution responded so poorly that a statistical analysis of their responses was not feasible. Thus, the responses of faculty and administrators in six colleges and universities are represented in this study. Among these six institutions there were 111 departments and fifteen offices (e.g., presidents office, vice-presidents office, offices of the various deans) consisting of 1,099 professional academic persons.

**Distribution and Collection of Instruments**

The investigator visited each of the institutions, discussed the study with representatives of the upper-administration, and made arrangements for the instruments to be distributed among the faculty and administration. The instruments were distributed to all cooperating institutions during the month of October, 1968.

The instruments were collected from December, 1968, through February, 1969. Follow-up requests were made for the return of instruments. Administrators, particularly, responded well to this follow-up request. Anonymity was guaranteed, thus no way was possible in determining who had or had not returned instruments. It was discovered that many of the faculty members in these institutions were inordinately slow in returning such instruments.

**Hypotheses and Statistical Measures Used for Testing**

The hypotheses together with an identification of the statistical analysis employed in testing each hypothesis follow:
I. There is no relationship between management style and administrative success.

a. No relationship between management style and number of (1) staff meetings held within an academic year, (2) staff meetings where only information is given, and (2) staff meetings where actual decisions are made by staff and leader.

b. No relationship between management style and percentage of faculty "turnover."

c. No relationship between management style and percentage of growth in number of student majors: (1) undergraduate, (2) graduate.

d. No relationship between management style and average number of students (per year) who continue their education and hold graduate degrees at either the same or other institutions.

e. No relationship between management style and the percentage of faculty holding (1) the doctorate, (2) masters, (3) bachelors, and (4) no degree.

f. No relationship between management style and percentage of faculty who have been in the department (1) 1-5 years, (2) 6-10 years, (3) 11-15 years, (4) 16-20 years, (5) 21-25 years, (6) 26-30 years, and (7) 31-over years.

g. No relationship between management style and the percentage of faculty holding tenure.

h. No relationship between management style and the percentage of faculty holding the rank of (1) professor, (2) associate professor, (3) assistant professor, (4) instructor, and (5) other ranks.

i. No relationship between management style and the percentage of growth reflected in buildings and equipment.

A score to represent management style is obtained by developing a mean score from the various faculty ratings given on Form 4. Administrative success (or "output") data are obtained through the use of Form 2. The statistical measure to be used for the above is a linear-correlation. See page 211 for formula.
II. There is no relationship between management style and personal-professional characteristics of administrators.

a. No relationship between management style and present age.

b. No relationship between management style and highest degree earned.

c. No relationship between management style and age at time of receiving highest degree.

d. No relationship between management style and length of time in present administrative position.

e. No relationship between management style and number of years in previous administrative positions.

f. No relationship between management style and total length of time in administrative positions.

g. No relationship between management style and percentage of time devoted to administrative duties.

h. No relationship between management style and the average number of hours worked each week.

i. No relationship between management style and the number of memberships on institutional committees.

j. No relationship between management style and the number of memberships held on regional and/or state committees.

k. No relationship between management style and the number of memberships on national committees.

l. No relationship between management style and the number of memberships in professional organizations.

m. No relationship between management style and the number of memberships in community organizations.

n. No relationship between management style and the number of non-fiction books read within the past twelve months.

o. No relationship between management style and the number of professional journals subscribed to and read regularly.

p. No relationship between management style and the number of research projects completed within the last five years.
q. No relationship between management style and the number of research projects in progress.

r. No relationship between management style and the number of professional consultant services rendered since becoming an administrator: (a) total, (b) with fee, (c) without fee.

s. No relationship between management style and the number of speeches, lectures, and/or public appearances made (off campus) within the past twelve months.

t. No relationship between management style and the number of publications (a) before becoming an administrator, (b) after becoming an administrator, and (c) total.

u. No relationship between management style and the number of formal courses taken in Higher Education and/or administration.

A score to represent management style is obtained by developing a mean score from the various faculty ratings given on Form 4. Personal-professional characteristics are obtained through the use of Form 2. The statistical measures to be used for the above are linear-correlation and analysis of variance. (ANOV is used only for b.) See page 211 for formulae.

III. There is no difference between perceived management style as measured by self, superordinates, and subordinates.

a. No difference between management style as measured by self and superordinates.

b. No difference between management style as measured by self and subordinates.

c. No difference between management style as measured by superordinates and subordinates.

A mean score is derived from the eighteen items on Form 3 for the self management style rating. The superordinates score is drawn from Form 1 where the superior gives only one score for each of the administrators under his supervision. The subordinates mean score is
derived from the various ratings given by the faculty on Form 1. The statistical measures to be used for the above are analysis of variance and Student's "t" test. See pages 211 and 212 for formulae.

IV. There is no difference between perceived management style and preferred management style of faculty within all institutions.
   a. No difference between perceived and preferred management style within an institution.

The perceived management styles of all administrators in all six institutions, as measured by the faculty on Form 1, were combined for one set of scores to be used in a "t" test measured against preferred scores which were obtained in the same manner and from the same form. Sub-hypothesis IV-a incorporates the same procedure but is limited to the scores found within each institution. The statistical measure to be used for the above is Student's "t" test. See page 212 for formula.

V. There is no difference among institutions in preferred management style.
   a. No difference among departments in preferred management style within one institution.
   b. No difference between self and subordinates in preferred management style.

Preferred management style scores are obtained from faculty ratings on Form 1, with individual scores being combined to result in a mean score for each department. Hypothesis V is measured by placing the scores of each administrator within an institution in a column, making a six-way analysis of variance table. Hypothesis V-a relies upon the chi-square one-sample test for measurement since there is
only one mean score for each department and since the very large institutions would have twenty or more departments which would result in a very large analysis of variance table. The constant score for the chi-square one-sample test was obtained by computing a mean score of all preferred scores within the institution. Hypothesis V-b is measured through the "t" test by placing all self mean scores together. See pages 211 and 212 for formulae.

VI. There is no difference among institutions in perceived management style.

   a. No difference among departments in perceived management style within one institution.

   Procedures for measuring the above are the same as those used in hypothesis V. See pages 211 and 212 for formulae.

VII. There is no difference between the management style of the president and the management styles of other administrators within the same institution.

   The management style of the president is obtained by computing a mean score from the ratings given on Form 5 by each of the president's immediate subordinates. All other administrators obtained their rating from scores on Forms 4 and 5 with the mean score resulting in the usual manner. The statistical measure to be used for the above is the chi-square one-sample test ("o" equals scores of all administrators except the president and "e" equals president's score). See page 212 for formula.

VIII. There is no difference among major academic areas (Science-Mathematics, Humanities, Professions, Social Sciences) in
preferred management style. (See Appendix B for a listing of
disciplines and/or departments placed under each major academic
area.)
a. No difference between Science-Mathematics and Humanities in
preferred management style.
b. No difference between Science-Mathematics and Professions in
preferred management style.
c. No difference between Science-Mathematics and Social Sciences
in preferred management style.
d. No difference between Humanities and Professions in preferred
management style.
e. No difference between Humanities and Social Sciences in pre-
ferred management style.
f. No difference between Professions and Social Sciences in pre-
ferred management style.

The mean scores given to each administrator who fell within one
of the four major academic areas were aligned into columns for a four-
way analysis of variance test. The mean scores were aligned into
columns of two for the "t" tests for hypotheses VIII a-f. See pages
211 and 212 for formulae.
IX. There is no difference among major academic areas (Science-Mathe-
matics, Humanities, Professions, Social Sciences) in perceived
management style. (See Appendix B for a listing of disciplines
and/or departments placed under each major academic area.)
a. No difference between Science-Mathematics and Humanities
in perceived management style.
b. No difference between Science-Mathematics and Professions
in perceived management style.
c. No difference between Science-Mathematics and Social Sciences
in perceived management style.
d. No difference between Humanities and Social Sciences in perceived management style.

e. No difference between Humanities and Professions in perceived management style.

f. No difference between Professions and Social Sciences in perceived management style.

The mean scores given to each administrator who fell within one of the four major academic areas were aligned into columns for a four-way analysis of variance test. The mean scores were aligned into columns of two for the "t" test for hypotheses IX a-f. See pages 211 and 212 for formulae.

