Canadian and International Education / Education canadienne et internationale

Volume 25 | Issue 1 Article 4

10-24-2012

Improving the management of universities in developing countries

Wayne Ingalls

Follow this and additional works at: http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci

Recommended Citation

Ingalls, Wayne (1996) "Improving the management of universities in developing countries," *Canadian and International Education / Education canadienne et internationale*: Vol. 25: Iss. 1, Article 4.
Available at: http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci/vol25/iss1/4

This Research paper/Rapport de recherche is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Canadian and International Education / Education canadienne et internationale by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact kmarsha1@uwo.ca.

IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT OF UNIVERSITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

WAYNE INGALLS
MOUNT SAINT VINCENT UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

In recent years aid agencies have realized that the strategies employed since the end of World War II such as capital investments in economic infrastructure, education and human resource development, and technology transfer are not in themselves enough to guarantee economic growth and development in the third world. Institutions and organizations must be created and fostered to serve as the vehicles through which improvements can be made. As a result, many aid agencies such as USAID have made institution building one of their primary goals (Hage and Finsterbusch 1987:1).

In the light of this focus, a number of authors from the fields of both development management and administrative science have studied projects and organizations in developing countries with a view to finding ways to improve their performance. These studies have identified various factors which have contributed to success and have suggested a number of theoretical approaches and applications of organizational theory as the best ways to build effective institutions in the third world. (Paul 1982, 1983; Hyden 1983; Kiggundu, Jorgensen and Hafsi 1983; Korten 1986; Hage and Finsterbusch 1987; Israel 1987; Jedlicka 1987; Korten and Siy 1988; Adamolekun 1989; Kiggundu 1989; Jaeger and Kanungo 1990; Hardy 1990 and 1991; Brinkerhoff 1991; Esman 1991; Leonard 1991; Kaijage 1993)

Moses Kiggundu (1989) has attempted to integrate the theories and knowledge of administrative science with those of development management in order to produce a more comprehensive approach to improving the management of organizations in developing countries. As part of his theoretical approach, he creates a profile of the developing country organization, which is drawn from two sources. It is based, first, on a number of studies which show that organizations in developing countries enjoy common structural and managerial features and that these features differ from those found in the industrialized nations (Negandhi 1979; Lammers and Hickson 1979; Faucheux, Amado, and Laurent 1982; Kim and Utterback 1983; Nicholson et al. 1985; Dasah and Kiggundu 1985; Blunt 1983). Second, it comes from his

experience working with organizations in Uganda, Kenya, India, and Ghana. His profile focuses on three levels in the organization: senior management, middle management, and operations.

According to Kiggundu, senior management is likely to be overworked, putting in long hours on the job and participating in a range of activities outside the institution. An inability or unwillingness to delegate is a major cause of the long hours, because even the smallest details are sent up the hierarchy for senior executive decision. Administrative and technical support are not strong so that senior managers have to perform support functions such as budgeting and background research.

Middle management is not strong either, with weak organizational systems and controls. Either because of top management's authoritarian style or because middle managers lack technical skills and experience, there is little evidence of independent action. In turn, middle managers exercise close supervision of their staff and allow little delegation and participatory decision making.

The operating levels are generally inefficient and costly. With overstaffing running from 18% to 50%, employees tend to be underutilized. Pay is poor and the reward system bears little relation to performance and other organizationally relevant criteria.

Because Kiggundu's profile fits many organizations in developing countries, it is a useful tool for those who are seeking ways to build and improve the performance of institutions in these nations. Identifying weaknesses common to organizations in the third world allows development managers to focus on them and on ways to overcome them.

One organization in the developing world which has received relatively little attention in the development literature is the university, despite these institutions' central importance to the development effort. University trained people are needed for leadership roles in government, business, and the professions, and developing country organizations require the advice of indigenous consultants. Highly educated people and world class research are necessary to devise the policies, design the programs, and implement the projects needed for economic growth and development (Yesufu 1973, World Bank 1988, Sherman 1990).

The purpose of this paper is to determine whether the profile of the developing country organization outlined by Kiggundu can be applied to universities, and if it can, to consider the strategies necessary to overcome the weaknesses he has identified. It will first look at the

university as an organization. Next, it will apply Kiggundu's profile both in theory and in an actual university in a developing country. Finally, it will consider ways in which such institutions can go about improving their management and administration. The topic should be of interest to both development theorists and students of the university as an organization.

