



Exploring the Impact of Bureaucratic Governance on Institutional Performance in Tanzania: A Case of St. Augustine University of Tanzania and the University of Dar es Salaam

Scholastica Egbert Kileo & Ernest Mallya

Institute of Adult Education & University of Dar Salaam

Email: scolakileo@yahoo.com & etmallya@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the impact of bureaucratic governance on the performance of Tanzanian universities, focusing on St. Augustine University of Tanzania (SAUT) and the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM). This study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive case study design. The study sample comprised 67 participants, including council members, senate members, human resource officers, directors, deans, students, and academic and administrative staff members. The data were collected through interviews and documentary reviews and were analysed through thematic analysis. The findings reveal the dominance of bureaucratic governance that affects universities both positively and negatively, whereas negative impacts outweigh positive ones. If bureaucratic practices remain unchecked, they could affect institutional autonomy, timely institutional transformation, and adaptability in this competitive world. This study recommends reducing bureaucratic practices and integrating other models to enhance the institutional performance of Tanzanian universities.

Keywords: *Bureaucratic governance, university management, institutional performance, Tanzanian universities.*

Introduction

Many scholars and practitioners have debated the concept of governance in higher education in the 21st century (Rowland 2017). Although this concept is gaining interest, governance models operating in these entities seem to be abstract concepts and are not well-known to most educational stakeholders. In African higher

education, governance models have evolved over the decades, but their impact on university leadership and institutional performance does not appear to be highly significant. Focusing on the application of the bureaucratic governance model in the contemporary world, empirical evidence shows that this model does not accurately reflect the realities of contemporary university structures and governance processes due to the developments that have taken place in universities (Buckner, 2016; MacGregor, 2016; Rowlands, 2017; Scott, 2011). Such developments include globalisation, advanced technology, knowledge-based economies, and market forces. These developments have not only affected their educational status but also moved them from the traditionally known university management to modern management systems that require the commodification of knowledge and governance to cope with emerging challenges (Samir, 2022). Okwakol (2009) asserts that developments such as globalisation have been enhanced by increasing the mobility of people, the demand for university education, and access to knowledge across borders. With these developments, university management have been forced to think more about devising the best ways to make their institutions survive and thrive in this era of competition for market forces (AIDhean, 2017). The pressure for change necessitates universities to adopt and integrate new leadership styles and management approaches to achieve sustainable leadership and human resource development and to facilitate the building of an enabling working environment for employees and institutional performance (Samir, 2022). However, the bureaucratic model prevails in university governance (Fielden, 2008).

Focusing on the impact of the bureaucratic model, there is a need for a detailed understanding of its features and operation. The bureaucratic governance model, also known as bureaucracy, is an administrative system designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals in an organisation (Pandya, 2011). Prasad (2022) identifies three types of powers in organisations: traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal, with the features of the bureaucratic organisation as follows: administrative class responsible for maintaining and coordinating the activities; division of work, formalized official rules, and hierarchical structures with a well-defined chain of command; and the impersonal relationship among individuals through a system of official authority and rules where the lower offices are supervised by higher authorities to ensure accountability within the organization. In bureaucratic systems, tasks are assigned based on merits and expertise to promote systematic operations and a clear hierarchy of authority, with a specialized division of labour,

recruitment, and promotion being merit-based, emphasizing technical competence and rewarding seniority or achievements, to ensure professionalism and minimize personal bias (Prasad, 2022).

Moreover, the bureaucratic model is designed to ensure efficiency, predictability, and accountability, making it widely adopted in complex organisations such as universities. Divjak (2016) highlights that the complexity of universities is in terms of diversified functions, operating budgets, compact structures, the number of employees, high student enrolment as well as the programmes operating. Divjak further notes that, managing complex organizations such as universities creates governance challenges in the process. However, with such complexity, public administration practitioners such as Weber, as cited by Pandya (2011), suggest that the bureaucratic model fits in the context of university governance, as it is one of the most influential frameworks in higher education. This model emphasizes efficiency and accountability through specialization, hierarchical structures, and merit-based systems.

Similarly, Nyarugwe (2014) sees the bureaucratic governance model as effective in managing large, resource-intensive institutions such as universities by providing stability and clarity in roles and processes. Universities, as complex organizations, need this model to suit their purposes. In addition, Prasad (2022) identifies some aspects of bureaucracy that may positively contribute to efficiency in institutional performance: (i) extensive rules and regulations that clarify what employees are expected to do as they focus their attention; (ii) decision-making is rational, as it is governed by rational factors, but not by decision-makers and personal factors; (iii) there is proper maintenance of official records; therefore, employees may refrain from doing any wrong.

However, the bureaucratic governance model has faced significant criticism in the field of higher education. Although this model offers stability and clarity in structures, roles, and governance processes, it is often criticized for its rigidity (Shattock, 2013). Having authority and control-oriented focus, this model has been noted to hinder responsiveness to the dynamic and rapidly changing environments of modern higher education (Prasad, 2022; Shattock, 2013). Its static nature makes it slow to adapt to changes in the current era subjected to globalization, technological advancements, and market-driven demands (Mzenzi, 2022). The concentration of power in higher offices further exacerbates the lack of inclusivity, marginalizes diverse perspectives, and reduces opportunities for shared governance. These limitations underscore the need for alternative governance

models that balance the structure and stability of bureaucracy with greater adaptability and inclusivity to modern challenges in higher education (Trackman, 2008). Additionally, bureaucratic systems tend to implement existing policies rather than foster innovative or participatory governance strategies in the formulation of these policies (Harmsen, 2014).

