THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLEDGE

Leadership and Governance Challenges in African Universities! Call for Transformative Leadership! A Case of Universities in Zimbabwe

Milton Gwakwa
Lecturer, Faculty of Commerce, BA ISAGO University, Botswana

Abstract:
This paper considers some of the new realities that are likely to affect higher (tertiary) education, particularly those arising from globalization of education systems demanding a re-focus on leadership and governance issues in Africa. The paper then explores the role that leadership and governance play in helping institutions to address the new realities, pivoted on transformational paradigms, particularly as change impacts on institutional culture and functioning. Reality has always been somewhat at odds with these liberal ideals which contradict with the view that universities should be more accountable while increasing their autonomy-a paradoxical philosophy in itself. The assertion of collegial processes of democracy and transformative tissues (here defined as systems) should be replaced by stronger corporate management; and that universities should act less as critics of society and more as servants responding to the needs of the economy, promising to supply qualified and expert human resources and 'useful' research in response to market demands. The need to move away from traditional management systems which had no flavour for leadership vibes is a thing of the past. I am of the opinion that universities require leadership (not over-administration or heavy corporate management); that responsibilities need to be delegated down from the centre on the basis of trust and with a particular emphasis upon the importance of leadership at the middle level; and that academics and administrators need to work together in new ways that go beyond the traditional model of academic ministers and administrators who are bound by regulations ,some of them created wrongly and to perpetuate self-interests and not interests of the very institutions and society at large. Hence, I am advocating for transformative dynamics in university leadership and governance systems. Notwithstanding these pressures for change, Universities in Africa need to embraces change as part of their culture and impress upon on societal gains. The elitist thinking occupying the minds of many universities' leadership does not add value to knowledge production and consumption. A qualitative – phenomenological paradigm was adopted in which leadership and governance systems in Zimbabwe Universities were interrogated. The findings indicate high level of governance crisis in African Universities. The study therefore has recommended the need for the adoption of a transformational culture embedded in ubuntu philosophy that promotes exploitation of indigenous knowledge systems.

Keywords: corporate governance, black box, transformational leadership, administrators versus leadership, africanology, ubuntu

1. Introduction

Authentic change requires authentic transformative leadership and governance engagement in our tertiary institutions. Africa's development cannot be discussed in the absence of the role of Universities in driving that change. It is undeniable that there is widespread recognition that education is the key and foundation to the well-being of any society and that transforming Universities and school systems is critical to sustained growth and success. Despite the many advances in information and communication technologies, indeed world-class universities in Africa remain a relative rarity. I am convinced as an academic and researcher that part of the reason for this resides in the nature and form of organisational structures, governance and leadership styles that are no longer appropriate in the information age. We all need to understand that the frontier of human productive capacity today is the power of extended collaboration, empowerment of communities within and without our environments, the ability to work across global and technological boundaries, and the ability to create and nurture learning organisations, encouraging creative and innovative cultures.

We should note that until the 1980s, institutional leadership, management and administration were seen by many inside and outside the institution as a "necessary evil" (see, for example, Clark, 1983), since then it has become in many respects a self-justified activity (Maassen, 2003). National and in the European case supranational white papers and other policy documents have contributed in many respects to this development by clearly setting the mark: universities are expected to be more responsive, more effective and more efficient. No one can deny the argument that a more direct and dynamic interaction between universities and their environments is necessary, and an important condition for this to be realised is the professionalization of institutional management and governance structures (Clark, 1998; Olsen and Maassen, 2007).

The tone of leadership and governance framework is a critical ingredient towards attaining sustainable development. I have written this paper out of the desire to provoke debate and challenge African Universities to think in other terms and to embrace globalization without negating our own Indigenous Leadership Approaches (ILAs) and Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS). As a product of African Universities' education systems and having worked in these universities both as an academic and administrator, I feel obliged to ignite the debate on the caliber of the 21st leaders within our universities in which issues of governance and leadership are at the centre stage of the transformative process, especially in a globalised socio-economic environment universities are exposed to. I need to quickly appetize the readers of this paper that I strongly feel that the imposition of western worldviews has contributed to a systemic erosion of indigenous worldviews, languages, knowledges and practises and even influence the governance systems adopted by many of African universities. I am not sure if I can be blamed to mention that most of our leadership, especially those Professors, Doctors and Mr (stas) who have attained their qualification in the western world have been brainwashed to the extent that anything indigenous is not modern (I stand to be corrected, but will retain my freedom to state my personal opinion on the matter). Community engagement will remain the pillar of my views and I believe this holds the greatest promise for stimulating the resurgent forces that can play a lead role in reclaiming, renewing and revitalizing Indigenous responsibility for Indigenous peoples and their resources and how they choose to employ governance paradigms and leadership styles appropriate in Africa, of course without negating forces of globalization. Are we aware that as the world faces increasing uncertainties and shift to knowledge economy, education plays a larger role in creating productive society? Designing and managing learning university organizations that can sustain a competition in this fast-changing environment demands transformative and best governance conscious leaders who would envision building intellectual capital for the future development of Africa. The calibre of our continent is that most of the countries in Africa are multi-ethnic, multi-linguistic, multi-cultural and multi-religious. This very composition reflects the composition of our universities. This has implications on governance approaches. This diversity is not going to change. But if we fail to use this diversity as a force for good, welcoming and blending the positive aspects of our differences into a richer whole, we shall fail in our quest to embrace and uphold democratic ideals. The diversity paradox is yet another form of crisis thwarting quick development and the upholding of democratic value in our universities. Let me conclude the conclusion by this African Proverb which says:

"Tomorrow belongs to the people who prepare for it today". That is what we should do and our leaders should, and it is a concept all of us in Africa must embrace. Without it, we will never take our rightful place in the world fraternity of nations - for we are part of an inescapable global interdependency, and many of the decisions we make and paths we choose to follow will be informed by our role in this world community as universities. The need for the redevelopment and reshaping of the African continent in addressing key social, economic and political priorities in a coherent manner cannot be overemphasized. It is a challenge on the shoulders of our universities. It is part of an African solution to African problems, and an expression of commitment by university leaders to the people of Africa, and to the international community. Our only enemy is inaction by our leadership - otherwise, everything is possible. We must confront our demons, raise our heads proudly, shoulder the burden and go the extra mile-led by a spirit of ubuntu. In this paper, I suggest that good governance, transparency, and accountability embody partnerships between universities and society, and among citizens—partnerships sustained not by good intentions alone but by lasting, converging incentives for both industrial and national growth to regional and international growth.

2. Problem Statement

The world we live in is no longer constant. Change has become a constant factor then. Shifts in governance in higher education and research lead to a different institutional environment. This implies changing audiences, rules, norms, and values that govern higher education and its linkage to industry and commerce. The central problem is that African leadership moves behind the clock and many of whom are cocooned in a black box. The world of knowledge and governance seems to be moving faster than they can lift their left and right legs. This directly impact on the movement of followers who, in many cases appear to be more upright than those they follow. Africa is poor not because it is poor. The whole tale of poverty hinges on leadership both the political and academic. No one can discuss development of a nation in the absence of the role universities have to play. Thus, this study has been motivated by the need to create debate and provoke *thought leadership* in the minds of African institutions and the African peoples and prepare Africa for serious transformation bearing in mind that transformation cannot begin from lower echelons of institutions but from the top, but when the top is asleep, the lower echelons will provoke in a professional way though, the top leadership to move with speed and think with power. With this background problem, a few questions need to be asked:

- What are the central governance crisis facing African universities?
- How has globalisation impacted on leadership dynamics?
- What new thinking paradigms should be put in place to enhance governance and leadership efficiency and effectiveness in African universities?

