

**LEADERSHIP ROLES IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE  
CLASSIFICATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

**Hasan Arslan  
Kocaeli University, Turkey**

**Mail Address: Kocaeli University  
School of Education  
Kocaeli/Turkey**

**Phone: 90.262.311 1629**

**Fax : 90.262.303 2403**

**E-mail: arslan.phd@gmail.com**

# **LEADERSHIP ROLES IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE CLASSIFICATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

**Hasan Arslan**  
**Kocaeli University, Turkey**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The main object of this paper is to focus on possible approaches to classifying higher education institutions. The intent of this paper is to explore approaches to effective leadership in the twenty-first century university that recognize and respond to the perceptions and attitudes of university leaders toward institutional structures. Different models of academic institutions lead to different roles for leadership are discussed in this study. Even all of them are called as universities, some mainly focus on undergraduate education for students because of their specific conditions and some deal with both academic research and post graduate education together. The institutions of higher education need to be classified in the framework of their distinctive goals, so that, they can be more effective. Universities can be thought as prototypes of the organizations of the future, but is it possible to count all of them as the same type of institutions? Certainly not, even they have some common goals, they want to achieve some different roles and functions as well. The recommendations are made with the view to increasing the quality, efficiency and educational opportunity in higher education.*

## INTRODUCTION

Universities are met with changing demands of the community at both organizational and social degrees. These demands have involved not only the administration, but also the mission of the organizations. Higher education institutions were previously providers of education which created knowledge for further academic advancement. Universities were formerly supplier of education which composed education for further academic development. Currently, however, these organizations must be responsive to the requirements and needs of the society. Society wants to see the universities as sources for making of quality manpower, for improvement of the community and economic advance and helping to answer of difficulties met by the society. The importance of universities has thus altered i.e. from perception of the significance of academic worth to that of economy. Funding needs as well as universities requirements have considerably facilitated the various reforms and involved both the administration and notion of higher education. This paper is aimed at revising administration development in higher education. The advises are made with the belief to advance the quality, capability and educational improvements.

In a fast transforming and constantly menacing communal and constitutional conditions, where all features of higher education are being inquired from origins of fund to the nature, quality and efficiency of organizational deeds. It is convenient to review the administrative outline within which the objectives of higher education are accomplished. It will also be beneficial to investigate some of the opposites which the transforming framework of higher education has brought about for this structure. Occasionally as the theorists of management are identifying universities as probable prototypes of the institutions of the future (Drucker, 1988; Handy, 1990, Peters, 1991), many universities are trying to a transform to a management type with foundations in an former period and in a distinctive organisational perspective (Pollitt, 1990). Two topics are discussed in this paper: initially, the alternative of a suitable pattern of governance, and secondly, within that pattern of governance, the application of management and leadership, it will be focused on the functions of inner players who are involved, as managers and leaders, with the system, assisting and supervising academic objectives. It is introduced the notion of administration primarily in order to point out that there is another scope of governance.

### **The Importance of Classification for Higher Education Institutions**

The institutions in Turkey cater a very large student population and harbour a large number of researchers. In addition these institutions come in a variety of shapes and sizes, fulfilling the multiple demands for higher education. Turkey's higher education institutions must play a pivotal role in realising the development of the country. Through the development process and the Turkey policy frameworks on education and research, higher education must play an important role for Turkey's economy and social future. However there are a number of challenges still to be met, such as the lack of sufficient investment levels in research and development, insufficient cooperation between higher education institutions and industry, lack of focus and concentration in research programmes, intransparency of the offering and quality of higher education programmes. Some of these challenges can be met by classifying the Turkey institutions of higher education. Classification of institutions of higher education can increase the efficacy of the higher education in Turkey.

The best-known higher education classification framework available today is the Carnegie Classification in the United States. This classification was designed in 1971 under the leadership of Clark Kerr and aimed to support higher education and research by identifying categories of colleges and universities that are similar in their functions. The US Carnegie Classification is currently being revised. After a fundamental reconsideration in 2005 a new classification system will be introduced. Like the previous and present systems, this new classification will include all (3.941) US universities and colleges that are degree granting and accredited by an agency recognised by the US Secretary of Education. If a classification system were to be developed in Turkey, it could be presented in accordance with the revised US system.

