

Management of Institutions within Thomas's Analytical Framework: A Ugandan Higher Education Case

HARRIET O. AYIORWOTH
harrietonen2@gmail.com

STELLA KYOHAIRWE
stella.kyohairwe@gmail.com
Uganda Management Institute

Abstract

The management of higher education institutions (HEIs) is quite a complex phenomenon. Many times, higher education institutions have become arenas of political betting rather than places of knowledge, skill generation and skill development. There is a great assumption that institutions exist to achieve rational ends. In the light of Thomas's analytical framework (2003:27), this paper, through examining the four perspectives – the rational professional view, political view, agency of capital view and the magic/religion view – indicates that management in institutions of higher education cannot be explained by only one perspective. The paper overlays Thomas's framework on to the management of selected higher institutions in Uganda to generate a theoretical meaning of how management in these institutions can be comprehended. The paper is theoretical with practical illustrations of what management actually entails in higher education institutions in Uganda.

Keywords: management, higher education institutions, rationality

Introduction

Management is one of those common activities applying to all kinds of organisations. While management might be traced way back during the industrial revolution, modern organisations borrow management principles and practice from Frederick Winslow Taylor's Scientific Management Theory at the beginning of the 20th century. Subsequent schools of thought towards the mid 20th century such as the Human Relations Movement by Mary Parker Follett, the Systems Approach by Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Talcott Parsons and others, Theory X and Y by Douglas McGregor as well as Contingency Theory by Fred Edward Fiedler and William Ouchi's Theory Z went a long way to create a firm foundation for management practice today (Clegg, Kornberger and Pitsis, 2005).

It is clear that throughout the entire century, the search for a common meaning of the concept

of management remained elusive. Consequently, many scholars document variants in definitions of management as:

“Knowing exactly what you want men to do, and then seeing that they do it in the best and cheapest way” (Taylor, 1911, p. 7), “to forecast and plan, to organize, to command, to co-ordinate and to control.... (Henri Fayol, 1916, p.5-6), “the art of getting things done through people” (Mary Parker Follett...), “the art of getting things done through and with people in formally organized groups”, (Koontz 1961, p. 186).

The understanding of what management is, therefore, continues to generate controversies and conceptual debates among management thinkers, scholars and researchers in different organisations and contexts. This paper explores the meaning of management in the context of higher education institutions in Uganda that have undergone unprecedented mega changes as in other countries elsewhere (Daigneau, W. et al. 2005; Staley and Trinkle, 2011).

In this paper, we also acknowledge and re-echo Olum’s (2004) concern that elements of the external environment – economic, technological, social, political, and ethical, combine to impact on the way organizations, including HEIs, are managed. Therefore, management practices in HEIs in Uganda, and elsewhere in the world, cannot avoid being shaped by the external environment. However, the paper’s focus is on Thomas’s (2003) analytical framework of four major perspectives to management that include: rational profession view, agency of capital view, magic/religion view and politics view.

Thomas’s (2003) analytical framework typology examines the ‘means’ and ‘ends’ of management to explain what management does and how it does it. His view is that management is a social practice in which various means are deployed to achieve various ends. The view is in congruence with Dunham & Pierce (1989) who claim that management involves the process of planning, organising, directing and controlling organisational resources in the pursuit of organisational goals.

Defining and Managing of Higher Education Institutions in Uganda

United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) defines higher education as all types of education or training provided at post-secondary level by universities or other tertiary educational establishments approved by the competent state authority (UNESCO, 2009). Globally, higher education in many countries such as those in the USA, UK, and Australia generally fits into this definition. In Uganda’s context, higher education refers to all forms of training beyond a full course of secondary (post A’ level) provided by universities and other tertiary institutions, leading to the award of certificates, diplomas and degrees and conducting research (Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act, (2001) as amended). Although the higher education landscape in Uganda is still dominated by universities, the system is fast evolving to accommodate more



