

Higher Education Administrators' Managerial Competency in Turkey

Aydın Balyer¹ and Kenan Özcan²

¹ Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Education, Turkey

² Adıyaman University, Faculty of Education, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 18.06.2017

Received in revised form 13.10.2017

Accepted 22.10.2017

Available online 05.11.2017

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study is to identify higher education administrators' competencies in interpersonal, informational and decisional roles. Based on qualitative methodology, the researcher interviewed 40 administrators (rectors, vice-rectors, deans, vice-deans, department heads, directors and vice-director). Results indicate that while experienced administrators use their charisma and human relations, inexperienced ones prefer using legal power. Regarding decision-making, most of them are authoritarian while some are delegators and few are supervisors. Finally, as far as administrators' informational roles are concerned, although they are aware of the importance of the information age, a few administrators have competency in this role. It can be concluded that university administration is not considered a professional career in Turkey and most higher education administrators do not have adequate managerial competency. It is recommended that higher education administration should be accepted as a professional career and administrators should be selected among those who have managerial competency.

© 2017 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

Higher education, higher education administration, administrators, competency

3

Introduction

In recent years, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have changed tremendously all over the world. Bentoa (2000) underlines that these changes stem from political and economic systems, and all these changes affect both operations and management bodies in these institutions. It is figured that these changes can also result in more complex structures in HEIs, because this new situation forces universities to change and renew their management structures accordingly (Anyamele, 2004; Bayenet, Feola & Tavernier, 2000; Clark, 1998; Davis, 1997a; Dill, 1999; Rudzki, 1995). Only by changing their management operations, these institutions can adjust to the changing complex situations. For that reason, higher education leadership becomes more crucial not only for the management of academy and academic facilities but it also influences their teaching and research efforts the society expects from them (Bargh, Boccock & Smith, 2000; Firestone, 1996).

Higher Education Management

HEIs are diverse organizations which require leaders to be well-informed about multiple organizational elements (Smith & Wolverton, 2010). Research conducted on higher education leadership shows that university leaders should be proactive rather than reactive ones by generating strategic plans, designing their own institutional leadership and governance (Askling & Kristensen, 2000; Dahlgard, Larsen & Norgaard, 1997; Ogawa & Bossert, 1997). Kouzes and Posner's research (2003) nominated characteristics and qualities of a leader claims that a leader should be honest, forward-looking, competent, and inspiring. In

¹Corresponding author's address: Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Education, Esenler, İstanbul. Turkey.

Telephone: + 90 212 383 55 92

e-mail: balyer2001@gmail.com, balyer@yildiz.edu.tr

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2017.04.002>

addition, Meek, Goedegebuure, Santiago, and Carvalho (2010) put that university administrators need to demonstrate “*professional competency*” such as being able to define vision, mission, objectives, and strategies as well as managing financial and human resources.

However, Kekäle (1997) underlines that leadership models developed in other contexts cannot be implemented to higher education, because these institutions have unique features. First, handling the knowledge is the most crucial thing at universities. This makes each knowledge area (*disciplinary department*) become more different than the others and the basic building block of higher education organization. Secondly, decision-making power is spread across a number of units and actors range from rector to academic staff. In HEIs decisions are not taken from the top management and mostly this process is delegated. Thirdly, in HEIs sudden and major changes are rare and extremely difficult to affect because of the diffusion and the fragmentation of tasks. Finally, authority is located at the lower level (Kekäle, 1997).

For all these reasons, according to Knoeppel (2010) and Amey (2006), effective leadership at higher education requires critical reflection and deep understanding of organizational and universal culture and values. Therefore, higher education administrators should have competency in providing a shared vision and meeting student and/or staff needs. However, this role is also a multi-faceted one, since HEIs differ from other organizations. In these institutions, faculty ownership is fundamental. This role requires more focus on empowering activities than in any other organization (Rowley, 1997). Rowley (1997) indicates that at HEIs, leadership should be shown at a different level in the managerial hierarchy as followed:

- **Module leadership.** This role involves planning, coordinating teams, designing teaching, learning and assessment strategies.
- **Course leadership.** In this role, the administrator ensures that courses are delivered successfully on a day-to-day basis.
- **Operational management.** In this role, the administrator ensures that specific stages in a research project are satisfactorily completed in accordance with a pre-agreed timetable as well as allocation of resources.
- **Strategic leadership.** It involves the creation of a culture, systems and values that facilitate progress towards the vision.

Moreover, HEIs face increasing demands from both internal and external environment, so the quality of university management should be improved by changing the mechanisms, techniques, styles and competency of leaders (Eisemon & Kourouma, 1994; Salmi, 1994; Ziderman, 1994). This shows that higher education administrators’ competency has an increasing importance.

