University Rectors' Administrative Skills

Research Article

Aydin BALYER[1]

[1] *Yildiz Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Management, Istanbul, Turkey*, ORCID: 0000-0003-1784-2522

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	The main goal of this study was to determine university rectors' administrative skills according to academic unit administrators' views. Qualitative phenomenological research design was employed in this study. The data were collected with an interview method and to that end 20 administrators were interviewed. They were chosen with maximum sampling method. The data were analyzed with content analysis technique. Results revealed that although most university rectors of this sample have poor administrative skills and frequently use autocratic management style. They do not run academic councils effectively, create a positive organizational culture, and are unable to transform their university into a third generation higher education institution. It is recommended that while appointing rectors, their administrative experiences, qualifications and qualities should be evaluated as well as formal requirements.

Introduction

As pioneer organizations, higher education institutions (HEIs) play vital roles in the development of a country both economically and socially all over the world. For this reason, there is an increasing pressure on functions of these institutions coming from business, social environments, scholars, schools, parents and policy makers. In this era, the function of universities as institutions devoted essentially to teaching and research may be weakened by the struggle to be entrepreneurial and market-relevant (Altbach, 2008). This creates a pressure on HEIs and this pressure forces them to make a transformation in their speed and mode of service delivery, which has been characterized with the term of efficiency.

Efficiency became a central policy concern as governments sought to satisfy the increased demand for higher education with the same or less level of funding (Kupriyanova, Estermann & Sabic, 2018). The term efficiency is defined as the level of performance that describes using the least amount of input to achieve the

highest amount of output. It is also put as the ability to produce better educational results with given limited budget (Agasisti, 2017; Johnes & Tone, 2016; Sadlak, 1978; Sporn, 2003). In order to meet increasing expectations rising from both the society in which they operate and business stakeholders they work with, HEIs should function effectively and the effectiveness of HEIs can be possible only with under competent administrators. At this point, administrative roles of rectors at HEIs become more important than ever. However, it is a question of matter whether university rectors have required administrative skills to move the university forward. For this reason, it is significant to research if university rectors have administrative skills to transform HEIs into third generation higher education institutions. Taking all of these into consideration, increasing expectations and pressures strongly push these institutions to establish a more effective administrative system to provide expected results (Altbach, 2011; Hénard & Mitterle, 2010).

Higher Education Administration

Higher education administration involves managing a group of facilities ranging from scientific, technological, social contexts inside to business and social partners outside the institution. Bell, Warwick and Galbraith (2012) underline that HEIs are currently functioning with a change pressure and climate of uncertainty. In this context, higher education administrators are facing differing and increasing administrative problems. As a result of it, HEIs require a professional administration system which can be provided with only administrators having required administrative skills.

The literature on higher education administration points out that when HEIs behave strategically, the role of management is pivotal in developing their results (Shattock 2000; 2010) and McDade (1987) claims that university administrators, especially rectors are responsible for it. Birnbaum (2001) underlines higher education does not need more management techniques, it needs better managers. This makes higher education leadership become more important than ever.

Leadership in Higher Education

In HEIs, university rectors carry out top leadership roles. In these institutions, there is a tradition of choosing rectors among full-time professors in all over the world. When the Turkish higher education management system is concerned, rectors used to be selected by academic staff, and then appointed by the president till 2018 (Teker, Teker & Sayan, 2013; YÖK, 2015). With the latest regulation released in 2018, the president can appoint rectors among professors directly from inside or outside the university at public universities (Resmi Gazete, 2018). In foundation universities, the decision is solely made by the board of trustees, and the president finally approves it (Teker, Teker & Sayan, 2013). Currently, in the Turkish higher education management system, rectors have a broad authority ranging from appointment of university directors, professors and other teaching staff to distribution of faculty members and other staff among faculties, teaching and learning consumables within a faculty and acceptance of a research project (Ataünal 1993: 72; Doğramacı 2007; Gürüz 2001; Hatipoğlu, 2000: 196-197; Gök, 1998:76; Ortaş, 2006; Tekeli 2003). As they manage a huge system, they are expected to have an ability to set a vision, translate the mission with their inspiring behaviors and personal traits, and manage all academic and other administrative processes successfully. All this work requires administrative qualifications and qualities and administrative experience.