The paper posits that African universities must proactively take charge of fostering institutional governance and leadership so as to translate leadership competence into strategic assets. Such assets are key to bolstering intellectual capital, strategic scanning, i.e. the capacity to recognize the behaviour of interconnected systems to make effective decisions under varying strategic and risk scenarios, and the transformation of knowledge. To this end, African universities need to transcend their current 'modern' system of education to a post-modern perspective, which recognizes context, collaboration and knowledge as valued skills. Enhancing institutional leadership is also crucial if Africa is to compete in today's rapidly globalizing world and knowledge society. More importantly, doing so has direct impact on shaping the quality of leadership on the Continent, and consequently the resulting policy decisions and governance. It is important to note that the views propounded in this paper are very personal and I cannot be held accountable for

those who take them with factuality thinking. While I acknowledge views and opinions presented to fully belong to me, the final say rests with the reader and consumer of this paper. Indeed, the presentations (views and opinions) emanates from both the empirical evidence obtained and interrogation of existing studies on governance and leadership issues in institutions of higher learning in Africa and beyond. I will not be held answerable to mere opinions and views emanating from the academic freedom and expression, you will come across throughout the paper. Hence counter and pro-counter researches on the area of governance and transformative leadership in institutions of higher learning are encouraged.

3. Methodological Approach
Quite unusual in many paper presentations, I decided to quickly show off at this quick juncture in brief though, the methodological approach used in carrying out this study. This article is both conceptual and empirical. The delineation of transformative leadership and good governance theory is conceptual and draws on its historical and more recent theoretical roots. To investigate it empirically, I identified four universities across Zimbabwe using a backward mapping approach, attempted to determine, abductive reasoning (Evers and Wu, 2006) - meant to determine whether transformative leadership might include inference to good governance. The four were studied, using multiple interviews, confirmatory interviews with others, and observations in situ, to identify practices that might conform to categories of transformative leadership and good governance. Transformative leadership begins with questions of justice and democracy, critiques inequitable practices, and addresses both individual and public good. Data obtained from the interviews were thematically analyzed and complemented by positivistic presentations.

4. Terminology
Maassen (2003), states that "**governance** is about the frameworks in which universities and colleges manage themselves and about the processes and structures used to achieve the intended outcomes – in other words about *how* higher education institutions operate". This means that governance is a "relational concept that can be considered to incorporate leadership, management, and administration" (Reed *et al.*, 2002). Although it is common to identify different governance levels, *e.g.* the national, local, institutional, sub-unit or discipline levels (Reed *et al*., 2002; Santiago *et al.,* 2008). My focus in this paper is on the institutional level (university level).

4.1. Transparency
Official business conducted in such a way that substantive and procedural information is available to, and broadly understandable by, people and groups in society, subject to reasonable limits protecting security and privacy

4.2. Accountability
Procedures requiring officials and those who seek to influence them to follow established rules defining acceptable processes and outcomes, and to demonstrate that they have followed those procedures

4.3. Black Box
Unclear and undemocratic systems practiced covertly by those in leadership. The cultures and systems in place are not inclusive and key information is a privy of the few. Society is always asking what is in 'that' system that they are hiding (tinted systems) of governance or black box management system.

5. Brief History of Zimbabwe's Education System
Zimbabwe is one country in Africa and world over that has high appetite for learning. This high appetite is embedded in the country's cultural heritage and history as resembled by the figure below. I am not going to say a lot about Zimbabwe's heritage serve to say that the level of education anxiety among Zimbabwean as emanate from our ancestral desire to be innovative and creative. The leadership and governance approaches that today have been diluted by colonial influences, have their roots in ancestral Zimbabwe depicted by the Great Zimbabwe Ruins below, the ruins from which the country draws its name, and the ruins from which two of the major universities are named after-University of Zimbabwe and Great Zimbabwe University. Zimbabwe's indigenous culture and education systems are embedded in the spirits and cultures of the unsung ancestors such as Ambuya (Gogo) neHanda and Sekuru (Khulu) Kaguvi and the many pre-and post ancestors of the 15th century and after-who form the DNA of the current governance systems within our Zimbabwean societies and education fraternity is not an exception. It is the reason why I always salute indigenous thinking models fused with modernity in all our spheres of life. And those who negate this philosophy find themselves trailing behind development as coping with modernity cannot be possible if we ignore our roots. Any meaningful governance system in any society cannot be discussed away from the root-heritage of a people and as such forms of governance in Zimbabwean societies can be traced back to the period of great Zimbabwe monuments construction characterized by wisdom of the leadership then. The figure below is the Great Zimbabwe monument situated in Masvingo. It is from this monument that (as alluded to already) that the current governance systems in Zimbabwean societies can be traced back to. (Read the history of the leadership by the mambo and how they were able to expand and grow their empire in the region). In a nutshell, I strongly feel that transformational governance systems must be directly connected to the cultural heritage of a nation. The figure below depicts the roots of Zimbabwe's heritage.

Figure 1: Great Zimbabwe monuments: Zimbabwe's Heritage
Source: Adapted from Great Zimbabwe's Archives (2017)

6. Central Governance Systems Applicable to Zimbabwean Universities

The titular head of the university is the Chancellor and reporting to the Chancellor is the Vice Chancellor who happens to be the Chief Executive Officer and head of the University. The sitting president of the country automatically qualifies for Chancellorship. The university is governed by a University Council comprising the university's chief officers, representatives of the Senate, staff and students, nominees of the Minister of Higher and Tertiary Education and representatives from various sectors of commerce and civil society. As alluded to earlier on, the chief executive of the university is the Vice Chancellor who is appointed by the Chancellor after consultation with the Minister of Higher and Tertiary Education and the University Council. The Vice-Chancellor is assisted by one or more Pro Vice Chancellors, appointed by the University Council with the approval of the Minister of Higher and Tertiary Education. Critical to note is that the academic authority of the university is vested in the Senate, comprising the university's chief officers, the deans of faculties and full professors, the chairmen of departments and staff and student representatives. The university is divided into faculties, managed by a Dean (Executive or Substantive) and governed by a Faculty Board comprising all professors and lecturers. The Senate is the highest Academic authority in the university. A culture of Committees drives many facets of university operations and these committees make recommendations in line with their terms of reference(s).

7. Formatting of Degree Programs

Practically, in many a case the format of undergraduate learning in universities in Zimbabwe is rooted in lectures, by professors or lecturers and tutorials by lecturers and teaching assistants. A number of programmes also have laboratory-based practical work and field schools. Tests and assignments on course content are graded for a theory coursework grade. Practical work, where applicable, is graded for a practical coursework grade. The degree programmes follow the course or module unit model, and in many programmes it is possible for students (learners) to select some of the courses from a range of options (electives). Honours degrees have a compulsory project course that the students must complete individually, with different projects carried out by each student. Research by students therefore plays a key role in knowledge acquisition and knowledge building. There is a high culture and high appetite for innovation and creativity among Zimbabwean students. This appetite is however sometimes thwarted by lack of resources and support both from the private and public sectors. (It is not the government's mandate alone to see innovation through but other stakeholders who in any case are the direct beneficiaries of products from universities, e.g. private sector.) The undergraduate programmes offered lead to Bachelor, Bachelor (Honours), and Intercalated Bachelor degrees. This arrangement cannot be discussed outside governance and leadership arrangements as this has direct implication on quality of graduants and quality of the degrees themselves as perceived by industry and commerce.