**Statistical Measures**

For correlation analysis the linear-correlation coefficient was used for the purpose of discovering the direction (either up or down) or relationship of variables to one another. Mueller and Schuessler explain the advantages of the linear correlation coefficient (r) as follows:

... r is primarily a predictive device to forecast, for example, the expected level of performance on one variable from observed performance on another. Since r is slope, it manifestly must have a direction: predominantly up or down, according to whether the variables are positively or negatively related. It follows that the direction of the slope reflects the type of relation, which is then symbolized by a plus or minus sign. ... 4

The linear correlation coefficient formula used in this investigation is as follows:

\[ r = \frac{n \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{[n \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][n \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}} \]

---

\[ r = \frac{N \sum xy - \sum x \sum y}{\sqrt{N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2} \cdot \sqrt{N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2}} \]

In addition to an analysis of variance test, for much of the data, Student's "t" test will also be employed in analyzing part of the data. The reason for using both tests is explained by Blalock:

It will be noticed that the . . . problem could have been handled by using difference-of-means tests involving the \(t\) distribution. Three separate pair-by-pair comparisons might have been made between (the three categories). In contrast to this method, analysis of variance offers a single test of whether or not all three types differ significantly among themselves or, in other words, whether they all could have come from the same population. The advantage of analysis of variance is that a single test may be used in place of many . . .

It should not be concluded that analysis of variance is always preferable to a series of difference-of-means tests, however. The latter tests, when used cautiously, may yield considerably more information. For example, analysis of variance may lead to significant results primarily because on category is far out of line with the rest. Had this category been excluded the conclusion might have been quite different. A series of difference-of-means tests might indicate this fact more clearly.\(^5\)

The analysis of variance formula used in this investigation is as follows:

Total = \[ \sum \sum x_{ij}^2 - \frac{\left( \sum \sum x_{ij} \right)^2}{N} \]

Between = \[ \sum \frac{\left( \sum x_{ij} \right)^2}{N} - \frac{\left( \sum \sum x_{ij} \right)^2}{N} \]

Within = total - between

---

Student's "t" test formula is as follows:

\[
\frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sqrt{\frac{N_1 S_1^2 + N_2 S_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2}}} \sqrt{\frac{N_1 + N_2}{N_1 N_2}}
\]

df = \(N_1 + N_2 - 2\)

The remaining analyses will be made with the chi-square one-sample test. As explained by Siegel, the chi-square one-sample test is a test for "goodness of fit" and may be used to test whether a significant difference exists between an observed number of responses falling in each category and an expected number based on the null hypothesis.

A reservation must, however, be made in the use of this test:

The literature does not contain much information about the power function of the \(x^2\) test. Inasmuch as this test is most commonly used when we do not have a clear alternative available, we are usually not in a position to compute the exact power of the test.\(^7\)

The chi-square one-sample test has been chosen for use in this study for the reason just mentioned, there is no clear alternative available.

The formula for the chi-square one-sample test is as follows:

\[
\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}
\]

For the purposes of this study a modification has been made in that "O" and "E" are scores rather than frequencies.

---


CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE ANALYZED DATA

These data were gathered for the purpose of analyzing selected behavior characteristics of administrators in higher education. An attempt was made to ascertain relationships (1) between the management characteristics of administrators and selected success criteria and (2) between the management characteristics of administrators and personal-professional characteristics. It was hoped that from such an analysis, certain characteristics and management styles indicating the best management style for leadership success might be identified. Differences, if any, were sought concerning the perceptions and preferences of management styles among self, superordinates, and subordinates; among departments; among major academic areas; and among administrators.

Descriptive Data

These data were drawn from six cooperating senior colleges and universities located in the state of North Carolina. Among these six institutions there were 111 departments and fifteen offices (e.g., presidents office, vice-presidents office, offices of the various deans) consisting of 1,099 professional academic persons. Of this number, 86.6% of the departments and offices are represented in the study, and 46.4% of the individuals responded. A complete analysis of the responses obtained from the individuals in the six institutions,
and from each institution individually, may be seen in Appendix B, Tables 9-15.

Among the eighty-seven administrators who were involved in this study, the following profile was developed of the "average" administrator both in personal and departmental characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present age</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree earned</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of receiving highest degree</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in present administrative position</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in previous administrative positions</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of years in administrative positions</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of time devoted to present administrative duties</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours in work week</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of memberships in institutional committees</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of memberships in regional and/or state committees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of memberships in national committees</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of memberships in professional organizations</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of staff meetings held in department within an academic year</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of staff meetings for information</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of staff meetings for decision-making</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The number of meetings for information and decision-making will not produce a total of 12.8 due to &quot;overlapping&quot; purposes of meetings.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of community organizations in which he is active at present</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-fiction books read within the past 12 months</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of professional journals subscribed to and read regularly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of research projects completed within the last five years</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of research projects in progress</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of professional consultant services since becoming an administrator</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of consultant services with fee</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of consultant services without fee</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of growth in departmental faculty per year</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of speeches, lectures, and/or public appearances made (off campus) within the past twelve months</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of publications</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of publications before becoming an administrator</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of publications after becoming an administrator</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of annual growth in undergraduate departmental student majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of annual growth in graduate departmental student majors (of those with graduate studies)</td>
<td>118.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of departmental faculty holding:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of annual faculty &quot;turnover&quot;</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty who have been in the department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ years</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty holding tenure</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty holding each professorial rank:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of growth in value of buildings and equipment for department use (per year)</td>
<td>137.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses Tested

There were nine major hypotheses and thirty-one sub-hypotheses to be examined in this research. The results of the statistical analysis of each of these forty hypotheses follows: (asterisk indicates significance at p < .05 level of confidence).

I. THERE IS NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUCCESS. (Management style refers to the four systems of management as discussed on pages 196-197. The continuum used in this study indicates that the most autocratic or dictatorial administrator will have a score of 1 while the most participative and democratic administrator will have a score of 20.)

a. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND NUMBER OF
   (1) STAFF MEETINGS HELD WITHIN AN ACADEMIC YEAR
   \( r = .1452 \)
   (2) STAFF MEETINGS FOR GIVING INFORMATION ONLY
   \( r = .1892 \)
   (3) STAFF MEETINGS FOR ACTUAL DECISION-MAKING BY
       LEADER AND STAFF
   \( r = .1466 \)

b. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY TURNOVER
   \( r = .0996 \)

c. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND PERCENTAGE OF GROWTH IN NUMBER OF STUDENT MAJORS:
   (1) UNDERGRADUATE
   \( r = .2072 \)
   (2) GRADUATE
   \( r = .0022 \)

d. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER YEAR WHO CONTINUE THEIR EDUCATION AND OBTAIN GRADUATE DEGREES AT EITHER THE SAME OR OTHER INSTITUTIONS
   \( r = -.0397 \)

e. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY HOLDING THE
   (1) DOCTORATE
   \( r = .0232 \)
   (2) MASTERS
   \( r = .0007 \)
   (3) BACHELORS
   \( r = .0143 \)
   (4) NO DEGREE
   \( r = -.3236* \)

f. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY WHO HAVE BEEN IN THE DEPARTMENT
   (1) 1-5 Years
   \( r = .6677* \)
   (2) 6-10 Years
   \( r = -.1415 \)
(3) 11-15 Years \( r = -0.2226^* \)
(4) 16-20 Years \( r = -0.1227 \)
(5) 21-25 Years \( r = -0.0185 \)
(6) 26-30 Years \( r = -0.1627 \)
(7) 31-over Years \( r = 0.1340 \)

**g. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY HOLDING TENURE**

\( r = 0.0143 \)

**h. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE PERCENTAGE OF STAFF HOLDING THE RANK OF**

- (1) INSTRUCTORS \( r = -0.1633 \)
- (2) OTHER RANKS \( r = 0.2104 \)
- (3) ASSISTANT PROF. \( r = -0.0461 \)
- (4) INSTRUCTORS \( r = -0.0959 \)
- (5) OTHER RANKS \( r = -0.2253^* \)

**i. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE PERCENTAGE OF GROWTH REFLECTED IN BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT**

\( r = 0.0255 \)

As indicated above, only four of the twenty-five variables were found to be significant at the accepted .05 level of confidence. Three of these four variables are negative relationships; thus, as the management level is judged to be more autocratic we have evidence that:

1. there is an increasing number of persons on the faculty without a degree,
2. there is an increasing number of persons who have been on the faculty from 11-15 years, and
3. there is an increasing number of persons who do not hold one of the usual four academic ranks.