THE UNIVERSITY AS AN ORGANIZATION

A large literature exists on the nature of universities as organizations. It has been noted that universities differ in many respects from businesses and other public sector institutions (Perkins 1973; Livingstone 1974; Clark 1983). Four major institutional models have been identified: the bureaucratic (Weber 1947), the collegial (Millett 1962), the political (Baldridge 1971), and the organized anarchy (Cohen and Marsh 1974). While none of these models is found in a pure form in any one institution, it has been argued that they have given rise to a mix of organizational cultures which may be characterized as collegial, managerial, developmental and negotiating (Bergquist 1992). Another factor which can affect organizational structure is institutional type, since size, orientation, location, and religious affiliation can all influence the nature of the institution and the way in which it is organized (Birnbaum 1988).

In the organizational theory literature, such factors would be called contingencies. Contingency theory was first introduced by Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) who focused on environmental factors. It has been further developed with additional or more specific factors: market (Burns and Stalker 1961), technology (Perrow 1967), and size (Blau and Schoenherr 1971). Building on the work of Miller (1977, 1981, 1986, 1987), Mintzberg (1979) argued that organizations fall into a limited number of configurations based on a number of design parameters, such as job specialization and planning and control systems, and the four contingency factors of age and size, technical systems, environment, and power. From this theoretical perspective, the university is described as a professional bureaucracy, where the operators, i.e. those "who perform the basic work related directly to the production of products or services," (Mintzberg 1979:24) are the faculty. Because their work is complex and highly specialized, it cannot be supervised by managers. The coordination of tasks comes about through the standardization of skills and knowledge by the profession rather than bureaucratic rules and regulations. As a result, decision making is

largely decentralized. Such organizations function well because most professionals are highly motivated.

This discussion has assumed Mintzberg's division of the organization into the strategic apex, the middle line, the core operators, the technostructure, and the support staff (1979). According to this division, the core operators in a university are the faculty. Although the university usually takes the form of a professional bureaucracy, the support staff, i.e. most of the employees providing academic support and dealing with administrative matters such as finance, personnel and physical plant, are organized into the configuration called the machine bureaucracy. Machine bureaucracies are tightly controlled from the top and follow standardized bureaucratic procedures. As Mintzberg suggests, these are "enclaves" of machine bureaucracy within the professional bureaucracy (1979:360-61; 1989:179).

In her discussion of configuration and strategy making in the universities of Brazil, Cynthia Hardy (1991) marries configuration theory to the four models of the university already identified. The result is four variants of the professional bureaucracy: the collegial, the political, and the anarchic, and rational-analytic forms. She also suggests that universities can operate as machine bureaucracies, although rarely, and in another configuration, which Mintzberg (1979) calls the adhocracy. This organization is highly innovative and its members are always seeking new structures to solve new problems. Obviously, few universities fit this mold either.

Although universities come in a variety of forms, they do share many features. The best way to describe the university as an organization in theory is with Mintzberg and Hardy to see it primarily as a professional bureaucracy. In addition, however, it is also important to note that most of those who provide academic support and perform administrative functions are organized as a machine bureaucracy. The university is thus fundamentally a dichotomous institution.

KIGGUNDU'S PROFILE AND THE UNIVERSITY IN THEORY

It is now time to ask the central question. Does Kiggundu's profile fit the developing country university? An attempt will be made to answer this question first in theory and then in relation to an actual developing country university. On the face of it, Kiggundu's profile should not fit perfectly for a number of reasons. As already noted, the university ought to manifest the characteristics of the professional

bureaucracy, but it also contains enclaves of support staff who are organized as a machine bureaucracy. In such a configuration, there is only one top management which oversees the whole, but the organization then divides into two sectors with two types of middle managers, one type for the academics and another for the support staff, and two types of operatives, the faculty and support staff. It is likely to find Kiggundu's profile fitting one type but not the other.

Turning first to top management in Kiggundu's profile, another problem emerges. In the professional bureaucracy, the operating core, the faculty are the central element (Mintzberg 1979). Because their work is highly specialized and complex, they enjoy a great deal of autonomy and participate widely in decision making process ranging from hiring colleagues to making academic policy in Senate. Administratively, decentralization ought to be the norm, yet in Kiggundu's profile top management is unwilling or unable to delegate, centralizing all decision making so that it becomes a bottleneck in the organization.