8. Governance Issues

The function of governance is to ensure that an organisation or partnership fulfils its overall purpose, achieves its intended outcomes for citizens and service users, and operates in an effective, efficient and ethical manner. This principle should guide all governance activity. The governing body should make sure that there is a clear statement of the university's purpose and that it uses this as a basis for its planning. It should constantly review the decisions it takes, making sure that they further the university's purpose and contribute to the intended outcomes for citizens and users of services. The governing body should decide how the quality of service for users is to be measured and make sure that it has the information it needs to review service quality effectively and regularly. It is important to give an ear to and hear the views of users and non-users from all backgrounds and communities about their needs, and the views of service users from all backgrounds about the suitability and quality of services. This information can then be used as the basis for planning and service improvement within and without the university.

Good governance will look different in different places but should always be designed to be genuinely inclusive and accountable, giving all local people an equal opportunity for involvement. I believe there is no blueprint for achieving good governance and no single set of solutions. There are many methods that can be employed to engage people and find out their aspirations and views for a place, but it is the spirit in which these are employed that is most important. Universities that are able to engage successfully with local people will be able to ensure that their services and facilities continue to meet the needs of local people into the future, something that many of African institutions are failing. New governance approaches are at the forefront of discussions on public sector reforms, including higher education and research (de Boer, Enders, & Leisyte, 2007). Rethinking governance has led to new institutional arrangements in coordinating the public sectors (Kooiman, 2000; Mayntz, 1998). In higher education and research the analysis of governance systems has had a prominent place for more than two decades. Various concepts and models of higher education governance have been developed and extensively discussed, both by researchers and practitioners (Braun & Merrien, 1999; Clark, 1983; Maassen & van Vught, 1994). One way of looking at the shifts in governance in higher education is by observing and analysing governmental reforms. Following Pierre and Peters' (2000) state-centric view, governmental reforms may be a good point of reference for the analyses of shifts in governance and their consequences. Such reforms imply changing rules of the game in higher education and research.

Many scholars have explored governance reforms and the rise of managerialism in a comparative perspective in greater detail (Amaral, Jones, & Karseth, 2002; Braun & Merrien, 1999; Currie, De Angelis, De Boer, Huisman, & Lacotte, 2003; de Boer, Enders, & Schimank, 2007; Goedegebuure, Kaiser, Maassen, & De Weert, 1994; Kehm & Lanzendorf, 2006; Kogan & Hanney, 2000). The major insights of these studies highlight how different higher education and research reforms influence the changes in university governance.

9. Soft and Hard Governance

Many states are experiencing and or adopting shifts of governance- from hard governance which is referred to as legally binding regulations (prescriptions and instruction) to soft governance which is referred to as advisory, persuasive and sense making leadership frameworks (discourses, agenda setting, sense-making, social technologies). Critical to note in the current trends in our education systems, especially in the developed world (Africa needs to copy and indigenize contextually) is that the states are – with inspiration from global trends and trans- and supranational agencies – being developed into hyper- complex and polycentric states with no single centre of power but with numerous means of influence and networks, where power is distributed and decisions are negotiated. There are isomorphic tendencies in governance at several levels in the ways hard governance (legally binding regulations) is being substituted or supplemented by soft governance (advisory, persuasive and sense-making methods). The rigidities of many universities in Africa explains why our universities (I say our because I am a true African child born and bred in Africa, in a piece of African land named Zimbabwe) have not done so much to spear head development both at micro and macro level. The calibre of leadership, is very good in ''crying'' (**Kuzhamba chaiko**-*literally meaning making lots of noise*), I mean continuous complaining on various limitations such as resource shortage but these institutions cannot be forgiven and excused this time around. I do not want to paint all universities in Africa 'cry babies', we indeed have a handful of our university leaders who have what it takes to take Africa to its rightful place and who have done very well in championing the growth of Africa by their exemplary governance systems, systems that embedded the ubuntu perspective and placed the African flag first before visitor's flag. Indeed, we have them, but I am not privileged at this point in time to mention them by names. I know many of us, who are well exposed to education systems in Africa –can correctly guess and list these tertiary houses that makes us a proud continent.

As we deliberate on the hard and soft frameworks of university governance, the role of the state cannot be ignored neither can it be overemphasized. The state and other similar authorities are making lower authority levels more accountable to higher levels in an attempt to satisfy political requirements for transparency and accountability in public sectors and institutions. It is mandatory to note that lecturers and non-academic staff (some say non-teaching or support staff) are accountable to University leaders, Universities to Higher Education Ministries, and the Ministry reports to Government through Cabinet or an equivalent Board.

In the same endeavour focus and alignment of activities must spell out in *toto,* to see that the establishment of accountability is accomplished primarily through contracts between all levels of the educational system. Focus is also placed on national planning (curriculum), the testing and examination of student learning outcomes, and the introduction of benchmarks and indicators used for comparisons at all levels. Many of these benchmarks and indicators are taken from international comparisons. These contracts leave it to lower-level agents to administer human and financial resources in ways that produce the desired and ever-expanding goals. The point I am trying to make clear to all readers is that leadership in universities make governance decisions within the context of other key players especially the government. The extent to which outside forces determine direction and paths to be taken directly influences the transformative paradigms at play and the role universities can play in driving change and national development. What I am referring to here is the degree of 'political interference' or 'Institutional politicking' in the management and running of universities in Africa. This raises further questions: Does political interference in the governance of universities enhance or derail progress and change? To what extent should universities be left alone to decide on the future of themselves and the nations they belong to?

10. Conceptual issues on Governance
The following section will discuss some of the contemporary conceptual issues on governance.

11. Polycentric Societies

Understanding leadership and governance in the African context requires an understanding of certain concepts that have a direct bearing on the phenomena under discussion. The existence of the so called polycentric societies is necessary enough to constitute governance segmentation and delineation. Thus, this polycentric tenet is another perspective on the societal, political and cultural development - sociological and structural analyses of the living conditions in contemporary societies and cultures (Giddens, 1991; Kirkeby, 1998). Understandably, those analyses indicate that a basic condition for our lives is the hyper-complexity of societies (Thyssen, 2001), which is evident in both an increase in complexity in terms of time (society is changing at a much higher speed than before), in terms of space (the number of actions involving communication has increased dramatically), in the global risks that are increasingly created by humans, rather than by nature (Beck, 1986) and the resulting contingencies and individualisation. Because of these developments, society and more so universities have become more hyper complex. Let me also borrow from the writings by Myint et al, in their publication on learning organisations in the Information age ,in which they quoted yet another governance guru, Starratt (2001), in which he continuously questions knowledge paradigm *"We have to accept the irony of knowledge – that it distorts in the very process of revealing reality- and understand that its pursuit requires that we perform a simultaneous act of deconstructing our knowledge even while we are constructing it"* (2001. It is against this backdrop that I have always insisted on the need to continue to question the status quo, even in the quest of our cultural heritage, indigenous approaches and the fusion of our rich indigenous knowledge with modernity. This cannot be an event and neither can it be achieved if knowledge obtained daily is also not interrogated.

