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CHAPTER ONE
1.0 INTRODUCTION
1.1. Introduction

Developments in higher education particularly universities in Africa continue to be tremendous as they have been challenging for the continent, to various governments and all stakeholders (Jegede, 2012). The challenges however, have never been as profound as they now appear in recent times; thus, requiring scholarly attention. The catalysts for educational reform which include massification, equity and social justice, inclusiveness, expansion, employability, globalization, skills and competencies shortage and national development have continued to multiply (Okwakol, 2009). At the same time within the continent, between countries and within countries, differences in areas such as demography, funding, physical infrastructure, levels of academic support, qualified academic staff, management and decision making and local challenges have continued to increase rather steeply. This is not to mention the double-edged effect of brain drain which stands apart as an issue of major occurrence affecting higher education in Africa (Jegede, 2012) despite the fact that ICT has at the same time created avenues for repatriations of the gains accruable to the drain (Olaoye, 2008).

The above challenges are occurring in an environment which demands that higher education in Africa and Uganda in particular must focus on global competitiveness while it strives to be locally relevant and centrally placed to contribute meaningfully to sustainable total development of the continent, countries and individuals (Mpaata, 2010). This study intends to empirically assess the perceived relationships between bureaucracy and decision making in public and private universities in Uganda. Generally, university education has profoundly changed in the past three decades, and those involved in the academic enterprise have grappled with the implications of these changes (Altbach and Todd, 1999). The management systems in universities have faced pressures of increasing numbers of students and demographic changes, demands for accountability, reconsideration of the social and
economic role of higher education, and the impact of new technologies, among others (Okwakol, 2009).

While the management systems function in a national environment, the challenges faced play themselves out on a global scale (World Bank, 2009). With the numerous changes in the university sector, decision making has equally become more challenging than before. Moreover, universities are by nature bureaucratic institutions which pose a fundamental question on how such organizational arrangements affect decision making in university systems.

This introductory chapter unravels the background to the study where the historical, theoretical fundamental concepts as well as the context of the study are discussed. The entire background is discussed at global, regional and national contexts. The chapter then states the problem, the purpose of the study, the objectives, research questions and hypotheses. It then covers the significance, scope of the study; justification and gives some operational definition of key terms as they will be used in the study.

1.2. Background to the Study

Historically, university education has been recognized as a key force for modernization and development. It is perceived as an important form of investment in home capital development (World Bank, 2009). As universities are charged with formation of human capital through teaching, building knowledge base through research and knowledge development, and dissemination and use of knowledge by interacting with the knowledge users (Okwakol, 2009); those entrusted with managing such institutions need to make decisions that promote this historical goal.

University governance and decision-making structures around the world have long been a site of study for higher education researchers (Dill, 1997; Neave and Van Vught, 1994). These studies have identified a number of different governance arrangements in varied contexts. Some researchers have
focused on public universities administered by governments directly or through governmental agencies (Neave and Van Vught, 1991). Others have analyzed higher education institutions that are characterized by faculty and university administrative governance (Chait, Holland, and Taylor, 1996). Literature in Britain, Canada and the United States has addressed a wide range of institutions that are neither run in a completely autonomous fashion by faculty and administrators, nor under the direct administration of governments and their agencies. The most typical form of organization for these institutions revolves around a semi-autonomous body: the board of trustees or governing board (Jones and Skolnik, 1997; Chait, Holland and Taylor, 1996). An emerging body of literature has begun to focus on instances of crisis in the contemporary university and the role of governing boards under crises (Ordorika, 1999; Pusser, 1999; Herideen, 1998).

The former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan reiterated that African universities must become a primary tool for Africa’s development in the new century. He noted that universities can help develop African expertise; enhance the analysis of African problems; strengthen domestic institutions; serve as a model environment for the practice of good governance, conflict resolution and respect for human rights, and enable African academics to play an active part in the global community of scholars (UN, 2000).

Nkosi-Kandaba (2004) examined the participative decision making in South African universities with four major aims: to investigate the extent to which the universities practice participative decision making, to establish whether certain administrative managers’ characteristics influence the practice of participative decision making, determine whether there was any difference among the universities practice in participative decision making; and to determine whether there was any association among ranks assigned by respondents to the participative decision making steps. The study found out that managers held negative perceptions about participative decision making and therefore concluded that university managers did not practice participative decision making. This could be true of the situation
in Uganda’s universities in that he challenges experienced in the universities are a result of top management holding negative perceptions about participative decision making and avoid participatory approach like in the case of Kyambogo University.

Obondoh (2001) conducted a research in two universities in Kenya: Kenyatta University and University of Nairobi on student involvement in university governance. He found out that within universities, academic, management staff and students are often in disagreement with administration. Administrators are seen as defenders of the state (authority) that appointed them and that they actually implement their directives. Heads of departments, directors of institutes and deans of faculties are often perceived to limit decision making in that they resort to single-handed decision, which they then present to faculty boards as views from the members. Academicians are often too preoccupied with issues of teaching and research, and therefore, limited time for meeting. The student associations are often banned or co-opted as extensions of the administration. Similar scenarios have been observed in the Ugandan universities although there in need for empirical evidence before conclusions can be drawn.

Situations like those found out by Nkosi-Kandaba (2004) in South African universities and Obondo (1998) in Kenyan universities formed the basis for explaining conflicts that reigned high in most universities in South African and Kenyan universities. These conflicts resulted in costly damage to property following student riots and strikes. In other universities, accusations were labeled on Principals, Chancellors and Vice Chancellors of the universities with demands for their immediate resignation or expulsion. Former Mongusuthu Technikon University in Durban and the former Chancellor of the North University in South Africa are some of the examples of the atrocious acts resulting from issues to do with decision making.
Management structures for universities are highly differentiated throughout the different countries in the world. As noted by Altbach (2005) the different models for university governance present with several variations. For instance, Coldrake, Stedman, and Little (2003) discuss the shared traditions and history of university education worldwide. For instance, in a study carried out in Pakistan to analyze some of the issues of university’s governance; focus was made on some policy considerations regarding governance, analysis of the decision-making practices and finally recommended some “best practices” to the universities’ governance. The study further examined the challenges of governance in higher education and how universities were acting in response to them. It addressed the rising role and participation of stakeholders in higher education governance and emerging approaches of management in the governance of higher education in Pakistan. The study focused mainly on the governing body of the universities, and its roles and relationships with other stakeholders. The results of the study showed that in Pakistan the state is the key player in the governance and decision-making of higher education. This too is similar to Ugandan universities particularly the public universities.

McMaster (2007) examined the different cultures in universities and the traditional relationships between faculty and administration, characterizing historical transitions and suggesting that universities today are undergoing transitions in culture especially with reference to decision-making. Similarly, Kezar and Eckel (2004) pointed out that the substance of governance and decision-making has changed during the last decades with more emphasis put on high stake issues and more incremental decisions made in a less collegial mode – the reasons for this stem from trends that have devalued the notion of participation and also from the external pressures for more accountability and demands for quicker decision-making that sometimes is achieved through bureaucracy.

Dearlove (1997) emphasized that, under the conditions of mass university education, no university can avoid the need for some sort of bureaucratic management and organization. With changing roles
in human resources and the external pressures for accountability affecting internal university relationships, McMaster (2007) provides insights by defining decision-making approaches in terms of nested partnership between faculty and administration, contiguous partnership, and segmented partnership. With debates over the recent trends, university organizations, governing associations, and numerous institutions themselves have set forth policy statements on models of governing the universities in the twenty-first century.

Generally, the management process in universities is complex and includes many different layers (or authoritative structures). Each structure differs in levels of responsibility by type of institution, culture of the university, and historical evolution. Thus, in Zimbabwe, there is no single organizing approach for decision making (Nyarugwe, 2014). Researching on governance and decision-making in church-related institutions of higher learning in Zimbabwe, Nyarugwe (2014) found out that Trustees and Boards have been delegated authority by college and university charters from the University councils’ legislature for oversight and decision-making. The legal requirements for boards are typically very loose; they need to assemble with a quorum periodically and oversee certain broad responsibilities. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, boards dominated decision-making, and faculty had little involvement. However, as faculty professionalized in the late 1800s, there was a concerted effort among faculty to obtain greater authority within the decision-making process. For instance, Birnbaum (1991) noted that in Michigan University, the reality of decision making today is much different than the strict legal interpretation would suggest with boards having total authority. From the structuring of universities, it is evident that they are bureaucratic in nature and thus, it is important that a clear understanding of bureaucracy is made.

Bureaucracy is an organization made up of many departments and divisions that are administered by lots of people. The characteristics of bureaucracy were first formulated in a systematic manner by the German sociologist Max Weber (1864-1920), whose definition and theories set the foundations for
all subsequent work on the subject. They refer to (i) the division of labor in the organization, (ii) its authority structure, (iii) the position and role of the individual member, and (iv) the type of rules that regulate the relations between organizational members. A highly developed division of labor and specialization of tasks is one of the most fundamental features of bureaucracy. This is achieved by a precise and detailed definition of the duties and responsibilities of each position or office. The allocation of a limited number of tasks to each office operates according to the principle of fixed jurisdictional areas that are determined by administrative regulations.

The bureaucratic organization is characterized by a rational and impersonal regulation of inferior-superior relationships. In traditional types of administration (feudal, patrimonial), the inferior-superior relationship is personal, and the legitimation of authority is based on a belief in the sacredness of tradition (Pearson, 2010). In a bureaucracy, on the other hand, authority is legitimized by a belief in the correctness of the process by which administrative rules were enacted; and the loyalty of the bureaucrat is oriented to an impersonal order, to a superior position, not to the specific person who holds it (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011). When one shifts the focus of attention from the organization as a whole to the role and status of the individual member, the following features characterize the bureaucrat’s position. Starting with the mode of recruitment, the bureaucrat is not selected on the basis of such considerations as family position or political loyalties. His recruitment is based on formal qualifications (diplomas, university degrees) that testify that the applicant has the necessary knowledge to accomplish effectively his specialized duties (Person, 2010). However, the other most important issue that was noted by Pollitt & Bouckaert (2011) in as far as bureaucratic management is concerned is that of decision-making.

Formally, universities have a rationally organized social structure which involves clearly defined patterns of activity in which; ideally, every series of actions is functionally related to the purposes of the entire university (Pearson, 2010). There are integrated series of offices, of hierarchal statuses, in
which a number of obligations and privileges are closely defined by limited and specific rules. For instance, in a typical university setting, this flows from the highest offices of the University Council, through Senate down to individual departments. Each of the offices contains an area of imputed competence and responsibility. Authority, the power of control which derives from an acknowledged status, inheres in the office and not in the particular person who performs the official role (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011). Official action ordinarily occurs within the framework of pre-existing rules of the university. The system of prescribed relations between the various offices involves a considerable degree of formality and clearly defined social distance between the occupants of these positions. In the bureaucratic nature of universities, formality is manifested by means of a more or less complicated social ritual which symbolizes and supports the pecking order of the various offices (Nyarugwe, 2014).

This type of formal organization observed both in public and private universities is bureaucratic in nature as articulated by Max Weber (Pearson, 2010). As Weber indicated, bureaucracy involves a clear-cut division of integrated activities which are regarded as duties inherent in the office. A system of differentiated controls and sanctions is stated in the regulations. The assignment of roles occurs on the basis of technical qualifications which are ascertained through formalized, impersonal procedures (e.g., examinations). Within the structure of hierarchically arranged authority, the activities of “trained and salaried experts” are governed by general, abstract, and clearly defined rules which preclude the necessity for the issuance of specific instructions for each specific case. The generality of the rules requires the constant use of categorization, whereby individual problems and cases are classified on the basis of designated criteria and are treated accordingly (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011).

The pure type of bureaucratic official is appointed, either by a superior or through the exercise of impersonal competition; he is not elected. A measure of flexibility in the bureaucracy is attained by electing higher functionaries who presumably express the will of the electorate (e.g., a body of
citizens or a board of directors). The election of higher officials is designed to affect the purposes of the organization, but the technical procedures for attaining these ends are carried out by continuing bureaucratic personnel (Person, 2010). This bureaucratic nature of universities makes university management complex especially in matters of decision-making. Complexity is defined as the measure of heterogeneity or diversity in environmental sub-factors such as customers, suppliers, socio-politics and technology (Chae and Hill, 1997; Chakravarthy, 2011). As complexity increases, the ability to understand and use information to predict, plan and make decisions becomes more challenging (Black and Farias, 2011). As all systems increase in complexity over time (Farrell, 1998), the increasing complexity leads to more change (Conner, 1998). As the system becomes more complex, making sense of it becomes more difficult (Black and Farias, 2011) and adaptation to the management.

Contextually, due to high demand for university education, governments around the world have had to engage in privatization of university education. This in itself has been due to public sector reforms orchestrated under the doctrines of New Public Management (NPM). New Public Management (NPM), a term formally conceptualized by Hood (1991) denotes broadly the government policies that aim at modernizing and rendering the public sector more efficient. The basic hypothesis that NPM holds is that market oriented management of the public sector leads to greater cost-efficiency for governments, without having negative side-effects on other objectives and considerations. Ferlie et al (1996) described New Public Management in Action as involving the introduction into public services of the “three Ms”: Markets, Managers and Measurement.

