Professional and Bureaucratic Decision Making Behaviors of Managers in Academic Administrators

Halim Güner[1]

Abstract

Professional or bureaucratic decision-making behaviors are closely related to the structure of organizations as well as to the expertise of managers. As the manager becomes more specialized in his management approach, knowledge and experience, it is seen that they make the right decision without making bureaucratic decisions. Universities are an organization where bureaucratic and professional decision making is seen. University administrators are chosen from academicians in Turkey. The most important feature of academics is that professionalism is at the core of their work. For this reason, academic managers are expected to display professional behavior rather than bureaucratic behavior. The aim of this study is to examine the bureaucratic and professional behaviors of academic administrators in decision making and from what they are affected by while carrying out decisions. In this framework, structured interviews were held with ten academic managers at various levels who are managers of the Marmara University Göztepe campus units. As a result of the qualitative analysis of the data obtained, it was found that academic administrators behave professionally in many ways, but also adhere to the rules and regulations. This commitment takes place in the form of flexible decision-making in favor of individuals to the extent allowed by the rules.

Keywords*:* Academic administrators, Administration, Bureaucratic behavior, Professional behavior,

INTRODUCTION

It is inevitable to have managers in many institutions. Regardless a horizontal or flat management approach adoption in new organizational structures, an institution without a manager cannot be considered. Situations such as participation in decisions, strict implementation of regulations, taking initiative vary in the functioning of the institution. This variability depends on the hierarchical structure of organizations as well as the type of job, education level and position of the manager. For example, the management style of a university manager and a bank manager is not the same because of their job and position. While one does not go beyond bureaucracy, there is a shift towards professionalism towards bureaucracy. However, advanced control and follow-up is carried out to reduce uncertainty and ambiguity in the operating policies of many institutions. Thus, the level of determining competence and autonomy was lowered (Kemshall, 2002).

[1] Educational Administration, Education Faculty, Mus Alparslan University, Muş, Turkey
h.guner@alparslan.edu.tr https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1537-7655

Theorists dealing with organizations stated that the management of organizations consists of three main units; regulatory, prescriptive and cultural-cognitive units. Regulatory unit: is associated with regulatory rules. It is imperative to comply with these rules. However, these rules are generally compelling and there is no penalty for non-compliance. Normative Unit determines the desired behaviors with norms from people. These norms are clear. In addition, these norms can be changed and regulated over time. Failure to comply with these norms can mean the loss of trust and credit even if there is no penalty. Cultural-Cognitive Unit: while regulatory and normative rules are written and specific, cultural-cognitive rules are not. But these are obvious things known to all. These are historical traditions from routine, culture, and symbols (Scott, 2001; Suchman, 1995).

Katz examined effective management styles with three characteristics; technical ability, human ability and conceptual ability (Shenhar, 1990). Technical competence procedures, techniques and methods are related to knowing and applying them correctly. In general, this becomes more important in sub-category professions or sub-group of hierarchy. As the hierarchy shifts up, this technical competence becomes less important. Some good professions above the hierarchy do not require any technical competence. Human competence is the competence sought in jobs that are intertwined with society. Managers with this competence are aware of their emotions and expressive abilities, they know how to be useful and their limits. Other features include accepting the beliefs of the other people, making the other people feel safe, being sensitive to the needs of the people and motivating others. Conceptual competence is about seeing the organization as a whole. Another part of the functioning of an organization is to know how it affects relationships and positions (Katz, 1955; as cited in Pettersson & Andersson, 2012).

Mechanical management is more preferred because it saves many people, especially top managers, from uncertainty and risk. Mechanical bureaucracy takes advantage of coded information. Mechanical bureaucracy can be defined by segmentation, close surveillance, and by creating fixed paths to reduce uncertainties. Much attention is paid to establishing rules, following the steps and setting performance standards to manage. Even knowledge and skills that increase performance have been determined in documents (Baruch, 2004; Lam, 2000). Mechanical bureaucracy tries to reduce the use of unwritten information and correct mistakes by monitoring performance (Flynn, 2002). In this respect, although it aims to minimize mistakes by making use of past experiences, the constant structure of the ever-increasing laws, regulations and rules is reflected in the organizational culture and a stable organizational structure is formed and closed to changes. Fish and Coles (2000) stated that lowering autonomy and monotonous practices for this static monotonous structure decrease motivation in mechanical bureaucracy.

