

Perceptions of the Dilemma – Order versus Freedom at Managing Faculty: A Literature Review

Dr. Figen Karaferye^{1*} Prof. Dr. Esmahan Agaoglu²

1. School of Foreign Languages, Dumlupinar University, Kutahya, Turkey

2. Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Anadolu University, Eskisehir, Turkey

Abstract

This study aims to examine the perceptions of the middle management (deans and heads of departments) and academicians on the dilemma order versus freedom at faculty management. It discusses how this dilemma is seen at an operational level and how it can be managed at university where both parties -with a managerial role or not- are academicians/academics and have professional expertise. The literature on organizational dilemmas was analyzed to answer the questions “which side of the dilemma is seen dominantly in different organization types?”, “how does examining organizational structures from different perspectives help understand educational organizations?” and “in that way how can dilemmas be managed in educational contexts especially in the academic context?” The major findings include the tendency to one side of the dilemma in different perspectives to organizational structure creates problems in the organizational management. However, balancing the order or freedom dilemma at an operational level improves effectiveness. Balancing dilemmas at faculty management is specifically difficult due to differing perceptions of academicians and the management. It needs the effective usage of other instruments in organizational life. The dynamics of organizational structures and processes in Higher Education (HE) institutions are growing attention due to the growing importance of HE institutions worldwide. Research on how effectively the operating core itself at HE institutions is managed is becoming more important in the field. This study explores the problems in the management of faculty at an operational level based on dilemmas between academicians and the middle management.

Keywords: Dilemmas, Faculty management, Middle management

1. Introduction

Higher Education (HE) management and the dynamics of organizational processes in HE institutions are growing attention due to the growing importance of HE institutions worldwide. Dilemmas seen in university management processes can create problems among academicians and managers between upper-lower levels, in organizational culture and climate. They can prevent the organization to achieve its goals effectively. Similarly, those problems can occur between organizations and/or between the organization and its sub-organizations. Since research on how effectively academicians at HE institutions are managed is becoming more important in the field, this study explores the problems in the management of academicians at an operational level based on dilemmas between academicians and the middle management. The middle management includes department heads and deans who strive towards handling many challenges due to the impact of their strategic position.

2. What are organizational dilemmas?

A dilemma is the paradox of two opposing ideas. It is not a problem to be solved with a single answer. It has two sides to be dealt with equally (Ogawa, Crowson & Goldring, 1999). Hoy and Miskel states that the dilemma of order versus freedom is frequently seen in formal organizations. Both order and freedom are necessary and desirable for effectiveness. However, when one side increases, the other one decreases. Hoy and Miskel states the order vs. freedom dilemma seen in academic organizations in managerial practice at an operational level are coordination vs. communication; bureaucratic discipline vs professional expertise and managerial planning vs. individual initiative (Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

Communication element is very important for the organization. However, free flow of information can prevent coordination, consensus may not be reached and communication can cause problems (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). On the other hand, coordination require differentiation, centralisation, vertical hierarchy and limited communication since it is the process of combining human and material resources to achieve organizational goals (Şişman, 2010). Rational organizations function in order through centralisation, hierarchical authority and rules and regulations (Geist, 2002). However, over-emphasis on bureaucratic elements can create problems for the organization. In addition, professional expertise and bureaucratic discipline elements can conflict.

Professional expertise is based on the specific structure of the profession, its standards and group supervision. On the other hand, bureaucratic discipline is based on the division of labour and specialization, highly respecting rules, hierarchical authority, upper controlling the lower and technical competency (Hoy & Miskel, 2010; Sergiovanni et al., 1999). Another order vs. freedom dilemma element managerial planning requires vertical hierarchy, centralized management, career development planned & guided by the upper level and a strong control mechanism. However, subordinates who actively take part at the operational level may not

be able to communicate effectively with their superiors in decision making and this may cause problems in not being included in the plan (Bursalioglu, 2008). On the other hand, individual initiative requires creativity and practicality in problem-solving (Binnewies, Ohly & Sonnentag, 2007). However, in that case a managerial planning principle integrity of control and plan can be broken since an unplanned decision can be put into practice by using the initiative. It can be difficult to control the decision. And for the sake of the organization plan and control must not be separated since unplanned action can not be controlled and can carry risks (Bursalioglu, 2008).

It is important to know that there are no positive or negative sides in dilemmas. Both sides are equally important and desired for the organization. Depending on the organization type and structure, the dilemma can be in a balance or one side can be seen higher than the other. As universities are in matrix structures, there is not a single prescription for them. Thus, at managing faculty, a manager does not have to choose just one side of the dilemma, he/she can apply both sides of it.

3. Understanding organizations and organizational dilemmas in managerial practice

It is important to reinforce the understanding of different organizational theories/models/metaphors to be able to handle with dilemmas accordingly. By looking from one perspective/paradigm may not help understand the situation or solve a problem. Problems in organizations can involve complexity and uncertainty at different levels. Thus, being aware of different perspectives and paradigms may help bring new angles and solutions to the organizational matters when they are needed (Bell, Warwick & Galbraith, 2012; Harris & Nelson, 2008). It is important to approach things in a multi-perspective way in organizational life, it provides new angles/methods instead of being limited to one (Mingers, 2001).