To some, the very notion of changing the Carnegie Classification borders on heresy. But heretical notions are sometimes needed to bring about positive change. The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education was developed in 1970 by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (a project of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching) to aid its policy research. The Commission needed a taxonomy that reflected the great variety of American higher education while providing "more meaningful and homogeneous categories than are found in other existing classifications." The "existing classifications" at that time typically differentiated institutions according to simple descriptors such as level (two- or four-year, with four-year sometimes divided into doctoral and nondoctoral) and control (public or private, with private sometimes divided into sectarian and nonsectarian). Such taxonomies failed to capture important differences, grouping very different institutions and separating institutions with much in common, such as public and private research-intensive universities.

The Classification was developed as a research tool. When the Classification was published in 1973, the Commission decided to make the Classification available in published form because it would be helpful to many individuals and organizations that are engaged in research on higher education. In the three decades since its development, the Carnegie Classification has been adopted by a wide range of users: researchers, policy makers, funding agencies, institutional personnel, even news magazines. Institutions commonly invoke their Carnegie Classification as a concise and consensually understood means of self-description.

Ironically, the Classification's wide acceptance may be its greatest liability, as its present uses have far exceeded its original purpose.

It is important to note the Classification's strengths, which in large measure account for its durability. The Classification is simple. The category definitions are straightforward, and require no complex statistical manipulations. It is easy to see how an institution's classification follows from the data. The Classification is objective. Institutions are classified according to public data on selected dimensions of institutional activity. In other words, they are classified according to behavior. To the extent that the Classification is thought to characterize institutional mission, it is mission as enacted by the institution. The Classification is analytically useful. Countless studies have demonstrated the discriminant utility of its categories with respect to a wide range of institutional, student, and faculty characteristics as well as student outcomes. The Classification provides a basis for shared understanding. It gives researchers, policy makers, and institutional personnel a common language for characterizing institutions, such that research findings and other analyses are readily interpreted and compared. The Classification has the ring of truth. Many of those who know higher education find that the institutional groupings make intuitive sense — they hang together. There is disagreement on this assessment, however: Some argue that it is based on prominent institutions that are clustered in relatively small categories.

Certain types of institutions are much more finely differentiated than others. Doctorate-granting institutions — 7 percent of the institutional universe in 1994 — are divided into four subcategories. Yet two-year colleges — 40 percent of the universe, encompassing a considerable diversity of institutions — are not divided into any subcategories. With a few exceptions, the category definitions use absolute cutoffs — a particular number of degrees at a certain level, a particular number of fields represented, or a particular level of federal funding. While this is an element of the Classification's desirable simplicity, it introduces a confounding effect of institutional size. As a result, average enrollment declines systematically from Research I to Master's II. The differences that result when one replaces an aggregate measure of research activity (as is used in the Classification) with measures. If one has half as many faculty members as the other, the similarity with respect to aggregate funding may conceal considerable differences with respect to the activities of individual faculty members. There are a number of technical shortcomings associated with the measure of research activity used in the Classification. Each of these factors compromises our ability to assess an institution's true level of research activity.

Each of these would likely be based on multiple measures, with appropriate controls for size as needed. After a "menu" of indicators is developed, they will be combined to produce a series of classifications. Another dimension of the new system will be differentiation of two-year colleges. A system of multiple classifications offers several advantages: It acknowledges the complexity and diversity of American higher education, by recognizing that institutions that resemble one another when viewed through one lens may look quite different through another lens. It better differentiates the classification enterprise from ranking: There will no longer be a single way to group institutions, exerting a singular homogenizing influence. Users of the new classification system will have to think carefully about the dimensions of institutional variation that are most relevant to a given purpose, and then would select the classification (or classifications) that best distinguishes institutions along those dimensions. Under such a system, there will be less risk associated with institutional innovation: Adaptation in one direction would not necessarily come at the expense of distinctiveness in other areas.