As opposed to the bureaucratic structure, in mechanical structure an understanding of professional management exists. In professional management, the dependency on the rules is based on necessities, and when necessary, decisions are made based on the initiative provided by the knowledge, experience and expertise of the manager, not according to the rules. The professional is defined as an expert in his field and manages his own business. Professional bureaucracy is also defined by the decentralization of management and decision making. It is

also about maintaining professionalism and coordination among experts rather than control (Mintzberg, 1992). According to McWilliam (2004) professional evaluation has three main characteristics; making the most appropriate choice to solve the situation, having standards in decision making and applying standards to events. But professionalism does not mean ignoring the rules. On the contrary, it combines the knowledge and experience provided by the expertise with regulations and rules. For this reason, it is accepted that the understanding of professional bureaucracy prevails in the administration rather than a completely free and irregular understanding. In fact, the main reason for success in some organizations is the joint management of knowledge and bureaucracy that underlie professional decision making (Ruston, 2006).

Professional bureaucracy has important features such as professional control and self-management (Mintzberg, 1992). Professional bureaucracy makes use of wisdom. These organizations are managed by people who increase their skills and knowledge with formal education and have a high level of autonomy and experience. This type of bureaucracy operates with standardized professional skills rather than authority and fixed rules (Baruch, 2004). Professional bureaucracy involves the employment of professionals in important jobs. Organizations are generally of a certain nature; A few managers in the middle part of the hierarchy make the link between the upper strategic division and the lower division. In the professional bureaucracy trained staff provide support in the management of professional business. In this bureaucracy, people are trained with a standard, that is, with a university degree and then selected as employees. Hospitals, universities, law firms can be given as examples of such organizations. In other words, professionals such as teachers, doctors and lawyers with academic degrees work in professional bureaucracy (Mintzberg, 1992). Thanks to standard qualifications, professionals know how to work and what to expect from their colleagues. Because professionals are usually experts in their field and they are in control and management of their own work. Professionals often do their jobs independently and individually, face-to-face with their customers and do not get much support from their colleagues. In other words, making their own decision in the business process. However, sharing of activities, ideas and coordination is of course among the employees within the organization (Schön, 1983).

Turkey has a management team of academics at the university. In the decision-making processes, management is carried out according to the regulations and university specific rules. However, a strict understanding of bureaucracy cannot be applied due to the organizational structure of the university and the consisting culture of students. Extent of the flexibility permitted by the regulations, rules and the initiative of the manager when necessary or the operation of the process according to the decisions made as a result of the board meetings are common situations. Nevertheless, bureaucratic management approach is common in universities. The purpose of this study is to determine the level of use of bureaucracy and professionalism by academic administrators in the university while performing their jobs and the effects of their assistants on this issue. In determining this purpose, the following questions were searched;

1. Are academic managers acting bureaucratic or professional while making decisions at the management stage?

2. Which factors are effective for academic administrators to behave bureaucratically or professionally in the management process?

3. To what extent do the assistants of the academic managers influence their managers' decisions to behave professionally or bureaucratically?

METHOD

Information about the design of the method, sample selection, data collection tool and analysis of the data obtained were given below.

Research Pattern

Qualitative research method was used as a research design. Qualitative research can be defined as a research method in which the process of describing events and perceptions in their natural environment is realistic and as a whole (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). In this study, qualitative data were obtained with a voice recorder based on the interview form data.

Research Sample

The universe of the research consists of academic administrators in Marmara University Göztepe Campus. The sample was composed of 10 academic administrators who can be reached from within this universe. These managers were to serve at various levels. The sample consisted of three deans, one vice dean, two deputy directors of institutes, two vice-chairmen of the departments, one vice director of vocational school and one head of department. Three of them were female and seven are male in terms of gender. This diversity was not a pre-planned situation.

Data Collection Tool

Semi-structured interview questions were used as data collection tools. These questions were submitted to two expert opinions. The questions were finalized according to the feedback from the experts. However, according to the flow of the interview, different questions were directed to the interviewees without going beyond the scope of the study. The interviews were recorded with a tape recorder with the permission of the interviewees. Interviews lasted 20-40 minutes on average.

Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed using the "descriptive analysis" technique evaluated within the scope of qualitative research. Data belonging to the same participant were written by hand before analyzing. Then, the recorded text was compared with the speech of the relevant participant from the audio recording device. After this stage, the responses of the managers for each question were analyzed, common views were collected under the same headings, and the statements of the participants were transferred to the research in their original form. While transferring these expressions, the participants were coded from Y1 (Manager 1,…), Y2, Y3 to… ……… Y10. In descriptive analysis, direct quotes are frequently used to reflect

the views of the participants in a striking way. The aim was to present the findings to the reader in an edited and interpreted manner (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011).

FINDINGS

Difference of University Administration in Aspect of Management

The first question addressed to individuals in the interviews what was the aspects that make university administration different from other institutions. The interviewees stated that the feature that distinguishes the university administration from other institutions is its own culture. Some of this culture meant that the culture formed by the academician due to their work (n = 3). In other words, they stated that the decision made should be more careful and acceptable due to the presence of academicians in the group served. There were also people who stated that this situation made the management more difficult (n = 2). Some of the participants said the following on these issues;

> *The fact that people have different personality traits, the group being served is more comfortable and freer can make management difficult. For example, I cannot give orders to the professor, but I would like to (Y1).*

> *What makes university administration different from other institutions is the academic mindset. The relationship between the top and bottom is different here, academic staff are more comfortable and have more self-confidence (Y2).*

> *There is an academic difference. I have to behave more hierarchically, rather like a friend. It can change according to the title. For example, while the professor manager behaves more hierarchically, I (assistant professor) behave less hierarchically (Y3).*

> *Here, of course, it is necessary to manage academicians who have passed certain academic stages. It makes it a little more difficult, they question more. Every step should make sense and have a backing. But of course, communication can be easier (Y4).*

The question of what was the most important characteristics that a manager should have was generally answered as characteristics such as communication (n = 5), fairness (n = 4), knowledge (n = 4), trustworthiness-honesty (n = 3). Different characteristics are also expressed by the interviewees. These were leadership, creativity, taking responsibility, serving, being tolerant, loving people, being hardworking, empathizing, knowing values, being accommodating, and making effort. Although the order of importance varies according to the respondent, communication, information and justice have come to the fore.

> *Their relationship should be very good with all stakeholders. Establishing a trust relationship is very important, I think the most important qualification of a good manager. Equality is not complete, but it is important to feel trust (Y3).*

> *A good manager should also have features such as justice, creativity, responsibility, service, and the rightful evaluation of the one who deserves it (Y8).*

So I think a manager should have tolerance, love people, be hardworking, fair and honest. I think it's important to empathize, to be hardworking, fair, reliable. He should also know how to say no. But the very important thing is s/he must be honest and reliable. It is the first condition for me that working people have confidence in the manager (Y10).

The most important quality is to have good relationships with people. Otherwise, he can write very good articles but not be a good manager. Then leadership, then justice. Actually, justice comes first and should be conscious about human rights (Y2).

Some of the interviewees stated that the manager should have a good knowledge both in his job as well as features such as justice and communication.

It should be fair in distribution of work. Justice and communication are also important. Knowing value is also important. Of course, the manager should know all aspects of the business and give that trust (Y4).

The manager needs to know the compromise. The manager should also have a command of his branch. (Y5).

A good manager means one who knows good human relations, but he must also know the laws and procedures. In other words, he should know very well the requirements of his job, first of all, human relations, social relations, smiling face and then (Y7).

First of all, the human trait of course. He / she will know the legislation, regulation, that is, the routine operation, will be very good knowledge. But this is something that can be won by everyone. Even if it is not recruited, it has resources. But first of all, I think they are human characteristics, where communication skills are very important. I think a manager with very good communication is an ideal manager if he has some knowledge of legislation (Y9).

A manager also said that it is the qualification of a good manager to make as much effort as possible.

Well, once I rely on it. If a manager is trying, I think he will be a good manager no matter who he is (Y6).