3.1. Rational/bureaucratic/mechanical understanding of organizations

Rational/bureaucratic/mechanical understanding of organizations is based on classical organization theory and it is based on Taylor's (scientific management & efficiency), Fayol's (organizing) and Weber's (bureaucracy) studies. Due to its mechanical understanding of organizations and ignorance of the human side, the theory has been criticized. When the dilemma seen in managerial practice is examined, it is seen that there is a significant emphasis on bureaucratic discipline element.

This way of understanding is also explained with the machine metaphor. In this metaphor/understanding, work environment is stable, roles and duties are clear and people work as clockwork on the same routines over and over. However, bureaucracy shapes itself unquestionable; adaptation to change becomes more difficult and alienation may start among staff especially at the bottom level in hierarchy (Morgan, 1998). In that kind of bureaucratic and mechanical organizations, coordination element is high and communication element is low. Professional expertise element is seen as Taylor put it that work is done by trained and fully-equipped workers specialised in the field. However, control is mostly bureaucratic and not like the way professional expertise element requires it (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Academic organizations are not that much fixed and stable (Bursalioglu, 2010, p. 17; Şimşek, 1997). Academicians' informal side, their professional expertise and the communication element need to be considered at managing faculty.

Even though bureaucratic and mechanical understanding of organizations is criticized, there is not a completely different alternative in schools and universities now since a rational approach is needed (Aslanargun, 2007; McKibbin, 1981). School structure consists of differentiation and integration among specialised roles and duties. Division of labour and vertical & horizontal processes bring different elements together to operate. Yet, the right structure can change since there is not one true prescription. Therefore, it is important to gain a rich understanding of different structure alternatives (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Walker & Lorsch, 1996).

In conclusion, in organizations with a predominant rational/bureaucratic/mechanical understanding, vertical hierarchy is strongly felt in coordination and bureaucratic discipline elements. Consequently, academicians need to convey information to the upper level in a strong hierarchical structure which means they need to stand by for the guidance in decision-making and/or in applying something accordingly -even about the things in the field that they are professionalised in. Communication element is seen in a vertical direction from the top level to the base (English, 2006). Hence, red-tape increases and processes slow down. In Table 1, dilemmas seen in rational/bureaucratic/mechanical organizations are given.

Table 1. Dilemmas in rational/bureaucratic/mechanical organizations

Dilemmas	Tendency towards
Coordination vs. communication	Coordination: Organizing upon roles, duties and functions; centralized management; vertical hierarchy.
Bureaucratic discipline vs. professional expertise	Bureaucratic discipline: Division of labour and specialization, highly respecting rules, hierarchical authority, upper controlling the lower, technical competency.
Managerial planning vs. individual initiative	Managerial planning: Vertical hierarchy, centralized management, career development planned & guided by the upper level, strong control mechanism.

3.2. Organizations with an emphasis on the human factor

An emphasis on the human factor in organizations first started with the neoclassical theory. The theory expanded the classical theory understanding of organizations by bringing new perspectives. Its most important contribution is changing the mechanical understanding of organizations (Shafritz & Ott, 1996). Particularly, Hawthorne studies raised awareness of human needs, motivation and relations. In these studies in order to reduce the feeling of alienation, workers were motivated to participate in decision-making, they were appreciated and happiness of the workers was one of the primary goals (Harris & Nelson, 2008).

The Zen approach to organizations also makes emphasis on the human factor. The Zen organization is the result of many elements (including the known and the unknown), human relations and respect are the top priority. Collaboration among academics and contribution are important (Lotto, 1981). The collegial understanding of organizations sees contribution and collaboration among academics important just like the Zen approach. With a collegial management understanding at university; managers make decisions together with the academics; responsibilities are shared; normative links and politics are highlighted (Aypay, 2006; Şimşek, 1997).

Research shows that the interaction and concordance between academicians and the management are effective in teaching & learning processes. Academicians' dedication and commitment to the school influence their performance since there is also an organic link between the academicians and the school, rather than a mechanical one. Feelings, ideas and needs of the humans cannot be ignored since educational organizations are the systems serving humans via humans and with humans as the input and output (Burns & Stalker, 1996; Şişman, 1995). The educational leader in an organization with a strong understanding of human factor is open to communication; he believes in his colleagues and shows his belief in them openly; he encourages and empowers the academicians (Bolman & Deal, 2003). To the leader, every individual is unique and important.

In conclusion, in organizations with an emphasis on the human factor, socio-psychological side of the employees is emphasized. Communication element is emphasized highly, unlike classical theory in which bureaucratic discipline and coordination elements are emphasized. Particularly, horizontal communication is emphasized in Barnard's and Mayo's studies (English, 2006). The possibility of a difference between individual's goals and organizational goals leads to the individual initiative element. Here, academics are recognized with their own ideas and goals as individuals. Control is upward in these organizations with a strong understanding of human factor, which can be associated with professional expertise as professionals/employees have a point. In Table 2, dilemmas seen in organizations with an emphasis on the human factor are given.