<b>2000 Edition of the Carnegie Classification</b>	
<b>1994 Edition</b>	<b>2000 Edition</b>
<b>Research Universities I</b> 50 or more doctorates per year, and \$40 million or more per year in federal support	<b>Doctoral/Research Universities I</b> 50 or more doctorates per year across at least 15 disciplines
<b>Research Universities II</b> 50 or more doctorates per year, and \$15.5-40 million or more per year in federal support	<b>Doctoral/Research Universities II</b> 10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year overall
<b>Doctoral Universities I</b> 40 or more doctorates per year across at least 5 disciplines	[Included in above categories]
<b>Doctoral Universities II</b> 10 or more doctorates per year across at least 3 disciplines, or 20 or more doctorates per year total	[Included in above categories]

<b>Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I</b> 40 percent or more of bachelor's degrees in liberal arts fields, and restrictive in admissions*	<b>Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I</b> At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and at least half of bachelor's degrees in liberal arts fields
<b>Baccalaureate Colleges II</b> Less than 40 percent of bachelor's degrees in liberal arts fields, or less restrictive in admissions*	<b>Baccalaureate Colleges II</b> At least half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees, and less than half of bachelor's degrees in liberal arts fields
<b>Associate of Arts Colleges</b> [no explicit distinction from Baccalaureate Colleges]	<b>Associate's Colleges</b> Less than half of undergraduate awards are bachelor's degrees
*Admissions selectively indicated by achievement profile of entering students (high school class rank, and standardized test scores)	
<b>Average Enrollment by Carnegie Classification, 1994</b>	

### American Association for Higher Education, 2003

Such a system is not without risk or difficulty. The taken-for-granted nature of the present system will be undermined: Different analysts will employ different classifications, making it more difficult to compare findings from multiple studies. There might be disagreement about the appropriate classification for certain purposes, such as composing peer groups. And the complexity of the new system might discourage its acceptance: The community might reject it altogether, or simply embrace just one of its new classifications — effectively reproducing the present system. But we are persuaded that the potential benefits of a new approach are worth these risks. This is an ambitious undertaking, and its success will depend in large measure on the participation and assistance of the higher education community.

A classification scheme facilitates the identification of potential partner institutions. Within a classification segment, institutions can more easily associate and create consortia. Through a classification scheme, institutions of higher learning will be stimulated to clarify their missions and choose appropriate profiles. As a result the overall higher education system will become more transparent and policy-instruments can be better targeted. Higher education classification system should provide a variety of lenses through which institutional missions and important differences among institutions can be examined and analysed. A classification scheme should classify all higher education institutions in recognisable categories. Such a classification is not meant to reflect quality differences, nor a ranking of institutions. The idea of this classification is to identify the similarities and differences among Europe's higher education institutions. Relevant dimensions of such a classification system are the type of degrees (certificates, BA, MA, PhD), and the range of programmes that an institution offers (comprehensive and specialised institutions).

Higher education institutions should be offered the option to be classified in more than one category. The classification should characterise institution's functions as revealed by behaviour, which should be based on retrospective objective data and transparent definitions. An important relationship could be developed between the classification scheme and the perspective on quality assurance in higher education. The development of a classification system of higher education institutions could be the next important step in the further development of a higher education system that is globally competitive and offers crucial contributions to the further growth of the knowledge society.

The Classification's weaknesses fall into two broad categories: internal ones, which derive from the way the categories are defined and labeled; and external ones, which derive from the way the classification is interpreted and used. Although the Carnegie Classification represented a great leap forward in describing the diversity of higher education in the United States, it is nevertheless a great simplification to distill that diversity into a handful of characteristics and a single way to group institutions. The order in which categories are presented, combined with the use of numbered subcategories, permits the interpretation that the classification values some categories over others. Although the Classification is often described as characterizing institutional mission, it does not attend to the traditional components of mission equally. Research is measured explicitly; instruction is addressed only indirectly, through degree conferrals and field coverage; and service is absent. Certain types of institutions are much more finely differentiated than others. While this is an element of the classification's desirable simplicity, it introduces a confounding effect of institutional size. As a result, average enrollment declines systematically from Research I to Master's II. There are a number of technical shortcomings associated with the measure of research activity used in the classification. The Classification has traditionally used total federal to capture research activity. While this source has the considerable advantages of reliability and, it has several shortcomings as the sole measure of research activity. Each of these factors compromises our ability to assess an institution's true level of research activity.

