Lecturers' perceptions towards the management style of the merged public higher learning institutions into University of Rwanda

Barthelemy Bizimana[1], Jean Claude Ndagijimana[2,] Claudien Ntahomvukiye[3] & Irénée Ndayambaje[4]

[1,2,3,4] University of Rwanda-College of Education, School of Education

Abstract

As of the year 2013, seven public higher learning institutions in Rwanda were merged into one university called University of Rwanda (UR) with apex specialized colleges. Since then, complaints about its management have been reported. The present study aimed at making a scientific investigation about lecturers' perceptions. Convergent parallel design was chosen. Using simple random technique, from a target population of UR 1229 lecturers, the study sampled 121 lecturers who answered to the questionnaire survey. Besides, purposive sampling enabled to include 5 senior managers, i.e. 3 from colleges and 2 from university headquarters; and subject them for interview. The overall findings informed that lecturers are not satisfactorily involved in managerial and structural changes of UR. To avoid (i) any sort of misunderstanding of lecturers' level of cooperation and (ii) ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the ongoing changes, this study recommends the institutionalization of a consultative/participative managerial style across UR.

Introduction

Across times, higher education has acquired the reputation of being the level of education that detains expertise to train manpower required in various sectors of activities (Musa, 2013). Moreover, higher education is also recognized to be the hub for replica of innovations (Lašáková, Bajzíková & Dedze, 2017). Therefore, states need higher education to achieve sustainable development (Mader & Rammel, 2015; Varghese, 2013). Besides, the employers need the university to produce graduates who have relevant skills and values (Nilsson, 2017). With regards to individuals, higher education is called to respond to the diversity of potential candidates, their motives and thus fulfill their learning desires (Sogunro, 2015). All these justify the reasons why, over the past decades, higher education across the planet has undergone remarkable reforms and change to meet the contemporary trends and demands of the society (Pincus, et al, 2017; Hines, 2017).

In as far as the management of public higher education is concerned, all countries under the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OCDE) as found on the American, European and Asian continents have adopted the New Public Management (NPM) which emphasize on accountability and results in the public sector (Broucker & Leisyte, 2015). As implication, any reform, change, expansion or modernization in European higher education mandatorily takes into account research and teaching staff expertise, views and know-how (European Commission, 2017). Moreover, to guarantee of the initiated changes, the implementation should avoid pressure and safeguard transparency and fairness all the way through (European Commission, 2017).

In the African context, researchers are also advocating for re-consideration of the central role and voices of lecturers if the quality of teaching and learning being looked for in higher education is to be achieved (Mbirithi, 2013).

Hence, as a new trend, African universities are rethinking their role by shifting from their ivory tower role to being responsive to the needs of business and industry (Varghese, 2013). It is in this perspective that Gondwe and Walenkamp (2011) demonstrated that in Africa talents and manpower are being wasted; making therefore a call for policy makers. In fact, Gondwe and Walenkamp (2011) contend that Africa experiences lots of cases of students who, due to economic or school performance reasons do not finish their secondary education. At higher education, students' progression is obstructed by rigid structures, processes and the limited absorption capacity of the institutions (Sawyerr, 2004). Most worrying is the fact that school/university-leavers do not have thoughtful specialized, practical, employable or entrepreneurship skills which hamper the general economic development (Rudhumbu, et. al, 2016; Gondwe & Walenkamp, 2011). In line of this new trends and demands, the Government of Rwanda (henceforth GoR) has undertaken major reforms in public higher education.

During the National Kivu Leadership Retreat of 2011, the Government of Rwanda (GoR) recognized the role that education plays in accelerating socio-economic development. It is within this context that the GoR envisaged a one university system with a focus on providing quality higher education within a research-led institution by producing high quality graduates who have knowledge, skills and attitudes required to meet the demands of the economy of the country.