Table 2. Dilemmas in organizations with an emphasis on the human factor

Dilemmas	Tendency towards
Coordination vs. communication	Communication: Informal communication, horizontal way of communication.
Bureaucratic discipline vs. professional expertise	Professional expertise: Upward controlling based on the worker's expertise.
Managerial planning vs. individual initiative	Individual initiative: The acceptance of a difference between the organization's and individual's goals.

3.3. Organic and interactionist approaches to organizations

Since 1950s, organizations have been considered as organic entities with their internal and external interactions and the contingency theory came up. The theory is a synthesis of classical and neoclassical theories. It explains the organization as an open system with its sub-systems in interaction with its external environment (English, 2006). Hence, it gives much more importance to communication than the former two theories.

Natural selection and adaptation theories accept organizations as living entities which can survive as long as they conform to natural development and change law. However, when they cannot conform, they can no longer be effective and functional (Balci, 1992). Organism metaphor also makes emphasis on contingency. It suggests that due to being contingent, an organization is able to respond to different situations and continue surviving. In contingency theory, educational organizations are seen as socio-technical systems. Educational manager and academics/teachers are interdependent as a team. Being a contingent leader encompasses different

applications such as giving orders to employees, guiding them, or supporting them. Preference of the application depends on the status of the employees. Even though organism metaphor suggests that an organization can be renewed in every situation, in educational organizations there is no local-based innovations (Ertan-Kantos, 2011).

K. Weick says educational organizations are different from other organization types. So they need to be managed differently; and he defines schools as loose systems. Schools as loose structured systems are flexible and open to innovation. They need to be responsive to their surroundings. However, schools cannot be explained just with the loose-coupling features as they have tight-coupling features, too. Moreover, problems can arise when two different aspects of nature are brought together. For instance, a supervisor conducts an inspection and evaluation during a class visit within a limited time. Frequent supervisions cannot be conducted since they may cause a decrease in the effectiveness of the courses. Consequently, many things will be left to professional expertise and autonomy. However, research suggests this can also create some problems in management (Weick, 1982).

Schools are predominantly values-based and partly force-based organizations and when compared to schools, universities are more value-based organizations. A. Etzioni sees the organization as a whole according to the force type. However, sub-organizations or groups within the organization may be different. For instance, the values of the student or teacher groups or the administrative or technical staff groups of the school may be based on different bases. In this case, it should be taken into consideration that different groups may act on different compliance bases when the educational manager deals with the organization on an adaptation basis. On the other hand, organizational adaptation may also be an exerting pressure on the members of the group. This can have negative consequences, especially in assessment applications in educational organizations (Bursalıoğlu, 2010).

The symbolic framework indicating that managers and academicians are interactively united around shared-values as a team argues that the manager should know how the thoughts, expectations, understandings and behaviors of academicians are created, developed, and understood. It also puts forth an educational manager should know that teachers'/academicians' actions take place on symbols which are routinely shared. Knowledge and management of shared values and symbols by the school manager paves the way for school management to pursue more compromise and mutual understanding (Şişman, 2007). Through the use of symbols, organizational meanings, values and beliefs, the behaviors of the academicians are directed in a university where the symbolic framework characteristics are strongly seen. Cultural norms are formed and the staff act according to these norms. Interaction and communication among all staff is preliminary (Aypay, 2006).

Another model emphasizing interaction among employees is the Theory Z. According to the theory, communication between employees and managers should increase (Harris & Nelson, 2008). Here professional expertise and communication elements are predominant. In that, participation of the academicians in decision-making is high, peer/group control is seen in the organization instead of control of the upper level. Moreover, coordination is based on professional routines and organizational culture (Balcı, 1992). In Table 3, dilemmas seen in organizations with a high level of understanding of organic and interactionist approaches are given.

Table 3. Dilemmas in organizations with organic and interactionist approaches

Dilemma	Tendency towards
Coordination vs. communication	Communication: In & out of the organization, regarding values and the value-system, multi-directions in communication, interaction between the leader and academics.
Bureaucratic discipline vs. professional expertise	Professional expertise: Autonomy, the structure of the profession, and peer/group supervision.
Managerial planning vs. individual initiative	Managerial planning: Participatory decision-making with the guidance of the management.

3.4. Dialectical and postmodern approaches to organizations

In the 1980s, traditional paradigm and its theories started to change with the studies based on evolutionary processes, dialectics and institutional finance (Van de Ven & Poole, 2004). New public management, learning organizations, strategic management, organizational citizenship, new institutionalism, governance, total quality management and other quality tools are under the title of postmodern organization theory. Postmodern theory has a critical and innovative perspective to the management theories before itself. Decentralization, horizontal organization, changing understanding of chain of command and control can be suggested as the main differences.