Rectors' Administrative Qualifications and Qualities

As top leaders at universities, firstly, they are supposed to be innovative in order to follow the newest developments closely. The world has been changing, and they should be able to innovate their institutions according to the changing conditions. Secondly, they should have an intellectual background and scientific point of view to coordinate and manage senatorial members, deans, and other managers to realize academic and societal goals. Thirdly, they should be the strongest motive for the academic and administrative staff to move the university forward with their democratic, fair, tolerant, flexible and transparent behaviors. When

rector is highly motivated at university, it may stimulate the staff accordingly. Finally, they should also possess scientific competence and vision to develop university both at national and international level (Morgan, 2006) because in today's global world of work and even at national level, universities are ranked with their scientific achievements and efforts.

As the position of rectors is about leadership, they are expected to be a full professor especially coming from inside. Although, provisions regarding rectors' required qualifications are often defined by the law in the Turkish higher education management system, in some cases this may be ignored from time to time. Rector candidates may be successful academicians in their own fields, but administering a university requires a broad work scope ranging from managing academic and administrative staff to establishing relationships with business sector. Hence, while rectors are appointed, their personal qualities, administrative qualifications, communication skills, and administrative experience may not be primary criteria. While these are ignored, this may end up with failing establishing a collaborative working condition at their institutions. Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to determine rectors' administrative skills according to educational unit administrators' views. The findings obtained from this research may shed some light on the way of rector selection process, and also help policymakers improve the Turkish higher education management system. In this regard, through this study answers of the following questions were researched:

1. What are the participants' views about their rector's administrative skills in general?

2. What are the participants' views about their rectors' administrative styles?

3. What are the participants' views about their rectors' efforts to develop a positive organizational culture at their universities?

4. What are the participants' views about their rectors' efforts to transform their universities into a third generation higher education institution?

Method

This study was carried out with a phenomenological research design. These kinds of researches can help obtain detailed knowledge on any topic which is being researched (Creswell 2012; Denzin & Lincoln 2011; Marshall & Rossman 2006). These types studies can also be used for describing, analyzing, and interpreting a culture-sharing group's common behavior patterns, beliefs and language which develop over time among educational unit administrators at higher education institutions.

Study Group

The study group of this research was composed of 20 academic unit administrators. The participant administrators were from 17 different universities in Turkey in 2018-2019 academic year. Maximum variation method was implemented in order to specify the participant administrators. By using this method, it was aimed to provide equal or close balance among participants. By implementing this method, it was aimed to provide maximum presentation of the participants (Bailey, 1994). For this purpose, equal or approximate academic titles, heads of departments, age groups and experience is provided. The administrators' demographic variables are as followed:

Table 1. The administrators' demographics

Gender		Age		Position		Management Experience (Year)	
Male	10	25-30	1	Vice Dean	5	1-5	6
Female	10	31-35	3	Head of Dept.	6	6-10	4
		36-40	2	Head of Prog.	5	11-15	4
		41-45	5	Director	4	16-20	2
		46-50	6			21-25	1
		51 and over	3				
						26 +	3
Total	20		20		20		20

As shown in Table 1, 5 participants were professors, 9 associate professors, and 6 assistant professors. Regarding age, 1 participant out of 20 was below 30 years old, 11 were between 31-45 and 8 were between 46-55. When their posts are concerned, 5 were vice deans, 6 were head of department, 4 were director of school/institute and 5 were head of program. As far as management experience is concerned, the participants' management experience is between 2 and 13 years.

Data Collection and Analysis

In this study, the data were obtained with a semi-structured interview technique. By employing such a technique, the respondents explain their ideas frankly about some certain topics (Bailey 1994; Kerkhof 2006). For gathering the data, in the first place, the respondents were e-mailed to ask if they would like to join in this research process or not. In this manner, twenty academic unit administrators agreed to join the study voluntarily. The volunteer administrators were confirmed just after they were warranted safety of the data to be gathered from them. The participants were assured that their identification would be kept safe and would not be given anybody else. They were also promised that their names and their institution names would be kept in secret. After that, the interview days, time and place were determined. On that day, the participants were called on. After taking their allowance, the interviews were recorded. Each interview lasted nearly 40-50 mins.