The overarching goal of establishing the University of Rwanda (UR) was to transform the public higher education to improve quality and effective teaching and learning (GoR, 2011). UR was created under the law N° 71/2013 of 10/09/2013. Its mission, organization, powers and functioning were fixed by Official Gazette No 38 of 23.09.2013. According to UR vision, by 2020 it would have educated the next generation of leaders in Rwanda who are prepared and dedicated to building a more just and sustainable world (http://www.ur.ac.rw/?q=node/53). The mission of UR is to support the development of Rwanda by discovering and advancing knowledge through the highest standards of academic excellence, where students are prepared for lives of service, leadership and problem solving. To achieve its mandate, UR has undertaken a number of restructuring in terms of governance, organization structure and rationalization of academic programmes (Byumvuhore, 2017). Despite the continous restructuring, partners of UR have continuously raised complaints about its poor managerial effectiveness as expressed in waste of public funds, inadequate staffing, poor infrastructural and learning resources (Tuyisenge, 2017). Indeed, it was reported on several occasions that UR had experienced financial crisis leading to poor services delivery (Makuruki, 2016) and extreme delays of staff salary (Mbananabo & Kanamugire, 2016). It is against this backdrop that the present study was set to make a scientific investigation about lecturers' perceptions towards the UR management style. In fact, lecturers not only contribute in students' achievements (Rhoades, 2012) but also in the overall higher education transformation (Veniger, 2016). Therefore, in the context of UR, lecturers' perceptions should be valuable.

Research objectives

The present study was guided by the following research objectives:

    (i) To explore the level of lecturers' agreement with the objectives of the creation of University of Rwanda.

    (ii) To point out the implications of the changes under University of Rwanda on lecturers' community.

    (iii) To propose mechanisms that would make lecturers integral part of University of Rwanda.

Review of related literature

The concept s of management and management style

Although the concept of 'management' is often used interchangeably with 'leadership', management is unique in theory and practice (Middlehurst, 2012). According to Mary Parker Follett, management refers to "the art of getting things done through people" (Bedi, 2009). Thus, the key functions of management include (i) Planning, (ii) Organizing, (iii) Staffing, (iv) Directing, (v) Controlling, (vi) coordinating (Thenmozhi, 2006).

The 'Management style' is understood as approach used by managers to put into effect their authority in the workplace and ensure that their objectives are achieved. It is also about the way managers relate to and deal with their colleagues, subordinates and team members (Chartered Management Institute, 2012). Therefore, the management style increases organizational effectiveness and efficiency (Bucata & Rizescu, 2016). In the present study, management style was operationalized in terms of (i) the way the top management takes decisions and communicates them to concerned parties, (ii) institutional procedures, accountability and services delivery control, and (iii) the extent to which employees are valued as vital resources to the institution they work for.

Change management in higher education

Organizations are now moving from simple to complex organizations (Bratnicka, 2015). These dynamic changes are brought by the imperative to gain a competitive advantage in the fast changing world (Amagoh, 2008). Though changes may aim at rationalization of resources, improvement of staff effectiveness and increase of the quality of outcome (West, 2005), it is hypothesized that employees' feelings should be considered throughout the organizational change (Dahl, 2011). Considering the fact that organizations vary in a number of ways such as governance and/or structure, it is important that any proposed change takes into account the extent to which it will impact on the lives of employees (Lusthaus, et al., 2002). That is the reason why Vogel (2012) insists that managers should lead by heart.

In actual fact, the best practices in change management (USAID, 2015) inform that in order to adopt a holistic approach to continuous change, there is imperative to put emphasis on communication, teamwork, education and training as well as adaptive culture. If this is done, there is greater likelihood to avoid resistance to change which can obstruct the achievement of organizational aims (Yılmaz & Kılıçoğlu, 2013). Sources of organizational resistance

may include a conservative culture, fierce protection of current practices, and prevalence of disciplinary or territorial viewpoints (Jost, 2015). Educational managers and policy makers should therefore avoid resistance to change by not applying coercive measures. Rather, these educational leaders should understand the complex nature of change, as well as knowing reasons behind resistance to change, and learning or applying methods to overcome these barriers (Al-Haddad & Kotnour, 2015). Some of the methods that could be used to overcome resistance to change include communication, participation and involvement, facilitation and support, negotiation as well as agreement (Yılmaz & Kılıçoğlu, 2013).

McAvoy and Butler (2006) argue that change is problematic in any development project. In an attempt to understand reasons why some changes are successful in one place and fail in another one, Farrant (2006) mentioned the following: (i) barriers in communication and consultation; (ii) traditions, (iii) absence of financial support, (iv) late provision of material; (v) absence of appropriate co-ordination; (vi) lack of consensus about the project; (vii) poor rewarding system; (viii) misunderstandings, conflicts and tension at work place.

