

The Status of Leadership and Governance in the Ethiopian Public Higher Education Institutions: Structural Set-up in Focus

Wossenu Yimam¹, Daniel Desta² and Kenenissa Dabi³

Received: 11 May 2022; Accepted: 23 December 2022

Abstract: Leadership and governance functions are of major importance in interpreting the diverse changes, outlining potential scenarios, developing organizational responses and bringing about the anticipated change. The public higher education institutions/HEIs in Ethiopia have introduced a series of reform programs in order to meet the needs of their stakeholders. Nevertheless, such reform programs could not bring about fundamental changes in the operation as well as achievement of the major institutional objectives. This study attempted to address such core issues as influence of the structural set-up of public HEIs on the realization of their major functions, the presence of participatory and empowering structural set-up in the HEIs as well as structure-related challenges of HEIs. To this effect, a descriptive survey design coupled with qualitative data collection and analysis procedures was employed so as to get the views and perceptions of the study participants regarding the core issues. The study was carried out in eight public HEIs (Addis Ababa, Ambo, Bahir Dar, Haromaya, Hawassa, Jimma, Mekele, and Wollo Universities). The participants of the study included ten university officials, 1368 academic and administrative staff, and 40 students' representatives. All in all, 1418 participants have expressed their views through questionnaires, interviews and FGDs. The quantitative data were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, one-way ANOVA, and Tukey multiple comparison tests. On the other hand, the qualitative data were analyzed qualitatively after the recorded data were properly transcribed and thematically categorized. The results of this study unveiled that the existing structural set-up of the public HEIs was inappropriate and does not enhance the accomplishment of the institutions' major functions. Besides, the working relationships that exist between and among incumbents at the various levels of the sample HEIs were found to be hardly productive. Apart from these, the incidence of leadership instability, absence of transparent and participatory culture, undue interference from the regulatory bodies, etc. were found to be the most frequently mentioned challenges in the HEIs. It was thus concluded that the existing structural set-up could not allow the public HEIs to bring about effectiveness and efficiency in their performance. Recommendations that help to curb the challenges and improve leadership and governance practices in the HEIs are forwarded.

Keywords: Governance, Higher education, Leadership, Performance, Structural set-up

¹ Associate Professor, Institute of Educational Research, Addis Ababa University, Email: wamedie@gmail.com

² Associate Professor, Institute of Educational Research, Addis Ababa University, Email: dandestad@gmail.com

³ Assistant Professor, College of Education and Behavioral Studies, Addis Ababa University, Email: kenenissad@yahoo.com

1. Background

Leadership and governance functions are of major importance in interpreting the diverse changes, outlining potential scenarios, developing organizational responses and bringing about the anticipated change. When considering issues of leadership and governance in higher education, researchers like Middlehurst (1993) concentrate on different elements of the system, i.e. the external environment, government policy and steering, internal institutional architecture, and academic operations. Across the different analyses of this system or parts of it, a number of cross-cutting themes also emerge. According to Middlehurst (1993), these include questions about the role and nature of higher education, issues of relationships and boundaries between and among incumbents at college and department levels as well as the various echelons of the administrative wing of the system, questions about the focus and dynamics of change and about the place of institutional learning and research in supporting and evaluating change.

There appear to be three ways in which the term 'governance' is used in different countries and by different authors. The term refers to:

- The constitutional and legal framework which regulates the relationship between universities and government (state or federal) - 'the governance of higher education' - this may include the operations of intermediate agencies (Sizer & Cannon 1999);
- The overall structure and process of internal co-ordination and control in an institution - 'university governance' - or of an institutional activity - 'the governance of research' (De Boer 1999);
- The specific role and activities of an institution's most senior, strategic committee or board - 'the governing body' (Scott 1996).

While it is possible to make sharp distinctions between these three interpretations, it is also possible to draw out certain shared features. Two important features concern the positioning of governance in relation to the organization of universities, and the governance role. The positioning of governance is, as a point of authority for the system, the institution or institutional activity. For example, a legal framework for higher education establishes the rules and accountabilities within which universities must operate, while a governing body will establish similar guidelines for institutional activity and act as guardian of the legal and constitutional position of the university, its members and activities. The legal framework is likely to be interpreted by a variety of intermediary agencies.

The leadership and governance landscape of Ethiopian higher education, as it emanates from national provisions and experiences in higher education institutions, is multiple and complex. The ideal of good governance and effective leadership of higher education institutions and the subsequent practices have their foundations on this comprehensive landscape that brings forward the major issues and leadership and governance concerns the higher education institutions need to respond to and act on.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Nowadays, our world is becoming a knowledge-based society and the role of education in general and in higher education in particular is the center of this phenomenon. Given the critical role of universities in socio-economic development, no country can afford to fail in the provision of the required support to at least some HEIs of high quality. Accordingly, Ethiopia introduced tertiary level education by establishing the University College of Addis Ababa/UCAA in 1950. Since then, series of measures have been taken to expand higher education in the country. Particularly, after the promulgation of the Education and Training Policy in 1994, higher education in Ethiopia has expanded at an alarming rate. Consequently, the number of public universities in the

country has reached more than 50 these days. This unprecedented expansion has brought its own challenges as well as opportunities. In response to the internal dynamics and external pressures, the public HEIs in our country have attempted to implement a series of reform programs such as BPR, BSC, Kaizen, etc.

Even though such reform programs have been introduced in the public HEIs, they could not meet the needs of the university community as well as the Government. Besides, the structural setup and governance system in these institutions did not result in fundamental changes that would relieve them from the status-quo. Be that as it may, except a few local studies that focus on models of higher education governance, for instance, “Rethinking the Ethiopian Experience” (Mengistu, 2018), “The Dynamics of Higher Education Governance Policy Process in Ethiopia” (Befekadu and Bultossa, 2018), and “The Status and Challenges of Ethiopian Higher Education System and Its Contribution to Development” (Teshome, 2004), no comprehensive study has been undertaken so far concerning the core issues related to leadership and governance, in general, and the effect of the structural set-up of public HEIs on the realization of the institutions’ major functions, in particular. Consequently, there is a visible knowledge gap in this area. The present study is thus designed to contribute its share towards bridging this gap.

1.2 Objectives and basic questions of the study

The general objective of this study is to explore the extent to which the existing structural set-up and leadership practices of public HEIs enable them to achieve efficiency, effectiveness, quality, flexibility and customer-centeredness in discharging their duties and responsibilities. More specifically, the study attempts to answer to the following basic questions:

1. How far does the existing structural set-up enable the Ethiopian public higher education institutions to play their roles in the

- realization of their major functions?
2. How participatory and empowering is the structural set-up of the higher education institutions?
 3. What structure-related challenges encounter the governance and leadership system and practices in the public higher education institutions?

1.3 Scope of the Study

This study does not intend to delve into governance and structural theories and models. It rather focuses on uncovering the effect of the structural set-up of public HEIs on the realization of the institutions' major functions, the nature of the structural set-up, and the major structure-related challenges that encounter Ethiopian public HEIs.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Conceptualizing Leadership, Governance and Structure

There appears to be no clear consensus in the literature over the meaning of governance and the relationship between governance and management (Goddard, 2005). According to Carnegie, (2009), the concept of governance in public universities deals with the missions of public universities while enabling them to be vital institutions in economy and society. Governance is an important topic, especially in the public sector and particularly when public organizations are undergoing rapid transformation (Carnegie and Tuck, 2010). The discourse and debate concerning the mission, the shape and scope of universities is currently relevant like in the past; therefore, it's not strange that universities and the public are often preoccupied with governance (Parker, 2002).

As Scott (1996) noted, the governance role involves acting as intermediary, balancing power between parts of a system (for example, between stakeholders and institution, or academics and managers),

negotiating and sometimes acting as arbiter between different interests. The role can be political and representative (on behalf of stakeholders). It may involve extensive fund-raising. In some cases, the role has shifted from being largely symbolic and ceremonial to being strategic and supervisory. The governance function, particularly at Board level, is increasingly one of 'steerage'.