After completing the interview, the data analysis process was commenced. The gathered data were analyzed with content analysis technique. This technique generally aims to analyze similar data on a particular subject and have comments on it (Mayring 2000). During this analysis process, first of all, the raw data were organized. That means that each interview record was reanalyzed several times by listening to recorded audiotape in order to provide the rightness of the data. Bogdan and Biklen (2007), describe it as improvement of coding categories, mechanical sorting of the data, and analysis of the data within each category. In this process, every participant's interview was coded separately in accordance with their opinions. At the same time, new emerging and repeated themes were categorized into three as category definition, exemplification, and codification regulation. Here, the answers of each question were disunited into meaningful categories. Then they were and codded. The separated codes were also compared with that of the researcher and the consistency was calculated (90%) (Miles & Huberman 1994). In the second place, the conceptualized statements were assembled. In the third place, it was purposed to avoid from repetition of the words. Finally, the determined results were expressed and provided relationships between each other. Establishing a cause-effect relationship among the existing parts was also aimed. The administrator's opinions were coded as A1, A2, A3, and A4…

Trustworthiness and Rigor

In order to provide trustworthiness and rigor, some precautions were taken. First of all, the researcher here was in the role of facilitator and listener. In this process, the interviewer only asked questions and recorded the administrators' responds. They did not lead the participants. The interview questions were analyzed by five colleagues who were experts in qualitative researches in order to provide content validity. The questions were finalized after the experts' feedbacks and recommendations. Moreover, the administrators' hesitations about the confidentiality of the detailed answers were eliminated. Also, in order for participants not to be influenced by some power relations, the interviews were conducted outside university campuses.

In addition, in order to provide the validity and reliability of the research some further precautions were taken. In the first place, the interview form was finalized after a full research about the literature to ensure a good contextual framework. After interviews were scribed, each interview subscription was sent to the participants for member checking. In the second place, for increasing external validity of the research, the research design, participants, data collection, analysis and interpretation were described in a detailed way. In the third place, in order to provide internal reliability, all data were scribed having no interpretation. Moreover, the raw data and coded data have been preserved by the researcher and other researchers are welcomed to examine them.

Limitations

This study has some limitations. Firstly, in this study group the participant administrators were volunteers and they may not represent other administrators within other HEIs. For this reason, the conclusions drawn here can be limited this group of administrators. Therefore, while transferring these results to other administrators, it is necessary to be careful. In the second place, the data analysis and interpretations of the results reflect the researcher' perspective. Another researcher may infer differing results with same data sets (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Creswell, 2002).

Findings

In this part of the research, findings are presented below each main theme.

The Participants' Views on their Rectors' Administrative Skills in General

In this part, the participants were asked on their rectors' administrative skills in general. Their responses were presented below:

Table 2. Rectors' Administrative Skills in General

Theme	Codes	f
Administrative Skills	lack of administrative skills	16
	generally uses try and error method	15
	cannot implement the management processes properly	15
	not pluralistic and participatory in management	14
	does not share power or empower the others	14
	is easily affected from the people around him/her	12
	is not visionary	12
	is not logical and participatory in decision making	11
	uses legal power and status quo	9
	can be under the effect of pressure groups	8
	has good communication skills	7
	develops organizational culture	7

A participant participated in more than one view.

As far as the participants' views were analyzed, most administrators consider that their rectors have poor administrative skills. According to them, with these poor administrative skills, it cannot be possible for rectors to develop their universities. With the current law, rectors are chosen and appointed among full time professors. However, they think that having a title of professorship does not guarantee to be a good and effective administrator. They need other administrative skills and qualities and administrative experience as well. In this regard, an administrator stated, "*As our rector has never been to an administrative post before, he tries to solve many problems with a trial-error method (A15)*." An administrator underlined,

> "*It is probably considered that being a professor may be enough to administer a university. They may also consider that any professor can manage a university. Professors can be successful academicians in their own fields. However, administration is a field which requires administrative skills and experience. For example, a veterinary professor can be specialized in animals. S/he can be really good in his field, but managing thousands of students and staff is more different than it. And as a complicated work, it requires more other qualities and qualifications such as leadership and visionary (A4)*"

