COMPARISON OF METHODS BY WHICH UNIVERSITIES ARE MANAGED IN THIRD WORLD AND DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Behnaz, Mohajeran[1]† --- Saeedeh, Fahim[2]

[1]PhD on Educational Management, University of Urmia Iran

[2]PhD student of Higher Education Management, University of, Urmia Iran

ABSTRACT

In today's world, countries' progress and development are based on information and Science. Research and production of science and technology are the most important bases for economic, social, cultural, industrial and political growth and development. Change and growth, human development, progress and advancement of science and etc each have an important position and have their own domain that are ultimately driven with correct management (Nourshahi, 2011). In this manuscript after review of the topic's literature, University management in third world and developed countries is evaluated and discussed, compared side by side and finally strategies for improvement of management in Iran and third world countries are suggested. If there is any change or important action to be taken about higher education and research, one of the successful methods based on experience of large and number one universities in the world is delegation of election of university chancellor to the board of trustees. Research on this topic first requires consideration and serious thoughtfulness in the election of the members of the board of trustees themselves. These members should be selected from the most well known scientific, university, economic, social and cultural figures and the board should be considered the main place for legislation and selection of the University chancellor and director.

Keywords: University management, Third world countries, Developed countries.

Contribution/ Originality

This study is one of very few studies which have investigated the difference between third world and developed countries regarding university management. Election of university chancellor has been brought as an example and people involved and factors influential on the latter are discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

During the past 50 years, in countries across Europe, America and other developed nations, universities have gradually played an important and elemental role in human progress and development and as a result, industrial and economic advancement. Such that today's progressed world is thankful to universities and has no doubt in supporting, respecting and providing resources for them.

One of the factors resulting in universities being able to correctly play their key role is the management organization and methods of selection of board of trustees and chancellors and directors of the university and research institutes.

If there is to be change or important action taken in the field of higher education and research, one of the most important actions is reflection on the method of selecting their chancellors and following that, the directors of other scientific and research centers of the country (Malekzadeh, 2013). In the 21st century, science institutes and particularly universities have heavy responsibility to achieve goals and functions that society expects from them. They should be able to benefit from their maximum ability and capacity. The most important usable capacity of a university, which is in ways more important than others, is the capacity and ability for management and leadership.

On the one hand, university independence which roots from scientific freedom is dependent on the method and kind of university leadership and management. The university chancellor who is the individual with the highest administrative and scientific responsibility needs to play the role of a strong leader and manager for realization of the latter (Nourshahi, 2011).

The significance of the role of university directors in advancing the university's level of quality and progress is undoubtable and clear. As a result, the conditions and qualifications needed for the management of the university (particularly chancellorship) is a topic of consideration; here, the results of numerous researches done in this and other countries with this regard which are comparative studies is presented in a Tabular format and in summary. Each of these studies at the end has provided practical suggestions.

Table-1. Major studies on the topic of university management in third world and developed countries

Nourshahi (2011)		In this research, typology of experiences of the three countries of America, Canada and England in the use of criteria for election of university chancellor has been discussed and it has been compared with criteria extracted from theoretical background. Discovery of differences and similarities is the main goal of side by side studies which by evaluation of other educational systems can lead to correction and change of the goal system. Sample selected includes universities whose leaders are picked by election and the process of electing university chancellor has a relatively long record.
Modarress (2014)		In this manuscript, after evaluation of functions and goals of higher education in today's world, various management patterns in universities and particularly patterns of collaboration have been discussed. Next, by analysis of the current situation in higher education, *Continue*

		distancing from the collaborative pattern and its undesired side effects has been presented as the most important eventin higher education in the country and short term strategies for leaving this situation has been provided.
Chourchian (1999)		This research evaluated visions, challenges and new methods in university management and at the end moved from today's programs to planning using techniques and tactics of gradual change in the dimensions of cognition, outlook, individual behavior and group behavior with special attention to the change of structure, technology and behavior….
Pounder (2001)		He considers behavioral cohesion necessary and needed for bilateral trust between university chancellor and members of the scientific committee and administrative personnel and believes that the professors prefer that the university director have the qualification of being a defender, connector, motivator and encourager rather than have roles such as manager, observer, supervisor, evaluator and hirer. In his opinion, the members of the scientific committee have more persistence upon the university chancellor having leadership instead of managerial roles.
Rantz (2002)		He has considered ability to assert and establish organizational values and moral principles and playing the role of a moral director by making individuals concernedwith values and standards, creating pledge and loyalty in employees, valuing humans and in summary performing the role of balancer, connector, diplomat and manager of differences as other necessities of a university chancellor.