The actual number of faculty without degrees or academic rank is quite small. However, these persons fell within six of the 87 departments being analyzed and these six were obviously sufficiently autocratic in management to create statistical significance. The one positive relationship indicates that as the management level becomes more participative there is an increasing number of persons on the faculty who have been in the department from 1-5 years. This relationship is
actually at the $p < .001$ level of confidence. All other relationships were too small to reach the .05 level of confidence. Thus, there is little evidence that a relationship exists between management styles and administrative success as defined in this research.

The second hypothesis was concerned with relationships between management styles and person-professional characteristics of administrators. The results of the linear correlations run with these twenty-four characteristics are as follows:

II. THERE IS NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND PERSONAL-PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ADMINISTRATORS

- a. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND PRESENT AGE $r = -.1898$

- b. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED

  $p > .05$ Analysis of Variance test. Accepted.

- c. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND AGE AT TIME OF RECEIVING HIGHEST DEGREE $r = -.0986$

- d. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND LENGTH OF TIME IN PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION $r = -.0055$

- e. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND LENGTH OF TIME IN PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS $r = -.0324$

- f. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND TOTAL LENGTH OF TIME IN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION $r = .0190$

- f. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND PERCENTAGE OF TIME DEVOTED TO ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES $r = -.0528$

- h. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS IN WORK WEEK $r = .1069$

- i. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS ON INSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEES $r = -.0097$

- j. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS ON REGIONAL AND/OR STATE COMMITTEES $r = .0223$
k. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS ON NATIONAL COMMITTEES  
   \( r = 0.0400 \)

l. NO RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS  
   \( r = -0.0993 \)

m. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS  
   \( r = -0.0111 \)

n. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF NON-FICTION BOOKS READ WITHIN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS  
   \( r = 0.0782 \)

o. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS SUBSCRIBED TO AND READ REGULARLY  
   \( r = 0.0352 \)

p. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF RESEARCH PROJECTS COMPLETED WITHIN THE LAST FIVE YEARS  
   \( r = -0.0028 \)

q. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF RESEARCH PROJECTS IN PROGRESS  
   \( r = -0.0239 \)

r. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT SERVICES RENDERED SINCE BECOMING AN ADMINISTRATOR:
   (1) TOTAL  
   \( r = -0.1222 \)
   (2) WITH FEE  
   \( r = -0.1516 \)
   (3) WITHOUT FEE  
   \( r = -0.0590 \)

s. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF SPEECHES, LECTURES, AND/OR PUBLIC APPEARANCES MADE (OFF CAMPUS) WITHIN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS  
   \( r = -0.0514 \)

t. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS
   (1) BEFORE BECOMING AN ADMINISTRATOR  
   \( r = 0.1159 \)
   (2) AFTER BECOMING AN ADMINISTRATOR  
   \( r = -0.0636 \)
   (3) TOTAL  
   \( r = 0.0982 \)

u. NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AND THE NUMBER OF FORMAL COURSES TAKEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND/OR ADMINISTRATION  
   \( r = -0.0221 \)

As can be observed, the correlations were very low. The analysis of variance test indicated no significance. Thus, the null-
hypothesis, that there is no relationship between management styles and personal-professional characteristics of administrators, is accepted.

The third major hypothesis was concerned with differences in the perceived management style of an individual as seen by himself, his superordinates and subordinates.

III. THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERCEIVED MANAGEMENT STYLE AS MEASURED BY SELF, SUPERORDINATES, AND SUBORDINATES

p < .05 Analysis of Variance test. Rejected.

a. NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AS MEASURED BY SELF AND SUPERORDINATES

p > .05 Two-tailed Student "t" test. Accepted.

b. NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AS MEASURED BY SELF AND SUBORDINATES

p < .05 Two-tailed Student "t" test. Rejected.

c. NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MANAGEMENT STYLE AS MEASURED BY SUPERORDINATES AND SUBORDINATES

p > .05 Two-tailed Student "t" test. Accepted.

As seen above, an analysis of variance test indicated a significant score with p < .05, thus the null-hypothesis was rejected. Further analysis through Students "t" test, however, indicated no difference between self and superordinates, and superordinates and subordinates. The "t" test discovered the difference to lie between self and subordinates, with self scores higher than subordinate scores.

The fourth hypothesis was concerned with differences between what persons perceived the present management style to be and what they preferred.
IV. THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERCEIVED MANAGEMENT STYLE AND PREFERRED MANAGEMENT STYLE AMONG FACULTY IN ALL INSTITUTIONS

\[ p < .05 \] Two-tailed Student "t" test. Rejected.

a. NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERCEIVED MANAGEMENT STYLE AND PREFERRED MANAGEMENT STYLE WITHIN AN INSTITUTION

\[ p < .05 \] Two-tailed Student "t" test. Rejected.

The data were analyzed to see if differences existed among the six institutions and among departments within a single institution. In all cases the null-hypotheses were rejected at \( p < .05 \). There is, indeed, a difference in what they perceive to have, and what they would prefer to have. In all cases they prefer to have a more participative management style used than the one in current use. See Appendix B, Tables 16-21 for the actual scores for each department and office in each institution.

The fifth hypothesis was concerned with differences among institutions and departments concerning the management style they prefer. V. THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE AMONG INSTITUTIONS IN PREFERRED MANAGEMENT STYLE.

\[ p > .05 \] Analysis of variance test. Accepted.

a. NO DIFFERENCE AMONG DEPARTMENTS IN PREFERRED MANAGEMENT STYLE WITHIN ONE INSTITUTION.

\[ p > .05 \] Chi-square one sample test. Accepted.

Obviously both null-hypotheses must be accepted. However, an additional sub-hypothesis under number V was that there would be no difference between self and subordinates in preferred management style.

b. NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF AND SUBORDINATES IN PREFERRED MANAGEMENT STYLE.
p < .05 Two-tailed Student "t" test. Rejected.
Thus, there is a difference in the preferred management style of the
leader and his subordinates, with leaders preferring more participa-
tion than subordinates indicate they prefer. See Appendix B for self preferred scores by institutions.

The sixth hypothesis was concerned with differences among in-
stitutions in perceived management style.

VI. THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE AMONG INSTITUTIONS IN PERCEIVED MANAGEMENT
STYLE.

p > .05 Analysis of variance test. Accepted.

a. NO DIFFERENCE AMONG DEPARTMENTS IN PERCEIVED MANAGEMENT STYLE
WITHIN ONE INSTITUTION

p > .05 Chi-square one-sample test. Accepted.

The data supported the null-hypothesis with p > .05, which did not
meet the level of significance established for this research. In
addition, the sub-hypothesis was also accepted. There are no differ-
ences in perceived management styles among departments within insti-
tutions or among all six institutions.

The seventh hypothesis was concerned with differences between
the management style of the president and the management styles of
other administrators within the same institution.

VII. THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MANAGEMENT STYLE OF THE
PRESIDENT AND THE MANAGEMENT STYLES OF OTHER ADMINISTRATORS
WITHIN THE SAME INSTITUTION.

p > .05 Chi-square one-sample test. Accepted.

A chi-square one-sample test was run within each of the six institutions
and in all cases the data was found not significant. It was concluded
that there is no difference in administrative styles within the same institution between the president and other administrators.

The eighth hypothesis was concerned with differences among the four major academic areas and their preferences in management style.

VIII. THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE AMONG MAJOR ACADEMIC AREAS (SCIENCE-MATHEMATICS, HUMANITIES, PROFESSIONS, SOCIAL SCIENCES) IN PREFERRED MANAGEMENT STYLE.

p > .05 Analysis of variance test. Accepted.

Six sub-hypotheses suggested no differences between any two of the four major academic areas. Students "t" test was used for this analysis and in all six cases the data produced were not found to be significant. It was concluded that there are no differences between the major academic areas concerning their preferred management style. See Appendix B, Table 28, for a comparison of scores in these four major academic areas.

The ninth hypothesis was concerned with the differences in perceived management style among the four major academic areas.

IX. THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE AMONG MAJOR ACADEMIC AREAS IN PERCEIVED MANAGEMENT STYLE.

p < .05 Analysis of variance test. Rejected.