Just as the term governance is subject to different interpretations, leadership is conceptualized in different ways. In this connection, Middlehurst (2010) points out the following three ways in which leadership is understood as:

- a role which is carried out formally by particular post-holders (Presidents, Directors, Deans and Heads of Department, etc.);
- a function that can be - and needs to be - performed at different levels in an institution, in both formal and informal contexts;
- a process of social influence that guides individuals and groups towards particular goals (organizational, professional, social, creative etc.).

The role of leadership is to assist the institution (and its particular parts) to identify and evaluate emerging realities, to assess the options available and to prepare strategies for moving towards one or more scenarios. At present, while there are many trends that are clear, there are also a series of unknown factors, for example, the social and political power of the university as an idea and an organizational reality (Sizer & Cannon 1999, Scott 1996, De Boer 1999). Middlehurst (2010) further emphasizes that leadership and governance are concerned with overall direction and strategy within a framework determined by regulatory requirements on the one hand and purpose, values, culture, history and mission on the other. In general, leadership and governance are crucial to addressing the new realities that may be emerging for higher education institutions.

Structure is important for establishing lines of communication, designating authority, and facilitating access, for example; but it has perhaps received too much attention in comparison to other important frameworks. As Riley & Baldrige (1977) noted, structures are as good as the people on them each year. Ironically, studies examining structure find that people, interpersonal dynamics, and culture affect governance processes most and can be related to efficiency, responsiveness, and participation—the very three issues that many campuses currently struggle with (for example, Cohen & March, 1986; Lee, 1991; Schuster *et. al.*, 1994). Moreover, structural variables explain few outcomes including effectiveness, implementation of policy, commonality of purpose, and the like.

2.2 Review of Empirical Studies

Issues related to leadership and governance were the focus of many studies in the 1960s and early 1970s. Researchers during this period attempted to delineate decision making bodies such as boards, presidents, colleges, departments programs and how much authority of each entity is possessed (Duryea, 1991; Gross & Grambasch, 1974). These studies identified the bureaucratic qualities of institutions and their salient features including chain of command, role differentiation, increasing number of policies, and systematizing of processes that were resulting from increased size and complexity (Mintzberg, 1979; Stroup, 1966). Additional scholars described the legal environment of governance, such as charters from states to institutions; federal, state, and local legislation that shapes academic governance; contractual arrangements and the like (Birnbaum, 1988; McGee, 1971).

Researchers demonstrated the usefulness of sub-units such as faculty senates, student governments, or campus councils as ways to distribute decision making effectively in complex organizations (Baldrige, 1971; Clark, 1963; Mintzberg, 1979). One major outcome of these early debates and scholarship was the 1966 statement on government of colleges and universities formed jointly by the American

Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards for Universities and Colleges. The intent of the statement was to clarify roles in campus governance among the Board, president, faculty, and students and illustrate mutual interdependence.

In the 1970s, governance studies explored the impact of increasingly larger campuses, decentralization, and diffuse authority on campus decision making. For example, Weick (1979) developed the concept of coupled dependency that showed decentralized decision-making structures as slower, less efficient processes, yet loosely interconnected allowing for innovation and flexibility. He used higher education as an example of organizations that had achieved a workable balance between decentralized and centralized authority and decision-making structures. These characteristics gave colleges and universities an advantage over tightly coupled institutions in their ability to respond to changes because the organization as a whole does not have to respond to the environment, instead individual units could react. Furthermore, these individual units were able to sense more detailed and nuanced changes in the environment than the institution as a whole.

The organizational scholarship of Mintzberg (1979) in the late 1970s confirmed Weick's findings arguing that the changes in the 1960s created a newly coined structure, the professionalized bureaucracy, in which democratic involvement disseminated power directly to professionals and created needed autonomy. Professional bureaucracies are able to organize large scale organizations, but to decentralize decisions to a large degree, as Mintzberg notes: "A single integrated pattern of decisions common to the entire organization loses a good deal of meaning within this structure" (p. 55). Although Mintzberg did not study only higher education institutions, his work was quickly utilized by higher education scholars since the organizational environments he studied, such as law and medicine, were closely aligned to higher education. Mortimer and McConnell (1979) also

studied the distribution of authority (or delegated authority) across institutional decision-making structures, but they were concerned that not enough mechanisms existed to ensure accountability. They wondered whether professionalism would facilitate appropriate decision making (yet they offered no empirical support for this contention).

Cohen and March (1986) produced another major study of presidential leadership and governance, arguing that the large size and complexity of campuses, diffusion of authority, and decentralization of governance made presidential leadership less influential than commonly thought. Within certain universities authority was so diffuse that it lessened the leader's ability to influence decision making and later, implementation. Cohen and March were among the first scholars to focus on communication, information channels, leadership, and other aspects of governance that had been ignored. Some scholars interpreted the study of Cohen and March as critiquing governance structures or suggesting they were not as effective as they should be (Kerr & Gade, 1986).

Scholars in the field suggest that the most important aspect in understanding governance systems is to examine organizational structures such as lines of authority, roles, procedures, and bodies responsible for decision making. For any governance process, a structural form can be designed and implemented to improve effectiveness and achieve ideal functioning. Scholars also study structure because they believe that it can be "managed" or altered more directly and because it influences social interaction, which can be more difficult to shape directly (Kezar and Eckel, 2004).

One of the first individuals to examine governance from a structural perspective was Clark Kerr (1963). The notion of Kerr is that the Multiversity was a structural description of the many changes that had occurred as a result of the increased federal and state support for higher education, trends toward massification, and the increasing number of constituents that had a stake in college and university

operations. Kerr wrote that “Flexner thought of a university as an ‘organism.’ In an organism, the parts and the whole are extricably bound together. Not so the multiversity—many parts can be added and subtracted with little effect on the whole or even little notice taken if any blood spilled. It is more a mechanism—a series of processes producing a series of results—a mechanism held together by administrative rules and powered by money” (p. 20). Clark’s mechanistic octopus that can lose limbs at will provides one of the first structural images of governance that began to characterize scholarship for decades. In addition to providing structural images of governance, Kerr and other scholars in the 1960s sought to understand how institutions could organize decision making on increasingly large campuses and determine whose voices should have authority in an environment where more people were demanding control (Dahl, 1962).

According to Keller (1983), studies in the 1970s signaled that higher education governance had lost its ability to be efficient, responsive, and effective as it grew increasingly complex over the 1950s through the 1970s. Several commentators noted that higher education was being scrutinized by legislators and the public who demanded greater standardization and centralization in addition to a more managerial approach (Fisher, 1984; Kerr & Gade, 1986; Mortimer & Mc-Connell, 1978). New governance structures were needed to organize the increased number of individuals included in governance and the diffusion of authority. After studying existing structures, Keller (1983) recommended a more efficient approach, which is labelled as Joint Big Decision Committees (JBDC). These new committees borrowed from a host of traditions: collegial structures that were representative across campus, a bureaucratic model that maintained highly structured roles and definitions of responsibilities, and a business model focusing on strategy, planning, and priority setting. The intent of the committee was to recentralize decision making and authority, in the hope that it would be more efficient, but maintain cross-campus input (Keller, 1983). Later studies of these committees found that many disbanded, others never got off the ground, and most did not work as hoped; the structures

were not more efficient, and campus members had less ownership of decisions (Yamada, 1991).

Another major study undertaken by Schuster *et. al.*, (1994) examined strategic governance or strategic planning councils (innovative structures like the JBDC). The study examined joint planning and governance structures that were purported to enhance institutional decisions and policy by being more responsive to the environment, could be created more quickly, and were effective in including strategic priorities. However, similar to Yamada's study of JBDC, strategic planning councils were not successful (Schuster *et. al.*, 1994). In fact, the findings illustrated that structure usually does not guarantee that the process will work (Schuster *et. al.*, 1994). Structural alterations allowed campuses to tinker with decision-making processes but did not address major challenges, such as developing expertise needed to address complex decisions, weighing the viability of policy, or examining how efficiency and effectiveness would be affected by implementation. As more campuses began to experiment with ways to reconfigure governance processes in the 1980s, a series of studies related to participation levels (still focused on ways structures facilitated involvement) in governance were conducted, since there was concern that new approaches threatened shared governance (Williams, *et. al.*, 1987).