tertiary institutions. Currently, other than universities, HEIs in Uganda include business colleges, technical colleges, national teachers' colleges, agricultural colleges and management institutes, among others. HEIs in Uganda operate under the legal and regulatory frameworks provided by the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act (UOTIA, 2001) as amended and other frameworks by the National Council of Higher Education (NCHE) respectively. The Act provides for the governance structures of HEIs through laws, policies, and rules that act as standard operating procedures. HEIs are directed under the leadership of governing bodies and management who lead these institutions on behalf of the owners or stakeholders. The university management, according to UOTIA, 2001 for instance, consists of officers like the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the University Secretary, the Academic Registrar, the Librarian, the Bursar and the Dean of Students. Universities have organs of administration that include the University Council, the Senate and other academic bodies that are comprised of stipulated membership as per the law to ensure that a management function is carried out effectively for the purpose of realising institutional goals.

Considering that management is central in running HEIs, this paper aims at elaborating what management is, not in terms of a structure but in the context of a function within HEI. The discussion is based on Thomas's (2003) analytical framework for management that explains the relevance of rationality in management. This framework was specifically selected for its attempt to provide an insightful and thought-provoking study of controversies surrounding management of contemporary organizations.

Rational Profession Perspective and Management of HEIs in Uganda

According to Herbert (1947), rationality is a relation of conformance (efficiency) between pre-established 'ends' and 'means' to reach them. Hodgkinson and Healey (2011) view rationality as an analytic, systematic, rule-based and explicit mechanism for decision-making. Thomas (2003) views rationality as an attribute of the means managers use to achieve given ends. From these sample definitions, it can be observed that rationality is all about calculative and conscious decisions and actions taken by managers to ensure that an organisation achieves its intended objectives.

In order to analyse management of HEIs in Uganda in the light of the rational professional view, the basic assumptions of the model need to be outlined. These assumptions include:

- i. Managerial behavior is based on conscious reasoning and not just on intuition or experience. This implies that managers make decisions based on formal and systematic analysis of the available information. Choices are influenced by rules and cause-effect relationships (Evans, 2003; Hodgkinson, Sadler-Smith, Burke, Claxton and Sparrow, 2009).
- ii. The decisions and actions of managers are guided by clearly defined vision and mission of the organisation.
- iii. Organisational goals are also clearly and specifically defined and hence managers can



determine the likely outcome or what they expect to achieve.

- iv. Managers operate in a highly formalised social structure.
- v. Managers are assumed to determine alternative choices and courses of action (strategies).
- vi. Managers take decisions and act in the interest of the organization, that is achievement of unitary ends.

Although some claims of the rational profession model of management may be challenged, by contemporary management scholars and practitioners on the basis that present day organizations operate in a highly complex and dynamic environment. In this paper we argue, based on our experience in HEIs, that there is still substantial evidence of management practices in HEIs in Uganda that draw on the rational model discussed herein.

The bureaucratic model of management, with its rules, regulations, and standard operating procedures guiding decisions and actions of those in management remains a dominant feature of management in HEIs. Generally, managers of HEIs largely rely on formal structures and processes when taking critical decisions that affect their institutions. For instance, the decision taken by the management of Makerere University to “discipline” staff implicated in the recently publicized sexual harassment at the University was based on the University’s Policy and Regulations against Sexual Harassment (2006) as amended. This and other policies and regulations in many other HEIs apparently are the bases upon which HEIs’ managers execute their day to day functions. In this regard, managerial decisions and actions appear to be highly professional, objective and rational. However, unlike the traditional bureaucracies found in the corporate world, private sector, or in ecclesiastical where decision-making is a preserve of a few individuals in the top administrative hierarchy, bureaucracies in HEIs are thought to function in a different way and considerable power is decentralized to units such as colleges, schools, or departments (Makerere University, 2017)

In addition, universities and other HEIs have visions, missions, goals, strategic objectives and core values that act as guidelines for rational managerial decisions and actions. Uganda Christian University (UCU), for instance, has core values that reflect their Christian background. One of their core values, for example, is Christ-centeredness. UCU may not recruit personnel into top management positions if they do not have strong Christian values and most specifically are of the Anglican faith (UCU Strategic Plan 2012-2018). Another vivid point of illustration is the Uganda Management Institute (UMI) – a government institution building management and administrative capacities of public and private organisations. UMI has strategic objectives as well as core values. One of the strategic objectives is to attract, develop and retain high-quality staff. The recruitment of highly qualified and competent staff currently at the institute could be a manifestation that managerial decisions at UMI are largely influenced by the institute’s strategic objectives and core values.