Since the hypothesis has been rejected it is necessary to examine the data through a series of "t" tests to locate the area or areas that do differ. The two areas found to differ are:

c. NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SCIENCE-MATHEMATICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES IN PERCEIVED MANAGEMENT STYLE

p < .05 Two-tailed Student "t" test. Rejected.
d. **NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES IN PERCEIVED MANAGEMENT STYLE**

\[ p < .05 \] Two-tailed Student "t" test. Rejected.

While the Social Sciences were found to have no differences with the Professions, and there were no differences among the other combinations, the Social Sciences are significantly different from the Humanities and the area of Science-Mathematics, with the Social Sciences indicating that their leaders are perceived to be less participative than those in the Humanities and the area of Science-Mathematics. See Appendix B for a comparison of these scores.

**Additional Findings**

A further examination of the evaluation forms included an item analysis to determine the standard deviation score of the eighteen items for both faculty and self responses. The combined means of each of the eighteen items results in a standard deviation of .9 for faculty ratings \( \text{mean} = 14.0 \) and 1.3 for self ratings \( \text{mean} = 15.4 \). This consistency between items appears to further support the validity of the instrument as a reliable tool to assess these characteristics. The mean scores for each item, by institutions, may be seen in Appendix B, Tables 30-35. The combined perceived mean scores by faculty in each institution may be seen in Appendix B, Table 36. The combined perceived mean scores by self ratings of administrators may be seen in Appendix B, Table 37.

Note that as a group the faculty from all institutions perceive their leaders to be weakest in items 12, 7, and 17, in that
These questions appear related in that the faculty would like for their leaders to be more participative in making decisions concerning objectives and to review the progress of achieving these objectives. Clearly, the faculty finds their leaders weakest in inviting participation in the decision-making process.

On the other end of the continuum the faculty, as a group, find their leaders most participative in items 2, 10, and 9, in that order. These questions and their mean scores were:

2. How free does faculty feel to talk to leader about problems and responsibilities? 15.7
10. How accurate is upward communication? 15.6
9. How is downward communication accepted? 15.5

Note that these items are concerned with communication and indicating that the faculty believes the line of communication is relatively free and open. However, these scores must be rounded in order to bring them up to the lowest score in the Participative Group management system. An examination of the remaining items indicates that in addition to items 12, 7, and 17, items 3, 5, and 6, also received relatively low scores which indicate that while communication is open, actual decision-making, responsibility, and cooperative teamwork is not invited, except on a purely Consultative basis.
The administrators, however, chose items 5, 17, 16, and 7 as the lowest scores on their self perceived management style. These questions and their mean scores were:

5. Where is responsibility felt for achieving organization's goals? 13.7
17. How concentrated are review functions? 14.1
16. How much covert resistance to goals is present? 14.4
7. How much communication is aimed at achieving organization's objectives? 14.4

Note that two of these agree with the faculty's low ratings--numbers 7 and 17. Note also that all of the above ratings are concerned with goals, objectives, and review functions. Apparently, the leader perceives the faculty as showing resistance to the goals of the organization. Possibly this is related to item 12, which the faculty placed as the lowest score; i.e., if the faculty were invited to participate in actual decision-making, perhaps this would eliminate much of the resistance which the leader perceives and would also increase the feeling of responsibility among the group on a participative level which the leader perceives as being the weakest item among these eighteen.

The administrators see the greatest degree of participation being in connection with items 2, 4, 15, 3, 9, and 8. None, however, even when rounded to the nearest whole number, can get above the lowest score in the Participative Group category. These questions and their mean scores were:

2. How free does staff feel to talk to leader about problems and responsibilities? 16.4
4. Is predominant use made of threats, punishment, rewards, or involvement? 16.3
15. How are organizational goals established? 16.2
3. Are staff ideas sought and used, if worthy? 16.1
9. How is downward communication accepted? 16.1
8. What is the direction of information flow? 16

Thus, the leaders and faculty agree on the relative placement of only two items in the above list, items 2 and 9. Both are concerned with open communications. Item 10, from the faculty list, is the only item from the eighteen where there is perfect agreement—upward communication has limited accuracy. A comparison of the two lists of scores, indicates that the greatest degree of difference is between items 12, 3, 8, 6, and 15, in that order. Numbers 3, 8, and 15 are in the above list. Note that these areas of greatest disagreement are basically concerned with decision-making and establishing goals.

As mentioned above, only one item received the same score from both faculty and leaders. On all other items the leaders perceived the management style to be more participative than the faculty. However, even though both faculty and leaders prefer participative management (see Appendix B, Tables 16-27), and leaders indicate a stronger desire for participative management than faculty, neither the faculty nor leaders find present management practices to be in this category. Both perceive present management to be on a high consultative level.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Problem

Many educators have written of the need for empirical research in higher education. Some have suggested that one reason for the many present problems in higher education is that of the lack of knowledge about the actual operation of a college or university—that we do not really know what makes the organization "tick." Much has been written about higher learning and about the organizations known as colleges and universities, but little can be found in the literature that refers to viable research, and only a few doctoral dissertations have concerned themselves with empirical research studies dealing with higher education.

This research was conceived to help add to this area of knowledge where so little is known and where so much needs to be done. The basic purposes of this study then, were to (1) determine if the most successful administrators found in selected higher educational institutions are applying classical organizational procedures or are using the newer systems of management, (2) determine the professional and personal characteristics of successful educational administrators in an effort to find tangible measures of leadership qualities, (3) discover and examine other variables contributing to successful higher education.
education administration, and (h) develop an instrument which will make it possible for the upper-administration of higher educational institutions to determine if their departments are functioning in the manner they desire and achieving the goals of the institution.

In an effort to achieve the above stated purposes, an important limitation of the study was the type of institution to be investigated. The decision was made to limit the study to senior institutions which offered the baccalaureate degree or higher. Within this limitation, however, an attempt was made to gain breadth and depth by obtaining both church-related and public supported institutions, liberal arts colleges and multi-purpose institutions.

Design of Study

As descriptive research the study relies upon questionnaires for obtaining data. The survey method rather than the case method was chosen for this investigation in an effort to gain a cross-sectional and extensive view of administration in senior colleges and universities. The study sought to measure the effectiveness of administrators in higher education by eliciting an evaluation of each administrator by his subordinates, superordinates, and himself, and correlating these evaluations with personal and professional characteristics.

The four management styles used in this study are discussed fully on pages 196 to 197. These four styles are (1) Exploitive Authoritative, (2) Benevolent Authoritative, (3) Consultative, and
(l) Participative Group. Each administrator was assessed through eighteen variables each of which could be rated along a continuum of scores from 1-20. Number 1 would have been the most authoritative and autocratic management possible and number 20 the most participative and democratic management possible. (See Appendix A, Table 7.)

Personal and professional characteristics were obtained from a questionnaire presented to each administrator (see Appendix A, Table 5).

The investigation includes six senior institutions which are representative of certain diverse characteristics such as both small and large institutions, private and public control, complex and simple organizations, undergraduate and graduate programs, and vertical and horizontal administrative organization.

The scope of the study includes all academic administrators within a single college or university; i.e., department heads (chairmen), directors of departments and schools, academic deans, vice-presidents for academic affairs, and the president. The study also includes the active participation of the entire faculty of the institution.

Discussion of Findings

The methodology and instruments used in conducting the study appear to have served the purpose satisfactorily. No problems arose with any of the six institutions regarding the distribution and
collection of instruments. All official contacts with the institutions were cordial, and the individuals with whom this researcher worked were helpful and interested in the study. The response from administrators in these six institutions was particularly gratifying. A response of 85% is considered quite high with questionnaire research. It is considered exceptionally high in this case since the administrator had not one, but three questionnaires to complete. The faculty responded with less enthusiasm, but were represented with a respectable response of 46%. A negligible number of questionnaires were returned incomplete, indicating to this researcher that the participants understood the questionnaire without difficulty. This assumption is supported by the very high correlations obtained when the eighteen items were intercorrelated. The intercorrelations of the eighteen items indicated no correlations less than .86 with the majority of correlations running .9+. Thus, the management evaluation forms appear to be highly consistent in assessing the characteristics expressed in the questionnaire.

