

“Impact of Differences between Management and Leadership Skills on Effectiveness in Higher Education Institutions”

Mohammad Sadegh Bijandi¹⁺, Aminuddin bin Hassan², Tajularipin bin Sulaiman³,

Roselan bin Baki⁴

Departments of Foundations of Education & Language and Humanities Education, Faculty of Educational studies^{1, 2, 3, 4}, University Putra Malaysia, (UPM) Serdang, Malaysia

Abstract In higher education institutions (HEIs), various roles have to be performed, and each of them is likely to carry a certain prestige, the amount of which will depend on the importance of that role to the achievement of goals and on preconceived expectations of the role. we expect the role of president in university to be more important than of general manager and more prestige is accorded to the president and also the role of dean, deputy dean and head of department are more prestige than the other administrators in university. This literature review article is going to understand and address the differences between management and leadership in HEIs. The findings of different studies have shown that management skills are used to plan, build, and direct organizational systems to accomplish missions and goals while leadership skills guide teams to focus on the game plan leaders inspire the team players to use the management tools to accomplish the mission, goals, and objectives.

Keywords: Higher Education Institutions, Management, Leadership, Effectiveness, Roles and Skills

1. Introduction

Over the past decades, HEIs have been increasingly held accountable for measurable outcomes. Increases in competition for scarce resources and a decrease in the public's trust in higher education practices have resulted in demands for campuses to demonstrate their productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency. The evaluation of administrators- leadership and management- may well provide needed and appropriate information about institutional effectiveness, but it may also constitute a high stakes evaluation process for individuals. As a matter of fact, we know fairly little about university leadership and knowledge of the ways in which university leaders develop and sustain conditions and processes. Only a generally acknowledged statement “where we find good universities, we will find good leaders” (see; [1];[2]) were emphasized by some scholars. However, other authors such as [3]; and [4] based on their studies claimed that it has been difficult to construct a description of university leadership, which goes beyond common heuristics of grounded in everyday practice. In this article some of related studies were tried to review for finding the differences between management and leadership skills in HEIs and at the end it tried to address the effectively relationship of these variation with groups and individuals to productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency of HEIs.

2. Literature review

In 1937 [5] modified Fayol's administrator roles list. They identified that an administrator for being able to do his tasks as well as performance, he or she should be familiar with his/her roles and know what successful implementation skills for each role is necessary. They reported the roles as planning, organizing,

⁺ Corresponding author. Tel.: + 60173106730; fax: +603 89468187
E-mail address: bijandi110@gmail.com

staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. Here, these roles from the perspective of higher education were explained a little bit more:

- Planning- it is about determining what needs to be done and the methods for accomplishing the goals of the HEI.
- Organizing- it means the establishment of the formal structure of authority through which tasks are arranged, defined, and coordinated in HEI.
- Staffing- it is related to the personnel function of bringing in and training the staff and maintaining a favourable HEI environment.
- Directing- it is about the continuous task of making decisions, issuing specific and general orders and instructions, and supervising the HEI performance.
- Coordinating - it means the duty of inter relating the various parts of the HEI and making sure that necessary resources are available.
- Reporting- it is about keeping both supervisors and subordinates informed about what is going on. This includes keeping adequate records in HEI.
- Budgeting: it is about the tasks related to fiscal planning, accounting, and control in HEI.

Based on the previous searches and evidences, it can be claimed that as we advance deeper in the university management, the basic assumptions underlining much of what is taught and practiced in the name of management are hopelessly out of date. Most of our assumptions about university, leader, technology and organization are at least 60 to 70 years old. While we are in a new situation, but our managerial and governance systems are stuck in former situation. Thus, it is time for a completely new model. On this point, according to situational leadership theory, leaders need to modify the way they interact with their followers. In the present article, the researchers focused on leader's behaviour that were represented in two dimensions as follow:

- A combination of how much task-oriented interaction, and
- How much group orientated interaction they exhibit?

Some researchers such as [6] and [7] based on the previous studies and their findings stated that managers need to take responsibility for the performance of others and for taking this responsibility, they suggested that managers for being good developers of their staffs should have the following characteristics:

- Draw out the strengths and weaknesses of their staff rather than suppressing them;
- Reward their people both materially and psychologically for the risks that they take in attempting to develop themselves;
- Positively seek to identify learning opportunities for staff;
- Give personal time to the development of staff - for example in reviewing and analysing activity associated with learning;
- Involve their subordinates in some of their own tasks and do not simply delegate tasks that they do not wish to do themselves;
- Share some of their problems and anxieties with their staff as one way of enhancing staff development;
- Listen rather than talk;
- Do not seek to shape individuals as replicas of themselves;
- Take risks on the desired results of their departments in pursuit of relevant learning opportunities for their people.