A female administrator said, "*If rectors are selected with some political considerations, they may have a tendency to feel under pressure and it may influence their decisions (A20)."* For example, an experienced administrator put,

> "*Rectors are influenced by some power relations if they are appointed with some political concerns rather than their administrative qualifications and qualities, they feel under pressure to meet political demands. In this regard, I think some of our rector's administrative behaviors are influenced by some political groups (A8)*"

Another administrator said,

> "*Our rector is a medical doctor, and he tries to see all the problems as health services and he does not have a vision for a better university He does not manage the university with a participative method. Hence, a collaborative working atmosphere can be provided when academic staff participate in decisions. (A10)."*

On the other hand, few participants find their rectors' administrative skills enough, and they find their rectors successful. They put that their rectors have required administrative skills and manage their university well. In this manner, two administrators underline,

> "*Our rector is usually fair and tries to implement laws and regulations. He is positive and tries to balance relationships. He is qualified enough both in human relations and administrative skills. He supports students and administrative staff and contributes too much to develop our university. We can reach him whenever we want to, he listens to our problems, and takes necessary steps (A11/A14)."*

The Participants' Views on Their Rectors' Administrative Styles

In this part, the participants were asked what their administrative styles are and their responses were presented below:

Table 3. Rectors' Administrative Styles

Theme	Codes	f
Administrative styles	Autocratic	35
	Democratic	5
	Consultative	5
	Persuasive	8
	Laissez-faire	6

A participant participated in more than one view.

When rectors' management styles are concerned, findings show that most rectors of this sample prefer autocratic management style. Regarding their power sources, they mostly use legitimate power and coercive power. They seldom use reward power, expertise power and charismatic power. In this regard, two administrators stressed,

> "Our rector usually uses autocratic management style, and he uses both legitimate and coercive power. For me, rectors have a broad scope of authority at university. For example, he appoints people to departments without asking the others' opinions. For example, he appointed a math's professor as head of educational sciences institute (A2/A8)."

Another administrator stated,

> "Faculty boards rarely gather and only professors, associate professor and assistant professors are invited to these boards. Other academic staff (e.g, research assistants, instructors). During these boards, heads of departments make a presentation about their department. Then our rector has a speech, and if there is time left academicians speak. However, academicians prefer to be silent because of pressure they feel (A8)"

Two administrators said,

> "As our dean was not appointed, our rector substitutes as the dean at the same time. Last year, he cancelled representative selection ballots for assistant professors. The next day, he nominated one of the academicians and waited there until his candidate was elected, which disturbed us, because we felt to vote in favor of that candidate. If an academic is close to a rector, he can be promoted easier (A18/A17)."

On the other hand, few rectors are claimed to use consultative and democratic management styles while managing their institutions. In this regard, some administrators underlined, *"Our rector uses democratic and participative administrative styles. He usually uses expertise and charismatic power (A11/A9/A3)"* Similarly, another administrator underlined,

> "Our university has an old and institutionalized identity. Our rector behaves in accordance with its identity. He gives personal benefits according to their qualifications. Especially, for academic appointments, he cares about reports and scientific data. He also makes the decision with the participation of all faculty (A15)"

Another administrator stated, "*There are no privileged groups and people at my university. Everybody is treated fairly (A10).*" An experienced administrator stated,

> "As a transformational leader, our rector supports and motivates us to do new things. He is a creative and an innovative person and urges us to be so. He is also fair and does not discriminate people according to their political, religious and social status. He delegates his power as well. Thus, he creates a positive synergy all over the university (A11)"

In general, it can be inferred that most rectors use autocratic administrative style, they do not run academic councils, and care about merit in academic employment process. Most administrators consider that except for a few rectors most rectors of this sample share power with a very limited group of people. On the other hand, findings show that few rectors value people's qualifications and merits, and they behave fairly. In fact, according to McClure (1989), and Clare (2012) participation in higher education provides quality decisions.

The Participants' Views on Their Rectors' Efforts to Develop a Positive Organizational Culture

In this part, the participants were asked what their rectors do to develop a positive organizational culture and their responses were presented below:

Table 4. Developing a Positive Organizational Culture

Theme	Codes	f
Organizational Culture	The culture of power	18
	Bureaucratic culture	15
	The culture of success	6
	The culture of support	6

A participant participated in more than one view.