Additionally, Prasad (2022) highlights more shortcomings of the bureaucratic model, including goal displacement, unintended consequences, and inhuman organization, where there is an impersonal relationship and a closed system perspective. Prasad further describes bureaucracy as a system that depends on the internal environment alone, without interacting with the external environment. They are static and do not adapt to the environment. Buckner (2016) adds that bureaucracy is unable to predict change, including a rapid shift toward market logic in education. Harmsen (2014) also sees that hierarchical structures and centralized decision-making often limit stakeholders' engagement and adaptability in dynamic environments.

In addressing the inefficiency of the bureaucratic model, Taylor (2013) suggests that the shared-leadership model can address the powers and status differentials associated with the bureaucratic model in managing bureaucratic tendencies in an organization. Taylor further, contends that, if the administrators do not delegate authority among their members, and fail to ensure that team members feel open to voice opposition. As a result, leaders may not understand how less powerful members feel alienated or disempowered. With shared governance, Nyarugwe (2014) sees stakeholder involvement as an important aspect of institutional performance in the sense that it can contribute effectively to the development of an organization by providing innovative ideas. Samir (2022) adds that engaging people in workplace management requires training to equip them with skills in steering management issues. This implies that the issue of competence is important when engaging workers in an organization.

However, in assessing the governance and performance of universities, it is worth noting that these entities have unique features which necessitate a detailed understanding of the nature and operation of universities compared to other service institutions, as they are governed differently from businesses or other institutions in the corporate world. The legal establishment of universities worldwide mainly depends on two key concepts: institutional autonomy and academic freedom (Fielden, 2008). The principle of academic freedom is a key driver of many reforms in academic institutions and institutional performance, and a cornerstone for

autonomy, as it enables institutions to manage their affairs as fully as the state allows (Trackman, 2008).

Regarding institutional autonomy and academic freedom, Mzenzi (2022) revealed that Tanzanian universities respect these two concepts. In recent years, government control over university affairs has decreased, while the autonomy of universities in internal decision - making has increased. This is manifested in the University Act of 2005, which established the TCU as a regulatory body and repealed acts of parliament relating to individual universities enacted before 2005. Universities' increased autonomy is also reflected in their charter. The argument raised by Mzenzi implies that institutional autonomy and academic freedom are valued in reducing bureaucratic practices.

Apart from respecting academic freedom and institutional autonomy, these universities are also guided by their legal establishment. Tanzanian universities are guided by acts, national and institutional guidelines, and policies in their governance and operation which they should abide by. UDSM is governed by the University of Dar es Salaam Act of 1970, as stipulated in the University Charter (2007). The UA2005 repealed acts relating to individual public universities and established TCU as the regulatory body for HE institutions across the country (URT (2005). Similarly, the SAUT was established in 1998, subject to University Act No.7 of 2005.

Mzenzi (2022) notes that Tanzanian universities are guided by national and institutional guidelines and policies, as indicated in the methodology section. Although university governance arrangements are generally dictated by national governance frameworks, Bisaso (2017) highlighted that many researchers have reported the former (national policies) in isolation from the latter. This entails overreliance on national policies and guidelines rather than institutional policies, thus denoting the influence of bureaucracy from the government. Fielden (2008) notes that bureaucracy from the government, such as intervention from the government, creates fertile ground for increased government interference, thereby limiting institutional autonomy. Overreliance on the bureaucratic model in the operation of universities, national guidelines, and policies has been noted to affect institutional performance by limiting institutional autonomy and academic freedom to innovations and developments.

In light of this, several initiatives have been made to address the challenges associated with governance in Tanzanian universities in order to improve their performance. For example, establishing more units to make the institution function

well, adapting income-generating projects, developing partnering in and outside Tanzania, reviewing organizational structures, increasing leadership positions, student enrolment, and programmes. Several studies have been conducted regarding the governance and operation of universities, yet some governance challenges, such as the low pace of transformation towards institutional performance, still exist. It is assumed that this might be attributed to the prevalence of the bureaucratic model.

Notwithstanding the important role governance models play in the governance of universities, the impact of governance models operating in universities has been under-researched, as they appear insignificant on institutional performance and other governance-related aspects (MacGregor, 2016). Nevertheless, there is insufficient evidence to support the empirical literature that clarifies the impact of governance models on university performance, with Tanzanian universities as a particular case (Mzenzi, 2022). Moreover, in recent years, there have been several developments at different universities worldwide. Following these developments, various managerial methods and models aimed at making organisations more accountable, transparent, and manageable have been introduced into universities and their efficiency and accountability have been enhanced (Bora, 2014).