Several interesting observations might be made of the "average" administrator who participated in this study. He earned his Ph. D. when he was thirty-five years of age and became an administrator two years later; he works an average of fifty hours per week and serves on five institutional committees; he has read seventeen non-fiction books within the last twelve months and reads five professional journals regularly; he has completed two research projects within the past five years and is presently engaged in one; he has served
as a consultant seven times within his twelve year tenure as an administrator; his staff is growing at a rate of nineteen percent a year and his staff "turnover" is only six percent per year; thirty-nine percent of his staff hold the doctorate, fifty-six percent have been on his staff five years or less, and twenty-nine percent are assistant professors, while thirty-four percent hold tenure; he has given seven public addresses within the past twelve months; he has written a total of thirteen published articles, of which sixty percent were written before he became an administrator; the number of undergraduate majors in his department has increased at the rate of thirty-seven percent per year, and graduate students (in departments which offer graduate work) have increased at the annual rate of 118 percent; he has had an annual growth and improvement in physical facilities for his department of 137 percent; and he has taken two formal courses in the field of higher education and/or administration.

Some of the above characteristics were among those used to measure administrative "success" with management style. It was assumed that "successful" management would be reflected in the following tangible measures: (1) the growth in numbers of student majors within a department will be larger than less successful departments; (2) there will be a limited "turnover" of faculty within the department; (3) significant growth will be reflected in the physical facilities and other resources available to the department; (4) the majority of the faculty will hold tenure (indicating little "turnover" and superior teaching/scholarship; and (5) a larger percentage of students
achieving undergraduate degrees in those "successful" departments and institutions will obtain graduate degrees in either the same or other institutions. As will be seen, in the following discussion, no management style was found to correlate significantly with the above characteristics or assumptions.

The first null-hypothesis stated there is no relationship between management styles and administrative success. The majority of correlations obtained for the various sub-null-hypotheses were grouped between -.2 and .2. Only one item began to indicate a linear relationship and the r for this item was only .66. Thus, the null-hypothesis must be accepted—there is no relationship between management style and "success" using the various criteria measured in this research. Such factors as the number of staff meetings held per year, the amount of "turnover" in the staff per year, the number of students who continue attending college and obtain graduate degrees, the percentage of staff holding the doctorate, the percentage of staff who have been in the department any given number of years, the percentage of faculty holding tenure, the percentage of staff holding the various professional ranks, and the percentage of annual growth in physical facilities for departmental use have no relationship with management styles. The correlations indicate a fairly general spread of these variables throughout all of the various management styles reported.

The second major null-hypothesis stated there is no relationship between management styles and personal-professional characteristics of administrators. The data gathered here are in agreement with
leadership studies conducted in the business and industrial world. The "trait" approach to identifying successful leadership cannot be used. The null-hypothesis must be accepted based upon the findings in this research. The majority of correlations which developed from the analysis of the sub-null-hypotheses grouped between -.1 and .1. No relationship was greater than ±.18. Thus, no linear relationship could be discovered between management styles and such variables as present age; highest degree earned; age at time of receiving highest degree; length of time in administrative position and total length of time in administrative positions; percentage of time devoted to administrative duties and average number of work hours per week; number of institutional, state, regional, and national committee memberships; memberships in community organizations; number of non-fiction books read within past twelve months; and number of professional journals subscribed to and read regularly; number of research projects completed within last five years, and number presently in progress; number of consultant services rendered; number of public appearances within last twelve months; percentage of publications before and after becoming an administrator, and total number of publications; and the number of formal courses taken in the field of higher education and/or administration.

The third major null-hypothesis stated there is no difference between perceived management style as measured by self, superordinates, and subordinates. An analysis of variance test indicated that the null-hypothesis should be rejected at the .05 level of confidence.
Through a series of "t" tests the specific area of difference was located as being between self and subordinates. The null-hypotheses concerning no difference between self and superordinates, and superordinates and subordinates could not be rejected since \( p > 0.05 \). The difference then was between the leader and his subordinates. The accumulated sums of scores, means, and \( N \) for each of these categories may be seen in Appendix B, Tables 16-27.

As one might expect, from other research studies dealing with self perceptions, the leaders believed they were operating on a higher level of participation with their staff than the staff believed they were. This has been mentioned earlier in connection with the item analysis of the eighteen questions asked on the evaluation form. In that analysis we saw that the leader and faculty agreed on only one item. On all of the remaining items the leader scored himself higher than the faculty. Possibly the instrument would have value to administrators who were interested and mature enough for a self-evaluation. One can imagine that a truly progressive and "open" personality ("open" in the sense that Abraham Maslow, the psychologist, refers to open personalities; i.e., not defensive, secure, emotionally mature, etc.) could use the instrument to occasionally assess himself to see if he is in relative agreement with his faculty.

The fourth null-hypothesis stated there is no difference between perceived management style and preferred management style among institutions, with a sub-null-hypothesis stating no difference between perceived and preferred management style within an institution. In
the first instance an analysis of variance test was used, and with each of the six institutions Students "t" test was applied. In all cases the differences were significant at \( p \leq .05 \) level of confidence. There is, indeed, a difference in what the faculty want or prefer to have in management style and what they perceive to have at present. As indicated in Appendix B, Tables 16-21, they are clearly interested in having participative management. They also clearly have consultative management. When the sums of means are obtained for all departments it is clear that the faculty preferred management at the participative level with their mean score of eighteen, and the mode and median also being at eighteen. This score is, of course, in the middle of the five cells under Participative Group management on the evaluation forms.

The fifth major null-hypothesis stated there is no differences among institutions in preferred management style, with two sub-null-hypotheses concerned with differences among departments within one institution and differences between self and subordinates in preferred management style. In the first case an analysis of variance test indicated the null-hypothesis must be accepted since \( p > .05 \). The institutions do not differ in preferences concerning management style. All institutions seek the participative management style. A \( \chi^2 \) one-sample test was applied among departments within one institution and the result was the same, the null-hypothesis must be accepted at \( p > .05 \). All except one department indicated a preference for participative management. The null-hypothesis stating no difference between self and subordinates in preferred management style, however, was
rejected at \( p < .05 \). When scores were rounded to the nearest whole number, the leaders in all institutions indicated they preferred participative management, but at a higher level than the faculty indicated. Their mean score was nineteen, one point higher than the faculty. Frequently the researcher found administrators who marked their preference at the highest point on the scale for all items, under twenty. "Perfection," however, would appear to be unrealistic. In this respect, the faculty may be nearer to reality with their score of eighteen.

Additional information in Appendix B, Table 38, indicates the relative position of the departments under the five cells representing Participative Group management. Again, clearly indicated, is the desire of all departments to have participative management. Note that only one department, Nursing, strives for the highest possible rating.

The sixth null-hypothesis stated no difference among institutions in perceived management style, and no difference among departments within a single institution. An analysis of variance test was applied to the data for the institutions with the result that the null-hypothesis should be accepted at \( p > .05 \). There is no difference among the institutions in perceived management. A chi-square one-sample test was applied to the data to test differences among departments within one institution. This null-hypothesis was accepted at \( p > .05 \). In Appendix B, Table 39, we can see the relative position of the departments as they are perceived to be managed. Only five departments (when all departments are grouped together from all six institutions) achieve the Participative Group level of management. Appendix B, Table 40,
indicates the number of departments that were placed under each of the four management systems and the cells which they group under. Only one department was cast into the Exploitive Authoritative system, and only six under the Benevolent Authoritative system. The majority, 54.17% (50 departments) fell under the Consultative system and 35.95% (32 departments) fell under the Participative Group system. As noted below the table, the mean score for all departments was 14.29, the mode was 16 and the median was 15. While the largest single group of departments was barely in the Participative Group system, the mean and median department was in the Consultative system.

The seventh null-hypothesis stated there is no difference between the management style of the president and the management styles of other administrators within the same institution. A chi-square one-sample test was applied to the data with the result that the statement was accepted at p > .05 level of significance. This would appear to suggest that the presidents style might "carry over" or influence the style of all administrators within the same institution. However, since the null-hypotheses statements VI and VI-a indicated no significant difference between institutions or departments within a single institution in perceived management style, other tests would be necessary before this supposition could be supported.