2. GOALS AND FUNCTIONS OF UNIVERSITIES

Although at first glance, university is a place for training society 'sspecialty forces in various fields; yet, by testimony of all knowledgable, this is not the only function of universities and other important goals are also foreseen for them. As a result, goals and functions of universities are discussed in brief:

2.1. Human Development

Although an image of a progressed individual has been proposed in schools of thought and various countries; yet, in all countries, one of the main functions of the university is helping humans transcend to higher levels. The first responsibility and role of higher education is leading individuals toward common goals, interests, purposes, values, skills and ideals that make it possible to willfully and voluntarily guide people and governments towards higher and bigger goals and that purpose is humanitarianism (Farhangi and Hosseini, 2008).

2.2. Cultivation of Free and Critical Thinking

This topic is also one of the missions of the university so that students do not feel obliged to follow previous opinions and more or less accept them. It is clear that movement in reasonable and based on theoretical grounds and avoidance of denunciation is the necessity for every scientific

activity; yet, presence of an unfree atmosphere where individuals are fearful of expressing their opinions on any matter due to difference with the present ideas is contradictory to the basis of a university. As a result, a university should be a place for expression and emergence of new ideas, difference of opinions, strengthening of more logical theories and natural waning (needs attention) of weaker thoughts. This place cannot form without cultivation of critical, analytic and free thinking (Shiri, 2011).

2.3. Cultivation of Specialty Forces in Various Fields
2.4.1. Provision of Scientific and Research Services to Society

Due to clarity of these goals, they were not explained further.

It is obvious that if this function isacceptable, university leadership will also be appropriate and facilitate reaching these goals.

3. LEADERSHIP MODELS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Overall, Five models or methods of leadership have been proposed or experienced in higher education which are: Collegiate model, Political decision making model, Beaurocratic model, Work creating model, Participative model (Farhangi and Hosseini, 2008). The first two models will not be discussed due to lesser usage in current times. Characteristics of the other three are discussed below.

3.1. Characteristics of the Beaurocratic Model

The important characteristics of this model of leadership are as follows:

-Presence of nationally comprehensive systems for higher education, strict governmental laws of employment, advancement, legal structures and educational programs.

-Acting out of personal preferences is very strong and there is not much place for expression of innovation.

This leadership model has the following problems as well (Bennis, 1966):

-It blocks growth of organization personnel.

-It does not consider unofficial organizations.

-It does not have enough means for solving disagreements between groups.

-It does not have the power to absorb new techniques.

-Cultivates noninnovative individuals.

-These organizations rely on enforcement of strong power from above to below and this threatens the basis of their existence. On the one hand, it has been emphasized that in this model, knowledgeable individuals and researchers quickly acquire an indifferent state in response to show of power; because, show of power is against their needs. In reality, scientists and researchers do not fit in the hierarchy and their scientific power, and society's need for their services leads to constant insistence on their independence (Farhangi and Hosseini, 2008).

3.2. Characteristics of the Work Creating Model

The most important characteristics of this method of leadership are as follows:

-They are work creating and self managerial.

-They provide educational, research and consulting services and acquire needed resources from their customers.

-They are competitive, are sensitive to costs and dependent on a system of response.

4. THE PARCIPATIVE MODEL IN HIGHER EDUCATION

4.1. Constituents of the Parcipitation Theory

Participative culture opposes limitative and compliant culture. In this culture, individuals are aware of the trends of activities and have view points. Additionally, they interfere with decision making in various ways (Khaniki, 2009).

We will omit the overall description of this culture. Use of such a culture as a model for leadership developed from the popular theory of Fiedler (Fiedler, 1967). Based on his theory, one of the main bases for the success of leaders is selection of the model and method of leadership and directing of the organization based on the development level of the personnel.