Despite the changes taking place in many universities in this globalised world, bureaucratic governance frameworks continue to prevail in the governance of universities, impeding effective institutional performance in terms of transformation and other operational issues (Shattock, 2013). Furthermore, governance challenges in universities continue to affect institutional performance. Drawing on these insights, this article intends to explore the impact of the bureaucratic model on the institutional performance of the selected universities, SAUT and UDSM as particular cases, and propose strategies that can be employed to manage the shortfall of models in place to ensure institutional performance in the competitive and fast-changing environment of higher education.

Methodology

This study was conducted in the Dar es Salaam and Mwanza regions, where the two universities are located. The choice of the two universities was based on their representation of the other universities in the country, both private and public, and among the leading universities in Tanzania. The researcher used a qualitative approach with a case study design to guide the study. The study sample comprised sixty-seven respondents drawn from council members and senate members

including the Vice Chancellor, DVC (Academics), DVC (Administration) as well as DVC (Research). Other respondents were Heads of Schools and Departments, middle-level managers (Human Resource Managers), trade union leaders, academic staff, and administrative staff. The study employed purposive and convenience sampling techniques to obtain the respondents. Purposive sampling was used to select the two universities and key informants including the Council and Senate members, Vice Chancellors, DVCs, and SAUT's Board of Trustees. Convenience sampling was used to select academic and administrative staff based on accessibility. Data were collected through interviews and documentary reviews. The documentary review involved empirical studies, previous research reports, journals, official documents, policies, and guidelines related to university governance at both institutional and national levels. Additionally, key governance frameworks, including university charters (UDSM Charter, 2007; SAUT Charter, 2010), TCU guidelines, and the Universities Act of 2005 (CAP 346) were analysed to provide the study context. The data analysis employed thematic analysis procedures, going beyond identifying codes, patterns, and themes to uncover broader insights. Using thematic analysis, the data were coded into small categories of information based on sub-themes (Poth, 2018). The sub-themes focused on the impact of bureaucratic model based on respondents' views.

Findings and Discussion

This section presents the findings and discussion focusing on the main theme of this study. Generally, the findings reveal that bureaucratic model has both positive and negative impact. The following section presents the positive impact of bureaucracy governance model.

Bureaucracy enhances order and stability within the organization

With regard to the positive impact of bureaucratic model, the findings reveal that, this model maintains order and stability within universities. This is attributed with systematic procedures, formalized structures and rules which are adhered with individual within the organization. Respondents from the administrative rank strongly felt that some bureaucratic components, such as chain of command, extensive rule-governed regulations, rational decision-making, and proper maintenance of official records are well applied and can enhance institutional order and performance. Administrators believe that if these aspects are well applied in the governance of universities, they can bring efficiency to the institutional performance. Commenting on this, one participant had the following to say:

In my views, some bureaucratic components should be maintained in complex organisations, such as ours as they assure order within the institution. If well implemented, it will have a positive impact within the institution (*Interview # 25, UDSM, July 2023*).

This view was also shared at the SAUT, where a respondent in a superior position said:

Bureaucracy is necessary for institutions, such as ours. If those in power are held accountable, subordinates will follow suit. If properly applied, it can enhance institutional performance (*Interview # 71, SAUT, August 2023*).

These views show that administrators consider bureaucracy as a positive tool of governance within universities. They see that universities need bureaucracy to make things move, as it creates order within the institution, especially when it is well applied.

Bureaucracy maintains professionalism based on competence

This is one of the positive impacts of the bureaucratic governance model. The issue of professionalism considers competence and qualification of the employees for skilled man power. This takes place through appointing top leaders and allocating different officials in different position based on competence. One respondent had this to say:

The appointment and allocation of top managers rely on government guidelines and policies. For example, vetting and appointment of VCs and DVCs are based on TCU guidelines. Professors should hold the positions of VC and DVCs (*Interview # 85, SAUT, June 2023*).

Similar findings were observed at UDSM. The universities, whether public or private, are regulated by the same regulatory body, TCU.

Bureaucracy calls for observance of rules and regulations

With bureaucracy, there is an observance of fixed rules and regulations that suggest order in the organisation. It has been noted that the supervision of daily activities is governed by rules and regulations. One of the respondents from middle management said:

In UDSM, operations are organised hierarchically and governed by rules and regulations. In executing these duties, nothing is done without following fixed rules and regulations to maintain order in the universities and enable universities to perform their duties systematically (*Interview # 30 UDSM, June 2023*).

Similarly, at SAUT, when meetings are conducted on certain operational issues, they have to follow the hierarchies and chains of command as asserted by one of the members of the top management:

In our case, nothing could or should be implemented without approval from the board of trustees, except for academic matters. For matters of students and appointment of professional academic members for higher academic positions of leadership, there is external bureaucracy which is done by the TCU as a regulatory body for universities (*Interview # 30 SAUT, June 2023*).

Based on the assertions above, the issue of order has positive implications for organising matters within respective universities as it maintains order within the institution. It is easy to note, however, that only few aspects namely order, professionalism, rules and regulations of bureaucracy are noted as positive. The positive side of bureaucracy is mainly noted by the top-ranking respondents who see bureaucracy as an instrument that can help such complex institutions like universities. Meaning that, in some circumstances, bureaucratic model has to be applied in order to maintain stability for institutional performance. The issue of professionalism is also an important aspect on the institutional performance as it ensures availability of skilled personnel in running of the institution. observance of rules and regulations. Therefore, when applying the concept of bureaucracy in organization, it should be noted that there are strengths of bureaucratic model that could help in organizational performance.

