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ABSTRACT

GOVERNANCE PATTERNS:
CREATURE AND CREATOR OF THE
ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

by
Philip E. Hammel
May 19, 1975

College and university governance patterns emerge as an accommodation mechanism of the academic community to its environment. As the values and perceived needs of society change and/or the values and perceived needs of institutional components comprising the internal educational environment change, the primary administrative task is that of mediator. This task entails moving institutional components towards consensus and negotiating demands made upon the university by the external environment.

Since it is argued that effective governance is not achieved through the discovery of one particular set of principles or techniques, but rather through an understanding of the interaction between a changing environment and the application of the best available techniques to meet the demands of that environment, a clear understanding of these factors and their relationships is essential for
effective university administration.

In order to better anticipate and manage change, a paradigm relating five selected governance styles, various sets of institutional characteristics and environmental factors is proposed as a tool for evaluating decision alternatives in university administration.
CHAPTER ONE

SOCIAL PRIORITIES AND A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION

The decade of the 1970's is proving to be a period of many challenges for American higher education. Internal and external pressures are mounting and the imminence of change is giving rise to extensive speculation about gaining an advantage or maintaining status quo in a transforming environment; an environment which reflects shifting social priorities.

Describing the changing educational environment, Lyman Glenny writes:

The major trend which forces less funding growth for higher education is the establishment of a new set of social priorities in which higher education drops to a much lower position than previously held.¹

Further reflecting upon the education environment, Daniel P. Moynihan, former Educational Counselor to the President of the United States, notes:

One is bemused when members of the academic community get upset over reductions in one of the many categories of federal aid. Such reductions which are more than matched by increases elsewhere, simply reflect changed national interests, changed priorities, if

you will . . . In a political system, one man's raised priority is another man's reduced budget.  

Higher education is no longer the sacred cow that it was in the early '60's, and must face the inescapable reality of having to compete for limited public funds.

As explained by President Enarson of Ohio State University: "It is not self-evident that the addition of 300 more learned journals to the library counts as much more socially useful than dollars spent on day-care centers or fire-proofing the homes for the aged."  

In a similar observation, Glenny reports:

Health care, the common schools, the environment and recreation, among others, are surfacing as high priority concerns . . . the proportion of governmental budgets going to higher education will be no greater in 1980 than it is now, whether there are boom times or bad; Republicans or Democrats in office. The proportion of G.N.P. for higher education is no longer increasing.

Revealing the changing position of higher education in terms of governmental support, Moynihan adds:

Higher education has been deemed important to the government only to the extent that it has accomplished particular purposes that the government deemed important and could accomplish them more effectively, faster or cheaper than someone else. This may sound harsh for we academics spend a good deal of time reassuring ourselves that university and especially professors are vitally important to the future of

---


the nation. But there is a crucial decision to be made; something that is considered important to the nation by its proponents and beneficiaries becomes important to the government only insofar as those proponents and beneficiaries can convince the nation as a whole that it is important and that it is worth the money, more so at least than competing claimants for the same funds.\(^5\)

Speaking on financial pressure and higher education, Dr. Glenn S. Dumke, Chancellor of the 19-campus California State University and College system, states:

The days of the gravy-train are over. Everyone knows it, it is so evident that many have almost stopped talking about it, but it is a clear fact that the nation's public and benevolent dollars for welfare, Medicare and other pressures are such that higher education is due to get a much smaller proportionate slice of the fiscal pie from here on out.\(^6\)

Changed social priorities are reflections of underlying social values. Priorities are set when action alternatives are assessed in terms of most desired outcomes which influence choice behavior. A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group of the desirable which influences the selection of available modes, means and ends of action.

There are values which are categorized as universal and affecting the whole society and values which are particular and affect the individual. Jacob Getzels dichotomizes American values as: (1) sacred, and (2) secular.

\(^5\)Breedin, "Government and Higher Education", p. 5.

\(^6\)Glenn S. Dumke, "Dynamics of the Educational Environment", speech before the National Association of College and University Business Officers, Chicago, July 8, 1973.
The sacred or universal values are part of the American creed and constitute the basic and indivisiable beliefs. They are: (a) democracies, (b) individualism, (c) equality, and (d) human perfectability. From these sacred values have evolved the universal values of American education according to Grace Graham and other scholars.

Graham gives a more definitive description of Getzels' explicated sacred beliefs inherent in American educational philosophy. She states that the fundamental philosophy of education includes a belief in: (1) the intrinsic worth of the individual regardless of his race, religion, or socio-economic level, (2) the equality of man, (3) cooperation in solving the problem of general welfare, i.e., each man can contribute to the common good, (4) the potential rational nature of man, i.e., the use of evidence of reason in reaching decisions, (5) the perfectability or the improvability of man, and (6) government by consent.

While the fundamental philosophy which underpins higher education remains intact, thus assuring a certain level of continuing social support, an increase of this support is not likely in the foreseeable future. This is because social sustenance—dollars for higher education—is largely resultant from perceived self-benefit of its

---

supporting constituencies. In terms of Kenneth Collier's down-to-earth definition of values as being "a feeling in your bones about what sort of things are worth doing and having," a reduced incentive for public support of higher education can be in part attributable to: (1) the decline of the technological imperative, and (2) the democratization of education.

DECLINE OF THE TECHNOLOGICAL IMPERATIVE

World War II focused national awareness on the importance of the technological superiority to national security. Involvement in the Korean conflict helped sustain high levels of government sponsored research into the 1950's. With post-war prosperity, and large-scale private sector research activity impelled by the momentum of war-related "spin-off" industries, the U.S. was lured into a period of self-contentment and was sure of her scientific leadership and technological superiority.

The flight of the Russian Sputnik in the late 1950's was viewed by the U.S. as a national catastrophe for which higher education was believed to be the principle salvation. A huge influx of federal money resulting from the National Defense Education Act of 1958 elevated American higher education to the most favored position that it had ever experienced.
President John F. Kennedy made the faith explicit: 
"For the nation increasing the quality and availability of 
education is vital to both our national security and our 
domestic well-being." A public opinion survey conducted 
during the mid-1960's revealed that 60% to 70% of American 
families wanted their children to attend a college or uni-
versity and serious educational theorists were predicting 
that before the end of the 20th Century, 80% of the ado-
lescent age groups would attend college. In anticipation 
of these predictions, a rapid expansion of staff and faci-
lities occurred on all levels from community college to the 
graduate schools.

Encouraged by the abundance of the times, the 60's 
marked unprecedented growth in higher education, with en-
rollments doubling and budgets tripling. However, as the 
rising cost of government was reflected in tax rates and 
as the impact of "space feats" was dissipated, the balance 
was delicate and education fell from its pedestal with the 
advent of campus revolts in the late '60's. It is not 
likely that college and universities will regain their

9Hugh S. Brown and Lewis B. Mayhew, American 
Higher Education, The Center for Applied Research 
in Education, Inc., N.Y., 1958, p. 3.

10Ibid.

11Israel Kugler, "Collective Bargaining for the 
favored positions for some time to come.12

THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF EDUCATION

During the 1960's, the technological imperative, the GI Bill of Rights, and the post-war baby boom, all combined to produce bulging enrollments. Social consciousness opened the doors of higher education to the nation's minorities. Graduate after graduate was churned into the labor market. Domestic economic growth, boosted by an upward ratcheting standard of living and full-tilt production to supply a reconstructing Western Europe and Japan, gloried in unquenchable markets and abundant resources. However, toward the end of this period, foreign economic stabilization was achieved and normal trade competition restored on a world-wide basis.

The U.S. national debt skyrocketed due to space, defense and welfare programs. At the same time export markets were shrinking due to the restoration of foreign competition. In reaction, the economy and job market contracted and the recession of the mid-1960's was experienced bringing with it a new reality for American higher education.

Colleges, once an important means by which young people were screened for more desirable and better-paying

12Glenny, "The 60's in Reverse," p. 6.
occupations, could no longer guarantee a ticket into the higher status of professional fields. Democratization of higher education had produced the inexorable side-effect of professional saturation, and when combined with economic contraction produced a very sudden disillusionment with the economic value of the college degree. With a shadow cast on the direct incentives traditionally associated with a college diploma, the value of higher education itself was logically more vulnerable when assessed in terms of other social priorities.

THE CHANGING ENVIRONMENT AND UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

A matrix of issues expanding daily confronts educational administrators; compounding the scope of their alternatives--complicating the decision-making process. The traditional administrative role of providing academic organization and support resources for institutional missions of teaching research and public service is being re-examined as revealed by the remarks of scholars, professionals and legislators alike. James Perkins, Chairman of the International Council for Educational Development comments on the changing administrative role in a dynamic environment:

The traditional pattern of organization that we have inherited from the middle ages--faculty oriented with administration providing the minimal coordina-

tion necessary to keep faculty in some kind of marching order—no longer answers the complex needs of the modern university. . . New functions have been assumed that have conflicting organizational requirements. These the university has tried to handle within an organizational structure designed essentially for the promotion of instruction. Before recommendations for organizational change can be made, we must back up several steps and look at the university from different perspectives.14

Addressing the needs of contemporary higher education, Edward Wheatley remarks: "The stress on resources for higher education requires innovation in two major areas: The process of achieving educational objectives and the administration of the resources to carry on the process of education. It is important to reiterate that the purpose of college administration is to facilitate the accomplishment of the institution's educational objectives."15

Expanding on the new role of college administration, the Director of Penn State's Center for the Study of Higher Education concludes that:

The traditional governance system has purposes and goals at variance with those that the large society deems valid at this time in history. In fact, society is presumably threatened by the goals that it perceives as operative in academe, and by the methods used for their attainment, . . . it is seizing control, evoking power and authority and limiting in-


stitutional autonomy in order to establish or reestablish goals which it can approve.16

Recounting the need for administrative change in education, Lloyd Cooper explains:

Higher education holds a vital place in our modern society. Its direction and purpose, however, are not fixed and constant. Each day creates change. Each eddy of social, political and economic transition directs it in its next step forward. It takes perceptive forward-looking and capable leadership to manage this complex enterprise.17

Relating the need for change to public demands for accountability, Dr. Leon Lessinger determines:

This fast generating nation-wide demand for accountability promises the major and long-overdue redevelopment of the management of the present educational system, including an overhaul of its "cottage industry" form of organization. Many believe this can be accomplished by making use of modern techniques currently employed in business and industry.18

As further pointed out by Perkins:

Organizationally, the university is, in fact, one of the most complex structures in modern society. It is also increasingly archaic. It is complex because its formal structure does not describe either actual power or responsibilities; it is archaic because the functions it must perform are not and cannot be discharged through the formal structure provided in its charter.19


19Perkins, "Functions of the University," p. 679.
Commenting on institutional change, E.R.I.C. researcher George Arnstein asserts that:

Change is perceived by some people as a threat, by others as an opportunity. Change inevitably also exposes institutional lags; practices which made sense a decade ago but are reprehensible today . . . Change in our society also casts a shadow over practices which were thought to be good but which should now be re-examined.20

Speaking on change in university governments, Harold Hodgkinson suggests:

At the heart of the problem of government for campus and society is the fact that we have increased the populations on which governments are to work drastically but we have made almost no change in the basic configurations of governments with which we try to provide the social cement that is necessary for all social institutions. There are too many of us on campus and in the country for the old systems to work unchanged.21

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE TO THE CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

Though the need for change is widely recognized, administrative wheels seem to move slowly in this direction. Offering one opinion in this regard, James Hayes indicates: "There are many ways to organize college or university. Unfortunately, the bulk of college administrators find it convenient to ape each other rather than undergo the ordeal


of reorganizing in order to accomplish the mission of the individual college or university."

In response to the many calls for change, with emphasis on achieving a new set of institutional goals responsive to transforming social values, the educational administrator has found himself confronted with a new role which departs from his more traditional functions. Now competing in a society that has discovered that it exists in a universe of finite resources, new issues have arisen with which he must concern himself, such as:

(1) anticipating new social values;
(2) interpreting these values in terms of institutional goals;
(3) evaluating programs and selecting those which, within the constraints of foreseeable resource availability, maximize the achievement of institutional goals;
(4) allocating resources to selected programs;
(5) achieving more from each support dollar.

Since changing social values and consequent priorit al shifts are usually expressed in terms of resource allocation, administrative effectiveness is now measured in terms of its ability to secure and conserve these resources. The securing the conservation of resources are part of the functions of management.

---

After suggesting that university administrators "have a natural revulsion to the term management," Edward Wheatley further reflects that:

While it may be possible in the short run to maintain an adequate educational process with inadequate resource administration, in the long run it is neither probable nor possible . . . Analysis of recently developed concepts in business and government administration suggests techniques applicable to the management of institutions of higher education . . . If modern management techniques can significantly improve resource utilization in institutions of higher education, then the best long-range solution is obvious: (1) To incorporate such training into graduate degree programs in higher educational administration, and (2) to establish mandatory orientation and training programs in the new technology for all administrators in higher education.23

As revealed by the following remark of President Milton Grassell of Great Falls College, colleges, both large and small, have become complex organizations:

"Colleges and universities are more complex and often have larger budgets than our largest corporations. They are also more difficult to manage."24

Outlining the implications of increased complexity to presidential responsibilities, Grassell further reveals:

Successful college presidents within the foreseeable future will be different kinds of persons doing different work in different ways than their predecessors. As professional managerial leaders, successful college presidents will: (1) do more managing work which includes planning, establishing objectives, organizing,


directing and leading and measuring results according to predetermined objectives—the work they were hired to do; (2) do less operating work which rightfully belongs to subordinates; (3) express the institution's objectives in terms of result-oriented goals that are measurable; (4) express their own objectives as presidents in terms of result-oriented goals that are measurable; (5) work out with each administrative officer who reports directly to them mutually agreed-upon result-oriented goals that are realistic, obtainable and measurable; (6) measure results of performance of others according to progress made toward mutually agreed-upon goals; (7) hold themselves, as well as those reporting directly to them, accountable.25

Reiterating the need for good business practices in higher education, T. R. McConnell is also heard from:

As professionals, we should proceed with all deliberate speed to define standards of performance and to measure our effectiveness against them, for the general public and various constituencies will be pressing their values on us and attempting to hold us accountable in appropriate and inappropriate ways... Turmoil and disruption on the campuses; political action by students and faculty members; severe shrinkages in governmental, corporate and individual incomes, coupled with rising taxes; and a mounting distrust of higher education by the public are behind the increasing demand for colleges and universities to justify what they are doing and to disclose the effectiveness and efficiency of their operations.26

In retrospect, President Emeritus Eric E. Walker of Penn State University explains some of the frustrations encountered when directing an educational institution:

College presidents are not trained in business. Many cannot balance a balance sheet. They have no stockholders, do not calculate profit or try to pay dividends. Presidents, in general, would like to do something about their uncontrollable financial problems, but it is difficult to do so because they are without


allies. They feel that no one cares about the efficiency of the operation and no one will provide support if drastic action is taken. Unfortunately in the university community, efficiency is almost a dirty word. Although the university community has helped create new knowledge and put science and technology into industry, it has failed to put these new techniques into its own operation."

"Failure to participate in the management revolution that has swept American business and industry is haunting higher education today," says Alvin C. Eurich, President of the Academy for Educational Development, Inc., who continues: "Many academic administrators tend to get bogged down at the level of day-to-day problems, a useful and necessary activity but one which is limited in scope."\(^28\)

President Robert Lahti identifies this ad hoc basis of operation as "the housewives' principle: when you see a mess, clean it up."\(^29\) Contemplating a sad state of affairs in administration of higher education, Lahti surmises:

Whether the general effect is found in amateurism, an outmoded stewardship structure, or administration caught on a housewifely treadmill of routine chores, the cause is clearly the lack of experience and competency in the various levels of management. . . Poor scheduling, inefficient building utilization, unrealistic budgeting, and inadequate long-range planning are a few of the specific effects that

\(^{27}\)Eric A. Walker, "Efficiency is a Dirty Word," College Management, 1971, p. 4.


\(^{29}\)Ibid.
plague organizations which ignore or are unable to meet the need for greater competence in management. 30

Lahti observes that the common criteria for presidential selection encompass: academic qualifications including degrees, research ability, noteworthy publications, academic experience; evidence of status, i.e., previous title that the individual held in the immediacy of his being recognized as a contemporary in his field; socio-political information such as the individual's personal philosophy and his compatibility with the philosophy of the institution and his age.

Very few of the criteria listed above suggest a major emphasis on the applicant's management expertise as it relates to education. However, when examining the realities of a president's job, he is primarily a manager. Not only is there a lack of emphasis on management criteria in job qualifications of college and university leaders, but perhaps, even more surprising, this same lack of emphasis on qualification occurs in the selection of top leaders for state boards of higher education or executive directors of higher education coordinating councils. 31

Francis Rourke and Glenn Brooks, co-authors of the Managerial Revolution in Higher Education, found that there

30Ibid.

has been little tendency to recruit university presidents as a particular level of administration from anything other than an educational background. It has been pointed out that this source of leadership as it has been utilized today leaves much to be desired, resulting in administrators who come to their posts as amateurs in management. 32

John Caffrey, Director of Commission on Administrative Affairs of ACE, summed up the problem as an archaic approach on the part of educators to the managerial role concept. "Until the 19th century, the college administrator was simply a principal officer of the faculty. But this is not the year 1800 and the complexity of today's management problems and of the systems devised to solve them has created a new profession, one of the few important ones, by the way, for which little or no formal training is available. 33

The need for improved management in higher education is well-established. However, in realizing these improvements, James L. Hayes cautions: "Pressures developing from the outside do not create the best conditions for bringing about change. Unfortunately, there are forces developing in society that will tend to bring a


great deal more pressure on the educational world to do things better and more consistently with what is known about administration."