New Public Management (NPM), management techniques and practices drawn mainly from the private sector, is increasingly seen as a global phenomenon (Larbi, 2009). NPM reforms shift the emphasis from traditional public administration to public management. Key elements include various forms of decentralizing management within public services (e.g., the creation of autonomous
agencies and devolution of budgets and financial control), increasing use of markets and competition in the provision of public services (e.g., contracting out and other market-type mechanisms), and increasing emphasis on performance, outputs and customer orientation (Boston, 1996).

NPM reforms have been driven by a combination of economic, social, political and technological factors. A common feature of countries going down the NPM route has been the experience of economic and fiscal crises, which triggered the quest for efficiency and for ways to cut the cost of delivering public services (Larbi, 2009). The crisis of the welfare state led to questions about the role and institutional character of the state. In the case of most developing countries, reforms in public administration and management have been driven more by external pressures and have taken place in the context of structural adjustment programmes (Ferlie et al., 1996). NPM was essentially against traditional public sector arrangements which emphasized bureaucracy. During the 1970s and 80s, the public sector; including university education was subjected to the market ideologies. That is why; as Coldrake, Stedman, and Little (2003) suggests, in Latin America and some parts of Asia, the fastest-growing parts of the academic system are private institutions. Uganda is not an exception to this development. Out of 46 universities and degree awarding institutions, 67.4% of them are privately owned. In Central and Eastern Europe, private initiative is also of considerable importance. The students are increasingly seen as customers.

Altbach (2005) believed that the expansion of the private sector brings up issues of quality control and accreditation since in many parts of the world there are few controls as yet on private sector expansion. These dilemmas require sophisticated decision making as the various stakeholders affect decision making in universities. This is because universities are by their very nature complex organizations. In complex environments decision-making is best practiced in flat, decentralized, organic structures, as they can maintain global stability but absorb a high degree of uncertainty and still adapt at the detail level (Peters, 1999; Prendergast and Berthon, 2000). In such an environment
planning is still important, but it should have a short time horizon, information should be freely
distributed and used quickly, it should be about how to do things rather than what to do, and it should
include alternative possible outcomes (Skae, 1989; Nilson, 1995; Jones, 2000) – in other words, less
prediction, control and stability and more self or group control to enable quick adaptation to the
changes (Jaworski, 1988; Briggs and Peat, 1999).

Since the late 1990s, the European higher education system has had to face deep structural changes
for better decision-making. With the public authorities seeking to create an environment of quasi-
markets in the higher education sector, the increased competition induced by recent reforms has
pushed all publicly financed higher education institutions to use their resources more efficiently
(Briggs and Peat, 1999). Higher education institutions increasingly now aim at differentiating
themselves from their competitors in terms of the range of outputs they produce. This is also true of
the situation in developing countries in Africa and particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Until 1987, Uganda had only one public university with about 10,000 students (Okwakol, 2009).
Currently, there are six public and 31 private universities with a total of over 300,000 students
(NCHE, 2014). This implies that it is not only the demand for university education that has increased
but this has been accompanied by a number of decision-making challenges. Decision-making is very
important in the management of university education. Decision-making is the thought process of
selecting a logical choice from the available options (Ambalika and Kumar, 2007). When trying to
make a good decision, a person must weigh the positives and negatives of each option, and consider
all the alternatives (Doya and Shadlen, 2012). For effective decision making, a person must be able to
forecast the outcome of each option as well, and based on all these items, determine which option is
the best for that particular situation (Triantaphyllou, 2000). The problems arise when there are
difficult decisions to be taken, particularly about staffing and resources. At such moments it is
important to have clarity and predictability of processes, and an acceptance that these are fair and
inclusive to the most appropriate degree (Doya and Shadlen, 2012). And it is imperative that the factors that contributed to a decision are known and understood.

Since 2004, a number of Ugandan universities have faced challenges, including failure to pay lecturers on time, under funding of research, high turnover of experienced professors, crumbling physical infrastructure, lecturers and students’ strikes, poor international rating and lack of teaching materials (Kasozi, 2005; Ocwich, 2005 & Tabeja, 2008). Several arguments have been put forward to explain this situation and they include issues of poor governance, under funding, business pressure and profit motivation in the private universities, some universities being temporarily closed down while others have been de-registered (Lugazi University, Victoria at one time closed down). However, some of the challenges are believed to be associated with decision-making and that they led to student riots and strikes. For instance, in the past five years, strikes at Makerere University related to the university decision to raise fees for Non-Ugandans was believed to have been done without involving staff and student leaders (New Vision, 23rd October 2013s). The most recent scenario pertains to the management of Kyambogo University which has gone on for almost two years and demands were made for the Vice chancellor, Professor Isaiah Diege to resign (New Vision, 7th November 2013). The issue led to the intervention of Parliament, Cabinet, the Ministry of Education and Sports and the Inspectorate of Government. The Vice Chancellor was accused of making unilateral decisions and not involving staff and other stakeholders (New Vision, 7th November 2013). Later the Vice Chancellor was re-instated but the reinstatement met with a lot of resistance (New Vision, 30th October 2013)

Given that most universities are structured in a bureaucratic fashion and that studies alluded to above point to decision making as pertinent in the challenges faced by universities, it is imperative that an empirical study on bureaucracy and decision making is carried out to establish both the relationship and effect on management of universities particularly in Uganda. The present study seeks to find
answers to a number of questions; for instance, how does the rational and impersonal regulation of inferior-superior relationships in the universities affect decision making? On the other hand, how does legitimization of authority and the correctness of the process by which administrative rules are enacted affect decision making? How does the loyalty of the bureaucrat’s orientation to impersonal order and superiority in position affect decision making? These and several other questions pertaining to the division of labor in the universities, authority structure, the position and role of the individual staffs, and the type of rules that regulate the relations between organizational staff need an empirical study to explain the ultimate effect of bureaucracy on decision making in universities in Uganda.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

In the past five years, there have been several strikes in Makerere, Kyambogo universities (for public universities) and Kampala International University (for private universities) in Uganda. In these universities and perhaps in several other universities in the country, academic, management staff and students are often in disagreement with administration (New Vision, October 23, 2013). These disagreements result in costly damage to property following student riots and strikes. These strikes were blamed on issues relating to decision making in the institutions (New Vision, Nov 7, 2013).

Although several studies have been carried out on higher education in Uganda, they have not really focused on bureaucracy and decision-making. For instance; Basheka, Muhenda and Kittobe (2009) focused on programme delivery quality benchmarks and outcomes based education while Kayongo (2009) examined the need for a strong and effective public-private partnership in the provision of higher education in Uganda. Furthermore, Okwakol (2009) considered the challenges and prospects for quality assurance in science and technology education in African Universities; while Katamba (2007) made an assessment of government philanthropy towards private universities in Uganda and its implications for access, equity and quality of higher education. On the other hand, Nakabugo and Masembe (2004) restricted themselves on quality assurance in curriculum development in higher
education; while Kasozi (2003) was more concerned about the African universities’ capacity to participate in global higher education supply and production. None of these studies has specifically examined the influence of bureaucracy and decision making. This has created a knowledge gap that this current study attempts to fill. The present study is interested in the implications of the bureaucratic governance and corresponding effect on decision making in universities in Uganda.

1.4. Purpose of the Study
To establish how bureaucracy affects decision making in public and private universities in Uganda.

1.5. Objectives of the Study
The study will focus on the following specific objectives:

i. To examine the effect of the division of labor on decision-making in public and private universities in Uganda.

ii. To demonstrate how authoritative structure affects decision making in public and private universities in Uganda.

iii. To find out how participation of individual staff in various positions affects decision making in public and private universities in Uganda.

iv. To establish how existing regulatory rules affect decision-making in public and private universities in Uganda.

1.6. Research Questions
The study will be guided by the following research questions:

i. What is the effect of the division of labor on decision-making in public and private universities in Uganda?

ii. How does the authoritative structure affect decision making in public and private universities in Uganda?

iii. How does participation of individual staff in various positions affect decision making in public and private universities in Uganda?

iv. How do the existing regulatory rules affect decision-making in public and private universities in Uganda?
1.7. Research Hypotheses

The study will seek to verify the following null hypotheses:

**H1** Division of labour significantly affects decision-making in the Uganda’s public and private universities.

**H2** Authoritative structures significantly affect decision making in the public and private universities of Uganda.

**H3** Participation of individual staff in various positions significantly affects decision making in the public and private universities.

**H4** Regulatory rules significantly affect decision-making in the public and private universities.

1.8 Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Modifying Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureaucracy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social division</td>
<td>• Environment in organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technical division</td>
<td>• Knowledge of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Territorial division</td>
<td>• Organizational Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritative structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Centralized structures</td>
<td>• Rules (NATIONAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decentralized structures</td>
<td>• Accreditation (Accreditors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal structures</td>
<td>• -National policies (Accreditors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Informal structures</td>
<td>• -Political interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation of individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rationale; Structure</td>
<td>• Environment in organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Form; Decision issues</td>
<td>• Knowledge of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Degree of involvement</td>
<td>• Organizational Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decision process</td>
<td>• -National policies (Accreditors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory rules</strong></td>
<td>• -Political interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consensus procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethical procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rules-based procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rules of thumb procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conjunctive procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Literature Review- Max Weber; Eisenhardt and Zbaracki (1992)

Fig 2.1: Conceptual Framework (adapted from Harris, 2012, Weber, 1864-1920)

From the conceptual framework above, the independent variable is bureaucracy which includes the principles of division of labor, the authoritative structure, the position of the individual members and the regulatory rules (Weber, 1920). On the other hand, the dependent variable is decision making
which is based on rationality, bounded rationality, politics and power. However, from literature, decision making involves problem recognition and definition, goal selection, identification of alternatives and choice of decision. Ideally, the constructs under bureaucracy would provide appropriate attainment of decisions in organizations through problem identification and definition, goal selection, identification of alternatives and the final choice of decision. However, organizations do not operate in a vacuum. Therefore there are several factors that act as moderating variables and may affect appropriate decision making even in effective bureaucracies. These may include but not limited to the following: Environment in organization, Knowledge of members, Organizational Culture, National policies, Political interference, donors and associations as explained below.

Division of labour is an arrangement whereby people perform different functions at the same time. Though the term ‘division of labour’ is applied in the field of economics, yet in fact division of labour in modern society is not limited simply to labour but applies to all the factors of production and exists beyond the purely economic field. There are three forms of division of labour; social, technical and territorial divisions of labour (Agarwal, 2014). Division of labor has a profound effect on the bargaining opportunity of staff in an organization. Bargaining constitutes the baseline of collective decision-making in negotiations. In other words, division of labor denies some staff of the collective decision-making and negotiations. It is well-known from rational choice theory and reflects strategic action by rational utility maximizes in communicative processes. Despite their common interest in reaching agreement, actors typically have competing interests regarding the distribution of co-operation gains (Scharpf, 1997). In order to maximize their return, bargaining actors rely on threats and promises that have to be executed outside the assembly itself. Credibility increases with the attractiveness of an actor’s ‘best available alternative to agreement’. Accordingly, the outcome of a bargaining process, i.e. the distribution of gains, can be expected to reflect, by and large, the distribution of power among the actors involved (Elster, 1989). If decisions may be adopted by a majority, bargaining may stop short of consensus.
Working productively and developing feelings of cooperation and effectiveness in organizations is related to having the right people in the right positions of authority doing the right jobs. Structure, then, can be defined as a system of interrelated jobs, groups of jobs, and authority. There is no standard organizational structure, but most organizations and agencies follow the "Christmas Tree" system with the star (for example Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellors, Deans) at the top, smaller branches at management levels, and bigger branches at the implementation levels. Some would claim that the lower branches support the upper branches, but as in the tree, the branches are supported by a single trunk, which can be thought of as the organizational mission and objectives. Each part of the tree has its specific functioning in the decision making process. When all parts work together, the system survives and functions productively; has balance, and can be successful in its endeavours.

Universities have regulatory rules that often affect the decision making process because of the code of conduct expected of the members. For instance, it is the moral duty of members of university decision making-bodies to take part in meetings, except for cases of representing the interests of the Board at other meetings, or other employment, or a pre-organised leave authorized by the Vice Chancellor. The fact of the above hindrance and its reasons are to be reported (if they are known) to the organizer of the meeting well in advance, they are to make sure that the decisions made are well grounded, they are to aim at objectivity and be responsible in considering the consequences of decisions. They are to consider the opinion of all concerned in the questions on the agenda. They should express their opinion in short and in a civilized way. Furthermore, it is the moral duty of members of decision-making bodies to prepare for meetings and do their best to make well-grounded decisions that influence the lives and circumstances of the students and employees of the University. In case conditions for a well-grounded decision are not provided (not all information is available) they are obliged to make amendments. It is the duty of all taking part in the work of the decision making-bodies to represent
views that are objective and in coherence with the interest and opinions of all concerned. They are to provide constant information to those they represent. Members of the decision making-bodies should aim at a correct process where all views are evaluated. Votes disregarding possible opinions carried out with use of a special agreement, bribe or other means of influence should be avoided. It is considered an ethical offence to initiate, call upon, force or accept such a vote. Are all these your own words?

Although not formally part of university governance, outside forces such as state governments, donors, accreditors (such as NCHE), and associations (such as the Alumni) often affect decision making processes through funding, persuasion, policy, and guidelines. These other groups are important to acknowledge, even if their influence is infrequent and not formally defined by a Universities Act, statement, or set of principles. Legislatures use budget allocation as a way to influence university decision-making outside the formal decision making processes. Individual donors might ask to have a say in certain institutional decisions in exchange for a monetary contribution to the institution. The government can establish rules and regulations that indirectly affect university decision-making. For example, regulations about affirmative action have had an effect on university admissions decisions and policies. Accreditors and associations also have some influence on decision making in universities. Accreditors, for example, can define requirements for a certain field of study. These requirements influence the decision-making processes at universities that want to retain their accreditation status.

