

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 940

HE 017 049

AUTHOR Laughlin, J. Stanley
TITLE Attitudes, Administrative Styles, and Outcomes.
INSTITUTION American Association of Univ. Administrators, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 84
CONTRACT 400-82-0011
NOTE 5p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of University Administrators, 1133 Fifteenth Street, Washington, DC 20005 (\$2.00).

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)
JOURNAL CIT Administrator's Update; v5 n2 Spr 1984

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Role; *College Administration; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Competence; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Leadership Styles; *Organizational Climate; Productivity

ABSTRACT

The literature on administrative style is reviewed. Attention is directed to four basic concepts of administrative style: (1) the structured, classical, traditional model; (2) the participatory or employee-involved operation; (3) a more behavioral scientific style; and (4) the situational or environmental style. These ideas are more fully described, and it is proposed that even with various definitions of management styles in the literature, the key to a productive organizational system is the type of administrative style that directs the organization, not the organization that governs the people. If the organization is too autocratic, it may be because of the attitudes of the chief administrator. Based on the literature, a profile of an effective administrator is suggested. An effective administrator communicates well; establishes clear directions; can motivate subordinates through shared participation, rewards, and morale boosting; develops and maintains an openness with employees; strives for excellence; and recognizes subordinates' behavioral patterns. (SW)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED240940

Volume 5
Number 2

Administrator's

Spring
1984

American Association of
University Administrators

Update



Clearinghouse on
Higher Education

Attitudes, Administrative Styles, and Outcomes

J. Stanley Laughlin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official ERIE
position or policy.

In the last century, management styles in the American workplace have changed from an autocratic style to a more participatory, worker-involved style, and American higher education is no exception. That change in style has paralleled growth in American colleges and universities. Management style has moved from a teacher-student relationship to a larger manager-employee relationship, and it now appears that a movement back to a more cooperative management style has evolved.

Administrative Styles: Numerous Definitions

One problem with the literature regarding administrative styles is the lack of common terminology. Another is the lack of a common base for the different types or styles described. Despite those caveats, four or five basic models of administrative styles have been described in the literature.

Authors have described four basic styles: the structured, classical, traditional model; the participatory or employee-involved operation; a more behavioral, scientific style; and the situational or environmental by determined style. These basic styles have different names, depending on who is describing them. Some call them formal rational, bureaucratic, political, collegial (Chaffee 1982); others use terms like structural, information, and human (Huse and Bowditch 1973, p. 9); still others describe presidential styles as bureaucratic, intellectual, egalitarian, or counselor (Astin and Scherrei 1980). A fifth area may be

added, one that comes under the category "none of the above." It would include variations on these themes: a rather loose ambiguous style, a very dictatorial style, or even Kets de Vries' "folie a deux complex," in which the employer creates a madness that employees follow simply to "live" within the system (1979). Today's more common styles can be termed bureaucratic, collegial, political, situational, and organized anarchy.

The behavior style of management employs the attributes of stimulus and response—what habits, behaviors, and motivations operate within the situation at hand (Blake, Mouton, and Williams 1981).

The classical or traditional style is characterized by a manager-centered operation. Workers' efficiency is governed by the manager or boss, and the owner of the company has most of the rights (Taylor 1911). The participatory style of management recognizes that workers need to be more involved. A more cooperative relationship exists between manager and worker (Likert 1967). The behavior style of management employs the attributes of stimulus and response—what habits, behaviors, and motivations operate within the situation at hand (Blake, Mouton, and Williams 1981). The fourth style, the environmental theory, suggests that the one best way of management is to adjust to the situation. The situation in which

one finds himself or herself determines the management style (Fiedler 1967).

The definitions that describe these styles are so varied that it is often difficult to ascertain their meaning. The use of words like "administrator," "management," "leader" or "leadership" in relationship to a style of operation appears to be interchangeable. Some, however, use the word "management" to mean a more manual operation, working between the formulation of policy and control. This paper uses the terms in a more global sense in discussing styles used by decision makers, call them leaders, administrators, management, or managers.