12. Global Influences on Governance and Leadership

Research on governance and leadership across the globe has shown that a number of changes are taking place in Europe, America and Asia. Africa is not spared in this wave and hence the need to talk about the influences of globalisation in governance approaches adopted by African universities or Western universities planted in Africa. Thus, governance theories (M. Dean, 1999b; Foucault, 1976/1994) have found that it is not possible to govern a nation, its institutions and individuals, by commands and economic and administrative regulations set down by legislation only. This understanding is being supplemented, or perhaps even replaced, by the understanding that societies cannot be governed from one point, i.e. the government and or in this context University Council alone. University Councils and other authorities must scrutinise themselves as 'leaders of leaders' through indirect forms of power in 'polyphonic setting' (Pedersen, 2005). Paralleling that trend are supra- and trans-national agencies such as the OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) and the European Union, and SADC which are – when it comes to education and its governance and politics – not commissioned to use direct forms of power and are therefore developing 'soft forms of governance'. However, these agencies operate within the more general trend of globalisation. Globalisation is an intricate pattern of changes in economics and the divisions of labour. These developments show the need for universities to move away from their shells and transform themselves in order to be competitive.

My experience in universities reveals that for many years governmental institutions were state-run and managed according to rather detailed budgets and strict regulations. Now they have been transformed into organizations that must manage their own affairs and are accountable to authorities. The ways in which management and the 'production of output' are carried out is up to each individual organization. Site-based management of universities is one of these relatively new initiatives. Another way of trying to reduce complexity is, as mentioned above, the tendency to focus on evidence based practice or 'best practice'. One big challenge that African institutions of high learning faces is lack of autonomy and independence in decision making, hence the limitations on trans-thinking paradigms. This imposes self-inflicted deficiencies on transformational leadership.

13. Social Contracts

To what extent are social contracts respected by leaders in our Universities? There appears to be many answers to this question. This is one very important tool of governance in universities. There are a number of contracts, which include quality contracts between the university council, senate, faculties, local educational authorities, and the Ministry of Education. This is one example out of many social technologies that can be entertained in academic circles. Contracts also exist within the university themselves, such as annual plans developed by the lecturer, teams or individual departments, and the university leadership and individual student/learner's plans between students, parents, and lecturers. The contracts leave many decisions to the practice level, where people must manage themselves as long as they remain within the given framework and values. This type of leadership means that organisations and individuals must take over the values and norms laid out by the superior level. They must do so to such a degree that they make them their own values. Whatever the nature of contract is created, it is important to realize that too close and no breathing contracts limit staff creativity affecting progress and development of universities ultimately affecting national development. In general, sticking by the book by many university leaders (*prescripted* thinking model) is not good for development as it stifles innovation and creativity. African universities, many of them, are led by leaders who do not promote and or encourage á culture of making mistakes'. But accepting and adopting that culture of making mistakes for transformational gains and the embracement of new leadership architectures is a necessary but also dangerous move, capable of destroying relationships, trust and productivity in Institutions of high learning. According to Bass, transformational leadership encompasses several different aspects, as shown in Table 1 below:

Aspects of transformational leadership	Aspects of good governance
• Emphasizing intrinsic motivation and positive development of followers	• Genuine respect for people
• Raising awareness of moral standard	• A commitment to providing a voice for all residents - whether they are active participants or 'stand-by citizens'
• Highlighting important priorities	• Transparency and effectiveness in decision making
• Fostering higher moral maturity in followers	• Encouraging people to become involved and take on leadership roles
• Creating an ethical climate (share values, high ethical standards)	• A commitment to a collaborative process
• Encouraging followers to look beyond self-interests to the common good	• Taking responsibility to monitor and evaluate outcomes
• Promoting cooperation and harmony	• An openness to learning from poor decisions or approaches
• Allowing freedom of choice for followers	
• Using persuasive appeals based on reason	
• Using authentic, consistent means	
• Appealing to the ideals of followers	

Table 1: Transformational leadership versus Good governance
Source: Self –Created (Gwakwa, 2017).

The above aspects are necessary factors needed for good governance. A close look at transformational aspects reflects elements truly reflecting good governance.

14. The 4 I's of Transformational Leadership
Effective transformers carry certain characteristics, among which are four critical ones discussed below:
- Idealized Influence (II) - the leader serves as an ideal role model for followers; the leader "walks the talk," and is admired for this.
- Inspirational Motivation (IM) - Transformational leaders have the ability to inspire and motivate followers. Combined these first two I's are what constitute the transformational leader's charisma.
- Individualized Consideration (IC) - Transformational leaders demonstrate genuine concern for the needs and feelings of followers. This personal attention to each follower is a key element in bringing out their very best efforts.
- Intellectual Stimulation (IS) - the leader challenges followers to be innovative and creative. A common misunderstanding is that transformational leaders are "soft," but the truth is that they constantly challenge followers to higher levels of performance

Transformational leadership is said to have occurred when engagement in a group results in leaders and followers raising one another to increased levels of motivation and morality. When this happens in university communities, socio-economic development can be 'physically' felt. The evolution of transformational leadership in the digital age is tied to the development of organizational leadership in an academic setting. As organizations move from position-based responsibilities to task-based responsibilities, transformational leadership is redefined to continue to develop individual commitment to organizational goals by aligning these goals with the interests of their leadership community. The academic community and its leadership should act as the front-runner in this sense of redefining transformational leadership to suit these changes in job definition.

I believe that the future of transformational leadership and good governance is closely related to political globalization and a more homogenous spectrum of economic systems under which organizations and universities in particular find themselves operating. Cultural and geographical dimensions of transformational leadership and good governance become blurred as globalization renders ethnically specific collectivist and individualistic effects of organizational behavior obsolete in a more diversified workplace (universities today constitute students come from different backgrounds and ethnic groups).

There are three key factors influencing the degree to which a university integrates sustainability and all three are about leadership:
- The strength of commitment and leadership qualities of the CEO (Vice Chancellor, President or Equivalent)

If sustainability initiatives are to succeed, the CEO must believe it is the right thing to do and that business should do the right thing. She/he needs to have the foresight and courage to see that doing the right thing is good for university business. Her/his moral conviction must be strong enough to convince others to follow. (Most employees will want to follow a sustainable path if that is where they are led. Being part of a team which is taking a sustainable path will be a source of great satisfaction to many.) The CEO has an important role to play in ensuring that the management structures and governance processes are in place and the leadership styles of the executive team are conducive to integrating sustainability.
- The level of the Board understands of the relevance of sustainability to strategy and risk

The Board sets the strategic direction of a company. If the Board does not recognize the importance of staff, students, communities or risks associated with the limitations of developmental requirements, change will be limited. An understanding of these issues on the

business model, long term success and ability to deliver on strategy are critical. So too is an appreciation that identifying sustainability risks requires stakeholder engagement.