Educational organizations are divided into internal and external coalitions when they are treated as joint interest coalitions of individuals and groups. The internal coalitions are the coalitions governed by the person or persons holding the power in the school. Power is used as bureaucratic, ideological, professional centered and there political games and conflicts are experienced. External coalitions are teacher associations, other associations, professional organizations and groups or the media. These groups, as external influencers, try to pressure the functioning of the school and the decision-making mechanism (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Educational

leaders who adopt the political framework are realists. They come out of the academics/teachers, are aware of the characters that stand out according to their strength and try to attract them to their side. They try to manage conflicts that may originate from inside or outside (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

The political framework sees universities as political arenas in which more than one interest group or coalition takes place. In universities where the political model predominates, there is a danger of pursuing the aims of individuals or groups instead of organizational goals (Aypay, 2006; Şimşek, 1997). Another model is the organized anarchy framework that speaks of the random and political participation of people with different interests and agendas to the university management. This framework sees change in the universities as unpredictable (Şimşek & Louis, 1994).

A manager at university is confronted with many ambiguities and needs to manage in uncertainty (Clark, 1981; Cohen & March, 1996). Those ambiguities are in purposes, power, experience and in success. With the research on ambiguities in university settings, organized anarchy and garbage bin models have emerged. In the management of those organizations there may be opposing applications/contrasts to bureaucratic discipline and managerial planning elements due to the fact that differences in objectives can be observed, the unity of the plan can be broken. Moreover, decision-making can be based on chance and relativity can be seen based on personal feelings. The view emphasizing structural contrasts is the Marxist view. It is believed that the oppositions and conflicts will change and develop the organization. In this sense, appreciating structural contrasts in educational organizations in order for educational organizations to change and develop is seen necessary (Balci, 1992).

The dialectical view which discusses opposing ideas argues that education is the process that reduces change by controlling it and it makes production (Sönmez, 2009). It discusses that since schools are institutional organizations, institutionalized business processes (accreditation, diploma) are becoming more important and the work to be done may fall behind. Therefore, acting according to the institutional rules may become more of importance than the work to be done (Clark, 1981). In Table 4, dilemmas seen in dialectic and postmodern organizations are given.

Table 4. Dilemmas in dialectic and postmodern organizations

Dilemma	Tendency towards
Coordination vs. communication	Communication: Versatile and multidirectional communication, and networks.
Bureaucratic discipline vs. professional expertise	Professional expertise: Empowering staff, mutual and negotiable structure instead of a hierarchical structure.
Managerial planning vs. individual initiative	Managerial planning: Decentralization as an anti-practice to the former ones and changing understanding of control mechanisms.

4. Understanding dilemmas in the academic context

There are studies which underline that the academic management and leadership approach displayed by the middle manager define the academic research environment and that the manager/leader, being both the manager and an academician, carry out a stressful and difficult task. In a study conducted by Gidman (2013), where data is obtained from the academic staff through the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, what kind of leadership was displayed by the manager/leader and through the use of which leadership skills he/she managed the challenges along with dilemmas and tensions he/she experienced were discussed (Gidman, 2013). In another study, how the managers at regional universities in the United States managed the issues and dilemmas that emerged in the face of change and innovations and what kind of a decision-making process they followed were investigated through a phenomenological research method (Lee, 2009). In yet another study, how the administrators managed the dilemmas reflected on multiple organisational identities related to credit and non-credit segmentation at regional universities in the United States was scrutinised and it was indicated that organisational identities were shaped according to the perception and decisions of administrators (Gill, 2012). Another study was conducted by Zanjani (2012). Via interviews made with the chancellors at regional universities in the United States, how the upper management eliminated tensions in the light of the experiences of conflict occurred between the academic board or the board of regents and what type of a conflict management they interpreted as successful were investigated (Zanjani, 2012).

Studies analysing the effectiveness and success of school management brought forth the concepts of effective school and effective school management. Effective school management defines school success/school effectiveness. University managers being elected among academicians is seen as one of the challenges against effective management of academicians. Academicianship embodies the standards in other fields like engineering and medicine such as professional specialisation, autonomy, commitment, the power to perceive requirements. However, dominantly they lack any standard education on how to educate students (Ramsden, 1998). Thus, academicians' sense of duty and their approach towards the institution may differ from each other. At this point, middle managers, who are responsible of ensuring that educational activities are performed in a regular manner, strive towards gathering the academic staff around a common vision and common objectives to achieve joint

purposes and aims in line with the vision of the institution.

Studies indicate that a manager ensuring employees become of one mind and act as a body towards shared objectives will bring along a much more convenient institutional life. To that end, it becomes relevant that a department head—for instance— maintains transparency with each of his/her actions; provides regular, clear and intelligible information and thus includes the academic staff in all processes. Notwithstanding, in a study conducted by Hellawell and Hancock on this issue with the faculty deans and department heads at a university in England, it was observed that many managers have found it necessary or at least politically correct to keep certain things they do or plan to do from employees/colleagues (Hellawell & Hancock, 2003). Managers included in the study have expressed that certain things had to be discoursed without making public for at least a certain period due to the fact entrepreneurship and competition are on the foreground in this time and also not to damage the aspect of trust.