1.9 Significance of the Study

Education is fundamental to the development of Uganda as a nation. Therefore, it is necessary to ensure that management especially of higher institutions is carefully done to ensure that the teaching staff do their best to achieve the best outcomes in terms of graduates, who will in turn serve the country. The findings will provide a basis for improvements in management and will also be useful to the stakeholders in a number of ways. For instance;
The findings will provide a new basis for policy makers to take decisions about mitigating the challenges affecting management of institutions of higher learning in Uganda.

The findings will create an awareness and understanding to the university managers about the salient management challenges that need not be taken for granted but rather be given due attention for effective outputs.

The findings will be used by the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) in formulating and designing management training programmes and strategies for university managers.

The findings will be used by the university managers in identifying some of the major factors that lead to poor results in the universities.

Lastly but not least, the findings will also act as a source of reference for researchers who intend to carry out research in higher education management.

1.10 Justification of the Study

Universities are large and generally complex organizations, having many inter-related facets and areas that need to be co-ordinated, managed together to achieve efficiencies and effectiveness in achieving stated goals and objectives (Drucker, 2003). Such organizations also need to be adaptive; they need to respond to ongoing changes in the environments in which they operate e.g. the political, social, economic and technological conditions that together form the environment in which organizations operate. One of the ways this can be done is through adoption of the bureaucratic style of management. However, no available studies have been done to provide empirical evidence on the effect of bureaucracy on decision-making in such large organizations and particularly in universities in Uganda. This is the justification for the present study.
1.11 Scope of the Study

1.11.1. Geographical Scope
The study will focus on effect of bureaucracy on decision making in universities located in central of Uganda. There are well over 30 recognized universities in Uganda and majority of these are located in the central region. Furthermore, the universities in this region have had several strikes and riots and it is for this reason that the choice of study is Uganda.

1.11.2. Content Scope
In terms of content scope, the study will focus on examination of the effect of the division of labor on decision-making in universities, the effect of authoritative structure on decision making; the effect of the position of the individual staffs on decision making, and on the effect of regulatory rules on decision-making in universities.

1.11.3. Time Scope
The period between 2008 and 2013 will be considered for this study; this being the period during which the number of universities and their individual enrolments increased tremendously, thereby creating further complexity in decision making management

1.12. Operations Definitions

**Bureaucracy:** is an organization made up of many departments and divisions that are administered by lots of people. Bureaucratic organization is characterized by a rational and impersonal regulation of inferior-superior relationships.

**Decision-Making:** is the thought process of selecting a logical choice from the available options.

**Division of labour:** precise and detailed definition of the duties and responsibilities of each position or office.
Authoritative structures: these are the fixed jurisdictional areas that are determined by administrative regulations within a bureaucratic organization.

Position of individual: this is related to having the right people in the right positions of authority doing the right jobs.

Regulatory rules: is the moral duty of members of the organization decision making-bodies to take part in meetings, except for cases of representing the interests of the Board at other meetings, or other employment.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter therefore presents a review of related literature about bureaucracy and decision-making in organizations. The review begins with a theoretical review of the theory underpinning the study before delving into the historical trajectory of the use of bureaucracy in decision making, focusing on the division of labour and decision making in university contexts. The review further delves into the authoritative structures and decision making in universities, and on individual participation and decision making in university contexts. Finally, the literature review focuses on the regulatory rules and decision making in university contexts. The review is based on studies by various academicians and writers on issues of bureaucracy and decision making in organizations and institutions around the world. Therefore, the review presents some selected empirical studies on university management and gaps have been identified to justify the present study.

2.2. Theoretical Review

The study will be based on the Ludwig theory (1944) of bureaucratic management, the principal-agency theory and the systems theory. Ludwig theory discusses three theories: the iron triangle theory, the principle agent theory and the issue network theory. The iron triangle theory gives an overview of an alliance of people from three groups that comprise of the faculties that deal with issues of the students, the university council that enforces laws on how faculties should operate and other stakeholders. The members of the triangle often know each other well and members frequently move from one department to another. Members of the iron triangle work together to create decisions that serve their interests. The issue of network theory looks at individuals who support a specific decision not a broader one. The three parts of the iron triangle are often parts of a single issue network though other people may also be part of the network. These may include; scholars, the media...
and experts. By working together, members of an issue network can shape and determine decision making in a university.

In his 1944 work Bureaucracy, the Austrian economist Ludwig von Mises was highly critical of all bureaucratic systems. He believed that bureaucracy should be the target of universal opprobrium, and noticed that in the political sphere it had few defenders, even among progressives. Ludwig saw bureaucratic processes at work in both the private and public spheres. This particularly makes the theory applicable to this comparative study of public and private contexts. Ludwig believed that bureaucratization in the private sphere could only occur as a consequence of government interference. He wrote that no private enterprise will ever fall prey to bureaucratic methods of management if it is operated with the sole aim of making profit (Ludwig, 1944). However, this does not seem to be the case in Uganda. Instead, majority of the universities, both public and private have embraced the bureaucratic methods of management that could be responsible for the perpetual disagreements within universities in the country.

The principal agent theory has spawned a large amount of recent research in economics, finance, accounting, organizational behaviour, political science, and sociology (Donaldson, 1990). Its proponents prophesy that a revolution is at hand, that agency and related theories can greatly improve our understanding of why organizations exist and how they work (Hesterly, Liebeskind, Zenger, 1990). However, some scholars are troubled by these theories’ underlying assumptions about human behaviour and organizational processes. An agency relationship is present whenever one party (the principal) depends on another party (the agent) to undertake some action on the principal’s behalf (Donaldson, 1990). Hence, any employment relationship especially in universities is an agency relationship. The hiring university or a manager representing the owner interests is the principal and the staff is the agent. In public universities, the principal include the government who also work for the major principal-citizens. Given that most universities consist of multiple employees at various
organizational levels, the Deans, Heads of departments, lecturers among others developing and implementing decision making strategies and programs necessarily involves managing agency relationships. The private universities too; have principal-agency arrangements since most of them have ‘owners’ and those in management work on behalf of the proprietors of these universities.

To accompany the above two theories, this study adds the systems theory. Modern management is characterized by two approaches, the systems and the contingency approach. The systems approach views the organization (universities in this case) as a total system comprised of interacting subsystems, all of which are in complex interaction with the relevant external environment (Lerman & Turner, 1992). Organizations, such universities are pictured as “input-transformation-output systems” that compete for resources. The survival and prosperity of such organizations depends on effective adaptation to the environment, which means identifying a good strategy for marketing its outputs (products and services), obtaining necessary resources, and dealing with external threats.

Survival and prosperity also depend on the efficiency of the transformation process used by the organization to produce its goods and services, on worker motivation, and on cooperation. Decision making in universities constitute part of the transformation processes. Efficiency of the transformation process is increased by finding more rational ways to organize and perform the work and by deciding how to make the best use of available technology, resources, and personnel (Donaldson, 1990). Top management has primary responsibility for designing an appropriate organizational structure, determining authority relationships, and coordinating operations across specialized subunits of the organization (Yuki, 1994). Ideally, this is the essence of bureaucracy in organizations. A system can survive only when it delivers an output that can be exchanged for new inputs as well as for maintaining the system. The inputs in the universities include but not limited to maintenance and production inputs such as instructional materials and the students. The outputs include the systems returns products to the environment such as the graduates. In a transformation
process, decisions made by those in authority can have significant implications on the outputs in respect to their quality.

2.3. The Use of Bureaucracy in Decision Making - A Historical Trajectory

Although the term bureaucracy was not coined until the mid-1700s, the idea of rule-bound administrative systems is much older. The development of writing (ca. 3500 BCE) and the use of documents were critical to the administration of this system, and the first definitive emergence of bureaucracy is in ancient concept, where an emergent class of scribes administered the harvest and allocated its spoils (Hyden, Court and Mease, 2003). Ancient Egypt also had a hereditary class of scribes that administered the civil service bureaucracy. Much of what is known today of these cultures comes from the writing of the scribes.

On the other hand, the concept of governance for universities predominantly refers to the internal structure, organization and management of autonomous schools, colleges and departments (Aurangzeb, 2012). The organization of internal governance is generally composed of a governing board (Council, Board of Directors), the University Vice Chancellor (Executive Head, CEO) with a team of administrative staff, faculty senates, academic deans, department chairs, and usually some form of organization for student representation. In the United States, state institution governing boards often emphasize the concept of citizen governance in recognizing that board members serve a civic role for the institution. Managing structures themselves have become increasingly complex to establish a means of organizing an equally complicated system of intra-organizational, inter-organizational and governmental relationships (Okwakol, 2009). Whether university education, adult education, technical and vocational education, the complexities of managing education in today’s world is challenging and proves true at all levels of private and public education.

As universities have become increasingly interdependent with external forces, institutions are accountable to external organizational relationships such as local and central governments, equally in
managing business and corporate relationships. The nature of the managing relationships characterize whether governance is corporate and business oriented or defined more by a collegial shared form of governance (Aurangzeb, 2012). Governance in this sense is discussed by Kezar and Eckel (2004), who define it at the macro-level of policy decision making. Kezar and Eckel (2004) suggest that governance is a multi-level concept including several different bodies and processes with different decision-making functions. In this way, governance is sometimes defined at difference to the internal management of institutions. Throughout the world, many central and local governments have begun to establish coordinating and governing boards as both buffer and bridge to coordinate governance and institutional management.

With the complexity of internal structures, the external relationships between institutions and local, state, and national governments are evidently equally differentiated given the different forms of government in the international system (Aurangzeb, 2012). External governing relationships depend much on institutions, government policy, and any other formal or informal organizational obligations. Generally, institutions are recognized as autonomous actors with varying degrees of interdependence with, and legislated commitments to the external stakeholders, local and national government.

Most managers have been brought up in, and trained for, an environment of certainty, whereas they now have to cope with increased complexity, uncertainty and turbulence. The traditional authoritarian, control-oriented decision-making style, when applied in an uncertain environment, can lead to destabilization of relationships and behaviours, and also to unanticipated behaviours and possible explosive instability (McElwee, 1998). What is needed is a complex style of leadership – a transformational, facilitative or influencing leader (Fitzgerald and van Eijnatten, 1998). Managers need to set the organization’s direction and create the environment in which staff can operate (Gibson, 1996), and the lower levels can steer (control) the organization in the direction specified by management (McGlone and Ramsey, 1998). Managers create the conditions in which individuals,
teams and the system are encouraged to respond spontaneously to the changing environment (Fitzgerald and van Eijnatten, 1998), thereby enabling people to “self-organize” and so keep pace with the rapid changes (Baskin, 1998) especially with respect to decision making.

Decision making is considered as the process by which top management (including but not limited to University Council, Senate, Vice Chancellor, University Secretary and Registrar) and makes its most fundamental decisions. Decisions are important, in terms of the action taken, the resources committed, or the precedents set (Mintzberg et al., 1976). Research on decision making processes has been fairly extensive, and the literature reveals a large number of decision modes (Das, 1986; Schwenk, 1995). Each of them denotes a different perspective for the decision-making process and highlights particular aspects of the process. Considerable empirical evidence has been found to support a number of these modes (Hart and Banbury, 1994; Schwenk, 1995). Since the coexistence of many seemingly contradictory decision making modes generates much confusion, researchers have often felt the need to classify various modes (Cyert and Williams, 1993; Lyles and Thomas, 1998).

Eisenhardt and Zbaracki (1992) proposed three dominant paradigms of decision making processes: rationality and bounded rationality, politics and power, and garbage can. The rational and bounded rational paradigm are concerned with the degree to which decision makers have purposes, and describes decision making as a rather purposive, systematic and comprehensive process (Allison, 1997). In the case of universities, the leadership should be engaged in defining the purpose of the university, establishing the vision, and developing supporting strategies to achieve it; deciding what to do, when, and how. Accordingly, strategic decisions are made by the members of the university who have the ultimate responsibility to ensure fulfillment of its purpose and who accept the consequences when it does not. For the universities, strategic decisions are made by the Senate through the Vice Chancellor, who bears responsibility to the University Council.
In these two paradigms, decision makers are supposed to start with known objectives, then collect information, develop alternatives and finally identify the optimal course of action (Simon, 2005). The politics and power mode posits that the emergence, competition and resolution of conflicting interests are the essence of strategic decision processes (Baldridge, 1997). As decision makers harbour different and often conflicting goals in organizations, decision making often becomes a political operation whose ultimate result reflects the preference of the most powerful coalition. Finally, the garbage can mode (Simon, 2005) portrays decision-making processes as organized anarchies, in which a decision is largely dependent on chance and timing. In this kind of process, decision makers do not know their objectives ex ante, but merely look around for decisions to make. This could be the case for the universities in Uganda, given the scenarios that have manifested in Makerere and Kyambogo universities.

