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)
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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 Scherr 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 Ket's de Vries' "lieve 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
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 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 decision making, 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 procrastinates 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. 54).

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 dy...including "continuing communication, continuous feedback, and monitoring its educational effects" (pp. 557-58). 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...
In study after study and article after article, one finds components that contribute to effective systems. Open communications theory is perhaps the most important one. The manner of communication should be important to the administrator who wishes to be effective (Bonner 1962; Gratz and Salem 1961; Halpin and Winzer 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; 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 not the organization, taking into account the psychological and sociological aspects of dealing with people's behavior."

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.

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 of 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 people's behavior;
- A sense of openness and a described pursuit of excellence, which lend 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.