Mortimer and McConnell (1978) identified the growth of external forces on internal campus governance, noting that "faculties are beginning to realize that senates are no help when the enemy is the legislature or the governor. Senates themselves probably cannot invent lobbying mechanisms to counteract these external forces" (p. 165). They critiqued the AAUP/ACE/AGB joint statement on college and university governance for excluding important external groups that had a major effect on operations. A small body of research has looked at the relationship between collective bargaining units and faculty senates (Kermerer & Baldrige, 1981). This is one of the only early studies to examine layers of governance empirically.

Birnbaum's five-year inquiry (1985 –1989) into college and university organization is the most extensive study of governance in the last thirty years. His work was the first to demonstrate the importance of cybernetics, a concept that emphasizes the need to recognize the linkages between various governance sub-units, and that highlights the important role systems play in institutional choices (1988, 1989). Regardless of institutional size, Birnbaum (1991) argued, campus governance had layers/sub-systems and was highly complex. A major assertion in his work is that campus governance systems are not efficient but highly effective, suggesting that efficiency and effectiveness may be antithetical when applied to campus governance.

The overlap of authority and roles, for example, although redundant, allowed for better decisions to emerge. Dual systems of authority that accommodate the differing perspectives of faculty and administrators are the key to effective governance in that they retain both educational values (faculty) and responsiveness (administrators) (Berdahl, 1991; Birnbaum, 1991). Increasing efficiency may jeopardize effectiveness. Structural clarification as suggested by researchers such as Keller (1983), Schuster and Miller (1989), Schuster, *et. al.* (1994), and Alpert (1986) is not helpful for effectiveness and, in fact, is potentially dangerous.

One well-publicized study by Benjamin and Carroll suggested that campus governance was wholly ineffective and inefficient because of its structure (1998). Recommendations for restructuring campus governance included clarifying priorities and developing university-wide evaluation criteria for decision making. Yet, the authors conceded that only the constituents themselves could develop an appropriate structure, so they left the actual system modification to campuses. Other critics cited earlier findings that few campuses actually practice shared governance (Baldrige, 1982; Mortimer & Mc-Connell, 1979). The Mortimer and McConnell (1978) study showed that shared governance was not common at community colleges and comprehensive institutions but existed at only a small number of research universities and liberal arts colleges. They noted that the

move to centralized authority and tempering of autonomy happened long ago.

Moreover, Mortimer and McConnell noted that structures needed to respect the size and culture of the particular campuses and that shared governance might not be appropriate in all environments. Even the most recent publications, such as Baldwin's and Leslie's article (2001), illustrate that researchers continue to believe in the power of structure for improving governance. Earlier studies of structure illustrated the importance of people to the process, yet the conceptual emphasis on structure limited the depth, accuracy, and the use of the above findings. In other words, since the scope of most studies was not to study people, it was not a major focus of the results or discussion. The first major study to focus on the human side of governance was *Power and Conflict in the University* (1971) by Baldrige. According to Riley & Baldrige (1977), people throughout the organization are central to the process, since influence and informal processes are seen as critical to the formation of policy. Policy emerges from interest groups, conflict, and values; they are embedded in people, not structures.

The key contribution of Baldrige's study was that it debunked the myth that colleges and universities are primarily rational decision-making bodies and that a formal process or structure determines how decisions are made. In fact, informal deal making was so prevalent in his case study that it would be hard to know when formal processes were responsible for a decision within governance. In his analysis, Baldrige noted that his study failed to consider the way institutional structure may channel political efforts; yet, in the final analysis, interpersonal relations rather than structure shape the process. In sum, although structure is important to the study of governance, there has been overemphasis on the theoretical approach and that other questions need to be pursued. Structure will overlap and inform many of the proposed areas of scholarship, for example, looking at reward structures when examining motivation to participate in governance through the human relations theories.

Issues of leadership, governance, and structure have also attracted the attention of researchers in our country. For instance, in his study that focuses on models of higher education governance, Mengistu (2018) described the Ethiopian higher education governance model in the last six decades as state-centered model. He also noted that HEIs lack the financial, personnel and substantive autonomy. Regardless of change in regimes, it did not show any significant changes to respond to changes in social demands and the government's own strategic goals. So, he recommended a significant structural change in the governance of the sub-sector. Based on their review of higher education governance policy that has been maintained in the last three governments in the country, Befekadu and Bultossa (2018) found that the Ethiopian higher education governance policy process seemed the mirror reflection of the respective governments' ideologies. Another research, which focuses on the status and challenges of Ethiopian higher education system and its contribution to development, further identified inadequate capacity, lack of transparency and participatory approach of the leadership and management at sector-level and in the HEIs to be among the major challenges of the higher education system (Teshome, 2004).

It can be understood from the foregoing review that most of the critiques have focused on theoretical approaches as one of the main vehicles for understanding leadership and governance systems. But, there may be other issues that affect our knowledge base. For example, there is a paucity of inductive studies that might develop new theoretical perspectives to understand leadership and governance systems in detail. Researchers underscore that we need to expand the theoretical perspectives used, in addition to using several approaches simultaneously. Furthermore, it should be noted that human, social cognition, and cultural theories should be used in combination with systems and structures to create a richer understanding of leadership and governance systems.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Approach and Design

Quantitative research approach was used to carry out the present study. This approach is selected to obtain relevant information related to the existing governance system and leadership practices in the public universities. More specifically, the study employed descriptive survey design coupled with qualitative data collection and analysis procedures so as to get the views and perceptions of the study participants in breadth and depth.

3.2 Data Sources

The required data for the study were obtained from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data were obtained from the sample university officials, academic and administrative staff, and students' representatives. The secondary sources were policy documents found in the sample institutions and Ministry of Education, books, journals and other relevant publications.

3.3 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

There were 33 universities in the country during the data collection time. Out of these, eight (Addis Ababa, Bahir Dar, Haromaya, Hawassa, Jimma, Mekele, Ambo, and Wollo Universities) were selected on the basis of stratified sampling technique (using their year of establishment, i.e. the first six from the first generation, and the last two from the second generation universities). As regards sampling of participants, the concerned officials in the sample universities (presidents/vice presidents) as well as students (members of the students' council in the sample universities) were purposefully included in the sample; whereas, sample academic and support staff were selected on the basis of proportionate stratified random sampling technique (using their employment status, sex, qualification, and rank). All in all, ten university officials, 1368 academic and support staff, and

40 students' representatives have participated in the study.

3.4 Data Collection Instruments

For the collection of the relevant data, questionnaire, interview, and FGD guides were used. That is, a questionnaire adopted from Allan Schofield (2009) was used to get relevant information from the academic and support staff. The closed ended questions in the questionnaire are designed in a form of five Point-Likert scale covering strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1). A reverse order is used for scoring negatively stated items. Series of interviews were also held with concerned officials (presidents and/or vice presidents) of the sample institutions. Moreover, eight FGDs were conducted with those key informants who represent the student body/ students' councils in the sample universities.

3.5 Data Analysis Methods

The collected quantitative data of the questionnaire were first entered into the computer using SPSS Version 20. Following this, the entered data were cleaned and then data analysis was made using mean, standard deviation, one-way ANOVA, and Tukey multiple comparison tests. The data obtained through open-ended items of the questionnaires, the interviews and FGDs were analyzed qualitatively after the recorded data were properly transcribed. The transcripts were then coded, thematically categorized and analyzed so as to find consistent and prominent themes that emerged from the analysis.

4. Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion

4.1. Respondents' Profile

The data regarding employment type of the respondents indicate that 72.5% were academic staff while 22.7% were administrative/support

staff. The remaining 4.7% did not mention their employment type. It should be noted here that such proportion may not reflect the actual proportion of the academic and administrative staff in the sample universities. As regards the gender mix of respondents, the data showed that 76.5% were males whereas 20.2% were females. This may reflect the lower proportion of female employees in the public universities.