Similarly, Hickson (1998) identified three basic modes of decision making: dual rationality, incrementalism and garbage can. Hickson’ s garbage can mode is very similar to that of Eisenhardt and Zbaracki (1992) in that he believes that decision-making using this mode is largely dependent on chance and timing. The dual rationality mode posits that decision making is a process of handling both problems and politics (Hickson, 1998), so that it could be viewed as an integration of the rational mode and the political mode. For instance, in Makerere University where sometimes top management allows resolution of conflicting interests through the essence of strategic decision processes while at other times, decisions are left under the ambit of those with power. This has also been observed in the case of Kyambogo University where the Vice Chancellor has persistently been accused of making lone decisions. Although the different perspectives on decision-making have often been viewed as competitive explanations of decision-making processes, several authors have argued that they are complementary (Browne, 1993; Harrison, 1995).
Incremental decision making on the other hand, is a step-by-step process and the strategy is always amenable to adjustment. A series of incremental actions is adopted to ensure that large, complex strategic problems are factored into smaller, less complex, and hence more manageable increments for implementation (Joyce, 1998). There is some distinction to be made between logical incrementalism (Quinn, 1998) and disjointed incrementalism (Lindblom, 1999), the difference being in whether there is consistency among the increments towards a broad (rather than local) objective (Joyce, 1998). The garbage can mode is the same one as in Simon (2005) study.

On their part, Lyles and Thomas (1998) listed five primary modes of decision making: rational, avoidance, adaptive, political and decisive. Four of these are similar to the modes identified by Hickson (1998) and Eisenhardt and Zbaracki (1992). For example, the adaptive mode is largely based on logical incrementalism, and the garbage can mode is the key constituent of the decisive mode. On the other hand, the avoidance mode (Cyert and March, 1996) which delineates decision making as a systematic process aimed at maintaining the status quo appears to be an important supplement. In essence, the avoidance mode is about avoiding the identification of new problems so that strategic changes can be rendered unnecessary (Janis and Mann, 1997). This is also typical of the situation in Uganda’s universities where at times decision-making is delineated to ensuring a status quo in the interest of only a few.

An examination of the above typologies indicates a considerable degree of consensus regarding what the major modes of strategic decision making are. However, it should be noted that there are various other frameworks of decision making in the literature (Hart and Banbury, 1994; Nutt, 1998). For instance, Shrivastava and Grant (1998) suggested four prototypical patterns of decision making: autocracy, bureaucracy, adaptive and political. However, these four prototypical patterns of decision making remain largely unexplored especially with reference to management of universities. Decision makers are known to rely on a few judgmental rules, or heuristics, to simplify complex decision
situations. Although these rules of thumb are often necessary and useful, they also introduce challenges that can lead to severe and systematic errors in decision making (Kahneman et al., 1998). Thus, challenges can be viewed as a negative consequence of adopting heuristics. Challenges divert decision makers away from making optimal decisions in terms of utility maximization.

In a nutshell, three conceptually distinct aspects of decision-making can be distinguished: Cognitive aspects, for which the rational label is generally employed; social interaction aspects, usually labeled as political; and environmental adaptation aspects, for which different labels have been used. The present study maintains the rational label for cognitive aspects, the political label for social aspects, and uses the entrepreneurial label for aspects of environmental adaptation. More specifically, under the rational label the present study will consider the extent of thorough and systematic information processing and the development of alternative courses of action. The political label includes aspects such as the influence of power and political actions on decision processes, the scope for negotiations, and the extent of openness to others reflected in the search for agreement. The entrepreneurial label, preferred for its broadness, encompasses the definitions of “flexibility”, “originality” and “assertiveness” mentioned previously. This label covers aspects such as creativity and novelty in finding alternatives, acceptance of risk and change, and pro-activeness in the identification of problems and opportunities.

2.4. Division of Labour and Decision-Making in University Contexts

The division of labour is the specialization of cooperating individuals who perform specific tasks and roles (Garicano and Hubbard, 2003). Historically, an increasingly complex division of labour is associated with the growth of total output, the rise of capitalism, and of the complexity of industrialized processes. The concept and implementation of division of labour has been observed in ancient Sumerian (Mesopotamian) culture, where assignment of jobs in some cities coincided with an increase in trade and economic interdependence (Garicano and Santos, 2001). In addition to trade and
economic interdependence, division of labour generally increases both producer and individual worker productivity. In university setting for example, division of labour leads to greater coverage of work as various people are able to handle several projects and programmes within a set time frame.

In the broadest sense, the extension of the division of labor is the fundamental feature of a modern or developed economy, in which gigantic increases in the volume and variety of production have been attained - but at the cost of massively increasing economic interdependence within larger and larger populations spread over larger and larger geographical areas (Garicano and Hubbard, 2003). In such a complex society, instead of each individual or family attempting to produce all or most of what it consumes, the individual specializes in producing only a few kinds of good or service (or perhaps only small components of a single good or service) and then acquires all other desired goods or services from the production of other specialists by means of mutual exchange (or, in non-market economies, perhaps through coercive or customary transfer). In universities, different faculties and departments are engaged in development of specific skills in the students and at the end of the day, the students are able to graduate with desired skills in a given profession.

In the universities, staffs are involved in different activities to ensure the availability of services to students and for the overall well-being of the university. Although these activities may be different in a number of aspects, they have a social connectedness (Okwakol, 2009). An intricate and changing relationship of cooperation and exchange between university staffs exists within the institution, which is potentially conflictual. Despite the conflictual nature of this relationship, the division of labour in universities is the main economic strategy used to meet community basic needs for shelter, food, health and education (Kayongo, 2009). A number of factors are responsible for the division of labour today: some are gender-neutral and others are gender-biased. For example, teaching, planning and administration are activities ascribed to different staff. They have come about as a result of specialization and not necessarily from ability based on comparative advantage. Other variables
responsible for the division of labour, and more common in most rural societies, have to do with the allocation of activities to individuals based on kinship, age, descent, culture, education, status and marriage (Garicano and Hubbard, 2003).

The gap in the literature under division of labour and decision making in the university context is that most of the literature is not about Uganda and not necessarily universities. For instance, division of labour has been found to increase productivity in Mesopotamia and in the business sector. None of the literature has focused on education or universities in particular. This justifies the present study in order to establish the effect in the university management.

2.5 Authoritative Structures and Decision-Making in Universities

Effective management of universities involves the authorities making decisions about fundamental policies and practices in several critical areas concerning universities. Obondoh (2001) suggests that university managers across the world should put emphasis on the following issues: degree requirement, standards expected in student performance, quality of research and public service activities; and freedom available to individual faculty members in their institutional and research efforts. According to Obondoh (2001) besides the issues above, university managers in the world should consider the following: the appointment of staff, internal organizational structure; and the allocation of available resources to operate and support programmes for effective governance.

In university management, there are at least five important decision making dimensions that have to be made (Murphy 2000). These dimensions include academic decisions on core activities; administrative decisions about resource acquisition, allocation and expenditure; accountability to stakeholders; unforeseen challenges and strategic planning. According to Birnbaum (1992) as cited in (Gayle, 2003), the decisions in Australian universities are made by politicians, civil servants and various interest groups. Gayle, Tewarie and White (2003) consider this undemocratic and likely to create dependency on government bureaucracy by the universities. Such dependency might kill
institutional initiatives, incentives and innovations in management. On the other hand, Gayle et al (2003) argue that putting powers and resources in the hands of local communities would promote responsibility and informed decision making for effective governance in universities.

Universities and other Tertiary Institutions in Uganda are governed by University and Other Tertiary Institutions Act 2001 as amended. The Acts empower Universities to constitute governing boards; councils, appointments boards, senate and academic boards as organs of authority. These organs of authority monitor and control performance of Universities and other Tertiary Institutions as stipulated by Act 2001 as amended. The organs are constantly involved in decision-making processes that include but not limited to staff welfare, curriculum, infrastructural development and student welfare. Sometimes, decisions made by the various authoritative organs have led to problems within the universities and other tertiary institutions.

For instance, between 2007 and 2008 a number of decisions were made and approved by Kyambogo University Council and these include restructuring of staff, appointments, salaries and benefits (Kyambogo University Strategic Plan 2006/7). These have caused unrest among the academic staff at Kyambogo University. The academic staff took the issue to courts of Law, (Daily Monitor Newspaper, July 2005) which courts ruled in favour of the academic staff and ordered management of Kyambogo University to reverse the earlier decision on appointment letters. Kyambogo University council did not play its role to the satisfaction of the academic staff instead the courts of law had to resolve the matter. The legal costs paid by the University in addition to the time lost, and unrest caused disruptions in operations of the University. Furthermore, there was turbulence caused by the non-academic staff of Kyambogo University for fear that the University management could delay issuing integration letters to unfairly lay them off and replace them with other people, (Red Pepper News paper September 30, 2006).
Another typical example where organs of authority in a university setting made decisions that have had significant impact on management of the university is in Makerere University. Between 2005 and 2008, Makerere University Council made decisions and approved a new fees structure for the academic year 2005/2006. This caused public outcry and Government had to intervene and stopped the increment in fees (Daily Monitor News paper August 22, 2005). In another case, Makerere University Business School Council in 2003 as an affiliated Institute of Makerere University approved new fees structure which included computer and medical fees recommended by Management in the strategic plan 2003/04 and were to be paid annually by all students. However, continuing students agitated and refused to pay computer and medical fees. This caused unrest in the student community to the extent of students disrupting lectures at MUBS campus (Monitor Publications October 18, 2005).

In a similar situation, Mbarara University of Science and Technology had a debt of Shs 420 million as compensation to former owners of University Inn buildings since 1989 which the University Council and Top management failed to settle and instead continued to appeal to Government for their rescue (MUST Annual Financial reports 1990 – 2005). Failure to make a precise decision to settle the debt continued to cause management problems at MUST. The University was under threat to be sued (Red Pepper September 11, 2006).

In many developing countries such as India, Pakistan and Kenya, university education is a field where politicians play their games of dispute (Kogan, 2000). Kogan (2000) contends that conflicting political parties find it easy to mobilize groups of students or teachers at a university in order to influence political thinking. In playing these political games, politicians interfere with university decision making processes. This political interference has reduced the talents and opinions of university managers in ensuring effective management. Political influence in the decision making at the university differs from country to country (Nadam, 2008). According to Nadam (2008)
participation of teaching staff in decision making process in Pakistan universities is ignored. Researchers like Kogan (2000); Nadam (2008) and Gayle et al (2003) agree that the facilitation of greater involvement of teachers in university affairs came out as a serious administrative and leadership problem. The general absence of a culture of dialogue and joint forums in our universities is manifested in rising cases of unrest (Chacha, 2000).

University problems increase if there is lack of mutual communication between administrative and university staff (Garicano and Hubbard, 2003). Universities are not only pressured with a period of new social demands and rapid pace of technological and scientific change, but also with an increased number of government regulations and control. Governments steer university decisions and actions using various instruments (Kreysing, 2002). Government influences key university governance issues like appointment of boards, councils and the senate with clear agendas to pursue. Besides, government determines resources to be allocated and sets conditions for application of these resources. Matthai (1992) as cited in Nadam (2008) observes that decisions such as programme selection, faculty selection, planning and allocating budgets and formulating the academic policies, should be participatory. Nadam (2008) argues that this would involve all members of the statutory bodies. Such an arrangement of the government has reduced the powers of university managers and left everything to be managed by the government in power.

However, the structure of Pakistan universities, for instance, does not offer a great degree of autonomy to members to make decisions. Researchers such as Kezar and Eckel (2004); Kreysing (2002) and Allport (2001) found that the principal decision maker in Pakistan universities is the Vice Chancellor. This suggests that decision making and consensus are done in a black hole. Kezar and Eckel (2004) noted that decision making in Pakistan universities is unsatisfactory due to centralization of powers and exploitation of rules and regulations. From the foregoing, decision making in Pakistan universities is not made on the basis of specific techniques but according to
bureaucratic culture and political influence of the ruling party. Rahim (2002) argues that the Malaysian university is losing its autonomy due to the interference from certain government departments and ministries. The power of the senate has become less effective in determining the future changes and direction of public universities. Rao (2001) is of the view that higher education institutions must be given autonomy to manage their internal affairs, but this autonomy must be clear and transparent, be accountable to the government, parliament, students and the wider society.

In other universities of the world like in Australia, members of academic staff are not involved properly in decision making especially in departments. Matters such as institutional policies, allocating budgets, determining goals and work plans are determined by government (Allport, 2001). This is normative ideal of the rationalist perspective on decision making which implies that government sets the legal framework, has control over decision making process and the implication of policy. Management structures based on division of labour are also challenged by changes in educational technology, resources and participation. Allport (2001) argues that members of university academic staff in Australia do not participate in institutional policies, budgetary processes and in departmental work plans. Disparities in structures create different interpretations about management (Gayle et al, 2003). Allport (2001); Minor (2003) and Bradley (2003), have pointed out how differences in structures can lead to various expectations and interpretations.

Awaleh (2003) identifies similar problems of decision making as common in African universities like Mzuzu University in Somali where staff and student governance has been largely acrimonious. Awaleh (2003) further notes that quality of student leaders strongly shapes opinion and responsibility within campus. This has been a common source of friction between students and the administration and the process of a stable student government has been a difficult dream to attain. Awaleh (2003) contends that refusal to involve students and staff has resulted into strikes in some African universities. The ideas of Awaleh (2003) are supported by findings of Minor (2003) that the reduction
of involvement of the faculty in institutional decision making has resulted into many challenges where governance systems cannot respond appropriately. According to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2001), many governing bodies, faculty members and chief executives believe that internal governance arrangements have become so cumbersome, that timely decisions are difficult to make and small factors often are able to impede the decision making process. This could be true of the situation in Ugandan universities.