However, the negative impacts of bureaucratic model have been noted at SAUT and UDSM. The following section presents the negative impact of bureaucracy.

Implementation of the organizational plan is affected by too many procedures

Employees from lower cadres feel that the bureaucratic model impedes some governance aspects as a result of the long processes attributed to the chain of command and centralised decision-making. Centralised decision-making within the respective universities and the central government negatively affects institutions' performance in terms of delay in institutional transformation, allocation of resources, and financial resources in particular. An administrative officer stated:

In daily operations, some matters take too long for approval because of the prolonged decision-making process. Some issues should wait for approval from higher authorities such as the councils or senates. On my side, I see that some matters could be handled by the heads of departments, but in our

case, most of the issues are taken to a higher authority for approval (*Interview #26, UDSM, July 2023*).

One human resource officer suggested that:

For quick implementation of organizational goals, it is high time for heads of departments to be empowered to solve some of the issues rather than channelling all the issues to top management. We should reduce the number of procedures (*interview # 72, UDSM, August 2023*).

This implies that, in the absence of prolonged decision-making and approval, these institutions would be making headway towards the desired transformation. For example, if internal matters must wait for approval from the government or any higher authority, particularly those related to national policies and big projects, then the pace of implementation decreases. Organizational structures such as a chain of command and hierarchy stand in the way of progress. This calls for the reduction of lengthy procedures to ensure institutional performance.

Delay in responding to workers' requests leads to demotivation

Through long procedures, bureaucracy has been noted to negatively affect worker affairs. The pace of responding to the worker requests is too low. When one wants to process a request within the institution, one has to follow several procedures following hierarchies and chain of commands through different sections starting from the department and college level up to high-level management. One of the academic staff members said:

Before 2021, that is, in the 1990s and the early 2000s, when one wanted to process a travelling permit or any request, had to write a letter channelled manually through files. One can imagine that one has to be authorised centrally for a simple thing, such as travelling within the country. I suggest that management should be more responsive to workers' well-being, especially in good working conditions (*Interview # 24, UDSM, July 2023*).

One respondent further explained that long procedures have affected even promotion procedures among the staff, as asserted hereunder:

Promotion procedures versus remuneration packages for lecturers do not go on time. Until now, some lecturers have been promoted to different positions, yet they have not received new salaries. These procedures take a long time because of hierarchies and long procedures (*interview # 80, UDSM, August 2023*).

The findings indicate that some procedures lengthen the communication process. This delays the provision of feedback on workers' requests and needs, which are

essential aspects of workers' well-being. This tendency has negative effects on institutional performance. It kills the working morale to contribute fully to the organizational development in the operations of universities. The findings suggest that an immediate response to requests promotes working morale, thereby promoting institutional performance.

Financial management systems suffer due to centralization

The bureaucratic model is in the form of centralisation, in which governance systems are centralised which negatively affects institutional performance. The government's centralisation process has reached the point of centralising financial matters by establishing financial management systems. The centralisation of financial management systems has caused delays in the processing of financial matters. One ICT analyst said:

I have noted some new financial systems, such as Mfumo wa Ulipaji Serikalini (MUSE). This system complicates universities' operations in terms of accessing funds for immediate institutional operations. There is a time when the fund is needed to address immediate issues, but you find that the process takes a long time to reach the approval stage (*Interview # 27, UDSM, July 2023*).

This indicates that the system delays the processing of financial matters and, consequently, the operation of institutions. Similar findings were shared by SAUT, as one respondent said:

Provided that financial matters depend mostly on internal sources, internal financial systems are responsible for these processes. When the proposed budgets are requested, they should pass through many procedures. When a department proposes a budget, it should be taken to the VC, who then channels the request to the Board of Trustees. Here, it takes longer to process and approve (*Interview # 73, SAUT, August 2023*).

The assertion gives a very systematic way to be followed from the department level to the VC and up to the Board of Trustees, where the processes are too procedural. Public universities suffer more through MUSE, but private universities suffer from a longer tiring chain when the money is in the same neighbourhood. What we gather is that financial issues are key to every step in an institution, and when complaints are deafening, transformation is an illusion.

Bureaucracy from the government leads to skill drainage in universities

The findings indicate that, currently, the government has been noted to take out professors and other senior lecturers for administrative and political responsibilities. This type of bureaucracy which comes in terms of appointments from the government, negatively affects institutional performance. This leads to labour turnover and skill drainage from academic cadres. One of the administrative officers from the UDSM noted the issue of elite drainage as asserted hereunder,

There has been a tendency to take several professors and other senior staff out of universities through government appointments to fill in different administrative and political posts. Producing a professor is not a simple task because it requires many resources. This tendency is real unhealthy for sustainability of universities (*Interview # 82, UDSM, June 2023*).