Another area lacking clarity is the separation of the effectiveness of the manager from the effectiveness of the organization. This issue is too complex to address in an article of this nature; the intent of this discussion is to focus upon the effectiveness of the administrator rather than organizational theory.

Traits or Processes versus Product

One of the main differences in the use of a particular administrative style stems from attitudes regarding the process or the product. Any imbalance toward either end of this continuum relates to the method of operation. Both the process and the product have their assets. The person who carries certain attitudes from childhood or other environments can tip the style used. Blake, Mouton, and

AE 017 0119



Williams (1981) use a two-dimensional model in an attempt to focus upon more than one variable. One of their variables focuses upon the individual, the other upon the institution. Perhaps they are right when they suggest the process is too complex to be a one-dimensional path. It may even be multi-dimensional.

Behavior-Oriented Management

Only in recent years have we seen the practice relating peoples' behavior, management styles, decision making, and outcomes. The authoritarian, boss-centered style of management is moving toward a participatory style involving subordinates. The literature implies that a behavior-oriented, employee-employer relationship breeds success. In the social organizations, such as education, the

Only in recent years have we seen the practice relating peoples' behavior, management styles, decision making, and outcomes. The authoritarian, boss-centered style of management is moving toward a participatory style involving subordinates.

movement to shared management is being accepted as more effective (Blake, Mouton, and Williams 1981; Likert 1967; Skipper 1976). The manager who ignores employees' motivations is not as effective (Herzberg 1976). A behavior-oriented leader needs to assess motivation (Herzberg 1966), relationships between leaders and subordinates (Likert 1967), and satisfaction in the work environment (Herzberg 1976).

The Relationship between Behavior, Leadership Qualities, Administrative Styles, and Decision Making

Much in the literature suggests that employees' behavior, leaders' qualities, administrators' styles, and decision making are related. Fiedler suggests a variety of relationships as he describes his "contingency model."

"... The effectiveness of a group is contingent upon the relationship between leadership style and the degree to which the group situation enables the leader to exert influence" (1967, p. 15). Tiernan suggests that the manager's or leader's concepts,

behaviors, or motivations are reflected by the group. Using Herzberg's theories, he states, "The research shows that overall the driving force affecting employee motivation is not internal. Rather, it is the manager's behavior which is the predominant factor. Employees are a reflection of their manager!" (1981, p. 11).

Certain attitudinal configurations have been identified. Simon (1965) describes three types of personalities based upon their operational traits: those who quest for subjective certainty, those who are indifferent, and those who quest for objective certainty. Young (1968) uses Simon's article to discuss decision making and the involvement of uncertainty in decisionmaking, addressing how one may recognize it operating within an institution.

Because the organization faces both objective and subjective uncertainty, two sets of strategies are needed to cope with them. In terms of subjective uncertainty, the image of an executive as being one who is decisive, never vacillating, who acts rather than ponders, who does not equivocate or procrastinate may express only the craving for certainty. The organization's requirements of a definite authority structure, chain of command, and obedience are ways of coping with subjective uncertainty. Conversely, the organization's procedures for data collection and analysis are ways of dealing with objective uncertainty (p. 64).

How the organizational climate is affected by the administration's style of management is demonstrated by Astin and Scherrei (1980). Their work indicates that a bureaucratic presidential style is closely associated with a hierarchical administrative organization and that an egalitarian presidential style is associated with a humanistic administrative organization. Gratz and Salem, who believe that most academic institutions use a traditional bureaucratic structure (1981, p. 40), relate this connection well: "The organizational climate as produced through the leadership behavior of those at higher levels serves as a significant constraining force in determining the kinds of attitudes and behaviors individuals feel free to employ in an organization" (1981, p. 44).