In the case of educational change, Farrant (2006) proposes four factors that would guarantee the success. These are (1) adequate participation in planning by all stakeholders who will be involved at different levels and stages in the project implementation, (2) Support from authorities responsible for education where an innovation will take place, (3) enough preparation to ensure that the teachers who will be involved will be capable of meeting the demands required from them, and (4) clear delimitation of the sector in which an innovation may operate and extent of the supporting services that could be provided.

Effect of lecturers' participation in higher education change and growth
The central mission of any higher educational institution revolves around teaching, learning, research and community outreach. Thus, lecturers appear as key players in the whole process of the fulfillment of this mission as well as in the higher education strive towards change and growth. Stressing the role of lecturers, Truby (2003) underlines that it is essential that throughout the higher education change and growth, the actors bear in mind that lecturers like putting emphasis on teaching, the power to affect student learning and freedom. To add on, Schofield and Burton (2015) mention publication and research opportunities.

Research has shown a number of factors that demotivate lecturers and henceforth affect their contribution to the institution and overall student's growth. According to Sukirno and Siengthai (2011) and Truby (2003), some of the lead factors that discourage lecturers include lecturers' lack of empowerment in decision making and the administration's ignorance of the role of lecturers towards educational goals' fulfillment. In addition to these, Carney (2004), brings up the issues of (i) lecturers' feeling of being marginalized in the institution they work for, (ii) poor job satisfaction, (iii) heavy workload, (iv) poor wages, and (v) job insecurity. In the same vein, Truby (2003) highlights the lack of time and money to fulfill the assigned tasks among the key drawbacks. More to the point, in cognizance of the

internal and external constraints to the university merging, Goldman (2012) recommends that the initiators and the management take into account the academic staff experience, attitudes, perceptions and suggestions. This will not only assure effective implementation but also safeguard emotional and psychological wellbeing of individuals (Goldman, 2012).

Methodology

This study adopted the convergent parallel design. According to Cresswell (2012), convergent parallel design implies a concurrent quantitative and qualitative data collection procedure whereby these two strands of data are merged to help in the understanding of the research problem. Such a procedure plays a complementary role by overshadowing weaknesses of a single form of data. From a target population of 1229 UR lecturers; the present study sampled 121 lecturers, making approximately 10% of the target population as suggested by Amin (2005). In addition, 5 senior managers of which 3 from colleges and 2 from university headquarters levels were included in this study; making a sample size of 126 respondents in all. Simple random and purposive sampling techniques were used. Questionnaire surveys for lecturers and interviews for senior managers at colleges and UR headquarter level were the data collection instruments. Quantitative data generated by questionnaires called for descriptive statistics analysis by means of Statistical Package for Social Sciences and reported using tables (Orodho, Khatete & Mugiraneza, 2016 & Orodho, Ampofo, Bizimana & Ndayambaje, 2016). Qualitative data as generated by interviews and open questions in the questionnaires were used thematically and reported in narrative forms and/or direct quote (Orodho, Nzabalirwa, Odundo, Waweru & Ndayambaje, 2016). In the end, both quantitative and qualitative data were integrated for discussion, conclusion and recommendation purposes (Kumar, 2012). The interpretation of the quantitative data -as reported in different tables- was based on the mean score. Hence, Table 1 illustrates the basis for interpretation of the quantitative data from questionnaire survey of a five level Likert Scale.

Table 1: Interpretation framework for the quantitative data

Mean range of the responses	Interpretation
3.41-5.00	Agree/Happy
2.61-3.40	Undecided/Uncertain/no answer
1.00-2.60	Disagree/Not happy

Source: Boone and Boone (2012)

Findings

In three major sections reflecting the research objectives, this section presents and analyzes the findings on lecturers' perceptions about the merged public higher learning institutions into University of Rwanda.

Level of lecturers' agreement with the objectives of the creation of UR.

The first research objective to this study was to explore the level of lecturers' agreement with the objectives of the creation of the University of Rwanda. Table 2 presents the responses of 121 lecturers from various colleges who answered to the questionnaire survey on three abridged goals of the creation of UR.

