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This descriptive study surveyed deans (N=142), department chairs (N=392), and faculty (N=1173) to examine their perceptions of the relationship between resource adequacy within institutions of higher education and administrators' management styles. The clusters of variables examined were: (1) management style (use of communication and participation as techniques); (2) funding for professional development (travel expenses for conferences, equipment and book purchases, etc.); and (3) institutional characteristics (student populations, highest degree offered, affiliation). Study results indicated that perceptions of resource adequacy are more closely related to the institutional environment within which faculty work than to administrative management styles; an open management style did not necessarily translate into greater funding for professional development. In addition, the institution's characteristics largely determined resource availability and adequacy, which suggests that bright scholars will be excluded from pursuing their scholarly goals if they are not at the "right" institution. Contains 16 references. (GLR)
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Communication and participation are important contributors to organizational effectiveness (Davis and Newstrom, 1985). Participation encourages employees to contribute to group goals and share responsibility for the results. Participation involves sharing which may increase the power of both the employees and supervisors (Davis and Newstrom, 1985). Like participation, communication is vital to the success of any organization. Without communication, employees do not know what their co-workers are doing, and management does not receive information that is needed to operate the institution. Every act of communication influences an organization in some way (Davis and Newstrom, 1985).

Communicating with employees and allowing employees to participate in solving business problems is often beneficial for an organization. This same logic can be applied to administrators and faculty in academic institutions. A participative and/or communicative management style is more likely to produce high levels of satisfaction and motivation than an authoritarian management style (Lawler, 1974). Administrators' management styles consistently affect relationships with subordinates. Depending upon the management style used, administrators may or may not be able to help their subordinates reach their potential and make positive contributions to the institution. However, before administrators can decide to increase the level of participation or communication in their management style, they should look introspectively and evaluate themselves and their employees. Administrators have to consciously trust their employees for
an open management style to be successful (Cangemi, Kowalski, Claypool, 1985). Employees should not necessarily make all decisions, but they should be actively involved in the decision-making process. The following paper looks at one dimension of management style within the framework of higher education. This paper examines the relationship between the perceptions of resource adequacy within institutions and administrators' management styles.

This paper is primarily descriptive, for the survey on which it is based represents a preliminary stage of data gathering rather than elaborate theory testing. It takes the perspective originally developed by Gould in The Academic Deanship (1960) and most recently applied by the authors in their studies of graduate and continuing education deans as well as chief liberal arts academic officers. Recent reports on this research include "The Operational Importance of Teaching" in Teaching Sociology (12:47-70, 1984), "A National Study of Graduate Deans and Graduate Education" in the Council of Graduate Schools Communicator (17 [6]: 6, 1984), "The Question of Quality and the Role of the Dean" in the Journal of Continuing Higher Education (33: 2-7, 1985), "The College Dean: A Case of Miscommunication About the Importance of Teaching" in Liberal Education (67: 319-326, 1981), "Alternative Models for the Administration of Graduate Education" in Planning for Higher Education (15 [2]: 1-7), and "Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers: The Limits of Power and Authority" in Studies in Higher Education (12: 39-50, 1987).
Methods and Data Source

The population used in this study includes deans, department chairs, and faculty within all colleges and universities identified by the editors of Barron's Guide (1984 edition) with a total student population of more than 1,000. A stratified random sample was drawn from this universe which resulted in mailing questionnaires to 265 academic deans. After one follow-up mailing, 54 percent of the deans returned usable questionnaires. One portion of the questionnaire asked the deans to provide names of department chairs in each of nine disciplines: biology, chemistry, English, history, mathematics, music, political science, psychology, and sociology. The department chairs were then sent a parallel instrument and in turn asked to provide names of their faculty members. Fifty-four percent of the department chairs responded. The faculty members in each of the departments were sent a third version of the questionnaire containing items similar to those in the questionnaires for deans and chairs. The final faculty sample consists of 1,173 faculty members who are matched with 392 department chairs and 142 deans. Deans and chairs lacking at least one matched chair and one matched faculty member were omitted from the final sample. Although random sampling procedures were used throughout the study, the snowball effect of biases introduced by modest response ratios in a multi-stage sampling design such as this one makes it impossible to claim that the final matched sample is truly representative of the institutional universe from which it was drawn.