Managers, who have to manage and balance dilemmas, have the right of judgement and preference regarding the work they perform. This judgement may differ according to the institutional culture in the organisation in question (Carnall, 2007). For instance, in case a manager frequently uses his/her judgement on the side of the aspect of professional specialisation in his/her management of the bureaucratic discipline and professional expertise dilemma, the institutional culture may be said to dominantly embody reconciliatory/supportive cultural features and human resources framework features. Additionally, it may be related to a brain metaphor when desired to be illustrated metaphorically (Harris & Nelson, 2008; Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Department heads and deans as the middle management strive towards handling many challenges due to the impact of their strategic position. In the study conducted by Ramsden on persons acting as department heads at the universities in England, Hong Kong, Singapore, New Zealand and Australia, the three most significant challenges they faced have been asked of the department heads. In conclusion of the study, the following responses have been received with varying votes from department heads regarding the challenges they faced (Ramsden, 1998):

1. Maintaining quality despite diminishing resources, realising more with less;
2. Implementing academic management and leadership in a time of constant change;
3. Interaction of higher education with the varying environment (Vision requirement, innovations in education and research, issued arising from technological changes, excess information load and globalising higher education);
4. Number of students and standards (Acceptance of higher number of students, lesser academic motivation of students);
5. Academic personnel facing dilemmas between continuing their individual academic studies and fulfilling the responsibilities expected of them by the management.

Ramsden explains the conclusion with the fact that middle managers must somehow manage the conflicting priorities to achieve a good result, and correlated this with a German proverb: “Managers should see and hear but be blind and deaf”. Binary issues in conflict with each other may not have a definite solution but managers, together with the academics, should still strive to maintain a conciliating minimum level in line with the institution’s requirements (Ramsden, 1998, p. 7-8).

In the study where Wolverton, Gmelch, Wolverton and Sarros investigated the sources of stress for American, Australian and multicultural department heads, five aspects came out as particularly significant stress factors. These happened to be; administrative tasks, managerial relations, human relations, academic roles and external time (Wolverton *et al.*, 1999). In this study, certain solution ways have been recommended towards eliminating stress factors. Especially qualifications such as communicating skills, effective communication building between people and change management have been highlighted. In managerial processes, effective use of communication skills and techniques is essential. Academic staff and administrator/managerial staff maintaining a healthy level of communication reduces the stress in administrative/managerial processes. Managers should utilise their communication techniques, particularly those that may reflect with positive attitude and behaviour in their employees.

Approaching academics in a friendlier manner, ensuring their participation in the making of certain decisions, reducing their alienation and making them feel appreciated are beneficial (Harris & Nelson, 2008; Ramsden & Lizzio, 1998). However, this approach may also have its disadvantages. Because through this approach, the organisational and administrative/managerial approach that handles humans as social-psychological beings becomes predominant, where horizontal communication is underlined and many different opinions come together in decision making processes. In such cases, agreement may be delayed, communication may prevail coordination, comfort may prevail consistency and tolerance may prevail organisational persistence; possibly leading to diminished organisational efficiency (Hoy & Miskel, 2010; English, 2006; Harris & Nelson, 2008). Therefore, managers must follow a coordination-communication correlation in line with the institutional culture and aimed towards the institution’s objectives.

University, as much as being a community of scientific people, also is an institution rendering public services. It should be accountable against both the state and other segments. Thus, academic rights and freedoms have certain constraints regarding both individual perspective and macro perspective in terms of policies and the system. Academic institutions and individuals must act in accordance to certain rules (Henkel, 2005). Therefore, the path of individuals may conflict with the planning of the management. In regards to the interaction between the management and academicians; discord, conflict and dilemmas experienced in relation to expectations are attempted to be answered through the approach that handles managers and academicians as two separate cultures (see Table 5) (Bursalioglu, 2008; Ramsden, 1998).

The path that management may follow in the face of such problems must be developing a mechanism controlled and supported by the organisation to enable academicians to make decisions for the sake of the organisation, and thus managing administration-academician dilemmas as to ensure all plans and results positively contribute to realisation of organisational objectives, instead of disregarding academics' individual needs and aims (English, 2006; Bursalioglu, 2008). As an integral part of managerial planning, supervision may also occasionally constitute a problem between administrative staff and academic staff. However, employees with professional specialisation also need consultancy and supervision towards becoming aware of, and performing, their responsibilities (Walton, 1985).

Table 5. Reciprocal problems of academicians and managers

Academicians' problems arising from managers	Managers' problems arising from academicians
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of understanding of academic requirements, disregard of field specialisation; • Intervening with autonomy, excess supervision; • Standing against openness in decision making; • Disregard of individual requirements, rise of institutional culture; • Being obliged to spend less time to mainly significant tasks due to the increasing administrative work load, larger classrooms, students with less potential, low morale; • Transitivity between academic and administrative personnel; • Increasing unnecessary quality processes; • Deterioration in value of loyalty to discipline and professional control. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partiality towards individual desires, rejection of administrative qualification; • Attempts towards undermining administrative authority; • Excessive focusing on discussions, wasting of time, inefficient meetings, avoiding taking responsibility; • Weak consistency in terms of department and institution, marginal loyalty to study unit and to university, weak understanding of entrepreneurship; • Negative attitudes, culture of complaining and blaming; • Difficulty in accepting that roles became less distinct at modern universities; • Low accountability; • Excessive professional specialisation: Narrow, excessive field specialisation is slowness in adapting to external demands.

Source: Ramsden, 1998.

