LITERATURE REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF

GOVERNANCE THEORY

GLADYS L. IRIZARRY
Universidad de Puerto Rico
Ponce

According to Birnhaum, the size and complexity of universities in the United States seems to dictate that they have become large bureaucracies--rights of control over the totality of the academic functions and budget and finance. Schools and departments show a low regard for university goals and a high concern for disciplinary and professional values.

Since the 1970's, the movement toward decentralization of control over educational and administrative functions has begun to come up against external demands for more forceful central authority to the end not only of "law and order" but of a "more efficient use of resources."[1]

From 1945 to 1970 there was growth and prosperity. During the 1960's enrollment in postsecondary education increased, and many community colleges were founded.

Birnhaum states that shared authority is not the dominant pattern of governance in most institutions. This practice should be built on shared values that can give rise to consensus. Those concerned with colleges and university governance should look for ways to enhance joint involvement through collective bargaining or traditional structures as senates and committees.

Here in Puerto Rico higher education institutions are not unionized. I believe joint involvement may be accomplished through the Senate. The Senate is constituted by five faculty members elected by each unit and their deans and director. It also has a student representing the student government. The Senate is the voice of faculty and students. I think we have participation in

the decision making of our college, and that we can be heard without being organized into a union. Professional associations are also means to help a cause without bilateral negotiation.

Birnhaum also states that the sharing of formàl authority, the scope and form of internal participation in governance, and the vertical distribution of authority should be characterized by full and open consultation and joint effort built on a high degree of trust.

Sometimes the Institutions adopt the principles of consultation among faculty members, administrators, and students, but only a minority of faculty members are concerned about the reports and memoranda related to decision making. They are too busy with their teaching or research.

According to Sprunger and Bergquist, the governance process is organized around six functions of administration: planning, organizing, staffing, leading, evaluating, and developing. A change in one function causes changes in others; neglect in one area weakens the entire system.

Due to the responsibilities and the continually changing conditions of the college, the administrator must be concerned about his professional development. Interpersonal skills should be developed in order to serve institutional objectives. He is always related with people with different attitudes.

The administrator can be more effective if he can retain authority and responsibility for making decisions or delegate to those who have information needed to make sound decisions. He must have access to a close group of advisors, yet must share with campus groups both their decisions and the processes whereby the decisions are made.[2]

Pfeffer states that the problems of organizational design are concerned with control and not merely with the best way to produce more output. The

important question is who controls, and what is the scope and operation of the control.

There are two prominent perspectives on organizations. One sees organizations as having goals, and the problem of management—to recruit, train, control, and motivate organizational participants so as to achieve the organization's goals.

The second view of organizations sees them as coalitions, composed of varying groups and individuals with different goals. This view implies there will be conflict over objectives, rather than consensus due to the differences in background, varying socialization, training, and information. If there is no agreement over objectives and technology, rationality may not be achieved; therefore, control is critical in detemining efficient organizational action.

The formal structure specifies who reports to whom and who has the authority to evaluate another person.

Pfeffer believes that power and control accrue to those positions with the most discretionary control over critical and scarce resources. One special resource is information and access to and control of channels of communication.

It is important to remember that structure is nothing more than relationships among positions or roles in an organization, and since relationships change, structures change also.[3] It is hypothesized that structures would be developed so as to minimize the costs of coordination and communication.

According to Pfeffer, organization design is the process of grouping activities, roles, or positions in the organization to coordinate effectively the interdependences that exist. Patterns of behavior are maintained by rules and procedures formally written down, or by informally but strongly held norms about behavior.

Birnbaum writes that colleges and universities are not standard bureaucracies, but can best be described as "organized anarchies." He suggests that the leader's image should be that of the academic statesman, and that management should be considered a process of strategic decision making.

It is said that the garbage can process does not do a particularly good job of solving problems but enables choices to be made and sometimes allows problems to be resolved.

McGrath believes students should be given a formal role in academic government based on the political proposition that in free societies all those affected by a social policy have an inalienable right to a voice in its formulation. I believe there should be student involvement to solve some of the current problems in adjusting higher education to the social conditions of life today. They should have voice in the establishment of the purposes and in the shaping of the policies and practices of colleges and universities since they are consumers.

Helsabeck states that a highly participatory unit is one in which a large proportion of the unit has an effect on collective decisions made by the group. This unit is referred to as "democratic." The opposite situation is called "oligarchic." The limits of this variable are one-man rule (monarchy) and everyman rule (mass democracy).[4]

The Ponce Technological University College is a compound system where there is variations in decision-making arrangements.

The system-level authority and resource allocation decisions are corporate, monarchic, but the unit-level authority and resource allocation are federated, oligarchic.

The system-level resource acquisition decisions are moderately federated and oligarchic, but the unit-level resource acquisition decisions are federated, democratic.

The decisions of production at the system level are corporate and mass democratic; at the unit level, they are federated and mass democratic.

