



Participative Management Practices in the University Libraries of Punjab (Pakistan): Perceptions of Senior Librarians

Syeda Hina Batool

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Email: hina.im@pu.edu.pk

Mumtaz Ali Anwar

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Email: anwar.mumtazali@yahoo.com



The purpose of this study was to examine the presence of elements of participative management in the current management practices in the university libraries of Punjab (Pakistan). Seven components of participative management (Organizational structure; Leadership; Decision making; Goal setting; Motivation; Communication process; and Management controls), identified from the previous studies, were selected with the help of management experts. The idea was to develop a more comprehensive study later covering all aspects of participative management. Therefore, a beginning was made to examine the perceptions of senior librarians to find out gaps in the current practice of participative management in the university libraries. The participants included the head librarian and three senior most professionals from each library. Survey method, with a questionnaire, was used. Findings revealed that all the seven components of participative management were generally favoured by the respondents. Both groups of respondents had significant differences on four components: leadership, decision making, goal-setting and motivation. Suggestions are made to improve participative management in these libraries.

Keywords: Participative management; University Libraries; Librarians; Pakistan

INTRODUCTION

The participative management concept is not new; the idea came, went and reappeared at different times as management roles changed. It is a multidimensional concept and has been defined in a number of ways by various scholars. It has been described as "the process of involving subordinates in the decision-making process. It stresses active involvement of people. It uses their



expertise and creativity in solving important managerial problems. It rests on the concept of shared authority which holds that managers share their managerial authority with their subordinates" (Anthony, 1978, p. 3). The modern library has a complex environment which requires a suitable management structure for effective service.

Participative management theory originated with the changing role of management, emerging technology, international/national competitors, and growing customer expectations. The researchers from steel, apparel, automobile industry and Columbia University discovered that companies which focused on employee satisfaction, their needs, and participation were significantly more successful and productive than those that were focused on profits only (McLagan, 1995). As a result, many participative management practices were developed. Although participative management was mainly discussed in the industrial environments, its principles, rules, and developments were applicable to all types and sizes of organizations. They were equally applicable whenever there was an interaction between persons, materials and finance to achieve some defined objectives (Dawra, 2004). It was focused on increasing employee performance and developing long-term relationships with them. According to Maccoby (2015), participative management includes three degrees of involvement: consultation, value based influence, and formal power sharing.

The adoption of best participative management practices in libraries should lessen the pressure of administrative issues on library managers and improve the quality of service. These days library managers mostly focus on increasing finances, implementing technology, and improving services. Equally important is the willingness of staff to fully contribute to achieving future goals and objectives for the betterment of the library. Previous studies (Lewis, 1975; Marchant, 1971; Oosthuizen, & du Toit, 1999) have demonstrated that participative management helped libraries gain the willingness of their staff to work hard and improve their efficiency. Reese (2009), giving examples of collaborative decision making in special collections and technical departments, asserted that participative management was needed for effective and efficient working.

Although librarians' leadership skills have been discussed by several researchers, the leadership style based on participative management is somewhat neglected. "For more than half a century participative management has been presented as the answer to problems of productivity, growth and work humanization, yet only few information workers in information services participate



in formal and effective participative management programs” (Martell’s study as cited in Oosthuizen & du Toit, 1999, p. 216). A number of scholars have indicated areas that are especially suitable for the participation of library staff. They include planning, budget preparation, co-ordination, job organization, public relations, drafting of reports, etc. (Cabral, 1987). Unfortunately, the understanding of participative management is not common among librarians who believe that taking risk of inexperienced employees is worthless. But the present transformation of information requires planning, coordination and organization by several professional minds. There is a need to recognize the importance of participative work in libraries.

The current library management issues require more and more staff participation to meet the challenges created by the application of advanced technology and changes in the information environment. It is also important to understand the scenario from the point of view of library staff. A perusal of the published literature shows that no recent study has focused on the perceptions of Pakistani library staff about participative management. The purpose of this research is to study the perceptions of senior library professionals about the current practices in the seven selected components of participative management in the university libraries of Punjab (Pakistan).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on participative management in libraries is scant and outdated. Therefore, a small number of studies from other disciplines and those related to libraries are reviewed below.