Table 2: Level of lecturers' agreement with the objectives of the creation of UR

Abridged objectives of the creation of UR	Lecturers' view	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Uplift Academic standards	Strongly Disagree	25	20.6		
	Disagree	7	5.7		
	Uncertain	0	0	3.5	1.4
	Agree	63	52		
	Strongly Agree	26	21.5		
Enhance research	Strongly Disagree	41	33.9		
	Disagree	5	4		
	Uncertain	0	0	2.9	1.4
	Agree	74	61.2		
	Strongly Agree	1	0.8		
Effectiveness in coordination of programmes	Strongly Disagree	0	0		
	Disagree	12	9.9		
	Uncertain	0	0	4.3	0.9
	Agree	51	42		
	Strongly Agree	58	47.9		
Create a world class university	Strongly Disagree	33	27.2		
	Disagree	6	4.9		
	Uncertain	9	7.4	3.2	1.5
	Agree	49	40.4		
	Strongly Agree	24	19.8		
Enhance communication and service delivery	Strongly disagree	19	15.7		
	Disagree	35	28.9		
	Uncertain	13	10.7	2.9	1.3
	Agree	44	36.4		
	Strongly agree	10	8.3		

Source: Primary data (2014)

The analysis of the data in Table 2 leads to realize that lecturers do much believe that the creation of University of Rwanda will uplift academic standards (Mean=3.5, Sdt Dev=1.4) and bring about the effectiveness in terms of Effectiveness in coordination of programmes (Mean=4.3, Sdt Dev.0.9) . Nonetheless, the surveyed 121

lecturers are doubtful whether UR is established to become a world class university (Mean=3.2, Sdt Dev 1.5). These lecturers tend to disagree that the creation of UR will enhance service delivery (Mean= 2.9, Sdt Dev=1.3)

Implications of the changes under University of Rwanda on lecturers' community

Established in the year 2013, the University of Rwanda (UR) is relatively a very young higher education institution. However, UR is a result of the merging of seven well established Rwandan public higher education institutions. Hence, in line with the second research objective to the present study, it was quite informative to scan the "lecturers' work experience in academic life of these institutions" in order to realize the extent to which the changes under UR would be affected by this variable.

Table 3: Lecturers' years of experience in the former public higher learning institution

Lecturers' years of experience	Frequency (N)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0-2 years	9	7.4	7.4
3-5 years	45	37.2	44.6
6-8 years	2	1.7	46.3
9-10 years	3	2.5	48.8
11 years & over	62	51.2	100
Total	121	100	

Source: Primary data (2014)

The data in Table 3 indicate that the majority (51.2%) of the lecturers were long servants (11 years and above) of the former public higher education institutions that were merged to create the University of Rwanda. It was therefore important to ask all respondents to this study their overall view of the merging. Table 4 gives a snapshot of the answers.

Table 4: Lecturers' anticipation about positive changes in academic staff welfare

Lecturers' views	Frequency (N)	Age range
Strongly disagree	32	11 years and over
Disagree	60	9-10 years
Uncertain	12	0-2 years
Agree	14	6-8 years
Strongly agree	3	3-5 years
Total	121	

Source: Primary data (2014)

The data in Table 4 show that lecturers who do not expect much of the positive changes in terms of academic staff welfare are those long servants of the former public higher education (9 years and above). Those who

were quite fresh in the academic life (0-2 years) could not decide whereas those who have spent 3 to 8 eight years remain optimistic about potential positive changes.

Proposed mechanisms that would make lecturers integral part of University of Rwanda management.

The third objective of this study was to proposed mechanisms that would make lecturers integral part of University of Rwanda management. As a starting point, this study explored whether lecturers were happy with the ongoing changes under UR after its creation and if they are involved at some extent in these changes. Table 5 gives the scenario.