Board diversity, including, but not only gender diversity, becomes really important in ensuring the Board is fit to drive change towards a sustainable business.　Common sense dictates and research has shown that women on boards increase the social and environmental sustainability focus along with profits (McElhaney and Mobasseri, 2012).

- A senior leader with the expertise, leadership skills and authority to make it happen

A committed, proactive executive will be needed to make change happen.　They will need to be knowledgeable about sustainability issues, processes, performance management and communication.　If universities are to change in time to avoid negative (social, environmental and business) consequences, this person needs to be senior enough to have authority. They need to have the ear of the CEO.　Moral authority and leadership skills are important, but not enough for the scale of change required.

15. Challenges of good governance (Nature of crisis)

Governing and managing a university cannot be compared to governing and managing a pre-school, school or college. In leadership theory, there is near consensus on the need for distributed leadership. There is an understanding that the Vice Chancellor or President cannot be sufficiently informed to make all decisions in universities, nor can she/he be present in all places and situations where decisions need to be made. This is eminently the case in classrooms, where lecturers have to interpret demands, goals and situations and make decisions many times every lesson. It is also the case in departmental teams that meet to plan, evaluate their instruction or engage in professional development. If vice chancellor is not present, she/he is excluded from making decisions (of course, she/he can construct the frameworks within which teams manoeuvre). To what extent do leadership in African universities allow this level of autonomy? Another crisis looms!

The dilemma between integrated management structures and dual management structures is imposing a lot of conflict within the governing structures in most of our universities. This move from elected towards appointed academic leaders and the adaptation of representative decision-making structures form an important back-drop to understand another dilemma in current university governance design – the dilemma between integrated management structures and dual management structures. Greater formalisation of roles and responsibilities especially concerning leadership, often combined with stronger task specialisation, is the main reform element causing this dilemma. The juxtaposition of integrated versus dual management structures refers to the way in which administrative and academic decision-making functions are organised. Competing" decision making structures should be avoided, meaning that one should abandon dual structures in favour of integrated ones making the whole decision-making process more transparent, accountable and streamlined

Another live crisis facing African universities is the dilemma between centralisation and decentralisation in more autonomous universities. According to (Amaral, Jones and Karseth, 2002; Whitchurch, 2006; Taylor, 2006) one of the most obvious and important consequences of the changes in the institutional governance structures concerns the changes in the *distribution* of authority, in the form of the decentralisation of tasks from the government to the higher education institutions. The central reform intention is that power and authority should be given to those who know the higher education challenges and problems best and as such know best how to solve them. The consequence of this increased institutional autonomy is in general a centralisation of power inside the institutions (Meister-Scheytt, 2007). This leads to a serious dilemma since the understanding of what centralisation in a university or college means may vary (Shattock, 2006). The autonomy of various schools and faculties inside a higher education institution is in this respect important, in which institutional centralisation along with substantial faculty independence is a must implement.　Recently, Taylor (2006) has argued that one of the main challenges universities currently face is to balance the need for central strategic decision making with more devolved responsibilities throughout the universities. Autocratic and political appointees find it a hotter and disturbing move than professionally gifted leaders.

One of the challenges of good governance is failure to build broad-based support for reform by university leadership. There is no doubt that governance reform calls for transformational leadership that requires lasting leadership and commitment from above, and that identifying reform "champions" is an important early stage in providing such leadership. Such initiatives and commitments cannot be effective if they are confined to "one-man show" model of reform and leadership. It is far better to get out into communities, industry and departments and learn about popular concerns, and build a broad base of support. Significantly there is need to *pay close attention to problems and controversies*: as suggested by many authors on governance and those issues can mobilize popular energies and commitment far more effectively than can good and encompassing ideas alone.

It is understood that many governance problems result from a shortage of resources or a lack of technical and political capacity on the part of university leadership. Underestimating opposition to reform and new governance systems is an error many leaders make. Serious reforms may encounter increasing resistance within from within, or from segments of the public, to the extent that they begin to gain "traction"; yet it will be at precisely those points that active support from top leadership and from civil society may be most important. There is need to realize that transparency and accountability problems are particularly likely to persist because of vested interests, stakeholders have, and leaders must be aware that at times those resisting enhanced transparency and accountability will go through the motions—filing reports, producing data, carrying out reviews and assessments—in ways that actually conceal rather than reveal and attacking governance problems.

Good governance reforms often emphasize stakeholder goods, such as efficiency, honesty, cultural empathy, and the like, to the exclusion of private benefits. Other kinds of appeals—that better governance should emphasize on rewarding employees (good salary, loan facilities, promotions-vertical and parallel and many fringe benefits) to keep employees happy, protect their families and properties—receive too little attention, even when the goal is enlisting the participation and support of them. Failure to pay close

attention to incentives is like failure to set goals for the organisation. As a result, good-governance efforts encounter collective action problems: people decide that if reform improves governance for anyone it will do so for all, and thus that their own efforts are inconsequential or even unwanted. Thus, extensive efforts must be made to persuade staff, government functionaries, students and societal leaders that they stand to benefit from transformed governance.

The need to pay attention to public opinion seems to be farfetched for our universities even in emerging privately owned institutions. Thus, public opinion matters respect by the leaders. Leadership has a tendency of ignoring public opinion but this is at their peril. Surveys and community meetings to identify what people believe about the current state of affairs and expect of from the universities are essential. So are sustained efforts to educate the public about key problems, the justification for proposed changes, the costs of better governance, and results thereto. The richness of indigenous knowledge tapped from the public(s) is critical in designing programs and courses that have an African flavour and meet international standards perse.

Good leaders who need to transform themselves widen their thinking capacity by thinking regionally and then globally. Neighbouring universities and colleges may well be coping with similar problems and constraints, and may be finding ways to accountability, and transparency mechanisms to new and complex situations. In addition, few of the problems good governance is intended to attack are contained within national boundaries. Sharing ideas, experiences, and resources, coordinating functions on a regional basis, and peer review of governance procedures can all contribute to reforms appropriate to social realities, and can make better use of scarce resources. African universities while having a forum where Vice Chancellors meet, need to continue to have bilateral and multi-lateral agreements to enable them to actively and continuously interact and share their failures and successes not only at Vice Chancellor level but even at faculty and departmental levels.

While a growing number of businesses are calling for graduates who can apply sustainability thinking to business problems, many universities have been slow to act. Of the thousands of universities world-wide, just over 500 have signed the UN Principles of Responsible Management Education. In doing so, they have committed to addressing this need for change in leadership capabilities through education, research and engagement.

Universities and governments have been slow to create opportunities and rewards for inter-disciplinary research without which we cannot find solutions to sustainability problems. The mechanisms by which universities are funded, journals are ranked and academics are assessed combine to discourage academics from engaging with real problems and communicating their work to those who can act upon it (more on this in Adam Larrianaga Gonzalez, 2007). Academics also need to be guided by a sense of 'the right thing to do' or their moral compass (See Howard, 2012).

In attempting to improve policy and implementation it is tempting to rely too much on laws and top-down policymaking. Controls on administrative, academic and personnel systems can become so strict that faculties and departments cannot manage and get their programs implemented in time. Hence excessive legislation and regulation is one of the greatest crisis affecting the operations of universities to the extent of stifling development. Discretion can be reduced to such a minimum that cases with any unusual aspects take weeks and months to be resolved. The resulting inflexibility wastes resources and opportunities, produces policies that are unresponsive to social realities (thus eroding the credibility of good-governance efforts), and can increase incentives to corruption.