Higher Education Administrators’ Competencies

Bayenet *et al.* (2000) put that both in theory and practice universities are often described as professional bureaucracies and their internal organizational structures are usually highly compartmentalized. Therefore, these leaders need a combination of leadership styles and management competencies in order to address the challenges faced in the sector (Black, 2015). As universities have a certain sense of tradition, Brennen and Shah (2000) claim that strong institutional management style is needed at HEIs. At universities, leadership must be dispersed in departments, research groups, amongst administrators and academic support staff. No central leadership group can deliver university success unless there is leadership at departmental levels (Shattock, 2003).

As administrators’ competence has been one of the controversial issues, Murphy (2002) and Sousa (2003) emphasize that higher education leaders need to develop their own creative skills like interpersonal communication, creativity thinking, decision-making, and information technology. In this regard, according to Kouzes and Posner (2007) an effective leader recognizes that there is always room for improvement.

Scott, Coates & Anderson (2008) underline that competence and capability are little known concepts HEIs. In fact, competence is considered as a person’s capacity to connect knowledge, skills, attitudes and professional identity that are relevant for a certain profession (Balci, 1988; Dauphin, 2005; Krüger, 2009). It is also described as being adequate or well-qualified both physically and intellectually to perform duties of any specific profession (Botha & Camphor, 2008; Bryman, 2007; Drew, 2006; Shahmandi, Silong, Ismail, Abu Samah & Othman, 2011).

As stated by Crosthwaite and Erwee (2014) and also Wahab and Mahmood (2015) higher education administrators need to possess a unique balance of managerial leadership competencies for their own efficiencies. In this regard, Mintzberg (1973) found that that managerial competency is associated with performance, and administrators have ten basic roles. However, in this study these roles were categorized into three major roles as *interpersonal roles, information roles and decisional roles*.

Administrators' Interpersonal Roles

Interpersonal development is defined as the ability to work with diverse individuals (Freeman & Kochan, 2012). In this respect, these leaders should be;

Figurehead: Every manager must perform some duties of a ceremonial nature like greeting the touring dignitaries and represent the institution. Here, the manager is a symbol.

Leader: This role involves relationships with subordinates, including motivation, communication, and influence. Here, the manager defines the atmosphere in which the organization will work. The manager transmits information, makes strategic decisions, integrates individual needs and organizational goal.

Liaison: In this role, the manager makes contacts inside and outside the organization with a wide range of people like subordinates, clients, business associates, government and trade organization officials.

Administrators' Informational Roles

Three roles describe the informational aspects of managerial work:

Monitor: This role involves seeking current information from many sources by scanning his environment for information, interrogating liaison contacts and subordinates and receiving unsolicited information.

Disseminator: In this role, managers pass information to the others, both inside and outside the organization.

Spokesman: In this role, managers send some of their information to people outside the organization about company policies, needs, actions, or plans.

Administrators' Decisional Roles

Four roles describe the decisional aspects of managerial work:

Entrepreneur: In this role, they search for improvement of their unit to adopt it to changing conditions in the environment. Administrators design it by delegating the responsibility (*giving responsibility to others*), having an authoritarian style (*delegating design, but retaining choice making*) or supervising the staff (*retaining design and decision in projects*).

Disturbance handler: This role involves responding to high-pressure disturbances by resolving conflicts among subordinates or between manager's department and other departments.

Resource allocator: In this role, they make decisions about how to allocate people, budget, equipment, time and other resources.

Negotiator: This role involves formal negotiations and bargaining to attain outcomes for the manager's unit responsibility.

Also, Gentry, Harris, Baker, and Leslie (2008) identify that managerial skills are important at different levels and across different functions of an organization in today's work environment especially at HEIs. Therefore, according to Smith (2000), leaders and professionals need to be able to utilize a full set of integrated managerial competencies, especially in interpersonal roles, informational roles and decisional roles in their managerial practices. Research and scholars recommend that administrators provide ample venues for leadership experiences as well as teaching leadership skills and knowledge (Conover, 2009).

In Turkey, higher education administrators come from a variety of experience, academic and educational backgrounds. In HEIs, sometimes these backgrounds are not asked most of the time. For example, no other qualification is asked for being a rector, dean or head of department except for academic title. If an academician has a title of professorship in any field, this means that s/he can become a rector at a

university although they have no single day administrative experience before. As a result of this management type, there may arise some problems, while they are performing their administrative roles (Lazarenko & Nikishina, 2014). For this reason, it is a matter of question whether higher education administrators' have managerial competencies regarding their *interpersonal, informational and decisional roles*. Since research on managerial competence has been narrowly focused on K-12 school administrators, there is a need for exploring the higher education administrators' managerial competencies. Such a research can be important to help administrators and policy makers to understand higher education administrative needs better to enhance their management systems.