If the purpose of college administration is to facilitate the accomplishment of the institution's educational objectives, modern management techniques can be good tools to meet these objectives. To understand the implications of governing style as reflected by methods used in managing educational resources, a review of the history of managerial thought is necessary at this point.

---

34Hayes, "Importance of Management," p. 196.
CHAPTER TWO

MANAGEMENT THOUGHT AND HIGHER EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

As observed by Hayes, "One of the characteristics of a scholar is his readiness to confront new thinking, new experiences, or new situations by first finding out what is already known . . . but isn't it strange that when the same scholar is promoted to an administrative post, he feels no obligation to find out what is already known about administration."¹

Higher education suffers in part from certain philosophical discrepancies which spring from loyalties to several different traditions. There is the renaissance belief that a liberal education is valuable to any vocation or calling and is the proper preparation of a gentleman. There is the reformation belief that college should prepare practitioners of the learned professions. Then there is the American democratic belief that college should prepare people for less exalted vocations and serve as an instrument of national policy resulting from a scientific revolution and post-World War II climate of constant political

Conflicts between its medieval foundations and requirements of mass-producing workers for jobs in modern society requires that the practices of higher education be examined to see whether some improvements or changes could be made which would allow basic philosophy to prevail but to be applied in different ways. In this regard, the historical study of business management practices is valuable to educational purposes in an adapted context. Supporting this position are the comments of Hayes and Ikenberry who state:

Administration is basically the same in all given institutions. It makes very little difference whether we have a manufacturing plant, a hospital, the government, or university. The basic principles of administration are present in every one of them and no matter what the administrative mode may be, faculty-centered, administrative-centered or otherwise, the management function must be recognized. It would seem to be the essence of good scholarship for effective management techniques to be identified and applied in education. The mission of an organization, the kinds of people involved, and the external environment in which organizations exist, all of these, may change the art of administration but they do not change the principles.

The similarity between colleges and universities and organizations in society far outweigh their points of differences. Colleges and universities resemble many other complex organizations: they have governing boards, chief executives, a highly developed

---


3Hayes, "Importance of Management," p. 196.

4Ibid., p. 197.
bureaucratic organizational structure, an apparent mission, clients, they spend money, they save money, compete, make capital investments, are audited, they own and manage massive hotel complexes, entertainment enterprises, travel and rental car services, and maintain security forces at a significant level. 5

Arnstein supports this point with his statement:
"The university is a corporation, factually, legally and etymologically. It is, among other things, a non-profit business which uses banks, owns real estate, buys insurance, and does all of the other things that businesses do." 6

Administration can be defined as getting things done through and with other people. Where good administration prevails, it is likely that more things can be done by people who work together in some kind of meaningful relationship than by the same number of people acting individually. This concept is not equating good management with how to run a computer, implementing planned programmed budgeting systems, stimulating the professional man or another of the specialized management techniques presently in fashion. It is rather a personal commitment in attitude, habits, knowledge and skill in applying basic principles. An explanation of these principles completes the remainder of this section.


THE BASIS OF MANAGEMENT THOUGHT

For various physical and psychological reasons, man is a gregarious animal, dependent upon contact, cooperation and interaction with others in the attainment of his goals. In his attainment, man wishes to gain the highest level of achievement with a minimum level of effort leading to the necessity of organized activity in human endeavor. As endeavor becomes more complex, the function of managing effort towards common objectives becomes increasingly important and the tasks inherent to management more difficult. This, in part, explains the attention given to management from scientific and philosophical perspectives alike. As recognized by Claude S. George in his book, The History of Management Thought, "a true and comprehensive history of management would be a history of man . . . ferreting out managerial thought is no easy task because men, though managers, did not write about or recognize management as such until fairly recent times."\(^7\)

In fact, other than in the mid-19th century writings of the classical economists such as Adam Smith and James Mill who had identified management as a variable in microeconomic theory, no scholarly treatment of management had appeared. It was not until the turn of the century and the

---

beginnings of scientific management arising out of concern for the problems of bigness and emphasis on progress and incentive technique, that management as a separate field finally came into being.\textsuperscript{8}

**Traditionalists**

Management science was born in 1911 with Frederick W. Taylor's *Principles of Scientific Management*. In this work he emphasized:

(1) Development of a science for each element of man's work; (2) scientific selection and training of each working man; (3) analysis of the work being done for conformance to the principles of science which had been developed; (4) specialization of management and worker functions.\textsuperscript{9}

The impact of scientific management was beyond improved organization, product reliability, advanced labor and material utilization, and profit effectiveness. As explained by C. S. George:

If nothing else, Taylor firmly planted the concept of research in place of rule of thumb, and management has continued to experiment and look for the new as a basic element in a sound management approach. Taylor advocated the importance of research, standards, planning, contact, and cooperation as a basis of successful business venture.\textsuperscript{10}

At about the same time, other major contributions were being developed in the field of management science,

\textsuperscript{8}Ibid., p. 85.


\textsuperscript{10}George, *The History of Management Thought*, p. 94.
Henry Gantt in 1901 presented the Gantt Chart stressing the importance of hierarchy and scalar relationships in understanding organizations. Harrington Emerson in 1913 emphasized the objectives of a firm and their relationship to organization. Henri Fayol, in 1916, conceptualized the universality of management and produced the first comprehensive theory of organizational science. When any new science is applied, there will be reactions to it. Regarding the field of management science, such questions were being asked as:

... What is a fair day's work? ... How long should a worker be required to do a given job? ... How should the worker be supervised? ... What is the best way to select a worker for a job?

To ponder such questions as those mentioned above, managerial philosophers, later to be known as "behaviorists", emerged to contribute a new dimension to managerial thinking, no less important than the more pragmatic predecessors.

Behaviorists

The behaviorists believed that the centrality of

11 Alex W. Rathe, Gantt on Management, N.Y.: American Management Association, 1950, p. 150.


14 George, The History of Management Thought, p. 123.
the individual in cooperative endeavor should be the basis for organizational theory. Since management was really just getting things done through people, it was believed that workers and their motivation should receive the principal concentration in managerial effort. It was suggested by the behaviorists that management scientists had overlooked fundamental social and philosophical considerations creating inconsistencies between organization and personal goals. Some of the earlier writers of the behaviorists school, and their more significant contributions, are discussed below:

Oliver Sheldon. . . This noted social scientist introduced the principles of social responsibility and pioneered the movement towards "conceptual" as opposed to "materialistic" management theory.15

Elton Mayo. . . This famous Harvard professor originated the behaviorists school of management theory with the publication of his book, The Human Problems of Industrial Civilization. Within ten years, every practitioner in personnel management or human relations pointed to Mayo's work to support the contention that each individual's problems were so important to the firm that any manager worthy of the name must be concerned with personal human relations.16


Complementing the work of Mayo, the writings of Mary Parker Follett developed the management philosophy based on the grounds that any productive and enduring society must be founded upon the recognition of the motivating desires of the individual and the group. Drawing on her background in social work and psychology, she felt that authority as an act of subordination was offensive to man's emotions and therefore could not serve as a good foundation for cooperative organization. She raised such thought-provoking questions as: "Is power a power over or power with?" "Is authority a social status or integrating force?" "Does it [power] inhere in the environment--does it arise from the laws of the situation--or is it conferred from without and enforced from without?"\(^17\)

Referring to Mrs. Follett in a paper on humanistic movement, Robert Birknap makes the following observation:

Many of her perceptive observations made 50 years ago are still so timely that they merit careful examination and consideration by today's students of the leadership process . . . in a 1925 paper, she indicates that there are three possible means for the resolution of conflict within a group . . . domination, compromise, and integration . . . in fact, only one of these, integration, really settles the issue with any degree of permanent satisfaction. Thus, while still seeing great stress on compromise as a proper means of settling disputes, Follett clearly

\(^{17}\)George, *The History of Management Thought*, p. 131.
recognized nearly 50 years ago that such a solution was only rarely permanent. 18

To summarize in the words of C. S. George:

Mary Parker Follett was a true management philosopher, a pioneer who helped span the gap between the mechanistic approach of Taylor and our contemporary approach emphasizing human behavior. More than any other individual, she is responsible for the group process approach to solving managerial problems. 19

Chester I. Barnard . . . Influenced by the works of Follett, but considering the realities of implementation and expediency, Chester I. Barnard wrote the book, The Functions of the Executive, in 1938.

In this book, when Barnard describes formal organizations as "that kind of cooperation among men that is conscious, deliberate and purposeful within the context of a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces," 20 he establishes necessary integration of scientific and behaviorist approaches to underpin the Management By Objectives theory soon to arise.

Management Processists

Borrowing from both the traditionalist and the


19 George, The History of Management Thought, p. 42.

behaviorists, the management process school of thought made its appearance in the early 1950's. From this approach, management is viewed as a universal and practically identical process regardless of the sphere of operation. Concentrating on the management function of planning, organizing, staffing, directing and controlling, only the elements of measurability as applied by the quantitative school were needed to enable the next logical step in organizational theory; the development of Management by Objectives.

In 1955, the prolific Peter S. Drucker published his first and most famous book, *The Practice of Management*. In the preface, Drucker explains that the purpose of his book was:

... to aim at being a guide for men in major management positions enabling them to examine their own skill and performance, to diagnose their weaknesses, and to improve their own effectiveness as well as the results of the enterprise they are responsible for by providing both a union and what management is and concrete guidance in the knowledge, performance and discipline needed.\(^{21}\)

Expanding on these points, Drucker went on to say:

... and while man can never really master his environment while he is always held within a tight vice of possibilities, it is management's specific job to make what is desirable first possible, and then actual. To manage a business . . . means to manage by objectives. Throughout this book this will be the keynote.\(^{22}\)


\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 12.
With this statement and subsequent development in *The Practice of Management*, Drucker established a new approach to management and established himself as father of Management by Objectives.

Discussing the significance of Management by Objectives, John W. Humble states that "Management by objectives in recent years has captured the imagination and practical support of top management."23

Subsequent to *The Practice of Management*, Drucker authored two other classics: *Managing for Results* and *The Effective Executive*, in which he further developed the Management by Objectives approach. To complete the background of Management by Objectives, the work of George F. Odiorne entitled *Management by Objectives*, should be mentioned for it explains the installation and operation of the Management by Objectives approach.

This brief exploration of the development of management thought provides a conceptual framework helpful in comparing governance styles in higher education. Since it has been clarified that the management of enterprise has experienced a continuum of styles ranging from autocratic domination of traditionalists, to the participative direction of the behaviorists, a similar range of styles can be identified in the governance of colleges and universities.

---

At this point, with management established as part of the educational administrative function, it would be helpful to trace the development of governance in higher education as it relates to the changing educational environment.
CHAPTER THREE

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

BEGINNINGS

The modern university emerged as the search for truth moved from the monastery and church to secular institutions at Paris, Cambridge, Oxford and Bologna during the 12th and 13th centuries. In those early times, it was the students who held all the power in the university since it was their guilds who called upon the masters to come to their centers to teach according to their educational needs.1 As the number of institutions and students increased, and as students became increasingly mobile in their quest for knowledge, guilds of masters than organized to provide continuity to the educational process. The concept that faculty was the university started at this time.2

With the primary focus on imparting knowledge within a loose organizational structure, established only to meet requirements for minimal continuity, there was very little to administer in the early university. Usually, a presiding officer recruited from the faculty served on a


rotating basis and he became director or chancellor for this period while minimal bookkeeping chores were handled by a clerk.

The concept of primus inter pares which prevailed for centuries in the administration of higher education, is abstracted by Dumke:

Higher education did not consist of bosses and employees. It consisted of a group of professional people who liked to be regarded as a community of scholars. Managers or administrators were looked upon as merely those scholars who were temporarily sacrificing their scholarly operations to undertake certain distasteful housekeeping chores. The role of chief administrator was to be regarded as first among equals. ³

Self-rule by the students and teachers of the early university was based upon collegiality or "shared authority" in the true sense of the word. It was hence an antibureaucratic governance pattern characterized by a close sense of communication. The non-complex nature of the enterprise did not demand anything more elaborate. As the number of students continued to increase, as financial endowments emerged and had to be managed, and as property was acquired and had to be taken care of, the complexity and scope of the administrative chore increased. ⁴ As administrators became increasingly preoccupied with house-


keeping tasks, courses and degree offerings became the province of the faculty. The resulting de facto academic administration also increased in complexity as subject matter divided and subdivided and specialization became the order of the day. So long as the central and almost exclusive mission of the university was teaching, the faculty and administrative assignments remained closely related and therefore conflict rarely arose between the two domains. However, this harmony was to be short-lived as the university continued to grow in its complexity. Describing the disparity between academic and maintainence administration, Louis Vaccaro makes the following comment on these parallel hierarchies:

... as the professionals' body of knowledge increases and the profession seeks to make such knowledge available to people, it becomes necessary to structure the activity of knowledge-getting (research), knowledge-letting (teaching or application) and the training of more professionals. What has developed to facilitate this activity we call complex organization. And within this organization two fundamental types of activities take place--professional and bureaucratic. One opts for creative imaginative approaches. The other strives to achieve orderly codified and regularized activities. Fundamentally, the two pull in opposite directions. That is, they originate from quite different value bases and assumptions. It is not so much that the goals of the organization are seen as different, but that they, the administrators and faculty, see their own activities as demanding different approaches.

5Ibid.

6Louis C. Vaccaro, "The Conflict of Authority in the University," College and University, Spring 1969, p. 234.
COMPLEXITY AND THE EMERGENCE OF BUREAUCRACY

When the university acquired additional structure and became a bureaucratic organization, it found that it must utilize the services and expertise of administrative specialists. Such individuals could be described as those drawn into administrative activity because it was felt to be rewarding and necessary. As faculty came to confront the reality of bureaucracy and hierarchy, an enduring conflict became inevitable due to the fundamental differences in approaches to achieving its institutional goals. At the root of this problem, W. Richards Scott identifies four more or less distinct areas of conflict:

(1) Professional's resistance to bureaucratic rules;
(2) the professional's rejection of bureaucratic standards; (3) the professional's resistance to bureaucratic supervision; and (4) the professional's only conditional loyalty to the institution itself. 7

To further alienate the faculty was the notion that bureaucracy was a hierarchy in which the more rational would rule the less rational. From the viewpoint of the faculty, by far the best trained members of the organization were to be found in the middle administrative posts and teaching positions. Problems surrounding the concept of authority based upon position versus authority based on knowledge remains unresolved to this day. 8

7 Ibid., p. 236.
8 Ibid., p. 234.
Since the beginnings of the university, instructors have recognized private study, professional writing, and scholarly effort outside the classroom as vital ingredients in contributing to the primary function of teaching. This necessary adjunct to teaching was originally a personal matter of the individual professor and not until the 19th century had much administrative consideration been given to its support. However, as scholarly attention turned from the transmission of known truth to a search for new knowledge, it was becoming increasingly clear that research was emerging as an end in itself regardless of its impact on teaching and that research was to be added to teaching as a mission of the university. To facilitate this additional mission, different administrative apparatus was required to handle the new research function.

Rendering an account of conflicting missions in the university, James Perkins recounts that the adjuncts of research require "completely different administrative skills from those necessary in an exclusively teaching enterprise as well as a different style of management and controls," and continues by explaining that "as the dimensions of research activity increase, the growth of new structures outside the formal and traditional university
patterns were inevitable." 9

The research entrepreneur needed protection from distractions; the research effort also required administrative devices that could cut across departmental and collegiate levels; and finally, the research enterprise required a separate budgeting process and freedom to independently manage funds received from outside agencies. To meet these special needs, new administrative structures emerged in the form of institutes, agencies, and councils, which were to deal directly with top university administration for space and personnel and with outside sources for funding. 10

With the research and teaching mission posing different and often contradictory requirements for organization structure, the administrator found himself caught in the middle of opposing faculty viewpoints, compounding the problem of disparate internal objectives.

Administrators began to feel pressure from the government which had taken interest in the institution's capability as a research enterprise. Perkins promotes the notion that the push of technology, coupled with the interest of government and other outside agencies vastly accelerated the research enterprise. Explaining the impact of this development, Perkins speculates:

9Perkins, "Functions of the University," p. 685.

10Ibid.
In research, ideas become more important than people. The laboratory and library more important than the faculty meeting, and the external funding more important than the internal budget allocation. The judgment of peers and one's field of specialization rather than the progress of students become the critical measure of performance in the research-oriented institution.11

HIERARCHAL ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

In order to maintain institutional continuity in the face of the research imperative, a strengthened administrative machine was necessary and appeared as a hierarchal arrangement of administration which theoretically was to facilitate and maximize the efficiency of professionals in their important work towards achieving the missions of the university which included both research and teaching. Capturing the essence of this transformation, Frederick Rudolph summarized this in his volume, The American Colleges and Universities, as follows:

The American colleges and universities, in their development from simple institutions to complex organizations, not only replaced the old-time professor with the academician, but the colleges and universities also required a new kind of executive officer and methods of financing and areas of administration. Growth fed upon growth and the answer to the problems of growth, unless it was to be chaos, was organization.12

11 Ibid.
The necessary organization, which appeared in the form of hierarchal governance contributed to the addition of codes and standards, committees and expanded bureaucracy. Along with their industrial counterparts of the late 19th century, prominent college and university presidents ran their institutions with an independence bordering on autocracy.

Along with organizational ambiguities resulting from the introduction of conflicting missions within the university, there arose accompanying ambiguities as to the identity of the university itself. Dumke points out that in the late 19th century, the president was the institution.13 To contrast this statement, T. R. McConnell observes: In the eyes of the law, the university is the governing board,"14 while James R. Hayes promotes that "the faculty is the university."15 And finally Harold Enarson reminds us that with their strong sense of possession, the students consider themselves to be the university.16

These conceptual extremes as to the identity of the

13Glenn S. Dumke, "Dynamics of the Educational Environment," speech before the National Association of College and University Business Officers.


university can be related to similar extremes in management style; a continuum with the extremes of a presidentially dominated autocratic governance pattern on one end, and a traditional faculty-dominated governance pattern on the other.