When administrators' views regarding developing a positive culture are concerned, it can be understood that most rectors fail to develop an organizational culture at their institutions. In this context, an administrator claimed, *"The term that defines the culture of our university is "Small Fear Shop" In such a university culture, rectors have a broad authority. In such an organizational culture, it is too difficult to see motivated staff (A4)"*

An administrator said,

> *"For me, a rector can contribute to organizational culture by delegating some of his power. Our rector promised to share his power before the election, but later the situation did not change. I am a head of department, I am not asked for most decisions. Simply, our rector and vice rectors decide and ask me to implement. I feel that I am here just to sign papers like a notary (A12)"*

However, few rectors are claimed to create a positive organizational culture. Some administrators emphasized,

> *"Even though we sometimes have some problems, our university has a settled positive organizational culture and they are solved successfully. Our rector wants to create a good and fair organizational culture. I think he is doing well in this manner (A11/A6/A9)"*

In general, at most universities of this sample, there is a culture of power and bureaucratic work process and this ends up with an unpleasant working place. If rectors behave in an unfair way, it may work peace there. At such an atmosphere, success is cannot be rewarded and supported. However, few rectors are claimed to create a positive organizational culture by establishing a human-friendly institution. These rectors create such an atmosphere with their caring and fair behaviors.

The Participants' Views on Their Rectors' Efforts to Transform the University into a Third Generation Institution

In this part, the participants' views of their rectors' efforts to transform the university into a third generation higher education institution were asked and their responses were presented below:

Table 5. *Transforming the University into a Third Generation Institution*

Theme	Codes	f
	University invests a lot of its resources on techno parks	20
	No contribution to university itself and academics	20
Entrepreneur University	No support from the academics	14
	Establishing university-industry relationship	8

A participant participated in more than one view.

In general, academic unit administrators have the opinion that rectors of this sample invest a lot of university resources on techno parks and technology transfer offices. Although there are huge expectations from techno parks and technology transfer centers, the outcomes are far behind the expectations regarding transforming the university into a third generation higher education institution. Currently, universities cannot even transfer technology effectively, and support faculty members for scientific researchers, conferences and some other scientific activities. In this regard, an administrator stated,

> *"Our rector had high expectations from these investments, and hoped to transform the university into a third generation one. He launched techno park on university campus. At first, he was dealing with all problems. Then, probably he lost his interest in techno park. There are only few firms. Interestingly, he complains about this situation from time to time (A10)"*

Another administrator put, "*At our university, there is no support from academics. (A11)*" An administrator claimed, *"Our new rector does not go out of campus to establish university-business relationships. He is always in his office. Therefore, it is impossible to transform the university (A3)"* Two administrators stressed, *"There is limited effort to establish relations to the business environment. (A9/A12)"*

In this regard, most rectors of this sample are claimed to have failed to transform the university into the third generation institution as they cannot not establish good relations with the industry. It is considered that in time, they do not care much about these kinds of things especially if they are in their second term in the office. In the Turkish higher education system, a rector can be appointed as a rector at most two terms of four years.

Results, Discussion and Recommendations

The current research was conducted to determine rectors' administrative skills. To that end, a number of results were obtained. According to a result, most rectors of this sample have poor administrative skills. this may stem from the way they are selected and appointed to the office. With the current law, any person who has a professorship title can be appointed as a rector in Turkey. It is evaluated that having a title of professorship cannot guarantee to be successful as a rector. Although it has been criticized harshly in academic environments from time to time, political concerns may sometimes become determinant. Hence, while choosing rectors, their administrative qualifications, qualities and administrative experience should primarily be asked as well. In fact, it is an administrative position, and rector candidates' administrative qualities, qualifications and administrative experience are critical to conduct such a role. Otherwise, they may experience and learn many things with trial and error method, which may cost high for a country's economy. These results align with some findings of other researches. In this regard, Balyer and Özcan (2017) found that most higher education administrators in Turkey do not have adequate managerial competency. Similarly, Mahlamäki Kultanen and Majuri (2013) underlined the necessity of rectors' administrative experience and skills besides their scientific successes in their own fields. As far as academia is concerned, leadership is a special case to meet academic and societal needs (Tierney, 1998). Here, Sathye (2004) underlines that academic leaders should work closely with the teaching and research teams. Nworie (2009), Spence (2018) and Schofield (1996) put that working in today's higher education environment is more different than it was in the past. For

this reason, rectors should be competent administrators. Schwartzman (1993) indicated that ideally modern administrations should evolve from the reliance on professional schools to the reliance on academic communities. The weakness of a country's academic communities, and the strength of other sectors, administration becomes more complicated. Therefore, as Wilkinson (1978) summarized, "*We must be competent administrators, in addition to being managers*".