Next, there are external weaknesses — difficulties related to the Classification's impact and usage: Its broad acceptance reinforces the notion that there is only one meaningful way to group institutions, and that those in different categories have little in common. Its interpretation as a status hierarchy can have important consequences for institutions, especially their access to human and fiscal resources. As a result, many institutions; especially doctorate-granting institutions — have adopted "moving up the Carnegie Classification" as an explicit institutional goal. In effect, the classification plays a role in shaping the system that it means to describe: The research tool has become an unintended policy lever. This has implications for institutions' ability to innovate and, in combination with the uneven attention to the components of mission described above, raises questions about

system-level change and adaptation. To the extent the classification exerts normative pressure on the system, there are strong incentives for institutions to conform to particular models of institutional activity, and indeed to particular indicators of activity.

## Models of Governance for Higher Education Institutions

Many scholars, e.g. Mangham & Silver (1987), Hirsh & Bevan (1988), have indicated to a chaos of comprehension and a scope of application concerning to the conditions used to define different sides of the 'administrative structure'. Besides the word 'administration' itself, there are other words frequently joined with it, such as 'leadership', 'management' and--in the context of higher education, but not business (Birnbaum, 1988)--'governance'. Governance is described as follows by Birnbaum (1988): There is no single generally accepted definition of governance . . . I shall use it in a very broad way to refer to the structures and processes through which institutional participants interact with and influence each other and communicate with the larger environment. . . A governance system is an institution's answer--at least temporarily--to the enduring question.. ."Who is in charge here?"

According to Kotter (1990), management is about coping with complexity, while leadership is about coping with change. The roles of management are as a result to direct and supervise, primarily so as to shape an organisation efficient and effective within admitted goals. Management may also use both these roles in the foster of transformation in the organisation, but successful transformation cannot be introduced by order; it is the mission of leadership to define the route of transformation and to have the members of the organisation ready, even excited members in the transformation stage. Finally, there is administration, the role of which is to perform a plan within a structure of institutions, principles and practices. It can fulfil the aims of either management or leadership. That is to say management rules, leadership influence and lead, administration assist.

Alterations which are ongoing influencing higher education are both external--economic, social, technological and political--and internal. The improvement and change of knowledge leads to transformations in curricula, in connections between disciplines and departments and in those areas of research. All of this is expected; change is the usual case of higher education and has been so for a long time (Taylor, 1987). The important thing is the effects of external changes on both governance and academic system. Transformation in higher education for the success is to be achieved through the application of systematic planning, organisation and control. The institutions of higher education should be careful in their financial management, but they are in charge of the creation, informing and preservation of knowledge, discharged through the activities of teaching, research, continuing education and public service.

Through documentary research, a study has been made on the management of higher education institutions. The objectives of the studies are different, since each country differs in legal background, social and economic environment and historical development of higher education. In the case of the U.S.A., a study has been made on the overall pictures of 3 different categories of higher education institutions, namely: Community college; Comprehensive university; Research university; Specialized university; and Virtual university.

It can be seen that the new approaches to higher education institution management have been adopted by two main groups. These are: Group 1 includes universities and colleges, which have enjoyed institutional autonomy from their foundation, e.g. higher education institutions in the U.S.A. where there are state universities, non-profit and profit private universities. Innovations are therefore mainly initiated by institution administrators and not from state policy. Accreditation is made on the voluntary, not compulsory, basis by the institutions. There are also different quality - control bodies, namely: regional, professional, and specialized organizations. The accreditation is recognized at both national and international levels. Group 2 comprises state universities receiving annual subsidies from the central government. All countries have a common policy of decreasing subsidies to higher education institutions, leaving the students with increased financial burden. Higher education regarding the role of the institutions in knowledge creation and internationalization; use of strategic development plans to attain desired results; and prescription of indicators for evaluation. Attempts have been made by institutions in some countries to strengthen themselves.