Strategic planning carried out by HEIs can also be considered as a highly objective rational process. This is because it essentially involves careful and systematic analysis of available data and information in order to make forecasts (Thomas, 2003). It is important to note that strategic plans



drawn by HEIs, for example, Makerere University's Strategic Plan (2008/2009 – 2018/2019) in Uganda are essentially informed by broader policy frameworks such as the National Development Plan (NDP) II, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Uganda Vision 2040, among others. This implies that strategic plans are a product of highly professional, rational thought processes. In fact, in management literature and practice, strategic decision-making is considered a highly rational process because it is analytical, systematic and linear (Elbanna, 2006; Cabantous & Gond, 2011). The bureaucratic linear paradigm in strategic planning seems to be what most administrators and managers of HEIs engage in, especially in government institutions like public universities. Bureaucrats in these public universities still tend to have a mechanistic view that there is a standard way of thinking and behaving. For instance, university managers continue to heavily rely on institutional vision and mission statements as foundations of strategic plans, and the use of techniques such as SWOT analysis in strategic planning. Hinton (2012) opines that linear thinking in strategic management seems to be so entrenched in HEIs that it is equated with logical or rational thinking. But the dynamic, unpredictable and competitive conditions in the higher education landscape are making HEIs that are still in the mechanistic paradigm lose touch with the reality of today's world. HEIs inevitably need to embrace an adaptive model of planning to accommodate changing situations.

Objective rationality in human behaviour, however, has been challenged, especially by behavioral scientists and the neo-classical school of thought. Human beings, it is argued, do not behave as rational machines, even in the most organised organisational structures (Herbert, 1955). Findings from cognitive psychology and behavioral studies indicate that judgment, decision-making, and behaviour are not exclusively based on logical reasoning, but are also subject to heuristics, cognitive biases, intuition and pressure towards conformity with the group or authority (Marnet, 2008). In fact, according to Herbert (1955), bounded rationality explains actual behaviour other than theoretical behaviour. The implication is that the behaviour of managers or administrators of HEIs may not at all times be objectively rational. Some circumstances may require a quick, practical response without necessarily resorting to the traditional bureaucratic, rule-based approach. Public universities like Makerere and Kyambogo, for example, have frequent staff and student strikes. Such a state of affairs demands a fast response from management to control the possible adverse effects.

One critical factor that has put to test Thomas' (2003) objective rational professional model of management (which pre-supposes that management operates under circumstances of socio-economic stability) was the introduction of public sector reforms in Uganda in the mid 1990's instigated through World Bank sanctions. Such a development impacted on management and other institutional practices in public HEIs (Bisaso, 2010; Nabaho, 2019). Among the reforms included cut in budgetary allocations to the higher education sector, with funding priorities reallocated to support lower education sector (Musisi, 2003; Mamdani, 2007). New public management demands that public Universities introduce market elements as components into their management practices in order to raise funding to support management of these institutions. As a result, public

Universities in Uganda have had to introduce reforms like cost-sharing, and private students' scheme to raise additional funds. In such complex, uncertain and dynamic economic environment, purely objective rationality explaining managerial behavior in which managers have total control of situations is highly questionable. Adopting business-like characteristics also implies that HEIs managers interface with an intricate network of people- parents, government, donors, political actors, business communities, civil society organizations among others. Rationality in managerial behavior in such complex environment is subjective and managers require to adapt to emerging challenges and realities of the time. In the same way, globalization with its emerging issues of internationalization of higher education, new technologies, academic collaborations, increasing competition in the higher education landscape, massification of education, and changes in students' demands among others, all require adaptive and innovative management practices that may not necessarily be hinged on the rigid classical rational objective model. Managers of HEIs instead need to continuously endow themselves with innovative management and leadership skills to be able to successfully manage HEIs in this 21st century (Onen, 2014) as cited in Emunemu & Akinwumi (2014).