The other weakness which Kiggundu identified in the top management of organizations in developing countries is the lack of administrative and technical support. Without this support, senior managers are often forced to perform such functions as budgeting and background research. In the university, this kind of support is usually provided by a number of staff officers such as budget directors and institutional researchers. The number of such officials will depend on the size and complexity of the enterprise. In small institutions, the chief financial officer may perform both, while in a large institutions several officers may be involved in support tasks of this sort.

When we turn to the middle management, the dichotomous nature of the university comes into play. While the academic sector of the university is normally organized as a professional bureaucracy, the administrative sector more nearly resembles a machine bureaucracy. As a result, middle management may take two forms. According to Kiggundu, middle management enjoys weak organizational systems and controls. In the academic sector, given the expertise of the faculty, middle management, that is, the deans and department heads, exercises little real control. They may decide how many courses a faculty member may teach, where faculty will be accommodated in offices, or who is to get an allocation of resources like a computer, but such decisions are usually made in consultation with faculty members involved. When it comes to decisions about what is actually taught and how and the focus of research and how it is to be conducted, deans and department heads

have little or no input. Unlike the middle managers in Kiggundu's profile, deans are capable of some action independent of the senior executives, but only when it has the blessing of faculty. Again unlike the middle managers in Kiggundu's profile, deans would never exercise close supervision of faculty or discourage delegation or participative decision making.

While they may serve at the discretion of faculty, deans and managers of the middle line in universities are not without power. Mintzberg has identified two areas in particular, where they can exercise influence. The first is in resolving conflicts between departments or individuals which arise in the highly politicized environment of competing experts. The second is in the dean's ability to obtain resources for the faculty. By using their political skill and will, deans can exercise a great deal of power. (Mintzberg 1983:399, 1989:179-181)

In the administrative sector, however, Kiggundu's profile may fit perfectly. In the machine bureaucratic structure of university administration, it is entirely possible for middle managers to have weak organizational systems and controls, to have little scope for independent action, and to exercise close supervision of their staff, allowing for little delegation and participatory decision making.

Again, at the operating levels, two situations prevail. In general, Kiggundu finds operating levels in the developing country organization inefficient and costly. In the academic sector, given the nature of exercise, operating levels do tend to be inefficient and costly. High quality faculty demand high salaries and can move to find the highest bidder. High quality instruction in a university involves small classes and individual attention in a resource rich environment of library holdings, laboratory, computing, and other specialized facilities. Although many developing country institutions are hard pressed to find the resources to retain qualified faculty and to create a rich teaching and research environment, most are trying to do so. Compared to the numbers being serviced and the costs incurred at the primary or secondary levels in these countries, the academic operations in universities are inefficient and costly. Because of the expense, however, staffing levels are not usually high, nor are employees underutilized. Because they are highly motivated, what time is not spent in teaching goes to research. Nor is there a problem with morale. Faculty enjoy their work, although many like to complain about their lot in life. Finally, the performance evaluation system is fairly well suited to institutional goals, although the measurement of good teaching has always proven difficult.

Kiggundu's description of the operating levels in the developing country organization may be appropriate for the support staff providing academic support and performing other administrative functions. The operations of office clerks and maintenance staff, for example, may indeed fit the profile. Operations could be inefficient and costly where overstaffing is the norm, pay is poor, and the reward system fails to encourage good performance.

To summarize. Kiggundu's profile may fit certain aspects of the developing country university. In a professional bureaucracy, decentralization should be the norm, but it is conceivable that among developing country institutions there are those where the senior management refuses to delegate and enjoys weak management support. The weaknesses of middle management differ according to the sector of the university, they are managing. In the academic sector, it is the nature of the institution to have weak middle management; in the administrative sector, the weaknesses of the middle management may relate to organizational systems and controls, lack of independent action, and close supervision of subordinates. Differences again appear at the operations level, where the faculty exercise a great deal of power, while the support staff operations may be costly and inefficient because of overstaffing, poor pay, and an institutionally irrelevant reward system.