Innovations in higher education institution management in countries commonly share similarities in the aspects:

1. Use of information technologies in management of academic and operational affairs;
2. Co-operation with external agencies and networking;
3. Income generating and expenditure control; and
4. Focus on quality control and improvement of functioning for increased operational efficiency and effectiveness.

We may therefore have to look elsewhere than to business in any search for appropriate models of governance of higher education institutions. Cohen & March (1986) have put forward eight different possible models. These indeed include a 'business' model, that of the competitive market. The conditions which they postulate for this model to work in *higher education* are: (1) few frictions in the relevant markets of students, staff legislators and benefactors; (2) virtually perfect knowledge about the alternatives on all sides; and (3) relative ease of entry for new higher education institutions into the system. On the basis of the work of Cohen & March, as well as that of others, Birnbaum (1988,1989) has suggested the 'cybernetic model' as most suitable for higher education institutions.

Higher education institutions must be designed to run themselves, once an overall direction is established. The leadership in higher must act as facilitators or as 'transactional' rather than 'transformational'. Kotter (1990) indicates that, these situations call in the first place, not for management to 'control complexity', but for proactive leadership to 'produce useful change'. Such

leadership must however be supported by competent management, for change creates its own complexity, with secondary and often unintended consequences. These are frequently counterproductive (Elton 1988), although it is usually possible to avoid undesirable consequences by dividing an institutional system as a whole into subsystems and concentrating attention on the normally few subsystems that are strongly coupled to the subsystem that is being changed. All this raises the question of the extent to which the two functions of management and leadership differ from each other.

Universities have been criticised for not operating efficiently and productively enough. One suggestion has been to transfer business leadership and management models to the University administration. Today, universities need more leadership to create shared values and joint goals for the whole organization. Otherwise the increased demands cannot be met. Leadership needs, however, to be adapted to the knowledge intensive nature of these organizations, direct copying of business models does not work. In the future the solutions created in academic organizations may even show the way to the business world.

The number of unique institutional types is then equal to the product to all the values of all the variables, and each institution within the population can be identified as belonging to one, and only one of the institutional types" (Birnbaum, 1983). However, a general methodological requirement concerning the selection of the number of variables that will be used to define types warns that care must be taken that the number N is large enough to permit adequate differentiation between types, but small enough to permit clustering of similar institutions within types.

Many long-established universities must adopt the management model with clear rules and regulations for administrative purpose. The focus is on the participatory and consultative process through a committee represented by the different faculties or agencies concerned. Decisions are made on consensus of the committee members. With such power in decision-making, personnel of the internal units are able to gradually learn about the functioning of the institutions as well as acquire the necessary experience. The second model can be representative of the functioning of private universities. Emphasis is along the line of business administration under the direction of the institution's owner or founder. Administration is rather centralized, with planning, achievement presentation and evaluation based on the business concept.

The third model can be adopted by independent universities free from the bureaucratic system or by autonomous universities with internal units run along the line of the private sector. Administration can be adjusted in accord with the planned strategic plan.

In the fourth model management on a network basis largely depends on inter-institutional cooperation, the trend of which is on the increase. It is aimed at building academic strength; sharing of resources; social services; teamwork; exchanges of knowledge and mutual learning. The conditions of success of this line of management depends on an efficient communication system and sharing of clear common goals. It is to be noted that each institution has a management model which is a combination of the various models, depending on the philosophical concept, historical background and vision of the administrators. These models are not entirely exclusive.

## **Roles of Management and Leadership in Higher Education**

The distinctions between management and leadership are not always obvious, since the roles of manager and leader are generally combined (Mintzberg, 1973 and Stewart, 1986). Leadership is often taken to be synonymous with 'headship' or formal position at the apex of an organisation or unit (Holloman, 1984), and both roles are closely associated with other forms of social influence such as power and authority (Bryman, 1986). However, the assumption that management and leadership are either coterminous or else that one is part of the other, has been challenged in the past decade by several writers, including Bryman himself, Bennis & Nanus (1985), Bennis (1989) and Kotter (1988,1990), although agreement is lacking as to whether the roles can be complementary in the same person or are possibly in conflict. Bennis, in particular, sees clear distinctions between a manager--who maintains systems, relies on controls, has a short range view, accepts the status quo--and a leader, who energises, motivates, has a long range and even visionary view, and challenges and changes the status quo. It is difficult to see how such different roles can be combined in the same person.

