

ONS04162

Management: the dark side of academic leadership programs in the enterprise university.

In general terms, a deal of uncertainty remains about what constitutes leadership in the academy. There are some generally agreed upon ideas. First, in the academy, leadership is generally seen as a higher-purpose activity than management. Second, academic leadership is usually seen in one of two ways: either as a trait or as behaviour. The first view results in the notion that leaders are born not made and that those people fortunate to have been born with the potential for leadership merely need some experience in the field to bring it out. The second view results in the notion that most people can be taught to be good leaders with the right amount of and kind of training. Third, in general terms the academy has, apparently, long operated on the belief that its staff will rise to an appropriate level of leadership as and when ability is matched by opportunity. However, recent case studies from the UK suggest that leadership's primary concern, change, may be less evident in the academy than management's primary concern, maintenance. This study looks at the leadership training programs in one of Australia's largest universities, particularly in relation to a re-examination of Jaques' Stratified Systems Theory.

Andrys Onsman
Higher Education Development Unit
Monash University

What is the Enterprise University?

The enterprise university is a term coined by Professor Simon Marginsonⁱ, the director of the Centre for Research in International Education at Monash University. He noted that Monash embraced the concept with vigour, to the point where he had to invent the term hyper-entrepreneurialism to describe its strategic intent. The term refers to universities with strategies that aim to change from being dependant on Federally allocated budgets to increasing their market-based income from such avenues as overseas students, full fee paying post-graduate courses, consultancies and commercial research. Monash articulates its strategy in terms of wanting to be "a self-reliant, broad-based, global university and learning organisation."ⁱⁱ The strategy, for example, was made spectacularly manifest in Monash University's successful bid for the 200 million plus dollar synchrotron.

Adopting such an aggressive strategy was the brainchild of disgraced ex-Vice Chancellor David Robinson rather than the incumbent, but Professor Richard Larkins is keen to capitalise on that success, especially as it has yielded results such as Monash's rise on the Times Education Supplement's ranking of "international universities" to 33rd in the world. But Professor Larkins' emphasis on research has met with limited success so far: Monash was well down on the list of research grant winners – except in the area of Medicine where National Health and Medicine Research Council and Health Service grants topped 18.5 million.

Universities are usually structured triangularly on axes of teaching, research and management. Notwithstanding the push by the current Minister of Education, Dr Brendon Nelson, to create some teaching-only institutes, universities generally jiggle the percentages but have some currency in each of the three. Of course, there is management in teaching and in research and even in management, but the usual interpretation of management on the meta level is as the administrative support to both research and teaching. In simple terms it is the over-all running of the place.

In this theoretical world, the teachers teach, the researchers research and the managers manage. When you become excellent at teaching, you assume a leadership role in teaching. When you become excellent in research you assume a leadership role in research. When you become excellent in management you assume a leadership role in management. That, you would think, is leadership in the academy. But in fact, that structure is tied to the cloistered buildings and genteel honour-based rules of the old English universities, where professors all had flowing white hair and smoked luxurious pipes. The American Ivy league academies on the other hand haven't needed or sought government sponsorship for decades – well, not beyond paid consultancy work anyway.

What is Academic Leadership in the Enterprise University?

There is a plethora of writing that compares and contrasts leadership and management: perhaps the most often cited is John Kotterⁱⁱⁱ from Harvard. Usually the distinction revolves around leadership getting the right thing done and management getting the thing done right. Management happens through directives; leadership happens through inspiration. Whatever way it is described, the upshot invariably is that leadership is a higher purpose activity than management. One commentator summed it up by saying that leadership is sexier than management: and indeed who wouldn't prefer to be

a leader than a manager? What comes through is that leadership is for the greater good of the institution, the almost moral dimension of operating on a higher plane than management. Leadership is good.

Adolf Hittler was a good leader. So were Stalin, Poll Pot, Winston Churchill and Genghis Khan. Apparently Custer was charismatic and Osama bin Laden commands tremendous popular support. The list of megalomaniacal, Narcissistic, emotionally illiterate, morally bereft, self-aggrandising leaders seems endless. But try coming up with an uncontested list of squeaky-clean leaders. Except for Nelson Mandela, they all seem to be fictional, religion-based or both. It may be true that the most effective form of leadership is a benign dictatorship, but just try finding one.