Exempting professional experts from consultancy and supervision, leaving them excessively free to expect them to manage themselves and the process may lead to lack of performance in academic environment. An academician's capability to assess his/her own performance and to be aware of his/her goals provide positive impact on efficiency; however, self-management will not be sufficient by itself in academic environment (Ramsden, 1998). The academician may from time to time see this situation as academic requirements not being able to be understood by the management, or disregard of field specialty by the same. Because acting in accordance to the profession's genuine structure, standards and group control as a yield of professional expertise is a tool of supervision that is seen necessary and employed in academic environment. Excessive professional expertise, on the other hand, may make it difficult to adapt to external demands. And in this instance, management may get concerned on how balanced the individual desires/demands are both in terms of institution and in terms of its distribution among academicians themselves. On the other hand, university institution has a bureaucratic structure. Thus, the academic autonomy brought by professional expertise and the hierarchical control brought by bureaucracy clash causing a dilemma (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). This is because bureaucratic notion sees standardisation appropriate for a systematic implementation (Sergiovanni *et al.*, 1999). Management strives towards maintaining administrative authority but this may cause reaction due to being excessive intervention.

Hellawell and Hancock (2003, p. 6-7), in their study where they questioned how university, which they

interpret as a traditionally bureaucratic, precautionary and “proper” institution, may establish and manage professional and academic programmes that become more and more rather commercial enterprises, observes this consequence as a dilemma by itself. At this point, the study questions which formal structures are required, particularly which kind of supervision is appropriate, which level of knowledge is necessary, how much authorisation may be realised and which personality patterns may bring success. Dilemmas such as ‘academicians’ field specialisations shall be regarded but hierarchical control shall be maintained’ or ‘accountability shall be established but quality processes in line with operation shall be implemented only through receiving the desires and acceptance of academicians’ are among issues that make managers’ work more challenging. Issues such as total quality management, performance assessment and performance indicators happen to disturb academicians from time to time. They may see quality processes as an external intervention or an increasing workload beyond routine works (Ramsden, 1998). And when additional studies/work that are brought by quality processes are assessed as increasing workload, avoiding responsibility may become an issue. However, with the development of information technologies and postmodern influences having been felt in management, quality processes become tools compulsory to be employed by managers.

It is not conceivable that the academic staff and administrative staff to have the same perspective and interpret and assess situations similarly at all times. Differing voices, ideas and conflicts may arise between the two staffs. Adverse attitudes, complaints or sometimes even a blame culture may be probable. The important thing here is what kind of path does the management take, how it manages the conflict and how it implements a management towards transforming negative tendencies into positive. Contrasts and conflicts may contribute to the development of an organisation (Balci, 1992). An order may ensue following uncontrollable random developments and chaos (Morgan, 1998). Management may go for diversification of communication channels and highlight the use of symbols and values to achieve this. An interaction between the manager and academic staff that is based more on accord and mutual understanding may ease administrative processes (Şişman, 2007). Care may be shown in displaying joint action in decision making processes so that academicians may participate more in administrative/managerial operations. However, acting as a wide community at all decision-making processes may also cause increase of discussions, focusing excessively on discussions and being carried away from subjects at hand, thus leading to waste of time and inefficient meetings.

Middle managers may at times be stuck between the conflicting wills of senior management and academic staff. In such times, they may utilise a leadership style that makes things convenient when with academics and take up a more traditional, hierarchical manner that is appropriate for authority when with the senior management (Gmelch, 2004). Tensions between academic staff and administrative staff may display increase especially during periods of change. Thus, managers should supervise change management in a planned manner and by highlighting their leadership skills. Effective management of change requires the skill to gather people resources, opinions, opportunities and demands together inside a new synthesis. Vision and creativity are of importance. Impressing people, realising interdepartmental interaction, accepting new ideas and developing new working methods, new performance standards and quality are also of importance. Organisational policy, providing support, establishing coalitions and assisting people in overcoming the concern, stress and uncertainty brought by change are essential aspects of change management (Carnall, 2007).

Some dilemmas faced regarding implementations towards academic staff management and leadership may be listed as follows: Caring for academicians or focusing on whether work is done; adopting regular tiered management or displaying visionary contingency leadership; being controlling or highlighting participation; measuring performance or aiming to develop personnel. Dilemma-situations may come up against a manager during many management and leadership processes such as vision building, planning, motivating, steering, performance evaluation and personal development and more. Thus, in any process related to academic leadership, leaders and academicians must accept that dilemmas and tensions may become prominent and act in awareness that many problems will repeat themselves, very few will have correct responses, and priorities in accord and competition will govern daily choices and decisions. The following questions may be asked in all dilemma-situations (Ramsden & Lizzio, 1998):

- Does this choice have a solid example in my experiences as an academic leader?
- Should one of these two alternatives come out prevailing or may the two approaches be considered together?
- How did I manage this dilemma before, and how can I manage it?
- Which factors lead me to find one choice superior to another choice?

Which side, which approach or method the manager/leader shall adopt and implement in case of a dilemma may vary. The answer to which side of dilemmas are preferred more frequently regarding management and leadership implementations may be informative of the culture, structure and habits of the organisation in question. For instance; the choice that the manager will make when obliged to make a preference between progressing towards a predefined and planned direction or deciding together with the academic staff after mutual consultation -a frequent dilemma- may provide insight into the educational organisation in question and its

management.