Since most university professors have been at the university since their tutorial assistantship days, and money has been spent on developing them in their careers. All of a sudden, they are appointed to fill the political and administrative posts, this negatively lead to shortage of professors at universities. The question is, for how long will the government continue appointing professors and other senior academic staff for leadership and political posts? If this issue remains unchecked, it leads to decreasing skilled manpower, hence affect sustainability of universities.

Bureaucracy limits institutional autonomy

This concern was reported by several respondents (across the two universities), who revealed the government's great control over universities. One administrative officer said,

In the operation of our institution, we see government influence over universities has an impact on institutional decisions. The government provides directives. This situation makes our university depend on directives, policies, guidelines, and funding. Consequently, institutions' autonomy and freedom are limited, thus affecting some decisions on matters needing immediate measures (*Interview # 88, UDSM, October 2023*).

The findings imply that bureaucracy from the government affects institutional autonomy and freedom in the decision-making process, policies, guidelines, and financial matters through centralised systems monitored by the government. Universities do not operate independently. Some instruments guide operations to maintain quality and standards, whether public or private.

Bureaucracy affects the appointment of top university management

For UDSM, procedures on how the leaders are obtained have been mentioned by employees as one of the governance concerns of their respective institutions. Members of academic and administrative staff see that they are limited in the election of leaders for higher positions. One senior academician said,

Employees are partly involved in proposing the names of leaders, which makes their participation minimal. There is a search committee that I see as ‘tailor-made’ to suit a predetermined leader. In my view, the staff should be given the right to propose and choose the people they want. (*Interview # 83, UDSM, July 2023*).

Despite the existence of a search teams, this assertion reveal limited democracy in the appointment of top managers. The appointment procedures for top management leaders of the university such as Council members, the Chancellor, and the Vice-Chancellor are presidential appointees. These procedures are stipulated

This suggests a change in appointment procedures, such as less engagement of the search committee and direct election rather than appointments.

Bureaucratic practices affect the rate of transformation

With regard to the impact of bureaucratic model on institutional performance, the effects have been noted on the transformation. The findings reveal that the model affect the transformation rate in a negative way. At UDSM, one of the Human Resource officers said:

The pace of change in our university has been gradual. I think this is due to the way the system works. Long procedures, a chain of commands, and rigidity to changes affect the implementation of some issues. These bureaucratic practices slow down transformation in terms of implementing organizational plans (*Interview # 84, UDSM, July 2023*).

The delay in the transformation process may be attributed to long procedures. In turn, this impedes innovation and development in universities, thus affecting institutional performance as suggested by Taylor, (2013). Bureaucratic practices affect the pace of change and transformation within universities.

Similar findings are attested by one member of the top management from the same institution:

When an institution relies on bureaucracy, the pace of transformation or change becomes very slow, thus affecting some innovations and

developments that must occur in the respective institution. (*Interview #9, UDSM, June 2023*).

With these assertions, it is an indication that bureaucratic model prevails in the operation of these universities which prevent transformation to occur as it was expected. Both employees and top management see bureaucratic model as a hindrance factors for transformation. The findings suggest that, for university to attain effective transformation, it should reduce bureaucratic procedures such as centralised decision-making, hierarchies, and the chain of command

Similar findings are shared at SAUT, as attested by one member from the top management:

In our case, as a private university establishing new centres, there are conditions that the institute has to meet. For example, TCU guides and permits expansion into new centres based on the requirements stipulated in the guidelines. This practice denotes the bureaucracy imposed by government organs (*Interview # 86, SAUT, June 2023*).

Respondents have a feeling that some of these ‘good’ standards are sought in a way that is too domineering to private universities. Most of these respondents see bureaucracy from higher authorities as having negative implications, as they perceive the concept negatively. The findings are in line with Mzenzi (2022), who revealed that in the current legislation, the chancellors of all public universities are required to be people of outstanding integrity with academic and administrative experience. This means that universities put emphasis on professionalism and competence of those responsible in governance matters and other related areas. In the respective universities, bureaucracy is associated with the influence of the final decision-making bodies, such as the councils and senate that provide directives to be implemented at different levels. Pollitt and Bouckaert (2023) see that bureaucratic management does not tell us how and who is engaged in formulating these policies and decisions within the institution. Such practice making limits employees’ involvement at different levels. However, other bureaucratic components such as rules and regulations, hierarchies, and a chain of command affect institutional performance, both positively and negatively.

Based on the respondents’ views, bureaucracy affects these institutions’ performance in several ways. It has more negative than positive implications for institutional performance. This implies that the bureaucratic model has been found with limitations in the operation of SAUT and UDSM in the following ways; First, with bureaucratic models, management can be top-down rather than down-top

management. This limits the participation of employees in contributing fully to organizational development, as top-down management tends to give directives rather than receive from employees (Shaw, 2018). Consequently, it impedes several developments and innovations within the respective universities. Second, there are directives that comes from government regarding the operation of universities, appointment of top academic managers (such as VCs and DVCs), procedures regarding students' enrolment systems, and provision of loans for students' welfare. Due to the fact that universities operate under national guidelines, they must adhere to and operate according to government policies, rules, and regulations so as to maintain quality and standards in the provision of services. With regard to the operation of TCU, it is important to understand that, TCU operates at the country level and not to individual university as it is responsible for regulating all universities in Tanzania. Therefore, for the matter of quality, universities should run their internal matters while adhering to national policies

The findings suggest that when this model is applied, it might be inefficient to foster organizational performance in several aspects, such as the transformation equation. Most probably, those who responded to this question were raised by a non-leading group, the academic group, and the administration group.