According to this theory, the degree of personnels' participation in an organization needs to be in accord with their developmental stage. It is obvious that with the presence of intelligent people in universities, their participation level in leadership should be at high levels. This issue is the reason for seriously suggesting the use of participative culture in universities as an appropriate model.

4.2. Comparison of the Method of University Leadership in Third World and Developed Countries

Based on studies performed in this country and abroad and what has been related to this study, it was tried to provide a comparison between university leadership in third world and developed countries which has been tabulated in summary in Table (2).

Table-2. Comparison of university leadership between third world and developed countries

Method of University Leadership in Third World Countries	Method of University Leadership in Developed Countries
Selection of university chancellor is dependent on interaction between political groups and connections with various parties and based on a party's coming to power and loss of power by another, the method of leadership in the university changes.	In progressed countries and reputable universities, selection of university chancellor is by the board of trustees.
University members' role in selection of chancellor is faded.	Members of the board of trustees in reputable universities partake the responsibility of the most important university affairs including choosing the chancellor, directors and overall university policies. These individuals are selected from the most important scientific, university, economic, social and cultural figures and university leader is selected without influence of the government and politicians and based on scientific and managerial experiences. As a result, universities are independent and have independent power of organization and do not allow governmental meddling in university decisions which is overlooked in third world countries.
Side by side with attending theoretical bases of general and higher educational leadership, attention	University leadership with the clear characteristic of understanding and accepting participation of
	Continue

is not given to the face to face university challenges.	professors and belief in cooperative culture and working together in the university is one of the major criteria for the selection of university chancellor.
The skill of solving differences and the ability to maintain participatory activities, cooperative structure and agreement in university criteria is faded.	The two dimensions of university directorship and executive management are clearly major dimensions forming university leadership.

4.3. Role of University Chancellors and Educational Leaders in University Directorship

Organized studies of higher education systems, as a specialty domain, show new roles and responsibilities for university directors in the 21st century complex and unattached society.

1. University chancellors need a preinteractive leadership to become familiar with four resources of power, balancing systems and methods of cohesion:

a. Legal power

b.Political power (of students)

c. Scientific power

d.Group power of directors

2. University leaders gradually find themselves having a smaller space for maneuvering.

3. The job of the university director or educational leader has increasingly become complex and difficult.

4. University directors need a cognitive structure and new ways for action so that they can disrupt dependent thinking for individuals who wish changes in universities.

5. Role of university directors in novelty bringing is generally accompanied with toleration of difficulties due to external changes.

6. University leaders face much more complex challenges compared to their own predecessors.

7. University leaders should remember that hope discipline means giving new abilities to the scientific committee and hope discipline for students means planting hope in their hearts and minds.

8. University leaders need to know that the secret to success is making students hopeful about learning and for this mission, respect for student personalities is considered a major precondition. Students need to be persuaded that as precious individuals in a world full of difficulties, they can be sources of effectiveness (Ghourchian, 2001).

4.4. Suggestions for Improving University Directorship

-Based on experience of large and number one universities in the world, one of the successful methods in action planning is delegation of selection of the university leader to the board of trustees of every university. To research this issue, first serious consideration and implementation needs to be done for the selection of the members of the board of trustees. Members of this committee need to be selected from the most well known scientific, university, economic, social and cultural figures and the board of trustees need to be assigned as the body for legislation and selection of university chancellor and directors. At the time of selecting university chancellor, the board of trustees can select a strong working group composed of at least two members of the board and evaluate the candidates and introduce the most important individuals to the committee so that after election of one of the individuals with appropriate criteria, the appointment of university

chancellor by the director of the board can realize. University chancellor is responsible to respond to the board of trustees. In the process of looking for and selecting the best chancellor for every university, the board can at the same time of acquiring opinions of professors, personnel and students, elect an individual with outstanding history and a practical plan for university progress.

- With independence of university directorship and a completely scientific, technical, social and nonpolitical vision of the universities and provision of the grounds for healthy scientific competition between universities, their role changes from its present configuration (a noncreative administrative organization) to a center producing science and technology. Governmental budgets will be provided for them in the form of help or research grant and they will exit the state of constant budgeting. With this action, universities will play important role in guiding government and society towards a lasting progress and remove them from the presently inactive configuration where they are directed by the government.