KIGGUNDU'S PROFILE AND A DEVELOPING COUNTRY UNIVERSITY

Having considered Kiggundu's profile of the developing country organization theoretically in relation to the university as an institution, our next task to attempt to determine how the profile fits an actual developing country university. The university chosen is the University of Botswana. This institution was founded in 1982, growing out of an earlier institution, the University of Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland established in 1966. In its short history it has grown to serve roughly 4000 students in faculties of Humanities, Education, Social Science, and Science. As the country's only university, it has enjoyed the support of the government and has grown rapidly to meet the demands of a rapidly expanding population.

Faced with the prospect of having to double its enrolment by the end of the decade, the university engaged the services of a Review Commission, a "blue ribbon" panel of experts, to advise it how best to

respond to the challenge of further rapid growth. The Review Commission recommended restructuring the administration and the Council struck an internal task force under the aegis of Senate to make recommendations on implementing the new structure (University of Botswana 1990, 1991). As part of its work, the task force carried out a management audit on the senior group, the academic administration, and the Registrar's and Bursar's departments, who were responsible for the administration of everything else. The reports of the Review Commission and the Task Force provide a valuable source of information about the structure and operations of this developing country university (University of Botswana 1992, 1993).

From the outset, it is clear that Kiggundu's profile applies to the senior management, especially the Vice Chancellor. The major recommendation by the Review Commission was to restructure the administration by getting the Vice Chancellor out of the day to day operations of the institution by appointing two Deputy Vice Chancellors, one for academic and one for administrative matters. (University of Botswana 1990:37-45). As would be normal in a small rapidly, growing institution, the Vice Chancellor sat on every committee and made virtually every decision. Once the institution reached a certain size, this style of management was no longer sustainable. The Vice Chancellor needed lieutenants to whom he could delegate substantial sectors of the institution, while he got on with the strategic planning and top level liaison with government officials. Thus, it seems that the situation described by the Review Commission and corroborated by the task force fits Kiggundu's profile perfectly.

The second element of Kiggundu's profile of the senior management also seems to apply. Another recommendation by the Review Commission, corroborated and further delineated by the task force, involved the creation of a number of departments headed by directors and designed to provide technical support. (University of Botswana 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994). Some of these departments would provide information and planning support to senior administration and thereby overcome the second major weakness of the senior level in the developing country institution, the lack of administrative and technical executive support.

Moving to the middle level, the task force's management audit showed the weaknesses on the administrative side predicted by Kiggundu's profile. Organizational systems and controls were lacking, and managers showed little initiative while exercising close supervision of their staff. On the academic side, the middle

management of deans and department chairs displayed the weak management expected in the professional bureaucracy. Deans and chair were elected for three year terms. Thus, the short term of office and method of selection reinforced the power of the faculty over these managers (University of Botswana 1992).

At the operations level, the faculty exercised the kind of power expected of experts in a professional bureaucracy. They served on committees and made decisions about promoting and hiring academics. Their power was mitigated somewhat, however, by the need to refer many decisions up the line ultimately to the Vice Chancellor. As far as their work was concerned, they performed their teaching, research, and service functions with little interference from either deans or senior management (University of Botswana 1992).

The academic support and administrative operations more nearly approximate Kiggundu's profile. Overstaffing was a problem. The library, for example, with a collection of 200,000 volumes had a staff of 125. Pay was poor and performance evaluation appeared non-existent (University of Botswana 1992).

From the foregoing discussion it should be clear that despite reservations about the inappropriateness of Kiggundu's profile for an organization which has elements of both the professional and machine bureaucracies, it can be applied to the senior administration, middle management, and the non-academic operations level.

OVERCOMING ORGANIZATIONAL WEAKNESSES IDENTIFIED BY KIGGUNDU

The solutions proposed for the University of Botswana seem appropriate to overcoming the weaknesses found in Kiggundu's profile of the developing country organization and are related to a set of issues he identifies as "some of the most important . . . in development administration, as well as the management of the organizations in developing countries." (143). The first of these issues is decentralization, and decentralization is precisely what a senior management unable or unwilling to delegate needs. Although Kiggundu is clearly thinking about decentralizing in broader terms than delegation within a relatively small organization, moving decision making down from the Vice Chancellor or senior administrative group does represent a form of decentralization (Kiggundu 1989:228-255; Mintzberg 1979:181-213).