The Association of Governing Boards (2001) recommends that boards reiterate their ultimate responsibility and authority. The boards should make it explicitly clear about who has the right to make or participate in specific kinds of decisions and clarify ambiguous or over-lapping stakeholders’ involvement. According to Bradley (2003), in most universities in Australia, United States of America and Europe, Vice Chancellors (sometimes called Presidents or Rectors) take most of the responsibilities like approving and monitoring the performance of the university, oversee and review the management of the university, establish policies and procedures consistent with legal requirements and community expectations, and monitor academic activities of the university. This lack of delegation in decision making processes delays decisions and leads to inefficiency and ineffective university governance (Garicano and Hubbard, 2003). Therefore, participation by staff and students in governance is very important.

In his study, Allport (2001) observed that Hong Kong University had committed to the principles of good governance so as to ensure that the university was fit for the purpose as an institution of teaching, research, consultancy and other professional services to the community. These principles emphasize academic freedom and autonomy in performance in terms of added value to student association and academic advancement, public accountability, social responsibility, transparency, ethics and professionalism. However, Allport (2001) did not consider division of labour as an
important aspect in university management. The present study therefore seeks to make an examination of bureaucracy particularly in universities in Uganda.

The Australian Centre for Higher Education Policy Analysis (2004) encouraged university staff members to participate in effective management in Australian universities. Through exercising their rights and responsibilities, staff would engage in debates concerning the effective operation of their institution and ultimately lead to collective decision-making for the effective performance. This can be equated to the role of position of individual members in a bureaucratic system, which is typical of all universities. However, in most African countries, heads of public universities are appointed by government and in some countries it is also the government which appoints Deans and Departmental heads (Chacha, 2001). This external influence by government creates a lot of chaos in effective management of universities because the university body tends to bend to the rules and regulations of the government which may at times have no concern for quality. Chacha (2001) argues that the experience witnessed in African universities during the recent past has underscored the need for better management of universities in terms of efficiency, accountability, transparency, effectiveness and flexibility. Unfortunately, Chacha does not mention anything to do with challenges that could be related to the bureaucratic nature of universities and its effect on decision-making. This provides a justification for the present study.

Since 2004, a number of Ugandan universities have faced challenges, including failure to pay lecturers on time, under funding of research, high turnover of experienced professors, crumbling physical infrastructure, staff and students’ strikes, poor international rating and lack of teaching materials (Kasozi, 2005; Ocwich, 2005 & Tabeja, 2008). Several arguments have been put forward to explain this situation and they include issues of poor management, under funding, business pressure and profit motivation in the private universities, some universities being temporarily closed down.
while others have been de-registered. This lays a foundation for considering examining the effect of division of labour on decision-making which is an important aspect in university management.

On the other hand, Asimwe (2012) examined the development and sustainability of effective management of universities in Uganda and the extent to which effective management has contributed to university attainment of set objectives. The specific objectives of the study were to identify obstacles met in implementing measures of effective governance, identify and describe the steps taken in developing and sustaining effective governance in Ugandan universities, and to develop a governance model suitable for Ugandan universities. Asimwe (2012) found out that the universities are governed by boards. However, other findings indicated that Ugandan universities are faced with many obstacles which are limiting the effective management. It was also indicated that the quality of risk management and internal controls in universities were high. It was recommended that Ugandan higher education needs improvement in the management of universities to reduce the challenges faced. This could be initiated not through incremental change but more importantly through the management renaissance where by the universities can be provided with a greater leeway in their functions to sustain effective management. The major gap in Asimwe’s study is that no mention of the actual challenges faced was made. Therefore, the present study attempts to consider examination of division of labour (bureaucracy) as one plausible challenge.

From the above examples, it is clear that various authoritative (bureaucratic) organs within public and private universities are constantly involved in decision making processes and several of the decisions have caused management challenges within the universities. The gap in knowledge in this case is the fact that it is not clear whether the mode of the decision-making processes could be responsible for the management problems in the universities or not, thus, the essence of the present study. Advocates of good management (UNDP, 1997) believe that efficient institutions, successful businesses and effective civil society organizations are characterized by certain factors that have remained elusive.
Therefore, if universities must reinvent themselves in order to satisfy stakeholders’ demands and meet the challenges of bureaucratic decision making in their management processes, they need to understand bureaucracy (division of labour) and how it can be applied in decision making? It may be important that fundamental changes in the course of decision making in the universities are introduced including new ideas or ways of doing things that strongly depart from the bureaucratic structures. Most often, innovations are motivated by dissatisfaction with existing conditions or conventions for instance the management problems earlier alluded to in this sub-section. They are sometimes demanded by groups outside of organization; special interest groups, political parties, organized groups of citizens, or international organizations; or by dissatisfied factions in organization bureaucracies, e.g. Council, Senate, Lecturers, Students and Support Staff. Often, innovations result from performance gaps – that is, from disjunctions between public expectations and institutional performance. The recognition that conventional policies or programmes are no longer achieving their objectives can inspire innovative changes that set them on new paths.

The challenges facing public universities in Uganda indicate the need for reforms in the management of the said institutions but this must be based on empirical data that studies such as the present one can provide. This means that there is need for leaders of institutions of higher education to implement broad policy changes since change is part and parcel of organizational life. Organizations that do not adapt to change risk the hazards of stagnating or going out of business. In fact, the ability to adapt to a changing environment is a source of competitive advantage. Improved governance of public universities benefits a wide range of stakeholders that include students and employers.

Mwiria et al. (2006) point out that joint participation is the most critically needed area of reform in the management of public universities in Kenya. These authors contend that poor corporate governance practices in Kenyan public universities have contributed to numerous strikes and closures over the past decade. Strikes and closures have led to prolonged time for students to graduate and
disrupted academic life. Further, some prospective students and resident staff have been forced to opt for the private universities and overseas institutions. Mwiria et al. (2006) opine that some of the governance issues that need to be addressed relate to management structures, student affairs, staff and student associations, appointment of Vice Chancellors, and the role of the Commission for Higher Education (CHE).

It has been noted that poor governance structures, such as the bureaucratic forms in most public and private universities, have been associated with disrupted academic life (Garicano and Hubbard, 2003). Moreover, governance involves the recruitment of individuals managing institutions of higher education and determines the relevance of management structures. For instance, in Kenya, a policy implication is that Kenyan public universities should consider decision-making as a serious issue and train their council and university management board members on its application and importance (Mensah 2002). On the other hand, the bureaucratic practices used in developed countries are not directly applicable in developing economies because of political, economic, technological and cultural differences (Rabelo & Vasconcelos, 2002). This means that there is a need to develop models of decision making that consider the conditions in each developing country and that are not directly borrowed from developed countries. However, the gap is that there is not empirical evidence about Uganda’s public and private universities, thus, the need for present study.

2.6 Individual Participation of Staffs and Decision-Making in Universities

People at professional or non-professional levels are often involved in daily decision making, whether for simple or complicated problems. More and more people realized that intuition is essential to making good and right decisions, particularly for those managers at all levels in an organization who sometimes are under the conditions of high uncertainty or little precedent (David, 2009). The factors of intuitive decision making style consist of experience, knowledge and others (Harteis, Koch & Morgenthaler, 2008). It is learnt that not only managers and owners of businesses profess to
possess competencies for using intuitive alone in decision making, but actually academicians (tutors, lecturers and professors) also inject their intuitive and judgment into their decision making process. Generally, academicians are required to have a high educational level and wide experiences in their areas of expertise. Their nature of jobs indeed plays an important role in research activities and also journals contribution. As yet, there is no specific study that pertains to academicians with intuitive decision making style and furthermore the previous researchers prefer to revolve around managers in intuitive decision making (David, 2009). Whatever the mode, decision making has been argued to be participative if it is to be effective. There is no empirical evidence for the Ugandan Universities and this justifies the present study.

Participation is generally defined as a process which allows employees some influence over their work and the conditions under which they work (Heller, Pusic, Strauss & Wilpert, 1998). For example, Locke, Schweiger and Lathan (1986) define Participation in Decision Making (PDM) as joint decision making. This refers to decisions being made by manager in collaboration with the subordinates. However, this definition does not suffice, as the finality of the decision lies with the manager, thus, employees do not have any real influence over their work or work conditions. It also excludes, delegation, which has been explicitly included by other theorists (Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt, Lengnick-Hall and Jennings, 1988; Sagie & Aycan, 2003). One of the most comprehensive definitions of PDM is proposed by Heller, et al.; (2009). The value of this definition lies in capturing different forms of PDM, including direct (i.e. personal) and indirect (i.e. representative) participation, as well as intensities of participation (minimal to comprehensive). It also allows employees a certain level of influence over their work or working conditions, which was neglected in their definition proposed by Locke et al.; (1986). With this understanding of PDM in mind, the theoretical rationale for implementing PDM programs was explored from an organizational perspective, as well as human resource perspective.
Studies from different scholars present different findings. According to Adams and Adams (2006), the current education system in many countries focuses only on analytical skills. On top of that, Klein (2006) supported that educational staff prefer to use systematic methods in problem solving regardless of a complex or simple problem whereas intuitive decision is more difficult to use in complex situations. Davis and Davis (2003) also argued that school principals tend to decide intuitively. Apart from that, individual academician has unique characteristics such as field of expert, working experience, age and others. Thus, it is necessary to look at how different personal factors relate with intuitive decision making style of academicians. Sinclair and Ashkanasy (2002) believed that time pressure is also another factor that influence intuitive decision-making style. In addition, Martin, Bandali, and Lamoureux (2005) found that decision maker would use heuristics decision-making style in high time pressure than intuitive decision-making style. The research finding is aligned with the study of Judge and Robbins (2006); they argued that decision makers use intuitive decision making style when time is restricted and pressurized.

Khatri and Ng (2000) examined the important role of intuition in strategic decision making. The study focused on senior managers of companies representing computer, banking, and utility industries in the US. The study found that intuitive processes are often used in organizational decision making. The use of intuitive synthesis was found to be positively related to organizational performance in an unstable environment, but negatively related in a stable environment. Research by Klein (2006) examined the comparison of educational decisions between intuitive and computerized Decision Support System (DSS). Respondents were divided into two groups and they were asked to resolve an educational problem. The holistic procedure and DSS programme were used accordingly. Individual group was provided with an identical dilemma but at different levels of complexity. One group had been offered a limited number of alternatives to solve limited number of criteria in order to compare the effectiveness of the various alternatives. The other group was presented with a larger number of alternatives to solve larger number of criteria. The findings showed that respondents
gained the similar result when they solved simple question when they used intuitive or computerized decision support system. However, when respondents solved the complex questions, the two approaches achieved the different results.

On the other hand, Hayes, Allinson, and Armstrong (2004) measured the gender perspectives of managers and non-managers or whether women are more intuitive than men in general. This research examined the gender differences by using Cognitive Style Index to measure the intuition of managers and non-managers from United Kingdom. They found that there is no difference between female and male managers in term of using intuition. But, excitingly, the researchers found that female non-managers are more analytical than male non-managers and female managers. Pretz (2008) examined the effects of intuitive and analytical strategy and the level of experience on problem solving. Undergraduates were requested to provide response in the research in order to test their problem solving in college life. Research results showed that chosen appropriateness of strategy depends on the problem solver’s level of experience. The finding found that more experienced respondents would prefer intuitive perspective than analytical.

Active public participation and involvement – whether at public meetings, in the public media or by means of public enquiries, thereby demonstrating an inquisitive and challenging mind – are all important elements of the dynamics of local participatory democracy. Such participation can constitute input by individuals or via civic-based organizations. One of the greatest challenges in African States remains how to ensure people at local level, particularly in the rural areas, participate in local politics (Mensah 2002). The low turnout at Local Government elections in many African countries is a matter of concern, whatever the reasons. Participation can, thus, take different forms. It may comprise the articulation of problems and needs (housing, electricity, roads); participation in decision-making; participation in the execution of decisions; participation as a control function, or most importantly, being an active and integrative participant in the community (Pretz, 2008).
The kind of participation described above involves the obligation to take part actively in local authority elections at regular intervals. Participation as an integral part of local democracy will become a farce if it is practised only as a privilege for the few and not as a right for all. A workable democracy at local level presupposes the institution of stable local representative systems, characterized by a productive working relationship among all local players (Pretz, 2008). Usually, such process involves the development of authoritative capacity and structures, efficient in decision-making and administration, capable of finding answers to questions regarding the nature and standard of services required the priorities in a given community, the viability and affordability of services demanded, and the financial means to satisfy them. This will involve effective working relations with higher levels of Government, due particularly to resource scarcities in most local areas.

Innes & Booher (2003) asserted that the central contention for effective participatory methods involve collaboration, dialogue and interaction. They are not reactive but focused on anticipating and defining future actions. They are self-organizing both in content and membership. They challenge the status quo and ask hard questions about things otherwise taken for granted. They seek agreement or at least build shared knowledge and heuristics for collaborative action. This framework is not based on the mechanistic imagery of citizens pushing on government, but on the complex systems imagery of a fluid network of interacting agents, gathering information from each other and the environment and acting autonomously based on their needs, understandings, and shared heuristics (Axelrod & Cohen, 1999; Kelly, 1997).