Many studies have been conducted to measure the managers’ attitude towards participative management in the industrial and banking sectors (Banai & Katsountos, 1993; Haire, Ghiselli & Porter’s study as cited in Banai, & Katsounotos, 1993; Huselid’s study as cited in Banai, & Katsounotos, 1993). After the emergence of the concept of ‘human capital’, many organizations have started to place stress on effective human resource management strategies such as team building, participative management and job satisfaction. Several researchers have found that managers, in general, favour participative management but at the same time believe that their subordinates were incapable of leadership, taking responsibility, and self-direction. The control and sharing of information was highly influenced by the inhibitive culture in organizations and was promoted through management education system. It was also found that participative work was strongly associated



with decreased turnover, increased productivity and improved financial performance (McLagan & Nel, 1995).

Somech (2002) examined five dimensions of participative management: decision making, degree of participation, structure, target of participation, and rationale in a school environment, indicating that it was hard to cover all aspects of participative management in one study. A questionnaire was used to collect data from a sample of 99 principals from 600 elementary schools of Iran. The results indicated that traditional authoritative system was replaced by a consultative management system in which the principals discussed issues with teachers but final decision was still being made by the authority. The teachers were only involved in technical issues of decision making rather than qualitative and goal setting issues. Only a few schools had developed explicit structure for staff participation. The principals' motives for participative management were mentioned as: to improve the quality of decisions, to improve quality of teaching, and to facilitate principal's own work load. It was suggested that the school principals might have biased opinions on their management structure. Therefore, a suggestion was made to conduct a study that should include teachers' perceptions on the practice of participative management and cover its other important components.

Shagholi et al. (2010) tried to determine the extent of the use of participative management practices aiming to refine the management structure of Iranian high schools by adopting participative management style. They used 15 components of participative management in a questionnaire containing 96 items and collected data from 903 female school teachers. The findings showed that the teachers desired that the school managers adopt participative management. They also suggested that explicit and formal structure of participative management should be developed. The findings showed that 14 components of participative management obtained high mean values while one, i.e., 'share power' obtained the lowest. This showed that the teachers did not desire authority; they wanted respect, participation, and achievement. The 'involvement' component was the most desired among teachers. It was suggested that the perceptions of school managers about participative management practices should also be measured to improve the system. The study suggested the application of all components of participative management for the betterment of organizations. The concept of shared leadership from middle managers' perspective was investigated by Cawthorne (2010) who found that in contrast to the findings of Shagholi et al. (2010) these middle managers reported that they were accountable for their decisions, but they



received lesser information from the top leadership. It has been reported that no study of library staff participation in decision making had been conducted prior to Marchant's research (1971). His study, based on Likert's participative management theory, was conducted in academic libraries which found that managers had complete confidence in their employees, flow of communication was free, group decision making was promoted, and employees were offered economic rewards for achieving organizational goals. It was found that job satisfaction was highly affected by the managerial style, faculty was better satisfied with staff involvement, and group interaction helped staff unity. Its results confirmed Likert's theory that was being tested in the study. Similarly, Lewis (1975) examined the organizational structure of selected university libraries in order to measure professional staff participation in the decision making process. A questionnaire was self-administered to library directors and professional staff. The directors perceived themselves as practicing participative management than did the librarians. The younger librarians experienced limited participation.

Akpena (1997) who investigated participative management in the Nigerian university libraries found that staff involvement patterns included committee system, staff meetings and other patterns of communication. The researcher examined the level of staff involvement and found it at a satisfactory level in decision making. The degree of effective participative management in academic information services in South Africa was examined by Oosthuizen and du Toit (1999) by surveying: the management style, low and high level decision-making areas, existence of group participation and its patterns, and the functions performed by formal groups. All employees with at least two years of experience and a minimum qualification of matriculation were included in the study. The results indicated that employee participation was practiced in low level decisions (job description, work methods, setting of output areas, and organization of work groups). It was concluded that management was controlled by supervisors and participation was still limited.

A recent and interesting study was conducted by Jena and Rautaray (2010) in the medical college libraries of Orissa, India. It investigated that how the characteristics of an organization affected the organizational structure of the library by exploring the actual and desired levels of participative management. It was found that the library staff perceived very low about the internal control in the library and perceived participative management as a significant factor to increase effectiveness of the staff.