Method

The current research was conducted with a phenomenological research design. These kinds of researches provide in-depth knowledge about a topic (Creswell, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). These kinds of researches are also used for describing, analyzing, and interpreting a culture-sharing group's shared patterns of behavior, beliefs, and language that develop over time among higher education administrators.

The author conducted 40 interviews of academic/managerial staff chosen with maximum variation sampling method from 5 universities in the 2016/2017 academic year in Turkey. The idea behind this method is that it is possible to look at a subject from all available angles, thereby achieving a greater perspective. This method is also known as heterogeneous sampling which involves selecting candidates across a broad spectrum relating to the topic of study (Bailey, 1994). The participants' demographics are as followed:

Table 1. The Administrators' demographics

Age	n	Gender	n	Total Administrative Experience	Administrative Experience At This School	n	Education	n
25-35	3	Male	32	1-5 years	1-5 years	10	Graduate	9
36-46	12	Female	8	6-10 years	6-10 years	9	Masters	5
47-57	15			11-15 years	11-15 years	8	PhD	26
58+	10			16-20 years	16-20 years	7		
				21 +	21 +	6		
Total	40		40			40		40

As presented in Table 1 above, most administrators are young and middle-aged (n=30), only 10 of them were over 58 years old. As far as experience is considered, most administrators are experienced in total (n=32), but when experience in their in school is concerned, most of them can be regarded as inexperienced. Regarding education, while most administrators (n=9) have graduate degrees, some of them have master's degree (n=5) and most of them have (n=26) PhD degrees.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected by using constructed interview method which can best be characterized as a semi-structured interview. By using this method, the respondents are confronted with a triad of elements and then asked to specify some important ways in which two of the elements are alike and, thereby, different from the third (Bailey, 1994; Kerkhof, 2006). Administrators' opinions were collected through with semi-structured questions. In this method, the participants express their thoughts freely around particular topics. In order to collect data, first, in an e-mail, the administrators were informed about the purpose of the study, and they were asked if they could participate in this research voluntarily. The participant administrators were consented after being assured of the confidentiality of the data to be obtained from them. They were promised that their identities would be kept in secret and their names would not be mentioned in any part of the study or shared with anyone else. Then, an interview was planned on an agreed-upon day, and they were visited on that date. The interviews were both recorded and noted with their permission and each took approximately 30-40 minutes.

The data were analyzed with the content analysis technique. This technique usually purposes to analyze similar data on a topic and comment on it (Mayring, 2000). Firstly, the data were organized. In this regard, the researcher revisited each interviewer and listened to each recorded audiotape while reviewing the transcripts to ensure the accuracy of the data. Each participant's interview transcript was later analyzed according to the data analysis procedures described by Bogdan and Biklen (1998), which call for development of coding categories, mechanical sorting of the data, and analysis of the data within each coding category. In this respect, each administrator's interview was coded separately according to their views on *interpersonal, informational and decisional roles*. Through this research, emerging themes and repeated themes were grouped into coding categories in three steps as category definition, exemplification, and codification regulation. In this regard, first, the answers to each question were separated into meaningful categories, named, and coded as *interpersonal, informational and decisional roles*. Secondly, the conceptualized statements were gathered. Thirdly, it was aimed to avoid repetition. Lastly, the identified results were explained and related to each other. It was also purposed to build a cause-and-effect relationship among the separate parts. In this respect, the administrators' views were coded as A1, A2, A3, and A4...

In the process of organizing and analyzing the data, the constant comparative approach was used. This method results in the saturation of categories and the emergence of theory. Theory emerges through continual analysis and doubling back for more data collection and coding (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Glaser, 1992). Through this method, each set of collected data were revisited in terms of key issues, recurrent events, or activities. Each participant's data were reviewed several times for confirmatory and contradictory statements until the data were organized into satisfactory categories and sub-codes to address the research question. In order to fulfill the aforementioned purpose, the following semi-structured questions were raised:

1. *To what extent higher education administrators competent in interpersonal roles, informational roles and decisional roles?*
2. *What are critical leadership competencies essential for higher education administrators (e.g., chancellors, presidents, vice presidents, and deans)?*
3. *Are these competencies considered valid and critical by higher education administrators?*