This overview of governance history in the university points towards governance style as being more a function of environmental pressures than anything else. This notion can be supported by Ralph Prator's observation that effective governance is not achieved through the discovery of one particular set of principles or techniques, but rather through understanding of interaction between a changing environment and the application of the best available techniques to meet the needs of that environment. 17

Accepting the assumption that the educational environments are continually changing, and that these environments require flexible administrative patterns to meet the challenges of these dynamics it would be beneficial to examine in relation to contemporary educational issues those governance patterns which have appeared to this point in educational history.

---

CHAPTER FOUR

AUTHORTARIAN GOVERNANCE

INTRODUCTION

Higher education as established in the United States was initially comprised of theological institutions to provide for the training of clergy in the new world. In this colonial setting of democratic emphasis, university governance was based on rule by board of clergy as administered by a chancellor or proctor. As the purpose of the universities was to expand into the training for other learned professions, the clergy was steadily displaced by business and professional men until their domination was to be largely complete by the late 19th century.

The Dartmouth College Decision construed the university charter as a contract with the state not subject to ex post facto revision. This decision was important in that it assured valued protection from political interference to private colleges. However, this rule did not apply to public institutions since the state may not make contracts with itself.¹,² In 1784, the State of New York established a board of regents to allow the King's College

(Columbia) to be made a state institution. By 1787, a broadened concept was worked out under which the university of the State of New York was defined as an agency of the state to serve as an umbrella for the whole of higher education; both private and public. Over the years, the regents acquired authority to develop plans for higher education, charter institutions, initiate and coordinate state colleges, accredit colleges, supervise licensing in professions, grant degrees, and investigate fraudulent and discriminatory practices in higher education.\(^3\) With this as the predominant model for higher education in the United States, the university could be described in simple terms as a board of regents which receives a charter from the state, appoints a chancellor to administer, approves the faculty to teach, and selects the students admitted to learn.

Under such an organization, the board, the faculty, the administration, and students together made up the academic community which embraces the functions of teaching, later to be expanded to include research and public services as the missions of the university. The corporate form of organization offered the advantages of separate legal entification, continuity of life, protection of trustees from individual liability, and mechanization for

---

\(^3\)Henderson, "Control in Higher Education," p. 2.
organizing and processing very large and complex programs.\(^4\)

Over time, the principal executive officer of the board rose to assume tremendous and concentrated power. The authoritarian, though sometimes paternalistic, governance pattern which emerged during this period can be better understood by examining the attitudes of the times and values of administration and board members.

**BACKGROUND**

During the 19th century, boards of regents were usually appointed by the governor or elected by the citizenry. Those persons who became trustees usually came from the politically sophisticated or the business/legal segments of society. Men predominated and they were typically beyond middle age; thus, boards became weighted in favor of the values which prevailed in American business and politics, particularly among the more conservative types.\(^5\) Authoritarian-paternalistic management styles were typical of board members who were leaders of business and industry during the 18th and 19th centuries.

Max Weber, in his "Essays in Sociology", recalls that in the Western world, we have inherited our practices in the organization and administration of institutions from

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 3.

\(^5\)Hubert Park Beck, *Men Who Control our Universities*, p. 131.
the church, military and aristocratic hierarchies. Also, it should be remembered that since the "boss" system worked so well to improve efficiency for America during the industrial revolution, it is understandable, therefore, why board members whose experience was primarily in business management considered efficiency in the utilization of resources as a desirable goal for colleges and universities and had extreme confidence in concentrated authority. This concentrated authority was delegated to the college president, chief administrative officer of the board. Names come to mind such as Elliott of Harvard, Hutchins of Chicago, and Sproul of California, whose strong personalities were spectacular in their verve and daring. 6

AUTHORITARIAN PATTERNS OF THE PRESENT

The flamboyant seat-of-the-pants administrative approach, when viewed superficially, has appear to this day as evidenced by the success of S. I. Hayakawa at San Francisco State University. As a matter of fact, some still yearn for the good old days when the authoritarian model seemingly made life much simpler.

Ikenberry suggests: "Some will ask for the clock to be turned back so that the perceived power and authority

of the college president can be restored."\textsuperscript{7} Lindahl suggests that administrators of United States colleges and universities are shackled with restrictions and believes that administrators "have the responsibility for leading rather than merely maintaining an organization and must be granted the authority to do so."\textsuperscript{8} His argument is compelling and is backed up with studies such as that of Lon Hefferlin who discovered that the presidents of dynamic institutions are those who appear to play a less conservative role.

Another observation regarding the authoritarian governance pattern was made by T. R. McConnell who found that under high stress, the collegial influence-oriented social system tends to regress to relationships of power and to bureaucratic organization and administration.\textsuperscript{9} McConnell holds that during times of disruption and turbulence, it may be expected that administrators and governing boards should assert greater authority over faculty. Ikenberry furthers this notion in that he perceives higher education to be in a "great climacteric"--a period of stress--which will extend into the foreseeable future.

\textsuperscript{7}Stanley O. Ikenberry, "The Organizational Dilemma," \textit{Journal of Higher Education}, Jan. 1972, p. 34.

\textsuperscript{8}Lindahl, "Administrative Authority," p. 528.

This period will see incessant demands for increased institutional accountability, for stronger corporate controls, for greater power and authority in the office of the president, and for curbs on faculty autonomy.10

Speaking from the firing line, Dumke reiterates the need for strengthened authority:

"Traditional systems of academic governance are no longer as dependable or effective as it was once thought they were, and the decision-making process in which committees make most of the administrative decisions have proved to be unworkable during the late '60's. The necessity of administrative accountability is before us. Even though we are talking a good game of trying to avoid it, what we are inevitably moving towards is a much more hierarchal system of academic governance.11

The above arguments are well-taken, particularly when considered in terms of the expediencies of this approach and its suitability as a solution to the emerging requirements for accountability in higher education. However, they do not attend well to behavioral aspects which are important to issues such as productivity and collective bargaining.

Gerald M. Platt and Talcott Parsons warn that the reassertion of administrative authority could carry with it an ominous consequence: "the faculties of distinguished institutions are not likely to accept without opposition

10Ikenberry, "The Organizational Dilemma," p. 23.
the strengthening of bureaucratic authority and hierarchy
. . . the results of this organizational over-emphasis and
the assertion of administrative authority are likely to
shatter the delicate balance on which decision-making by
reciprocal influence depends and undermine the mutual trust
necessary for effective collaboration between faculty mem-
bers and administrators."¹² To bring this reality into a
practical focus, Platt and Parsons point out that questions
of financial and general educational policy, though formally
in the hands of the board of trustees, are highly influ-
enced by the senior faculty of the nation's prestigious
institutions. In matters of faculty appointments and pro-
motion, the faculty voice in academically distinguished
institutions is decisive, even if the final formal approval
rests with the president and the governing board.¹³

Pointing out another difficulty in the authoritar-
ian approach, Ikenberry writes:

The assumption of a relationship between academic free-
dom and academic quality is suggested by the fact that
excessive central controls, whether exercised by the
church or the state, or by presidential abuses of
power, have been a continuing concern of accrediting
associations.¹⁴

Although the short-term benefits of the authoritarian
model are sometimes tempting, common sense would dictate

¹³Ibid.
¹⁴Ikenberry, "The Organizational Dilemma," p. 27.
that long-range needs of higher education should be of principal concern. Certainly, before returning to old ways of governance, a look into factors surrounding their prior discontinuation should be made.
CHAPTER FIVE

TRADITIONAL GOVERNANCE

BACKGROUND

Post-19th century American economic growth and consequent enlargement of the middle class, gave impetus to the decentralization of education based upon: (1) American egalitarian ideas, and (2) resource availability. For the first time, access to higher education was a real possibility for much of the working class. The geometric progression of knowledge and newly assigned role of higher education in research related to national security, contributed to an increased portion of public resources being channeled into higher education.

High resource availability, when coupled with an understandably short supply of qualified university instructors, resulted in a faculty push for higher salaries and more influence in institutional decision-making.

The institutional necessity of attracting and holding good faculty became the imperative of governing boards, and in consequence, administrative style had to move in a faculty-pleasing direction. With a pendulum effect in motion, the power shift was dramatic and in a very short time "shared authority" had entrenched itself to the point of being recognized as the traditional form of governance,
even though it had been absent from the higher educational scene for 300 years.

The shared authority concept of university governance has been labeled--mainly by faculty--as "traditional" governance since it is based on the medieval collegial principle of the community of scholars. As has been pointed out earlier, this is the governing style which dominates during period of high faculty influence such as the pre-19th century and post-Sputnik periods in university history. Though perhaps the polar opposite of autocratic governance, the "traditional" pattern cannot always be considered truly participative since power is not always evenly distributed and is sometimes concentrated in the hands of faculty.

THE FACULTY AND "SHARED AUTHORITY"

The current interest in the concept of "shared authority" has been intensified by the notion that it may be the means to artificially extend a more favorable status quo for faculty members nostalgic about the academic "bull market" of the 1960's. To maintain their improved situation, professors have organized to strengthen their bargaining position. The American Association of University Professors' statement of 1966 advocated internal governance system built around independent constituencies made up of governing boards, administrators, faculty, and students.¹

The A.A.U.P. statement was followed by a task force report from the American Association for Higher Education, then an affiliate of the National Education Association. The A.A.H.E. report developed more fully the concept of shared authority, a term which is currently being used to support the ethic of more effective hearings for students, faculty and other inadequately heeded constituencies.

Shared authority, as defined by the A.A.H.E. report, represents the middle zone of authority continuum which ranges from administrative dominance at one extreme and faculty dominance on the other. The A.A.H.E. task force stated that shared authority might best be implemented through the establishment of an internal organization such as an academic senate which would include both faculty and administrative members and would rely upon information sharing, reason and, in some cases, binding arbitrations to resolve faculty-administrative disputes. Collective negotiations are also a means of achieving shared authority, according to the report.

Ikenberry reveals his belief that the present organizational structure of colleges and universities is not well-designed to accommodate the tension produced by the

---

While the belief of the A.A.H.E. that their brand of shared authority is midway between administrative and faculty-dominated governance patterns, the writer feels that their position favors the faculty and does not meet the definition of participative governance which more logically should occupy this center position.
professional/organizational dilemma. The increases in sheer size and scale of college and university operations, have made the accommodation of internal polarization increasingly difficult. Ikenberry states that "As a bureaucratic hierarchy has increased, universities have become more impersonal. Governance by an oligarchy is not only common but perhaps inevitable."3 Enarson has observed that "as each university constituency pushes its own advantage to the outer limit, the university becomes strife-torn and, even in some instances, immobilized."4

Contemporary educational literature has become littered with reports of task forces, studies, committees, and commissions searching for the perfect system of university governance.5 Numerous proposals for achieving the "shared authority" governance schemes have been advanced: (1) Boards of trustees should be made more representative by including the young, poor, minorities and non-establishment types; (2) faculty, students and non-academic staff should be added to the Board of Trustees either as advisors or as voting members; (3) faculty senates should be reconstituted to include student representatives and possibly non-academic

5Ibid.
staff; (4) all university meetings should be open to interested members of the university community; (5) formal procedures for hiring, promotion and tenure for faculty should include opportunity for full student participation; (6) university-wide policy issues should be presented to all members of the university community for referendum vote; (7) reconstituted university-wide senates should assume full legislative power while the trustees should sit as a supreme court of sorts delineating the respective authority of faculty, students and president.

Commenting on these proposals, Enarson summarizes:

Obviously, some of the proposed reforms have merit. Yet, I have an uneasy feeling that such instant solutions suffer from a common defect: They avoid the hard business of changing attitudes by the easy escape of tinkering with the machinery of government... I doubt that changing the machinery of university government would make much difference. It is not so much machinery and system that lie at the core of the difficulty, rather it is the heritage of stubborn attitudes that cripple the capacity for mutual respect and teamwork... The promised land of good government is within reach, only if we have the wit and the will to abandon the cherished prejudices that cloud our vision and yield a daily diet of frustration and anger.6

INTERNAL POLARIZATION IN THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT

The tragic consequence of internal polarization is the lack of trust which it engenders and to a certain extent, even institutionalizes. Such lack of trust is parti-

6Ibid.
cularly threatening to institutions which recognize organizational weaknesses within themselves. The system of parallel hierarchies which permeates higher education in the United States today brings with it inherent friction between faculty and administration. The organizational dilemma therefore requires institutions to strive for better balance between the requirements for professional autonomy and academic freedom on the one hand, and the necessity for greater institutional accountability and effectiveness on the other.⁷

At the base of institutional polarization as a problem in university governance, are the principles of motivation which are common to all human activity which centers around self-benefit, or as described previously—each constituency pushing for its own advantage. However, any expansion of one constituency within the finite boundaries of an institution will be construed as an intrusion into the territory of another. Introducing this concept to higher education, Robert Ardrey, in his book The Social Contract, suggests a theme which is perhaps too familiar to college administrators:

It is obvious that with the conceptual capacities of the human mind, the imperative to defend the territory has been extended far beyond fence posts and locked doors. Jobs, departments in an organization, jurisdictions of labor unions, spheres of influences,

whether in politics or crime, are as jealously guarded as a warbler's acre. When I first suggested the subject of my book [The Social Contract] to C. R. Carpenter, he was amused: 'Why bother with animals; why not just visit Pennsylvania State University for a few weeks and keep an eye on the faculty?'

An Educational Resources Information Center study entitled "Structural Innovations in Higher Education", territoriality in its various forms was by far the problem most frequently mentioned by the heads of administrative and academic units. From the study it was clear that all institutional factions favored progress toward solving governance problems, but few wanted that progress to be made at the risk of cost to themselves. Eleven out of thirty-two references to problems dealing with territorial concerns in various degrees of subtlety and detail, revealed territoriality to be perceived as "establishment status quo" and that territorial concerns are one of the overriding university problems encountered. The study also revealed jealousy over appointive power and fear of interdepartmental competition for funds.

Survey respondents suggested many techniques for coping with territorial concerns which ranged from "administrative fiat" to "friendly politiking in the senate". Some suggested manipulation and exploitation of other com-

---

peting forces, while others felt that ignoring the whole situation to be the most effective tactic.\(^9\)

Since most institutional evaluation of proposed governance change boils down to an argument of "what's in it for me?", it can be concluded that traditional departmental and administrative provincialism is still an enormous obstacle to the unification of the university.

All administrators would not consider their concerns with "shared authority" within the context of the traditional governance pattern as being merely provincial. Some educational writers feel that this concept has in reality made administrators "captives" of the faculty. Developing this point, Lindahl propounds:

But which came first? Servile administrators or powerful faculties? The organizational flux of late has been a product of the general challenge to authority and autocratic control. This change has a particularly dramatic and penetrating impact on higher education, and has affected such formidable institutions as the military, the Catholic Church, and big business. As a result, administrators of most of these organizations, especially the public institutions, have become more cautious. This has been most evident in higher education where the relationship is predominantly collegial.\(^10\)

Contributing opinions as to the effects of increased faculty power, Dumke advances that:

---

\(^9\) Ibid., p. 728.

This is an age of iconoclasm, an age of questioning the establishment and examples are legion... Some of the most hallowed institutions of the church are being questioned and threatened. The family, itself, one of the solid foundations of the puritan ethic, which in turn has been a fundamental concept on which this nation was built, is being eroded on all sides by changing social mores.11

In studying changes in educational "establishments", it is helpful to be reminded that any changes in basic social values will inevitably filter up through the mechanisms of socially controlled institutions and will have an effect on the status quo, particularly when the institution is highly politicized as is American higher education.

Explaining the impact of politicization in higher education, Lyman Glenny, director of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, states: "... of all the outside forces operating on the public institutions, limiting their autonomy and the policy powers of their leaders, most debilitating are the new statewide coordinating boards and the state budget offices... clearly they have major policy-making rules. Super-board control over the goals, functions, and programs of the individual college or university may be so considerable that they are at times dictated to the college or university. Under these boards,

---

the powers to plan and to approve programs have the capability of finally determining the major functions which colleges or universities may perform."12

A discussion of the politization of educational naturally leads into a discussion of managerial governance and the issue of accountability.

CHAPTER SIX

THE MANAGERIAL GOVERNANCE PATTERN

It has been established that with the democratization of education and decline of the technological imperative, the position of higher education in competition for public support has been seriously affected. In its not-so-favored position, education has been subject to a new scrutiny bringing with it demands for evidenced efficiency; better known as "accountability."

Developing the history of accountability in higher education, James Perkins recalls:

From the beginning, it was recognized that the university must establish a delicate balance of independence and dependence with the society . . . that created it. The need for independence was grounded on the demonstrable need to examine orthodoxies if the learning process was not to be strangled by constrictions of the field of inquiry. At the same time, it was recognized that church and state had fundamental interests in the university, mainly on the training of new elites, that demanded a loose monitoring of the whole exercise.

Such "loose monitoring" as described above has evolved instead to mandated accountability which challenges traditional institutional authority relationships in higher education. Demands are heard for increased legislative and executive intervention, judicial rulings which remove campus

---

authorities from the decision-making process, and more cen-
tralized institutional coordination and planning.\(^2\)

Creating internal pressures for accountability, some governing boards within institutions are attempting to modify their traditional role through greater involvement in internal governance matters and through the use of veto power. The Pennsylvania State University Board of Trustees issued a document in June of 1970 which redistributed internal power and authority relationships and reserved authority previously delegated to the university president. In the past two or three years, the University of California Board of Regents has assumed direct authority over such previously unmonitored areas as curriculum and personnel assignments on individual campuses. Recent pressure by the Board of Regents at the University of Texas resulted in the firing of a college dean.\(^3\) All these described measures are exerting constraints on the capacity of institutions to make binding decisions about internal matters.