Awan (2009) studied the leadership styles of chief librarians, the relationship between their style and employee commitment and organizational culture. His sample included the professional staff of the university libraries only. The results showed that authoritative leadership was the dominant style of the chief librarians. However, high level of commitment was reported from the participants. This may be because of low financial and growth opportunities in the outside job market which was very limited.

The research literature on participative management in libraries, as well as the instruments to study it, is very limited as indicated by the review above. There is a need first to initially investigate this area and then develop a comprehensive instrument to study this phenomenon. It is hoped that this initial study will in time lead to that goal.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The development of modern educational system and R&D culture in Pakistan demanded increased efficiency and quality in the provision of information services. The related literature highlighted the importance of participative management practices in organizations and indicated improved service quality when the traditional authoritative style was replaced. The available research on participative management in libraries has investigated very limited constructs of participative management, namely: decision domain, collective problem solving, staff meetings, and formation of groups/committees. Cawthorne (2010) reported that no study had investigated shared leadership from middle managers' perspective. Middle managers or senior librarians were the key stakeholders in participative management. This area was quite neglected in research especially in the local context. Although some studies on the management in Pakistani libraries have been conducted, no study, as far as we have been able to establish, has been done on participative management in libraries. Therefore, it was considered imperative to conduct a study on this issue.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES & QUESTIONS

The objective of this research was to study the nature of practices in relation to selected components of participative management (Organizational structure; Leadership; Decision making; Goal setting; Motivation; Communication process; and Management controls) in the public university libraries of the Punjab. The following research questions were used to achieve this aim:



- (1) What are the perceptions of the senior librarians about the current practices of participative management in the public university libraries of the Punjab?
- (2) What are the differences between the perceptions of heads of libraries and their senior librarians about participative management practices in their libraries?

METHODOLOGY

Several previous studies that investigated participative management in libraries have used survey method successfully (Gerry & Klingberg, 1988; Jena & Rautaray, 2010; Lewis, 1975; Oosthuizen & du Toit, 1999). It was, therefore, decided to use this method for the present study with a questionnaire as a data collection technique.

Development of the instrument

The related LIS literature was very limited and outdated. It did not provide a suitable instrument to measure participative management. It was, therefore, decided to develop a new instrument based on literature from LIS, management sciences, and related disciplines focusing on only the following aspects of participative management: organizational structure, leadership, decision making, goal setting, motivation, communication process, and management controls. It was to be done under the guidance of experts and was to be reviewed and approved by them. Therefore, the relevant literature was scanned carefully in order to derive conceptual statements related to the selected dimensions of participative management. These statements were carefully reviewed, merged, revised, and then edited resulting in a list of 39 statements. These statements, grouped into seven components, formed the first draft which was submitted to a panel of six experts consisting of management and LIS faculty for scrutiny. This process resulted in some changes in the text and the addition of two statements. The revised draft, consisting of 41 statements forming seven components, was pilot tested using 12 senior library professionals from three private sector universities. An Urdu version of the instrument, using the back-translation process, was also prepared for the convenience of the participants. The instrument used a five-point Likert type scale, i.e. 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = No Opinion, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. The internal consistency of the 41 statements was tested using Cronbach's alpha (CA). Its CA value was .939 which was excellent (George & Mallery's study as cited in Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

Population

The population of the study was librarians working in the public sector universities in the Punjab. The private universities were not included because they varied a great deal among themselves and with the public universities in terms of age, size, resources, and management. It was also decided, due to the nature of the research problem, to include only the senior staff from the libraries that had at least a professional staff of four. Out of 21 public sector universities, only 11 had four or more librarians. The remaining 10, with a professional staff of less than four, were excluded. The selected 11 libraries had a total of 44 senior working professionals. Two of these were on long leave. The study sample, therefore, was 42.

The questionnaire was personally administered to the respondents located in Lahore. It was distributed to the other respondents through mail and electronic mail. Phone calls and emails were used as follow up. Out of 42 librarians, 40 responded, all of these questionnaires were usable. All head librarians ($n=11$, 100%) and 29 (93.5%) out of the 31 senior librarians returned the questionnaires. The overall response rate was 95.2 percent which was excellent.