Agency of Capital Perspective and Management of HEIs in Uganda

The agency of capital perspective to management draws its origin largely from the Agency Theory or the Principal-agent Theory. The theory describes the relationship between two or more parties in a contract where one party (principal) engages another party (agent) to perform some services on their behalf (Jensen and Meckling, 1976). Owners of the firm or company (principals) have to employ managers (agents) to run the business as they monitor the performance of the agents to ensure that the latter act rationally in the interest of the principals.

In a capitalist structure, the interest of the principal, which is profit maximisation and cost minimization, is usually parallel to the employees' interest. Profit maximisation results in exploitation of labour in terms of excessive workload for employees, sometimes longer working hours and yet in most cases, inadequate payment is made for labour service. Management decision and actions that are usually considered rational results in the exploitation of employees' labour. This explains why management is considered an exploitative activity under the agency of capital perspective to management (Thomas, 2003). How can this perspective be overlaid on to the management of HEIs in Uganda? We discuss the agency of capital perspective to management by considering two separate scenarios: management of private HEIs and management of public HEIs.

Agency of Capital and Management of Private HEIs in Uganda

Private HEIs in Uganda are largely for-profit institutions. Based on the Agency Theory, the owners of private HEIs such as private universities are the principals. The owners may be private individuals or an organisation such as the church. Universities such as Uganda Christian University, Uganda



Martyrs University, Islamic University in Uganda, Bugema Adventist University, are some of the faith-based private universities. Others like St Lawrence University, Cavendish University, Victoria University, Kampala International University, among others, are owned by private individuals or a group of private individuals. The agents are the top management that is involved in the day-to-day running of these universities. These may include Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor and other members of the management team such as the Board of Trustees. Private HEIs, unlike public HEIs, have a relatively high degree of autonomy in the way they are managed, although government, through NCHE, provides an oversight role (Echel-Ochwa, 2016).

Managers of private HEIs are accountable to the owners of these institutions and are expected to take rational managerial decisions that maximise the wealth of the owners (shareholders). Owners of private universities, for instance, provide the capital and other resources and expect management to utilise these resources efficiently and effectively to maximise returns to the owners. The managers are usually under pressure to fulfill the interest of the owners or shareholders. Often, this has resulted in putting staff – academic and non-academic – under pressure to deliver results. The workload for academic staff is usually high, especially in terms of teaching hours, regular assessment of students and other assigned tasks. Management on their part is involved in rigorous supervision and monitoring of staff, all in the name of ensuring efficiency and effectiveness.

Quality assurance mechanisms and performance measurement techniques are applied basically with a view to ensure that shareholders' wealth is maximised at the end of it all. This, in Ochwa-Echel's opinion, (2016), is a common practice in private universities and other private HEIs in Uganda. Management, in this perspective, is considered an exploitative activity, the type that Karl Marx describes in a capitalist socio-economic structure.

However, research by Tusubira and Nkote (2013) also indicates that managers of private universities often fail to align the interests of the agent with those of the principal due to conflicting goals, casting doubts on the expected objective rationality. Managers of private universities are said to have personal interests and goals to pursue, which tend to conflict with those of the owners. Pursuing of personal interests by the managers oftentimes is to the detriment of the private institutions, worse still to shareholders. This could be part of the causes of dismal performance displayed by private universities in Uganda in areas such as finance (Tusubira and Nkote, 2013; Ochwa-Echel, 2016).