Validity and reliability

In order to provide trustworthiness and rigor, some precautions were taken. *First*, the interviewer played the role of facilitator and listener by simply asking questions and recording the answers without leading the participants. In addition, the questions were reviewed by four field experts to provide content validity. The final forms of the questions were developed with these experts' views. Moreover, the participants' were content enough with the confidentiality of the research to get in-depth answers without any hesitation. The places were chosen out of the schools to avoid being affected by power relations. The precautions taken to ensure the validity and reliability were as followed:

- a. While preparing interview form, the related literature was examined to create a contextual frame to increase the internal validity. Member checking was also done. Furthermore, the administrators were able to express their views freely and sincerely as their identities were promised to keep secret.
- b. Research process was described in detail to increase external validity. The design, working group, data collection, and data analysis. The raw data and coded data were preserved by the researcher and other researchers are welcomed to examine them.
- c. All of the data were transcribed without any interpretation to provided internal reliability. Also, another academic having experience on qualitative research methodology coded the data. This code was compared with that of the researcher and the consistency was calculated (88 %) (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Limitations

There are a number limitations of this research in terms of transferability to the population. First of all, the sample was composed of volunteers and they are not necessarily representative of other administrators within other institution. For this reason, the results are limited to this studied group and while inferring about the results, more caution should be exercised. In the second place, the researcher was the main

instrument of data analysis. The analyses and comments are a product of the researcher's interpretation of the data. It is clear that a different researcher may identify different features of importance within the same data sets (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Creswell, 2002). Lastly, even though, the researcher aimed at interviewing equal gender representation, it was impossible because of the high representatives of administrators.

Findings

Administrators' views on interpersonal roles

With interpersonal role, administrators set up a network of relationships, both inside and outside the organization, deal with people within an organization.

Table 2. Administrators' views regarding interpersonal roles

Main Theme	Sub Theme	f	%
Interpersonal Roles	Be a model for colleagues	10	25
	Use legal power	7	17,5
	Use charisma and human relations	10	25
	Integrate personal and organizational needs	4	10
	Maintain individuals and groups outside	4	10
	Create a positive organizational culture	5	12,5
Total		40	100

As can be understood from the participants' views, most administrators use their charisma and human relations (n=10) regarding their interpersonal roles. Especially, experienced administrators think that they have competency in interpersonal relations. In this regard, an experienced dean states, *"Academic units are different from other institutions. Therefore, I mostly prefer using my charisma and personal relations to make people work, instead of using legal power (A 13).* Moreover, administrators also try to be good role models for academic staff (n=10). An administrator, *"I do my work with great care, and I have a right to ask staff to do so. If you cannot be model for the academic staff, it is impossible to manage them (A 13)."*

On the other hand, especially inexperienced administrators prefer using legal power to control things (n=7). An inexperienced dean claims, *"It is not easy to manage academic staff. Charisma is something gained years after. Sometimes I use my legal power.* These administrators evaluate that they have limited competency in interpersonal relations. Especially in their first years in office, they have difficulty with managing diverse groups. They also do not know much about legal procedure in their first years, which leads them to use legal power. But in the following years, they improve their administrative competency in terms of interpersonal relations. Few administrators care about creating a positive academic culture at their institutions (n=5). They also have difficulty with integrating personal and organizational needs (n=4). An administrator emphasizes, *"I have a difficulty with integrating personal and organizational needs. Some people interpret events from their points of views. They may also put their personal priorities ahead rather than organizational ones, which is hard to manage (A9).*

In general, findings indicate while experienced administrators use their charisma and human relations, especially inexperienced administrators prefer using legal power in their daily managerial practices. Most administrators emphasize that managing academic units are more difficult than other institutions. In fact, it requires talent, experience and expertise to manage these institutions. It is seen that some administrators care about creating a positive academic culture. Administrators also evaluate that they face some pressures outside the university, which is hard to resist due to some political considerations.

Administrators' Views on their Informational Roles

In informational roles, administrators must collect, disseminate and transmit information to the organization by monitoring, seeking information for the good of the organization.