Considering the role of the government in the operation of universities, it should be noted that the state wishes to monitor and assess institutional performance in terms of quality and standards. The institution has to have a governing board (council) that holds its managers accountable for achieving institutional goals, particularly the vice chancellor. There is an implicit acknowledgement that, the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology is entitled to hold institutions accountable in many respects and must retain overall strategic control over the sector (Fielden, 2008). Therefore, it is worth noting that TCU does not only monitor the performance of private but also public universities for the matter of maintaining quality and standards.

At the two institutions, the bureaucratic model affects the decision-making process as it makes it centralised. In the case of UDSM, directives come from the top management, starting from the council, senate, directorates, dean of colleges, and heads of department, and go downward to the level of employees. Similarly, at SAUT, bureaucratic practices are imposed by the Board of Trustees and the University Council under the Catholic Bishops of Tanzania (Tanzania Episcopal Conference) (SAUT Charter, 2010). With bureaucracy, the direct involvement of employees to meet their managers is minimal because of the structures and

hierarchies within the specified universities. Instead, a representational form of leadership is employed, where they are represented by the heads of departments in management forums. This limits workers' contribution to organizational performance, as they are not sure that all their views from the department are presented to the management. For example, employees from lower cadres perceive that limited participation kills innovative ideas for organizational performance. These findings are in line with Chuks (2017) and AIDhean (2017), who see the involvement of employees as an important aspect of an organisation's performance.

The findings of this study are in line with those of earlier studies that found that universities are characterised by bureaucratic components. This means that most universities remain highly hierarchical, practising centralised decision-making as top-down management, which is dominant and persistent (AIDhean, 2017; Buckner, 2016; Chuks, 2017; Pandya, 2011; Prasad, 2022). These bureaucratic components, such as centralised decision-making, have caused most universities to delay achieving organizational goals, including transformation (Buckner, 2016). On the other hand, the bureaucratic model maintains order due to hierarchies, chains of command, fixed rules, regulations, and division of labour, as well as professionalism within the respective universities. This suggests that the operation of different governance models in universities may help them benchmark their governance models with those of other institutions. If universities opt to practice extreme institutional autonomy, they should have the capacity to run their affairs, including funding and other issues that require support from the government.

However, when it comes to practice, the situation shows that state influence over the governance and operation of universities through their organs is inevitable, as most universities depend on government grants to run their affairs, particularly public universities. However, government control over Tanzanian public universities has existed since the establishment of the first university in Tanzania, with UDSM being the case (Lawi, 2008; Luhanga, 2009). TCU (2020) highlights that the state-control model (bureaucracy from the central government) sets standards to be observed by all universities and colleges in the provision of quality education and the conduct of some academic matters. As stated by Mzenzi (2022), for the matter of quality, government organs set standards for quality provision of services. This means that bureaucracy is inevitable because of the government's role in the operation and sustainability of these institutions. Based on these arguments, there is controversy regarding the practice of institutional autonomy, as opposed to the role of the government in Tanzanian universities.

What is needed is checks and balances on the operation of these universities and the way autonomy and state control over universities are practiced to strike a balance towards institutional performance. As stated by Buckner (2016), state control over universities ensures that standards and quality in the provision of education are maintained according to the country's guidelines and policies. It is worth-noting that bureaucracy from the government is a matter of quality and standards, but not for suppressing other universities. Weber's notion does not guarantee the acceptance and overreliance of this model in the operation of universities. Other governance models should be put in place to supplement one another in terms of their strengths and weaknesses (Trakman, 2008).

Evidence from the documentary review resonates with the main findings from the field. For example, Mzenzi (2022) and TCU (2020) reveal that the bureaucratic model has several implications for the performance of universities as academic institutions. The analysis of these implications is based on features of bureaucracy as per Weber (in Pandya, 2011; Prasad, 2022), including the chain of commands, hierarchies, long procedures, and centralised decision-making. Moreover, the issue of authority has been noted to affect the university's performance in terms of the flexibility of the institution, due to legitimacy and formalised powers. This kind of authority limits the university's flexibility in accommodating non-formal kinds of power and influence from the external environment. In addition, bureaucracy falls short as it emphasises a formal structure that gives very little about the process of dynamism. This affects university performance. Moreover, the bureaucratic paradigm does not explain how an organisation changes over time, thus negatively affecting the arrangements and pace of change within universities. Furthermore, bureaucratic paradigm does not deal with extensive policy formulation rather, it explains how policies may be carried out most efficiently after they are set but says little about the process by which a policy is established in the first place (Buckner, (2016). The issue of carrying out policies without taking part in their formulation, might have implication on the way those policies are implemented, as may be reinforced out of context.