One of the most challenging experiences faced by university leadership which is a pressing issue in this respect is to handle the growing gap between management intentions and academic realities, and to deal with the lack of trust between managers and academics in many higher education systems. This lack of trust has mainly been caused by moving from vertical to horizontal or complementary, forms of governance. In this endeavour flexible leadership is called for, otherwise resources and time will be wasted in managing the gap instead of managing progress.

16. Zimbabwe's experiences-Results from the Study

As alluded to prior on there are 15 universities in Zimbabwe. 70% of these are state-owned and the remainder are private universities and the majority of which are church owned. Only four universities were chosen and studied. While they were challenges in accessing information, especially from the Vice Chancellors, I managed to interview senior members of the university councils and academic staff to find out the state of governance systems at these institutions. It emanated from the discussions I held that they were deep seated challenges from these universities in terms of governance and leadership structures. While there are a lot of positive developments, Zimbabwean universities faced challenges emanating from global and political challenges to resource limitations. This is what one of the Professors had to say 'There is lack of autonomy in terms of key decisions that are needed to drive our university. Certain decisions have serious political implications and therefore cannot be taken without engaging the politicians who have a say towards this facet. In the end, they are delays and sometimes management will become reluctant in making future decisions. Overall too much interference by those who are not directly involved in the day to day management is not palatable and good for development.'' The other revelation quite stunning was on the ability of leadership conceptualisation of indigenous knowledge on program design. There appears to be serious reluctance by our universities in designing curriculum that has a local content. This is what one respondent had to say: 'Our hands are sometimes tired up as we cannot freely embrace indigenous philosophies. There is generally a thin king that the local content is inferior and of low value to western staff. While I personally believe in the need to blend the two, the current systems underestimate indigenous knowledge power''. I also wanted to find out the various forms of crisis that they were facing and what came out in terms of ranking and intensity is shown in the table that follows:

No	Nature of Crisis	Frequency
1	Devolution of power (centralisation Vs decentralisation)	70%
2	Blending ubuntuism and indigenous knowledge systems in curriculum (Africanisation of degree programs	80%
3	External influence	60%
5	Transformational mindset	40%
6	Internal stakeholder involvement	56%
7	Political interference	70%
8	Level of community involvement	30%
9	Quality assurance assurances	20 %
10	Internationalisation of curriculum	70%
11	Incentivisation programs	60%
12	Degree of involving opposing forces	65 %
13	Impact of globalisation	70%

Table 2: Crisis intensity ranked
Source: Self-created-Gwakwa (2017)

The Table above shows the challenges in governance experienced by the four selected universities. The reverse intensity measurement (which I am proposing is applicable in this study). The reverse intensity model means that the lower the percentage the more favourable the factor is i.e. the more positive and less felt is the crisis. For example, a score of 20% in quality assurance represents an 80% high score in the ability of good governance on quality assurance issues. Inversely a 70% score on political interference represents a 30% non-interference factor which is a negative score in terms of governance interference on that matter. The best fit in terms of governance, according to the above table is found in quality assurance (20%), community involvement (30%), Transformational mindset (40%).On the higher negative factor universities have deficiencies of blending ubuntuism-indigenous knowledge systems with western based curriculum (80%) meaning only 20% were able to blend ubuntu content with their current program curriculum. Devolution of power with 70% mean that only 30% of the universities have fully embraced the concept while the 70% still believe in centralization of decision making. Generally speaking, one would like to conclude that these universities faces challenges in these various areas and adopting a transformative philosophy is necessary if they have to find space in the ever-changing institutional environments. While this pattern may not represent all African universities, but these results provide an insight in terms of the challenges (governance crisis) most African universities are facing.

17. Recommendations
One of the major recommendations, I want to make is the creation and enhancement of net work management by all stakeholders who have a direct interest in the growth and sustainable development of the universities in Africa. That means that management influence is less direct and more in the form of sense-making, setting agendas and institutionalized influence. Within their teams, lecturers have to collaborate very closely and therefore have to invest their personality in their work. It is not enough that they invest their time and presence; they must be motivated and engaged and empowered.   Leadership in networks at a distance presupposes a distant leadership, and the loose couplings are a means to produce this. This reduction of university complexity is, in fact, an example of economizing the management and leadership effort, in that the governing network draws on the participating members' efforts, skills and experiences at the campus. It is important to note that elements of this self governance derive from the consideration that the lecturers and other staff members involved are professionals and as such are quite capable of governing themselves precisely because they are professionals. Do we think the current crop of leadership African universities succumb to this philosophy? Is this not one governance crisis Africa universities face? Depending on the model adopted (hard or soft governance model-this question can only be answerable when one looks at the model adopted by any given university at a given point in time). Adopting a soft governance model should get priority for effective transformational paradigm to be experienced.

It is paramount in this paper to mention categorically that good governance and good leadership is about mobilizing and strengthening the freedom of lecturers and non-academic members of staff, students and communities around us in order to make it possible for them to govern themselves. The 'conduct of conduct' (Sørensen & Tofting, 2005) aims at encouraging the staff and other stakeholders to participate in the University management functions, and to place that responsibility on them without the use of coercion.

The adoption of free and deep democracy is necessary for the enhancement and development of practical transformational governance in Africa. Dewey (1916 in; Mulford & Moreno, 2006) saw 'deep' democracy as involving respect for the dignity of individuals and their cultural traditions, reverence for and proactive facilitation of free and open inquiry and critique, recognition of interdependence in working for the common good, the responsibility of individuals to participate in free and open inquiry, and the importance of collective choices and actions in the interest of the common good. It is useful to position the view of democracy that is used by Dewey, Beane & Apple: the concept of participatory democracy (popularly known as academic freedom), which seems to be the most appropriate and useful concept in regard to universities and education.

It is perhaps surprising that there is no common code for university governance in Africa let alone Sub-Saharan Africa to provide guidance across the complex and diverse world of university services, which are provided by the tertiary institutions and a range of other agencies. The Good Governance Standard (GGS) for universities will addresses issues raised in this paper head on. The code of conduct will provide a basis for all stakeholders to challenge sub-standard governance by universities and hence in a way push for transformation and change of leadership, if found wanting and sleeping on duty.

The leadership body should take the lead in establishing and promoting values for the university and its staff. These values should be over and above legal requirements (for example, anti-discrimination, equal opportunities and freedom of information legislation) and should build on the agreed code of conduct. They should reflect stakeholder expectations about the conduct and behaviour of individuals and groups who control university operations. The governing body should keep these values at the forefront of its own thinking and use them to guide its decision making.

The leadership body should include: identifying key strategic, operational and financial risks, assessing the possible effects that the identified risks could have on the organisation, agreeing on and implementing appropriate responses to the identified risks (internal control, insure, terminate, modify, accept) and putting ensure that the university operates an effective system of risk management. This should in place a framework of assurance from different sources, to show that risk management processes, including responses, are working effectively.

There is a need for policies that increase the space for debate and consultation, encourage innovation, and pursue desired outcomes with positive incentives rather than through prohibitions alone. Open debate airing real differences, while engendering some controversy, can elicit sustained participation— particularly if it has clear-cut effects upon the decisions and policies eventually implemented.