If all this sits uneasily with those who make their living from leadership education, then they are only fooling themselves. Leadership can be evil, not just in history or politics but also in the modern organisation. Worse there is nothing we can do about it.

It is what Harry Onsman^{iv} calls the Darth Vader side of leadership. It's not a subject often discussed in Management literature. It's even less discussed in Academic Management literature. It would imply that there are university vice-chancellors, school principals and heads of departments who show a less-than-balanced^v approach to the role, and whilst we may privately believe that to be patently obvious, we certainly wouldn't say so. At least not until we're in a position of leadership, in which it would no longer be true.

Monash University, probably like all Australian universities, bases its notion of leadership on Kotter.^{vi} On the Staff Development Unit web-site are listed the key differences between managers and leaders.

While much continues to be written on this topic from a number of perspectives, it is generally agreed that:

- *management is about the present while leadership is about the future*
- *managers are dedicated to the maintenance of the existing organisation, whereas leaders are often committed to its change in some way*
- *managers manage things, like resources and leaders manage/lead people*
- *management is about being efficient and leadership is about being effective*
- *leaders do the right things; managers do things right*
- *both leadership and management are important for organisational effectiveness and it is their combination and the balance between them that is the challenge*
- *an individual can be both an effective leader and an efficient manager, although this is not always the case and so developing leader/managers needs to be an organisational priority*

- *the exercise of leadership is not dependent on being in a formal position of authority and it is becoming a more distributed function throughout organisations.*

The most we can say from that is that leadership in the academy is an ambiguous concept, but one aspect of the difference between leaders and managers is made very clear. From the table below it is obvious that managers have had a happy childhood whilst leaders come from broken homes. The twelfth difference suggests that perhaps the members of the Stolen Generation would make the best leaders. Those of you from a happy stable family background can forget becoming vice-chancellors.

Differences Between Managers & Leaders

<i>Managers</i>	<i>Leaders</i>
<i>Administers</i>	<i>Innovates</i>
<i>Replicates</i>	<i>Originates</i>
<i>Maintains</i>	<i>Develops</i>
<i>Focus on systems & structures</i>	<i>Focus on people</i>
<i>Relies on control</i>	<i>Inspires trust</i>
<i>Short range view</i>	<i>Long range perspective</i>
<i>Asks how & when</i>	<i>Asks what & why?</i>
<i>Eye on bottom line</i>	<i>Eye on horizon</i>
<i>Accepts status quo</i>	<i>Challenges status quo</i>
<i>Classic "good soldier"</i>	<i>One's "own person"</i>
<i>Does things right</i>	<i>Does the right thing</i>
<i>Uneventful early childhood</i>	<i>Developmental conflicts requiring mastery & reflection</i>
<i>Life seen as steady progression of positive events and security</i>	<i>Life punctuated with challenges & disruptions</i>
<i>Feel strong sense of belonging</i>	<i>Feel separateness; create rather than inherit identity</i>
<i>Maintain identity and self esteem through others</i>	<i>Self confidence grows out of self identity and vision that drives achievement</i>

What does the Enterprise University require from its Leaders?

One of the places where the nexus between the theoretical and the actual becomes manifest is in position descriptions for leadership vacancies. Scanning the senior academic positions vacant at Monash University at the time of writing reveals the ambiguity of leadership expectations.

Every position description for positions vacant at the professorial level starts with a variation of “will be expected to provide leadership.” This is hardly unexpected. As an example, the Position Description for professor of Marketing starts with:

The professor will be expected to exercise a special responsibility in providing leadership in a discipline(s) relevant to the Department of Marketing, by fostering excellence in research, teaching, professional activities and policy development within the department and, more generally, in the university and the wider community.

Apart from echoing the University ethos of teaching, research and management, the paragraph is fairly generic, as all such statements tend to be. It is when we look at the list of actual duties that the picture becomes clearer:

Specific duties will include:

- *Provide a continuing high level of personal commitment to and achievement in a discipline(s) relevant to the Department of Marketing.*
- *Engage actively in high quality, internationally recognised research.*
- *Play a key role in the fostering and promotion of research by individuals and other groups within the department, especially at the Clayton campus.*
- *Participate in the development of research policy.*

The first four duties relate directly to research: either doing it, training others to do it or developing the policy on it.