Table 3. Administrators' views regarding informational roles

Main Theme	Sub Theme	f	%
Informational Roles	Monitor and seek external information	8	20
	Enable people to understand new things	5	12,5
	Transmit external information to subordinates	7	17,5
	Speak on behalf of organization	5	12,5
	Not be able to follow information	15	37,5
Total		40	100

In general, research findings indicate that most administrators cannot follow informational changes adequately. In this regard, mid-level administrators want senior university management to provide what they need indeed (n=15). In public universities, mid-managers do not feel it as a must. Moreover, some administrators enable people to understand new informational in their institutions (n=5). Especially inexperienced administrators find it difficult to follow informational technology and adopt it to their institutions as they have no time left from daily chores. According to them, when something new happens, their senior management informs them about it and therefore; they feel that they do not need to chase after it. In this regard, an inexperienced woman administrators states, *"I am stucked with paperwork and I have no time to follow what is going on outside. Although I hear something new, it takes too much time to bring it to my institution and adopt it to the school (A35)."* They also claim that they personally hope to urge their own assistants and vice-directors to follow and adopt these changes quickly, but bureaucratic and economic constraints prevent them from reaching their goals.

On the other hand, some administrators are personally interested in new information and try to transmit external information to their subordinates. In this regard, especially some administrators are fond of technology and personally follow these changes and bring it to their institution, but their basic constraint is reaching it because of slow bureaucratic procedure. Sometimes, it may take too long time to provide these things. An inexperienced administrator presents,

"We live at the age of information and informational technology. As universities are pioneer intuitions, we should monitor and seek external information. I am personally interested in new information. However, because of heavy bureaucratic procedure, it sometimes takes more time than we expect. Therefore, we sometimes fall behind the informational changes (A 28)."

It is seen that although administrators live at the age of information and are aware of the importance of it, a few administrators have competency in informational roles. While some administrators follow information and enable people to understand in their institutions, some others expect their senior management to do it for them. A great number of administrators claim that their basic problem is adopting these changes to their institution because of slow bureaucratic process and time constraints.

1. Administrators' Views on their Decisional Roles

Making decisions is the most crucial part of any managerial activity. While performing these roles, an administrator can be an entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator and negotiator.

Table 4. Administrators' views regarding decisional roles

Main Theme	Sub Theme	f	%
Decisional Roles	Delegator	12	30
	Authoritarian	20	50
	Supervisor	8	20
Total		40	100

Findings show that most administrators are authoritarian in their managerial practices when decision making is concerned (n=20). In respect, they figure that they are not delegating all responsibility to others, because they consider it as being risky. The administrators evaluate that they are selected as rectors and deans. Therefore, it is their right to make decisions, not academic or administrative staff. They also evaluate that it is also difficult to take quick decisions at crowded meetings, so they prefer to decide themselves and inform the others.

On the other hand, some other administrators describe themselves as delegators (n=12). They consider that faculty boards are kinds of delegating bodies, which means they have their own decisions and senior management just approves it. In this respect, academic committees at faculties are seen adequate bodies to participate in decisions. An experienced vice-rector figures, " *Each department has its own committees to make decisions. They discuss all decisions in these bodies, and then we approve them. They make their own decisions at university boards and committees, but the rector has the final word (A2)*. In addition, results introduce that some administrators are supervisors as far as decision making is concerned (n=8). In their administrative practices, they delegate all decisions to the others, and they just supervise the groups by scheduling the time, programming the work, authorizing the actions and negotiating with the staff. They also participate in negotiation activities as delegators. In this manner, an experienced dean underlines, " *I describe myself as a supervisor. As a dean, there are some situations that I delegate to the departments, but I want to say the final word. They know what the good thing is for our faculty, they decide accordingly (A3)*."

In general, as can be seen from the participants' statements that most administrators are authoritarian while a great number of administrators are delegators when decision making is concerned. Administrators justify it with time constraints. They consider that decisions cannot be taken in large faculty committees and meetings. Taking the decisions in a senior management body and informing the others is a practical way.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, results were discussed in Turkish higher education context. In this regard, when the administrators' interpersonal roles are concerned, results show that while most experienced administrators use their charisma and interpersonal/human relations in their managerial practices, inexperienced administrators prefer using legal power. They accept that charisma is something gained years after. For this reason, in the first years in the office, they tend to use their legal powers. Findings also indicate that higher education management is far more difficult than other management types in any other institution. Results also emphasize that although some administrators try to create a positive academic culture, they are not successful. Vesi (2010) claims that culture is the glue that holds and organization together. Its culture encompasses basic often-unexamined assumptions about how things are done, as well as the norms and values that guide are employee's behavior. They consider that managing a group full of professors and associate professors is not as easy as it seems. Furthermore, sometimes they have difficulty with integrating personal and organizational needs as some people may evaluate things from their own points of views. In this case, they should mediate personal and organizational needs.