The eighth major null-hypothesis stated there is no difference among major academic areas (Science-Mathematics, Humanities, Professions, Social Sciences) in preferred management style. The six null-hypotheses under this major statement sought to determine if there
were differences between any two of these major academic areas. As in
the earlier cases where institutions and departments had been examined
for differences, if any, concerning preferred management style, no dif-
fferences were found here. Through an analysis of variance test and the
Student "t" tests, all statements were accepted at p > .05. There are
no differences between major academic areas in management preferences.

The ninth major null-hypothesis stated there is no difference
among major academic areas in perceived management style. An analysis
of variance test rejected this statement at p < .05. Thus, Students
"t" test was applied to the remaining sub-null-hypotheses in an effort
to discover where these differences lay. It was discovered that the
Social Sciences differ significantly with the areas of Science-
Mathematics and from the Humanities, but not from the Professions.
All other combinations were accepted. Why would the Social Sciences,
as a group, perceive their management to be lower in participation
than the other two areas? Do persons in the Social Sciences expect
more from their leaders than the other areas? Are the people in
Social Sciences more socially and politically active and more concerned
with interactions between governments, organizations, peoples, and the
like, which create a consciousness of these interactions which is not
shared by persons in the other areas? Is this difference generally
recognized in the academic community? Is it taken into consideration
in the appointment of chairmen for departments in these areas?
Conclusions

One of the basic purposes of this research was to determine the professional and personal characteristics of successful educational administrators in an effort to find tangible measures of leadership qualities. The data gathered in this research do not meet this objective. Apparently, if there are specific leadership qualities of a professional and personal nature which contribute to "successful" administration, they cannot be found through the approach used in this research. Several questions which arise are these: If the faculty response had been larger than forty-six percent, perhaps as large as the administrators response of eighty-five percent, would the results have been different? Are there other variables which should be examined, such as specific personality characteristics (charisma) of leaders? Is the questionnaire method unsuitable for research of this type in higher education? Could different results be obtained through the case method of research? What part does the informal leader or leaders within a department play? Are there faculty members who are informal leaders and who are actually exerting more influence on the direction of the department than the formal leader? If no relationship can be found between management style and personal and professional characteristics which indicate "success," how are leaders chosen in higher education? What are the criteria used for selection of leaders? Of what value are "administration" courses if no relationships exist between management styles, personal and professional characteristics, and "success?" If the
assumptions used to define "success" in this research are not valid, what are the criteria for success in higher education? Has the rapid growth which higher education has experienced during the past fifteen years created a situation where any leader and his department will show growth, progress, and advancement? Would leadership qualities be more likely to emerge during a period when institutions must compete for students? The research conducted by David G. Brown, and reported in his book The Mobile Professors (see page 174), indicates that the attitude and ability of administrators are the most important factors in deciding upon new available positions by faculty members. If this is true, why was the "turnover" rate in these institutions of no significance? Is the need and desire for participative management which is so strongly supported in this research by both faculty and administrators, and which is so strongly supported in the literature and by various professional organizations, purely a psychological need and desire? Do faculty perceive of participative management as contributing in any way other than the personal satisfaction of being involved? Does participative management contribute to nothing but a "happy" faculty? Are faculty complaints about the lack of opportunity to become involved in a participative fashion valid, or is this an occupational "gripe?"
The research conducted by Archie R. Dykes (see page 175) and others indicates that many of the best faculty members avoid participation for various reasons. Should these reasons be explored in depth? Edward A. Doyle (see page 179) discovered that departmental chairmen were selected on the bases of three criteria: (1) previous teaching
experience, (2) outstanding teaching ability, and (3) "administrative talent." What is "administrative talent" if one can find no correlations between various types of management style? Is handing reports in on time and being a "nice guy to work with" all that is needed? John K. Hemphill (see page 180) discovered that departments that achieve a reputation for "good" administration are those led by chairmen who attend to two facets of leadership, which are basically (1) organizing activities and solving problems within the department, and (2) "developing warm relationships with members of the department." Howard F. Aldmon's research (see page 181) indicated the most important concern of the faculty member in relationship to his department chairman was that the chairman must give considerable effort to "establishing and maintaining working relationships with staff members." These findings appear to support the idea that human relationships, per se, are perhaps the most important factor in participative management in the view of the faculty. Is this all it should be?

Specific conclusions to be drawn from this research are as follows:

1. The methodology and/or instruments used in this research does not identify "successful" leadership in higher education.

2. Higher education leaders are basically applying classical management techniques through the Consultative system, but lean very much toward the Participative Group system.
3. Professional and personal characteristics of administrators in higher education cannot be successfully correlated with management styles and leadership qualities.

4. The evaluation instrument does serve to identify differences of opinion between individuals regarding the eighteen items used for evaluation purposes.

5. The instrument can be used by administrators for a reliable assessment of management techniques as rated by peers.

6. Other types of research must be explored, possibly the case method, which will permit a more comprehensive and in-depth study of an institution if leadership qualities are to be delimited and if personal-professional characteristics are to be found which correlate with management styles.

7. The instrument is highly consistent within itself. All items correlate with each other at .86 or higher.

8. Faculty and administrators strongly desire participative management, with administrators indicating a stronger desire than faculty.

9. Perceptions of actual management systems in use differ between subordinates and self ratings of administrators. Administrators consistently rate themselves higher than faculty rate them. The instrument could serve to instruct the administrator of these differences.
10. The faculty is most concerned about being permitted to participate in decision-making and setting goals and objectives for their area.

11. Communication, which is frequently referred to in the literature as being the weakest factor in faculty-administrator relations, is not the weakest, but the strongest. Actual decision-making is the weakest.

12. Administrators feel the weakest factors are feeling responsibility for achieving organizations goals, reviewing functions of the area, resistance to organizations goals, and lack of communication aimed at achieving organizations goals.

13. Faculty and administration agree that communication is open.

14. The "average" administrator shows no unusual characteristics, except that he has probably published more articles than the "average" faculty member, and may be involved in more research than the average faculty member.

15. Superordinates have an accurate perception of the management styles of other administrators, if subordinate ratings are used as the criteria.

16. The area of Social Sciences appear to be more critical of their leaders than other academic areas.

17. The concept of participation has been supported by writers in business, industry, and education since the early 1900's.
The research literature, however, indicates participation has not yet been achieved, and this study supports that contention.

18. Research has not yet developed tangible measures of improvements which will develop from participative management.

19. The need and desire for participative management appears to be a psychological need of the professional-educator. This reason may be the only purpose of participative management in higher education--but a highly important one.

**Recommendations and Implications**

If sound research "ends up asking more questions than it has answered," this study is indeed "good" research. Questions which have emerged from these findings may be found on pages 239-242. Following are recommendations which would appear to be logical developments of and from this study.

1. Further research is needed. If the questionnaire approach is to be taken in pursuing the objectives of this study, it would appear that one must be assured of almost complete cooperation of the faculty. Only with a majority response could one definitely reject the idea that there are tangible benefits from participative management.

2. Further research might be more productive if the case method is used. Possibly the instruments could be used as a first
step in such a process. However, it appears that in-depth and longitudinal studies must be conducted within a single institution if significant variables are to be isolated.

3. The literature and findings from research indicates to the researcher that the faculty member is not very interested in whether the institution has a "flat" or "tall" organizational hierarchy, as long as he is permitted to help make decisions and establish goals for his area of concern. The emphasis which some literature has placed upon the desire of the faculty to be involved in institutional policy-making may be inaccurate. There are suggestions that lead one to conclude that the faculty does not expect to be involved in all decisions regarding the entire institution, but, rather, he is intensely interested in his own area--his own department or discipline. Direct participation must occur where he is. Further research might establish if this is true.

4. Administrators should use this instrument or a similar instrument for self-assessment and self-improvement.

5. Longitudinal research could be conducted to determine if the use of such instruments, for self-assessment purposes, actually resulted in increased participation.