Frustrated by threats to their self-direction, the concerns of various university components have resulted in demands from student and faculty groups alike for a greater


\(^3\)Ibid.
share of policy-making power. Conflicts arising from student and faculty activism have drawn the ire of the public and governing boards. Caught between the internal and external environments of the university, college administrators have necessarily had to "cover their flanks" by monitoring quality, time and costs of university programs. However, in most instances such monitoring has been merely an exercise because of insufficient authority at the campus level to match the responsibility imposed from without.

To achieve accountability, management theory explains that authority and responsibility must be co-terminous and co-equal. In an attempt to reveal the limitations within which the visible and legally responsible policy-makers of higher education reach decisions, Lyman A. Glenny notes that decisions of long-range importance are "often circumscribed by the kinds of information furnished, as well as by the form in which it is presented." Some of Dr. Glenny's illustrations of authority thwarting in college and university administration are detailed in the sketches shown below:

Business Office. -- The business manager, under a variety of different titles depending on the size and type of institution, has always exercised far more influence on budget administration and on the internal

---

fund allocations than has been commonly supposed. Even when faculties and students determine that new programs or major changes in curriculum are necessary, it is the money manager who assesses the financial means for funding.

To effect new ideas normally requires money or reallocation of existing funds. The alternatives which the formal policy-makers will have before them will be those which the business manager suggests after examining many variables. The variables include, among others: sources of income, the conditions under which such funds may be expended, the commitments previously made orally and in writing to outside contractors as well as deans and department heads, the rules and attitudes of the funding source toward the particular changes proposed and all of the rules and regulations which have been established by outside agencies and inside councils and senates. Because his office is the sole interpreter of most if not all the constricting documents establishing operating parameters, whatever the money manager decides can and cannot be done is quite likely to prevail with the president and internal committees.

Usually only persons who have worked closely with the policy-makers in the business and budget offices know the extent of their assumed power and the general
may continue to assert their freedom to collect and analyze data and information which they deem important. Normally, they may also write up the official report on the directed research and suggest in it the alternative course or courses of policy action which they deem logical or desirable from their frame of reference.

Admissions and Student Financial Aids Offices.-- The offices of admissions and financial aids exert a significant effect upon the ability of the educational part of the college or university to carry out its tasks. It is the admissions officer who finally determines which students with which capabilities and from which socio-economic backgrounds enter the college or university. It is the financial aids officer who has had substantially larger and larger sums to distribute to prospective and enrolled students. Among other factors, how these officers perceive financial need, college objectives, scholarship records, ethnic minorities, and the straight versus youth culture has significant bearing on the kinds of students that the faculty will find in their classrooms. Again professional people are found doing the job for which they were trained, but the impact of decisions by these anonymous officers who are subjected to little real supervision needs to be pointed out.

Accrediting Agencies--The accrediting agencies, and
their troops of invisible professionals who do the re-
viewing and recommending, exercise control not only
over the educational program within the institution
but also heavily influence organization and administra-
tion. The purposes of accreditation initially arose
from the concern about "diploma mills" and the need to
facilitate the transfer of students between institutions.
In addition, these organizations contend to promote
high standards, protect the society from incompetent
professional practitioners, encourage self-evaluation
and experimentation, and protect the institutions from
undue political interference and educational frauds.

The university is becoming increasingly vulnerable
to the demands of the institutional and departmental
accrediting associations which are requiring the uni-
versities to conform to higher and more elaborate
standards of education, library resources, and physi-
cal space. Some are also demanding particular organi-
zational and administrative arrangements ranging from
the title to be given to the head of the faculty group,
to whether certain departments or schools will be in-
dependent from the regular governing machinery of the
university. After conforming to the requirements of
accrediting associations, the latitude left to the
administrators and governing board can be significantly
reduced.
Several state systems of higher education have become so concerned over their helplessness in the face of the accrediting societies that some states are seriously considering the alternative of establishing a single state accrediting agency and freeing their institution from all other accrediting bodies. To achieve the same ends, certain federal agency heads are recommending that a federal accrediting commission be established.

Federal Agencies--Depending upon institutional type and degree of commitment to graduate education and research, another outside force has had mixed effects on institutions of higher education. Federal agencies of many different types with many different objectives are present wherever federal research or scholarship dollars are being utilized. In reality, federal largesse has induced or seduced every level of government. Much of industry and commerce and all kinds of private agencies, colleges, and universities have been equally vulnerable to federal financial enticements. The federal interests in higher education are highly specialized with a wide range of priorities.

Imbalances have been created in the educational program by the concentration of federal funds for research and graduate training in the sciences. The project system of support through which funds are granted
directly to university scientists has tended to draw primary loyalty of faculty members from the institutions to the agencies providing research funds, and has reduced administrative control over budgeting and allocations of faculty time and institutional physical facilities. In responding to the mission-oriented fragmented federal programs, the institutions have found themselves with dozens of masters, all of whom are anonymous, each with scattered responsibility and no overall federal philosophy or goal to bind them into a coordinated effort.

State Government.--Of all state government influences operating on public institutions, limiting the autonomy and policy powers of their leaders, among the most debilitating are the new state-wide coordinating boards and state budget offices. The boards have been created primarily to control overlap and duplication of programs, to optimize the use of state funds and to plan for the orderly development of the whole of higher education in the state. Clearly, they have major policy-making roles in that super-board control over the goals, functions and programs of the individual college or university may be so considerable that they may seem at times to be dictating to the college or university.

With the power to plan and approve programs, state boards have the capability to finally determine the
major roles and functions of each college or university within their purview. The board can limit some universities to undergraduate work or reward others with authority to grant masters degrees and still others with the right to grant advanced graduate degrees and conduct research. No new degree program or major, no department, school, extension center or campus may be started without the approval of the coordinating body.

Beyond the power to plan and approve programs, tasks fundamental to the educational role of the institution, is the power of budget review. While this power is only an advisory one to the governor and legislature, its exercise may have as much effect on the institutions as if the legislature itself had spoken. New educational programs, new teaching-learning technology, and other innovations are almost entirely at the mercy of the coordinators. The level of funding of every new change is by board consent. It is also the boards' budget formulas which often determine institutional appropriations.

Budget reviews seek out inefficiencies and means to optimize state resources. The review of state coordinators may differ markedly from those of the leaders of the colleges and universities and yet they will prevail more often than not, even if challenged in legislative halls.
College presidents and governing boards are being held accountable in every sense of the word with the task of providing efficient and high quality education to their students. It is argued that both from within and without, their authority is being usurped, thus dissipating their functional authority into the hands of a host of faceless civil servants and other professionals who have no direct responsibility for the welfare of the college or university.

The managerial pattern of university governance, though bringing with it more organization and structure to the decision-making process, seemingly has also brought a debilitating system of specialization. As layer upon layer of bureaucracy is added to provide evaluating mechanisms which build to the point of "evaluating the evaluators", the self-correcting property which is the genius of the "systems management" approach, is defeated by counter-productive "complexification" and a bogging kind of group process. Harold Enarson warns that in higher education "accountability must be the watch-word, but that we must recognize that accountability can only be attached to individuals, not to conglomerates or committees. If everyone is involved in everything, no one is truly accountable for anything."^5 Contributing to this theme, Lester Anderson cautions:

---

As governance focuses on accountability, it calls tenure into question; as tenure is threatened, so academic freedom is threatened; and as academic freedom is threatened, the goals of the university, goals that require it to be creator and social critic, are threatened.6

The position of the National Educational Association regarding the issue of accountability is revealed by the following remarks of its president, Helen Bain:

... instructors can never be held accountable with justice under existing conditions. The classroom instructor has either too little control or no control over the factors which might render accountability either feasible or fair. Instructors constitute the greatest resource of educational expertise in this country, yet they are often looked upon as hired hands. As a result, their expertise is denied and the most powerful of human forces, intrinsic motivation, is forfeited.7

Restating the need for self-direction before accountability, Donald Darland writes:

The N.E.A. is saying that if a profession is to be accountable, why not delegate the responsibilities which are concommitant with being accountable. For a legislature to delegate such a right to profession is not to give up the right, but rather to place responsibility with those directly involved. The current trend towards accountability in education is a potpourri of logic and nonsense. It is logical that the public should expect profession to account for its performance; on the other hand, it is nonsense for the public to ask a profession, one that is naked

---


7Helen Bain, "Self Governance Must Come First, Then Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1970, p. 413.
of authority to govern its own standards or to account for suspected failings in its performance.  

Rand Corporation Educational Consultant Steven Barrow promotes the following general principle: "Each participant in the educational process should be held responsible only for those educational outcomes that he can affect by his actions or decisions and only to the extent that he can effect them."  

If the managerial educational governance pattern has arisen in response to provide accountability, it should be first determined just what accountability is and what it is not. Cooper explains that accountability is merely a device; a procedure to help administration and faculty to define decisions, goals, and aspirations more clearly. In a definition promoted by "efficiency cultists", accountability is advertised by its proponents as "an innovation which is guaranteed to stir inner administrators and faculty from passive repose into sudden and productive activity . . . . With tangible, modifiable measures of educational output, it will be able to determine the producers and re-

---


ward them and will also be able to eliminate accumulated dead wood and stimulate the organization into greater productivity."\(^{11}\)

To depart from the emotional definitions of accountability, Dr. Leon Lessinger contributes a more scholarly version:

Accountability is the product of a process. At its most basic level, it means that an agent, public or private, entering into a contracting agreement to perform a service will be held answerable for performing according to agreed-upon terms within an established time period and with a stipulated use of resources as performance standards.\(^ {12}\)

This definition of accountability requires that the parties to the contract keep clear and complete records and that this information be available for outside review.

Managerial governance in colleges and universities seems to be by and large a reaction to accountability demands from the external environment. It can also be argued that American Higher Education has evolved along a course parallel to the development of the greater society it serves, and principles underlying management success by other sectors would logically be extended for use by the educational enterprise.

The results-oriented governance approach advocated as part of the managerial governance pattern has had the

11Ibid., p. 656.
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\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 656.

positive effect of "putting the focus on the students rather than the process."\textsuperscript{13} Commenting on the potential of results-oriented governance styles, James L. Hayes states:

What we know about management by objectives probably has far more relevance for the college and university than we now suspect. To make it effective, however, we will have some dramatic changes in faculty organization and there is some doubt... how many faculties are courageous enough to do this, even though it would reduce the cost of education, improve the morale of the students, and bring about true decentralization.\textsuperscript{14}

During a recent visit to the University of Utah, Dr. George S. Odiorne, Dean of the College of Business and author of the books \textit{Management by Objectives} and \textit{Management Decision by Objectives}, shows how he applies professional management principles to university level administration. Dr. Odiorne explains:

Management by objectives has proven to be both popular and energizing in its application to the faculty. It permits a great deal more freedom in style and manner in which results are achieved, and requires less bird-dogging and manipulation over specific behavior. If the results are good, the policies adhered to, the individual is free to do what he will. The climate is considerably relaxed, there is more zest in the work and the atmosphere is considerably freer.\textsuperscript{15}

Managerial governance, with its emphasis on results

\textsuperscript{13}Glenn S. Dumke, Remarks made at the California State University and Colleges Auxiliary Organizations Managers' Meeting, Jan. 16, 1974.


rather than process, distinguishes between managing and doing. The percentage of time an administrator spends in actual management, or the emphasis that he places on managing as opposed to doing,\textsuperscript{16} can be a direct gauge of the effective use of his time. Managerial governance has a great potential for time effectiveness in that it promotes extensive delegation of authority. When combined with appropriate feed-back mechanisms or systems which verify that the job has been accomplished at a given quality level without the administrator having to personally check out the delegated task, the administrator is freed from daily operating decisions and can concentrate on the more global issues which can lead to real organizational improvement.

To facilitate results-oriented management, specialized information and budgeting systems have been developed. The objectives of these techniques are to provide administrators with the proper information base for decision-making. Management information systems capture, process, analyze and disseminate information vital to decision-making to proper decision points on a timely basis. Planning and program budgeting systems offer a modern management technique that involves the development of long-range objectives for specifically defined areas of activities; identify the programs necessary to meet these objectives; detail the resources

necessary to support programs, and the anticipated accomplishments of the programs.\textsuperscript{17}

In managerial governance, full recognition is given to the old concept that a budget is a plan of operation stated in financial terms. There are several steps involved: (1) development of objectives for the entity concerned; (2) planning, i.e., identifying and considering the alternative courses of action available as means for objective achievement; (3) programming, i.e., assembling the units necessary to carry out the plan and specific programs and determining the manpower, materials and facilities necessary for accomplishing the program; (4) analyzing the cost of alternative programs for an extended time span and selecting the most appropriate alternative; (5) progress reporting, continued review analysis and revision to modify programs in light of changing objectives.

When Charles Hitch resigned as controller in the Department of Defense, where he had served under former Secretary Robert McNamara, to become president of the University of California system, one of his first objectives was to convert the university budgeting process from its functional base to a planning, programming and budgeting system. Reacting to President Hitch's approach, T. R. \textsuperscript{17}

McConnell felt that the most significant changes were "increased power and authority in the hands of hierarchal administrators." 18

The thinking that strengthened hierarchal organization as the answer to demands for accountability may hold too true in one respect; the sacrificing of higher level incentives for an expeditious and central hierarchal administration. This may well provide mechanics for embarrassing results. What are the objectives? Goal achievement or reports? Pondering the drawbacks of results-oriented governance, Lloyd Cooper suggests:

And notwithstanding its new attire, this somewhat sodded and shop-worn practice cannot be suddenly endowed with magical properties and qualities which it never exhibited in years of business exposure. We make a mistake when we support the concept that uniform management is ideal management. In fact, uniformity is probably exceptionally undesirable. No two administrators react to a given situation in identical fashion and this is healthy. Each has his own working philosophy and his unique way of approaching a problem. Decision-making is not an easy process. No simple procedure supported by whatever depths of computer assistance or statistical sophistication is capable of providing the final answer, neither is concern with administrative trivia ... Preoccupation with detail and accountability takes the vitality out of administration, leaving only a shell without live direction or purpose. The human element is unmatched in importance and human judgment, trained and finely honed by years of experience is impossible to replace where difficult decisions must be made.19

Governance of higher education has been subject to

---


criticism from many sources. Student discontent, faculty militancy, and legislative scrutiny have been burdens falling one after the other onto already harrassed administrations. Amid demands for reform and academic reconstruction has emerged a clamor for, and preoccupation with, efficiency and accountability in higher education.

In many universities, entire departments and administrative units have been caught up with a preoccupation to tag everything in terms of behavioral objectives. Without careful planning and integration upward of individual, to departmental, to school, to institutional goals; the whole process can be of little real value. Some of the counter-productive side effects of misdirected scientific management are revealed in a recent Educational Journal editorial:

Just as politicians, regardless of their philosophies, are elected on the basis of territorial control and manipulation, just as military personnel regardless of their strategic and tactical skills are promoted on the basis of kill-ratios and subservience to superiors, and just as biochemists regardless of their concepts of life are rewarded on their progress in creating organisms in the laboratory, so, in an age of accountability, we feel that high level college administrators regardless of philosophy or long-range goals will be retained and rewarded to the extent that they will attain short-run, highly visible and measurable goals over which they have limited control.20

Rather than arguing the reason for its presence, Lieberman feels the underlying issue is not whether to have

---

accountability but what kind of accountability will prevail.\textsuperscript{21} The fact that governors and legislators all over the country are confronting the issues in accountability suggests that educators had better do so also. Furthering this speculation, Lessinger states: "Accountability is becoming \textit{sine qua non} for education in the 1970's. How to engineer accountability for results in public education is the central problem for the profession."\textsuperscript{22} Terell Bell's impressions of accountability were revealed by his statements made at a recent conference on the subject sponsored by the Educational Testing Service:

> Our sophisticated scientific and production-oriented society is demanding a more sophisticated scientific and production educational system. Accountability is the key word in all of this for it implies goal-directed and performance-oriented educational leadership. It implies analysis of feedback and correction of need to more accurately focus on our targets.\textsuperscript{23}

In another paper sponsored by the Educational Testing Service, Richard Peterson recognizes that, "neither the process nor the philosophy of accountability will be easy or inexpensive to carry out, yet the payoff in the form of identification of institutional strengths and weaknesses should be well-worth both the expense and effort that is


involved."^24

From the presidential perspective, Robert Lahti of William Harper College expresses his views on the role of accountability techniques: "Effective use of time accountability, reassessment, reform and timeliness of administrative decision-making are guiding lights for the future administrator in higher education. The intellectual climate in the intellectualizing process in higher education today can become more efficient."^25

Regardless of the many reasons underlying its establishment, numerous questions remain unanswered concerning implementation of accountability measures: To what extent should each participant be held responsible for results? To whom should they be responsible? How are results to be defined and measured? How will each participant's contribution be determined? What will be the consequences for professional educators of being held responsible?^26

Included with several concerns associated with accountability in higher education, T. R. McConnell views recent accountability developments as increasing the power and authority of hierarchal administrators. Dr. McConnell


believes that faculty are not to be nearly so free in establishing the substance or scheduling of their workloads as they have been in the past. The transfer of significant authority of hierarchal officers is a development looking toward a stronger, more efficient, more accountable bureaucratic control. Also implicit is the assumption that the bureaucracy will be more accountable to the public which the university serves. However, he further observes that the larger meaning of colleges and universities can be seriously compromised by such developments. The question fundamentally is one of establishing and maintaining social and cultural values.

The university should serve society by being a custodian, transmitter, creator and critic for the culture. To disturb this relationship is to change society. However, powerful forces are at work in society to maintain the status quo. When colleges and universities criticize or create, the conserving social forces operate to prevent change. The emphasis on managerial governance stressing mechanisms of accountability could be attempts by certain elements of society to control the university which as a change agent threatens their values and security.