Decision Making Process

Another question directed to the interviewers is what behavior they show predominantly in the process of bureaucratic and professional decision making in the management process. The majority of the administrators (n = 7) replied that the regulation came before. In other words, when asked which one applies when it is between the regulation and their professional decision, they said that they act in accordance with the legislation and rules. They stated that this priority is due to not being able to go beyond the rules and regulations. However, they stated that laws provide flexibility in favor of people in terms of flexibility (n = 10).

Everything needs to be within the rule. Even if it is a simple thing, it has to be done in accordance with the regulation. So the regulation makes the job easier. There must be rules, after all. If it is open to interpretation, it is decided for the benefit of the person (Y4).

Everything is suitable for the black book. Of course, there are no details here, there are general rules. Works are carried out in accordance with these general rules. I apply the existing rules, but I soften them legally and use them in favor of people (Y5).

Let's say we live not a lot but 25%. We try to be humane when faced with something like this. Yes, there is bureaucracy, but we work with people and we need them too. If we do not come intentionally, we think about a solution in favor of the person. Of course, these rules are within the flexibility framework allowed by the regulation (Y7).

Bureaucracy, yes, limits us. For example, our programs come from Higher Education Council. If it is up to us, maybe we will put different lessons (Y9).

Of course, we came across a lot, in that case whatever the regulation is. Because the moment you break out of the regulation, it immediately comes behind. But this is interpreted in favor of our teachers (Y10).

Within the framework of logic and conscience, I can stretch the official practice as much as I can. I do this in favor of human beings (Y5).

One interviewer stated that he was not torn between bureaucratic decision making and professional decision making.

Rather than bureaucracy, it is the vision, mission and perspectives that bother us. I have not encountered a situation that disturbs the laws and regulations very much (Y8).

Other interviewees stated that professionalism should be applied when there is a gap between bureaucratic decision making and professional decision making (n = 3). One of the interviewees replied that the reason for this is that the university administration process requires this, and another interviewer answered that the human dimension should be prioritized.

Bureaucracy will also be known (in decision making), but professionalism should be the main thing (Y2).

You determine the main skeleton, the main framework with rules, and then you wait for the manager to make professional decisions. If you try to do everything formally, this creates trouble. I think the management doesn't work like that (Y6).

The human dimension stands out. In other words, if an individual will suffer when you act bureaucratically, we prefer to be professional. If there is no such situation, we can choose bureaucracy (Y1).

The two interviewees stated that they act in accordance with the rules and regulations, but when it is considered that the regulations and rules do not comply with this, it can be objected and discussed and changed in the board.

As long as you don't change the rules, you must follow the existing rules. If you have an objection after applying it, you can do it (Y5).

We have both regulations and guidelines, we comply with it. We look at the directive too much and take it seriously. We can change the directive if needed. We reflect our practices to the directive (Y3).

Assistance of Secretaries

When we asked the participants about the effect of their assistants, namely their secretaries, in professional and bureaucratic decision-making, they received different answers but they were not very effective (n = 8). We see that especially those whose secretaries are inexperienced say that they are helping themselves instead of getting help from the secretary.

When we want to make professional decisions, our assistants can urge us to act bureaucratically. There is a law for this, my teacher, officers. Maybe it should be like this, but sometimes such situations arise at the decision point. But it's a bit of a way we're there. If it was up to the officer, it wouldn't work we turn the business into a little more professional (Y1).

Well, whether we are getting help from the secretary or we are helping them is a controversial situation here frankly. With us, the secretary only brings and takes documents. I will do what is necessary. The reason for this has become a culture rather than ignorance (Y9).

I found my secretary and raised him myself (Y5).

Our secretary has just started. Therefore, we make our decisions ourselves, within the knowledge of our president. Therefore, we did not encounter such a thing (Y6).

Two interviewees responded in the opposite direction (n = 2).

There are usually things I consult and this is usually within the framework of laws and regulations. The secretariat is very helpful in this regard. For example, I sometimes go out of line while making a decision, and when the document is received by the officer, she or he can warn me and correct it (Y7).

Secretaries sporadically guide us in making decisions. Very little (Y2).

When we asked the interviewers whether the managers and / or secretaries needed a training when they just started their jobs, four interviewees said that training was needed but

should be given when needed (n = 4). All those who responded in this direction did not distinguish between secretaries and managers. In other words, all of the interviewees who said that managers need training, thought the same thing among the secretaries.