6. Research should be conducted on the influence of the informal leader in higher education.
7. Perhaps at this point in time, until research can identify more accurately "principles" of administration in higher education, training for administrative positions in higher education should consist of a broad and general knowledge of the literature in all fields relating to administration. In addition, psychological and sociological works dealing with the academic man would appear to be most helpful. Also, the history of the development of higher education and the current forces impinging upon higher education would appear to be indispensable.
APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

TABLE 3

BASIC MANAGEMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>System 1 Exploitive Authoritative</th>
<th>System 2 Benevolent Authoritative</th>
<th>System 3 Consultative</th>
<th>System 4 Participative Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
MANAGERIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF EACH CATEGORY

SYSTEM I. EXPLOITIVE AUTHORITATIVE:
Faculty does not feel free to discuss things with leader
Leader has no confidence and trust in faculty
Leader seldom gets ideas and opinions of faculty
Very little communication between leader and faculty
Information flow downward
Leader has no knowledge or understanding of problems of faculty
Bulk of decisions made at top of management
Faculty are not involved in decision making
Orders are issued

SYSTEM II. BENEVOLENT AUTHORITATIVE:
Leader has condescending confidence and trust in faculty
Faculty does not feel free to discuss things with leader
Leader sometimes gets ideas and opinions of faculty
Some communication between leader and faculty
Information flow mostly downward
Leader has some knowledge and understanding of problems of faculty
Relatively little cooperative teamwork present
Policy decisions made at top, many decisions within prescribed framework made at lower levels
Faculty is never involved in decision making; occasionally consulted
Orders issued, opportunity to comment may or may not exist

SYSTEM III. CONSULTATIVE:
Leader has substantial but not complete trust and confidence in faculty; still wishes to keep control of decisions
Faculty feel rather free to discuss things with leader
Leader usually gets ideas and opinions and usually tries to make constructive use of them
Quite a bit of communication between leader and faculty
Information flow both down and up
A moderate amount of teamwork is present in department
Broad policy and general decisions made at top, more specific decisions at lower levels
Faculty is usually consulted but ordinarily not involved in the decision making
Orders issued after discussion with faculty
TABLE 4 (continued)

SYSTEM IV. PARTICIPATIVE GROUP:

Leader has complete confidence and trust in faculty in all matters
Faculty feels completely free to discuss things with leader
Leader always gets ideas and opinions and always tries to make constructive use of them
Much communication with both individuals and groups
Information flow down, up, and with peers
Very substantial amount of teamwork present
Faculty is involved fully in all decisions related to their work
Except in emergencies, goals are usually established by means of group participation, thus avoiding issuing orders
# TABLE 5

**LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrative title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Present age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Highest degree earned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age at time of receiving highest degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How long have you held your present administrative position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of years in previous academic administrative positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Percentage of time devoted to present administrative duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Average number of hours in your work week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of institutional committees of which you are a member at present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Number of regional and/or state committees of which you are a member at present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Number of national committees of which you are a member at present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Number of professional organizations in which you hold membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Number of staff meetings held in your department within an academic year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Number for information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Number for decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Number of community organizations in which you are active at present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Number of non-fiction books read within the past twelve months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Number of professional journals to which you subscribe and read regularly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Number of research projects completed within last five years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Number of research projects in progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Number of professional consultant services since becoming an administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) With fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Without fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Number of faculty on your staff when you became an administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number at present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Number of speeches, lectures, and/or public appearance you have made (off campus) within the past twelve months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Number of publications (if numerous, please guess) before becoming an administrator, and after becoming an administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Number of student majors in your department when you became the chief administrator: Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Number of student majors in your department at present: Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Number of students who have received their undergraduate degree in your department during your tenure as chief administrator, and have since completed a graduate degree? ______________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Number of faculty on your staff holding:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctorate as highest degree____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's as highest degree_______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bachelor's as highest degree____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no degree ________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Total number of faculty that have been under your supervision since you became the chief administrator ________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Number of faculty that have been in your department: 1-5 years____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years____, 11-15 years____, 16-20 years____, 21-25 years____, 26-30 years____, 31 and over years____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. How many faculty hold tenured positions in your department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The number of faculty holding each professorial rank in your department: Professor____, Assoc. Prof.<strong><strong>, Asst. Prof.</strong></strong>, Instr.<strong><strong>, Other</strong></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Total number of faculty that have been added since you became the chief administrator ________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Estimated value of buildings and equipment in your department when you became the chief administrator (in dollars) $_______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated present value $______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Number of formal courses you have taken in Higher Education and/or administration, if any______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 6</td>
<td>Appendent Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF PERCEPTION PROFILE OF MANAGEMENT CHARACTERISTICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does faculty accept organization's goals?</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How much covert resistance to goals in present?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How free do faculty feel to talk to leader about teaching and other responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are faculty ideas sought and used, if worthy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent is increasing punishment, rewards, or involvement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Where is responsibility felt for achieving department's goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much cooperation exists?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How much communication is aimed at achieving department's objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What is the direction of information flow?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How is downward communication accepted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How accurate is upward communication?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How well does leader know problems faced by faculty?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. At what level are decisions made? (Levels: Leader, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are faculty involved in decision-making related to their position and responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What does decision-making process contribute to motivation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How are organizational goals established?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How much covert resistance to goals in present?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How concentrated are review functions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7

**PROFILES OF MANAGEMENT CHARACTERISTICS (FOR FACULTY)**

**Department**

**Institution**

### Instructions:
1. To the right of each question, please place an N at the point which, in your experience, describes your organization at the present time (Monday). Treat each line as a continuous variable from the extreme on the left to that on the right.

2. In the same manner, please place an L at the point where you would like to see your organization fall with regard to that question (L = Like). Treat each line as a continuous variable from the extreme on the left to that on the right.

### Questions:

1. **Does faculty accept organization's goals?**
   - Seldom
   - Sometimes
   - Usually
   - Almost always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **How free does faculty feel to talk to leader about teaching and other responsibilities?**
   - Almost none
   - Condescending
   - Substantial
   - Almost complete

3. **Are faculty ideas sought and used, if worthy?**
   - Seldom
   - Sometimes
   - Usually
   - Almost always

4. **Is predominant use made of threats, punishment, rewards, or involvement? (Threats: Threat of no promotion, no tenure, poor teaching schedule, overwork, etc. Punishment: Through actual use of threats. Rewards: Pensions, tenure, etc. Involvement: Failure to give suggestions either individually or through group action for policy decisions within department.])**
   - Mostly with leader
   - Leader and some faculty
   - Fairly general
   - At all levels

5. **Where is responsibility felt for achieving department's goals?**
   - Almost none
   - Little
   - Some
   - Great deal

6. **How much cooperative teamwork exists?**
   - Very little
   - Little
   - Quite a bit
   - Great deal

7. **How much communication is aimed at achieving department's objectives?**
   - Downward
   - Mostly downward
   - Down and up
   - Down, up and sideways

8. **What is the direction of information flow?**
   - Downward: Information originates in head of departments office and moves down to lowest professional ranks. Sideways: Information given between peers.

9. **How is downward communication accepted?**
   - Often wrong
   - Censored for the leader
   - Limited accuracy
   - Usually accurate

10. **How accurate is upward communication?**
    - Little
    - Some knowledge
    - Quite well
    - Very well

11. **How well does leader know problems faced by faculty?**
    - Mostly by leader
    - Policy by leader, some delegation
    - Policy by leader, more delegation
    - Throughout, but well integrated

12. **At what level are decisions made? (Levels: Leader, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor.**)

13. **Are faculty involved in decisions related to their position and responsibilities?**

14. **What does decision-making process contribute to motivation?**

15. **How are organizational goals established?**

16. **How much covert resistance to goals is present?**

17. **How concentrated are review functions? (Process of appraising growth, standards, etc.**)

18. **Is there an informal organization retaining the formal one?**

TABLE 8
PROFILE OF MANAGEMENT CHARACTERISTICS (FOR ADMINISTRATORS)

Instructions:
1. In the right of each question, please place an N at the point which, in your experience, describes your organization at the present time (1 = now). Treat each line as a continuum variable from the extreme at one end to that at the other.
2. In the same manner, please place an N on the point where you would like to have your organization fall with regard to that question (L = now). Treat each line as a continuous variable from the extreme at one end to that at the other.

Example:

Does staff accept organization's goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Nor</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How accurate is upward communication?

2. Are staff involved in decisions related to their position and responsibilities?

3. How much covert resistance to goals is present?

4. How are organizational goals established?

5. Are staff ideas sought and used, if worthy?

6. How cooperative teamwork exists?

7. How much communication is needed to achieve organization's objectives?

8. What is the direction of information flow? (Outward: Information originated in leader's office and moves down through administrative levels. Sideways: Information given between peers.)