The respondents for the two groups were used in statistical analysis for comparison purposes in relation to both research questions. The data were analyzed using the SPSS software.

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to investigate the current practices of seven components of participative management and the differences in perceptions among head librarians and their senior professionals on these components. The following sections present the findings and discussion.

Aspects of Participative Management

(i) Presence of committees/teams in the libraries. The respondents were asked to indicate whether their libraries had committees and teams for the participation of professional staff in decision making. One head librarian did not respond. The results revealed that a majority of the head librarians ($n=9$, 81.8%) mentioned that they had committees in their libraries with one (9.1%) reporting in the negative. Similarly, 21 (72.4%) senior professionals indicated having committees in their libraries whereas 8 (27.6%) reported no committees. Eight (72.7%) head librarians and 17 (58.6%) senior professionals mentioned that they had teams also. The results showed that more libraries had committees for staff participation than

teams. More head librarians indicated that they had teams for staff participation than did their senior subordinates.

(ii) Presence of seven components of participative management.

1. Organizational structure. Previous studies had concluded that organizational structure was a very important component of participative management and open management style with explicit procedures were strong predictors of participative management practice. Four statements (Table 1) were constructed to find out whether these libraries had adopted any formal/informal measures of organizational structure that supported participative management. It is interesting that all the participants rated two organizational structure statements (1.1 and 1.3) quite low, with only one (1.2) being quite high. The head librarians rate two statements higher than the senior professionals. There is a significant difference between both groups on one statement (1.2) only. This component ranked fifth in the overall ranking of the seven components with a mean of 3.68 (Table 2). It seems that these participants have a low opinion of the present organizational structure that should encourage participative management in their libraries.

2. Leadership. Effective participative management demands person-centered leadership which “emphasized individuality as much as team work” (Plas, 1996). This important component of participative management consisted of five statements (Table 1). Two of these statements (2.2 and 2.3) received quite low opinions from the participants while one (2.1) scoring quite high. The head librarians generally gave positive opinions than their senior colleagues. However, none of these five statements had significant differences between the two groups. The difference between the means of both groups shows that head librarians’ perceptions were more positive on their style of leadership. This component received third rank among the seven components with a total mean of 3.78 (Table 2).

3. Decision Making. Some previous studies (Lewis, 1975; Oosthuizen, & du Toit, 1999) focused on decision making to measure the degree of participative management and supported the idea of involving professional staff in decision making on major issues (peer evaluation, planning, budgeting, making policies and procedures, etc.). Seven statements (Table 1) were formulated to measure the participative decision making domain in these libraries. Two of the seven statements (3.2 and 3.5) received very low opinions from the respondents. Overall,



the head librarians gave higher scores to all these statements than the senior professionals. The composite mean of 3.98 for the head librarians is much higher than 3.49 for the senior professionals (Table 2). This low opinion of senior professionals resulted in the lowest composite mean score of 3.62 for decision making ranking sixth among the seven components. Two of the statements (3.6 and 3.7) show significant differences among the two groups.

Table 1

Mean Values of Participative Management Statements

S. N.	Statements	Composite	Head Librarians		Senior Professionals	
		Mean	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Opinions about Organizational Structure (N=40)						
1.1	My management assigns leadership role in committees and teams only to competent professionals.	2.48	3.73	1.27	3.45	1.02
1.2	My management accepts and implements committee decisions and recommendations.	4.25	4.55	.522	4.14	.581
1.3	My management makes committee reports, decisions, and recommendations available to professional staff.	2.35	3.64	1.20	3.66	.897
1.4	In my library, professional staff design and manage their own day-to-day activities and make their own operational decisions.	3.32	3.09	.944	3.41	1.08
Opinions about Leadership						
2.1	My library management involves professional staff in administrative decision-making to develop leadership (N=40)	4.25	4.00	.894	3.62	.979
2.2	The subordinates in my library feel free to discuss important issues about their jobs with their immediate superiors. (N=40)	2.28	3.27	1.55	3.38	1.04
2.3	The existing management style of my library is democratic rather than bureaucratic. (n+39)	2.56	4.55	.522	4.14	.833
2.4	Superiors in my library	3.58	4.00	.894	3.66	1.11