4.2. Data Analyses on the Core Issues Related to Leadership and Governance

Structure has been the major emphasis in studies of leadership and governance during the last fifty years or so. Scholars suggest that the most important aspect in understanding leadership and governance is to examine organizational structures such as lines of authority, roles, procedures, and bodies responsible for decision making. In this connection, the first basic question of this research was framed as follows: How far does the existing structural set-up enable the public higher education institutions to play their roles in the realization of their major functions?

Three sub-questions were developed to properly address this basic question. The first sub-question focuses on the appropriateness of the existing structural set-up in enabling the different levels of the public universities to play their respective roles. In order to get the views of sample respondents on this issue, the following five items were included in the questionnaire:

- whether there are effective arrangements to ensure good standards of behavior by the university board and staff,
- whether there are effective arrangements for the university board to challenge key issues,
- whether the university board understands the institution's delegation arrangements,

- whether the senior management team understands the institution's delegation arrangements, and
- whether delegation arrangements in the university are appropriate.

The descriptive statistics for the appropriateness of the structural set-up of universities is presented in the following table.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for the appropriateness of structural set-up of universities

Universities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Jimma	192	3.22	.80484	1.20	5.00
Hawassa	267	2.76	.86194	1.00	5.00
Wollo	185	2.97	.79424	1.00	4.80
Mekele	97	3.21	.85851	1.60	5.00
Haromaya	179	2.81	.64602	1.20	4.80
Ambo	108	2.97	.81581	1.00	5.00
Bahir Dar	154	2.78	.93142	1.00	4.40
Addis Ababa	83	2.73	.74151	1.00	4.40
Total	1265	2.92	.83098	1.00	5.00

As can be seen from the table above, the overall mean score, i.e., 2.92 is below the agreement scale (4) and much further below the highest scale of agreement (5). This range is set based on the responses of the study groups to the five basic features of structural set-up on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

This result seems to indicate that the structural set-up of the sample universities is not appropriate/does not enable higher education institutions to accomplish their major functions. In other words, this

result seems to imply that the sample universities lack appropriate structural set-up that enhances the accomplishment of their major functions. The existing structure could not bring about effectiveness and efficiency in the performance of the institutions.

Table 2: One-Way ANOVA for the appropriateness structural set-up of universities

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares		Mean Square	F	P
Between Groups	41.330	7	5.904	8.926**	.000
Within Groups	831.493	1257	.661		
Total	872.823	1264			

**P < 0.01

In order to compare the means of respondents in the sample universities and determine whether or not there exist significant differences between the mean scores, One-Way ANOVA was computed. As shown in Table 2, the results of analysis of variance revealed the existence of statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the respondents in the sample universities with regard to the appropriateness of the structural set-up of universities to accomplish their major functions, $F(7, 1257) = 8.926$, $P < 0.01$. Post Hoc test was necessary to identify the sample universities that contributed to these differences. Accordingly, Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison test was computed.

The post hoc test revealed the presence of statistically significant mean differences between Jimma university and the other sample universities except Mekele, Ambo and Wollo universities; between Mekele university and the other sample universities except Ambo and Wollo universities (mean difference = 1.09, $P < 0.05$) indicating that the structural set-up of the four universities was found to be more

appropriate than the other universities to accomplish their major functions. Apart from this, no other comparison was significant at the 0.01 alpha level (See Annex 1 for details). The overall appropriateness of the existing structural set-up of the universities was considered questionable and problematic in terms of enabling different role players, though differences were observed across the universities.

The participants involved in the interviews and focus group discussions shared their views and experiences in their respective universities. Students' representatives of one of the sample universities expressed their expectations in association with what learners and teachers deserve from the structures and the leadership. They emphasized that it is imperative to ensure the curriculum is relevant and students complete all planned contents before graduation. The students need to be actively engaged in university activities. The actual practices in the universities, however, appear different. The university structures are one of their serious concerns from the point of view of their functioning.

An official from one of the sample universities also has the following to say regarding practices observed in his university.

The existing structural set-up and governance system of our university is better than the previous one although there is still a need for more flexible structure. All colleges have financial autonomy. This service will also be decentralized to the department level in the near future. Students' services are relatively in a good condition but we still need to do more to make the services more effective and efficient. There still is a need for more human and other resources to enhance efficiency, effectiveness, communication and collaboration among academic units and support services.

Another official also indicates both the strengths and weaknesses related to the structural set-up and governance system and its implications. In the words of the official, *"the existing structure has a*

gap. It does not allow control over research activities compared to teaching activities”.

The second sub-question was related to whether or not the roles and responsibilities of incumbents in the sample universities are clearly delineated. Accordingly, the following ten items were presented to the respondents so they express their level of agreement to each:

- The university board's primary statement of responsibility accurately identifies its key responsibilities.
- The academic values the institution expects its staff to demonstrate are clearly set out.
- I am clear about the individual roles and responsibilities of members of the university board.
- I am clear about the role of the university board in appointing a head of the institution.
- There are clear roles and responsibilities for the vice presidents, college deans, associate deans and department heads.
- The university board takes the responsibility for key decisions.
- The president takes the responsibility for key decisions.
- The vice presidents take the responsibility for key decisions.
- The deans take the responsibility for key decisions.
- The department heads take the responsibility for key decisions.

The following table provides the descriptive statistics for the delineation of clear roles and responsibilities for the incumbents in the universities.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for the delineation of clear roles and responsibilities of the incumbents

Universities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Jimma	193	3.39	.73598	1.40	5.00
Hawassa	251	3.17	.80026	1.00	5.00
Wollo	186	3.24	.74927	1.00	4.70
Mekele	99	3.35	.78562	1.70	5.00
Haromaya	173	2.86	.65772	1.30	4.90
Ambo	104	3.15	.78863	1.40	5.00
Bahir Dar	149	3.00	.83503	1.00	4.80
Addis Ababa	78	2.91	.80804	1.00	4.30
Total	1233	3.15	.78484	1.00	5.00

As seen from the data in Table 3, the overall mean score, i.e. 3.15, is below the agree level (4) and far below the strongly agree level (5). This result seems to imply that the roles and responsibilities of the incumbents at the various levels of the sample universities are not clearly delineated and hence the incumbents were not able to accomplish their respective duties as expected for there was a visible duplication of efforts.

Table 4: One-Way ANOVA for the delineation of clear roles and responsibilities of the incumbents

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Between Groups	38.488	7	5.498	9.350**	.000
Within Groups	720.386	1225	.588		
Total	758.874	1232			

**P < 0.01

As shown in Table 4, the results of analysis of variance revealed the existence of statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the respondents in the sample universities with regard to their ratings to the delineation of clear roles and responsibilities for the incumbents in the universities, $F(7, 1225) = 9.350, P < 0.01$. Post Hoc test was necessary to identify the sample universities that contributed to these differences. Accordingly, Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison test was computed.

The test revealed the existence of statistically significant mean differences between Jimma University and the other sample universities with the exception of Wollo, Mekele and Ambo Universities. Besides, there was statistically significant mean differences between Mekele University and Haromaya, Bahir Dar, Addis Ababa, Jimma and Hawassa Universities which indicates that the roles and responsibilities of the incumbents in Jimma, Mekele, Ambo, and Wollo Universities were delineated in a relatively better way than the other universities. This may also imply that the incumbents in these four universities were able to accomplish their major functions. Apart from this, no other comparison was significant at the 0.01 alpha level (See Annex 2 for details). Except the relative difference which is significant in some cases, the universities showed general agreement on the prevalence of lack of clarity of incumbents' roles.

The third sub-question ponders over the extent to which the working relationships between and among the various levels of the universities were constructive/productive. To this end, the following three items were included in the questionnaire.

- There are constructive/productive working relationships between the university management and colleges,
- There are constructive/productive working relationships between and among colleges, and
- There are constructive/productive working relationships

between colleges and departments.