Innes & Booher (2004) identified five purposes of public participation in policy decision-making as follows: (i) Participation is for decision makers to find out what the public’s preferences are so these can play a part in their decisions. (ii) It is to improve decisions by incorporating citizens’ local knowledge into the calculus. Both purposes are increasingly important as government gets larger and more distant from its constituencies. (iii) Participation is meant to advance fairness and justice. There
are systematic reasons why the needs and preferences of many groups, particularly the least advantaged, are not recognized through the normal information sources and analytic procedures. These needs may only come onto the radar screen during an open participation process. (iv) Public participation is about getting legitimacy for public decisions. (v) Participation is something planners and public officials do because the law requires it.

In the United States of America, the purposes enumerated above, are said to be achieved through the practice of collaborative participation (Connick & Innes, 2003). In collaborative participation, participants - public agencies, powerful private interests, and disadvantaged citizens; are treated equally within the discussions. In these collaborative processes, learning takes place, and often conflicts are resolved, and innovations emerge (Healey, 1997). Innes (1996) also said that in collaborative participation, interdependencies are uncovered and participants can discover how all may benefit from improving a resource. These interdependencies are between the social, political and economic realities and these play a vital role in the formation and upbringing of the community. Rittel & Webber (1973) suggested the sixth and the seventh purposes of participation which are; (vi) Participation can be to build civil society; (vii) To creates an adaptive, self-organizing polity capable of addressing wicked problems in an informed and effective way.

The knowledge gap with respect to all the studies cited above is that none of the studies was done in Uganda. At the same time, the studies did not focus on bureaucracy and decision making in the university settings. This thus justifies the present study.

2.7 Regulatory Rules and Decision-Making in University Contexts

Decision-making in teams is influenced by many different factors that are outside of strategic firm-level models. As a result, this research empirically examines how decisions around number, type, and timing of new product introductions are influenced by biases that can arise from shared motivations
and goal pursuit strategies in dyadic teams. To that end, regulatory focus theory is utilized, which sheds light on how such biases occur and can be remedied.

Product managers differ in how they approach problems, tasks, and decisions. Some are more willing to take action quickly, assume risk, and persist in achieving goals. Others are more cautious in their decisions and actions, looking to safeguard against failures and ensure stability. Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997) argues that individuals fundamentally differ in how they approach and pursue goals, either focusing on aspirations and accomplishments (engendering a promotion focus) or on responsibilities and safety (engendering a prevention focus). This study examines the chronic (trait) differences in regulatory focus between members and the ensuing effects on new product decisions.

Individuals with a promotion focus emphasize achievement and the pursuit of gains; they are sensitive to the presence and absence of positive outcomes; they concentrate on hopes, aspirations, and ideals; and they employ approach (eager) strategies, which ensure for the presence of positive outcomes (gains) and/or against the absence of positive outcomes (non-gains). Promotion-focused decision-makers favor action and pay less attention to details, given their strong preference for locomotion rather than waiting (Kruglanski et al., 2000). They choose to act quickly and maintain focus until the activity is complete (Higgins, Kruglanski, and Pierro, 2003). For example, a promotion-focused product manager will be motivated to “get it right” (presence of a positive) with a new product investment, and might act more quickly on a new product investment opportunity.

On the other hand, individuals with a prevention focus emphasize safety and the avoidance of losses; they are sensitive to the presence and absence of negative outcomes; they concentrate on duties, obligations, and “oughts”; and they employ avoidance (vigilant) strategies, which ensure for the absence of negative outcomes (non-losses) and/or against the presence of negative outcomes (losses) (Higgins and Spiegel, 2004; Higgins, 2005). They exhibit cautiousness and focus on details (Förster, Higgins, and Bianco, 2003), weighing all alternatives and their attributes, taking longer to “do the
right thing” (Higgins, Kruglanski, and Pierro, 2003; Kruglanski et al., 2000). For example, a prevention-focused product manager will be motivated to “avoid getting it wrong” (absence of a negative) with a new product, and might deliberate longer over a new product opportunity.

As a result, while all product managers strive to successfully achieve objectives aligned with top management directives, promotion-focused managers typically engage in an eager (or approach) goal pursuit strategy, focusing on achieving the full vision of the product concept, exceeding the expectations of top management in gaining a competitive advantage, and pursuing more innovative products, thus satisfying their need to achieve the most positive outcomes possible. An eager strategy is defined as one by which individuals seek to ensure for the presence of “hits” and against errors of omission (Crowe and Higgins, 1997). On the other hand, prevention-focused managers typically engage in a vigilant (avoidance) goal pursuit strategy, such as making sure to stick closely to the firm’s specific revenue, customer satisfaction, or profit objectives, in an attempt to avoid errors, thus satisfying their need to avert negative outcomes and foregoing opportunities that may lead to greater, yet more risky outcomes.

A vigilant strategy is defined as one by which individuals seek to ensure “correct rejections” and against errors of commission (Crowe and Higgins, 1997). It is important to note that prospect theory (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979) is related to, but different from regulatory focus theory, since the two theories deal with different aspects of how and why individuals approach/avoid pleasure or pain. Regulatory focus theory deals with striving for accomplishment versus striving for safety under the same desired end state or goal, whereas prospect theory deals with gains vs. non-gains and losses vs. non-losses under different desired end states or goals (Idson, Liberman, and Higgins, 2000). For example, even when members of a NPD team are motivated by the same positive prospect of attaining profits by successful new product introductions, a promotion focus would lead to viewing earning profits as an accomplishment, whereas a prevention focus would lead to viewing profit
attainment as a managerial responsibility to fulfill. Although both would focus on specified organization goals (profits, sales) as their reference point, a promotion-focused manager would approach the desired end goal with strategic eagerness, whereas a prevention-focused manager would approach it with strategic vigilance. Controlling for regulatory reference, regulatory focus effects persist (Crowe and Higgins, 1997; Shah, Higgins, and Friedman, 1998).

Studies show that there has been a renewed interest in the governance of universities and an increasing demand from governments and communities to improve the quality and accountability of universities (Trends in Higher Education Governance 2009; García-Aracil and Palomares-Montero 2010; Brown 2011; Marshall et al. 2011). Moreover, the current global environment in which universities operate and the academic enterprise itself has changed dramatically over the past three decades. Many challenges have also been presented in the way in which universities are governed, managed and held accountable (Coaldrake et al. 2003; Baldwin, 2009; Brown 2011; Garrett and Poock 2011; Marshall et al. 2011). This explains why there have been calls for adopting corporate management of universities, greater instrumentalism in curricula for workforce skilling of graduates, growth in student enrolment, and a change in the nature of academic work itself (García-Aracil and Palomares-Montero 2010; Brown 2011; Vidovich and Currie 2011).

Marshall et al. (2011) believe that “effective leadership and management at all levels of higher education institutions are integral to institutional quality and enhanced innovation”. This is in line with the view of Baldwin (2009) who believes that academics play a crucial role in the success of universities, but that governance is required for the infrastructure and the support to realize quality and innovation. He explicitly states that governance is “the glue that holds the university together” (Baldwin, 2009). The challenges facing universities could be reduced by enhancing the ability of governance to sustain and strengthen the essential nature of the university and facilitate
responsiveness to the needs of the people (Baldwin, 2009). However, to achieve this, the governance environment under which universities operate needs to be understood.

The studies cited in the literature above were mainly in the business sector and not in education and particularly in universities. For those that were done in universities, the studies are not in African context and in particular not Ugandan universities. This justifies the present study with respect to bureaucracy and decision making.

2.8 Synthesis of the Literature and Research Gaps

University education is perceived as an important form of investment in home capital development. Universities are charged with formation of human capital through teaching, building knowledge base through research and knowledge development, and dissemination and use of knowledge by interacting with the knowledge users (Okwakol 2009). University education is becoming increasingly competitive in terms of students, staff and resources. This calls for proper management of the resources by ensuring effective decision making within the university setting.

Lessons learned from the literature review include the fact that effective management of universities involves the authorities making decisions about fundamental policies and practices in several critical areas concerning universities. In university management, there are at least five important decision making dimensions that have to be made (Murphy 2000). These dimensions include academic decisions on core activities; administrative decisions about resource acquisition, allocation and expenditure; accountability to stakeholders; unforeseen challenges and strategic planning. University problems increase if there is lack of mutual communication between administrative and university staff. Furthermore, reduction of involvement of the faculty in institutional decision making results into many challenges where governance systems cannot respond appropriately, ending up in strikes. The review of literature has shown that many authors have focused on university education but they
The present study will therefore seek to examine this effect in order to fill the existing knowledge gap.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the methodology of how the research will be carried out. It describes how the desired information concerning the perceived relationships between bureaucracy and decision-making in public and private universities in Uganda will be obtained. It describes what will be done, how and why; taking into consideration the type of research design, the study population, sample size, sampling methods, data collection instruments and procedure as outlined here below.

3.2 Research Design
A research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims in combining relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure. It is the conceptual structure within which research is conducted; it constitutes a blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data (Kothari, 2006). As far as this study is concerned, the descriptive research design with both qualitative and quantitative approaches will be used. The qualitative approach will be used to collect, analyze and describe the opinions of the respondents about bureaucracy and decision making in universities in Uganda through development of themes from the data collected. The quantitative approach will be used to describe the data collected through questionnaires using means and standard deviation. In order to compare the difference in bureaucracy and decision making in public and private universities, the casual comparative research design will be adopted and used as the blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data. The casual comparative research design will be appropriate because according to Odiya (2010) casual comparative design is used when investigating the causes of difference between two things or situations. So, since this study seeks to establish the perceived effect between bureaucracy and decision making in public and private universities; causal comparative will be necessary.
3.3 Study Population

In this study, the units or individual for a target population will include the 100 members of the Governing Councils of Universities, 100 Members of Senate and 10 Vice Chancellors of Universities in Uganda, 2290 teaching and 2000 non teaching staff, 300 student leaders and 200 members of the university communities. From the statistics obtained from NCHE (2014), the target population of the study to be selected is 5000. These categories form the bureaucratic structure in universities and are responsible for making various decisions that affect management of the universities. This is why they have been considered to be part of the target population for this study. Table 3.1 presents a breakdown of the composition of this target population.

3.4 Determination of Sample Size

As already noted, there are currently 37 universities in Uganda and Table 3.1 provides a breakdown of the proportions in terms of public and private.

Table 3.1: Proportions of Public and Private Universities in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of University</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Universities</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Universities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCHE (2014)

Determination of the number of public and private universities will be in a ratio of two to three that is 40% to 60% respectively. So four public and six private universities will be selected on regional basis and used in the sample. From the population of study given above and in accordance with the Krejcie and Morgan sampling frame the sample size of the study will be 357 respondents. To ensure representativeness for each category of respondents, simple proportions have been used to obtain a
sample representing each unit of the population. Therefore, Table 3.2 presents the summary of the population of study, the sample size of the study, the individual sizes of each category of respondents.

Table 3.2: Summary of Population of Study and Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Respondents</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Sampling Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of Council</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>Purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Senate</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>Purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching staff</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Stratified random</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teaching staff</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student leaders</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Guardians</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5000</strong></td>
<td><strong>357</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCHE (2014)

3.5 Sampling Techniques and Procedure

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), sampling is a process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals selected represent the large group from which they were selected. The purpose of sampling is to secure a representative group which will enable the researcher gain the necessary data that the study seeks to find. In this study, purposive sampling will be used to select the members of the University Councils, Senate and the Vice Chancellors as indicated in Table 3.2. These will be selected purposively because purposive sampling is sampling techniques that allows a researcher to use the people that have the required information with respect to the objectives of his/her study (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). This is also in agreement with Kothari (2006) who stated that purposive sampling is used when one is sure that those particular people have the much-needed data that the study seeks to find. In universities, members of the University Councils, Senate and the Vice Chancellors are by virtue of their positions
and responsibility, take a leading role in decision making of university management, thus; they have information that this study seeks to find.

The other method of sampling that will be used is the stratified sampling which is a probabilistic method that offers equal chance to every subject in the different strata of the population to be selected and avoids biasness on the part of the researcher (Kothari, 2006). However, within each stratum, simple random sampling which is also called the lottery method will be used. This involves giving numbers to every subject, folding the numbers and placing them into a container and then picking any number at random (Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) and writing the name of the subject assigned that number. After that the first picking, the ballot is folded and replaced and the process repeated until the intended sample is obtained. This is to ensure equal chances for every ballot picked. If a ballot that has already been picked is picked a second time, it is ignored and replaced. Therefore, simple random sampling will be used to select the teaching, non-teaching staff and the student leaders. On the other hand, convenience sampling which involves conveniently identifying available respondents; will be used to link the researcher to other respondents under the category of Parents.

3.6 Data Collection Methods
The quantitative methods will employ the use of a questionnaire while the qualitative will employ interviews.

3.7 Data Collection Instruments
To collect a large quantity of data, survey methods using questionnaire and interviews will be used. The Questionnaires are made of a set of items developed to address specific objectives in a study (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). According to Amin (2005), questionnaires are less expensive; they offer greater assurance of anonymity allowing respondents to give sensitive information without fear. Questionnaires are often used to collect data from large samples because they are cheap to administer, free from bias of the interviewer, provide adequate time for respondents to fill them.
Apart from being easier to administer, questionnaires are more reliable and also easier to analyze (Amin, 2005). In this respect, pre-tested questionnaires will be used to collect data from the selected teaching, non-teaching staff and student leaders in the universities. Interviews will be used to collect data from the members of the University Councils, Senate and the Vice Chancellors; and from the opinion leaders around the universities.