	empower subordinates by providing fewer guidelines and controls for the individual through clear directions, guidelines, desired outcomes, and the understanding of available resources. (n=36)					
2.5	The superiors in my library have full confidence and trust in their subordinates. (N=40)	3.75	4.18	.874	3.55	.985
<i>Opinions about Decision Making</i>						
3.1	My library management seeks as much in-put from professional staff as is reasonably possible before making decisions on policies and practices.	3.85	4.18	.874	3.76	1.05
3.2	My library management seeks as much in-put from professional staff as is reasonably possible before making decisions on policies and practices.	2.03	4.27	.786	3.86	1.09
3.3	In my library professional staff has a voice in all major decisions regardless of their positions.	3.58	3.82	1.32	3.48	.475
3.4	My library management depends on a few senior professional staff to make decisions.	3.28	3.00	1.34	2.62	1.14
3.5	The superiors who make decisions in my library are fully aware of the problems at lower levels in the organization.	2.73	3.64	1.43	3.14	1.21
3.6	The superiors in my library actively seek feedback from the subordinates so that decisions could be improved, if found necessary.	4.08	4.45	.522	3.93	1.03
3.7	The subordinates in my library are fully involved in all decisions related to their work area.	3.90	4.55	.688	3.66	1.04
<i>Opinions about Goal-Setting</i>						
4.1	The management in my library tries to empower subordinates towards a collective vision /	3.85	4.27	.647	3.69	1.00



	mission of the library. (N=40)					
4.2	In my library, goals are usually established with discussion with concerned subordinates. (N=40)	2.43	3.91	.944	3.45	1.15
4.3	In my library, once goals are established, they are fully accepted by all with no reservation. (N=40)	3.55	3.91	.944	3.34	1.04
4.4	In my library, the subordinates are motivated by the superiors to believe that the goals established with their participation could not be achieved without their full contribution. (n=39)	4.15	4.73	.467	3.79	1.23
4.5	The superiors make their subordinates fully aware that the results of goals will have a significant impact on the organizational achievement. (N=40)	4.23	4.73	.467	4.03	1.05
4.6	The management of my library continuously endeavors to link employees' personal goals with organizational goals. (N=40)	3.63	4.09	1.04	3.45	1.05
4.7	In my library, achievements of goals by employees are taken into consideration during their performance evaluation. (n=39)	2.31	4.09	.944	3.41	1.18
<i>Opinions about Motivation</i>						
	My library management involves professional staff in					
5.1	administrative decision-making to increase their Motivation. (N=40)	3.98	4.45	.522	3.79	1.01
5.2	The management of my library lets the subordinates know how important they are to the success of the library. (N=40)	3.78	4.09	1.37	3.66	1.20
5.3	The superiors in my library demonstrate concern for their subordinates' interests and needs. (N=40)	2.30	4.00	.894	3.59	.907
5.4	In my library, credit for work done is given to those who do the work. (n=39)	2.10	4.36	.505	3.59	1.26
5.5	In my library, subordinates are	3.60	4.18	.874	3.38	1.14

	encouraged to use their own creativity in their work and are rewarded for their achievements. (N=40)					
5.6	In my library, the management is open to new ideas and different perspectives of subordinates. (n=39)	2.31	4.00	1.18	3.45	1.18
5.7	The decision-making process in my library helps to create the necessary motivations in those subordinates who have to carry out the decisions. (N=40)	4.00	4.36	.505	3.86	1.02
5.8	In my library, career advancement opportunities (training courses, workshops and participation in conferences) are provided to all staff on an equitable basis. (N=40)	3.53	4.09	1.13	3.31	1.36
<i>Opinions about Communication Process</i>						
6.1	In my library, there is a reasonable flow of information from superiors to subordinates.	4.03	4.36	1.20	3.90	.939
6.2	In my library, there is a reasonable flow of information from subordinates to superiors.	3.73	3.91	1.13	3.66	1.04
6.3	In my library, there is a reasonable flow of information from subordinates to subordinates at same or different levels.	3.88	4.09	1.04	3.79	.726
6.4	In my library, information received from superiors is viewed by the subordinates with suspicion.	2.28	3.73	1.34	3.72	1.03
6.5	In my library, information received from subordinates is generally inaccurate.	2.28	3.45	1.36	3.83	.889
<i>Opinions about Management Controls</i>						
7.1	In my library, subordinates are significantly involved in the process of staff development. (n=38)	3.76	4.18	.874	3.34	1.31
7.2	In my library, subordinates are significantly involved in the employee's performance evaluation. (N=40)	3.83	4.36	1.02	3.62	1.04