Another result showed that most rectors of this sample use autocratic administrative style more often. Moreover, they do not run academic councils effectively by making decisions with a limited of administrators around them. In addition, they do not also care about merit in academic employment and promotion processes and in this regard, they change settled rules according to different people. In fact, HEIs are organizations in which people have high level of perception and literacy, and academic staff need autonomy on their work. Therefore, using an autocratic management style may harm academic work peace. Instead, they are expected to use a consultative, participative and democratic style. Nevertheless, it was found out that a few rectors are claimed to use consultative, participative and democratic management styles. With their participative and democratic management styles, their universities become more productive places. In their study, Özcan, Karataş, Çağlar and Polat (2014) found similar results. They reported that most administrators use legal, coercive, and reward power styles, they rarely use charismatic and expert power style. In fact, according to Mcclure (1989), and Clare (2012) participation in higher education provides quality decisions.

A further result indicated that most rectors of this sample fail to develop a positive organizational culture at their institutions, because most rectors of this sample prefer a culture of power and bureaucracy instead of support and success culture. Nonetheless, few rectors of this sample are claimed to create a positive organizational culture by establishing a human-friendly institution with their caring and fair behaviors. In these institutions, power distance is low, and staff can reach rectors easily. It is an expected situation for a university. The study results are not consistent with the literature. In this regard, Karadağ (2015) found that rectors show helpful, supportive, effective, cooperative, ambitious, and confident and open in their communication skills. Indeed, Fiedler (1972) stated that the administrators should demonstrate situational leadership behaviors, and he noted that the effectiveness of a leader depends on his/her environment. Whereas, Nworie (2009) claims that effective leadership is crucial to the survival of any enterprise, as well as in authorizing, managing, and sustaining change efforts. Similarly, as Gordon and Whitchurch (2007) and Ramsden (1998) underlined good management models are increasingly required to meet the perceived development needs of staff, lead teaching and research, develop vision, translate mission and provide a strong networking, provide a collaborative and motivational environment, show a fair and effective administration, provide development and recognition of performance and strengthen interpersonal skills. In addition, Sol and Swatman (2002) and Baltaru (2002) state that most universities should now realize the importance of building strong and professional administrative systems which foster positive organizational culture.

A final result revealed that most rectors of this sample are claimed to have failed to transform their universities into third generation higher education institutions. Administrators stated that rectors do not establish good relations with the industry outside as well as academics inside. If they are in their second and last terms in the office, they lose interest in most things. Hence, they are supposed to be more sensitive to academic, societal and business environments' expectations, which is mostly about their transformational leadership behaviors. In this context, Balyer (2012) implied that vision building, high performance expectations, developing consensus about group goals and intellectual stimulation are among a leaders' basic quality. Hence, McDade (1987) and Pohoata (2014) underlined that administrators, particularly senior executives, are responsible for developing visions and goals to transform their institutions, which is expected by the competitive world of work and different sectors. *Hayter, Lubynsky and Maroulis (2017) aslo claimed that in order to transform a university into a third generation higher education institution, the establishment of new*

companies based on technologies derived from university research is a must. By establishing these companies, university can transfer technology to the society in which they operate and benefit itself from these efforts. In his study, Çelik (2011) reports the systemic barriers and oppressive structures in the Turkish higher education system that stand as solid blocks against any change and transformation the returning scholars could potentially instill.

Consequently, it can be asserted that although Turkish university tradition has had a long historical back-ground, an understanding of professional management has not been developed fully so far. Currently, the common understanding is that management work can be carried out by anyone else. Now, being a professor in any field is considered to be enough to be appointed as a rector who will be responsible for thousands of students, academic and administrative staff. In this context, Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley (2009) noted that there have been widespread calls to set new administrative structures that respond more appropriately and effectively. However, in the Turkish higher education management system politicians and some interest groups are believed to be influential in the selection and appointment process of rectors. Indeed, rectors do not feel a need of looking at inner reflections of HEIs, because their appointment do not depend on inner reflections any more.