### 3.8 Pre-testing (Validity and Reliability)

Whatever procedure for collecting data is selected therefore, it should always be examined critically to assess the extent to which it is likely to be valid and reliable. This assertion is supported by Mbabazi (2008), where he mentions that instruments applied in collecting data should be valid, reliable and free from bias and error. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) defines reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials; while validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represents the phenomenon under study. According to Judith (1999), validity and reliability may be achieved by asking other people such as colleagues, pilot respondents or fellow students whether the instruments devised measure what they are supposed to measure. For this study, reliability will be ensured by pre-testing the questionnaires and interview guide, among a few corresponding respondents, other than the ones they are intended for. This approach will help in identifying weaknesses in the instruments and to further improve on them before they are administered. Respondents will be requested to suggest any improvements or amendments, which will be included in the final instruments. This will ensure validity and reliability of the instruments hence data to be collected. Furthermore, validity of the instrument will be assessed through consultation and rating the items and then computing the Content Validity Index (CVI) which is a measure of validity of the instrument. CVI was computed from a formula;
CVI = \frac{VR + R}{K};

Where VR is for Very Relevant, R for Relevant and K is for total number of items in the instrument.

The result from the computation of CVI will be interpreted according to George and Mallery (2003) scale (1 - 0.9 = Excellent; 0.8 – 0.89 = Good; 0.70 – 0.79 = Acceptable; 0.60 – 0.69 = Questionable; 0.50 – 0.59 = Poor; and 0.0 – 0.5 = Unacceptable) to determine the validity of the instrument.

As already stated, to ascertain reliability, the researcher will pre-test the research instrument on a reasonable number of respondents, who will not be used in the final data collection process. After pre-testing, the Chronbach’s Coefficient Alpha (α) will be computed to indicate the level of reliability of the instrument. A simplified α formula to be used is; \[ \alpha = \frac{Np}{1+p(N-1)} \]; Where N equals the number of items and p equals the mean inter-item correlation (0.1). The value of α will also be interpreted according to George and Mallery (2003) scale.

3.9 Data Analysis

The data collected will be cleaned and edited to ensure consistency, completeness and accuracy before it is entered into the Statistical Packaged for Social Scientist (SPSS) a computer software programme. Using the SPSS, the data will be analyzed descriptively using means and correlation analysis to determine the perceived relationships between bureaucracy and decision-making in the universities. Where necessary, comparison of results will also be done by considering the percentages obtained through the use of MS Excel. The analyzed data will be presented in tables and chart forms for making precise interpretation and conclusions.

3.10 Measurements Scales

The questionnaires will consist of four sections: Section A for demographic data of respondents, Section B for collection of data on bureaucracy (IV), Section C for collection of data on decision making (DV) and Section D for collection of data on the possible moderating variables in the study. The questionnaire will be constructed on a 4-point likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree and
Strongly Disagree). In analyzing the responses from the liekert scale of the questionnaire, means and standard deviation generated through the SPSS package will be obtained and an appropriate scale to interpret the means will be used (4.51-5.00 = Very High effect; 3.11- 4.50 = High effect; 2.51-3.10 = Moderate effect; 1.00-2.50 = Low effect; and Less than 1 = Very Low effect). To test the hypotheses, SPSS will be used to generate values for regression whereby interpretation will be based on the standard regression value (0.05). If the value obtained is below the standard, then it means that there is significant positive effect; and vice versa if it is above the standard. In order to establish the perceived relationship between bureaucracy and decision making, the SPSS will be used to generate the inferential statistics (Pearson correlation) which will indicate the magnitude of the relationship. However, interview will consist of a set of items on bureaucracy, decision making and the moderating variables in the universities under study.

3.11 Ethical Considerations

The researcher will respect anonymity of the respondents by ensuring confidentiality of the respondents and the data provided. This will be done through assurance that the information they will provide will be purely for academic purposes and that their identity will not be disclosed to anyone. This will be highlighted in the introductory part of the questionnaire. All the sources of literature have been acknowledged through citations and referencing. Lastly, objectivity will be considered during report writing to avoid personal bias.
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5.0 APPENDICES

MBARARA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
PhD RESEARCH PROJECT

Dear Respondent,

Request to Complete a Research Questionnaire.

I am a PhD student of Mbarara University of Science and Technology, conducting a study on bureaucracy and decision making in public and private universities in Uganda; a comparative survey. This is part of the requirements for successful completion of the programme. You have been identified as a potential respondent in this study. Therefore, this is to request you to complete this questionnaire as honestly as possible. Your opinion will not only be respected but will also be treated with utmost anonymity and confidentiality. The responses you will give will be strictly used for the purpose of this study.

Yours sincerely,

Kyatuha Ovia Mwisaka

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LECTURERS, NON-TEACHING STAFF AND
STUDENT LEADERS

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Instruction: For each of the items in this section, kindly tick (✓) in the box that represents the right option and where necessary, specify accordingly.

1. Sex 1. Male □ 2. Female □
2. Duration of service within this Institution
   1. Less than one year □ 2. 1-5 years □ 3. 6-10 years □
   4. 11-15 years □ 5. More than 15 years □
3. Designation
   1. Council member □ 2. Member of Senate □ 3. Administrative staff □
   4. Dean □ 5. Head of Department □ 6. Lecturer □
   7. Student Leaders □ 8. Other (specify) ……………………………………
   4. Diploma □ 5. Other (specify) ……………………………………
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SECTION B: BUREAUCRACY

Please tick on the rating scale whether you “Strongly Agree” (4), “Agree” (3), “Disagree” (2) or “Strongly Disagree” (1) with each of the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION OF LABOUR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There is a clearly marked division of labour in this university known by everybody.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In this university, there is strong stakeholder involvement in the election process of top managers in university governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is an appropriate governance structure that duly ensures that managers have appropriate authority and resources to perform their duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is an independent nominating committee for top management to ensure effective decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The division of labour in this university is based on social class of individuals which negatively affects decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The division of labour in this university is based on technical knowhow (training) and experience of the individuals and this positively affects decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Division of labour is based on departmental sub-divisions in the university setting for improved decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Our top management bodies (Council, Senate, etc) are well constituted for effective leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Information between governance structures (Council, Senate, Colleges, Schools, Departments, etc) flows easily from top to bottom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. There is formality on all committee proceedings at the various structural levels in the university thereby positively affecting decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPATION OF INDIVIDUALS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. There is effective participation of various individuals in the decision making process in this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The university plans orientation process for new members on each management committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The members sitting on each management board or committee are aware of what is expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The agenda of meetings is always well planned for everyone to effectively participate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Members of the committees/boards receive written reports to the board in advance of meetings to enable them participate effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The participation of individuals on the basis of purpose of the decision being made at the time has minimized disagreements in the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Most members on the management committees/boards effectively participate because the members come to meetings prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Participation of individuals depends on the structural setting in the department or faculty thereby improving on decision making in the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The participation of all members on each management committee/board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Involvement of individuals on the basis of the nature of decision issues obtaining at the time improves on the ultimate decisions in the university.

21. Since all decisions made are a result of collective participation of the members, the decisions are always good.

22. Effective participation of members at various levels of university business has improved on management.

### REGULATORY RULES

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The guidelines for all proceedings are clearly laid down and known to all members involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The procedure of decision making in particular cases is through consensus while in other cases it is by voting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>It is a requirement that before decisions are made, exhaustive discussions are held before members subject themselves to the ultimate decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Decision making in this university is hinged on determined ethical procedures that are provided in the rules of procedure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>In execution of any decision, Management sticks to the established procedures as required by the rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>The management controls have significantly reduced fraud and misuse of university resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>The members of the various committees usually discuss all management issues before reporting anything to the rest of the university community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The regulatory rules used in this university have helped control disagreements among stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>The regulatory rules have been a source of problems as they affect the decision making processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Governance committees continuously review the regulatory rules to ensure that there is consensus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUTHORITATIVE STRUCTURE

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>In this university, the decision making procedures used negatively affect the decisions made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>The university has decentralized authority to departments in order to improve on the decision making process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>In this university, authority is vested in formal structures for improvement of decision made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Failure to clearly define where authority lies has created problems in the decision making process in this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Most of the problems in this university are a result of the fact that authority is vested in the hands of a few top administrators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Centrality of decision making in a university setting negatively affects implementation of the decisions made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Lack of authority at the lower administrative structures in this university has greatly affected decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Liberalization of authority is greatly improved decision making in this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION C: DECISION MAKING**

Please tick on the rating scale whether you “Strongly Agree” (4), “Agree” (3), “Disagree” (2) or “Strongly Disagree” (1) with each of the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION MAKING</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Decision making in this university follows a clearly defined procedure that is known to all stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Decision making in the university is rational, always based on critical evaluation of the situation obtaining in the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Decision making in this university is haphazardly done without involvement of stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Decision making in this university is politically engineered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Decision making in this university is dictated by those in whose hands power is vested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. The problems of the university are a result of the poor decision making process employed by top managers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Decision making in this university has been negatively affected by the red-tape (bureaucratic) system of management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. In making decisions in this university, those involved determine the factors most important to the decision, and then use those factors to evaluate their choices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Some of the options chosen are often much more difficult to implement than expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. When communicating the decisions, management includes the rationale and justification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. In a group decision-making process, those involved tend to support the friends’ proposals in order to find ways to make them work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Before a decision is communicated, there is always an implementation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. When making decisions, they consider a variety of potential solutions before they make the decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. In this university, those involved in decision making, take time to choose the best alternative for each situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Whenever there are doubts about any decision, we usually recheck the assumptions used in the decision making process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. I think that involving many stakeholders to generate solutions can make the process more complicated than it needs to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. In this university, people are often times surprised by the actual consequences of their decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. In this university, people are often times surprised by the actual consequences of their decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. During the decision making process, most people tend to have strong “gut instincts” about problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. The decision making in this university relies on peoples own experience to find potential solutions to a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Before starting a decision-making process, those involved try to determine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the real issue.

62. After making a decision, it is final because they know that the process is strong.

63. Decision making in this university is done after evaluating the risks associated with each alternative.

64. The decision making process is selectively done by only a few people.

**SECTION D: POSSIBLE INTERVENING VARIABLES**

Please tick on the rating scale whether you “Strongly Agree” (4), “Agree” (3), “Disagree” (2) or “Strongly Disagree” (1) with each of the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENING VARIABLE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65. The environment in this university does not promote effective decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. The decision making process significantly contributes to the challenges faced by management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. The level of knowledge and experience of the members on the decision making bodies has a significant effect on the decisions made in this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. The organizational culture in this university significantly contributed to the nature of decisions made by university authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. The national policies such as those laid down by National Council for Higher Education; significantly affect the decisions made in this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Political interference is one of the factors hindering effective decision making in this university and accounts for most of the problems faced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Ownership of the university (government or private) does affect decision making and is responsible for most of the problems encountered by management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you so much for participating in this study

END
APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR MEMBERS OF COUNCIL, SENATE, VICE CHANCELLORS AND OPINION LEADERS

The following items will be used to guide the face to face interviews with the members of University Councils, Senate, the vice chancellors and student leaders of the universities under study.

ITEMS

1. Could you kindly explain how the following are appointed: Council Members, Members of Senate and the Vice Chancellor?

2. As a Council Member (Senate, Vice Chancellor, Opinion leader), in this university, comment on the institution’s adherence to principles of sound decision making and management like compliance with National Council of Higher Education regulations, flow of authority in accordance with management structures and accountability?

3. In your opinion, what do you think are the obstacles limiting effective decision making and management in this university?

4. What activities has your university undertaken to develop and sustain effective decision making?

5. Comment on the performance of the following university organs in ensuring effective decision making and management in the university:
   - i. University Council,
   - ii. Senate,
   - iii. University Secretariat.

6. How do you view the status of your university’s organizational and management structure, mechanism and academic freedoms?

7. Would you say that the university management structure is bureaucratic? If yes, could you kindly explain why you say so?

8. In your opinion, how are decision made in this university? Kindly describe what happens and how decisions come into force.

9. In your view, is there any relationship between the nature of university organization (structure) and the nature of decision making in this university? Please explain your response.

10. What other factors could be responsible for the nature of decisions made in this university?

11. If you were to advise the university managers in this university, what do you think they should do to improve on the decision making processes and ultimately the management of the university?

Thank you so much for participating in this study
APPENDIX III: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR UNIVERSITY PARENTS/GUARDIANS.

The following items will be used to guide the face to face interviews with the Parents/Guardians of the students in the universities under study.

ITEMS

1. Since you are the guardians/parents of the students in this university, you might have knowledge on how the following are appointed: Council Members, Members of Senate and the Vice Chancellor. Could you please explain how they are appointed?

2. As a parent/Guardian of the student in this university, comment on the institution’s adherence to principles of sound decision making and management like compliance with National Council of Higher Education regulations, flow of authority in accordance with management structures and accountability?

3. In your opinion, what do you think are the obstacles limiting effective decision making and management in this university?

4. What activities has your university undertaken to develop and sustain effective decision making?

5. Comment on the performance of the following university organs in ensuring effective decision making and management in the university:
   i. University Council,
   ii. Senate,
   iii. University Secretariat.

6. How do you view the status of your university’s organizational and management structure, mechanism and academic freedoms?

7. Would you say that the university management structure is bureaucratic? If yes, could you kindly explain why you say so?

8. In your opinion, how are decision made in this university? Kindly describe what happens and how decisions come into force.

9. In your view, is there any relationship between the nature of university organization (structure) and the nature of decision making in this university? Please explain your response.