Table 5: Lecturers' stand about the ongoing changes under UR after its creation

Statements	Level of Agreement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Dev
Lecturers are happy of the ongoing changes	Not at all	32	26.4		
	A little	60	49.6		
	No answer	12	9.9	2.1	1.0
	Fair	14	11.6		
	A lot	3	2.5		
	Total	121	100		
Lecturers are actively involved in the change process	Not at all	61	50.4		
	A little	47	38.8		
	No answer	0	0	1.1	1.0
	Fair	11	9.1		
	A lot	2	1.7		
	Total	121	100		

Source: Primary data (2014)

The data in Table 5 inform that lecturers are generally not happy on the ongoing changes after the creation of UR (Mean=2.1, Sdt Dev =1.0). Moreover, the data in the Table 5 communicate that lecturers are not actively involved in the changes that are being initiated/taking place (Mean=1.1, Sdt Dev=1.0). It is on this ground that the researchers approached the senior managers at the college and UR headquarters to know more about the change processes.

On the extent to which lecturers are informed and involved in the ongoing changes within UR, the interviewee coded IQS 2 replied: "…*prior to the merging, lecturers were invited for consultation but many did not turn up to attend the scheduled meetings yet we have communicated to them through their heads of department….they are not responsive. It is therefore, an individual responsibility to take interest..."*

In the view of another informant IQS 1; "…*UR is a legal body. It has a mission and a vision... We have defined values and we must remain accountable vis-à-vis our responsibility to students and to the Rwandan*

population…. Our part is done but individuals have to make their choice… We must achieve our mandate….Anyone who is against can chose to go away…."

Probing further to know whether some of the proposed changes would not bring about a lot of bureaucracy, the informant IQS 5 replied: "….No no! These c*hanges will not bring more bureaucracy and centralization …It is only that Lecturers may have not been sufficiently informed or may have not made an effort to be informed on the nature of the* new structure …" As for the UR efficiency, the same informant, IQS 5 went further and said that there is no room for a lot of bureaucracy at UR because (i) the structure is clear and the (ii) positions like the ones of the Chancellor and the Board are not involved into day to day management running.

Discussion and conclusion

In line with the first research objective that aimed at exploring the level of lecturers' agreement with the objectives of the University of Rwanda, the findings informed that lecturers do much believe that the creation of University of Rwanda will uplift academic standards and bring about the effectiveness in terms of programme coordination. This information ties with the fact that the prime concern of lecturers in higher education is about teaching and impacting on students learning (Truby, 2003). Nonetheless, the fact that lecturers seem unconvinced that UR is established to become a world class university might be tied with what is required to have a world class university. Lecturers might have underestimated the publication and research opportunities (Schofield & Burton, 2015) under UR and hence deny the UR dream to become a world class university for now. This perception is revealing in the sense that institutions that want a global visibility should have locally exhibited unquestionable appreciation in the entire academic and administrative facets. Also, one may guess that lecturers have discovered that UR management is merely emphasizing on policies and standards by ignoring that these are fulfilled by individuals; who in the practice seem less considered. Therefore, there is need to get out of dream, develop a shared vision, institute a culture and an environment that are favorable for communication, criticisms, evaluation and monitoring.

The second objectives intended to point out the implications of the changes under University of Rwanda on lecturers' community. Data indicated that the majority of the lecturers were long servants of the former public higher education institutions that were merged to create the University of Rwanda. Indeed, the data exhibit the reality that lecturers who do not expect much of the positive changes in terms of academic staff welfare are those long servants of the formerly merged public higher education institution. This implies that the changes that brought about the creation of UR and the ongoing ones after UR creation might be overlooking if not sacrificing individual welfare. This is controversial because complex organizations (Bratnicka, 2015) that aim to remain competitive (Amagoh, 2008), have to take into account the employees' feelings throughout the organizational change (Dahl, 2011) because this will also safeguard emotional and psychological wellbeing of individuals (Goldman, 2012). Like that organizational structures (Lusthaus, et al., 2002) should be shaped in such a way that employees foresee that the management has

heard their voices and is leading by heart (Vogel, 2012). It is such an attitude that will prematurely discover potential roadblocks (Al-Haddad & Kotnour, 2015), discard any sort of resistance to change (Yılmaz & Kılıçoğlu, 2013; Jost, 2015) and improve staff performance because the higher the lecturer's loyalty to the organization's vision, the higher their job execution.