- *Make a distinguished contribution to the teaching of marketing at undergraduate and graduate levels and to the training of honours and postgraduate research students.*

The next duty is a combination of teaching and research. This duty is the sum of the teaching requirements. At this level there isn't a great expectation to do a lot of teaching – simply choose a few of the best post-graduate students. Well, someone's got to do all that research.

- *Actively participate in the development and operation of programs in marketing, in particular at the Clayton campus.*

- *Provide academic and administrative leadership by playing an active role in the enhancement of academic standards and in the development of educational policy and curriculum areas and by being involved in administrative matters within the Department of Marketing and the university.*

The next two duties indicate where the professor is expected to contribute to teaching: at the overall curricular level and at the quality level. With Monash's AUQA review a year away, that is also to be expected.

- *Provide management and supervision of academic and general staff.*

The next duty is a straightforward management task, and the last one refers to service to the discipline and profession.

- *Participate in and provide leadership in community affairs, particularly those related to the disciplines of marketing, in professional, commercial and industrial sectors where appropriate.*

Overall the position description is fairly standard. Looking at all the twelve professorial positions vacant at the time of writing, there is not a great deal of variation between them. In every case, when we ask which duties are administrative in nature a different picture emerges. In the example used above, the duty listed second is clearly research and the one that is listed fifth is mostly teaching. The rest are fundamentally administrative. For the most part they involve meetings, committee work, policy development, in fact anything that will take him or her away from teaching and research. This is repeated in all twelve position descriptions and seems to indicate that despite the rhetoric, it seems that the Enterprise University's principle idea of leadership is management.

How can Academic Leadership exist in the Enterprise University?

Exemplifying the Enterprise University, Monash has embraced the notion of the leader as manager, or leader-manager. According to Monash's website, managers have to be functionally and technically expert as well as:

have a leadership role which involves developing employees, facilitating operational integration and articulating shared visions. Managerial skills nominated as necessary for 2010 by the Karpin Report (1995) included the manager as leader/enabler and leader/coach.

Learning organisations recognise that everyone has leadership potential and part of the role of managers is to bring out this leadership dimension. Because of this, it is claimed that success in managerial jobs increasingly requires leadership, not just good management, and ideally, organisations need to develop leader/managers.

The table below summarises the different emphases in the roles of leader, leader/manager, and manager.

<i>Leader</i>	<i>Leader / Manager</i>	<i>Manager</i>
<i>Is concerned with growth</i>	<i>Is concerned with institutional growth.</i>	<i>Is concerned with maintenance</i>
<i>Is a director</i>	<i>Engages in reflective practice.</i>	<i>Is a stage manager.</i>
<i>Writes the script</i>	<i>Communicates meanings of script.</i>	<i>Follows script.</i>
<i>Challenges the people.</i>	<i>Channels challenges into morally fulfilling and productive programs.</i>	<i>Keeps people happy.</i>
<i>Has vision.</i>	<i>Institutionalises vision.</i>	<i>Keeps lists, schedules and budgets.</i>
<i>Exercises power of shared purpose.</i>	<i>Enables power of professional and moral community.</i>	<i>Exercises power of sanctions and rewards.</i>
<i>Defines what is real as what is possible.</i>	<i>Defines reality as what is possible for now, for our circumstances; for tomorrow may be different.</i>	<i>Defines what is real as what is.</i>
<i>Motivates.</i>	<i>Facilitates reflective practice.</i>	<i>Organises.</i>
<i>Inspires.</i>	<i>Encourages.</i>	<i>Fixes.</i>
<i>Illuminates.</i>	<i>Cheerleads, celebrates.</i>	<i>Co-ordinates.</i>

(Course notes from SDU program: Leadership and Management Development – Core Program (level 1),

Whilst it may seem that Monash is hedging its bets, the University itself suggests that it is a compromise solution that allows its leaders to be flexible, a key requirement of leadership during times of rapid change. It goes on to list the other key characteristics of leadership as:

- communicate vision*
- demonstrate integrity*
- gain commitment to others*
- enable people to reach goals previously considered unattainable*
- focus on results*
- ensure customer satisfaction*

All these are characteristics of good managers rather than good leaders. The differentiation seems to have been subsumed into leader-manager, because the characteristics that separate the leader-managers from the follower-doers are:

identifying themselves as change agents and intend to make a difference
being courageous individuals but prudent risk takers
believing in people and being sensitive to their needs
being value-driven and life long learners
having the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty
being visionaries