Effective Systems: Organizational Structures and Productivity

Gratz and Salem (1981) relate organizational systems and communication. Tyler (1982) suggests ways the organization can be effective and dynamic, including "continuing communication, continuous feedback, and monitoring its educational effects" (pp. 657-58).

Even with the various definitions of management styles in the literature, the key to a productive organizational system is still the type of administrative style that governs the organization, not the organization that governs the people. If the organization is too autocratic, it may be because of the attitudes of the chief administrator.

The role of the administrator of the future will need to change to be effective.

Even with the various definitions of management styles in the literature, the key to a productive organizational system is still the type of administrative style that governs the organization, not the organization that governs the people. If the organization is too autocratic, it may be because of the attitudes of the chief administrator.

What this means is shorter, flatter organizations; it means responsive management; it means a true willingness to allow people to participate in setting their own destiny; it means that the militarily oriented hierarchy that has characterized societies and most business enterprises is a thing of the past, and the quicker we recognize it the better. All organizations will have to think of their key assets in terms of people and knowledge. People can be the most flexible of all assets; knowledge is the one thing that will give us insight into change and the consequence of change. Many companies say that people are its most important resource, but few believe it. Many people say that they live or die with their people but then spend all of their time analyzing balance sheets and income statements (Schacht 1970, pp. 34,31).

In study after study and article after article, one finds components that contribute to effective systems. Open communication is perhaps the most important one. The manner of communication should be important to the administrator who wishes to be effective (Bonner 1982; Gratz and Salem 1981; Halpin and Winer 1957; Mazzarella 1981; Richardson and Mortimer 1978; Skipper 1976). Much more interaction with various groups: student groups, faculty groups, staff—is needed for communication. Informal communication appears to be more effective than formal, written communication.

An openness and a desire for the pursuit of excellence are part of this communication, and several authors describe them in different ways (Likert 1967—the participatory models; Mc-

In study after study and article after article, one finds components that contribute to effective systems. Open communication is perhaps the most important one.

Gregor 1960—Theory Y; Richman and Farmer 1974; Tannenbaum and Schmidt 1958). Ouchi's Theory Z, another example of the open communications theory at work, rests upon a key variable of trust and the values of egalitarianism.

Egalitarianism is a central feature of Type Z organizations. Egalitarianism implies that each person can apply discretion and can work autonomously without close supervision, because they are trusted. . . . If people deal with one another in segmented ways, as one role to another, then these dehumanized relationships easily become authoritarian (Ouchi 1981, pp. 68,67).

Identified, stated, and visible directional goals are another trait of an effective system (Likert 1967; Mazzarella 1981; Richardson and Mortimer 1978; Skipper 1976). Administrators who do not develop institutional goals and direction are seen as inconsistent or desiring power, not open. The amount of information generated often indicates what tasks are identified. Some say that the greater the uncertainty about a task, the greater the

amount of information created (Meredith 1981). Stated goals and direction indicate a more successful college (Magarrell 1982). A successful college is so because it has a "sense of purpose" and is "organized and systematic," even though it requires heavy faculty involvement (Magarrell 1982, p. 28).

Another factor contributing to an effective system is the recognition of what motivates people to perform and what is required to maintain high morale (Herzberg 1976; Likert 1967; McGregor 1960; Maslow 1943; Tierman 1981). Administrators should seek to develop a style taking into account that people motivators are important to the outcomes of higher education. "Managements that are not prepared to provide whatever motivators are possible in the job are

The effective administrator must also be able to recognize the behavior of the status quo. He or she must have sharply improved diagnostic and problem-solving skills.

not prepared to meet the challenge of managing adults" (Herzberg 1976, p. 83). The following motivators are possible:

The growth or motivator factors that are intrinsic to the job are achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or advancement. The dissatisfaction-avoidance . . . factors that are extrinsic to the job include: company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security (Herzberg 1976, p. 58).