Training is absolutely necessary, for example, it should be related to legislation and correspondence. It is necessary to benefit from knowledge and experience (Y6).

A training can be given to the manager to know the existing laws, to read that notebook well, to explain the problems he will encounter the most, to know the management scheme and to teach whom to behave and to teach the dialogue between people. He needs such training in his secretaries, especially he needs to keep up with updates (Y7).

Rather than directly hiring a teacher and making him a manager, I think he should first be taken to in-service training. I think a short training will be beneficial. I think that secretaries should also be trained at the points they lack. But they do not accept this deficiency of course (Y9).

Education is a must. I think training is essential for a good manager. My character is good, if I had received training on how to be a better manager in this subject, maybe I would be a better manager. I think such an education should be given (Y10).

Three people (n = 3) who participated in the interview at the point of necessity of education stated that education may exist, but learning by living in the process raises the administrator and the secretary. These people stated that what can be learned through education is limited and that there may be a short training for them.

Training may be good in the early days of managers, but I am not talking about exaggerated theoretical things. When the basic information and regulations about management are required, a break can be taken. Management is gained through experiences (Y4).

Job descriptions for the secretary can be trained, but experience is very important. He gets educated, but eventually learns by asking and living. But at least things like writing a petition in accordance with the regulation should be given through training (Y9).

So some basic information can be given, but this should not exceed three months. It can be given in the form of such seminars. But it is necessary to experience many things and encounter it by entering the kitchen personally. Learn theoretical knowledge, these are not enough (Y2).

In addition, some interviewees stated that this was unnecessary and that it should be learned in the work, and that training was given to a certain extent (n = 2).

No, it is not something that can happen with education. Communication is more important. It feels like managing people is not something that can happen with education. If there is, it does not exist (Y1).

If there was training, but I don't know how useful it would be. I am someone who believes in master-apprentice relationship. A little too believer. A little difficult with training. People need to mature. Of course, the top ones should raise the bottom ones (Y5).

Selection of Managers

The common concern of those who gave both answers was that this choice should be made in line with some criteria in both cases, although some interviewers were appointed and some said to be elected to the question of whether the managers were appointed by appointment or by election. Four people (n = 4) said that they should come by choice. Even if two of them are election, some criteria of the candidates should be considered, and one of them said that people should make fair judgments in order to choose the right person. In addition, they stated their justification that the manager should not come with appointment as the bureaucratic dependency of the manager would be (n = 2) and it would affect the atmosphere of the unit negatively (n = 1).

Those who come with election become more free and independent. Nobody gets addicted. It aims to improve the institution in order to be able to attend the next election. The appointed person does not have such a problem (Y1).

Those who are appointed are more dependent on bureaucracy, but those who are chosen are of course better in communication and loyalty to whoever chose them. However, a sense of justice must be good in people, or if we bring people who are useful for us, it will not happen to us (Y2).

Both appointment and election have problems. While there is no change in the communication of elected friends with other people, this hierarchy is established in the appointed ones. It gets a little better with the selection. Maybe he has problems with him, but frankly, I prefer it to be by choice. Of course, it is best to choose the appropriate one for the task (Y3).

In other words, I think that someone who does not have a good communication and dialogue gets up and gets assigned to plug from above will disturb the peace within the unit. I think the only way is democratic choice. But of course, I think that the managerial qualification, the managerial qualification, the knowledge dimension of the person to be elected, that is, the candidates should have this competence (Y9).

Three people who gave their opinions to this question stated that the manager should come with appointment (n = 3). Two of them stated that the top managers should choose their own teammates to work smoothly.

I think it's important for a manager to set up his own team. But while doing this, one should not look at ideology, religion, language, and race. Look at the character. Does that person do his job properly, is there hypocrisy, does he do his job on time, or is he neglecting (Y5).

Either this topic is a controversial topic, I think, it changes according to your perspective. Making joint decisions is important, but I think the rector or dean should form their own team. Because you are doing a study, it is of course difficult to work with someone you cannot cooperate with in this study (Y6).