10. What other factors could be responsible for the nature of decisions made in this university?

11. If you were to advise the university managers in this university, what do you think they should do to improve on the decision making processes and ultimately the management of the university?

Thank you so much for participating in this study
**APPENDIX IV: KREJCIE AND MORGAM SAMPLING FRAME**

Determining the sample size (s) required for a given population (N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Amin 2005 (Appendix)
APPENDIX V: WORK PLAN AND TIME FRAME

In order to carry out this study, the researcher will restrict herself to the work plan and time frame below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Research proposal development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library literature search and reading around and about the topic</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature search (Internet and other sources)</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultations with lecturers to sharpen the topic</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing draft proposal</td>
<td>Two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typesetting, proof reading and editing</td>
<td>Four days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working on the final proposal, printing, binding and submission</td>
<td>Three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of data collection instruments</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Pilot study</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Securing materials</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of questionnaires</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computation of validity and reliability</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusting items in the instruments accordingly</td>
<td>Three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Securing materials</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing out and photocopying instruments</td>
<td>Three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of questionnaires</td>
<td>Three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holding face to face interviews</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holding focus group discussions</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection of completed questionnaires</td>
<td>Three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Data analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coding and tallying</td>
<td>Three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcribing data</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Report writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing the draft report</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typesetting</td>
<td>Three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proof reading, editing and correcting draft</td>
<td>Two days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation with supervisor, reviewing and making final copy</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing, binding &amp; submission</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VI: COMPUTATION OF VALIDITY USING RATINGS FROM THREE EXPERTS

Three experts were requested to rate the items in the instrument as very relevant (VR), relevant (R) somewhat relevant (SWR) or not relevant (NR). Table below shows their ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater/Rating</th>
<th>VR/R</th>
<th>SWR</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rater 1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From data in the table, it is evident that all the raters agreed on at least 63 items as being either very relevant or relevant. Therefore, using the formula below, the content validity index was computed.

\[
CVI = \frac{VR + R}{K};
\]

Where VR is for Very Relevant, R for Relevant and K is for total number of items in the instrument.

Substituting in the formula;

\[
CVI = \frac{63}{71} = 0.887 = 0.89
\]

Interpretation

**Interpretation of the Reliability Coefficient**

Content Validity Index (CVI) presents an indication of the level of validity of the instrument. A high value for CVI indicates good level of validity of the items in the instrument. According to George & Mallery (2003) the values of the CVI are interpreted as follows:

i. Equal to or greater than 0.9 = Excellent Validity,

ii. Equal to or greater than 0.8 = Good Validity,

iii. Equal to or greater than 0.7 = Acceptable Validity,

iv. Equal to or greater than 0.6 = Questionable Validity,

v. Equal to or greater than 0.5 = Poor Validity, and
vi. Equal to or less than 0.5 = Unacceptable Validity.

Therefore, given that the calculated CVI for the Questionnaire was found to be 0.89 which is equal to greater than 0.7, it means that the validity of the questionnaire is acceptable. Thus the questionnaire can be used for data collection in this study and it will give valid results.
APPENDIX VII: COMPUTATION OF RELIABILITY USING CRONBACH ALPHA METHOD

Note:
The Cronbach’s Alpha method is used in computation of reliability when the items in the questionnaire have several responses from which the respondents have to select what is appropriate in their opinion. Since the questionnaire for this study had the following options; Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Indifferent, Agree and Strongly Agree; Cronbach’s Alpha method is suitable for determining the reliability coefficient. The reliability coefficient will then be used as a basis for the level of consistence of the questionnaire.

Procedure of computation

- Design a table in which to enter the responses from the piloted questionnaires
- From the table determine the variance for each item and the variance for the test.
- Substitute the values of the variances in the Cronbach’s Alpha formula.
- Compute the Reliability Coefficient.
- From the value of the reliability coefficient, make the corresponding interpretation about the consistence (reliability) of the questionnaire.

Cronbach’s Alpha Formula
The Cronbach’s alpha formula is given by:

$$\alpha = \frac{K}{K-1} \left( 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{K} \sigma_{Y_i}^2}{\sigma_X^2} \right)$$ ........................................ (i)

Where:
- $K$ - Is the number of items,
- $\sigma_{Y_i}^2$ - The variance of individual items $i$ and,
- $\sigma_X^2$ - The variance of the observed total test scores of the sample of respondents.

However
Variance of the individual items is calculated from the summation of:

$$\sigma_{Y_i}^2 = \frac{(\overline{X} - \overline{X})^2}{N}$$ .................................................... (ii)

Where:
- $\sigma_{Y_i}^2$ - Variance of the individual item,
X – Is the score given by the respondent,

\ \bar{X} – Is the mean score for that item.

N – Is the number of respondents

And

Variance of the total test scores is calculated from:

\[ \sigma^2_X = \frac{(X - \bar{X})^2}{N} \]  ……………………………………………… (iii)

Where:

\( \sigma^2_X \) - Variance of the test scores,

X – Is the total score given by the respondent,

\ \bar{X} – Is the mean score for that item.

N – Is the number of respondents

After extraction of the data from the completed questionnaires and using the above formulae (i, ii, and iii), Table 1 was constructed.

Table 1: Summary of Responses from the Pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Ppt</th>
<th>Division of labour</th>
<th>Participation of individuals</th>
<th>Regulatory Rules</th>
<th>Authoritative structure</th>
<th>Decision Making-1</th>
<th>Decision making-2</th>
<th>Intervening variables</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Variance of scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>211.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>343.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>343.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From the values in the last column of Table 1 and using formula iii, the total variance of the distribution of the scores for the pilot test was found to be 343.7.

Thus, $\sigma_X^2 = 343.7$

Also, from the values in the last row of Table 1 and using formula ii, the summation of the variance of the individual item scores of the pilot test was found to be 133.6

Thus, $\sigma_{Y_i}^2 = 133.6$

Substituting the above values in the Cronbach’s Alpha formula,

$$\alpha = \frac{K}{K - 1} \left( 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{K} \sigma_{Y_i}^2}{\sigma_X^2} \right)$$

Gives the reliability coefficient as being,

$$\frac{71}{71 - 1} \frac{(1 - 133.6)}{343.7} = 1.1 \times 0.4 = 0.7$$

Thus the reliability coefficient for the instrument is 0.7

**Interpretation of the Reliability Coefficient**

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. However, there is actually no lower limit to the coefficient. The closer Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient is to 1.0, the greater the internal consistency of the items in the instrument. A high value for Cronbach’s Alpha indicates good internal consistency of the items in the instrument. According to George & Mallery (2003) the values of the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients are interpreted as follows:

- vii. Equal to or greater than 0.9 = Excellent Reliability,
- viii. Equal to or greater than 0.8 = Good Reliability,
- ix. Equal to or greater than 0.7 = Acceptable Reliability,
- x. Equal to or greater than 0.6 = Questionable Reliability,
xi. Equal to or greater than 0.5 = Poor Reliability, and

xii. Equal to or less than 0.5 = Unacceptable Reliability.

Therefore, given that the calculated Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient for the Questionnaire was found to be 0.7 which is equal to 0.7, it means that the internal consistence of the questionnaire is acceptable. Thus the questionnaire can be used for data collection in this study and it will give consistent results.

APPENDIX VIII: CONSENT FORM
INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

This document outlines the research study and expectations for potential participants. It should be written in layman terms and typed on MUST-IRC letterhead. The wording should be directed to the potential participant NOT to IRC. If a technical term must be used, define it the first time it is used. Also, any abbreviation should be spelled out the first time it is used.

**NB: All the sections of this document must be completed without any editing or deletions**

Please use a typing font that is easily distinguishable from the questions of the form

---

**Study Title:** It should be the same as on all other documents related to the study

BUREAUCRACY AND DECISION MAKING IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN UGANDA: A COMPARATIVE SURVEY

Principal Investigator(s):

KYATUHA OVIA MWISAKA

INTRODUCTION

What you should know about this study:

- You are being asked to join a research study.
- This consent form explains the research study and your part in the study
- Please read it carefully and take as much time as you need
- You are a volunteer. You can choose not to take part and if you join, you may quit at any time. There will be no penalty if you decide to quit the study

*Provide here a brief background to the study*

- In the past five years, there have been several strikes in universities in Uganda.
- The strikes have been attributed to non-participatory decision making by top management in the university sector.
• Although several studies (Basheka, Muhenda and Kittobe, 2009; Kayongo, 2009; Okwakol, 2009; 2004, Kasozi, 2003); have been carried out on higher education in Uganda, they have not focused on bureaucracy and decision-making.
• This has created a knowledge gap that the current study attempts to fill.

Purpose of the research project: Include a statement that the study involves research, estimated number of participants, an explanation of the purpose(s) of the research procedure and the expected duration of the subject's participation.

Purpose: To make a comparative analysis of how bureaucracy affects decision making in the university sector in Uganda.

Objectives:

i). Examine the effect of division of labor on decision-making in public and private universities in Uganda.

ii). Demonstrate how authoritative structure affects decision making in public and private universities in Uganda.

iii). To find out how participation of individual staff in various positions affects decision making in public and private universities in Uganda.

iv). Establish how existing regulatory rules affect decision-making in public and private universities in Uganda.

• Research Design: A descriptive research design with both qualitative and quantitative approaches

• Study Population:
  - Members of Governing Councils
  - Members of Senate
  - Vice Chancellors
  - Teaching and non teaching Staff,
  - Students leaders
  - Opinion leaders.

• From the statistics obtained from NCHE (2014), the target population of the study to be selected is 5000.
• Sample Size: Using Krejcie and Morgan sampling frame the sample size of the study will be 357 respondents.

• Sampling Methods: Purposive, Stratified and Snowball.

• Data Collection Methods: Questionnaire, Interviews.

• Validity: Will be assessed through consultation with supervisors and then computing the CVI.

• Reliability: Will be by pretesting the questionnaires, interview guides and calculating the reliability coefficient (α).

• Data Processing and Analysis: The data collected will be cleaned and edited to ensure consistency, completeness and accuracy.

• Using the SPSS, the data will be analyzed descriptively using mean and a correlation analysis will be used to determine the perceived relationships between bureaucracy and decision-making in the University sector.

• Comparison of results will also be done by considering the percentages obtained through the use of MS Excel.

Why you are being asked to participate: Explain why you have selected the individual to participate in the study.

Procedures: Provide a description of the procedures to be followed and identification of any procedures that are experimental, clinical etc. If there is need for storage of biological (body) specimens, explain why, and include a statement requesting for consent to store the specimens and state the duration of storage.

Risks / discomforts: Describe any reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts-physical, psychological, social, legal or other associated with the procedure, and include information about their likelihood and seriousness. Discuss the procedures for protecting against or minimizing any potential risks to the subject. Discuss the risks in relation to the anticipated benefits to the subjects and to society.
**Benefits:** Describe any benefits to the subject or other benefits that may reasonably be expected from the research. If the subject is not likely to benefit personally from the experimental protocol note this in the statement of benefits.

**Incentives / rewards for participating:** It is assumed that there are no costs to subjects enrolled in research protocols. Any payments to be made to the subject (e.g., travel expenses, token of appreciation for time spent) must also be stated, including when the payment will be made.

There will be no costs to those who will participate in the study. However, the researcher will take time to brief the subjects on the nature and importance of the study in order to secure their willingness to participate in the study.

**Protecting data confidentiality:** Provide a statement describing the extent, if any, to which confidentiality or records identifying the subjects will be maintained. If data is in form of tape recordings, photographs, movies or videotapes, researcher should describe period of time they will be retained before destruction. Showing or playing of such data must be disclosed, including instructional purposes.

Identification of subjects will be done in consultation with top management in the institutions (universities) to ensure that those that have the necessary data are selected. The raw data will be kept secure until the project is completed and endorsed by authorities in the academia.

**Protecting subject privacy during data collection:** Describe how this will be ensured.

The researcher will respect anonymity of the respondents by ensuring confidentiality of the respondents and the data provided. This will be done through assurance that the information they will provide will be purely for academic purposes and that their identity will not be disclosed to anyone. This will be highlighted in the introductory part of the questionnaire. All the sources of
literature have been acknowledged through citations and referencing. Lastly, objectivity will be considered during report writing to avoid personal bias.

**Right to refuse / withdraw:** Include a statement that participation is voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled.

During the time of data collection, respondents will be briefed and told that they are free to participate or to refuse or withdraw at any stage without coercion.

**What happens if you leave the study?** Include a statement that the subject may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

The respondents will be at liberty to withdraw their participation in the study. A consent form will be attached where the respondents will be required to sign indicating that they have consented to participating in the study.

**Who do I ask/call if I have questions or a problem?** Include contact for researcher or Faculty advisor and Chairman MUST-IRC

At the introduction phase of the questionnaire, the respondents will be addressed on what to do in case they find difficulty. The name of the research and the contacts will be indicated for purposes of making consultations of otherwise.

**What does your signature (or thumbprint/mark) on this consent form mean?**

Your signature on this form means

- You have been informed about this study’s purpose, procedures, possible benefits and risks
- You have been given the chance to ask questions before you sign
- You have voluntarily agreed to be in this study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print name of adult participant</th>
<th>Signature of adult participant/legally authorized representative</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KYATUHA OVIA MWISAKA</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.10.2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.10.2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print name of person obtaining consent</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Thumbprint/mark | signature of witness |
APPENDIX IX: ETHICS FORM