The effective administrator must also be able to recognize the behavior of the status quo. He or she must have sharply improved diagnostic and problem-solving skills. Training can change or broaden perspective. Subordinates as well as managers need training to broaden scope and perceptions.

Even intensive self-study, however, will not necessarily replace the ineffective administrator.

Some problems are primarily the result of a failure in leader-

ship. An ineffective administrator may create low morale, wasteful use of resources, and lack of direction. Because self-study usually avoids pinpointing individual weaknesses, it, therefore, is not likely to correct problems created by poor leadership. . . . A self-study is no substitute for lack of administrative willingness to deal forthrightly with a well-defined issue (Dressel and Cammack 1971, pp. 277-78).

A good administrator identifies direction, identifies the problem, maintains high morale, and does not waste resources.

Conclusion

The review of literature regarding a desired administrative style generates more heat than light. Many excellent research studies have been completed, yet the correlated research between a specific style and an outcome or outcomes is minimal. More and more authors agree, however, that effective administrators employ certain actions that produce positive results:

- Effective communication, the key to which is an open communications system and the willingness to listen to the communication;
- Well-established institutional goals and directional statements that are visible, articulated, and followed;
- The maintenance of high morale through the administration's respect and appreciation of employees, taking into account the psychological and sociological aspects of dealing with peoples' behavior;
- A sense of openness and a described pursuit of excellence, which tend to reduce distrust and complacency and increase a sense of satisfaction among subordinates;
- An emphasis upon the person and not the organization, taking into account the way people interact.

An effective administrator is an effective communicator who establishes clear directions; knows how to motivate subordinates through shared participation, rewards, and morale boosting; develops and maintains an openness with all subordinates; strives for excellence; and recognizes subordinates' behavioral patterns.