I think one should stay out to be fair. The person's c.v. can be looked at, asked to someone, and observed. The direct assignment is wrong with the wrong selection. They do not choose the experience and ability of the person in the selection. There may be an appointment, but he must have special conditions (Y7).

One of those who gave an opinion stated that in both cases, namely, that the manager comes by election or appointment has problems and that the board of trustees can be a solution to this problem (n = 1).

We say centralization is not good, but this time there are groupings. Both have positive and negative aspects. What is the solution, you say democratic management, you say it should be through elections, and there are also problems in universities. Citizens make all their investments accordingly in order to be elected again. Maybe it should be a board of trustees, a former rector, an opinion leader, a businessman (Y8).

One person said that there should be a choice, but the candidates should be determined with multi-criteria standards in this selection and the people to be selected should be composed of both employees and managers in the unit (n = 1).

I think it should be a multi-criteria decision making technique. The number of publications of that person, the project, the things he will do for the institution, his success in his course, etc. must meet the criteria. Criteria should be viewed more broadly, but the standard should be so that the person should feel safe. Those who evaluate must also have balance. There must be both department professors and top lecturers (Y4).

To the question of whether the administrator should be from inside or outside, all of those who gave their opinions stated that they should be from academicians in terms of knowing the culture and operation of the university (n = 10). However, there were also participants who stated that outside counseling could contribute (n = 4).

The manager should come from within, not from outside, he should know and understand the university well. But a committee can provide consultancy, but I don't think it should look like it is managed mechanically (Y4).

If someone from the outside is a manager, I think the institution denies itself. Why isn't there any staff here? Of course, it can be used from time to time at the counseling

point. Because of course, someone who comes from below sees the deficits, problems and dilemmas of the institution healthier than someone who comes from within (Y6).

The manager must come from within. Just as you cannot get a baker certificate and go and bake, you must first learn how to bake bread. So it is necessary to come through it. It would be quite troublesome for someone who does not have a zero area to rule (Y7).

I do not find it right to bring someone who does not know the university, students, student psychology, academician and become a manager. I think someone who can breathe this air can do this job (Y9).

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

The university is an institution that contains its own dynamics. It has a unique culture. This culture stems from both the age and educational level of the students and the difference between the academic job and other jobs. This situation also affects the management process. What the participants of this interview generally stated is that the administration of the university is affected as much by this cultural structure. There are opinions that especially title and professional structure determine the style of interaction in management and there is a softer interaction. Frequently cited examples on this issue have sometimes been that the governed has a higher academic title or an equal academic title than the ruler, making the formality more humane or softer (Purcell, 1987). In addition, the reason why the academic community is more relaxed, free and questioning is the reason why the ruled community behaves softer, more humane and more careful in the management of the ruler, even if it is official, it can express its discontent, express its discontent, reject what is given or requested It may be inferred that it might be to avoid their attitudes that might make it difficult. This situation can both make it difficult to manage and make things more comfortable for a positive management due to the education level of the community (Farquhar, 1995).

It is seen that communication, justice, knowledge and trust come to the fore in the characteristics of the managers. We see that these four features enable the management to be accepted. The importance of communication is also related to the community. After all, in order for things to work, other employees must also fulfill their duties properly. In order to achieve this, there must be good communication with the governed. Good managers give importance to people, can establish personal relationships, put themselves in the shoes of others, and can manage their relationships effectively (Barling, Slatter, & Kelloway, 2000). Those who are governed also need to have confidence in management to embrace and assist. The feeling of trust can be provided in two ways. The management must be fair and just and fulfill the job it has undertaken properly. In order to fulfill a job properly, it is necessary to know the requirements of that job, the process, that is, the required information at the level of expertise. As can be seen, the features required in management are complementary to each other and must be in a professional management approach. Although indirectly, managers stated that they or managers should have these qualities and be professional. Considering that the respondents are managers, it can be commented that the managers say that they are

managers who have good communication, fairness, good knowledge and confidence (Barrett, 2006).