7.3	In my library, concern for performance controls is shared at all administrative levels. (N=40)	2.80	2.91	1.04	3.31	1.00
7.4	In my library, performance control and review is done at all administrative levels. (n=39)	3.87	4.09	.701	3.66	1.17
7.5	In my library, administrative reports (statistics and internal reports) are shared and used for guidance and problem solving rather than punishment purposes. (N=40)	3.80	4.18	.751	3.66	1.04

4. Goal-Setting. Seven statements (Table 1) were formulated for this component. All the respondents gave low opinions to two (4.2 and 4.7). The head librarians gave higher values to all these seven statements as compared to the senior professionals resulting in a composite score for this component of 4.24 for head librarians and 3.62 for senior professionals. It seems that the head librarians wanted to project a positive view of their style whereas the senior professionals were projecting a more realistic picture. There are significant differences for three statements (4.1, 4.4 and 4.5) between the two groups. Goal-setting received the second highest rank with a mean of 3.79 among the seven component of participative management (Table 2).

5. Motivation. Motivation is the “process or action of convincing others to make an effort in the pursuit of a goal” (Matsumoto, 2009, p. 319). Eight statements (Table 1) were included in the instrument for this component. Three statements (5.3, 5.4 and 5.6) received very low mean scores indicating a negative perception about motivation among these libraries. The scores given by the head librarians for all the eight statements were higher than those given by the senior professionals. However, only three statements (5.1, 5.5 and 5.7) showed significant differences among the two groups. The composite mean score of 3.76 for motivation gave it the fourth rank among the seven components. The composite mean for this component was 4.19 for head librarians and 3.61 for senior professionals indicating that there was a sizeable gap between the perceptions of the two groups.

6. Communication Process. The communication of information, up, down, and horizontal, is very important for the success of participative management. Five statements related to communication were part of the instrument (Table 1). The two negative statements (6.4 and 6.5) received a lower mean score of 2.28. In this

component also, head librarians scored higher means than the senior professionals. It is interesting that this component was ranked first among the seven components with a combined mean score of 3.81 (Table 2). It seems that communication between head librarians and their senior colleagues was reasonable. None of these five statements had any significant differences between the two groups. However, the head librarians had more positive opinions ($M = 3.91$) than their subordinates ($M = 3.77$).

7. Management Controls. These controls that “ranged from development of strategies to performance reviews, are backbone of the operation of any business” (Mclagan & Nel, 1995, p.104). However, these processes become more meaningful if these are carried out by involving people. Five statements were formulated to measure management controls in the sample libraries (Table 1). One statement (7.3) received a low mean score (2.80). All others received mean scores between 3.76 and 3.87. Only one statement (7.1) has a significant difference between the head librarians and the senior professionals. This component received fifth rank among the seven (Table 2).

Differences between the Perceptions of Head Librarians and Senior Professionals

The figures in Table 1 and 2 clearly show that the perceptions of head librarians are generally higher for individual statements (Table 1) and for the seven components (Table 2) than of their senior professional staff. Significant differences appear in only 10 of the 41 statements which are marked with a star. Only three components of participative management show significant differences between the two groups ($p=.044$, $p=.025$ and $p=.011$ at alpha level 0.05) which are Decision Making, Goal-setting and Motivation. The figures show that the head librarians felt strongly that these components were practiced in their libraries ($M=3.98$, $M=4.24$ and $M=4.19$) than their senior staff who had lower mean scores ($M=3.49$, $M=3.62$ and $M=3.61$). It seems that the head librarians were more positive in their opinions about their management style than their senior professional colleagues.

DELIMITATIONS & LIMITATIONS

Scholars have identified many aspects of participative management which were found to be multidimensional (Somech, 2002). The present study focused on its seven components selected after an extensive review of available literature with expert advice to initially investigate the area. These were: organizational structure, leadership, decision making, goal-setting, motivation, communication processes, and management controls. This study does not look into the other dimensions of

participative management. Since this study was limited to public sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan, its conclusions cannot be applicable to other universities and geographic regions.