Handy (1984) presents a different argument for dividing the roles, which, however, is particular to professional organisations. He points out that professionals in organisations act as autonomous competent individuals who manage themselves. This does not mean that organisational management is unnecessary in higher education institutions, at either departmental or institutional levels, but that it has to be balanced against individual management. Handy (1985) here introduces the idea of psychological contracts, which are essentially sets of expectations, between individuals and the different sub-organisations to which they relate within the organisation as a whole. These contracts, although mostly tacit, have to establish agreed areas of influence which it would not be possible to formalise through more usual forms of contract. Under normal circumstances, this balancing act leads to compromises which may result in institutional management largely dwindling into administration, with a clear separation of either from leadership:

In professional organisations the leadership function has to be carried out by the senior professionals--to hand it over to an outsider would be an abrogation of their responsibilities. The administrative function, on the other hand, can be delegated to outsiders or to junior professionals because it is under the direction of professionals.

The elements which are seen as most important are those which encourage the exercise of individual autonomy within the overall framework of collective action, in other words those which extend the leadership function from the senior staff to all the

staff in an organisation. They include the development of shared culture, values and mission; the importance of trust between centre and periphery, between customers and suppliers; the need for open access to information and constant feedback on decisions and performance; the flattening of management hierarchies; and the exercise of leadership at many levels of the organisation. These elements are what in essence in academia is called collegiality, at least as far as it applies to the academic staff: i.e. the involvement of all academic members of the organisation in committees, working groups and task forces, through consultation, as both leaders and led. That such collegiality is rarely extended to non-academic staff is one of the less attractive features of academia, but we will not pursue this feature further in this paper. Another aspect of academic collegiality is the freedom which it gives to individual academics to be creative. In the past, such creativity has expressed itself mainly through research and this aspect of it will become increasingly important in the polytechnics; in the future, it may be equally important in connection with teaching (Elton, 1992). All this may be a rather idealistic description of collegiality and we know that it frequently degenerates into academic selfishness, but the question still remains, whether an organisation should encourage or discourage collegiality. In a situation of threat to an institution, such encouragement may appear risky, but it may nevertheless be right.

Going over to a cybernetic model or--in the cases of universities--making it work better, will require appropriate individuals and groups to be trained to carry out what will be largely new and unfamiliar tasks. Handy (1984) considers that "each profession ought to establish its own theory and tradition of management and train its people in management as part of their professional duty". (Unfortunately, Handy here uses 'management' to include both management and leadership in our terminology, but distinguishes it from what we and he call administration).

It is necessary to separate policy and execution, the former being professional and collegial, the latter hierarchical and bureaucratic. Both tasks may require leadership and there are of course overlaps between them. The increasing complexity and specialisation of functions of universities has also expanded the role of administrators and blurred the boundary between policy-making and policy implementation.

The discussion so far raises the question as to how universities coped with the radical changes of the 1980s, which were exactly of the kind characterised by Birnbaum's two urgent situations. The whole situation is aggravated by the problem of divided loyalties in higher education, where academic loyalties to the discipline are normally much stronger than those to the institution, so that disciplinary goals, and hence policies, at departmental level can be and often are in conflict with institutional ones. Discipline-related leadership at departmental and faculty level is therefore essential for the development and change of academic programmes, not only in teaching and research, but also for services to employers and to the community.

Since the primary goals of higher education are academic, non-academic and in particular financial goals should normally be subordinated to them. We say 'normally', because if the position of an HEI sinks in the Maslow hierarchy of needs to the survival level, then the order of importance of goals must clearly be reversed. Under those circumstances, more authoritarian models of institutional leadership are needed to initiate rapid institutional change and strong institutional management to maintain it. If this situation becomes permanent, then it is likely that academics will get progressively alienated, academic goals will suffer and academic standards will drop. Evidence, as yet largely anecdotal, is beginning to accumulate that this is indeed happening. This is the counter-argument against the suggestion that competition is necessarily a good thing (Jackson, 1988). The achievement of academic goals may benefit from a certain amount of academic competition but, in spite of celebrated stories, of, for instance, a race for a Nobel prize, it benefits much more from academic co-operation. Such co-operation is likely to suffer from institutional competition, when the latter turns academic insights into business secrets.