On this regards, some researchers for example [8] and [9] in their studies also followed Mumford's suggestions and based on their findings stated that in order to exhibit these characteristics, managers need to develop appropriate adult-to-adult relationships, and the language and behaviour that is used in these relationships. Individual learning, then, to a significant extent rests on the relationships that managers collectively within an organization have with their staff. Some scholars such as [10]; [11]; [12]; and [13] in order to exhibit these characteristics also claim that higher education institutions need to reflect on the relationships that managers of both academic and non-academic staff form with their staff. In general, they reported that attention needs to be given to appropriate management development. They also based on [14] and [15] identified and presented five key environmental variables for HEIs leaders as follow:

- Environmental assessment,
- Leading change,
- Viewing human resources as assets
- Liabilities and
- Achieving coherence

According to the above points, they claimed that successful management of all of these variables can be viewed as adopting a problem-solving approach in that good quality data, good analysis and open discussion are central to this approach. Further to these statements, they demonstrated that one of the challenges in developing a general definition of leadership in HEIs is that it must serve for leadership in a variety of different environments and roles in a HEI. Therefore, in academic institutions, leadership should be exhibited at different levels in the managerial hierarchy. Finally, they listed some of the typical roles and the areas within a higher educational institution in which leadership might be exhibited as follow:

- **Module leadership:** it is concerned with designing the learning outcomes of a module and ensuring that students achieve those learning outcomes. This module says that leaders in HEIs should focus on involves planning, co-ordinating small teams, and designing teaching and learning and assessment strategies.
- **Course leadership:** it means operational management, concerned with ensuring that courses are delivered successfully on a day-to-day basis, and team and leadership and motivation and resource management necessary to facilitate this process.
- **Research project leadership:** it refers to academic leadership for identification of appropriate projects and in the framing of research questions, selection of research methodologies and appropriate directions for achieving valuable contributions to knowledge. On this point, operational management, concerned with ensuring that specific stages in a research project are satisfactorily completed in accordance with a pre-agreed timetable.
- **Head of department:** Focus on tactical management, concerned with the creation of a vision concerning excellence in relation to specific subject areas, and the allocation of resources to pursue each of these individual agendas. Facilitation and interfacing with institutional systems.
- **Senior management, including vice chancellor, deans, directorate and pro-vice chancellors:** concerned with strategic leadership, involving the creation and taking forward of visions concerning the future market position and reputation of the institution. It means that creation of culture, systems and values can facilitate progresses towards the vision.

Further to the above discussions, some other studies on the roles and characteristics of individuals such as [16]; [17]; and [18] which have been conducted based on [19] identified and reported some effective academic leaders roles. According to these studies, effective leaders in HEIs can be identified by five areas of expertise:

- As cultural representatives of their colleges and universities;
- As communicators they are continually striving for more efficient and more inclusive communication structures, networks and processes;
- As skilled managers;
- As planners/analysts; and
- As advocates of the institution and cultivate relationships with various groups and individuals on campus.

On this point, scholars like [20]; [21]; [22]; [23]; and [24] not only have posited new ideas that challenge traditional notions that organizations are driven by leadership but also they noted that the quality of leadership significantly affects organizational performance consequently. They also demonstrated that this faith in the power and wisdom of leadership and its potential to make a difference in colleges and universities underlies much of the literature of higher education and is particularly ubiquitous in contemporary and highly popular works on leadership.

3. Conclusion

Based on the above mentioned studies and according to [25]; [26]; [27];and [28] findings it can be claimed that official campus leaders- presidents and other academic officers- need to direct and guide their campuses if the problems of higher education are to be confronted and resolved. Therefore, the authors in the current article according to the literature supposed that the university leaders are effectively related with groups and individuals while maintaining a clear vision for the university program by:

- Fostering a spiritual climate;
- Creating a culture for learning;
- Researching and implementing effective instructional strategies;

Also the university leaders are effectively related by developing a personal professional growth plan, which includes activities such as:

- Membership in professional organizations;
- Attendance at relevant workshops;
- Professional reading;
- Assisting staff in professional development;
- Supporting staff in innovative practices;
- Maintaining appropriate certification;
- Promoting the university to its various constituencies; and
- Managing the variety of university functions