Finally, bureaucracy, does not deal with political issues, such as class struggles of groups within the university that want to force policy decisions toward their special interests, where participation can be manifested (Trackman, 2008). This argument implies that, bureaucracy does not allow class struggles, which brings about competition between managers and subordinates. Rather, it suppresses such acts to avoid resistances, strikes and the related consequences. The issue of preventing

such class struggles among workers has implication on institutional performance as it reduces resistance and strikes among workers, hence institutional stability. However, suppressing the workers from class struggles, may also lead to resistance, strikes as well as complaints, hence preventing changes within a given institution. This suggests giving chances to workers to air out their views and working on workers' complaints so as to reduce class struggles within the institution, which in a long run could have negative implication to institutional performance.

It is worth-noting that the centralization exercised by the government in terms of introducing centralised financial management systems such as MUSE were intended to enhance efficiency in financial matters to monitor the expenditure and flow of government funds. On the contrary, these systems have complicated the financial flow for operations of public institutions, universities in particular as there is delay in approval of such fund. The issue I see here is that, the delay in the approval and provision of fund for operational issues might be caused by inefficiency of the system or implementers who are involved in the process. It should be noted that the challenges associated with centralised systems are not only for public universities, but also for private universities and other government institutions. The centralised systems by the government are not only for MUSE, but also for other centralised systems, such as National e-Procurement System of Tanzania (NEST) which operates centrally to monitor government procurement arrangements. Similarly, NEST has been associated with a number of challenges, including delays in the implementation and completion of big government projects. This calls for rechecking the efficiency of these centralised systems, along with those responsible for decision-making, channelling, and approving financial matters. The findings suggest that the reduction of bureaucracy from higher authorities and within universities and the integration of other models to supplement the inefficiency of bureaucratic. Through this, institutional performance in terms of transformation and timely implementation of organizational plans can be realized, hence, help universities move from where they are to another point, particularly, enhancing transformation in universities.

However, the complexity of universities should not justify embracing bureaucratic practices that hinder institutional performance. As suggested in the findings, some components of bureaucracy that could foster institutional performance, such as assigning tasks based on merits and expertise, with a specialised division of labour, recruitment, promotion based on merits, emphasising technical competence, and rewarding seniority or achievements, to ensure professionalism, as well as a clear

hierarchy of authority, order, a clear hierarchy of authority, and rational decisions, can be maintained to ensure high performance of these entities. This suggests rechecking the way bureaucracy is practiced within these institutions to see whether the delay or long processes are caused by the bureaucratic governance system itself or the implementers responsible in the given sections to approve such matters. In addition, follow-up on the causes of these delays in processing financial matters or other requests that need immediate measures is important. However, bureaucratic practices that lead to inefficiency in institutional performance, such as static to changes, centralised decision making, goal displacement, unintended consequences, and inhuman organisation where there is an impersonal relationship and closed system (Prasad, 2022), should be reduced or eliminated to enhance institutional performance.

Empirical evidence (Trackman, 2008; AIDhean, 2017; Mzenzi, 2022; Taylor, 2013; MacGregor, 2016; Buckner, 2016; MacGregor, 2016; Rowlands, 2017; Scott, 2011) suggests that to achieve effective institutional performance, the issue of governance models in place should be taken into consideration along with other structural matters and resources. In addition, other performance drivers such as quality leadership, managerial procedures, and other governance tools such as policies and guidelines should be considered. Moreover, the decentralisation process through employees' and other stakeholders' involvement is of great importance as it helps in obtaining innovative ideas from employees to foster development and enhance institutional performance within the given institutions (Chuks, 2017). The shared governance model also adds value to universities because it involves reviewing and improving the university's policies and procedures, allowing contributions of stakeholders in leadership governance from the internal and external environments (Taylor, 2013). However, there is a need to revise and devise governance systems to adopt a governance model that strikes the balance between bureaucratic practices and stakeholder engagement (AIDhean, 2017). This study proposes the integration of governance models, such as collegial and shared governance, to complement each other in terms of strength and weaknesses. A dynamic environment and adaptability to changes should be considered to cope with global trends and the competitive environment of HEIs, particularly those changes which are beneficial for organizational growth.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study explores the impact of the bureaucratic governance model on institutional performance. The study found that, bureaucratic model affects

institutional performance in several ways, both positively and negatively. The impact has been noted in timely implementation of the organizational plans as well as performance of the respective universities. The study found that SAUT and UDSM embrace bureaucratic features, such as centralised decision-making, hierarchies, a chain of command, fixed structures, rules, division of labour, and authority. All these components of bureaucracy have been noted to have both positive and negative implications for the performance of SAUT and UDSM, with the negative outweighing the positive. In conclusion, university leaders should be flexible and ready to adapt to positive changes taking place in external environments to meet the market demands in this competitive environment of HEIs subjected to globalisation, knowledge-based economy, advanced technology, and market forces. This study recommends the adoption of a hybrid, that could help reduce bureaucratic tendencies from the government and within respective institutions. This kind of governance framework allows the application of other governance models and approaches that could help universities move from where they are to a better position. The hybrid model helps universities sustain competition in the current era of globalisation and a knowledge-based economy. Several aspects of governance can be achieved through hybrid governance framework. Regarding recommendations Policymakers and education leaders can use these results to examine their practices and set strategies to address the governance challenges associated with governance models. Policymakers and university administrators should revise national and institutional policies and guidelines to reflect and cope with current changes and challenges associated with globalisation, knowledge, and market forces to ensure the good performance of universities. Furthermore, the study recommends that the government reduce bureaucracy (state control model) over universities to enhance institutional autonomy without limitations. Meanwhile, administrators should reduce bureaucratic practices within their institutions and adopt a more flexible model that fosters institutional performance, along with revising other governance tools such as organizational structures, policies, and guidelines to suit the needs of universities in this current era subjected to several changes. Provided that this study focuses on the bureaucratic model, the study recommends that future studies focus on other subdimensions of governance that have not been examined at this level, such as undertaking research on individual governance model.