Agency of Capital and Management of Public HEIs

Unlike private HEIs that are basically profit oriented, public HEIs are essentially meant to deliver higher education as a public good, without profit maximisation consideration. This view is, however, changing as public HEIs are under pressure to embrace the new public management model that is market-oriented, requiring managers of public HEIs to become entrepreneurial in their functions (Nabaho, 2019). But even in their largely not-for-profit nature, the agency dilemma can be experienced, which arises whenever owners of an organisation or company cast doubt



on the motive of agents, that is whether the appointed agents will manage the organisation in the interest of the principal. Based on the Principal-agency Theory, the government is the principal while the university managers are the agents. Managers of public universities (agents) are expected by government to manage the university on the latter's behalf (Kagaari, Munene, and Ntayi, 2013). The government, for example, provides funds for research projects, teaching, and learning programmes with the expectation that public HEIs will be more accountable and produce higher education output in line with government objectives and strategic plans. To ensure that managers of public HEIs are responsible and accountable to tax payers who are funders of public HEI governing bodies like university councils are instituted by government to provide an oversight role of supervising the management of public HEIs. This, in a way, portrays the principal-agency relationship (Kagaari et al, 2013) in line with Thomas's (2003) analytical tool. Otherwise, having been developed within the discipline of financial economics, with emphasis on wealth or profit maximisation, the agency theory seems to be of little relevance to the management of public HEIs in Uganda.

The complexity of governance and management structures of public HEIs in Uganda also renders the agency theory too simplistic to be used in explaining management of public HEIs in Uganda, since it is erected on a single abstraction that governance involves a contract between two parties. But public HEIs like Makerere and Kyambogo Universities, with their intricate management and governance structures (Nabaho, 2019), may produce different agency relationships from the single principal-agency relationship perceived by the agency paradigm. In other words, the question of "who is agent for who?" can arise where management structure is complex.

It may, therefore, sound reasonable to support Thomas's view (2003) that neither real managerial work has much to do with the classical functions of planning, organising, issuing commands using formal and scientific techniques, etc. as in Fayol's view, nor is it a neutral administrative function executed for the benefit of those who cooperate in productive activity. In the agency and Marxist perspective, management is seen as an exploitative and repressive function by managers (agents) who engage in the maintenance of the organisational systems and in the systems of power and advantage of the principals/owners of HEIs.

Political Perspective and Management of HEIs in Uganda

The political perspective to management, according to Berkley (2003), employs a pluralist view in which managers are believed to use power and influence to determine 'means' and 'ends' regarding resource allocation. Cairns (2017) describes organisational politics as a process and behaviour in human interaction involving power and authority. According to him, organisational politics is a natural part of organisational life; it is the lubricant that oils an organisation's gears; it governs how decisions are made in organisations; and that it is a tool to balance diverse views of interested parties and actors. This makes management or administration even in HEIs innately political. In this approach to understanding management, objective rational decision-making alone may not work when interests are fundamentally incongruent. Instead, political behaviours and



influence tactics emerge in which managers have to engage 'cliques' or groups in bargaining, negotiating, alliance building and conflict resolution (Thomas, 2003).

No wonder that Bacharach and Lawler (1980) described organisations as politically negotiated orders rather than celebrated rational, harmonious entities. Based on the background given above, politics in the management of HEIs in Uganda stems from diversity of interests and the need to resolve those competing interests in some way. In public universities, for example, there are various actors or stakeholders such as government, university managers, staff, students, development partners, politicians, civil society organisations, and the community in general. All these actors have varied as well as competing interests in HEIs that university managers must take into consideration. Moreover, HEIs, just like any other organisation, provide power bases and platforms for expression of individual interests and motives. Therefore, university managers require not only a rational professional approach in dealing with these various interest groups, but also the political and interpersonal skills to handle conflicting agendas and shifting power bases. Effective managers of HEIs need to be in close touch with the different interest groups and coalitions so that they attend to the prevailing mood of their institutions. Keeping close with organisational members necessitates that those mandated to manage HEIs must be political so as to be effective in monitoring institutional morale and nipping problems in the bud. Sometimes it entails engaging in behind-the-scenes, informal, one-on-one relationships with different actors.

Further, politics in management of HEIs becomes unavoidable where there is scarcity of resources and managers sometimes require political maneuvers to make difficult decisions regarding resource allocation. Oftentimes, scarcity of resources and how it should be allocated results in disagreements and power struggles among individuals and groups within the organisation. For instance, government has cut its budgetary allocations to fund HEIs in Uganda. A decrease in public resources to fund public HEIs seems to be a global trend (Agasisti, 2017). Consequently, meager financial resources have to be allocated between various competing uses such as research, teaching and students' welfare, among others. Such a state of affairs requires not only professional managerial expertise but also political astuteness to make the appropriate decisions. University managers need to use their tactics of power to strengthen their influence over decision-making and control of the social dynamics within the institutions.