Bibliography

- Argyris, Chris 1964 *Integrating the individual and the Organization*. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Astin, Alexander W., and Scherrei, Rita A. 1980 *Maximizing Leadership Effectiveness: Impact of Administrative Style on Faculty and Students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Baldrige, Victor 1971 *Power and Conflict in the University*. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Baldrige, J. Victor, Kemmerer, Frank R., and Associates 1981 *Assessing the Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 8. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education. EO 216 653. 66 pp. MF-\$1 17, PC-\$7 24
- Blake, Robert R., Moulton, Jane, Srygley, and Williams, Martha Shipe 1981 *The Academic Administrator Grid*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Bonner, James S. June 1982. Japanese Quality Circles: Can They Work in Education? *Phi Delta Kappan* 63 (10): 681
- Cameron, Kim. March 1981. Domains of Organizational Effectiveness in Colleges and Universities. *Academy of Management Journal* 24: 25-47
- Chaffee, Ellen Earle. May 1982. Information Systems to Support a Decision Process at Stanford. *Cause/Effect* 5: 4-7
- Cohen, M., and March, J. 1974 *Leadership and Ambiguity*. The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Dressel, Paul, and Cammack, Elwin 1971 "Conducting Self-Study" in *Institutional Research in the University: A Handbook*, edited by Paul Dressel and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Fiedler, Fred E. 1967 *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Goldhaber, Gerald M., and Rogers, Donald 1978. Reporting Results of Communication Audits. In *Improving Instructional Communication*, edited by Gerald M. Goldhaber. New Directions for Institutional Advancement No. 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Gratz, Robert D., and Saiom, Philip J. 1981 *Organizational Communication and Higher Education*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education. ED 217 826. 91 pp. MF-\$1 17, PC-\$9 37
- Halpin, A. W., and Winer, J. 1957 *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University
- Herzberg, Frederick 1966 *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland: World Publishing Company
- . 1976 *The Managerial Choice: To Be Efficient and to Be Human*. Homewood, Ill.: Dow Jones Irwin
- Huse, Edgar R., and Bowditch, James L. 1973 *Behavior in Organizations: A Systems Approach to Managing*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley
- Kotter, J. Paul, and Vries, Manfred F. R. July-August 1979. Managers Can Drive their Subordinates Mad. *Harvard Business Review* 57 (4): 125-34
- Likert, Rensis 1967 *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- McGregor, Douglas 1960 *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Magarrell, Jack. 10 November 1982. "Decline in Faculty Morale Led to Governance Role, not Salary." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 24 (11): 1
- Maslow, A. H. 1943. "A Theory of Human Motivation." *Psychological Review* 50: 370-96
- Mazzarella, JoAnn 1981. "Portrait of a Leader." In *School Leadership: Handbook for Survival*, edited by Stuart C. Smith, JoAnn Mazzarella, and Philip K. Piele. Eugene, Ore.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon. ED 209 736. 353 pp. MF-\$1 17, PC-\$29 78
- Meredith, Mark. July 1981. "Investment in Vertical Information Systems as a Prevailing Strategy for Dealing with Task Uncertainty." *Cause/Effect* 4: 26-32
- Millett, J. D. 1978 *New Structures of Campus Power: Success and Failures of Emerging Forms of Institutional Governance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Ouchi, William G. 1981 *Theory Z*. New York: Avon Books
- Peterson, Marvin 1982. "An Outsider's View: Prelude, Interlude, or Postlude." In *Effective Planned Change Strategies: New Directions for Institutional Research*, edited by G. Melvin Hops. No. 33. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Richardson, Richard C., and Morimer, Kenneth P. Fall 1978. "Collective Bargaining and the Redefinition of Administrative Roles." *Education Record* 59: 332-44
- Richman, B. M., and Farmer, R. N. 1974 *Leadership, Goals, and Power in Higher Education: A Contingency and Open Systems Approach to Effective Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Schacht, Henry B. August 1970. "The Impact of Change in the Seventies." *Business Horizons* 13 (4): 29-34
- Simon, Walter 1965. "The Quest for Subjective Certainty." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 66: 171-85
- Skipper, Charles E. Winter 1976. "Person Characteristics of Effective and Ineffective University Leaders." *College & University* 51: 138-41
- . (Spring 1978). "Factor Analysis of the University Leader's Behavior." *College & University* 53 (3): 330-34
- Stroup, H. 1966 *Bureaucracy in Higher Education*. New York: Free Press
- Tannenbaum, R., and Schmidt, W. 1958. How to Choose a Leadership Pattern. *Harvard Business Review* 36: 95-101
- Taylor, F. W. 1911 *Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Row
- Tierman, Donald July 1981. "Motivation: The Manager's Dilemma." *Cause/Effect* 4: 10-15
- Toffler, Alvin 1980 *The Third Wave*. New York: William Morrow & Co.
- Tyler, Ralph June 1982. "Dynamic Response in a Time of Decline." *Phi Delta Kappan* 63 (10): 655-58
- Vroom, V. H., and Yetton, P. W. 1973 *Leadership and Decision Making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press
- Walker, Donald 1979 *The Effective Administrator*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Young, Stanley 1968 *Management: A Decision-Making Approach*. Belmont, Calif.: Dickenson Publishing Co.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current literature on higher education for the National Institute of Education's monthly bibliographic journal *Resources in Education*. Most of these publications are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). For publications cited in this bibliography that are available from EDRS, ordering number and price are included. Readers who wish to order a publication should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. When ordering, please specify the document number. Documents are available as noted in microfiche (MF) and paper copy (PC). Since prices are subject to change it is advisable to check the latest issue of *Resources in Education* for current cost based on the number of pages in the publication.

Administrator's Update is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, D.C. Series Editor is Glenn M. Nelson, Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh. Copies of *Administrator's Update* may be ordered for \$2.00 each from the American Association of University Administrators, 1133 Fifteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. Payment must accompany all orders under \$15.

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. 400-82-0011. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or the Department.