The second issue Kiggundu discusses is the transfer of technology, knowledge, and expertise. While the issue of transfer may not apply, the need to develop technical support for management is clear. Not only does senior management need information, planning, budgeting support, but middle managers need to be put into place who can manage technical operations such as building maintenance and financial control. By hiring professionals in personnel, finance, and engineering, the university should give senior management the confidence to delegate, provide management support to senior administration, create organizational systems and controls and encourage greater independence of action among middle managers and a greater willingness to allow participatory decision making (Kiggundu 1989:189-227, University of Botswana 1992, 1993, 1994).

The final issue is human resource development and utilization. According to Kiggundu, human resource management is "one of the weakest functions in organizations in developing countries" (153). Better human resource management would see organizational systems and controls implemented which would aid middle managers. Such devices as job descriptions outlining scope and authority would help both manager and those supervised understand the scope and limits of independent action. At the same time, appropriate hiring, compensation, and performance evaluation policies would go a long way towards efficiency and lowering the cost of academic support and administrative operating staff (Kiggundu 1989:145-188; University of Botswana 1992, 1993, 1994).

CONCLUSION

By now its should be clear that Kiggundu's profile can be applied to the developing country university with some reservations. From the theoretical perspective, the difficulties lie in the dichotomous nature of the university with its academic operations normally configured as a professional bureaucracy and its academic support and administrative operations organized along the line of a machine bureaucracy. As a result, while Kiggundu's profile may apply to one sector of the developing country university, it does not necessarily apply to the whole. His description generally applies to the senior management; but the dichotomous nature of the organization means that while the middle management and operations level of the academic and administrative support staff fit the profile, the more purely academic administration, with deans and chairs as middle management and faculty as the

operating core, does not. To overcome the problems identified by the profile, three of the issues facing developing country organizations can provide useful solutions. Decentralization will overcome the problem of failure to delegate by the senior management. The importation of technical skill, knowledge and expertise should provide senior managers with the support they need and professionalize most of the important administrative functions required by the institution. Specifically, development and deployment of a proper human resources management function should obviate many of the problems encountered both at the middle management and operations level on the administrative side of the university.

By making these kind of changes in their adminstration and management, developing country universities, like the University of Botswana, should be able to overcome many of the organizational shortcomings that Kiggundu identified in his profile. The profile itself, applied with the reservations and insights gained from this discussion, can be a useful device to assist change agents to pin point the shortcomings and provide the solutions to developing country institutions. In so doing, they should thereby improve the efficiency and quality of their institutions so that they are better able to make the kinds of contribution that are appropriate from such institutions to the economic development of their nations.

REFERENCES

Adamolekun, 'Ladipo. (1989) *Issues in Development Management in Subsaharan Africa.* Washington: The World Bank.

Baldridge, J. Victor. (1971) *Power and Conflict in the University* .New York: John Wiley.

Bergquist, William H. (1992) *The Four Cultures of the Academy.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988) *How Colleges Work: The Cybernetics of Academic Organization and Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blau, Peter and Schoenherr, Richard. (1971) *The Structure of Organizations.* New York: Basic Books.

Blunt, P. (1983) *Organizational Theory and Behaviour: An African Perspective.* London: Longman.

Brinkerhoff, Derick. (1991) *Improving Development Program Performance: Guidelines for Managers.* Boulder: L. Rienner Publishers.

Burns, Tom and Stalker, G.M. (1961) *The Management of Innovation.* London: Tavistock Publications.

Clark, Burton R. (1983) Governing the Higher Education System, in Michael

Shattock (Ed) *The Structure and Governance of Higher Education.* Guildford: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Cohen, M. and Marsh, J.C. (1974) *Leadership and Ambiguity.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Dasah, B.Z. and Kiggundu, M. (1985) *Report on the Debriefing of the Canada-Kenya Business Forum.* Hull,: Canadian International Development Agency, Briefing Centre.

Esman, Milton. (1991) *Management Dimensions of Development: Perspectives and Strategies* . West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Faucheux, C., Amado, G. and Laurent, A. (1982). Organizational Development and Change, *Annual Review of Psychology* 33: 343-370.

Hage, J. and Finsterbusch, K. (1987) *Organizational Change as a Development Strategy: Models and Tactics for Improving Third World Organizations.* Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Hardy, Cynthia. (1991) Configuration and Strategy Making in Universities, *Journal of Higher Education* 62:363-393.