All in all, in the Turkish higher education management system, rectors' scope of authority is considered to be large, and this may sometimes make some of the rectors tend to use this power to control most acts of all departments, courses, institutes and schools. To make matters worse, governance in private institutions goes often to the other extreme. They may sometimes be sole decision makers at their universities. This kind of administrative policy, may paralyze these institutions in the long term. Therefore, governance at higher education institutions should be handled with care. The recommendations reached through this study are below:

- Rectors should be selected by academic staff, representatives of administrative staff and students according to their administrative skills.
- With a ballot, academic, administrative staff and students should approve rectors' administrative experience, visions, qualifications and qualities before they are chosen and appointed.
- Faculty and department councils should be run more effectively to take good and participative decisions.
- Rectors should use reward, charisma, expert powers and democratic approaches more in human-oriented organizations like universities.

REFERENCES

Agasisti, T. (2017). Management of higher education institutions and the evaluation of their efficiency and performance. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 23, 3, 187-190.

Altbach, P. G. (2011). Rankings season is here. *International Higher Education*, 62, 1-3.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. *A Report Prepared for the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education*, 1-278.

Altbach, P. G. (2008). The complex roles of universities in the period of globalization. *Higher Education in the World* 3, 5-14.

Arap Kavili, S. (2010). Türkiye yeni üniversitelerine kavuşurken: Türkiye'de yeni üniversiteler ve kuruluş gerekçeleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 65(1), 1-29.

Ataünal, A. (1993), *Cumhuriyet döneminde yükseköğretimdeki gelişmeler.* Ankara: MEB Yükseköğretim Genel Müdürlüğü Yayını.

Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Methods of social research. A division of Macmillan*. New York: The Free Press.

Baltaru, R. D. (2018). Universities' pursuit of inclusion and its effects on professional staff: the case of the United Kingdom. *Higher Education*, 1-16. doi:10.1007/s10734-018-0293-7

Balyer, A. (2012). Transformational leadership behaviors of school principals: A qualitative research based on teachers' perceptions. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences,* 4(3), 581-591.

Balyer, A. & Özcan, K. (2017). Higher education administrators' managerial competency in Turkey. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*. 9(4), 917-929.

Bell G., Warwick J., & Galbraith P. (2012). The need for new higher education management practices and metaphors (p-3-30). In: Bell G., Warwick J., Galbraith P. (eds) *Higher Education Management and Operational Research. Educational Futures (Rethinking Theory and Practice).* Number: 54. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* 5th Edition, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Clare, C. (2012). Do industrial approaches to quality management and performance indicators work for higher education? (pp- 31-48) In: Bell G., Warwick J., Galbraith P. (eds) *Higher Education Management and Operational Research. Educational Futures (Rethinking Theory and Practice).* Number: 54. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*, 4th Edition, Upper Saddle, River, N.J.: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Çelik, S. (2011). Turkish higher education at the crossroads: critical issues of systemic and institutional structures. *Higher Education Review*, 43(2), 18-41.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Doğramacı, İ. (2007). Türkiye'de ve dünyada yükseköğretim yönetimi, Ankara: Meteksan A.Ş, Yayın No: 07-06-Y-0057-16.

Fiedler, F. E. (1972). The effects of leadership training and experience: A contingency model interpretation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(4), 453–470.

Glaser, B.G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, Ca.: Sociology Press.

Gordon, G., & Whitchurch, C. (2007). Managing human resources in higher education: the implications of a diversifying workforce. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 19(2), 135–155.

Gök, F. (1998). Cumhuriyet dönemi'nde eğitim sistemi ve üniversiteler. *İktisat Dergisi*, 383, 75-80.

Gürüz, K. (2001). *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de yükseköğretim tarihçe ve bugünkü sevk ve idare Sistemleri.* Ankara: ÖSYMYayınları, 2001-4.

Hatipoğlu, T. (2000). *Türkiye üniversite tarihi.* Ankara: Selvi Yayınları.