4. References

- [1] Dinham, S., *Principal leadership for outstanding educational outcomes*. Journal of Educational Administration, 2005. **43**(4): p. 338-356.
- [2] Nahavandi, A., *The art and science of leadership*. 2009: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [3] Montez, J.M., M. Wolverton, and W.H. Gmelch, *The Roles and Challenges of Deans*. Review of Higher Education, 2003. **26**(2): p. 241-66.
- [4] Jackson, N. and H. Lund, *Benchmarking for Higher Education*. 2000: Taylor & Francis, Inc., 7625 Empire Dr., Florence, KY 41042 (\$42.95). Tel: 800-634-7064 (Toll Free).
- [5] Gulick, L.H., et al., *Papers on the Science of Administration*. Vol. 4. 1937: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University New York.
- [6] Mumford, A., *Making experience pay*. 1980.
- [7] Stenmark, C.K. and M.D. Mumford, *Situational impacts on leader ethical decision-making*. The Leadership Quarterly, 2011.
- [8] O'toole, D.M., M.A. Spinelli, and J.N. Wetzel, *The important learning dimensions in the school of business: A survey of students and faculty*. The Journal of Education for Business, 2000. **75**(6): p. 338-342.
- [9] Heikkila, A. and K. Lonka, *Studying in higher education: students' approaches to learning, self-regulation, and cognitive strategies*. Studies In Higher Education-Oxford-, 2006. **31**(1): p. 99.
- [10] Saif, A., *Learning dimensions influencing undergraduate students' learning and academic achievement: students and professors perspectives*. Sana'a University Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, 2008. **5**(2).
- [11] Shulman, L.S., *Making differences a table of learning*. Change-New Rochelle Then Washington DC-, 2002. **34**(6): p. 36-45.
- [12] Carini, R.M., G.D. Kuh, and S.P. Klein, *Student Engagement and Student Learning: Testing the Linkages**. Research in Higher Education, 2006. **47**(1): p. 1-32.
- [13] Guerrero-Cano, M., D. Kirby, and D. Urbano. *A literature review on entrepreneurial universities: An institutional approach*. 2006.
- [14] Rowley, J., *Creating a learning organisation in higher education*. Industrial and commercial training, 1998. **30**(1): p. 16-19.
- [15] Bamford, D.R. and P.L. Forrester, *Managing planned and emergent change within an operations management environment*. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 2003. **23**(5): p. 546-564.

- [16] Milburn, P.C., *The role of programme directors as academic leaders*. Active learning in higher education, 2010. **11**(2): p. 87.
- [17] Jones, J.A., *The Role of Leadership Substitutes Theory in Adjunct Professor Preferences for Academic Leaders: A Qualitative Examination*. Journal Of Academic Administration In Higher Education, 2011: p. 25.
- [18] Bruns, K., et al., *Scholarship: The key to creating change through outreach*. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 2011. **8**(1): p. 3-11.
- [19] Martin, J.L., *Academic Deans: An Analysis of Effective Academic Leadership at Research Universities*. 1993.
- [20] Smith, Z.A. and M. Wolverton, *Higher education leadership competencies: quantitatively refining a qualitative model*. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 2010. **17**(1): p. 61.
- [21] Middlehurst, R., H. Goreham, and S. Woodfield, *Why research leadership in higher education? Exploring contributions from the UK's leadership foundation for higher education*. Leadership, 2009. **5**(3): p. 311.
- [22] Kantabutra, S., *Vision effects: a critical gap in educational leadership research*. International Journal of Educational Management, 2010. **24**(5): p. 376-390.
- [23] Kantabutra, S. and J. Tang, *Efficiency Analysis of Public Universities in Thailand*. Tertiary Education and Management, 2010. **16**(1): p. 19.
- [24] Kantabutra, S. and G.C. Avery, *The power of vision: statements that resonate*. Journal of Business Strategy, 2010. **31**(1): p. 37-45.
- [25] Bensimon, E.M., *Viewing the presidency: Perceptual congruence between presidents and leaders on their campuses*. The Leadership Quarterly, 1990. **1**(2): p. 71-90.
- [26] Heck, R.H., L.K. Johnsrud, and V.J. Rosser, *Administrative effectiveness in higher education: Improving assessment procedures*. Research in Higher Education, 2000. **41**(6): p. 663-684.
- [27] Bryman, A., *Qualitative research on leadership: A critical but appreciative review*. The Leadership Quarterly, 2004. **15**(6): p. 729-769.
- [28] Smith, B.L. and A.W. Hughey, *Leadership in higher education its evolution and potential: A unique role facing critical challenges*. Industry and Higher Education, 2006. **20**(3): p. 157-163.