9. How much decision-making process contributes to motivation?

10. How accurate is upward communication?

11. How well does leader know problem faced by staff?

12. At what level are decisions made? (Levels: Leader; staff)

13. Are staff involved in decisions related to their position and responsibilities?

14. What does decision-making process contribute to motivation?

15. How are organizational goals established?

16. How much covert resistance to goals is present?

17. How concentrated are review functions? (Process of appraising growth, standards, etc.)

18. Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?
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## APPENDIX B

### TABLE 9

**INSTITUTION 1: NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES RESPONDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty, less department heads</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of questionnaires received from faculty</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of unusable questionnaires</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires used in study</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty in departments used for analysis</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators in departments used</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators responding</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators responding</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in departments and offices used in the study</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators who responded from these departments and offices</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in institution</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty, less department heads</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of questionnaires received from faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty in departments used for analysis</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators in departments used</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators responding</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators responding</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in departments and offices used in the study</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators who responded from these departments and offices</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in institution</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11
INSTITUTION 3: NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES RESPONDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty, less department heads</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of questionnaires received from faculty</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of unusable questionnaires</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires used in study</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty in departments used for analysis</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators in departments used</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators responding</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators responding</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in departments and offices used in the study</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators who responded from these departments and offices</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in institution</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12

**INSTITUTION 4: NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES RESPONDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty, less department heads</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of questionnaires received from faculty</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators responding</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty in departments used for analysis</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators in departments used</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators responding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators responding</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in departments and offices used in the study</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators who responded from these departments and offices</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in institution</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty, less department heads</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of questionnaires received from faculty</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of unusable questionnaires</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires used in study</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty in departments used for analysis</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators in departments used</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators responding</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators responding</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in departments and offices used</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators who responded</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in institution</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14

**Institution 6: Numbers and Percentages Responding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments*</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of departments returning questionnaires</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty, less department heads*</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of questionnaires received from faculty</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of unusable questionnaires</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires used in study</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators*</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty in departments used for analysis</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty responding in these departments</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators in departments used</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of administrators responding</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of administrators responding</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in departments and offices used in the study</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators who responded from these departments and offices</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in institution*</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One department excluded due to current change in department head.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
<th>All Institutions: Numbers and Percentages Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of departments returning questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of departments returning questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of faculty, less department heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of questionnaires received from faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of unusable questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of faculty returning questionnaires used in study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of administrators returning questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of faculty in departments used for analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of faculty responding in these departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of faculty responding in these departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of administrators in departments used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of administrators responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of administrators responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in departments and offices used in the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators who responded from these departments and offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators in institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of faculty and administrators responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of faculty and administrators responding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 16

INSTITUTION 1: FACULTY PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES OF ALL ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office Code Number</th>
<th>Means Perceived</th>
<th>Means Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 13.68 17.45
TABLE 17

INSTITUTION 2: FACULTY PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES OF ALL ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office Code Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18

INSTITUTION 3: FACULTY PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES
OF ALL ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office Code Number</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 14.95 18.55
TABLE 19

INSTITUTION 4: FACULTY PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES OF ALL ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office Code Number</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>18.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 20

**INSTITUTION 5: FACULTY PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES OF ALL ADMINISTRATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office Code Number</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>18.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 21

INSTITUTION 6: FACULTY PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES OF ALL ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or Office Code Number</th>
<th>Perceived Means</th>
<th>Preferred Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.84</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.06</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 22

INSTITUTION 1: SELF PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED MEAN SCORES
BY ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Code Number</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 15.52 19.02
### Table 23

**Institution 2: Self Perceived and Preferred Mean Scores by Administrators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Code Number</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 24

**Institution 3: Self Perceived and Preferred Mean Scores by Administrators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Code Number</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**

Perceived: 15.09  
Preferred: 19.14
### TABLE 25

**INSTITUTION 1:** SELF PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED MEAN SCORES BY ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Code Number</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 26

**INSTITUTION 5: SELF PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED MEAN SCORES BY ADMINISTRATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Code Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 27**

INSTITUTION 6: SELF PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED MEAN SCORES BY ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Code Number</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 15.08 18.54
TABLE 28
PREFERRED MEAN SCORES OF ADMINISTRATORS WITHIN MAJOR ACADEMIC AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Professions</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Science-Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | 18.2 | 17.6 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
Mode | 18   | 18-19| 18-19| 18   |
Median| 18   | 18.5 | 18   | 18   |
TABLE 29
PERCEIVED MEAN SCORES OF ADMINISTRATORS
WITHIN MAJOR ACADEMIC AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Professions</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>Science-Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 14.36  15.4  12.6  15.0
Median 15    16   12    15
Mode 16      11   14   14
TABLE 30

INSTITUTION 1: MEAN SCORES OF EACH ITEM ON EVALUATION FORMS FOR BOTH PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES BY FACULTY AND SELF RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty Perceived</th>
<th>Faculty Preferred</th>
<th>Self Perceived</th>
<th>Self Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 31

INSTITUTION 2: MEAN SCORES OF EACH ITEM ON EVALUATION FORMS 
FOR BOTH PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES 
BY FACULTY AND SELF RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty Perceived</th>
<th>Faculty Preferred</th>
<th>Self Perceived</th>
<th>Self Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 32

**INSTITUTION 3: MEAN SCORES OF EACH ITEM ON EVALUATION FORMS FOR BOTH PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES BY FACULTY AND SELF RATINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 33

INSTITUTION 4: MEAN SCORES OF EACH ITEM ON EVALUATION FORMS FOR BOTH PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES BY FACULTY AND SELF RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty Perceived</th>
<th>Faculty Preferred</th>
<th>Self Perceived</th>
<th>Self Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 34

INSTITUTION 5: MEAN SCORES OF EACH ITEM ON EVALUATION FORMS
FOR BOTH PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED SCORES
BY FACULTY AND SELF RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty Perceived</th>
<th>Faculty Preferred</th>
<th>Self Perceived</th>
<th>Self Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 35

Institution 6: Mean scores of each item on evaluation forms for both perceived and preferred scores by faculty and self ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty Perceived</th>
<th>Faculty Preferred</th>
<th>Self Perceived</th>
<th>Self Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 13.4 18.0 15.1 18.5
### TABLE 36

**COMBINED FACULTY PERCEIVED RANKINGS OF ALL ADMINISTRATORS FOR EIGHTEEN ITEMS ON EVALUATION FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Institutions 1</th>
<th>Institutions 2</th>
<th>Institutions 3</th>
<th>Institutions 4</th>
<th>Institutions 5</th>
<th>Institutions 6</th>
<th>Combined Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 13.2, 14.3, 14.9, 13.4, 14.6, 13.4, 14.0

s = .9
TABLE 37
COMPARISONS OF ADMINISTRATOR SELF-PERCEIVED RANKINGS ON ALL EIGHTEEN ITEMS ON EVALUATION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Combined Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 15.5 14.7 15.1 16.1 16.1 15.1 15.4

s: 1.3
### TABLE 38

**FACULTY PREFERRED MANAGEMENT STYLE BY DEPARTMENTS AND OFFICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Economics and Business Admin.</td>
<td>Drama and Speech</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Business Educ.</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion and Philosophy</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Dean of Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Educ.</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 39

RANK ORDER OF DEPARTMENTS AND OFFICES ACCORDING TO PERCEIVED MEAN SCORES OF AREAS REPRESENTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System I</th>
<th>System II</th>
<th>System III</th>
<th>System IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploitive</td>
<td>Benevolent</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6 Presidents' Office</td>
<td>1 Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Geography</td>
<td>2 Health Ed.-Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Foreign Language-</td>
<td>3 Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music-Library Sci.-</td>
<td>4 Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deans of Arts and</td>
<td>5 Political Sci.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sci.</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Deans of Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Sociology and Anthropology, Religion and Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 English-Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Business Education-Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deans of Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 Physical Educ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drama and Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 Industrial Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 140
NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS IN EACH CELL AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System I Exploitive Authoritative</th>
<th>System II Benevolent Authoritative</th>
<th>System III Consultative</th>
<th>System IV Participative Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 2 1 2</td>
<td>6 5 13 13 13</td>
<td>16 6 7 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
<td>56.17%</td>
<td>35.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean score = 14.29
Mode = 16
Median = 15
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