There is not a specific formula as to who should govern colleges and universities. Different people claim the right to share in governing: those most affected by campus activities, those who are most competent, those whose cooperation is essential, and those whose resources sustain the institution.

The very existence of diverse grounds for authority with different applicability to different groups present a difficulty in deciding who should govern.

Faculty have the kinds and degree of qualifications essential to the task of the colleges and universities. The largest element of continuity and experience with the tasks and problems of the campus is that of the faculty.[5] Because of their tasks and competences, the faculty's cooperation is essential if the work of the campus is to be done.

There are also difficulties and disadvantages to faculty participation in campus governance. The use of faculty time to govern withdraws that time and talent from the tasks for which the faculty were employed and in which they are most expert. Also, a party at interest in a decision may press his interest improperly.

According to Springer and Bergquist, formal authority is conferred from above, but the acceptance of that authority (power) is granted from below.

There are different forms of power, but I believe a wise administrator should use reward power, the one which stresses benefits such as praise, delegation of responsiblities, recognition, salary increases, promotion, tenure, sabbaticals, research assignments, and reduced teachings loads. The subordinates feel they are competent and capable of doing something of value. They are motivated, satisfied, and thus willing to participate.

An administrator must delegate if he wants to have things done. He must be willing to let others make decisions, vest the subordinates with enough authority to carry out their assignments successfully, consider the person's abilities to perform, maintain open lines of communication, and establish proper controls to reward effective delegation and effective assumption of authority.

A professional at the head of the authority structure may over emphasize the major goal activity and neglect the organizational needs. He may lack skill in human relations, which in my opinion, is essential to effective management.

Birnbaum states that specialization characterizes the modern campus. We have moved from the transmission of knowledge to innovation in knowledge. The modern professor is a professional and thus seeks a high degree of autonomy. Interaction is down. In other words, the campus tends toward composite structure, toward a multiplicity of sub-cultures, toward intensive professionalism, and toward bureaucratic coordination.

Since expertise is a dominant characteristic of the campus, the faculty moves toward decentralized structure, and authority moves toward clusters of experts and the individual expert. Thus, professional authority tends to become the dominant form of authority.

Pfeffer agrees that one of the characteristics of modern organization is the division of labor into specialized roles. When the total task is broken into smaller components, each component becomes interdependent with one another. Since people hired differ from each other in background, education, and experience, the problems of coordination and control grow.

With the division of labor, people become very skilled and proficient, thus increasing their productivity. With specialization the factor of

motivation is not taken into consideration. The primary concern is production. People do not feel they are doing something of value, that they are competent, and that the work they are realizing is interesting and challenging. In order to feel satisfaction. you need recognition, which motivates you to give the maximum.

From the point of view of power and control in organizations, specialization can make replacement easier, can lead to decrease in power due to routinization, and at the same time may increase power of a given position if there are few people in the organization who are familiar with a given role.

Vertical differentiation may provide increased orderliness and review organizational processes, but more levels between the top and bottom of the organization may cause so much distortion of information that control may be lost rather than enhanced. Horizontal differentiation may also lead to different outcomes.

Control can be maintained by personal supervision and by formal rules. Since rules, once established serve as precedents and guides to behavior, they serve to handle situations in which conflict might otherwise arise. Rules confer legitimacy on actions that might otherwise be questioned. Rules reflect the compromises made by organizational participants to resolve disagreements and disputes.

Centralization is another way of resolving disputes and ensuring coordination. Recruitment and socialization can also help to achieve control.

Since the concept of organizational effectiveness differs with different constituencies, different levels of analysis, different aspects of the organizations, and different researh or evaluation purposes, effectiveness not only possesses multiple dimensions, but it is a construct composed of multiple domains which are therefore operationalized in different ways. Effectiveness in one domain not necessarily relate to the effectiveness in another domain.[6]

No single profile is necessarily better than any other, since strategic constituencies, environmental domains, and contextual factors help determine what combination is most appropriate for the institution.

The role of the leader of an organization is to manage the interdependence of the subunits so as to enhance the group's position.

Springer and Bergquist believe that those doing the more important functions and coping with the most critical contingencies come to have the more influence and come to be identified as leaders. Leadership is related to the use of rules, procedures, strategic resources, and crisis in obtaining increased power and influence.

The essence of academic leadership is the ability to mold the priorities of goals of the institution to those of faculty and staff.[7]

There are different kinds of leaders. The participative leadership is the style best suited to colleges. Subordinates are consulted and helped to perform the duties.

Many institutions have undertaken three major levels of planning:

.   the budgeting and scheduling process

.   the short-range planning

.   the long-range planning

This type of planning utilizes both quantitative and qualitative assessments of the external environments to determine institutional priorities and strategies.

Strategic planning is defined as the process of developing and maintaining a strategic fit between the organization and its changing marketing opportunities.[8]

A college or university may improve itself by carrying out a careful analysis of its environment and revising its major resources as providing a key to what it can accomplish. This analysis allows the organization to

formulate new and appropriate goals. After the goal formulation comes the strategy development. This will indicate certain changes that the institution must make in the organization design if it is to implement the strategy. Finally, attention is turned to improving the orgnaization's system of information, planning, and control to permit carrying out the strategy effectively.