The descriptive statistics for the status of working relationships that exist between and among incumbents at the various levels of the sample universities is presented in the following table.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for status of working relationships

Universities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Jimma	207	3.450	.88718	1.00	5.00
Hawassa	271	2.936	.98215	1.00	5.00
Wollo	196	3.251	.91404	1.00	5.00
Mekele	102	3.281	.96899	1.00	5.00
Haromaya	182	2.866	.81413	1.00	5.00
Ambo	113	3.333	.91178	1.00	5.00
Bahir Dar	155	3.150	.98414	1.00	5.00
Addis Ababa	90	2.785	1.09283	1.00	5.00
Total	1316	3.13	.96071	1.00	5.00

As seen from the table above, the overall mean score, i.e. 3.13 is far below the strong agreement scale (5). This result indicates that the working relationships that exist between and among incumbents at the various levels of the sample universities (between the university top management and college deans, between and among college deans, as well as between college deans and department chairpersons) were not productive at the required level. Such working relationships may negatively affect the smooth functioning as well as accomplishment of the institutions' major functions.

Table 6: One-Way ANOVA for status of working relationships

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Between Groups	64.833	7	9.262		.000
Within Groups	1148.860	1308	.878	10.545**	
Total	1213.694	1315			

**P < 0.01

As shown in Table 6 above, the results of analysis of variance revealed the existence of statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the respondents in the sample universities with regard to their ratings to the status of working relationships that exist between and among the incumbents at various levels in the universities, $F(7, 1308) = 10.545$, $P < 0.01$. Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison test was computed to identify the sample universities that contributed to these differences. Results revealed the presence of statistically significant mean differences between Jimma University and the other sample universities except Wollo, Mekele, and Ambo Universities.

This may indicate that the working relationships between and among the incumbents at various levels of the aforementioned four universities are more constructive than the other universities to accomplish their major functions. Apart from this, no other comparison was significant at the 0.01 alpha level (See Annex 3 for details). With the exception of variations in rating the degree of influence of working relations on the staff productiveness, the universities were similar in considering working relationships as problematic.

The extent of stakeholders' participation in important affairs of universities is among other conditions that indicate effectiveness of higher education leadership and governance system. This is

demonstrated by the role the university board and the management play in ensuring diverse representation of staff, students and external stakeholders in the university decision making bodies. The practice of considering suggestions from external stakeholders (e.g. local community), the arrangements made to consult with staff, building staff confidence in the university management and the board and the extent to which academic values are promoted are also considered in this regard. These situations describe the overall effectiveness of the university management and the board as well as the efforts made to enhance the strategic outcome of higher education institutions.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics for stakeholders' participation

Universities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Jimma	197	3.05	.84	1.00	5.00
Hawassa	261	2.68	.83	1.00	5.00
Wollo	179	2.79	.76	1.00	4.27
Mekele	93	3.06	.80	1.00	5.00
Haromaya	173	2.68	.62	1.00	4.64
Ambo	101	2.82	.77	1.00	4.64
Bahir Dar	141	2.75	.75	1.00	4.64
Addis Ababa	74	2.49	.59	1.18	4.00
Total	1219	2.79	.78	1.00	5.00

As it can be observed from the data in Table 7, some universities, for instance, Mekele University and Jimma University showed higher mean scores of 3.06 and 3.05 respectively followed by Ambo University with a mean score of 2.82 which is relatively higher than the remaining five universities. The rest of the universities namely, Wollo ($\bar{x} = 2.79$), Bahir Dar ($\bar{x} = 2.75$), both Haromaya and Hawassa Universities ($\bar{x} = 2.68$), and Addis Ababa university ($\bar{x} = 2.49$) showed closely related performance regarding stakeholders' participation and empowerment factor.

Table 8: One-Way ANOVA for stakeholders' participation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Between Groups	32.321	7	4.617	7.880**	.000
Within Groups	709.580	1211	.586		
Total	741.901	1218			

**P < 0.01

Comparison of the eight universities based on the mean scores obtained in the stakeholders' (staff, students and external stakeholders such as government and industries/employers) participation revealed that Mekele University and Jimma university demonstrated significantly higher mean scores ($F=7.880$; $p= 000$) compared to the rest of the universities involved in the study (Table 7). This shows that the two universities performed significantly better than others in leadership and governance of their respective universities. On the other hand, although with some mean differences in scores among them, the leadership and governance system in the remaining five universities showed significantly lower performance regarding staff participation and empowerment which are demonstrated in diverse representation of staff, students and external stakeholders in the university decision making bodies.

Student representatives involved in the study shared their views regarding the extent to which they participate in university affairs. The views expressed by students show that these are among their concerns. In the words of the students, "*There is lack of transparency and accountability and students do not have confidence in the university management and its functions*". The participants identified some illustrations that explain the situation.

The management does not let the students know rules and regulations of the university in general and students' rights and duties in particular. There is lack of clear guidelines. The management is unresponsive to the students' questions ...Basic services in the areas of education/learning, health, housing/dormitories, and food are unsatisfactory and yet untimely. There is no chance for the students to be heard.

The third basic question of the study pertains to the major structure-related challenges public universities encounter in the realization of their major functions. In the questionnaire 15 challenges were listed out of which the following five were selected for this basic question.

- Lack of good governance structures and procedures for effective implementation of the institution's strategic plan;
- Inadequate management capacity of university leaders;
- University leaders' poor understanding of their responsibility;
- Failure to empower middle and low-level management; and
- Lack of proper leadership for effective implementation of the institution's strategic plan.

The following table depicts the descriptive statistics for the major structure-related challenges the public universities encounter with regard to the realization of their major functions.

Table 9: Descriptive statistics for the major structure-related challenges

Universities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Jimma	197	3.23	.99729	1.00	5.00
Hawassa	265	3.69	.93875	1.00	5.00
Wollo	192	3.28	.99914	1.00	5.00
Mekele	97	3.40	.90692	1.00	5.00
Haromaya	174	3.56	.71511	1.40	5.00
Ambo	96	3.36	.99311	1.00	5.00
Bahir Dar	153	3.56	.92907	1.20	5.00
Addis Ababa	83	3.73	.88139	1.20	5.00
Total	1257	3.48	.94249	1.00	5.00

As seen from Table 9 above, the overall mean score, i.e., 3.48 is far below the strong agreement scale (5). This result indicates that the governance and leadership system of the universities is entangled with major structure-related challenges, which may negatively affect the accomplishment of the institutions' major functions.

Table 10: One-Way ANOVA for the major structure-related challenges

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Between Groups	41.396	7	5.914		.000
Within Groups	1074.288	1249	.860	6.875**	
Total	1115.684	1256			

**P < 0.01

As shown in Table 10, the results of analysis of variance revealed the existence of statistically significant differences between the mean

scores of the respondents in the sample universities with regard to their ratings of major structure-related challenges, $F(7, 1249) = 6.875$, $P < 0.01$. Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison test was computed to identify the sample universities that contributed to these differences. Accordingly, the test result revealed the presence of statistically significant mean differences between Jimma University and the other sample universities (Hawassa, Haromaya, Bahir Dar, and Addis Ababa Universities). This may indicate that the major structure-related challenges in the aforementioned four universities are more visible than the other universities in the accomplishment of their major functions. Apart from this, no other comparison was significant at the 0.01 alpha level (See Annex 4 for details). The challenges appear apparent in all universities, but with difference in degree of manifestations.

The issues of structure and leadership are interwoven. Both are meant to facilitate effective functioning and delivery of quality and timely services in an efficient manner. The qualitative data obtained from the study participants indicate diverse problems along this line. In quite many cases, the existing structures have functional problems. Structures differ across universities. Presidents and vice-presidents of some universities have special assistants whereas others do not. More importantly, the problems are more serious with incumbents than the structures. In the words of one of the officials, *“Enabling structures are in place; however, performance in the existing structure has not been effective and efficient”*. The management system is more of bureaucratic than efficient. In other cases, there are clear deficiencies in the structures that do not enable addressing newly emerging tasks that do not fit into the existing structure. The fact that the Civil Service Commission does not allow making adjustments on time is often mentioned as bottleneck to addressing the problem.

5. Major Findings and Concluding Remarks

5.1. Major Findings

From the analyses of the quantitative as well as the qualitative data, the following major findings and conclusions have emerged.