In this study, the clusters of variables examined were management style, funding for professional development, and institutional characteristics. Management style variables explored the extent to which admin-
Administrators use communication and participation as techniques. The variables that measure funding for professional development were: travel to conferences, travel to develop grants, research by senior professors, research by untenured professors, purchase of computer equipment, purchase of research equipment, purchase of library books, purchase of library journals, personnel for grant development, offering courses frequently enough, student research assistance, student teaching assistants, sabbaticals to improve teaching, and sabbaticals to do publishable research. Institutional characteristics reviewed were: affiliation, highest degree offered, total student population, and graduate student population. Throughout this study correlations were explored via Tau b, a correlation coefficient for non-parametric data that are ordinal in nature.

Results

It could be hypothesized that resources for various faculty development activities would increase as the administrator's management style is perceived to be more communicative and participative. The data suggest otherwise. Tables 1 and 2 depict selected correlations between perceptions of resource adequacy and management styles. Most of the correlations are either approaching zero or negative like those listed in Table 1. These correlations show little or no relationship between administrators' management styles and perceptions of resource adequacy.

Although correlations listed in Tables 1 and 2 generally do not indicate that there is a relationship between resource adequacy and administrative management styles, Tables 3 through 5 illustrate a
relatively stronger correlation between institutional characteristics and resource adequacy. Specifically, those institutions which offer graduate programs and have larger graduate and total student enrollments, appear to provide more funds for faculty development (whether related to teaching or research). Overall, resource adequacy seems to be more highly related to institutional characteristics than administrative management styles.

Discussion

Perceptions of resource adequacy are more closely related to the institutional environment within which faculty work than to administrative management styles. Deans, chairs, and faculty seem to agree that institutional characteristics are more similarly related to adequacy of resources than are administrative management styles. Specifically, there is a set of similar positive correlations for size and degree, although negative correlations are exhibited for affiliation. Although elite public institutions attract relatively greater levels of support, most of the public institutions in this sample suffer from varying degrees of resource deprivation.

Lack of significant correlations between management styles and perceptions of resource adequacy is disconcerting. Much of the literature on organizational behavior supports the premise that an open management style is necessary for good employer/employee relations. In higher education, this trend is accentuated by the complex set of countervailing forces at work on academic decision making. Traditionally, authority is vested in administrators by faculty. The integrative network of faculty committees and other internal constraints combine to make consensus a desirable, if
not indispensable ingredient in a university's culture. Consensus is
developed and sustained, at least in part, by an open administrative
management style.

Administrators can open their management styles by improving inter-
personal skills (Gibb, 1961). The increased demands and extra stress of
administrative work may often cause administrators to reveal both personal
strengths and weaknesses (Blake, Mouton, and Williams, 1982). Administra-
tors must then focus on maximizing strengths in order to effectively work
with their faculties.

That institutional characteristics are a better correlate of resource
adequacy is also unfortunate. Carried to their logical conclusion, the
data presented suggest that many bright scholars will be excluded from
pursuing their scholarly goals if they are not at the "right" institution.
Although we know that institutional characteristics do affect the funding
a scholar receives, it would be comforting to know that an administrator's
management style also has a positive impact on funding for professional
academic development.
Table 1. Selected Correlations between Faculty’s Perceptions of Resource Adequacy and Deans’ Perceptions of Administrators’ Management Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tau b Correlations Between:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Partic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Develop Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals to Improve Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals to do Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 1,077

Table 2. Selected Correlations between Faculty Perceptions of Resource Adequacy and Chairs’ Perceptions of Administrators’ Management Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tau b Correlations Between:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Develop Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals to Improve Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals to do Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 1,104

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.
Table 3. Deans Correlations Between the Perceptions of Resource Adequacy and Institutional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Conferences</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Develop Grants</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research by Senior Professors</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Research Equipment</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel for Grant Development</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 142

Table 4. Chairs' Correlations Between the Perceptions of Resource Adequacy and Institutional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Conferences</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Develop Grants</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research by Senior Professors</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Research Equipment</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel for Grant Development</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 380

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.
Table 5. Faculty Correlations Between the Perceptions of Resource Adequacy and Institutional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Conferences</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.09***</td>
<td>-.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Develop Grants</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research by Senior Professors</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>-.11***</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Research Equipment</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel for Grant Development</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.12***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 1,104

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.
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