In both established and renewed governances and transformed leaderships students, staff and industrialists will be final arbiters of what is, and is not, credible governance reform; thus, it is important to involve students, staff and industry in the shaping of reform agendas from the start.

There is need to strongly emphasise stronger academic and administrative leadership of institutions, and a clearer division of responsibility between academic and administrative leaders. Stensaker (2004). Individual countries, in their education ACT(s) must make it voluntary for the institutions to decide whether they want to continue the system with separate academic and administrative leaders. A typical governance arrangement in is to abandon the dual structure by giving the overall responsibility to the academic leader, who in turn may delegate tasks and responsibilities to the administrative staff. This implies that university leadership should be vested in the hands of academics and not administrators.

African universities should be very clear in their leadership portfolio that their main mandate is to serve the local, regional and international communities and contribute to overall socio-economic development, thus they are expected to develop a more explicit external orientation, implying a transformational leadership framework cannot be ignored and or taken for granted.

18. Conclusions

Change towards sustainable leadership and good governance is mostly about people and we can all make a difference – together in Africa. Accepting collaboration frameworks inevitably brings challenges and opportunities to and for the universities. In particular, for universities and school systems, it demands the rethinking of current practices and developing alternative conceptions of leadership, professional development and pedagogy (new cultures embedded in indigenous thinkology). It necessitates tackling the deep-rooted problems of social inequality and educational disadvantage that so many countries have yet to resolve. It requires that we look much more critically at the forms of leadership practice and governance systems most likely to secure long term transformation and change for Africa and the world at large. Paradoxically, universities are no longer the sole key player in higher education since ―the main change, as far as universities are concerned, is that knowledge production and dissemination, research and teaching, are no longer self-contained, quasi monopolistic activities, carried out in relative institutional isolation. As we speak today universities are only one amongst many actors involved in the production of knowledge (Gibbons, 1998). International rankings have added to the pressure on university governance. Salmi links high-ranking universities to three connected factors: concentration of talent, abundant funding and appropriate governance (Salmi, 2009). Autonomy that allows institutions to manage their resources capably and to quickly respond to the demands of a rapidly changing global market is essential, though not alone sufficient to establish and maintain world-class universities. It is again essential to assert that the forms of crises experience in managing a university are not mutually exclusive and distinct from each other. Thus, while academic democracy is often perceived as a system of internal representation, it could be argued that external representation in university governance is also a question of democracy, at least from a system perspective. External members in governing bodies in higher education institutions could be seen as representatives for civil society. To me this kind of democracy implies a limitation of the principle of workplace democracy by university employees. Good governance in Africa should be upheld by embracing African heritage and the spirit of ubuntuism.

19. References

i.   Aasen, P. and B. Stensaker (2007), "Balancing Trust and Technology, Leadership Training Higher Education", International Journal of Educational Management, Vol. 21, pp. 417-433.
ii. Adebanwi, W. and Obadare, E. 2013. (eds.) Democracy and Prebendalism in Nigeria: Critical Interpretations. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
iii. Amaral, A. and A. Magelhães (2002), "The Emergent Role of External Stakeholders", in A. Amaral, G.A. Jones and B. Karseth (eds.), Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp. 1-23.
iv. Amaral, A., G. Jones and B. Karseth (eds.) (2002), Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
v.   Askling, B. (2000), "Higher Education and Academic Staff in a Period of Policy and System Change", Higher Education, Vol. 41, pp. 183-203.

vi.   Baird, J. (2006), "Beyond Professionalisation: Enhancing the Governance Culture for Australian University Governing Boards", Tertiary Education and Management, Vol. 12, pp. 297-309.

vii.   Beane, J. A., & Apple, M. W. (1999). The case for democratic schools. In M. W. Apple & J. A. Beane (Eds.), Democratic schools, lessons from chalk face. Buckingham: Open University Press

viii.   Bourdieu, P. (1990). The logic of practice. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univeristy Press.

ix.   Chang, H. (2012). "Industrial Policy: Can Africa Do It?" IEA/World Bank Roundtable. New Thinking on Industrial Policy: Implications for Africa." Pretoria, South Africa. July 3-4.

x.   Dahl, R. A. (1961). Who governs? New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

xi.   Dean, M. (1999a). Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society. London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

xii.   Dean, M. (1999b). Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society. London: Sage.

xiii.   Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy in education. New York: Macmillan.

xiv.   Dewey, J. (1937). Democracy and educational administration. In J. Ratner (Ed.), Education today. New York: G.P. Putman's sons.

xv.   Diamond, L. (2011). "Why Democracies Survive," Journal of Democracy, 22 (1): 17-30;

xvi.   DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983, April). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality. American Sociological Review, 48, 147–160.

xvii.   Engelbert, P. (2000). State, Legitimacy and Development in Africa. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers..

xviii. Fashola, B. (2009). "Leadership, Followership, Good Governance and Development in Nigeria". Faculty Distinguished Lecture, No. 3. Faculty of the Social Sciences. University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

xix.   Foucault, M. (1976/1994). Viljen til viden. Seksualitetens historie 1[the will to knowledge. The history of sexuality 1]. København: Det Lille Forlag.

xx.   Greenwald, B. and Stiglitz, J. (2012). "Industrial Policies, the Creation of a Learning Society, and Economic Development". IEA/World Bank Roundtable. New Thinking on Industrial Policy: Implications for Africa." Pretoria, South Africa. July 3-4.

xxi.   Harbeson, John W. (2013). "Democracy, Autocracy and the Sub-Saharan African State," in John W. Harbeson and Donald Rothchild (eds.). Africa in World Politics: Engaging a Changing Global Order. Boulder: Westview Press.

xxii.   Herbst, J. (2000). States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

xxiii. Johnson, C. (1999). "The Developmental State: Odyssey of a Concept" in Woo-Cumings (ed.), The Developmental State.

xxiv.   Johnston, Michael, and Sahr J. Kpundeh. 2002. "Building a Clean Machine: Anti- Johnston, Michael. 1993. "Political Corruption: Historical Conflict and the Rise of Standards", Ch. 18 (pp. 193-205) in Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner (eds.),

xxv.   Joseph, M. [2012]. "Make Mistakes Ahead of Time". Interview. Insights Lab. September.

xxvi.   Joseph, R (1983). "Class, State and 'Prebendal Politics' in Nigeria," Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Studies. 21 (3): 21-38.

xxvii. Joseph, R (1987). Democracy and Prebendal Politics in Nigeria: The Rise and Fall of the Second Republic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

xxviii. Joseph, R. (1978). "Affluence and Underdevelopment: The Nigerian Experience," Journal of Modern African Studies, 16 (2): 221-239.

xxix.   Joseph, R. (2013). "The Logic and Legacy of Prebendalism in Nigeria," in W. Adebanwi and E. Obadare. (eds.) Democracy and Prebendalism in Nigeria: Critical Interpretations.