Hayter, C. S., Lubynsky, R & Maroulis, S. (2017). Who is the academic entrepreneur? The role of graduate students in the development of university spinoffs. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 42, 1237–1254. doi: 10.1007/s10961-016-9470.

Hénard, F., & Mitterle, A. (2010). Governance and quality guidelines in higher education: A review of governance arrangements and quality assurance guidelines. *OECD*, 1-116.

Karadağ, E. (2015). Communication skills and attitudes of Turkish university rectors and deans as they relate to leadership performance. *International Leadership Journal*, 7(1), 35-53.

Kerkhof vd, M. (2006). The repertory grid technique, (RGT), integrated assessment, Available at http://www.ivm.vu.nl/en/Images/PT4_tcm234-161509.pdf, 1-7. Accessed, 03.08. 2018, 0:00.

Kupriyanova, V. Estermann, T. & Sabic, N. (2018). Efficiency of universities: Drivers, enablers and limitations. In Curaj A., Deca L., Pricopie R. (eds) European Higher Education Area: The Impact of Past and Future Policies. Cham: Springer.

Mahlamäki-Kultanen, S. & Majuri, M. (2013). *A transition in the management of vocational education: from rector institutions to partnerships.* HAAGA-HELIA: University of Applied Sciences.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Online Journal Qualitative Social Research,* 1(2), 1-10.

McDade, S. A. (1987). Higher education leadership: Enhancing skills through professional development programs. *ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Report*: No. 5, 1-133.

Miles, M.B. & M.A. Huberman (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of the organization*. London, UK: Sage.

Nworie, J. (2009). Managing the growing complexity of administration of academic technology in higher education. *AACE Journal*, 17 (1), 23-44.

Ortaş, İ. (2006). Rektörlük seçimleri, bölüm başkanlığı seçimleri, dekanlık seçimleri: Eleştiriler, öneriler ve modeler. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Yazı Dizisi*, 1-18.

Pohoata, G. (2014). Management and leadership in the academic educational praxis in Romania. *Euromentor Journal*, 5(4), 18-26.

Ramsden, P. (1998). Managing the effective university. *Higher Education Research and Development,* 17(3), 347-370.

Resmi Gazete (2018). 477 Sayılı kanun ile bazı kanunlarda değişiklik yapılması hakkında kanun hükmünde kararname, *Resmi Gazete* No: 30468

Özcan, K., Karataş, İ.H., Çağlar, Ç., & Polat, M. (2014). Administrators' power usage styles and their impact on the organizational culture in colleges of education: A case study. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(2), 560-569.

Shattock, M. (2000). Strategic management in European universities in an age of increasing institutional self reliance. *Tertiary Education & Management*, 6, 93–104.

Shattock, M. (2010). *Managing successful universities*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education

Schwartzman, S. (1993). Policies for higher education in Latin America: the context. *Higher Education*, 25, 9-20.

Schofield, A. (1996). Strengthening the skills of middle management in universities: New papers on higher education studies and research. *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,* 1-111.

Sol, H. G., & Swatman, P. A. (2002). University e-commerce forum: Challenges for deans and Rectors. *15th Bled Electronic Commerce Conference eReality: Constructing the eEconomyBled*, Slovenia, June 17 - 19, 2002.

Spence, C. (2018). Judgement' versus 'metrics' in higher education management. *Higher Education*, 1-18. doi: 10.1007/s10734-018-0300.

Sporn, B. (2003). Management in higher education: Current trends and future perspectives in European colleges and universities. *The Dialogue between Higher Education Research and Practice, 97-107.* doi: 10.1007/978-0-306-48368-4.

Tekeli, İ. (2003). Dünya'da ve Türkiye'de üniversite üzerinde konuşmanın değişik yolları. *Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi,* 97, 123-143.

Teker, S., Teker, D., & Sayan, P. (2013). A comparative study for appointment procedures of university presidents. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 2(8), 123-131.

Wilkinson, G. L. (1978). Managers are more than just administrators. *Audiovisual Instruction*, 23(7), 20-21.

YÖK (2015). *2547 Sayılı Yükseköğretim Kanunu.* Retrieved from https://www.yok.gov.tr/arama?k=rekt%C3%B6r%20se%C3%A7imleri on 26.10.2019.