## Conclusions

In sum, the management innovation in Turkish higher education on the whole has similar trends to those of other countries, with priorities given to building cooperative networks in administration, academic affairs and research work. The focus is on offering academic services to diverse customers or groups of learners. Technologies have been availed of to assist in institutional management and in organizing teaching-learning activities. Regarding the strategies for introducing management innovation to gain the competitive edge, efficiency and educational equality, each institution will have to take into consideration its commitment, historical background and other internal conditions. Changes in the management methods of the institution will therefore have to be continuously made, without totally adopting practices of other institutions.

Both state and autonomous universities face the following problems: Decrease in government subsidy while expenditure remains the same or increases, thus limiting the fund for institutional development. The rules and regulations governing personnel are not yet clear. New approaches cannot be readily implemented, as positions of the staff and human resource management system is linked to general administration as well as fiscal and budgetary management. It is difficult to adjust salaries, wages or allowances which are not part of salaries. The remuneration may not be commensurate with the cost of living, nor does it provide sufficient incentive to maintain or attract highly qualified staff. Regarding management structure, newly established universities can easily adjust or set the administrative system, organizational structure and relevant rules, older institutions, however, have to face with many initial and boundary conditions. Coordination between the universities and outside agencies concerned is not clear. Official rules and regulations are inflexible and cannot be adjusted to accommodate the universities' changing needs, attitudes and understanding of the staff members. Officials of external agencies still follow the existing rules and regulations. Management innovation involves new practices e.g. reimbursement for persons or agencies. The staff members, however, do not clearly understand and are not so sure of the management innovation. Management has not given sufficient recognition of the students' interest. The policy of sharing resources has given rise to problems because of difficulty in accommodating timetables to suit both



parties. Special charges also have to be paid to agencies providing services. The aim of educating all to graduate at the Bachelor's degree level has affected the academic quality. The further education curriculum has not fully yielded the desired results due to unreadiness on the learners' part. Regarding research, the fund available is limited or not continuously provided. There has been lack of readiness and willingness of the persons concerned, both faculty staff and supporters. Different groups may have different interests. The research outcomes may serve individual preference rather than commercial application. Communication between academics of various institutions or between the academics and the community has been hampered by the time required, communication methods and teamwork culture. All institutions need self-adjustment and learning from one another, especially in working through networks. The personnel's capacity in the computer technology has not been fully utilized and has not therefore yielded maximal benefits.

It is in higher education to separate the different roles and tasks of leadership from each other, it is important to separate the roles of leadership from those of management, at least at the conceptual level. Otherwise the longer-term focus and more intangible aspects of leadership may not be given sufficient attention under the pressures on management. Leadership becomes particularly important at times of rapid change, as various authors have documented (Kanter, 1983; Peters & Austin, 1985; Kotter, 1990). Many staff at all levels appear to expect leadership to be exercised both individually and by groups: to give their work meaning, purpose and direction; to value their contribution to the achievement of goals; and to represent their interests to the outside world, whether this is at the level of department, institution or system.

The encouragement of competition at all levels, both intra and inter institutional, the pressure for performance-related pay and the deterioration in frank communication between centre and units have constituted an active discouragement of collegiality, leading to a loss of morale and trust in many institutions.

It was noted earlier that efficient management is always required in complex, modern organisations in order to drive the purposes of leadership through systems for decision-making, co-ordination, reward and accountability. However, in the last decade, the imperatives of control and accountability for resources and activities have dominated institutional concerns, resulting in an emphasis on restraint and containment rather than on empowerment, initiative and creative development. In other words, the balance has focused on managerial values and actions rather than leadership.