The strategic planning process is a sequential one where the goals go from the top down, but the detailed plans come from the bottom up. The faculty senate or other faculty representatives play an important role in the planning endeavors of most colleges and universities.

According to Cohen and March, there is ambiguity of purpose in the statements of the goals of a university. Goals are not clear, are problematic, and are not accepted. The level of specificity that permits measurement destroys acceptance. This is true but with an analysis of the environment (Kotler and Murphy), a picture of the most significant environmental developments can be produced, and the organization may formulate its future goals, strategies, structures, and systems.
The ambiguity of power leads to a parallel ambiguity of responsibility.

The allocation of credit to claim for the events of organizational life becomes a matter of argument. It has been already stated that having the control of resources gives one power. If an analysis of the resources is undertaken, the major resources are identified and the organization can pursue goals, opportunities and strategies that are congruent with its strengths, and avoid those where its resources are too weak.

The presidents attempt to learn from their experiences. They observe the consequences of actions and infer the structure of the world from those observations. They use the resulting inferences in attempts to improve their future actions.

If the attempt to modify current managerial practices or innovate for effective professional or personal development are taken into consideration, barriers would be confronted. The unit must provide resources for systematic organizational development which include process consultation, team building, intergroup activities, feedback, and structural-technical consultation.

People do not accept abrupt changes. They have to be prepared for the changes since changes bring tension, conflict, or competition. They have to be trained in relation to the new tasks, the needed skills to accomplish those tasks, and the relationship between the team members. These changes must be accompanied by appropriate structural modifications if changes are to be meaningful.

According to Pfeffer, change is resisted by those currently in control. Conflict over reorganization is bounded by the interdependence of the parties, and this interdependence is reaffirmed by the imposition of rules of conduct limiting the actions allowed and the changes permitted.

Higher education is more accessible than ever before. Colleges and universities encounter the pressures of variable student enrollment, shifting job opportunities for college graduates, greater consumer concern, limited financial resources, all accompanied by increased costs.

The Education Commission of the States recommended that planning should begin as soon as possible, that reassessment of goals and objectives must be developed, that there should be broader involvement in the change of institutional missions, that comprehensive planning shows long- and short-range planning, that planning should consider the special needs of all students, and that planning for special groups should be developed.[9]

The function of colleges and universities is to provide intellectual services. Higher education is more accessible than ever before. The rate of

social change is too rapid. The growing numbers of people, the complexity of
society, the continuing growth of knowledge and technological achievement give
the intellectual functions a rising importance. The well-being of society and
the quality of higher education depend upon an improved performance of those
intellectual functions. This achievement can be possible if governance is
shared by faculty, students, administrators, and representatives from the
community.

NOTES

1.   Robert Birnhaum, <u>ASHE Reader in Organization and Governance in Higher Education</u>, (Lexington, Massachusetts: Custom Publishing, 1983), p. 139.

2.   Benjamin E. Sprunger and William H. Bergquist, <u>Handbook for Colleges Administration</u>, (Washington, D. C.:   Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1978), p. 11.

3.   Jeffrey Pfeffer, <u>Organizational Design</u>, (Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Dawson, Inc., 1978), p. 24.

4.   Robert E. Helsabeck, <u>The Compound System</u>, (Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1973), p.   2.

5.   Morris Keeton, <u>Shared Authority in Campus</u>, (Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971), p.11.

6.   Birnbaum, <u>op. cit.,</u> p. 115.

7.   Springer and Berquist, <u>op. cit.,</u> p. 206.

8.   <u>Ibid.,</u> p. 396.

9.   Birnbaum, <u>op. cit.,</u> p. 311.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.

Baldridge, J. Victor. Academic Governance. Berkelyey: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.

Baldridge, J. Victor et al. Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Birnbaum, Robert. ASHE Reader in Organization and Governance in Higer Education. Lexington, Massachucetts: Custom Publishing, 1983.

Blau, Peter and Meyer, M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society, 2nd Edition. New York: Random House, 1971.

Cohen, Michael D., March, James G. Leadership and Ambiguity. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1974.

Epstein, Leon D. Governing the University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jewrsey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964.

Getzels, Jacob, Lipham, James M., and Campbell, Ronald F. Educational Administration as a Social Process: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968.

Helsabeck, Robert E. The Compound System. Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1973.

Hoy. Wayne and Miskell, Cecil. Educational Administration: Theory, Ressearch, and Practice. New York: Random House, 1978.

Keeton, Morris. Shared Authority on Campus. Washington D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.

Mason, Henry L. College and University Government. New Orleans: Tulane Studies in Political Science, Volume XIV, 1972;

Mortimer, Kenneth P., McConnell T. R. Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. Organizational Design. Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Dawdson, Inc., 1978.

Sprunger, Benjamin E., Bergquist, William H. Handbook for College Administration. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1978.