Research results also show that administrators try to be models for their colleagues by arriving at school early, attending meetings on time and doing their work in time. They also underline some pressures outside the university regarding some political considerations, which is difficult to balance it. In their studies, Cheryl (2010) and Skorková (2016) pointed out the most problematic area in administrators' competency is human relations. In addition, Cisneros-Cohernour, Bustillos and Riveroll (2014) and Potgieter and Coetzee (2010) found that the competencies in which administrators would like to acquire training were related to human relations (45.07%). Moreover, in their study, Junga and Shin (2015) found that the administrative staff's interpersonal skills affect their overall job satisfaction. In their research, Potgieter and Coetzee (2010) found significant relationship between the interpersonal competencies as being important for the job and the level of training required. In their study, Spendlove (2007) and Porter (2003) also found that most administrators perceived higher education managerial competency, experience, skills including the ability to communicate and negotiate with others are also felt to be important for effective leadership.

As far as administrators' informational roles are concerned, results indicate that although they live at the age of information and are aware of the importance of it, a few administrators have competency in this role. They consider that university management provides if something is needed. In this point, a few

administrators feel obliged to follow informational change and adopt it to their institution due to time constraints. Furthermore, even though some administrators monitor and seek external information, they fall behind informational changes as they are stucked with paperwork. Administrators also claim that bureaucratic and economic constraints prevent them from reaching their goals. In this regard, some administrators try to train their staff by establishing an IT department, but not many academics attend to these seminars voluntarily. In a study Gonzales (2004) identified needed competencies for the future higher education. According to him, senior administrators should have administrative skills, informative, social and institutional competencies.

When administrators' decisional roles are concerned, most administrators are authoritarian in their administrative practices. When asked, they justify it with time constraints and necessity of quick decisions. They consider that having committees at faculties is adequate to be informed about the decisions. Moreover, according to them delegating decisions to others is risky, because they are the ones who have the responsibility as selected rectors, deans or heads. However, some other administrators describe themselves as delegators. They consider that current faculty boards are kinds of delegating bodies. In addition, a few administrators describe themselves as supervisors. In their administrative practices, they delegate all decisions to the others and they just supervise the groups by scheduling the time, programming the work, authorizing the actions and negotiating with the staff. Similarly, Harrison (2009) states that managers can delegate decision making process to the academic staff as they have the capacity to decide in their fields. The disconnection between decision-making and implementation process may cause an imbalance between authority and responsibility. While the faculty see themselves as the center of authority in the academic environment, they are used to leaving responsibility of implementing to the administration (Meyer, 2014).

According to Altbach (1996) higher education administration will increasingly become a competency profession. Similarly, in many studies, it was claimed that there is an increasing dependency on managerial and leadership skill, competence, and effectiveness within HEIs in most countries in the transition to the knowledge era (Hamlin & Patel, 2017; Hemsall, 2014; OECD 2009; Vincent-Lancrin, 2006 Vuori, 2014). As a result of the literature and this study, it can be concluded that future academic leaders should have knowledge and competency to manage the 21st century higher educational system. Gedikoğlu puts that (2012) higher education administrators (rectors, deans, heads, directors) should be accountable regarding financial and administrative performance. In other words, universities should be managed with a responsible point of view in the direction of their missions. According to Kuzu (2013) universities attach importance to their relations with stakeholders in order to assay this change. Primary stakeholders are undoubtedly academicians.

In Turkey, university administration is not considered as a professional career. It is a commonly held view that anyone who has required academic title can work in management bodies. Most university rectors move straight from their classes to administrative posts sometimes without having education and much experience in the field of educational management. Hence, it is considered that administrative competency is needed for managerial positions at HEIs. The recommendations reached through this study are below:

- This study was conducted only with public university administrators. Similar study can be carried out with administrators of private institutions.
- This study dealt with administrators' competencies regarding interpersonal, informational and decisional roles. Another study can be conducted in other management competency areas.

References

- Amey, M. J. (2006). Leadership in higher education. *Change: the Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38, 6, 55-58.
- Altbach, P.G. (1996) Patterns in higher education development. Towards the year 2000. In Z. Morsy & P.G. Altbach (Eds.), *Higher education in an international perspective* (pp. 21-35). Geneva, Switzerland: International Bureau of Education.
- Anyamele, S. C. (2004). Institutional management in higher education: A study of leadership approaches to quality improvement in university management-Nigerian and Finnish Cases, Helsinki: *University of Helsinki Department of Education Research Report*, No: 195.