Hyden, Goran. (1983) *No Short Cuts to Progress: African Development Management in Perspective..* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Israel, Arturo. (1987). *Institutional Development: Incentives to Performance.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Jaeger, A. and Kanungo, R. (Eds) (1990) *Management in Developing Countries..* London and New York: Routledge.

Jedlicka, A. (1987) *Organizational Change and the Third World: Designs for the Twenty-First Century.* New York: Praeger.

Kaijage, Frederick J. (Ed) (1993) *Management Consulting in Africa: Utilizing Local Expertise.* West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Kiggundu, M. (1989) *Managing Organizations in Developing Countries: An Organizational and Strategic Approach.* West Hartford, CT: Kumerian Press.

Kiggundu, M., Jorgensen, J., and Hafsi, T. (1983) Administrative Theory and Practice in Developing Countries, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28:66-84.

Kim, L. and Utterback, J.M. (1983) The Evolution of Organizational Structure and Technology in a Developing Country, *Management Science* 29(10) 1185-1197.

Korten, David C. (Ed) (1986) *Community Management: Asian Experience and Perspectives* . West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Korten, Frances F. and Siy, Robert Y. Jr. (1988) *Transforming a Bureaucracy: The Experience of the National Irrigation Administration.* West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Lammers, C.J. and Hickson, D.J. (Eds) (1979) *Organizations Alike and Unlike: International and Inter-Institutional Studies in the Sociology of Organizations.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lawrence, Paul and Lorsch, J. (1967) *Organization and Environment.* Boston: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

Leonard, David. (1991) *African Successes: Four Public Managers of Kenyan*

Rural Development. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Livingstone, Hugh. (1974) *The University: An Organizational Analysis* . Glasgow: and London: Blackie.
Miller, D. (1981) Towards a New Contingency Approach: The Search for Organizational Gestalts, *Journal of Management Studies* 18:1-26.
Miller, D. (1986) Configurations of Strategy and Structure: Towards a Synthesis, *Strategic Management Journal* 7:233-49
Miller, D. (1987) The Genesis of Configuration, *Academy of Management Review*, 12:686-701.
Miller, D. and Friessen, P. (1977) Strategy Making in Context: Ten Empirical Archetypes, *Journal of Management Studies* 14:259-280.
Millett, John. (1962) *The Academic Community*. New York, McGraw Hill.
Mintzberg, Henry. (1979) *The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of the Research*.. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
Mintzberg, Henry. (1983) *Power In and Around Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs:: Prentice -Hall.
Mintzberg, Henry. (1989) *Mintzberg on Management: Inside Our Strange World of Organizations*. New York: The Free Press.
Negandhi, A. R. (1979) Convergence in Organizational Practice: An Empirical Study of Industrial Enterprises in Developing Countries, in C.J. Lammers and D.J. Hickson (Eds) *Organizations Alike and Unlike*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Nicholson, N., Ostrom, E., Bowles, D., and Long, R. (1985) *Development Management in Africa: The Case of the Egerton College Expansion Project in Kenya*. Washington: US Agency for International Development.
Paul, Samuel. (1982) *Managing Development Programs: The Lessons of Success*. Boulder: Westview Press.
Paul, Samuel. (1983) *Strategic Management of Development Programs: Guidelines for Action*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
Perkins, James, ed. (1973) *The University as an Organization*. New York: McGraw Hill.
Perrow, Charles. (1972) *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.
Sherman, Mary Antoinette Brown. (1990) The University in Modern Africa *Journal of Higher Education* 61:363-385.
University of Botswana. (1990) *Report of the Review Commission*. Gaborone: University of Botswana.
University of Botswana. (1991) *Decisions of the University of Botswana Council on the Report of the Review Commission*. Gaborone: University of Botswana.
University of Botswana. (1992) *Task Force One: First Report to Council on the Revised Organisational Structure*. Gaborone: University of Botswana.
University of Botswana. (1993) *Task Force One: Restructuring the University Administration: Consultancy Report*. Gaborone: University of Botswana.
University of Botswana. (1994) *Task Force One: Final Report to Council*. Gaborone: University of Botswana.

Weber, Max. (1947) *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press.

World Bank. (1988) *Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Policies for Adjustment, Revitalization, and Expansion.* Washington: The World Bank.

Yesufu, T.M. (Ed) (1973) *Creating the African University: Emerging Issues in the 1970s.* Association of African Universities, Ibadan, Oxford University Press.