The third objective was set to propose mechanisms that would make lecturers integral part of University of Rwanda. Generally, quantitative data report that lecturers are not happy with the ongoing changes after the creation of UR. Lecturers do also complain that they are not involved in the changes that are being initiated/taking place. This situation looks more divisive with the qualitative information from senior managers at the colleges and UR headquarters, which tells that lecturers were consulted prior to the creation of UR and they are also called for meetings. Nonetheless, a scrutiny of the reporting tells that lecturers do not attend these meetings and the senior management goes further implementing the set plans irrespective lecturers' level of involvement. In view of this problematic situation, the UR senior managers should not only be concerned about getting things done (Bedi, 2009). They should remember that an effective management starts from planning and a successful planning actively involves all key players (Thenmozhi, 2006). They are therefore called to work around the reasons why lecturers do not satisfactorily attend the called meetings. This is crucial because lecturers may have disliked the way the UR management relate with them (Chartered Management Institute, 2012). It might also be true that lecturers have discovered that their voices shall never be heard. Or, lecturers might have discovered that the management is not willing to entertain any forthcoming idea that redirects their courses of action. Hence, if UR management is looking for inalienable achievements (Bucata & Rizescu, 2016), it should reconsider the role of lecturers. Some of the effective strategies proposed by Farrant (2006) and Truby (2003) include (i) active involvement of stakeholders, (ii) improvement and diversification of communication channels, (iii) giving enough time for preparation for the change and (iv) availing required financial support. In fact, lecturers deserve empowerment in decision making (Sukirno & Siengthai, 2011; Truby, 2003). This would avoid (i) any sort of misinterpretation of lecturers' level of cooperation in the UR management and (ii) ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the ongoing changes. In other words, this calls for the institutionalization of a frank consultative/participative managerial style across UR.

References

Al-Haddad, S. & Kotnour, T. (2015). Integrating the organizational change literature: a model for successful change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 28 2, 234-262.

Amagoh, F. (2008). Perspectives on Organizational Change: Systems and Complexity Theories. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 13 (3), 3, 1-14

Amin, M.E. (2005). *Social Science Research: Conception, Methodology and Analysis*. Kampala: Makerere University.

Bedi, K. (2009). *Management and Entrepreneurship*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Bratnicka, K. (2015). Creativity and effectiveness in organizations. A new approach to an old question. *Management*, 19 (1)

Broucker, B., Wit, K.D. & Leisyte, L. (2015). *An evaluation of new public management in higher education*: Same rationale, different implementation. Paper presented in track 1 at the EAIR 37th Annual Forum in Krems, Austria 30 August till 2 September 2015.

Bucata, G. & Rizescu, A.M. (2016). Management Style as a Triggering Factor for Organization Effectiveness and Efficiency. *Journal of Defense Resources Management*, 7 (2) 13.

Byumvuhore, F. (2017, June 14th). University of Rwanda in fresh round of restructuring. *The NewTimes*, accessed on 29th September 2017 on http://www.newtimes.co.rw/section/read/214207/

Carney, K.L. (2004). *The University English Lecturer: Colleague or Commodity*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte. 198 pp.

Chartered Management Institute (2012). *Understanding Management Styles*, Available at https://www.managers.org.uk/~/media/Files/Campus%20CMI/Checklists%20First%20Management%20Role/Understanding%20management%20styles.ashx

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*, 4th Ed., Boston: Pearson.

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2017). *Modernisation of Higher Education in Europe: Academic Staff – 2017*. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Farrant, J.S. (2006). *Principles and Practice of Education.* Edinburgh: Longman.

Goldman, G.A. (2012). Exploring academics' experiences of a merger in higher education: The reflective experience of mergers (REM)-framework. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6 (14), 4862 - 4879.

Gondwe, M. & Walenkamp, J. (2011). *Alignment of Higher Professional Education with the Needs of the Local Labour market:The case of Ghana*. The Hague University of Applied Sciences.

Hines, A. (2017) "Emerging student needs disrupting higher education". *On the Horizon*, 25 (3), 197-208, https://doi.org/10.1108/OTH-02-2017-0010

Jost, J.T. (2015). Resistance to Change: A Social Psychological Perspective. *Social Research*, 82 (3), 607-636.

Kumar, R. (2012). *Research Methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners*, 3rd Ed., London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Lašáková, A., Bajzíková, Ľ. & Dedze, I. (2017). Barriers and drivers of innovation in higher education: Case study-based evidence across ten European universities. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 55, 69-79.