- Askling, B., & Kristensen, O. (2000). Towards the learning organization: Implication for institutional governance and leadership. *Higher Education Management*, 12(2), 17-41.
- Balci, A. (1988). *Training educational administrators: Research about elementary and secondary school administrators in Turkey*. Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences.
- Bailey, K.D. (1994). *Methods of social research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bargh, C., Bocock, J., & Smith, D. (2000). *University leadership: The role of the chief executive*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Bayenet, B., Feola, C., & Tavernier, M. (2000). Strategic management of universities: evaluation policy and policy evaluation. *Higher Education Management*, 12(2), 65-72.
- Bentou, Y. (2000). An analysis of innovation in Chinese higher education adaptable to the environment. In *OECD Current Issues in Chinese Higher Education*. Paris: OECD.
- Black, S. A. (2015). Qualities of effective leadership in higher education. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 4, 54-66. doi:10.4236/ojl.2015.42006
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Botha, L., & Camphor, F. (2008). *Proposal for the development and phased implementation of a UP-specific management and development programme*. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Brennen, J., & Shah, T. (2000). *Managing quality in higher education: An international perspective on institutional assessment and change*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), 693-710.
- Cheryl, C. (2010) *Managerial leadership competencies of heads of departments: a case study of higher educational institutions in Kerala, India*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Southern Queensland, USA.
- Cisneros-Cohernour, E. J., Bustillos, M. E. B., & Riveroll, Á. M. A. (2014). Determining the competences and professional development needs of educational administrators in the Southeast of Mexico, *Journal of Modern Education Review*, 4(7), 519–526, doi: 10.15341/jmer(2155-7993)/07.04.2014/004
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press.
- Conover, K. S. (2009). *Leadership competencies of branch campus administrators in multi-campus community college systems*, Graduate Theses and Dissertations. Paper 10697.
- Creswell, J. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Crosthwaite, C., & Erwee, R. (2014). *Managerial leadership competencies of heads of department in higher education institutions in Kerala, India*. Fourth Annual International Conference on Engaged Management Scholarship, September 2014.
- Dahlgaard, J. J., Larsen, H. Z., & Norgaard, A. (1997). Leadership profiles in quality management: A Danish perspective. *Total Quality Management*, 8(2-3), 16–30.
- Davis, J. L. (1997a). *A European agenda for change for higher education in the xx1st century*, European Regional Forum, 24–27 September, Palermo.
- Dauphin, B. (2005). Letter on competency for psychologists. *The Michigan Society for Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 15(2), 100-123.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Dill, D. D. 1999. Academic accountability and university adaptation: The architecture of an academic learning organization. In *Higher Education*, 38, 127–154.
- Drew, G. (2006). Balancing academic advancement with business effectiveness? *International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, 6(4), 117-125.
- Eisemon, T. O., & Kouroma, M. (1994). *Foreign assistance for university development in Sub Saharan Africa and Asia*. In Jamil Salmi and Adriaan M. Verspoor (Eds.), *Revitalizing Higher Education*. Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press.
- Firestone, W. A. (1996). Leadership: Roles or functions? In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration*. Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Freeman, S. & Kochan, F.K. (2012). Academic pathways to university leadership: Presidents' descriptions of their doctoral education, *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 7, 53-124.
- Gedikoğlu, T. (2012). Yükseköğretimde hesap verebilirlik, *Yükseköğretim Dergisi*, 2(3):142-150, doi:10.2399/yod.12.019.
- Gentry, W. A., Harris, L.S., Baker, B.A., & Leslie, J.B. (2008). Managerial skills: what has changed since the late 1980s, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(2), 167-181, doi:10.1108/01437730810852506
- Glaser, B.G. (1992). *Theoretical sensitivity: advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, Ca: Sociology Press.
- Gonzalez, E.M. G. (2004). *Perceptions of selected senior administrators of higher education institutions in Mexico regarding needed administrative competencies*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Office of Graduate Studies of Texas A&M University.
- Hamlin, R. G., & Patel, T. (2017). Perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness within higher education in France, *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(2), 292-314.
- Harrison, R. (2009). *Learning and development. 5th edition*. London: CIPD.
- Hempsall, K. (2014). Developing Leadership in Higher Education: Perspectives from the USA, the UK and Australia. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 36(4): 383–394. doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2014.916468.
- Junga, J., & Shin, J. C. (2015). Administrative staff members' job competency and their job satisfaction in a Korean research university, *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(5), 881–901, doi:10.1080/03075079.2013.865161
- Kekäle, J. (1997). *Leadership culture in academic departments*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu Publications in Social Sciences.
- Knoepfel, R. C., & Rinehart, J. S. (2010). A canonical analysis of successful and unsuccessful high schools: Accommodating multiple sources of achievement data in school leadership. *Educational Considerations*, 38, 1, 24-32.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Academic administrator's guide to exemplary leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Krüger, M. (2009). The big five of school leadership competences in the Netherlands. *School Leadership & Management*, 29(2), 109-127.
- Kuzu, Ö.H. (2013). *Yükseköğretimde değişen değerler bağlamında Avrupa yükseköğretim alanı yeterlilik düzeyi algısı: Öğretim elemanları üzerine bir uygulama*, Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.