The absence of responses such as the responses given to the characteristics of the manager, such as taking initiative, trusting his expertise, and based on his professionalism in decision making, also shows that managers behave bureaucratically as required by the rules and regulations. Although all managers stated that people decided in favor of their employees, most of them still stated that these decisions were within the framework permitted by regulations and laws. This situation should not be considered as unprofessional. Because there is no such thing as going out of regulation in the manager's job descriptions. Peterson and Blackburn (1985) state that there are compulsions in universities to implement formal procedures. However, not taking the responsibility at this point and acting within the regulation may be related to the fact that the manager does not want to fall into the guilty position, even if it is good intention. In this case, it can be said that the manager does not feel safe in this regard. Moreover, against possible objections, the manager has the opportunity to respond by showing the regulation. In addition, the lack of complaints from the managers in the direction of bureaucratic frameworks can also be interpreted as the regulations allow sufficient flexibility. However, despite all these, there are also interviewers' responses stating that they are more beneficial for people, they overcome bureaucratic behavior and make professional decisions in order to make decisions in their favor. In this case, there are also executive decisions that take this responsibility and show that it will be taken (Certo et al., 2008).

We see that secretaries, who are in the position of assistants to managers, are not able to influence the decisions of the managers. One of the reasons for this is that the secretaries cannot have as much command of the subject and the rules as the person in the executive position. It is even seen that their managers help these secretaries. Experienced secretaries, on the other hand, seem to correct some of the decisions that are contrary to the regulations, even if few, to their managers. These corrections are generally in the direction of making the manager behave more bureaucratically and the justification is that the opposite behavior will cause problems (Strathern, 1997).

Some interviewees responded positively that managers and / or secretaries needed training when they first started their jobs, while others stated that the job could be learned, while others stated that it could not be gained through training. Those who think that there should be a need for training are those who do not want to start too inexperienced. It can be said that they think this will be alleviated to some extent with education. However, most of the managers who participated in the interview, especially those with different managerial experiences in their past, stated that this job was gained through experience rather than education. The reason for this is thought to be that this is how their own experiences develop. In addition, it can be interpreted that the situations and learning encountered are more experienced by living (Spendlove, 2007).

It is known from the answers that nepotism, which has been the problem of universities for years, regarding the question of whether administrators should be appointed or elected, is that

the strong is the determining factor rather than grouping and qualification. For this reason, most of the answers are that both election and appointment situations seem problematic. One reason for those who call for choice and appointment is that the other method will not be fair. In addition, those who called election stated that this was more democratic, and those who said appointment stated the justification that this was the right of the manager to form his own team to work. The common decision of those who said one of the two methods is that some criteria should be determined in determining the manager. It was stated that these criteria should be determined as to determine the appropriate person and should not be injurious to the candidates. This conformity was stated in a different study as the person who can do the job at a high level should be the university administrator (McWilliam, Bridgstock, Lawson, Evans & Taylor, 2008). In this case, it can be said that the interviewees are disturbed by the illness of favoritism that has plagued the university for years.

All the administrators of the interviewees stated that the administrator should be from academicians who are educated in the university culture. This answer is consistent with the answers that management is acquired through experience and experience. The answers that the university culture is different from other institutions also support this. It is thought that those who grow up from within can best understand the structure of this culture. Some of the interviewees stated that they could benefit from outside people as consultancy. The reason for this can be interpreted as the connections with the outside world, the university may need people who can look from outside to respond to the changing world. In addition, it may be thought that the university's external consultancy may contribute to its more supervised work (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2004).

In this study, among the questions asked to the managers, the bureaucratic and professional decision making of the manager and the effect of his assistants on these decisions were investigated. Although the questions seem to be separate from each other, it is thought that professional behaviors are related to the questions asked. The perspective of a manager to the university culture and how much the management understanding is shaped by this culture, the characteristics of the manager, what affects him in decision making, the method of determining the manager is directly related to the perception of professionalism. For example, whether the manager needs or does not need training gives us a clue about how his professionalism develops. Likewise, their managerial characteristics give us a clue about how professionalism they exhibit. Considering all these, they are able to act professionally within the framework of the rules, but put their professionalism aside and display bureaucratic behavior when they conflict with the rules or where the rules are determinant. Nevertheless, the fact that they bend the rules in favor of people as much as possible indicates that they act professionally. In addition, considering the responses to selection or appointment, which are the methods of determining managers, it is revealed that the managers' autonomous act is not considered correct at the moment. Because the ambiguities between selection and appointment can be interpreted that, in one aspect, managers are not selected from those who are sufficiently qualified and therefore there are doubts that an autonomous structure will act according to the interests of a party rather than a unit. This

situation shows us that professionalism is not seen as sufficient to exceed the rules (Strathern, 1997).