xxx.   Joseph, R. (ed.) (1999). State, Conflict and Democracy in Africa. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

xxxi.   Joseph, R. and Gillies, A. (eds.) (2008). Smart Aid for African Development. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

xxxii. Joseph, R., Spence, K, and Agboluaje, A. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Latecomer Industrialization in Nigeria," https://africaplus.wordpress.com/2013/07/21/corporate-social-responsibility-and-latecomer-industrialization-can-nigeria-do-it/

xxxiii. Khan, M. (2012A). "Governance and Growth: History, Ideology and Methods of Proof," in A. Noman et al. (eds.), Good Governance and Growth.

xxxiv. Khan, M. (2012B). "Governance and Growth Challenges for Africa," in A. Noman et al. (eds.), Good Governance and Growth.

xxxv.   Khan, M. (2012C). "Governance Issues." IEA/World Bank Roundtable. New Thinking on Industrial Policy: Implications for Africa." Pretoria, South Africa. July 3-4.

xxxvi. Kim, T., Kwon, H. and Yi, I. (2011). "'Mixed Governance' and Welfare in South Korea," Journal of Democracy. 22 (3): 120-134.

xxxvii. Lin, J. (2012). "Comparative Advantage". IEA/World Bank Roundtable. New Thinking on Industrial Policy: Implications for Africa." Pretoria, South Africa. July 3-4.

xxxviii. Lin, Y. and Monga, C. (2012). "Solving the Mystery of African Governance," New Political Economy, 17(5): 659-666.

xxxix. Maassen, P. (2003), "Shifts in Governance Arrangements. An Interpretation of New\ Management Structures in Higher Education", in A. Amaral, V.L. Meek and I.M. Larsen (eds.), The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp. 31-53.

xl.   Maassen, P. (2008), "The Modernisation of European Higher Education. National Policy Dynamics", in A. Amaral, I. Bleiklie and C. Musselin (eds.), From Governance to Identity, Festschrift for Mary Henkel, Springer, Dordrecht.

xli.   Mignot-Gerard, S. (2003), "Who are the Actors in the Government of French Universities? The Paradoxical Victory of the Deliberative Leadership", Higher Education, pp. 45, 71-89.

xlii.   Mkandawire, T. (2012). "Institutional Monocropping and Monotasking in Africa," in A. Noman et al. (eds.), Good Governance and Growth.

xliii. Monga, C.. [2012]. "The Globalization Jackpot: Job Dividends from a Multi-Polar World". IEA/World Bank Roundtable. New Thinking on Industrial Policy: Implications for Africa." Pretoria, South Africa. July 3-4.

xliv.   Neave, G. (1998), "The Evaluative State Re-Considered", European Journal of Education, Vol. 33, pp. 265-284.

xlv.   Noman, A. and Stiglitz, J. (2012). "Strategies for African Development" in A. Noman et al. (eds.), Good Growth and Governance.

xlvi.   Noman, A. et al. (eds.) (2012). Good Growth and Governance in Africa: Rethinking Development Strategies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

xlvii.   Ohno, I. and Ohno, K. (2012). "Dynamic Capacity Development: What Africa Can Learn from Industrial Policy Formulation in East Asia," in A. Noman et al. (eds.), Good Governance and Growth.

xlviii.   Olsen, J.P. (2007), "The Institutional Dynamics of the European University", in P. Maassen and J.P. Olsen (eds.), University Dynamics and European Integration, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 25-54.

xlix.   Olsen, J.P. and P. Maassen (2007), "European Debates on the Knowledge Institution: The Modernisation of the University at the European Level", in P. Maassen and J.P. Olsen (eds.), University Dynamics and European Integration, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 3-22.

l.   Oyeyinka, B. and Sampath, P. (2012), "Institutional Capacity and Policy Choices for Latecomer Technology Development," in A. Noman et al. (eds.), Good Governance and Growth.

li.   Page, J. (2012). "Can Africa Industrialise?" Journal of African Economies. 21 (AERC Supplement 2): 86-125.

lii.   Paul, Samuel. 1995. "Evaluating Public Services: A Case Study on Bangalore, India."New Directions for Evaluation, American Evaluation Association, no. 67 (Fall).

liii.   Persson, A., Rothstein B, and Teorell, J. (2013). "Why Anti-Corruption Reforms Fail – Systemic Corruption as a Collective Action Problem", Governance , 26 (3): 449-471.

liv.   Pitcher, A. (2012). Party Politics and Economic Reform in Africa's Democracies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

lv.   Radelet, S. (2010). Emerging Africa: How 17 Countries Are Leading The Way. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press/Center for Global Development.

lvi.   Rodrik, D. (2007). One Economics Many Recipes: Globalization, Institutions, and Economic Growth. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

lvii.   Rothstein, Bo. (2011A). The Quality of Government: Corruption, Social Trust, and Inequality in International Perspective. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

lviii.   Rothstein, Bo. (2011B). "Anti-Corruption: The Indirect 'Big Bang' Approach," Review of International Political Economy, 18. (2): 228-250.

lix.   Rytmeister, C. and S. Marshall (2007), "Studying Political Tensions in University Governance: A Focus on Board Member Constructions of Role", Tertiary Education and Management, Vol. 13, pp. 281-294.

lx.   Samatar, A. (1999). An African Miracle: State and Class Leadership and Colonial Legacy in Botswana Development. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

lxi.   Samatar, A. (2002). "Botswana: Comprehending the Exceptional State," in Abdi Samatar, and Ahmed Samatar (eds.) The African State: Reconsiderations. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

lxii.   Sandbrook, R. (1985). The Politics of Africa's Economic Stagnation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

lxiii.   Santiago, P. et al., (2008), Tertiary Education for the Knowledge Society: Volume 1, OECD, Paris.

lxiv.   Shattock, M. (2006), Managing Good Governance in Higher Education, Open University Press, Maidenhead. Stensaker, B., J. Enders and H.F. de Boer

lxv.   Sklar, R.L (1983). "Democracy in Africa", African Studies Review, 26, (3/4): 11-24.

lxvi.   Smith, Daniel J. (2007). A Culture of Corruption: Everyday Deception and Popular Discontent. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

lxvii.   Taylor, I. (2012). "Botswana as a 'Development-Oriented Gate-Keeping State'", African Affairs, 111 (444): 466-476.

lxviii.   Taylor, S. D. (2012). Globalization and the Cultures of Business in Africa: From Patrimonialism to Profit. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

lxix.   Uslander, E. and Rothstein, B. (2012). "The Roots of Corruption: Mass Education, economic inequality and state building". The Quality of Government Institute (typescript).

lxx.   Vartiainen, J. (1999). "The Economics of Successful State Intervention in Industrial Transformation," in Woo-Cumings (ed.), The Developmental State.

lxxi.   Wade, R (2012). "How can Low-Income Countries Accelerate their Catch-Up with High-Income Countries? The Case for Open-Economy Industrial Policy." IEA/World Bank Roundtable. New Thinking on Industrial Policy: Implications for Africa." Pretoria, South Africa. July 3-4.

lxxii.   Wade, R. (2004). Governing the Market. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

lxxiii.   Wolf, M. (2012) "Pragmatic search for path to prosperity," review of Justin Yifu Lin, The Quest for Prosperity: How Developing Economies Can Take Off, Financial Times, October 14.

lxxiv.   Woo-Cumings, M. (ed.) (1999). The Developmental State. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

lxxv.   Young, C. (2012). The Postcolonial State in Africa: Fifty Years of Independence, 1960-2010. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.