Insecurity breeds mistrust. If mistrust between individuals, departments, institutions, or levels of government is merely a reflection of the mistrust between different seg-

ments of society, it could be that no particular pattern of governance will really offer improvement. Managerial governance, as any governance pattern, must be grounded in mutual trust, rather than the adversary's relationship in order to be effective. Before delving into the epitome of the adversary's relationship—the Collective Bargaining Governance Pattern—which seems so imminent on the educational horizon, it may be well to summarize on a trusting note in the words of Harold Enarson:

The university community, like the family, thrives on mutual respect and tolerance rather than on the meticulous and precarious balance of competing claims for power . . . As with the earth, there is an ecology of the human spirit also vulnerable to erosion by the careless and calculating. We have seen at first hand the ravages of neglect and the high cost of mistrust in the university . . . But as with the good earth, a powerful healing force is at our command; the awareness that we depend on one another. The magic word is trust; without trust we face an erosion of the spirit . . . with trust all things are possible.28

---

28Enarson, "Tinkering With University Governance," p. 50.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
GOVERNANCE PATTERN

The history of American higher education from the Civil War to the early 1900's contains not only a classic illustration of growth and organization, but also includes an immense number of changes which affect the complexity of university administration. These complexities have brought with them the addition of codes, standards, committees, departments and hierarchies, which often tend to frustrate professionals who strive towards originality and imagination.

Organizational principles and bureaucratization--the results of educational growth--are now being reacted to by many faculty and viewed as anti-professional.\(^1\) The most dramatic of these reactions has appeared in the form of collective bargaining negotiations. Although there are other reasons for the sudden popularity for collective bargaining, some of which are explored later on, one such explanation is offered by John Gianopulos: "College faculties are mobilizing their collective strength to improve their status as well as their working conditions with increasing speed. Faculties are not only demanding a voice equal to

---

\(^1\)Louis C. Vaccaro, "The Conflict of Authority in the University," College and University, Spring 1969, p. 233.
those of boards and administrators in developing educational policies, but are no longer satisfied with mere acquiescence to paternalistic superiority. They are also insisting on their full rights of give and take at the negotiating table.\(^2\)

Another possibility can be gleaned from a statement by Ralph S. Brown in an argument for the inclusion of policy matters as negotiable items in collective bargaining agreements: "As for college presidents, the effective heads of educational enterprise; they seem to consider faculty members as hired hands who are incapable of exercising any professional responsibility.\(^3\)

Glenn Dumke and Bertram Davis identify the basic principle underlying collective bargaining as being job-security.\(^4,\)\(^5\) In another address, before an association of business officers for the nation's universities, Dumke expressed additional feelings along this line: "The looming possibility of collective bargaining provides another complicating factor. The democratization of education may have

---


undermined the higher level needs satisfactions of faculty and staff which have formerly been partially satisfied by an elitist identity."6

Educators being familiar with the scientific process have examined the work of other groups in obtaining their goals: the plumbers, the longshoremen, and even medical doctors: hence, collective bargaining.

Expanding on this viewpoint, Ralph Brown explains:

Most physicians, lawyers and dentists have the fee setting power which in a large measure determines the income, working conditions, and other concerns related to the practice of those professions. The professor is a professional employee for whom others make the key decisions, particularly those which infringe on the material status of the profession--compensation, promotion, tenure, sabatical leave, work load, office space, secretarial and research assistants, etc. Whether the real reasons for collective bargaining are economic, philosophical, or more ego involved, is purely academic.7

The fact remains that the full implication of collective bargaining in the governance of higher education is just beginning to be realized, as pointed out by the following remarks:

Dumke - The imminence of collective bargaining makes the tightening up of the academic governance process an additionally difficult job.8


8Dumke, "Accountability in Action."
Lorenz - Collective bargaining in higher education is emerging as a force with which to be reckoned. In most cases, it is not too late for an institution in higher education to prepare for and conduct viable labor management relations.9

Bowker - Like it or not, collective bargaining with faculty is with us, and will be with us for the foreseeable future.10

Aronin - Labor relations in higher education is just entering the period of gestation. The entire field is pregnant. It is a case of what is past may not be prologue because movement is fast and change is certain.11

Howe - Several recent seminars on academic collective negotiations held in various regions of the country have had maximum attendance and a high percentage included senior colleges.12

An American Council on Education survey concluded that collective bargaining should be among the top ten events likely to occur in higher education during the 1970's.13

In fact, a survey taken by College and University Business in the fall of 1969 disclosed just how widespread concern over collective bargaining was:14


11 Locus S. Aronin, address before the Public Relations Commission of New Jersey, New Jersey, 1972.


13 Ibid.

14 Ibid.
More than one-third of the public institutions reporting said they had detected an increased desire of faculty members for collective negotiations; one-fourth of the private institutions agreed.

Nine percent of the public colleges and universities and three percent of private institutions reported a faculty strike or bargaining session during the academic year in 1968-69.

Forty-two percent of the public and twenty-one percent of the private institutions of higher learning were in the process of preparing collective bargaining guidelines.

Since the above information is, to a certain extent, a reflection of legally provided opportunity, the prognostication must be for the spread of the collective bargaining governance pattern. A majority of states have already enacted laws which offer the option to faculty of some variant of the bargaining relationship. More states are likely to follow suit in relatively short order. Where the faculty exercises the option, the burden of negotiation falls on the shoulders of the administration. Vigorous campaigns on a nation-wide scale to promote collective bargaining are well underway by a variety of faculty organizations. In recent years, both the American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association have invested increasing amounts of manpower and money in their higher education affiliates. More recently, the American Association of University Professors has reluctantly felt compelled to initiate a commitment aimed toward local chapters.

Of 254 colleges and universities with some form of collective bargaining agreements in the Spring of 1972, 243
were public institutions with representation by respective negotiating agents, allocated as shown below: 15

National Education Association 65%
American Federation of Teachers 25%
American Association of University Professors 5%
Independent organizations 5%

George Bernard Shaw observed that the real test of a man's breeding is how well he behaves in a quarrel. Collective bargaining will certainly provide higher education with such challenge.

Collective bargaining as it relates to higher education has been described in a variety of ways as illustrated below:

Lorenz - For the purposes of this section, to bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession. 16

Gardner - a short definition of collective bargaining is the mutual discussion and consummation of the terms of an agreement. A more sophisticated definition is the procedure whereby duly authorized representatives of labor and management get together on an equal basis to exchange ideas and positions pertinent to the inter-

est of both groups for development in good faith to a contractual agreement and operations of work to be performed for a specific period of time.\textsuperscript{17}

Lorenz - Collective bargaining might be defined as a vehicle used for the resolution of interest disputes by the process of compromise.\textsuperscript{18}

Davis - Collective bargaining is negotiation through an external agent which is the faculty's exclusive representative.\textsuperscript{19}

Doherty - Collective bargaining is a device used by workers to get the boss to change his mind. It is the hope of those who support bargaining that things will be different and better under it than they were when the boss enjoyed all the authority.\textsuperscript{20}

Perhaps the statement on governance of colleges and universities drafted jointly by the American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges can lend some understanding to the effect collective bargaining will have on university governance.

All institutional decisions are the product of a joint effort among the components of the institution--the trustees, administration, faculty, and to an extent the students. The decision-making process first involves the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all institutional components. Secondly, differences in weights of each voice should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter. The approach of shared authority is justified by non-hierarchal structure of

\textsuperscript{17}John C. Gardner, "A Short Course on Labor Law and Union Negotiations," \textit{American School and University}, April 1971, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{18}Lorenz, "Collective Bargaining," p. 35.


the university in which teaching and research are carried out by individual faculty members operating largely as autonomous professionals.21

In order to anticipate the implication which the A.A.U.P. statement might have on the existing faculty-senate, the following summary may be helpful:

**Faculty-Senate**

1. Relies on debate and persuasion and on the merits of the issue.
2. Does not concentrate much on working conditions.
3. Majoritarian Membership.
4. Faculty see their role as being different from administration but not necessarily in conflict.

**Union**

1. Relies on power first, then trade-offs.
2. Stresses improvement of working conditions.
3. Unitary membership.
4. Unions regard their roles in terms of an inherent labor-management conflict.22

Two major administrative concerns with collective bargaining are: (1) non-discretionary salary adjustments and (2) collegial governance systems being replaced with labor-management confrontation.23 However, on the other hand, collective bargaining forces upon institutions of higher learning an evaluation and review procedures both more rational and more just than have existed before. The characteristic "sink-or-swim" attitude which prevails in

---

23 Ibid., p. 2.
college faculty evaluation may give way to substantive due-process safeguards for probationary instructors. Also, collective bargaining appeals to the egaltarian inclinations of the majoritarian mentality. With the democratization of education, the role of the employee organization must be to seek settlement which will provide the greatest good to the greatest number.

Certainly the collective bargaining model will have significant fiscal implications as well as impact in the areas of compensation, governance, job security, and professionalism. When administrative priorities are "at odds" with employee priorities, faculty will have a strong incentive to attempt to block the administrative "unilateral" authority to set those priorities. The negotiating process might often produce certain types of trade-offs; for instance, a counteroffer to high pay could be among the following: (a) increased student-teacher ratio; (b) higher work load; (c) shorter library hours; (d) reduced student services.

Where faculty collective bargaining exists, the system of governance is likely to become more explicit, more uniform and more centralized, through necessity rather than by design. As questions are raised at bargaining tables, matters long left vague or variable have to be clarified and defined. The lawyers move in and as they move ambiguity out, something of value is lost as can be better understood by the comments of William Boyd:
On most campuses, one result of collective bargaining will be an increase in board power at the expense of faculty power. This will happen because the need for clarity will require a congruence between de jure and de facto power. Since de jure power is virtually a monopoly of the governing boards which have allowed faculties to achieve de facto power in important areas partly from design and partly from sloth, the faculty is largely to be the looser in any reprisals in reiterating of that situation. Ambiguity and a willingness to leave certain questions unraised has been important for the rise of faculty power. Explicitness in the demands for legalism will, I believe, now contribute to a renaissance of board power.24

Boyd further reveals:

In some ways, decentralization may still be pursued, but in fundamental matters of administration the trend on unionized campuses will almost surely be the other way. Departmental autonomy which faculty usually have in mind when they talk of decentralization may be an early casualty.25

Numerous other side-effects not necessarily bargained for in the adoption of collective bargaining governance styles could perhaps manifest. Contract negotiations and administrations put emphasis on legalistic grievance procedures, and their use in adversary proceedings could change the tone of university administration. The last remnants of collegiality would perhaps disappear. The replacement of the departmental chairman's office with the university personnel office as the locus of decision-making for personnel decisions may, in the long run, have a dele-


25Ibid.
terious effect on the quality of personnel decisions. Joseph Garbarino has noted that under the influence of collective bargaining, personnel policies become not merely more explicit, but more formal, more subject to review and appeal, more uniform, and more centralized. To this, Professor Garbarino has another sobering reflection:

One suspects that in those key institutions in which the untidy, unsystematic process of peer evaluation has worked with demonstrated success, the introduction of procedures that can be defended before an arbitrator or perhaps a judge will incur a real cost in quality. Uniformity means one rule for all. That means an end to discrimination, but it also means an end to those discriminating judgments that have in the past permitted some universities to excel while others remain mediocre or worse.26

Aside from conjuncture, it can be demonstrated that collective bargaining has already affected university governance. The right to bargain has introduced a new power factor in campus life. To the extent that faculty receives economic gains greater than those which would otherwise have been achieved, collective bargaining has influenced the allocation of university resources. Since resource allocation is the primary purpose of campus governance, collective bargaining by any group would have a significant impact. Moreover, an administrator who must deal with one or more unions will soon learn that consultation means more than just negotiating with faculty or perhaps students. It means remaining sensitive to the multi-faceted power struc-

26Ibid., p. 267.
ture of a contemporary unionized campus and maintaining a delicate balance between the host of components comprising the campus community.

Being relatively new to the collective bargaining scene, higher education in its attempt to learn from the experience of private industry has found that bargaining in higher education is set uniquely apart from other more conventional labor management relationships because of divergence of self-interest; meaning that in private industry, interest lies primarily in the areas of profit, working conditions, and wages. In higher education, administration and faculty, in addition to these considerations, have interests in improving the quality of education while retaining academic freedom. Other differences between the campus and industry perspectives include:

(1) In private sector, labor and management are easy to define; not so in higher education.

(2) In higher education, recognition and delineation between labor versus management's rights and prerogatives are hard to define.

Samuel Zagoria points out that while much has been written comparing public and private sector unionism, one essential difference divides them--the prohibition of strikes against the government. Because of this, one should conclude that in higher education it would be most beneficial to concentrate on perfecting impasse resolution machin-
ery as a substitute to the strike. However, as explained by Wynn:

Moreover we know that the incidence of strikes in the private sector of employment is declining in our own country, it is only in the public sector and especially in public education that strikes remain alarmingly numerous.²⁷

Explaining this apparent contradiction to law, Raymond Howe discloses:

It is certain that, except for the most gullible and naive adversary, what is not negotiable cannot be determined by unilateral pronouncement. It is also doubtful if it can be prescribed by law in any practical effect. Prohibition by law of the act of striking in public employment may have actually inhibited striking but it hasn't eliminated it.²⁸

Proposing methods for solving disputes in the public sector without the strike, Carl Stephens suggests the following:

(1) Strike in the public sector should be treated as strikes in the private sector (i.e., public employees should be allowed to strike except when the public's safety would be in danger);

(2) Disputes should be settled by compulsory and binding arbitration (third party);

(3) Fact finding bodies should be appointed to make recommendations for settlement.


If, after receiving the recommendations of fact-finders, the parties are still unable to achieve a settlement, the dispute should be passed to the appropriate legislative body for review for the enactment of a suitable legislative remedy.29

Offering other distinctions between collective bargaining in the public sector which are generally not present in private sectors, John Ferguson extends several additional considerations: first, the statutory grant of a right which is less than collective bargaining; second, a statutory management function or management rights clause which places limitations on bargaining; third, conflicts between the Public Employment Relation Act and other statutes particularly, but not limited to, Civil Service and Teacher Tenure Acts.

Illustrating the state of the art of collective bargaining in higher education, the 1970 national conference on collective negotiations in higher education revealed two major themes: (1) the impracticality of using years of labor relations experience in private industry as a model for present and future negotiations in higher education, and (2) the scarcity of information available to college and university management and employers who are now, or soon will be, negotiating agreements and debating grievances. There seems to be little more than institutional or labor union propaganda available as guides to college managers in

the area of collective bargaining at this point in time.

As a new reality grips higher education, a new mentality is taking shape to defend against ominous possibilities in a changing and gloomy environment of declining enrollment, reawakened interest in the skilled and technical trades, economic hardship, increased legislative scrutiny, and social disillusionment. Where tenure was once for academic freedom, seniority as established by collective bargaining may be for security. As Maslow or Herzberg might say, reality has hit higher education where it lives. The introduction of the element of insecurity to the educational matrix may well prove to be a factor sufficient to upset an already precarious balance between professionals and administration and polarize these groups into the traditional adversary's roles of labor and management.

For years, faculty have had only a conditional loyalty to the institutions with which they are affiliated. Contributing to an explanation of this occurrence, Louis Vaccaro offers the following observation:

Along with the rise and advance of the modern complex university have come forces which have made it necessary for the various professional societies such as the American Association of College and University Professors and the United Federation of College Teachers to increase their pervasiveness and hence their influence on the lives of their members. The consequence has been that members view such associations and their codes of conduct as the center of their professional lives.  

Subscribing to this point, Harold Hodgkinson adds:

An analysis of cultural factors would suggest that it is highly unlikely that the strategy of appealing to institutional loyalty will be a good strategy for dealing with faculty whose loyalty is often more with the learned society of which he is a member and which gives him his rewards. 31

In a similar context but belonging in a different vein, Theodore Vallence suggests a concept of dual allegiance of faculty members to the institute and the parent department which tends to make them somewhat transitory to institutional programs. "So long as the individual professor maintains his major career identity with his home discipline, and remains under the influence of peer groups into which he has long been socialized professionally, it is reasonable to expect less than even a proportional commitment to institutional as opposed to professional goals." 32 Whether such expectations are well-founded could be the subject of a more intensive study.

The high proportionate employment of professionals in the university setting brings an added dimension to the question of power and authority relationships in higher education. Professionals tend to bring with them certain values and expectations acquired as a result of their prior

31Hodgkinson, "Ideal Governance," p. 73.

professional training and experiences. The professional, for example, is likely to assign a high value and accord high authority to expertness and to be less mindful of authority inherent in organizational positions and status. His principle identification tends to be with his professional group of national or international dimensions, and not necessarily with the particular organization or institution by which he is employed. He tends to hold to individualistic standards rather than institutionally derived standards; to value specialized knowledge rather than broad and perhaps institutionally relevant competence and appears to be effectively neutral in a time of institutional crisis.

Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott summarize their characterization of professionals by observing: "A final characteristic of the professions is their distinctive control structure which is fundamentally different from the hierarchal control exercised in bureaucratic organizations. Professionals typically organize themselves into voluntary associations for purposes of control." Blau and Scott further argue that: "Every member of the group, but nobody else, is assumed to be qualified to make professional judgments." They conclude by suggesting that "this difference in social control, which is related to that between expert-
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ness and discipline . . . constitutes the basic distinguishing feature between professional and bureaucratic institutions which have otherwise many similar characteristics."\textsuperscript{35}

An ambivalent faculty caught between security and the higher level motivators of professionalism creates a climate which sets bargaining in higher education uniquely apart from other more conventional labor-management relationships. The professional role traditionally played by faculty is at odds with the trade union role of "employee" that a bargaining faculty assumes. Advancing this inclination, Bernard Mintz explains that in his role of negotiator with faculty he noticed their union teams vacillating between the two philosophical positions of professionalism and unionism; they contend that they are professional members of faculty and have legitimate concerns outside traditional collective bargaining and on the other hand they maintain some of their other demands to be standard in most union contracts which include:

1) Grievance procedures
2) Union security
3) Dues check-off
4) Workload
5) Participation in faculty appointments
6) Selection of college administrative officers

7) Tenure and promotion decision-making by peers \(^{36}\)

Adding to this description of the faculty bargaining position, Ikenberry includes the following:

1) Demands for openness of communication and related structural looseness

2) Strong commitment to professional values and norms

3) A high degree of personal security among professionals

4) A high degree of decentralized authority and responsibility

5) Jurisdiction over goals and over resources both human and material \(^{37}\)

It is characteristic of collective bargaining that the process itself tends to engender employee expectations. Employees tend to believe that not only can the boss be prevailed upon to change his mind, but also that he has the wherewithall tucked away somewhere to implement whatever the employee organization demands. To illustrate this point, the following negotiated agreements in the State University of New York bargaining agreement should be helpful:

1) Adequate office space, telephone and secretarial assistance;


\(^{37}\) Ikenberry, "The Organizational Dilemma," p. 29.
2) Annual salary guarantee
3) Consent of faculty for administrative use for electronic monitoring device
4) Election of department chairman
5) Evaluation of performance by colleagues
6) Faculty consultation on budget-making
7) Extension of employment beyond age 65
8) Final and binding arbitration of grievances
9) Liability protection insurance
10) Payment of tuition for post-graduate work
11) Provisions for early retirement
12) Racial integration of students and staff
13) Recognition of faculty and student participation in formulation of policy
14) Reduction of teaching load for head of the representative faculty organization
15) Release time for negotiation of representative faculty organization teams
16) The right to criticize the operation of the institution
17) Voice in selection of administration

If the above listing can be accepted as evidence of intra-institutional polarization, an insight into the psychology behind this mentality is provided through a summary of

---

research conducted by Mason Haire:

In a research demonstration of stereotyping, Haire found that labeling a photograph as that of a management representative caused an impression to be formed of that person different from that formed when he was labeled as that of a union leader. Management and labor form different impressions each seeing his offices as less dependable than his own group. In addition, each side saw his own group as being better able than the opposite group to understand a point of view different from its own. For example, managers felt that other managers were better able to appreciate labor's point of view than labor was able to appreciate management's point of view. Each had similar stereotypes of the opposite and considered the thinking, emotional characteristics and inter-personal behaviors of his opposite as inferior to his own.

A study by Robert E. Doherty profiles his findings of characteristics of faculty unionists:

1) Is not a risk-taker
2) Not particularly trusting of colleagues
3) Not particularly trusting of administration
4) Has no confidence in administration's ability to do right by them
5) Prefers salary schemes based on objective standards such as experience and graduate degrees
6) Has little confidence that deeply rooted tradi-
tions for high standards, collegiality, pride in excellence or affection for the institution exists at his campus. 39

Relating collective bargaining in higher education to a broader sociological scheme, it should be remembered that the motive behind collective bargaining has been concern by educational professionals that they get a fair share of the "fiscal pie". "When state legislatures extend collective bargaining rights to other public employees, they place the teaching profession in competition with other groups supported by public funds ... and if unorganized, the chance for a fair shot at public coffers while other claimants are pressing hard at the bargaining table are diminished quite a bit." 40 Adding to the competitive allocation argument, Samuel Zagoria states: "It follows that if collective bargaining is established in agencies competing for the same public dollars as education, educators will feel compelled to seek equal advantage in the scramble for these resources."

It is possibly true that in some institutions faculty administration or faculty-board relationships have deteriorated to a point where adversary positions have been established, communications broken down, and both faculties and its administrative board counterparts look to the law
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of labor relations to determine how best to carry on their relations. In some cases, the deterioration may be due to a clash between the old patterns of authority--authoritarianism--and the new demands for "participatory democracy." If this is the case, administrators, boards and faculties may see themselves locked in a struggle for power or control of decision-making powers. In such a crisis, normal impulse is to organize, either offensively or defensively.

Although contrasts in philosophy, internal to the institution regarding the issue of collective bargaining, are both glaring and intense, two lessons from the study of history and psychology should be remembered; the first is that every organization will generate disputes, and the second is that administration usually gets the kind of personnel relations it deserves.

The phenomena of collective bargaining, despite its relative youth on campus, has emerged as a natural product of the dynamic of forces arising from a set of objective conditions and the growing subjective realization of the import of these circumstances in the consciousness of faculty members.\(^1\)\(^\text{41}\) When faculty knows it has the right, when anxieties from financial pressures are felt, and when faculty perceives administration as being inept, arbitrary or capricious, chances are that faculty will organize in

\(^{41}\)Brown and Kugler, "Collective Bargaining For the Faculty," p. 78.
the direction of the collective bargaining model.

A study of the labor collective bargaining movement in America illustrates how an imbalance in power can be resolved to the benefit of both parties. However, it also shows how inequalities can result if limitations and responsibilities are not established. The academic profession has sought a vehicle which would provide several factors in addition to the normal bargaining elements of wages, hours, and working conditions. These additional elements include items such as shared authority, academic freedom, and quality of education.

Impact of collective bargaining will have an enormous effect on each component of the institution. In addition to providing economic benefits for the faculty and staff, it is hoped that this vehicle might insure participatory involvement for each group. One of the greatest concerns is that collective bargaining will not provide a unifying effect for the academic community. Thus, the self-interest of each group could destroy the development of higher education in America. It is for this reason that the appropriate vehicle must be used in a negotiating process.

An analysis of the history of organizations suggests that collective negotiation can be used to distribute power regardless of the organizational structure of the decision-making process. It would be understandable that in an en-
environment incubated during campus change and unrest of the 1960's, which is being influenced by current depressed economic conditions, pressures could emerge for a governance pattern of shared authority in which no sub-group has authoritarian power. However, due to the responsibility which is vested with the chief administrator, he must continue as the leader of the educational community to assure responsive and effective decision-making. Accordingly, the president should operate on the basis of sound principles of management in which the dignity and worth of each individual is considered, whether he be faculty, administrator, craftsman, student, or layman. He should apply basic decision-making principles considering the appropriate level of authority exercised, value judgments, standards, and action alternatives to each issue rather than arbitrary action based on personal gain and whims.

The impact of collective bargaining on the social image of higher education is most significant. While the profession wrestles with the professionalism issue of collective bargaining, society is primarily concerned with the quality of higher education. Society wants high quality faculty to apply their individual competencies to current societal problems and prepare students who are well-adjusted and who present employable competencies.

Since the quality of the institution's output is not always immediately measurable, new long-range quality-
effectiveness techniques should be implemented. Accordingly, institutions do not produce a product which provides profit to the institution; therefore, they must depend on public support for the financial resources needed to develop an educational program.

In the search for the governance scheme which maximizes educational effectiveness, thus assuring continued social support, while at the same time enjoying a broad-based intra-institutional acceptance, thus making long-range effectiveness possible, alternatives examined to this point do not measure up to the task. Some of these alternatives fall short because they contain elements of authority concentration which generates "out-group" alienation, because it fosters, rather than eliminates, the adversary's role. In answer to these inherent difficulties most factions of the campus community have at some point looked toward the participative governance pattern as a possible solution to their mutual problems. However, like purity, participative government is idealistically respected but little practiced. Although the basic philosophy which underpins contemporary theory of participative governance had emerged more than fifty years ago, too few actual examples of application are available to measure the effectiveness of this approach.
CHAPTER EIGHT

PARTICIPATIVE GOVERNANCE PATTERN

BACKGROUND

Fundamental to the concept of participative governance is the democratic ideal that power should be spread evenly through all organizational constituencies. In higher education, the diffusion of power is generally thought of as decentralization which, in this sense, simply denotes the transference of authority in its legislative, judicial, or administrative forms from a higher or central position in the institution into the lower or operative level.¹

Under a participative governance approach, academic departments and individual faculty members would take an active part not only in setting institutional goals but also in determining the most effective means of achieving these goals. Particularly the selection, retention, and promotion of staff would be heavily influenced by faculty members and by departmental, rather than institutional, action. Decisions about the nature of curriculum and about faculty work loads and schedules and a host of other important organizational matters are necessarily made in this decentralized fashion when the participative governance pattern is in

effect.  

As absolute freedom is held as the most ideal state of human condition, individuals within the organizational setting naturally resist anything perceived as an obstacle to their self-direction or self-expression, and particular dissatisfaction is experienced when the individual organizational member feels he is being dealt with unfairly, unjustly, dishonestly, or if there is disorder in the group.  

Dissatisfaction is easily aroused in the educational setting since current conditions are always compared to a previous and always better condition of collegiality which is its heritage (though unidentifiable to a particular point in history). Participative governance, in this sense, was the type of administration employed in the medieval university, which was antibureaucratic in form, and was characterized by a close sense of communication.

Perhaps the particular values which have characterized the shaping of the American character—such as thrift, time as money, and organizational efficiency—have much to do with the different approach which has directed and shaped the American university. From its earlier collegial form,

---
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4 Louis C. Vaccaro, "The Conflict of Authority in the University, College and University, Spring 1969, p. 235.
the American college and university developed into a more formal and bureaucratic institution. However, more recent changes have dictated that traditional notions of authority which normally exist within bureaucratic organizations do not hold within the present university. \(^5\) It is hardly surprising in this context that university-wide structures are being advocated in which faculty, students, and administration all participate. While such organization could be truly responsive to the concept of the ideal democratic community, it also carries with it all the time consuming complications of group process.

THE PARTICIPATIVE MISSION

The significance of the participative model is that it should do what it is designed to do: cut across the traditional organizational forms that dominate the major functions of the university which are teaching, research, and public service. \(^6\)

In his explanation of participative governance in the ideal university community, James Perkins writes:

If participative governance can be considered an end in itself, that end would be the achievement of an ideal democratic community within the institution. This goal would stem from the notion that the policies of the

\(^{5}\)Ibid., p. 236.

university must conform to the social aspirations of its members and its very style and organization must conform to the idea of a democratic society. Legitimate authority, according to this view, does not and cannot come from trustees as corporate owners. It can come only from the expressed wishes of all the constituent members of the campus: faculty, student, and staff. Decisions made by officials without community participation may be legally correct but democratically corrupt.

The notion of an ideal democratic community runs afoul of any number of traditional concepts of university organization. Among these are: the idea of faculty as a body whose independence, collectively and individually, is guaranteed by academic freedoms; and the employment of the chief executive officer by a body not elected by the local community. In a system of shared authority, all constituents of a university would have effective influence in the decision-making process.

It is reported that 300 institutions of higher education consider themselves to be moving in the direction of participative governance styles. Harold Hodgkinson summarizes some of the forms these changes from more traditional governance styles has taken:

(1) Elimination of the office of the president for substitution by a full-time chairman of the board who functions as the chief executive officer;

---

7 Ibid., p. 689.
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(2) Elimination of standing committees—when a problem comes up, those interested in working on it get together; leadership is elected internally; after the problem is solved, group is disbanded;

(3) Use of "mixed senates" made up of faculty, administration, and student representatives; the goal being to eliminate parallel structures of committees;

(4) A number of boards of trustees now have student representatives at board meetings. Many institutions have student representatives on the board itself;

(5) The first truly unicameral governance model began in October at Waterloo University in Ontario—a single governing board with student, faculty, administration and lay membership. They are the ultimate governing authority;

(6) A number of boards are adding faculty membership, although they often are distinguished faculty from some other institution than the one governed;

(7) A great number of academic departments have students on the departmental committees, but not usually the promotion and tenure committees. Many institutions now have student representatives on all major campus committees;

(8) More formal use is being made of student evaluations of teachers for promotion, although the decision is still in the hands of faculty and administration;

(9) State-wide student senates seem to be on the horizon, matching the state-wide faculty senates now in operation in a number of states;

(10) Presidential selection committees are now often composed of students and faculty as well as trustees and administration;

(11) Kentucky now requires by law students and faculty representation on the governing policy boards of all state institutions.\(^{10}\)

It can be seen that the alternatives in achieving, or at least initiating, a participative governance style

\(^{10}\)Ibid.
are numerous and the dangers of becoming ensnared in a multiplicity of parallel and overlapping committees is clear. The proliferation of committees, sub-committees, ad hoc committees, steering committees, and executive committees, in addition to councils, senates, boards, study groups, and task forces, requires enormous resources and commitment to effect even minimum coordination, communication, and cooperation.\(^{11}\) While the debate over the proper structures for joint participation at the campus level is important, there is also a concern for the appropriate functions of such bodies which can include advisory and deliberative responsibility in addition to campus legislative authority. If questions of function can be resolved, there remain dilemmas surrounding the basis of representation; the relationships of these campus-wide mechanisms with resisting governance structures; and, internal politicization. In practice, many participative governance schemes have been plagued with problems involving jurisdictional disputes between the various campus constituencies.\(^{12}\)

Many critics agree that the participative forms, with their focus on involvement, have all but paralyzed the institutional decision-making process. Commenting in this


The emergence of a university-wide organization with representation from its constituent parts has begun to raise important questions about where power really resides. Have the department and college faculties lost out to the university-wide structure? In its preoccupation with gaining the capacity to make legitimate decisions, has the community lost the capacity to make decisions at all? 13

Along the same lines, Robert Lahti adds: "Absence of leadership in the extreme or completely unstructured participative management styles implies no management at all, and would probably lead to lack of direction, inability to make decisions, and ultimately to chaos and anarchy—situations as destructive to organizational efficiency and to morale as any created by the extreme of preemptive leadership." 14 The effects of shared authority are also noted by Lindahl who suggests:

While the need for administrators in higher education to act expeditiously has increased, the capacity to do so has diminished significantly. This reduction of administrative initiative has resulted in marked increase in faculty power and involvement in campus administration. The collegial orientation or concept of shared authority which is the basic principle of campus government has reached sufficient magnitude to merit careful reconsideration. 15

Lindahl's remarks are ironic in the sense that the same faculty who cry out for complete participative govern-

13Perkins, "Organization and Functions of the University," p. 690.


ance are the same ones who criticize administration for "failure to act, or repeatedly making the conservative safe decision." 16

Weak or indecisive administrators are not necessarily victimized by participative governance, and some find it quite comfortable to their fashion. David Schimmel mentions a supporting observation:

It is probably true that an increasing number of administrators have begun to appreciate the advantages of passing controversial issues to councils and committees. In such cases, it may be necessary for faculty and students to take the initiative—to urge that academic leaders either take the risks that leadership demands or make way for others that have the ability or willingness to face the challenge. Some wary administrators have adopted the motto "When in doubt, refer." In this way, administrators hope to protect themselves against the difficulties that result from controversial decisions by pointing to committee recommendations. At the same time, such an administrator can take credit for sharing power, seeking participation, and favoring democracy—a record that would serve as a shield against future attack. 17

Sharing the same thought, Lindahl further adds: "There is a kind of security in referring most issues to faculty committees. With the administrator's role being that of implementing the decision, the timid, insecure breed of custodial administrator who assumes that he cannot move without overwhelming faculty concurrence . . . has stimulated the ascendence of faculty power." 18

16 Ibid., p. 530.
The types of difficulties outlined above have led to criticisms of participative approach as exemplified by the following remark made by the chancellor of a large multi-campus system: "The diffusion of accountability characteristic of the committee or participative plan for institutional governance is proving to be increasingly unacceptable to the systems which supply educational resources . . . how do we provide this accountability without regressing to authoritarian governance with all of its inherent 'employee-be-damned' counterproductive side effects."

Another area of controversy surrounding the participative governance approach is the amount of time elaborate committee process necessarily involves. This point is developed by James L. Miller, Jr. who states: "The large investment of faculty time required by newly elaborated governance structures is one that can be fully appreciated only by those who have been exposed to the problem." On the other side of the argument, Schimmel explains: "Maximum participation in governance by all constituencies on campus is a value to be encouraged, not curtailed. Sure it takes more time, but it's worth it to build a sense of trust and community." Dr. Schimmel goes on to play the devil's advocate role by saying:

19 Mortimer, "Dilemmas in Campus Governance," p. 484.
Everyone concedes that greater participation takes more time. The question is whether it is worth it. Most students and an increasing number of administrators think it usually is. I disagree. The problem with the present trend is that it utilizes a gigantic portion of a scarce university resource with few demonstrated positive results. It is built on the assumption that participation is an end in itself, and it implies belief that more participation will result in better decisions. . . the irony is, that under the banner of "freedom to participate" and "less bureaucratic administration" many students and faculty have become ensnared to a participatory process of their own making. 21

Resulting from the proliferation of committees, faculty, students, and administrators devote an increased portion of their time, energy, and intelligence to committee work. Dangers associated with this practice have been pointed out to be, "diffusion of responsibility, deflection of time away from teaching, counseling, studying, or relating, to spend a large portion of time considering questions of little importance and to make decisions that are of no higher quality than would have been made by able administrators in a fraction of the time." 22

Bardwell Smith feels that the problems of time associated with the participative approach are not insurmountable, but at the same time does not minimize their significance: "One of the persisting dilemmas will be the amount of time required to make an open system of governance work. Faculty and even students understandably com-

21 Ibid., p. 88.
22 Ibid., p. 87.
plain about the expenditure of time on committees, especially when they are chaired ineffectively. The more areas in which authority is shared, the greater the need to combine efficiency with accountability."  

Mortimer, with similar realizations, states:

It is a fact of life that faculty and students will not, and perhaps should not, devote large amounts of time over an extended period to participation in governance. Are the responsible and capable individuals going to devote their limited time to campus life problems and relegate to lower structures the relatively less-qualified? In non-crisis situations, a supply of responsible participants is a valuable but limited resource which should be used wisely.