References

- AIDhean, E. S. (2017). *Study of the decision-making process in higher education institutions: A PhD Thesis*; London Brunel Business School.
- Buckner, E. S. (2016). The changing discourse on higher education and the nation-state, 1960–2010. *Higher Education*. doi:10.1007/s10734-016-0056-2
- Bell, R. (2022). *The application of concurrent or sequential mixed-methods research designs and their methodological implications: Investigating tacit knowledge, its use, and application in automotive development*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Best, J. W. and Kahn, V. (2016). *Research in Education*. 10th edition: ISBN: 9332585806, 9789332585805: Pearson India, 2016
- Bisaso, R. (2017). Makerere University as a flagship institution: Sustaining the quest for relevance. In Daphnia Teferra (Ed.); *Flagship University, Africa* (pp. 425–466). New York: Springer.
- Chucks, J. M. (2017) Challenges and prospects of Africa's higher education: Association of African Universities <https://www.globalpartnership.org/blog/challenges-and-prospects-africas-higher-education>
- Divjak, B. (2016). *Challenges of Strategic Decision-making within Higher Education and Evaluation of the Strategic Decisions*. Centre of European Conference on Information and Intellect Systems, 41-47.
- Fielden, J. (2008). *Global Trends in University Governance*. Washington, D.C-USA, World Bank.
- Harmesen, R. (2014). *Governance of global universities: Leadership and policy challenges. Leadership and governance in higher education: A handbook for decision-makers*.
- Lawi, Q.Y. (2008). Present Conjuncture: The University of Dar es Salaam at the Beginning of the 21st Century in Kimambo, I. N., Mapunda, B. B. B., & Lawi, O. Y. (2008). *In Search of Relevance: A History of the University of Dar es Salaam*. Dar es Salaam University Press.
- Luhanga, M.L. (2009). *Courage for Change: Re-engineering, University of Dar es Salaam*, Dar es Salaam University Press: Dar es Salaam.

- MacGregor, K. (2016). *Governance models and leadership quality in universities: The global window for higher education*. University World News. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20160122161320466>
- Mzenzi, S. I. (2022). Analysis of the Governance Frameworks of Public Universities in Tanzania: What is Known and Needs Knowing? *Business Management Review*, 25(1), 15–41.
- Nyarugwe, R. (2014). *Governance and decision-making in colleges and universities–shared governance, governance structure, external influences, trends in governance*. Net industries and their licensors. Harare.
- Okwakol M.J.N. (2009). Need for Transformative Strategic Planning in Universities in Uganda. NCHE Journal Kampala.
- Pandya, R. S. (2011). *Administration and Management of Education*. Mumbai: Himalayan Publication House.
- Pollitt, C. and Geert Bouckaert, C. (2023). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis* DOI:[10.1093/oso/9780199268481.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199268481.001.0001) ISBN: 9780199268481
- Poth C. (2018). *Innovation in mixed-methods research: A practical guide to integrative thinking with complexity* (1st ed.). Sage
- Prasad. L.M. (2022). *Principles and Practice of Management*. Sultan Chang & Sons
- Rowlands, J. (2017). *Academic Governance in the Contemporary Universities: Perspective from Anglophone Nations*. Springer Singapore. DOI - 10.1007/978-981-10-2688-1.
- Samir, A. (2022). The Relationship between Good Governance and Improving Performance in Higher Education. *Journal of Business and Management Studies* Vol. 8, No. 2; December 2022. DOI: 10.11114/bms.v8i2.5789
- Scott, P. (2011). Leadership in universities. *International Journal of Leadership in Public Services*, 7(3), 229-234.
- Shattock, M. (2013). University Governance, Leadership, and Management in a Decade on Diversification and Uncertainty. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 67(3), 217-233.

- Shaw, G. (2018). The relationship between the state and the university in Ethiopia: The case of Addis Ababa University since 1950. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal* 9(2): Art. 327.
- Taylor M. (2013). Shared governance in modern universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 67(1), 80–94.
- TCU (2020). *List of approved university institutions in Tanzania as of 31 January 2020*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
- Trackman, L. (2008). Modeling university governance. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 0951-5224, vol. 62, Nos. 63-83.
- UDSM Charter (2007). *Councilors' Handbook. Rules and Procedures of the Council*. 3rd edition (August 2007). UDSM.
- URT (2005). *University Act No. 7 of 2005 (CAP 346)*. Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Government Printers.