Table 2

Combined mean scores of seven participative management components and differences between the perceptions of head librarians and senior professionals

Participative Management Components	Total Mean Scores	SD	Rank	Head Librarians		Senior Professionals	
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Organizational Structure	3.68	.627	5	3.75	.066	3.66	.638
Leadership	3.78	.676	3	4.09	.677	3.66	.650
Decision Making	3.62	.698	6	3.98	.508	3.49	.718
Goal-setting	3.79	.699	2	4.24	.491	3.62	.697
Motivation	3.76	.747	4	4.19	.576	3.61	.749
Communication Process	3.81	.636	1	3.91	.659	3.77	.635
Management Controls	3.68	.635	5	3.94	.429	3.58	.676

CONCLUSION

The current LIS literature is indicative of a growing concern for more democratic and participative rather than bureaucratic style of management. The diversification of information resources, user independence and direct access, and increasing volume of information available online and on the web makes it essential to involve staff at every level in the management processes. The findings of this research in general paint a positive picture of participative management in these libraries but lower opinions of senior professionals do indicate that the situation is not as healthy as the head librarians seem to project. This may be indicative of the prevalent situation in all libraries in the country, a situation that needs to be addressed by the library management. It is reasonable to suggest that a comprehensive study of all major libraries covering management style, staff and user satisfaction may be conducted in order to fully understand the prevailing management environment. It is suggested that a comprehensive study covering all components of participative management and using a larger sample should be conducted.



REFERENCES

- Akpena, J. E. (1997). Participative management in a university library: the case of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University Library, Bauchi, Nigeria. *Aslib Proceedings*, 49, 190–193.
- Anthony, W. P. (1978), *Participative management*. London: Addison-Wesley.
- Awan, R. (2009). *Relationship among leadership style, organizational culture and job commitment of university librarians* (MPhil thesis). Department of Library & Information Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
- Banai, M. & Katsounotos, P. (1993). Participative management in Cyprus. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 23(3), pp. 19-34.
- Cabral, A. M. R. (1987). Participative management. In Anthony Vaughan (Comp.), *International Reader in the Management of Library Information and Archive Service*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Cawthorne, J.E. (2010). Leading from the middle of the organization: An examination of shared leadership in academic libraries. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(2), 151-157.
- Dawra, M. (2004). Theories of management: Scientific management and classical school. In *Library science and theories of management* (pp. 141-142). New Delhi: Rajat Publications.
- Gerry, E., & Kilingberg, S. (1988). A survey of participative management in California State University libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, 49(1), 47-56.
- Gliem, J.A., & Gliem, R.R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/344/Gliem%20%20Gliem.pdf?sequence=1>
- Jena, P., & Rautaray, B. (2010). Participative management in medical college libraries of Orissa: A comparative study. *Library Review*, 59(3), 213-225.
- Kim, S. (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 231-241.
- Lewis, G. R. (1975). *Professional staff participation in the decision making process in selected university libraries* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from



Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC ED139423).

- Maccoby, M. (2015). Participatory management. Wiley Encyclopedia of Management, 2. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781118785317.weom020077>
- Marchant, M. P. (1971). Participative management as related to personnel development. *Library Trends*, 20(1), 48-59.
- Matsumoto, D. (Eds.). (2009). Cambridge dictionary of psychology. New York: Cambridge University.
- McLagan, P., & Nel, C. (1995). *The Age of participation: New governance for the workplace and the world*. San Francisco: Berret-Koehler.
- Oosthuizen, G. J., & du Toit, A. S. (1999). Participative management in academic library services. *Library Management*, 20(4), 213-220.
- Plas, J. M. (1996). *Person-centered leadership: An American approach to participatory management*. London: Sage.
- Reese, Garth D., J., (2009). An examination of the role of participatory management in academic special collections departments. *Library Leadership and Management*, 23(4), 161–167.
- Shagholi, R., Hussin, S., Siraj, S., Naimie, Z., Assadzadeh, F., & Al-Hejaili, H., (2010). Investigation on participatory management and identify the constraints. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 378-382.
- Somech, A. (2002). Explicating the complexity of participated management: An investigation of multiple dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(3), 341-371.