-Independence of universities: in the managerial patterns of centers of higher education such as universities and research institutes in the west and developed countries such as Japan, India, Turkey, Malaysia and others, rulers and governments essentially do not have a place in managing universities. It is not such that by the coming and going of the president of France or prime minister of England or India, university leaders in Paris, London or Bang lour will change. Or that by change in governments and after change in university chancellors, directors of colleges and other leading university appointees will change and it is natural that when university chancellors and other scientific leaders do not change with traversing of governments , the function of policies of those universities will also not change with this change (Ziba, 2013).

5. CONCLUSION

In focused university systems where the government determines all functions of higher education in policymaking, planning, management and action, practically the condition for advent of new thoughts and creativity in university directorship becomes limited. On the other hand, a university where all its dimensions are determined specifically by the government, the conditions for responsiveness will gradually wane. Another negative consequence of this approach is lack of growth and development of university directors and shortage of thoughtful and creative forces in the future. In other words, in a totally focused system where all financial resources, administrative trends, education programs, codes and rules are determined by the government, directors do not have roles other than performance of legislations and in general concepts such as planning, thoughtfulness, design, creativity, decision making and responsiveness is not going to have a clear place. Well known and clear principles such as scientific freedom, financial and administrative independence of universities are nesseccities for survival in novel higher education. Additionally, more attention to the independence of universities both in the dimension of scientific freedom and administrative and financial independence are cultivators of increased responsibility taking and responsiveness in university management and without the stability of the latter, practically discussion about responsiveness is futile; because, responsiveness has meaning only in relation to delegation of authorities. It is neseccary to also consider that discussion of scientific independence and freedom in universities is not equal to the loss of governmental role in them, but delegation of managerial authorities and planning to universities. In addition to creating an opportunity for

growth and development of today's leaders and training of tomorrow's leaders, it provides the possibility for governments to attend more important functions such as supporting the universities and supervision over appropriate university directorship and stabilization of response mechanisms. Selection of university scientific leaders with the agreement of the scientific committee has been emphasized as a basic necessity in the academic environment based on open questions from the members of the scientific committee. Additionally, attention to planning and strategic management in universities and stabilization of an auditing and responsive organized system can prevent many repetitive works due to political change. In addition to the increase in university independence in management of internal affairs, the grounds for growth of creativity and novelty bringing and use of various managerial patterns is provided; hereby, the ability to acquire experience in novel university management at the national level and looking more for better patterns in the future is provided.

REFERENCES

Bennis, W., 1966. Changing organization. McGraw-Hill.

Chourchian, N., 1999. Visions, challenges and new methods in university management. Science of Management, 12(47): 33-20.

Farhangi, A.A. and S. Hosseini, 2008. Leadership and management in universities. Science of Management Winter, 12(47).

Fiedler, F.E., 1967. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ghourchian, N., 2001. Visions, challenges and new methods in university management. Science of Management, 12(47): 33-20.

Khaniki, 2009. Culture of participation and suggestions for its advancement in universities. Journal of Reseach and Planning in Higher Education Fall, 14.

Malekzadeh, R., 2013. University management in Islamic republic of Iran. Sepid Weekly News, 2012. Issue Code: 2420.

Modarress, H.M., 2014. Analysis of national university and higher education organization management in recent years. Issue Code: 72994.

Nourshahi, N., 2011. Criteria for selection of university directors; comparison of experiences by some universities in America, Canada and England. Research and Planning of Higher Education Organization.

Pounder, J., 2001. New leadership and university organizational effectiveness: Exploring the relationship. Leadership and organization Development Journal, 22(6): 2001-2281.

Rantz, 2002 Leading urban institutions of higher education in the new millennium. Leadership and organization Development Journal, 23: 456-460.

Shiri, M., 2011. Discussion of factors leading to critical thinking in a reference college. Master's Degree Thesis. Emam Sadegh University.

Ziba, K.S., 2013. University management in Iran. Chehreh News. Issue Code: 6095.