Politics is also an inevitable and integral part of managing organisations and institutions such as HEIs when it comes to change management. Receptivity to change in organisations sometimes depends on how managers and administrators skillfully use their power, influence and authority to successfully drive the change agenda. For instance, recent attempts to raise tuition at Makerere University have been met with stiff resistance, not only from the concerned students and parents, but also from legislators. Such contentious issues demand skillful political maneuvers on the part of university managers to be able to get the desired results.

We acknowledge that although politics can be a healthy way to get things done in organisations, managers of HEIs have often misused their political power by engaging in self-serving behaviour that is destructive to the institutions. Sometimes university managers engage



in manipulative behaviour to serve their own interests or interests of a group, and maintain power by employing harsh management tactics – what Cairns (2017) refers to as ‘Machiavellianism’ in the workplace. Self-serving political actions by HEIs managers can negatively influence social groupings, cooperation, information-sharing and other organisational functions. Misuse of power and selfish personal ambitions in universities, for instance, could be the major cause of wrangles between or among university top management. Recently, there were media reports concerning the heightened intrigue between the Principal of Makerere University Business School (MUBS) and the chairperson of the MUBS Council. Behind such scenes usually lie managerial behaviour laced with selfish political ambitions. Politics in management displayed in this manner portrays it as a negative activity.

Political behaviour in the management of HEIs in Uganda, especially public HEIs, is also evident where institutional politics is interlinked with national politics. Oanda (2016) argues that Africa’s politicians view universities as critical outputs for building political clients. Politicians usually have a deep interest in who becomes vice-chancellor, guild president or who ascends the academic rank because of having hidden motives to influence decision-making to serve their own interests. Even when it comes to procurement services in these HEIs, research indicates that university leaders are influenced by politicians to employ service providers from their own networks (Oanda, 2016). Therefore, on the surface, HEIs governance organs appear free to make rational decisions about academic and other institutional matters. But in actual fact, ‘opaque’ networks have dominant influence over most managerial decisions in HEIs in Uganda. Sometimes management practices like promotion of staff, recruitment, staff appointment to certain positions, allocation of research funds for projects, and funding of foreign travels by staff at HEIs in Uganda portray a lot of negative politics on the part of HEIs managers.

On politics in management of HEIs in Uganda, we conclude that politics is an inevitable part of managerial behaviour. Managers of HEIs do not only need objective rational decisions and actions to get things done in their institutions; having political awareness and skill is equally important to be able to achieve results. In spite of the negative image portrayed, organisational politics is not inherently bad.

Magic/Religion Perspective and Management of HEIs in Uganda

The magic/religion view of management according to Thomas’s analytical framework compares the behaviour of managers to that of magicians and religious leaders. It is based on the claim that management as an activity or practice may not necessarily be based on scientific or verifiable facts. It questions the basic assumptions of the rational profession model and contends that managers may sometimes base their rationality on their personal belief systems and values. According to Thomas (2003), both magic and religion are associated with managing life’s uncertainties, and finding solutions to specific ‘ends’. Although the dominant view is that managers should act in a calculating manner on the basis of well-validated scientific knowledge, this rational behaviour is sometimes subject to their deeply held belief systems.



Shenoy (2017) contends that magic is all about creativity and making the impossible possible. Managers, just like magicians, are expected to be exceptionally innovative and courageous, consistently winning against all odds, and instilling confidence among the organisation's members. The magic/religion perspective argues that just like magicians and religious people, managers use techniques that are regarded as mysterious in the belief that certain desired outcomes will be achieved. Managers of HEIs operate in conditions of uncertainties and complexities in the higher education environment. For example, university managers deal with employees, students and other stakeholders whose behaviour cannot easily be predicted. Even for the most professional or expert university manager, objectively rational decisions may not adequately address staff or student morale, expectations, interests, goals, etc. Sometimes managers have to step out of their default style and provide tailor-made solutions that are beyond objective testing in the hope that staff motivation will increase. Therefore, what managers of HEIs sometimes do and how and when they do things can be comparable to what magicians and religious people do that are not scientifically grounded. This, according to Evje (2012), is what actually creates the magic. Managers deal with the belief that certain desired outcomes will follow their actions.