Suggestions

It is recommended to make changes in the method of determining the managers so that the managers can behave more professionally without being dependent on anything. It is believed that this change should be made according to standard criteria and in a manner that is included in its selection. These criteria can be in the form of academic achievement, course performance, project contributions, and projects for the unit, and votes received.

Considering that managers do not look very favorably on education, they pay attention on the experience and experience becomes more important. An arrangement can be made for those who are close to finish their management and those who are newly elected to work together in six or three months. Thus, manager training can be done by handing over and transferring the experience.

Considering the dissatisfaction with the secretaries, a training especially for secretaries is required. In this training, all kinds of equipment should be equipped to facilitate the work of the managers of the secretaries. These equipment are thought to be in the form of knowing correspondence, knowing regulations, supporting the manager and knowing job descriptions.

Control mechanisms can be developed within decentralized units. For example, an executive candidate who could not be elected or a group to be formed by his / her candidates may be asked to undertake this task. If this system is successful, it can be evaluated that the units switch to autonomous management approach.

REFERENCES

Alvesson, M. & Kärreman, D. (2004). Interfaces of control. Technocratic and socio-ideological control in a global management consultancy firm. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *29* (3-4), 423-444.

Barling, J., Slatter F. & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *21* (3), 157-161.

Barrett, D. J. (2006). Strong communication skills a must for today's leaders. *Handbook of Business Strategy*.

Baruch, Y. (2004). Transforming careers: From linear to multidirectional career paths. *Career Development International*, *9* (1), 58–73.

Certo, S. T., Connelly, B. L., & Tihanyi, L. (2008). Managers and their not-so rational decisions. *Business Horizons*, *51* (2), 113-119.

Farquhar, K. (1995). Not just understudies: The dynamics of short-term leadership. *Human Resource Management*, *34* (1), 51–70.

Fish, D. & Coles, C. (2000). Seeing a new: Understanding professional practice as artistry. In C. Davies, L. Finlay and A. Bullen (eds.) *Changing Practice in Health and Social Care* (London: Sage).

Flynn, R. (2002). Clinical governance and governmentality. *Health, Risk and Society*, *4*, 155 – 173.

Kemshall, H. (2002). *Risk, Social Policy and Welfare*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Lam, A. (2000). Tacit knowledge, organizational learning and societal institutions: *An integrated framework. Organization Studies*, 21, 487 – 513.

McWilliam, E., Bridgstock, R., Lawson, A., Evans, T. & Taylor, P. (2008). Who's Dean today? Acting and interim management as paradoxes of the contemporary university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *30* (3), 297-307.

McWilliam, E. (2004). Changing the academic subject. *Studies in Higher Education*, *29* (2), 151–163.

Mintzberg, H. (1992). *Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Pettersson, J. & Andersson, V. (2012). *Recruiting managers in professional bureaucracies* (Unpublished Master Thesis). The University of Gothenburg.

Peterson, W. M. & Blabkburn, R. (1985). Faculty effectiveness: Meeting institutional needs and expectations. *The Review of Higher Education*, *9* (1), 21-24.

Purcell, J. (1987). Mapping management styles in employee relations. *Journal of Management Studies*, *24* (5), 533-548.

Ruston, A. (2006). Interpreting and managing risk in a machine bureaucracy: Professional decision-making in NHS Direct. *Health, Risk & Society*, 8 (3), 257-271.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Basic Book.

Scott, R.W. (2001). *Institutions and Organizations, 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks*: Sage Publications.

Shenhar, A. (1990). What is a Manager? A New Look. *European Management Journal*, *8* (2), 198-202.

Spendlove, M. (2007). Competencies for effective leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*.

Strathern, M. (1997). Improving ratings: Audit in the British university system. *European Review*, *5* (3), 305–321.

Suchman, M.C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20 (3), 571-610.

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri [Qualitative Research Methods in Social Sciences]*. Ankara: Seçkin publicationYayıncılık.