Progressing towards a predefined and planned direction carries the bureaucratic discipline aspect within the bureaucratic discipline vs. professional expertise dilemma; and carries the managerial planning aspect within the managerial planning vs. individual initiative dilemma. In the event a manager who frequently experiences such a dilemma dominantly prefers toward progressing towards a predefined direction, it may be mentioned that a more rationalist-bureaucratic type of organisational structure has been adopted. While if the option of discussing the situation at hand and making decisions by consulting academic staff is preferred dominantly in the case of the above-mentioned dilemma, the aspects of professional expertise, individual initiative and communication may be said to have come predominant. And in this case, the organisational structure and management may be assessed to be of loose-coupling structure, relatable to the Theory Z, and implementing contingency approach.

Frequently experienced dilemma-situations may be expressed under the titles of order and freedom dilemmas as follows (Ramsden & Lizzio, 1998):

Practical examples to the coordination and communication dilemma:

- Progressing along a predefined path or discussing existing situation and deciding jointly;
- Displaying an open and transparent management or displaying a more closed and farsighted management;
- Acting based on academic and personal values or acting based on political power and influence;
- Inclining towards academic culture and tradition or towards adaptation to varying environmental conditions, change and transformation;
- Displaying that he/she cares about and regards employees or that he/she is a hardy manager who cannot be deceived;
- Separating academic staff from administrative staff or removing the distance between academic staff and administrative staff;
- Supporting conflicts and discussions or avoiding any conflict and discussion.

Practical examples to the bureaucratic discipline and professional expertise dilemma:

- Progressing along a predefined path or discussing existing situation and deciding jointly;
- Acting in compliance with academic excellence or acting as required by the upper structure of higher education;
- Focus on discipline or organisational culture;
- Focus on result and output or motivation and morale;
- Focus on when to give instructions and directions or when to listen and have consultation;
- Making employees accountable or allowing employees to establish their own standards based on their professional specialisation;
- Seeing academic management/leadership as a career or seeing management/leadership as a temporary position.

Practical examples to the managerial planning and individual initiative dilemma:

- Progressing along a predefined path or discussing existing situation and deciding jointly;
- Highlighting institutional objectives or individualistic objectives;
- Taking risks and supporting enterprising actions or acting with attentiveness and caution;
- Focusing on teamwork and shared objectives or allowing individuals to act in accordance to their own benefits/agenda;
- Acting in accordance to long terms plans or accordance to momentous, short term plans;
- Following administrative rules or bending and changing rules;
- Assisting in how to lead or maintain own power and authority.

Order and freedom dilemmas are intertwining concepts. Thus, it may be impossible to discern from each other with thick lines. Although they may be divided into two distinct main titles such as order and freedom, sub-titles/elements within the same title are correlated with each other. For instance, progressing along a predefined path is listed under the title of order, while discussing existing situation and deciding jointly falls into the freedom title. Progressing along a predefined path bears traces from the aspects of coordination, bureaucratic discipline and managerial planning under the order title. Likewise, discussing existing situation and deciding jointly bears traces from the aspects of communication, professional expertise and individual initiative under the freedom title.

5. Conclusion

There is no 'one correct method' to recommend to organisations as a recipe. There are matrices and intertwining structures. Which side of the dilemmas is to be chosen shall vary depending on fine analysis of existing situation,

determining demands and objectives, awareness and integration of employees/professional experts, and the approach adopted towards conflicts. In compliance to the analysis and determination conducted, the answer to which of the options is to be used or the point that brings both options to accord may be achieved.

Managers/leaders at university do not have to solely prefer one of the aspects under the order title or one of the aspects under the freedom title. They may also prefer to handle both options together. They have the right of judgement and preference regarding the work they perform. This judgement may differ according to the institutional culture in the organisation in question. The tendency to which side of dilemmas is preferred regarding management and leadership implementations may also be informative of the culture, structure and habits of the organisation in question. Therefore, dealing with an organization by bringing forth different angles and approaches is of importance.