These take us back to what Kotter sees as leadership qualities. Marginson's contention that as more is demanded of the institution, more will be demanded of the leaders but within a more rigidly defined compass seems to be holding. But the parameters of the bailiwicks aren't complete yet. Monash predicts that in the future the following characteristics will need to be added to the list:

thinking globally
appreciating cultural diversity
demonstrating technological savvy
building partnerships and alliances
sharing leadership

You may wonder how and when the Enterprise University will train its leaders. The answer seems to be – on the job, as you go:

The good news is that the skills of leadership can be learned in a variety of practical ways. Getting leadership experience through challenging work assignments on the job as early as possible in one's career is important, as is diversity of experience through assignments in different parts of the organisation if appropriate. Mentors can be a particularly helpful support to future leaders. Peer support and informal learning from colleagues as well as involvement in professional networks will assist. Independent, self-directed learning (eg reading), as well as participation in formal leadership development programs are other strategies for action.

Formal Training for Academic Leaders in the Enterprise University.

Monash has a number of Leadership training courses in place, the flagship of which is Leadership for the Future^{vii}.

The program is targeted at the top 200 senior managers of the University, covering the executive level, their direct reports and selected others. A particular focus of the program will be on leadership requirements of academic heads of departments, senior managers and heads of administrative units.

The identified foci for the program are:

- *the development of the Monash culture to ensure the achievement of the agreed vision*
- *the development of individual leadership capability to enhance present performance and to prepare participants for the challenges and demands for the future*
- *to engage participants in the process of building Monash University as a high performing learning organisation*
- *to assist participants to adopt a strategic perspective for their part of the organisation that is aligned top the overall University strategy*
- *to equip participants with the skills and tools to lead transformational change.*

At first glance the objectives seem to suggest that the purpose of the leadership training is to create free-thinking, pro-active visionaries. The core aspect seems to be the development of a shared vision. The rest are to do with equipping participants to ensure that everything the University does aligns with the vision. However, the foci take on a different aspect when it is realised that the first speaker at the initial three-day retreat was the vice-chancellor who described the vision in some detail. Participants were not expected to take part in the development of it, they were expected to ensure that it would become manifest in their bailiwicks, whether teaching, researching or managing. Few, if any universities in Australia do things differently. This isn't noted because it is somehow wrong, only as indicative that leadership in the academy nowadays is primarily managerial in practice. Whilst it may simply be a remnant of its past as a church-based institution, universities have a long history of being hierarchical, regardless of the current rhetoric about collegiality. The willingness to devolve real power is directly related to the intensification of work pressure and diminishing financial support from the public purse. As universities have lost 10% in actual dollar terms of their income between 1989 and 1999^{viii}, the increasingly delineated chains of command that increasingly tightening pro-active leadership were predictable.

The Enterprise University like any conglomerate systemic organisation struggles with any kind of devolved leadership. Ultimately the leader is the vice-chancellor, albeit that the university's board can and does sack the occasional one. Fundamentally, the seemingly unresolvable dilemma is that whilst one can be a leader at any level, one can only manage within the perimeters of one's jurisdiction. Areas of responsibility are sacrosanct:

demarcation disputes are often acrimonious and taken very personally. The problem is that it is very difficult to lead without managing, and therefore the reality is that any degree of meaningful leadership can only realistically occur within one's area of managerial jurisdiction.

As a final post-script, Nelson Mandela doesn't count as a leader because he was in jail for most of the time, where one just doesn't get a chance to be megalomaniacal on any worthwhile scale. Perhaps it is easier to be heroic battling against the leadership than being in it. Che, timeless Lancelot to Fidel's Arthur, was, and continues to be, an inspirational leader, but he made a terrible and bored manager.

ⁱ Marginson, S & M. Considine. 2000. *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

ⁱⁱ Monash University 2004, *Leading the Way - Monash 2020*, p16

ⁱⁱⁱ Kotter, J. 1990, *A Force for Change: How Management Differs from Leadership*, New York: Free Press

^{iv} Onsman H. 2003, *The Uncertain Art of Management*, Melbourne: McGraw-Hill

^v Kets de Vries, M. 1993, *Leaders, Fools and Impostors: essays on the psychology of leadership*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco

^{vi} <http://www.adm.monash.edu.au/staff-development/resources/artelmd.html>

^{vii} Monash University, 2004, *Leadership for the Future*

^{viii} Marginson, S & M. Considine. 2000. *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