- The existing structural set-up of the public universities was found to be inappropriate and does not enhance the accomplishment of the institutions' major functions (teaching-learning, research, community services, and technology transfer). It could not bring about effectiveness and efficiency in the performance of the institutions.
- The roles and responsibilities of the incumbents at the various levels of the sample universities were not clearly delineated and hence the incumbents were unable to accomplish their respective duties as expected since there was a visible duplication of efforts.
- The working relationships that exist between and among incumbents at the various levels of the sample universities (between the top management and college deans, between and among college deans, as well as between college deans and department chairpersons) were found to be less encouraging for meaningful engagement of the major actors in university affairs. Such working relationships may negatively affect the smooth functioning as well as accomplishment of the institutions' major functions.
- The leadership and governance system in most of the sample universities showed significantly lower performance regarding stakeholders' participation which is demonstrated by diverse representation of staff, students and external stakeholders in the university decision making bodies.
- The most frequently mentioned structure-related problems are:

a) incidence of leadership instability, b) less attention given to preparing substitute leaders, c) absence of transparent and participatory culture, d) the mismatch between expansion works and the capacity of the universities, and e) undue interference (too much control) from the regulatory bodies to the extent that institutions are not able to use their internal income for their initiatives.

5.2. *Concluding Remarks*

Effectiveness of higher education leadership and governance, among other conditions, is explained by the existence of decentralized management and institutional autonomy, meaningful participation of stakeholders in important affairs of the institutions, and the types and magnitude of challenges experienced by the institutions. Results of this study have shown that performance of most of the sample universities, with the exception of Mekele and Jimma, was poor. The perceived poor performance clearly shows that there are problems in quality of leadership and good governance in the universities. Hence, it is suggested that universities closely look into and improve their leadership and governance system with a focus on developing transparent and participatory culture in the institutions, devising a mechanism whereby leadership stability prevails in the institutions, ensuring academic freedom of HEIs, putting in place a decentralized management and institutional autonomy, introducing merit-based appointment of university leaders, and encouraging stakeholders' participation in important affairs of the institutions. Revisiting and clearly demarcating the role of universities and the regulatory bodies would also help alleviate the bottlenecks of the universities. In general, it is important that the HEIs give due attention to addressing the major challenges that negatively affect their performance.

References

- Allan Schofield (2009). **What is an Effective and High Governing Body in UK Higher Education?** London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Alpert, D. (1986). *Performance and paralysis: The organizational context of the American research university*. **Journal of Higher Education**, 56(3): 241-81.
- Altbach, P., Gumport, P., & Johnstone, B. (2001). **In defense of American higher education**. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Baldrige, J. (1971). **Power and conflict in the university**. New York: John Wiley.
- Baldrige, J. (1982). Shared governance: A fable about the lost magic kingdom. *Academe*, January-February, 12–15.
- Baldwin, R., & Leslie, D. (2001). *Rethinking the structure of shared governance*. **Peer Review**, 3(3), 18–19.
- Befekadu, Z. and Bultossa, H. (2018). *The dynamics of higher education governance policy process in Ethiopia*. **The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education**, 5(2) 1–28.
- Benjamin, R., & Carroll, S. (1998). *The implications of the changes in environment for governance in higher education*. In **W. Tierney (Ed.), The responsive university** (pp. 92–119). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Berdahl, R. O. (1991). *Shared academic governance and external constraints*. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffed, & T. H. White (Eds.), **Organization and academic governance in higher education** (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA.: Ginned Press.

- Birnbaum, R. (1988). **How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Birnbaum, R. (1989). *The cybernetic institution: Toward an integration of governance theories*. **Higher Education**, 18, 239–253.
- Birnbaum, R. (1991). *The latent organizational functions of the academic senate: Why senates do not work but will not go away*. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffed, & T. H. White (Eds.), **Organization and academic governance in higher education** (4th ed., pp. 195–207). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). **Rearming organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carlisle, B., & Miller, M. (1998). **Current trends and issues in the practice of faculty participation in academic governance**. ED423758
- Carnegie, G.D. (2009), “*the ABC of university governance*”, **Campus Review**, 19 (9), 8
- Carnegie, G.D. and Tuck J. (2010), “*The ABC of university governance*”, **The Australian Journal of Public Administration**, 69 (4), 431–441
- Chait, R., Holland, T., & Taylor, B. (1996). **Improving the performance of governing boards**. Washington, DC: ACE/ORYX.
- Clark, B. (1963). *Faculty organization and authority*. In T. Lansford (Ed.), **The study of academic administration**. Boulder, CO: WICHE.

- Clark, B. (1998). **Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation.** Tarrytown, NY: Pergamino.
- Cohen M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). **Leadership and ambiguity** (2nd ed., 1974 original). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Dahl, R. (1962) **Who Governs?** New Haven: Yale University Press.
- De Boer, H.F. (1999). *Changes in Institutional Governance Structures: The Dutch Case.* In Brennan et. al. (eds.) **What Kind of University? International Perspectives on Knowledge, Participation and Governance.** Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Dill, D. D., & Helm, K. P. (1988). *Faculty participation in policy making.* In J. Smart (Ed.), **Higher education: Handbook of theory and research** (Vol. 4). New York: Agathon.
- Dimond, J. (1991). *Faculty participation in institutional budgeting.* In R. Birnbaum (Ed.), **Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making** (pp. 63 – 78), New Directions for Higher Education, No. 75. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Drummond, M., & Reitsch, A. (1995). *The relationship between shared academic governance models and faculty and administrator attitudes.* **Journal for Higher Education Management**, 11, 1. EJ518196
- Duryea, E. (1991). *Evolution of university organization.* In M. Peterson (Ed.), **ASHE reader on organization and governance in higher education** (pp. 3 –15), Needham Heights, MA: Ginned Press.

- Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). ***En route to transformation. On Change: Occasional Paper***, No. 1. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Eckel, P. (2003). **Changing course: Making the hard decisions to eliminate academic programs**. Westport CT: Greenwood/Praeger.
- Eckel, P. D. (2000). *The role of shared governance in institutional hard decisions: Enabler or antagonist?* **Review of Higher Education**, 24, 15–39.
- Fairweather, J. (1996). **Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academia**.
- Des Moines, IA: Longwood. ED393363 Finkelstein, M., Seal, M., & Schuster, J. (1999). *New entrants to the full-time faculty of higher education institutions*. **Education Statistics Quarterly**, 1(4), 78–80.
- Fischer, F. (1984). **Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices**. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Gertrude Zziwa, (2014). *Does the Organizational Structure Affect the Management of Universities in Uganda? An Empirical Analysis*. **International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies**, Vol.6 (8).
- Gilmour, J. (1991). *Participative governance bodies in higher education: Report of a national study*. In R. Birnbaum (Ed), **Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making** (pp. 27– 40), New Directions for Higher Education, No. 75. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Goddard, A.R. (2005), "Accounting and NPM in UK local government – contributions toward governance and accountability" **Financial Accountability & Management**, Vol. 21 No. 2, May, pp. 267-424
- Goodman, P. (1962). **The community of scholars**. New York: Random House.
- Gross, E., & Grambasch, P. (1974). **Changes in university organization, 1964–1971**. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gumport, P. (2000). **Academic governance: New light on old issues**. Washington, DC: AGB Occasional Paper.
- Gumport, P., & Dauberman, J. (1999). *Managing for legitimacy: President's perspectives within public higher education*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education annual conference, November 18–21.
- Gumport, P., & Pusser, B. (1999). *University restructuring: The role of economic and political contexts*. In J. Smart (Ed.), **Higher education: Handbook of theory and research** (Vol. 14, pp. 146–200) New York: Agathon.
- Hardy, C. (1990). *Putting power into university academic governance*. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), **Higher education: Handbook of theory and research**. (Vol. 6). New York: Agathon.
- Ian O'Brian Austin (2009). *Understanding Higher Education Governance Restructuring: The Case of the University of the West Indies* (PhD dissertation).
- Keller, G. (1983). *Shaping an academic strategy*. In G. Keller (Ed.), **Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education**. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Kermerer, F., & Baldrige, J. V. (1981). *Senates and unions: Unexpected peaceful coexistence*. **Journal of Higher Education**, 52(3), 256–264.
- Kerr, C. (1963). **The uses of the university**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kerr, C., & Gade, M. (1986). **The many faces of the presidency**. Washington, DC: Association for Governing Boards.
- Kezar, A. (2000). **ERIC trends**. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. www.eriche.org.
- Kezar A., & El-Khawas, E. (in press). *Using the performance dimension: Converging paths for external accountability?* In H. Eggins (Ed.), **Higher education reform**. London: Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Kezar, A. and Eckel, P. D. (2004) *Meeting Today's Governance Challenges: A Synthesis of the Literature and Examination of a Future Agenda for Scholarship*. **The Journal of Higher Education**, Vol. 75 (4), 371-399.
- Kissler, G. (1997). *Who decides which budgets to cut?* **The Journal of Higher Education**, 68, 427–459.
- Lee, B. (1991). *Campus leaders and campus senates*. In R. Birnbaum (Ed.), **Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making** (pp.41–62). *New Directions for Higher Education*, No. 75. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Leslie, D., & Fretwell, L. (1996). **Wise moves in hard times**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Lucianelli G.(2013). *University Governance at the Crossroads: The Italian Case*. **International Journal of Business Research and Development**, 2 (2), 20-34.
- March, J. G. (1981). *Decision-making perspective*. In A. H. Van de Ven & W. F. Joyce (Eds.), **Perspectives on organization design and behavior** (pp. 205–248). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1986). **Organizations** (2nd ed.). London: Blackwell Business.
- McGee, R. (1971). **Academic Janus: The Private College and Its Faculty**. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.
- Mengistu, H. (2018). *Models of higher education governance: rethinking the Ethiopian experience*. **The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education**, 5(1) 31–56.
- Middlehurst R. (1993). **Leading Academics**. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press
- Middlehurst, R. (2010). **New Realities for Leadership and Governance in Higher Education**. Guildford: Centre for Continuing Education, School of Educational Studies, University of Surrey, U.K.
- Millett, J. (1962). **The academic community**. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). **The professional bureaucracy**. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Morgan, G. (1986). **Images of organization**. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Mortimer, K. P. & McConnell, T. R. (1978). **Sharing Authority Effectively: Participation, Interaction, and Discretion**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Parker, L.D. (2002), “*Budgetary Incrementalism in a Christian bureaucracy*”, **Management Accounting Research**, 13, 71–100
- Peterson, M., & White, T. (1992). *Faculty and administrator perceptions of their environments: Different views of different models of organization*. **Research in Higher Education**, 33(2), 177–204.
- Phillip M. M., James E. O.II, Paul F. B., and Jerono P. R. (2014). *The Need for a Conceptual Framework for Leadership and Shared Governance between Faculty and Administrators*. **International journal of Process Education**, 6 (1).
- Pope, M., & Miller, T. (1999). **A national profile of faculty governance leaders in higher education**. ED 429490.
- Reyes, P., & Smith, G. (1987). *Faculty and academic staff participation in academic governance: The social contract model*. Paper presented at the ASHE annual meeting in San Diego, Feb. 13–17.
- Riley, G., & Baldrige, J. V. (Eds.). (1977). **Governing academic organizations: new problems and perspectives**. New York: McCutchan.
- Rhoades, G. (1995). *Rethinking and restructuring universities*. **Journal of Higher Education Management**, 10(2) 17–23.
- Schuster, J., & Miller, L. (1989). **Governing tomorrow’s campus: Perspectives and agendas**. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

- Schuster, J., Smith, D., Corak, K., & Yamada, M. (1994). **Strategic academic governance: How to make big decisions better**. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.
- Scott, P. (1996). **Governing Universities: Changing the Culture?** Buckingham: SRHE/University Press.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sizer, J. & Cannon, S. (1999). Autonomy, Governance and Accountability. In Brennan *et. al.* (eds.), *What Kind of University? International Perspectives on Knowledge, Participation and Governance*. Buckingham, SHRE/Open University Press, 193- 202.
- Sporn, B. (1999). *Responsive university structures: An analysis of adaptation to socioeconomic environments of US and European universities*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Stroup, H. (1966). *Bureaucracy in higher education*. New York: Free Press.
- Teshome, Y. (2004). The status and challenges of Ethiopian higher education system and its contribution to development. *The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education*, 1(1) 1–19.
- Weick, K. (1979). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1–19.
- Williams, D., Gore, W., Broches, C., & Lostski, C. (1987). One faculty's perception of its academic governance role. *Journal of Higher Education*, 58 (6).

Yamada. M. (1991). Joint big decision committees and university governance. In R. Birnbaum (Ed.), *Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making* (pp. 79–96), New Directions for Higher Education, No. 75. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Office of the Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer, Addis Ababa University, for its financial support. The Institute of Educational Research, Addis Ababa University also deserves our appreciation for its close follow up and sustained support in facilitating the administrative and logistics requirements needed in due course of the research undertaking. Moreover, the authors owe special gratitude to all research participants for their cooperation in providing the required information reflected in all sections of this research report.

Annex 1: Multiple Comparison test for the appropriateness of structural set-up of sample universities

(I) University	(J) University	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Jimma University	Hawassa	.46474*	.000
	Wollo University	.25006	.058
	Mekele University	.01361	1.000
	Haromaya University	.40638*	.000
	Ambo University	.25127	.168
	Bahir Dar University	.44057*	.000
	Addis Ababa University	.49208*	.000
Hawassa	Jimma University	-.46474*	.000
	Wollo University	-.21467	.106
	Mekele University	-.45113*	.000
	Haromaya University	-.05835	.996
	Ambo University	-.21346	.293
	Bahir Dar University	-.02416	1.000
	Addis Ababa University	.02735	1.000
Wollo University	Jimma University	-.25006	.058
	Hawassa	.21467	.106
	Mekele University	-.23646	.284
	Haromaya University	.15632	.597
	Ambo University	.00121	1.000
	Bahir Dar University	.19051	.385

	Addis Ababa University	.24202	.321
	Jimma University	-.01361	1.000
	Hawassa	.45113*	.000
	Wollo University	.23646	.284
Mekele University	Haromaya University	.39278*	.003
	Ambo University	.23767	.423
	Bahir Dar University	.42696*	.001
	Addis Ababa University	.47847*	.002
	Jimma University	-.40638*	.000
	Hawassa	.05835	.996
	Wollo University	-.15632	.597
Haromaya University	Mekele University	-.39278*	.003
	Ambo University	-.15511	.771
	Bahir Dar University	.03419	1.000
	Addis Ababa University	.08570	.993
Ambo University	Jimma University	-.25127	.168

	Hawassa	.21346	.293
	Wollo University	-.00121	1.000
	Mekele University	-.23767	.423
	Haromaya University	.15511	.771
	Bahir Dar University	.18930	.583
	Addis Ababa University	.24081	.463
	Jimma University	-.44057*	.000
	Hawassa	.02416	1.000
	Wollo University	-.19051	.385
Bahir Dar University	Mekele University	-.42696*	.001
	Haromaya University	-.03419	1.000
	Ambo University	-.18930	.583
	Addis Ababa University	.05151	1.000
	Jimma University	-.49208*	.000
	Hawassa	-.02735	1.000
	Wollo University	-.24202	.321
Addis Ababa University	Mekele University	-.47847*	.002
	Haromaya University	-.08570	.993
	Ambo University	-.24081	.463
	Bahir Dar University	-.05151	1.000

Annex 2: Multiple Comparison test for the delineation of clear roles and responsibilities to incumbents

(I) University	(J) University	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Jimma University	Hawassa	.21753	.07342	.062
	Wollo University	.15147	.07880	.536
	Mekele University	.04418	.09480	1.000
	Haromaya University	.52721*	.08029	.000
	Ambo University	.24252	.09328	.157
	Bahir Dar University	.38561*	.08363	.000
	Addis Ababa University	.48194*	.10289	.000
Hawassa	Jimma University	-.21753	.07342	.062
	Wollo University	-.06606	.07419	.987
	Mekele University	-.17334	.09101	.548
	Haromaya University	.30968*	.07578	.001
	Ambo University	.02500	.08943	1.000
Wollo University	Bahir Dar University	.16808	.07931	.403
	Addis Ababa University	.26442	.09941	.136
	Jimma University	-.15147	.07880	.536