References

- Aslanargun, E. (2007). Modern eğitim yönetimi anlayışına yönelik eleştiriler ve postmodern eğitim yönetimi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 50, 195-212.
- Aypay, A. (2006). Üniversitelerde akademik etkinlik ve örgütsel davranış arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 46, 175-198.
- Balcı, A. (1992). Eğitim örgütlerine yeni bakış açıları: Kuram-araştırma ilişkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25 (1), 27-45.
- Bell, G., Warwick, J. & Galbraith, P. (2012). *Higher education management and operational research*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Binnewies, C., Ohly, S. & Sonnentag, S. (2007). Taking personal initiative and communicating about ideas: What is important for the creative process and for idea creativity?. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16 (4), 432-455.
- Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Business and Management Series.
- Burns, T. & Stalker, G.M. (1996). Mechanistic and organic systems. J.M. Shafritz ve J.S. Ott (Eds.), In *Classics of organization theory* (p. 209-213). New York: Harcourt Brace College Pub.
- Bursahoğlu, Z. (2008). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Bursahoğlu, Z. (2010). *Eğitim yönetiminde teori ve uygulama*. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.
- Carnall, C. (2007). *Managing change in organizations*. London: Pearson Education.
- Clark, D.L. (1981). A sampler of alternative perspectives and models for viewing educational organizations. D.L. Clark, S. McKibbin & M. Malkas (Eds.), In *Alternative perspectives for viewing educational organizations* (p. 31-45). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Cohen, M.D. & March, J.G. (1996). Leadership in an organized anarchy. J.M. Shafritz & J.S. Ott (Eds.), In *Classics of organization theory* (p. 385-399). New York: Harcourt Brace College Pub.
- English, F.W. (2006). *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ertan - Kantos, Z. (2011). Örgüt metaforlarında liderlik: kavramsal bir çözümleme. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1 (1), 135-158.
- Geist, J.R. (2002). *Predictors of faculty trust in elementary schools: Enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism and academic press*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Ohio: The Ohio State University.
- Gidman, L.K. (2013). *Faculty member perceptions of academic leadership styles at private colleges*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Indiana: Indiana Wesleyan University.
- Gill, D.P. (2012). *Noncredit and credit divisions in community colleges: the dilemma of multiple organizational identities*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Boston: University of Massachusetts.
- Gmelch, W.H. (2004). The department chair's balancing acts. W.H. Gmelch & J.H. Schuh (Eds.), In *The life cycle of a department chair: new directions for higher education* (p. 69-84). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Harris, T.E. & Nelson, M.D. (2008). *Applied organizational communication*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Hellawell, D. & Hancock, N. (2003). Between hierarchical control and collegiality: the academic middle manager in higher education. N. Bennett, M. Crawford & M. Cartwright (Eds.), In *Effective educational leadership* (p. 247-264). London: Paul Chapman Pub.
- Henkel, M. (2005). Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment. *Higher Education*, (49), 155-176.
- Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C.G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi*. (Translator: S. Turan). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Lee, O.W.K. (2009). *The 'innovator's dilemma' and the experience of community college leaders: a phenomenological inquiry*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Santa Barbara: Fielding Graduate University.
- Lotto, L.S. (1981). Believing is seeing. D. L. Clark, S. McKibbin & M. Malkas (Eds.), In *Alternative*

- perspectives for viewing educational organizations* (p. 15-30). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- McKibbin, S. (1981). Traditional organizational theory in educational administration. D.L. Clark, S. McKibbin & M. Malkas (Eds.), In *Alternative perspectives for viewing educational organizations* (p. 3-14). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Mingers, J. (2001). Combining IS research methods: towards a pluralist methodology. *Information Systems Research*, 12 (3), s. 240-259.
- Morgan, G. (1998). *Yönetim ve örgüt teorilerinde metafor*. İstanbul: Mess Yayın.
- Ogawa, T.R., Crowson, L.R. & Goldring, E.B. (1999). Enduring dilemmas of school organization. J. Murphy ve K.S. Louis (Eds.), In *Handbook of research on educational administration* (p. 277-296). San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ramsden, P. (1998). *Learning to lead in higher education*. London: Routledge Publications.
- Ramsden, P. & Lizzio, A. (1998). Learning to lead: Personal development as an academic leader. P. Ramsden (Ed.), In *Learning to lead in higher education* (p.227-252). London: Routledge Publications.
- Sergiovanni, T.J., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F.S., Thurston, P.W. (1999). *Educational governance and administration*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shafritz, J.M. & Ott, J.S. (1996). *Classics of organization theory*. New York: Harcourt Brace College Pub.
- Sönmez, V. (2009). *Eğitim felsefesi*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Şimşek, H. (1997). Metaphorical images of an organization: the power of symbolic constructs in reading change in higher education organizations. *Higher Education*, 33, 283-307.
- Şimşek, H. & Louis, K.S. (1994). Organizational change as paradigm shift: analysis of the change process in a large, public university. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 65 (6), 670-695.
- Şişman, M. (1995). Örgüt kavramının kültürel açıdan çözümlenmesi ve eğitim örgütleri. *Eğitim Yönetimi*, 1 (1), 79-94.
- Şişman, M. (2007). *Örgütler ve kültürler*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Şişman, M. (2010). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Van de Ven, A.H. & Poole, M.S. (2004). *Handbook of organizational change and innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, A.H. & Lorsch, J.W. (1996). Organizational choice: product versus function. J.M. Shafritz & J.S. Ott (Eds.), In *Classics of organization theory* (p. 220-231). New York: Harcourt Brace College Pub.
- Walton, R.E. (1985). From control to commitment in the workplace. *Harvard Business Review*, 3. <https://hbr.org/1985/03/from-control-to-commitment-in-the-workplace>. (Date of access: 29.11.2015)
- Weick, K.E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 63 (10), 673-676.
- Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W.H., Wolverton, M.L., Sarros, J.C. (1999). Stress in academic leadership: U.S. and Australian department chairs/heads. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22 (2), 165-185.
- Zanjani, M.M. (2012). *Voices of experience: understanding and enhancing successful conflict management by community college presidents*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Oregon: Oregon State University.