COMPROMISES AND ALTERNATIVES

Proposing a system of participative governance which overcomes the problems of time, the proliferation of committees, and other problems associated with shared authority, David Schimmel suggests a process of conditional decision-making which would: first, refer items normally considered by a committee to be conditionally decided upon by the president, dean, or department chairman responsible; second, a copy of the decision and the reasons for it would be issued to all faculty and students affected. If ten percent of the faculty and students do not register their


objections to the conditional decision within ten days, the decision would become final. If they did, then the issue would be referred to the regular committee system.  

Though relatively simple, the system of conditional decision-making would allow "housekeeping" matters to be handled by regular administrative machinery while controversial issues and other matters of concern could be reviewed by all parties affected by the decision. Seven premises and arguments underlie this proposal:

(1) If an able administrator fully explains the reasons for his decision and the alternatives considered, there should be general support for the decision and, in many instances, by a large majority of the students and faculty;

(2) it generally takes much longer for a committee to make a decision than for an administrator;

(3) it is probable that a good administrator will make at least as good a decision as a good committee—especially if administrators are chosen for their decision-making ability;

(4) even assuming that a committee might make somewhat higher quality decisions, it would still not be worthwhile to refer most issues to committees;

(5) by requiring administrators to explain their position on all significant issues, the community would be

benefitted in several ways; they would know where the administration stands and why, administrators would probably give more thought to their decisions even if the matter were referred to a committee, and an explanation of the administration's position would expedite the work of the committee;

(6) the rights of minorities to participate and be heard would be fully protected. There should be little difficulty in any responsible minority getting ten percent of the faculty and students to sign a petition requesting hearings or committee consideration; and

(7) this approach could provide for accountability by requiring a regular systematic review of all major decisions. Each semester, for example, the administration could be asked to make an outline of the consequences of its decisions which could be evaluated by the students and faculty.26

There are purported to be three principal advantages of the conditional decision-making approach: The approach would (1) attract more competent, energetic men to academic administration—men who expect their authority to be commensurate with their responsibility and who are willing to accept the challenge of publicly explaining their decisions, it would (2) educate students and faculty about the pres-

26Ibid., pp. 90-93.
sures, dimensions, and complexities of university administration, and would (3) minimize buck-passing.

The present system of accountability and rewards for university administrators has a lot to do with administrative decisions that are widely criticized by faculty and students. Many administrators are understandably more sensitive to, and concerned with, the way higher authority might react to administrative decisions than they are to the effect of those decisions on students and faculty. It should be remembered that true organizational effectiveness is better measured by the acceptance of the decisions than by the making of them.

One of the more important questions in any representative governmental structure is who should be represented and why. One reason for adopting a broad representative-based governance is to enhance legitimacy. Mortimer reminds us that "Much of the current threat to the internal stability of colleges and universities comes from those who perceive existing governance structures as non-representative and, therefore, illegitimate. A principle strength of the participative approach is that through committee assignments, task forces and the like, faculty and student members not only influence the course of the institution but gain valuable insight about the problems of the institution." 27

27 Mortimer, "Dilemmas in Campus Governance," p. 482.
Understanding of organizational process leads to its acceptance and acceptance to the legitimization of authority. The likelihood of peaceful adjustments to conflicts is also enhanced if institutional arrangements exist which encourage consultation and negotiation. Organizational commitment to decision implementation can be fostered merely through the mechanics of the participative process, providing that the decision-making structure is perceived as being legitimate. This organizational commitment is the cumulative manifestation of individual commitments to a particular course of action resulting from individual awareness of the opportunity for input in the shaping of the final determination. Though admittedly time-consuming, the participative process can sometimes offset the possible disadvantages through increased effectiveness in implementation of decisions resulting from reduced organizational resentments.

Underscoring the importance of institutional commitment to effective implementation, Perkins notes: "The contractual commitment of the university can be entered into only by the administration--generally by the president. Yet the success of such projects requires faculty support and at least the tacit acceptance of such commitments by the rest of the university community."²⁸ However, to illustrate how

seldom the importance of this commitment is fully realized, he further adds:

Any university president who has ever faced the question of accepting a $10 million cyclotron when his campus has been designated as the appropriate site for such a major project, and when both capital and operating costs are guaranteed for years to come, can know how little use there is in the existing administrative apparatus. Even though such a matter has campus-wide implications, it would rarely be raised, let alone discussed, at a campus-wide faculty meeting.29

The disparity between that which is known as good organizational practices from the behaviorist and group dynamics perspective and actual on-campus administrative practices in the struggle for pre-eminence of vested self-interests leads to the over-riding explanation of why the participative pattern is rarely successful in college governance: Simply stated, it is lack of trust.

Expressing his viewpoint as to the importance of trust to the participative governance pattern, Kenneth Mortimer explains:

Internal pressures for shared authority are being felt but the various models of joint participation obfuscate the term shared authority. The fundamental problem appears to be the nature of relations among the faculty, administration, students, and other constituencies. Simply stated, the joint participation model stresses information sharing, reason, and trust in relationships among constituencies . . . If regularized contact among the various constituencies heightens rather than resolves the conflict between them and seriously threatens the use of persuasion and trust, then more formal or codified structures may result.30

29Ibid., p. 686.

30Mortimer, "Dilemmas in Campus Governance," p. 481.
The relationship of trust to the participative model is not meant to imply that the importance of trust is limited to this approach. Quite to the contrary, the lack of trust in an organization can be generalized to be a major contributory factor to the inadequacies of most applied governance patterns in higher education today. Hodgkinson aptly summarized the importance of trust when he wrote:

... there is no ideal form or structure of governance which can be exported to any institution of any size and mission ... if people wish to, they can be dishonest and deceitful with each other regardless of the height of the governance hierarchy. There is no structure which will force people to trust each other.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{31}Hodgkinson, "Ideal Governance," p. 66.
CHAPTER NINE

INSTITUTIONAL PROCESS CHARACTERISTICS AND GOVERNANCE PATTERNS AND THEIR INTERACTION WITH THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

MISSION, MAGNITUDE AND CONFLICT

As American Higher Education enters the 1970's, the nation's college and university administrators find themselves confronted with counter-poised problems. On the one hand, they must serve an enterprise dedicated to scholarship and learning; an institution justified by the social imperative to impart the accumulation of man's knowledge to successive generations. From this point of view, the administrator's principal responsibility is to facilitate the maintenance of proper conditions by which, in the words of Alfred Whitehead, the nation's youth can be "brought under the intellectual influence of a band of imaginative scholars." From this perspective, simplicity, singleness of purpose, and a highly personalized learning experience still comprise the idealized university situation.

On the other hand, administrators must contend with an institution which has become in a real sense "big business": multi-directional, complex and impersonal.

Despite the dichotomy between these imperatives, one constant remains intact. The missions of the university: The transmission of culture, research, training and public service revolve around the search for truth. Perhaps
Cardinal Newman's century-old definition of the university as "high protecting power of all knowledge and science, of fact and speculation"\(^1\) is not so archaic as it may appear at the surface. Advancing the same conviction into the more pragmatic 20th Century, Clark Kerr asserts that the basic reality for the university is the wide-spread recognition that new knowledge is the most important factor in economic and social growth.\(^2\)

Restating the same concept from even a more practical point of view, Millett explains:

If the purpose of education were purely esoteric . . . unrelated to the every day life of our culture, then education would be an adornment and a luxury of society. Because Americans expect education to be useful, we have made it a cause for concern. Education can be useful only if advancing knowledge results in improvement in social endeavor. It is little wonder that professional scholars embrace the idea of progress. They would be impractical men indeed if they did not do so.\(^3\)

The concept of a professor at one end of a log and a student on the other still has a nostalgic appeal. But before getting too caught up with this notion, it should be remembered that complexification so central to the complaints with today's university is an effect of growth, maturity and
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increased specialization. In order to be manageable and functionable, systems have to be devised so that the myriad logistical details of the huge enterprise can be considered, and more importantly so that the prime movers of institutional purpose can be buffered from the demands, interruptions, and interferences of an impulsive, powerful and insensitive external environment.

Sociologists liken institutions to organisms which react to their environments. Simple environments should logically elicit simple reactions . . . but if the idea of complexity tolerance is introduced as being coping behavior that is rational up to the point at which intolerance is reached and beyond which behavior is unpredictable, it is less confusing to observe the academic community displaying simple reactions and simple-minded behavior when confronted with complex situations. Ostriches often do the same thing.

It has often been pointed out that when one's head is in the sand, another larger part of the anatomy is vulnerably exposed. Protecting faculty hindquarters must be added to the list of administrative functions. This is regrettable in itself because it is so little appreciated if even acknowledged.

Administration in the university was not initially recognized as a component of the academic community, and through the centuries has never been a very welcomed one. It has been at best a necessary evil, like the tax account-
The general rule is that the administration everywhere becomes, by force of circumstances if not by choice, a more prominent feature of the university. As the institution becomes larger, administration becomes more formalized and separate as a distinct function; as the institution becomes more complex the role of administration becomes more central in integrating it, as it becomes more related to the once external world, the administration assumes the burdens of these relationships. (Emphasis added)\(^4\)

One explanation for the emergence of university administration could be spontaneous generation arising from accumulations of dirt which had been swept under the carpet for too long. Even though a product of poor housekeeping, administration should be able to rise above its humble beginnings and engage in some sound planning rather than limiting its scope to "cleaning up messes."

It can be argued that administration can no more be escaped than can grey matter continue to function without the heart's blood supply. In facilitating achievement of organizational goals, our society has selected the hierarchical mechanisms of bureaucratic organization for this purpose. Surprisingly, this device is accepted rather matter-of-factly. For instance, Caplow, in *The Academic Marketplace*, writes:

> In order for any large-scale organization to carry out a complex program, a great deal of power must be exercised. Decisions must be made, and men must be induced

\(^4\) Kerr, *The Uses of the University*, p. 28.
to carry them out. In most large-scale organizations, the distribution conforms, more or less, to a ladder of rank and authority and is supported by the formal assumption that rank and ability are closely correlated.5

Kerr describes the university's particular brand of bureaucracy as "a mechanism - a series of processes producing a series of results - a mechanism held together by administrative rules and powered by money."6

For a complex endeavor, organization is an inescapable necessity. Being highly complex, the university cannot function without the services provided by its administration. Millett claims that the facts are actually these:

Administration is essential to the maintenance of the academic community as an environment of learning. A college or university cannot function, or would not long be able to, without the specialized and full-time endeavor of those who seek to free the energies of faculty and students for the pursuit of learning. . . . Administration in the academic community must:

1) provide educational leadership, 2) augment and allocate the scarce economic resources of the college or university, and 3) maintain the college or university as a going viable enterprise.7

With so much falling within its purview, administration is all too vulnerable to being taken for granted and being unappreciated. It is unfortunate that the relationship between administration and faculty could not be more synergetic.

6Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 20.
The academic community does not hate administration anymore than it loves it, or put another way, a university's administration is loved for what it does but is hated for what it is. Offering one explanation for the strained relationship between these two campus components, Dumke comments:

College professors behave like any other human beings in large masses. They stop acting as individuals, as professionals, and begin reacting as political beings subject to all the pressures and manipulations which are possible in large groups.8

But is it really quite as simple as Dumke claims? What are the issues which underly these systems described as the collective behavior of professors? Is this not an era when change is particularly confusing; when change seems to threaten the security of large numbers of individuals? Is there not an undermined confidence in economic growth? Does inflation not threaten the adequacy of fixed income? Have not scientific research and technological development proceeded so rapidly that few have been able to understand either? Does a new reality grip the academic marketplace?9

This summary of concerns as outlined by Millett in 1962 could as easily have been taken from Future Shock, published in 1970, wherein Toffler echos the same concerns. With all the warnings signs that had been put up along the way, edu-
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cators should not claim that today's situation is so surprising.

The fact cannot be escaped that the responsibility for anticipating and planning for change has been traditionally an administrative function. In spite of this need for leadership and sound planning, it has been pointed out that university administrations bulge with incumbants who come to their posts as amateurs in their prime task of management. Admittedly, this sad state of affairs has more to do with mission conflict than anything else, but this realization does not solve the problems at hand. Caffrey's observation speaks for itself:

We have administrators who are 99-99/100% pure academics trying to cope with environmental factors which are 99-99/100% pure non-academic.

To illustrate Caffrey's point, the following lists are grouped into examples of (1) educational objectives, (2) internal environmental components, and (3) external environmental components, respectively.

(1) As to its mission, the university is called upon to execute such functions as:

(a) raise the intellectual tone of society
(b) cultivate the public mind
(c) purify national taste
(d) enlarge the ideas of the age
(e) be the critic of society
(f) promote science
(g) instill patriotism
(h) provide moral guidance
(i) train the nations' technologists
(j) perform research
(k) render services to the community
(l) serve the state
(m) provide undergraduate instruction
(n) provide graduate instruction

(2) As to its identity, it has been claimed that:
(a) the president is the institution
(b) the governing board is the university
(c) the faculty is the university
(d) the students are the university

(3) As to control of the university, it has been argued that the university is controlled in part by:
(a) the professional and business community
(b) accrediting agencies
(c) trade unions
(d) federal agencies
(e) public school systems
(f) alumni
(g) state coordinating councils
(h) private foundations and other granting agencies
(i) the press
(j) state legislatures
As these lists grow, the complexity of the three
dimensional interface between mission, internal environment
and external environment increases exponentially. Kerr
states:

The university is so many different things to so many
different people that it must, of necessity, be par­
tially at war with itself.10

Other scholars of university governance share the
belief that complexity is concomitant with conflict:

Millett - The power of administration by its very nature
must necessarily come into conflict with faculty, stu­
dent and alumni power.11

Caplow - The system of loose lying power helps to
account for the extraordinary high incidence of conflict
reported in the universities we studied and the wide­
spread and passionate dissatisfaction of professors
with the workings of academic government.12

Therefore, the study of university governance is a
study of conflict. The study of conflict is a study of
power struggles in and among organizations. Toynbee con­
cludes that this struggle is characteristic of all known
civilizations and their institutions; that power must be
employed to advance social progress which is the vehicle for
increased freedom. But paradoxically, "Many scholars and
students who appear to be willing to accept the idea of gov­
ernmental power in a society as a condition of social pro­
gress are equally or more emphatically opposed to adminis­

10 Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 9.
trative power as a condition of academic progress."

The study of university governance patterns is a study of the locus of decision-making, of control within the institution. University governance effects the environment and the environment effects governance in a process of continuous interaction. To argue which effects the other more would be a "chicken or egg" argument. However, as we chart the history of governance changes noting shifts in the locus of controlling power, these shifts correspond in varying degrees to the responsiveness of administrations to new environmental factors.

During these shifts in the locus of power, another constant is noted: the establishment usually doesn't like it. "Change," to many, is often perceived as "threat." To an aggressor, change is perceived as an opportunity. Toynbee explains that a shift in the locus of power is the result of a successful struggle by a "creative, dominant minority over an uncreative, acquiescent majority" based on the premise that "when leaders cease to lead, their tenure of power becomes an abuse."

Since conflict in American universities has persisted in varying degrees since the inception of the institution, an accommodating mechanism has emerged which allows for operational continuity in the presence of significant inter-

nal polarization. The chronic adversaries' roles of administration and faculty have yielded a system of parallel hierarchies which is pervasive throughout organization in higher education. Caplow aptly describes this situation as follows:

In most large-scale organizations, the distribution of power conforms, more or less, to a ladder of rank and authority and is supported by the formal assumption that rank and ability are closely correlated.

This kind of arrangement cannot be established in a university faculty because of the double system of ranking. Academic rank is conferred by the university, but disciplinary prestige is awarded by outsiders, and its attainment is not subject to the local institution's control. . . . Yet power in some form must be exercised or the university cannot function.

The solution to this dilemma which has evolved in the American university is to let power lodge pretty much where it may. The fundamental device by which stresses in the university are resolved is a kind of lawlessness, consisting of vague and incomplete rules and ambiguous and uncodified procedures.  

It seems that with increasing complexity, the balancing of university components becomes more delicate, comparable to a chandelier rather than a teeter-totter. A tight grip on the reins characteristic of leaders such as Gilman, Eliot, Harper, Lowell, Jowett, Wheeler and Hutchins, is not effective with the loosely-hitched and spirited constituency of the multi-university. Academic loyalties now lie more with their disciplines than with their institution and often more with their research than with their students. During
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the post-N.D.E.A. academic bull market, coined "The Age of the Professor," the faculty attained sufficient mobility, organization and status to dispell the effectiveness of an administratively dominated governance pattern.

Commenting on this reality are contributions of two past university presidents:

John D. Millett, Miami University:

It seems fairly clear that in practice, boards of trustees do not exercise an absolute, or hierarchal authority within most colleges and universities. Power is shared by the major constituent elements of the academic community.15

Henry Wriston, Brown University:

While the (president's) power is real, it is much less than supposed. No matter how alert a president may be, he is hedged about by a bureaucracy which narrows the range of his free judgment. He is also restrained by the political nature of his office. He can say "no" only so often before resistance is stimulated to the point of becoming effective. He can set his judgment over and above advice for only a limited time and . . . must use power economically and persuasion to the fullest extent.16

However, even the gentlest of touch by the president/mediator:president/change agent is enough to set a hyper-reactive campus community into a tail spin. So, as of late, the chief administrator has often had to adopt a strategy of moving the spotlight off of himself and onto other environmental components. Kerr explains, "Most presidents are in the control tower helping the real pilots make their

15Millett, The Academic Community, p. 239.
landings without crashes, even in the fog."\textsuperscript{17}

But then, Kerr feels that the position of university presidents is a thankless job as evidenced by his concluding remarks:

He wins few clear-cut victories, he must aim more at avoiding the worst than seizing the best. He must find satisfaction in being equally distasteful to each of his constituencies; he must reconcile himself to the harsh reality that successes are shrouded in silence while failures are spotlighted in notoriety. The president of the multi-university must be content to hold its constituent elements loosely together and move the whole enterprise another foot ahead in what often seems an unequal race with history.\textsuperscript{18}

If it were possible to approach a perfect balancing of power at a university campus, this achievement would end at the instant of attainment due to the interest of institutional components in their own self-benefit. This would bias their perception of power distribution in the organization as being unfair, while actually it merely thwarts attainment of personal objectives. This conflict engendering process could well be the "catch-22" in governance for American higher education.