It is important to appreciate that there are differences in the management of research and teaching. Birnbaum (1988) argues that teaching and research require different and incompatible forms of management, in that research depends primarily on the activities of individual academics, while teaching requires the focus of an academic department. However, in the past, this view has resulted in individual academic freedom as an academic right not only for research, but also for teaching, with the result that it was difficult to achieve the departmental focus that comes from the work of course teams. Collegiality in this situation becomes equated with respecting individual colleagues' academic rights in their work as well as in corporate decision-making. University staff, on the other hand, will have to learn to work in course teams, but they will then expect to do this in terms of both the aspects of collegiality that we have mentioned, respect for the individual and willingness to work in teams. They will not be satisfied with the kind of limited freedom that a hierarchical management allows, and there is evidence that this limitation of freedom has already led to frustration and disillusionment in universities. It is this argument that convinces us that in the long run the hierarchical managerial model will not be in the best interest of academic work, whether in research or teaching.

The two 'complementary systems of action', that is management and leadership (Kotter, 1990), are always likely to be in a state of dynamic tension. In times of scarcity or uncertainty, emphasis will be placed on monitoring, assessment and reporting, in order to rein in the activities of individuals and groups. Often during this period, leadership of a directive and exhortative kind supports the managerial thrust. In happier times, there is likely to be more freedom for leadership at departmental and work-group levels to forge distinctive paths, stimulated by enabling management frameworks and a facilitative leadership style at institutional level. For the long term health of higher education institutions, the checks on individual and group activities need to be built into the systems of the institution in a way which matches professional codes of behaviour, so that self-regulation becomes habitual. At the same time, the leadership role in all its various guises must remain paramount: to explain, interpret and build internal commitment towards positive collective action in the face of external pressures or internal crises; in the absence of such pressures, to guide, represent, develop and support the key purposes of the institution; and at all times to offer new visions, insights and agendas which can act as unifying forces. From this follow a number of central questions concerning: the locus of power, authority and control; the appropriate leadership styles and management frameworks; the kind of training and development which will be required.

## REFERENCES

- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B., (1985), *Leaders: the strategies for taking charge*, New York, Harper & Row.
- Birnbaum, R., (1988), *How Colleges Work: the cybernetics of academic organisation and leadership*, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.
- Birnbaum, R., (1989), The cybernetic institution: toward an integration of governance theories, *Higher Education*, 18, pp. 239-253.
- Bryman, A., (1986) *Leadership and Organisations*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Cohen, M.D., & March, J.G., (1986), *Leadership and Ambiguity: the American college president*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. New York, McGraw Hill.

- Drucker, P., (1988), The coming of the new organisation, *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, pp. 45-53.
- Elton, L., (1988), Accountability in higher education: the danger of unintended consequences, *Higher Education*, 17, pp. 377-390.
- Handy, C., (1984), Education for management outside business, *Education for the Professions*, pp. 289-296
- Handy, C., (1985), *Understanding Organisations*, London, Penguin.
- Handy, C., (1990), *The Age of Unreason*, London, Arrow Books.
- Holloman, C.R., (1984), Leadership and headship: there is a difference, W. E. Rosenbach & R. L. TAYLOR (Eds) *Contemporary Issues in Leadership*, pp. 109-116, Boulder, CO, West View Press.
- Jackson, R., (1988), Higher education in Britain, *Higher Education Review*, 42, pp. 111-118.
- Kanter, R., (1983), *The Change Masters*, London, Unwin.
- Kotter, J., (1988), *The Leadership Factor*, New York, Free Press. 3, p. 251.
- Kotter, J., (1990), What leaders do, *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, pp. 103-111.
- McKonkey, D., (1989), Are you an administrator, a manager or a leader? *Business Horizon*, 32(5), pp. 15-21.
- Middlehurst, R., Elton, L., (1992), Leadership and Management in Higher Education, *Studies in Higher Education*, 17(3), pp. 251-265.
- Mintzberg, H., (1973), *The Nature of Managerial Work*, New York, Harper & Row.
- Peters, T., (1991), *Beyond Hierarchy*, London, Macmillan.
- Peters, T., & Austin, N., (1985) *A Passion for Excellence: the leadership difference*, Glasgow, Fontana/Collins.
- Pollit, C., (1990), *Managerialism and the Public Services: the Anglo-American experience*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Stewart, R., (1986), *The Reality of Management*, London, Pan Books.
- Taylor, W., (1987), *Universities under Scrutiny*, Paris, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.