Universities and other HEIs also continuously undertake forecasting, long-range planning and other future-oriented activities in extreme uncertainties. Such managerial faith in the possibility of control of uncertainty is not necessarily always based on objective rationality and professionalism. Managers may merely use managerial 'symbols' and 'rituals' based on their belief that a desirable outcome will be achieved (Thomas, 2003). Take for instance the requirements of enforcement of regular class attendance by students – to a specified percent regulation, often a minimum of 75% attendance of the course unit. It is believed that regular attendance leads to good student performance. However, it is evident that unless a combination of other measures in the form of sanctions or penalties is executed, there is no guarantee that class attendance enforcement is equal to high performance of students.

Rationality in this case is relative to a manager's belief system and values. Forecasting and making strategic plans by managers of HEIs have the same functions that magical rights have, that is, they are manifestations of anxiety-relieving superstitious behaviour (Shenoy, 2017).

Conclusion

There are as diverse views to what management is dependent on as to the people who attempt to define it. However, there is more to the reality of management than the formally defined functions. A discussion on management in HEIs in Uganda being perceived in a four-lens perspective suggests to us that management is no simple function to define and undertake. Individual managers apply context-specific objective or subjective means to obtain either collective or personal/group benefits (outcomes). It is only when we interpret the means and ends correlation that we can ably explain the managerial behaviour and actions. Rationality, beliefs/values, politicking and exploitation offer a comprehensive framework to understand the meaning of management in HEIs and other organisations.



References

- Agasisi, T. (2017). Management of Higher Education Institutions and Evaluation of their Efficiency and Performance. *Journal of Tertiary Education and Management*. Vol. 23, No. 3, pp.187-190.
- Bacharach, S. & Lawler, E.J. (1980). *Power and Politics in Organizations*. San Fransisco: Jossey – Bass.
- Thomas, A.T. (2003). *Controversies in Management: Issues, Debates, Answers*. Psychology Press, 2003.
- Bisaso, R. (2010). Organizational Responses to Public Sector Reforms in Higher Education in Uganda: A Case Study of Makerere University. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, Vol. 32, pp.343-351. DOI:10.1080/1360080X.2010.491108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2010.491108>.
- Cabantous, L., & Gond, J.P. (2011). Rational Decision-making as Performative Praxis: Explaining Rationality's Eternal Retour. *Organization Science*, Vol. 22, pp.573-586.
- Cairns, T.D. (2017). Power, Politics, and Leadership in the Workplace. *Employment Relations Today*, Vol. 43, No. 4.
- Calabretta, G., Gemsar, G. & Wijnberg, N.M. (2017). The Interplay between Intuition and Rationality in Strategic Decision-making: A Paradox Perspective. *Journal of Organization Studies*. Vol. 38, No. 3-4, pp.365-401.
- Clegg, S., Kornberger, M. & Pitsis, T. (2005). *Making Sense of Management in Managing and Organizations – An Introduction to Theory and Practice* (1st edition, pp.3-39). London: SAGE Publications.
- Daigneau, W. et al. (2005). *Planning, Designing and Managing Higher Education Institutions, PEB Exchange, Programme on Educational Building*, 2005/15. OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/541370867752>
- Elbanna, S. (2006). Strategic decision-making: Process perspectives. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 8, pp.1-20.
- Emunemu, B.O. & Akinwumi, F.S. (eds) (2014). Educational management in Africa. Papers in honour of Professor John Iheukwumere Nwankwo. The department of Educational Management University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. ISBN: 978-978-53335-2-7.
- Evans, J.S.B. (2003). In Two Minds: Dual-process Accounts of Reasoning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, Vol. 7, pp.454-459.
- Evje, B. (2012). The Magic of Leadership. Retrieved on 26 May 2018 from <https://www.inc.com/brian-evje/the-magic-of-leadership.html>.
- Government of Uganda (2001). Universities and other Tertiaries Act, 2001. Entebbe: Government of Uganda.
- Herbert, S.A. (1947). *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-making Process in Administrative Organization* (1st ed). New York, USA: The MacMillan Company.
- Herbert, S.A. (1955). A Behavioral Model of Rational Choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 69, pp.99-118.
- Hinton, K.E. (2012). *A Practical Guide to Strategic Planning in Higher Education*. Published by Society for College and University Planning, USA.
- Hodgkinson, G.P., Sadler-Smith, E., Burve, L.A., Claxton, G., & Sparrow, P.R. (2009). Intuition in Organizations: Implications for Strategic Management. *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 42, pp.277-297.
- Hodgkinson, G.P., & Healey, M.P. (2011). Psychological Foundations of Dynamic Capabilities: Reflexion and Reflection in Strategic Management. *Journal of Strategic Management*, Vol. 32, pp.1500-1516.
- Jensen, M.C. & Meckling, W.H. (1976). Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency, Costs, and Ownership Structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 3, pp.305-360.
- Kaehler, B. & Grundei, J. (2018). HR Governance. *A Theoretical Introduction*. Springer Nature: Switzerland AG.
- Kagaari, J.R.K., Munene, J.C. & Ntayi, J.M. (2013). Agency Relations and Managed Performance in Public Universities in Uganda. *S.A. Journal of Industrial Psychology*. 39(1):01-10.DOI: 10.4102/sajip.v39i1.916.
- Kivisto, J. (2005). The Government-Higher Education Institution Relationship: Theoretical Considerations from the Perspective of Agency Theory. *Journal of Tertiary Education and Management*. Vol. 2, pp.1-17.
- Kivisto, J. (2008). An Assessment of Agency Theory as Framework for the Government – University Relationship. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 339-350.