As it has been suggested that governance patterns are a generalization for the locus of institutional decision-making, the dynamics of which are characterized by institutional conflict, a summary of Victor Thompson's analysis of conflict would be illustrative at this point.

\textsuperscript{17}Kerr, \textit{The Uses of the University}, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., p. 41.
1. Conflict arises between the specialization of persons in an organization and the authority of hierarchy.

2. This is primarily due to several reasons:
   a. Superordinates tend to overemphasize the power of veto and underemphasize the reward of innovation.
   b. Superordinates are able to monopolize the means of communication.
   c. Superordinates often reserve the most rewarding and satisfying tasks for themselves.
   d. Subordinates are reminded more often of their duties and obligations than of their powers and rights.
   e. Highly professionalized work groups resent being subordinated in any manner since the guild concept with which they identify calls for leadership on a first-among-equals basis.
   f. The subordinates tend to believe that their importance and dignity as individuals are hampered by their status in the organization.

3. Superordinate power to restrict the subordinate's freedom of effort and to frustrate his ambitions results in latent or overt hostility within the organization.\(^{19}\)

These insights are enlightening when considering the managerial, participative, and collective bargaining governance patterns, for it is in these areas that the tug-of-war and trade-offs over superordinating and subordinating organizational characteristics are taking place.

How it came to pass that education borrowed the concept of hierarchy from the church and military and applied it to university governance rather than the concept of community on which the nation's political system is based, is baffling to some scholars in the field. This is especially true since few institutions are more political than universities.

Issues such as these pointed out by Millett emerge and re-emerge: (1) quality of educational endeavor; (2) programs of service; (3) curricula; (4) instructional methods; (5) student behavior; (6) alumni requests; and (7) financial supports.\(^\text{20}\) Thus, it would be naive to suppose that conflict within the academic community can be eliminated by some magic organizational formula or governance pattern.

A degree of tension may even be desirable between organizational components much as muscle tone is in the body. Mary Parker Follett, in her essay "Constructive Conflict," made the point that conflict defines difference in an organization and that resolution of these differences is healthy.

\(^{20}\)Millett, The Academic Community, p. 245.
when brought about through the process of integration. A less constructive but more intense resolution to conflict ensues when a strong controlling power base senses a threat to the status quo. In this case, the matter is settled by domination, or at best, by compromise.

Gauging by the sheer volume of literature on governance, it is unfortunately apparent that the present organizational conflict between faculty and administration has long passed the constructive stage at most universities. There seems to be more of a lashing out, a ventilation of frustrations--administration, being the established control component and focal point, must be a bit more restrained in its tactics than its adversaries. To this restriction must be added the disadvantage that administration must often do battle with several internal and external components simultaneously.

Changes in governance patterns, or even the more subtle changes in administrative style, are institutional responses to environmental stimuli--a balancing of pressures, the internal with the external. It can be said that these changes come about because all of nature abhors a vacuum. This saying also applies to social institutions operating within a society.

John Kenneth Galbraith unfolds this relationship with his now famous "Theory of Consistency:"

... There must be consistency in the goals of society, the organization, and the individual. And there must be
consistency in the motives which induce organizations and individuals to pursue these goals . . . It follows that if we know the goals of society, we will have guidance to the goals of the organizations which serve it and the individuals that comprise these organizations . . . Similarly, if we know how the individuals are motivated, we will know how organizations are motivated and also the reverse.21

In order for a social institution such as a university to be sustained by the society which it serves and in order for it to attract student "clients," it must fulfill these functions which society deems necessary. This realization is not new. In 1930, Abraham Flexner observed:

A university is not outside, but inside the general social fabric of a given era . . . It is not something apart, something historic, something that yields as little as possible to forces and influences that are more or less new. It is on the contrary . . . an expression of the age, as well as an influence operating upon both present and future.22

Speaking of environmental effect of society on its institutions, Millett concedes that the character of this nation's universities is a function of its values, and that in a different society the institution of higher education would have different commitments and different procedures. He identifies the "interrelation of society and institutional characteristics" as being a problem of ethics as well as of other realms.23

---


23 Millett, The Academic Community, p. 256.
Getting right to the point of environmental pressure, Kerr concludes:

To the academician, conservative by nature, the sound made by the new generation often resembles the howl of a mob. To the politician, it is a signal to be obeyed.24

And, finally, in the words of Charles W. Eliot, "The university must accommodate itself promptly to significant changes in the character of the people for whom it exists."25

Since the magnitude of pressure potential is commensurate with organizational complexity, no single component of the multi-versity can forbear the full measure of its application. This could assist in accounting for the new institutional sensitivity and responsiveness to the educational environment. A mutli-versity can no longer turn a "deaf ear" to criticisms nor otherwise ignore reality.

Several examples of institutional adjustment to changing environmental concerns come to mind:

When it was suggested that the university do its share to mechanize the nation and increase farm productivity, then came the land grant colleges—with an emphasis on the practical and applied.

When the nation came to realize the economic value of knowledge, then came the John Hopkins and the Michigans—with an emphasis on graduate schools and research.

24 Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. vi.
When society looked to improve the training of public servants, then came the Wisconsin idea—with an extension of university activities beyond the boundaries of the campus.

When it was recognized that knowledge could not remain contained within the classical paradigm, the emergence of Lernfreiheit with its system of free electives was established.

With the democratization of education came the state colleges and later, in a more complete expression of the idea, the "community college."

During the counter-reformation, a new emphasis on the total campus community was expressed by the addition of residence halls, student unions, student activities funding, and counseling services.

This same environmental responsiveness is evidenced by changes in the workings of campus administration:

The post-industrial revolution management concepts resulted in the principles of cost effectiveness and led to the establishment of planning centers within the administrative frame-work.

Today, when society tightens its belt and demands to know what it's getting for its educational dollar, state legislatures now hand down accountability mandates for objective evidence of popularly-determined institutional objectives to insure continued funding.

When, during long hot summers, ghettos burst into disruption, ethnic studies programs followed.

Whenever the job market contracts, a new vocationalism sweeps the educational matrix to provide training in areas of anticipated demand.
When a faculty gears up for collective bargaining, autocratic chief administrators are likely to be now replaced by chief mediators.

On the last topic, Wriston and Millett have said the following:

"The president has no power to command a member of the faculty. He can seek to influence him by persuasion, but any officer of instruction is free to go his own way."

"When consensus is not possible, then new leadership is needed."

Accepting the fact that environmental pressures will continue to intensify, it follows logically that static patterns of academic governance will be more difficult to maintain. If change cycles compress to the point where they occur several times during what has traditionally been a typical tenure period for institutional chief administrators (using this as a generalization for a particular governance pattern), several implications reveal themselves:

1) The position of chief administrator will become less secure.

2) Administrators will have to develop systems and skills for monitoring their environment more closely.

3) Anticipating and planning for change will become more central to the administrative process.

4) Successful administrators will have to possess the qualities and the skills necessary to be integrators rather than to be dominators of work groups.

Kerr describes what is expected of this new breed of administrator and academic leader:
*Friend of the students
*Colleague of faculty
*Good fellow to the alumni
*Sound administrator to the trustees
*Good speaker with the public
*Astute bargainer with foundations
*Politician with state legislature
*Friend of industry, labor and agriculture
*Persuasive diplomat with donors
*Champion of education generally
*Supporter of the professions
*Spokesman to the press
*Scholar in his own right
*Devotee of opera and football equally
*Decent human being

*Firm but gentle
*Sensitive to others

*Planted in the present
*Visionary yet sound
*Affable yet reflective
*A person of principle yet able to make a deal

"The president in the multi-versity is leader, he is also office holder, caretaker, inheritor, consensus-seeking, persuader, bottleneck. But he is mostly a mediator and a carrier of change."26

**MANAGING CHANGE**

Among his or her primary tasks of mediator and change agent, it is essential that a university administrator must be provided with new information systems yielding reliable assessment catalogs of environmental descriptions and institutional characteristics.

Additionally, historical information relating past governance patterns to particular sets of institutional characteristics should prove valuable in anticipating the

26Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 30.
impact of administrative decisions. These studies could also build toward a point of departure in developing new governance approaches which would possibly be more effective in achieving institutional goals.

Since the preceding chapters of this graduate project can succeed only in describing the development and characteristics of university governance patterns, this concluding section will offer a plan for completing the puzzle of understanding the interaction of governance and the academic environment. A proposed hypothesis of this research endeavor could be a paraphrase of Dr. Ralph Prator's observation mentioned earlier:

Governance Patterns - practiced in university administration are a function of the needs and pressures of a particular educational environment and social milieu.

In attempting to prove this hypothesis, it should be shown that administration in higher education acts upon and is acted upon by its environment, each cross-ruffing the other. A paradigm for grasping these relationships should be multi-dimensional, relating administrative characteristics with both institutional and environmental characteristics.

The administrative dimension of this proposed conceptual framework could be generalized and categorized from the preceding chapters and form the horizontal axis of a governance grid. Fortunately, comprehensive studies of institutional characteristics which are available will add
the second dimension to this device and will, therefore, form the horizontal axis of this matrix. For example, the summary of institutional characteristics used in the Stanford Project on Academic Governance, as outlined in Gary Riley's doctoral dissertation, will be used in the subsequent sketch of the matrix concept. Briefly described, these characteristics include the following:

Patterns of Decision and Participation

This includes an examination of the hierarchal decision-making structure in colleges and universities and the degree of dispersion or concentration of decision-making within the institution at its various levels. These concepts are measured by spheres of influence, institutional centralization, and departmental centralization.

Patterns of Control

These are represented by the characteristics identified as standardization and departmental autonomy. The former represents the type of organizational control over the working conditions of the faculty while the latter represents a form of professional control over the central core tasks of the institution. More specifically, departmental autonomy shows the degree to which professionals in the primary task units are able to make necessary decisions to carry out their professional activities.

Patterns of Evaluation

These are illustrated by the degree to which the professional faculty is evaluated by members of their peer group, or the members of the non-peer group present on the academic campus. With this variable, it is possible to assess the amount of all professional performance and activity that is evaluated by fellow faculty members and other persons who share the basic professional value system of the academic.

It is hoped that the "governance grid" which appears as the next page will help synthesize earlier discussions of
governance patterns and the process characteristics of institutional governance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattems of Decisions and Participation</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>Participative</th>
<th>Collective Bargaining</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are faculty involved in decisions related to the accomplishment of their tasks?</td>
<td>Patronistically</td>
<td>Mechanically</td>
<td>Consultively</td>
<td>Obligatorily</td>
<td>Essentially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who decides the nature of technical and professional content to be presented in the classroom and how is it determined?</td>
<td>Top administration by mandate</td>
<td>Individual instructor &amp; Dept. Chairman by compromise</td>
<td>All institutional Constituencies by integration</td>
<td>Academic Org., Academic O: &amp; Admin. Org. by mandate by negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are decisions regarding faculty working conditions formulated?</td>
<td>Through top-level conference</td>
<td>Upper and middle levels after discussion with faculty</td>
<td>Open forum</td>
<td>By negotiation at the time of contract expiration</td>
<td>Official faculty senate position as forwarded to administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What opportunity is there for all campus constituencies to influence &quot;global&quot; decisions?</td>
<td>Usually very little</td>
<td>Fair &quot;through a great deal of channels&quot;</td>
<td>Poor unless negotiated</td>
<td>Good if aligned with faculty position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To whom are tenure and promotion decisions appealed?</td>
<td>Nobody</td>
<td>Department Chairman</td>
<td>University Senate</td>
<td>Faculty/Admnistration Appeal Committee</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who sets research goals?</td>
<td>Department Chairman with approval of President</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty and Department Chairman</td>
<td>University Research Committee with approval of Senate</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty or as negotiated</td>
<td>Department Chairman and Dean of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who holds highest degree of influence over professional issues in the institution, i.e. selection of new faculty members, course offerings?</td>
<td>President and his staff</td>
<td>Department head as cleared thru top administration</td>
<td>University Senate</td>
<td>Administration or faculty depending on terms of negotiated agreement</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty and Department Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most important decision making in respect to the academic department is made...</td>
<td>Mostly at the top</td>
<td>Policy at top, some delegation</td>
<td>Throughout inst. and well integrated</td>
<td>At bargaining table</td>
<td>By Department Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization, codification and other types of bureaucratic red tape are exercised by administration...</td>
<td>In moderate magnitude but with great impact</td>
<td>Minimally, providing there is good goal direction</td>
<td>As approved by senate or as imposed by the external environment</td>
<td>Extensively to monitor min. performance as negotiated</td>
<td>Moderately by buffer impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal control of professional organizations and departments are...</td>
<td>Influenced heavily by top administration</td>
<td>Set at mid org. levels to enhance goal achievement</td>
<td>Developed by constituency of each group in consultation with university community</td>
<td>Set by contract designers</td>
<td>Set by faculty politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational &quot;tension&quot; due to administration/professional conflict is...</td>
<td>Very apparent but never discussed</td>
<td>Dealt with to minimize goal distraction</td>
<td>Debated extensively</td>
<td>Compromised at bargaining &quot;underground&quot;</td>
<td>Acted on by...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the nature of the formal contractual relationship between individual faculty members and the institution?</td>
<td><strong>AUTHORITARIAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>MANAGERIAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>COLLECTIVE BARGAINING</strong></td>
<td><strong>TRADITIONAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Take it or leave it&quot; as developed by administration</td>
<td>&quot;Here's what we agreed to&quot; based on performance goals and procedures determined by subordinates and middle administrators</td>
<td>&quot;Here's what is best for all concerned&quot; as developed by university senate</td>
<td>&quot;Here's a summary of our compromises, you'd better live up to them&quot; as developed by senior faculty</td>
<td>&quot;If you're smart, you'll agree to it&quot; as developed by administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the degree of specificity and formal control exercised by administration over determination of courses to be taught each term?</td>
<td>A great deal as determined by maintenance-coordination hierarchy</td>
<td>Moderate, with policy determined at top, but specifics developed at departmental levels</td>
<td>Relatively small with extensive input from most university factions</td>
<td>Very high as conceded during negotiation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty promotions are determined...</td>
<td>Primarily or largely at top</td>
<td>By Senate-appointed review committees</td>
<td>By negotiated criteria such as seniority</td>
<td>By senior faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New faculty is selected...</td>
<td>At departmental level based on achievement of planned performance goals</td>
<td>By university wide selection committee</td>
<td>As precisely outlined in union contract</td>
<td>By department chairmen and other senior faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual faculty task priorities are set...</td>
<td>By admin. order</td>
<td>By agreement between sup. and subordinate</td>
<td>By admin. as conceded in union contract</td>
<td>By faculty senate guidelines and dept. preferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work performance criteria is set by...</td>
<td>Top level maintenance-coord. administrators</td>
<td>Agreement between sup. and subordinate</td>
<td>Top admin. as outlined in negotiated agreement</td>
<td>Top level professional-task hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is student evaluation of faculty included as job performance criteria?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Most likely</td>
<td>Most unlikely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do faculty have input in the performance evaluation of department heads?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Most likely</td>
<td>Most unlikely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty performance is primarily evaluated as to effectiveness based on...</td>
<td>Administrative goals</td>
<td>Organizational goals</td>
<td>Institutional community values</td>
<td>Negotiated criteria</td>
<td>Senior faculty values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As an aside, this study dispelled the author's notion that governance patterns would be distributed along a continuum with participative and non-participative styles occupying the polar extremes, e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benevolent</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Consultive</th>
<th>Participative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Such was not the case, for the study of each governance pattern and the various governance process characteristics demonstrates that each governance pattern provides its own range of participatory content—the differentiating factor emerging, not as the degree of this content, but the power base through which it was controlled.

The above matrix is an attempt to illustrate in part the first two dimensions of the proposed study in order to consolidate the interactive relationships between institution characteristics and their governance patterns.

Following this approach, a more comprehensive and empirically-based model including the third dimension of environmental characteristics should prove useful to administrators in their primary roles as mediators and change agents. Utilizing this approach, administrators should be able to predict the impact probability of environmental changes on the campus community, the effects of administrative policies on the character of the institution, and the reaction of the external environment to campus issues, etc.

The observation that study and debate on governance has been relentless but basically fruitless in reducing
institutional conflict adds credence to the notion that a university gets the kind of administration that it deserves . . . and that "effective governance is not achieved through the discovery of one particular set of principles or techniques, but rather through an understanding of the interaction between a changing environment and the application of the best available techniques to meet the demands of that environment."

It is hoped that this discussion has served to help digest the overwhelming volume of current literature on governance in higher education and has served to indicate a direction for constructing a rationale for anticipating and managing change within the university.
SELECTED REFERENCES


Arnstein, George E. "The University as a Corporation." College and University Business (March 1970).


Dumke, Glenn S. Remarks made at the California State University and Colleges Auxiliary Organizations Managers' Meeting (January 16, 1974).


Gantt, Henry L. "A Bonus System for Rewarding Labor." Transactions of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (Sept. 1901).


Prator, Ralph. Private interview held at the office of the Chancellor, California State University and Colleges (December 10, 1973).


Vacarro, Louis C. "The Conflict of Authority in the University." College and University (Spring 1969).


Walker, Eric A. "Efficiency is a Dirty Word." College Management (Sept. 1971).