- Lazarenko, V. A., & Nikishina, V. B. (2014). Competence-based assessment model of inter-departmental interaction efficiency within higher educational institution. *Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences*, 5(4), 16-49.
- 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.
- Meek, V. L., Goedegebuure, L., Santiago, R., & Carvalho, T. (2010). Discusses the most relevant trends in middle-level management in higher education. In V.L. Meek et al (Eds.), *Changing dynamics of higher education*, (pp. 1-14), Melbourne, Australia.
- Meyer, H. D. (2014). The crisis of dual governance in higher education and the possibility of a new rapprochement: Insights from organization theory, *Telescope*, 20(2), 156-169.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. 2. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Murphy, J. (2002). *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century*. Chicago: NSSE
- OECD. (2009). *Higher education to 2030*, Volume 2. Globalization, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. ISBN 978-92-64-07537-5.
- Ogawa, R. T., & Bossert, S. T. (1997). Leadership as an organization quality. In M. Crawford, L. Kydd & C. Riches (Eds.), *Leadership and teams in educational management*. (pp.9-23). Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Porter, J. A., (2003). *The relationship between competencies perceived to be important for administrative effectiveness and the higher education administration doctoral program of study: A needs assessment*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Educational Leadership Department College of Education and Human Services.
- Potgieter, I.L., & Coetzee, M. (2010). Management competencies in higher education: Perceived job importance in relation to level of training required. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8(1), 306- 316.
- Potgieter, I.L., Basson, J., & Coetzee, M. (2011). Management competencies for the development of heads of department in the higher education context: a literature overview, *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 35(12), 81-103.
- Rowley, J. (1997). Academic leaders: made or born? *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 29(3), doi:10.1108/00197859710165065
- Rudzki, R. E. G. (1995). The application of strategic management model to the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, 29, 421-441.
- Shahmandi, E., Silong, A.D., Ismail, I.A., Abu Samah, B. B., & Othman, J. (2011). Competencies, roles and effective academic leadership in world class university, *International Journal of Business Administration*, 2(1), 44-53.
- Salmi, J. (1994). Conclusion: higher education reform in perspective. In J. Salmi & A. M. Verspoor (Eds.), *Revitalizing higher education* (pp.14-40), Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Scott, G., Coates, H., & Anderson, M. (2008). *Academic leadership capabilities for Australian higher education*, University of Western Sydney and Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing successful universities*. Berkshire: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Skorková, Z. (2016). Competency models in public sector, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 230(2016) 226-234.

- Smith, D. M. (2000). *Leadership and professional competencies: Serving higher education in an era of change*, Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- Smith, Z. A., & Wolverton, M. (2010). Higher education leadership competencies: quantitatively refining a qualitative model, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 17(1), 61–70.
- Sousa, D. A. (2003). *The leadership brain: How to lead today's schools more effectively*. Thousand Oaks CA:Corwin Press.
- Spendlove, M. (2007). Competencies for effective leadership in higher education, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21 (5), 407 – 417.
- Kerkhof, Van de M. (2009). *Repertory grid technique (RGT)*, Retrieved from http://www.ivm.vu.nl/en/Images/PT4_tcm53-161509.pdf on 27.10.2017 at 15:00.
- Vesi, H. (2010). Organizational learning in the higher education institutions (A case study of agricultural and natural recourses campus of university of Tehran), *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(1), 21-36.
- Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2006). What is changing in academic research? Trends and futures scenarios. *European Journal of Education*, 41(2), 169–202. doi: 10.1111/j.1465-3435.2006.00255.
- Vuori, J. (2014). Enacting the Common Script: Management Ideas at Finnish Universities of Applied Sciences. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. doi: 10.1177/174114321452301.
- Wahab, A., & Mahmood, R. (2015). *Effect of learning orientation and self-efficacy on performance of university leaders: entrepreneurial leadership as a mediator*. Paper Presented at The 18 th Annual Convention of Japanese Association of Administrative Science (JAAS) held atAichi University, Nagoya Campus, Japan, 14-15 November. Available at <http://hayalab.com/jaas/>
- Ziderman, A. (1994). Enhancing the financial sustainability of higher education institutions. In J. Salmi & A. M. Verspoor (Eds.), *Revitalizing higher education*. (pp. 78- 131). Oxford, New York, Tokyo: IAU Press and Pergamon Press.