	Hawassa	.06606	.07419	.987
	Mekele University	-.10728	.09540	.952
	Haromaya University	.37574*	.08100	.000
	Ambo University	.09106	.09389	.979
	Bahir Dar University	.23415	.08431	.102
	Addis Ababa University	.33048*	.10345	.031
	Jimma University	-.04418	.09480	1.000
	Hawassa	.17334	.09101	.548
	Wollo University	.10728	.09540	.952
Mekele University	Haromaya University	.48303*	.09664	.000
	Ambo University	.19834	.10768	.591
	Bahir Dar University	.34143*	.09943	.014
	Addis Ababa University	.43776*	.11610	.004
	Jimma University	-.52721*	.08029	.000
	Hawassa	-.30968*	.07578	.001
	Wollo University	-.37574*	.08100	.000
Haromaya University	Mekele University	-.48303*	.09664	.000
	Ambo University	-.28469	.09515	.057
	Bahir Dar University	-.14160	.08571	.718
	Addis Ababa University	-.04526	.10459	1.000
	Jimma University	-.24252	.09328	.157
	Hawassa	-.02500	.08943	1.000
	Wollo University	-.09106	.09389	.979
Ambo University	Mekele University	-.19834	.10768	.591
	Haromaya	.28469	.09515	.057

	University			
	Bahir Dar University	.14309	.09799	.828
	Addis Ababa	.23942	.11486	.426
	University			
	Jimma University	-.38561*	.08363	.000
	Hawassa	-.16808	.07931	.403
	Wollo University	-.23415	.08431	.102
Bahir Dar University	Mekele University	-.34143*	.09943	.014
	Haromaya	.14160	.08571	.718
	University			
	Ambo University	-.14309	.09799	.828
	Addis Ababa	.09633	.10717	.986
	University			
	Jimma University	-.48194*	.10289	.000
	Hawassa	-.26442	.09941	.136
	Wollo University	-.33048*	.10345	.031
Addis Ababa University	Mekele University	-.43776*	.11610	.004
	Haromaya	.04526	.10459	1.000
	University			
	Ambo University	-.23942	.11486	.426
	Bahir Dar University	-.09633	.10717	.986

Annex 3: Multiple Comparison test for the state of working relationships in the universities

(I) University	(J) University	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Jimma University	Hawassa	.51485*	.08651	.000
	Wollo University	.19918	.09340	.394
	Mekele University	.16984	.11338	.809
	Haromaya University	.58459*	.09523	.000
	Ambo University	.11755	.10962	.962
	Bahir Dar University	.30035	.09955	.053
	Addis Ababa University	.66570*	.11833	.000
Hawassa	Jimma University	-.51485*	.08651	.000
	Wollo University	-.31566*	.08788	.008
	Mekele University	-.34501*	.10887	.034
	Haromaya University	.06974	.08982	.994
	Ambo University	-.39729*	.10495	.004
	Bahir Dar University	-.21450	.09438	.310
	Addis Ababa University	.15085	.11402	.890
Wollo University	Jimma University	-.19918	.09340	.394
	Hawassa	.31566*	.08788	.008
	Mekele University	-.02935	.11442	1.000
	Haromaya University	.38540*	.09647	.002
	Ambo University	-.08163	.11070	.996
	Bahir Dar University	.10116	.10074	.974

	Addis Ababa University	.46652*	.11933	.002
	Jimma University	-.16984	.11338	.809
	Hawassa	.34501*	.10887	.034
	Wollo University	.02935	.11442	1.000
Mekele University	Haromaya University	.41475*	.11592	.009
	Ambo University	-.05229	.12800	1.000
	Bahir Dar University	.13051	.11949	.959
	Addis Ababa University	.49586*	.13554	.006
	Jimma University	-.58459*	.09523	.000
	Hawassa	-.06974	.08982	.994
	Wollo University	-.38540*	.09647	.002
Haromaya University	Mekele University	-.41475*	.11592	.009
	Ambo University	-.46703*	.11224	.001
	Bahir Dar University	-.28424	.10243	.102
	Addis Ababa University	.08112	.12077	.998
	Jimma University	-.11755	.10962	.962
Ambo University	Hawassa	.39729*	.10495	.004

	Wollo University	.08163	.11070	.996
	Mekele University	.05229	.12800	1.000
	Haromaya University	.46703*	.11224	.001
	Bahir Dar University	.18280	.11593	.764
	Addis Ababa University	.54815*	.13241	.001
	Jimma University	-.30035	.09955	.053
	Hawassa	.21450	.09438	.310
	Wollo University	-.10116	.10074	.974
Bahir Dar University	Mekele University	-.13051	.11949	.959
	Haromaya University	.28424	.10243	.102
	Ambo University	-.18280	.11593	.764
	Addis Ababa University	.36535	.12420	.065
	Jimma University	-.66570*	.11833	.000
	Hawassa	-.15085	.11402	.890
	Wollo University	-.46652*	.11933	.002
Addis Ababa University	Mekele University	-.49586*	.13554	.006
	Haromaya University	-.08112	.12077	.998
	Ambo University	-.54815*	.13241	.001
	Bahir Dar University	-.36535	.12420	.065

Annex 4: Multiple Comparison test for the structure related challenges

(I) University	(J) University	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Jimma University	Hawassa	-.46766*	.08725	.000
	Wollo University	-.05392	.09405	.999
	Mekele University	-.16954	.11504	.821
	Haromaya University	-.32586*	.09648	.017
	Ambo University	-.12579	.11544	.959
	Bahir Dar University	-.32118*	.09994	.029
	Addis Ababa University	-.50207*	.12136	.001
Hawassa	Jimma University	.46766*	.08725	.000
	Wollo University	.41374*	.08789	.000
	Mekele University	.29811	.11006	.121
	Haromaya University	.14179	.09049	.770
	Ambo University	.34186*	.11048	.042
Wollo University	Bahir Dar University	.14648	.09417	.777
	Addis Ababa University	-.03442	.11666	1.000
	Jimma University	.05392	.09405	.999
	Hawassa	-.41374*	.08789	.000

	Mekele University	-.11562	.11553	.974
	Haromaya University	-.27195	.09707	.095
	Ambo University	-.07187	.11593	.999
	Bahir Dar University	-.26726	.10051	.136
	Addis Ababa University	-.44816*	.12183	.006
	Jimma University	.16954	.11504	.821
	Hawassa	-.29811	.11006	.121
	Wollo University	.11562	.11553	.974
Mekele University	Haromaya University	-.15632	.11752	.887
	Ambo University	.04375	.13352	1.000
	Bahir Dar University	-.15163	.12037	.913
	Addis Ababa University	-.33253	.13867	.243
	Jimma University	.32586*	.09648	.017
	Hawassa	-.14179	.09049	.770
	Wollo University	.27195	.09707	.095
Haromaya University	Mekele University	.15632	.11752	.887
	Ambo University	.20007	.11791	.689
	Bahir Dar University	.00469	.10279	1.000
	Addis Ababa University	-.17621	.12372	.846
	Jimma University	.12579	.11544	.959
	Hawassa	-.34186*	.11048	.042
	Wollo University	.07187	.11593	.999
Ambo University	Mekele University	-.04375	.13352	1.000
	Haromaya University	-.20007	.11791	.689

Bahir Dar University	Bahir Dar University	-.19538	.12075	.739
	Addis Ababa University	-.37628	.13901	.121
	Jimma University	.32118*	.09994	.029
	Hawassa	-.14648	.09417	.777
	Wollo University	.26726	.10051	.136
	Mekele University	.15163	.12037	.913
	Haromaya University	-.00469	.10279	1.000
Addis Ababa University	Ambo University	.19538	.12075	.739
	Addis Ababa University	-.18090	.12643	.843
	Jimma University	.50207*	.12136	.001
	Hawassa	.03442	.11666	1.000
	Wollo University	.44816*	.12183	.006
	Mekele University	.33253	.13867	.243
	Haromaya University	.17621	.12372	.846
	Ambo University	.37628	.13901	.121
	Bahir Dar University	.18090	.12643	.843