- Makerere University (2017). *Makerere University Strategic Plan Review Report*. Kampala: Planning and Development Department.
- Makerere University, (2017). The report of the visitation committee on Makerere University, 2016. Makerere University, Kampala-Uganda.
- Mamdani, M. (2007). *Scholars in the Market Place: The Dilemmas of Neo-Reform at Makerere University, 1989-2005*. Kampala Fountain Publishers Ltd: Kampala, Uganda.
- Marnet, O. (2008). Behavior and Rationality in Corporate Governance. *International Journal of Behavioral Accounting and Finance*. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.4-22.
- Musisi, N.B. (2003). *Makerere University in Transition, 1993-2000*. James Currey and Fountain Publishers: Oxford and Kampala.
- Nabaho, L. (2019). Shared governance in public universities in Uganda: Current concerns and directions for reform. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331429982>.
- National Council for Higher Education (2011). The state of higher education and training in Uganda: A report on higher education delivery and institutions. Government of Uganda.
- Oanda, I. (2016). *How Political Interference keeps Hurting African Universities*. Retrieved on 4 June, 2018 from <http://www.google.com/am/s/theconversation.com/amp/how-political-interference-keeps-hurting-african-universities-5838>.
- Ochwa-Echel, J. (2016). Private Universities in Uganda: Issues and Challenges. *International Journal of Education and Social Science*. Vol. 3, No. 3, pp.1-8.
- Olum, Y. (2004). Management theories and practice: A critical review. A paper presented at the 15th East African Central Banking Course, held on 12th July 2004, at Kenya School of Monetary Studies.
- Staley, D.J. & Trinkle, D.A. (2011). The Changing Landscape of Higher Education. *Educause Review*, Vol. 46.
- Tibarimbasa, A.K.M. (2010). Factors Affecting the Management of Private Universities in Uganda. Unpublished PhD Thesis of Educational Management of Makerere University.
- Tusubira, N.F. & Nkote, I.N. (2013). Corporate Governance in Private Universities: Financial Performance Perspective. *Journal of Business Law and Ethics*. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.1-15.
- UNESCO. (2009). Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution. A Report Prepared for UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education, Paris.