Lusthaus, C., Adrien, M-L., Anderson, G., Carden, F. & Montalván, G.P. (2002) *Organizational Assessment: A Framework for Improving Performance*, Washington, D.C.: International Development Research Centre

Mader, C. & Rammel, C. (2015). Transforming Higher Education for Sustainable Development, In *Brief for GSDR 2015*, Available at https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/621564-Mader_Rammel_Transforming%20Higher%20Education%20for%20Sustainable%20Development.pdf.

Makuruki (2016, March 23rd). Kaminuza y'u Rwanda mu ruhuri rw'ibibazo bishingiye k'ubukene n'imiyoborerwe yayo. *Makuruki.rw*, Available at http://www.makuruki.rw/IMIBEREHO-MYIZA/article/Kaminuza-y-u-Rwanda-mu-ruhuri-rw-ibibazo-bishingiye-k-ubukene-n-imiyoborerwe-yayo

Mbirithi, D.M. (2013). *Management Challenges Facing Kenya's Public Universities and Implications for the Quality of Education*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Kenyatta University.

McAvoy, J. & Butler , T. (2006). Resisting the change to user stories: a trip to Abilene. *International Journal of Information Systems and Change Management*, 1 (1), 48-61.

Mbananabo, E. & Kanamugire, E. (2016, Sepetmber 11th). Abarimu barenga 100 ba Kaminuza y'u Rwanda bamaze amezi 11 badahembwa. Igihe.com, Available at http://www.igihe.com/amakuru/u-rwanda/article/abarimu-barenga-100-ba-kaminuza-y-u-rwanda-bamaze-amezi-11-badahembwa

Middlehurst, R. (2012). Leadership and Management in Higher Education: A Research Perspective, Working Paper No. 2012/47, Maastricht School of Management'.

Musa, C.N. (2013). Higher Education and the Challenges of Manpower Training and National Development in Nigeria. *Academic Research International*, 4 (4), 383-391.

Nilsson S. (2017) Employability, Employment and the Establishment of Higher Education Graduates in the Labour Market. In: *Tomlinson M., Holmes L. (eds) Graduate Employability in Context*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Orodho, J.A., Ampofo, Y.S., Bizimana, B. & Ndayambaje, I. (2016). *Quantitative Data Management: A Step by Step to Data Analysis Using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows Computer Programme*, (1st Ed.). Nairobi: Kanezja Happyland Enterprises.

Orodho, J. A.; Khatete, I. & Mugiraneza, J.P. (2016). *Concise Statistics: An Illustrative Approach to Problem Solving,* Nairobi: Kanezja Publishers.

Orodho, J. A., Nzabalirwa, W., Odundo, J., Waweru, P.N. & Ndayambaje, I. (2016). *Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods: A step by Step Guide to Scholarly Excellence*, Nairobi: Kanezja Publishers.

Pincus, K., Stout, D., Sorensen, J., Stocks, K. D. & Lawson, R. A. (2017). Forces for change in higher education and implications for the accounting academy. *Journal of Accounting Education*, 40, 1-18.

Rhoades, G. (2012). Faculty Engagement to Enhance Student Attainment. A Paper prepared for National Commission on Higher Education Attainment, Available at http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Faculty-Engagement-to-Enhance-Student-Attainment--Rhoades.pdf

Rudhumbu, N., Makambe, U, Mkali, O-B., & Ndlovu, B. (2016). Understanding Graduate Employability: A Case of a Selected Higher Education Institution in Botswana. *European Journal of Training and Development Studies*, 3 (2), 1-16.

Sawyerr, A. (2004). Challenges Facing African Universities: Selected Issues. *African Studies Review*, 47 (1), 1-59.

Schofield, C. & Burton, F. L. (2015). *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 52 (3), 265-276.

Sogunro, O.A. (2015). Motivating Factors for Adult Learners in Higher Education. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4 (1).

Sukirno, D. S. & Siengthai, S. (2011). Does Participative Decision Making Affect Lecturer Performance in Higher Education? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25 (5), 494-508.

Thenmozhi, M. (2006). Management Concepts and fundamentals, Indian Institute of Technology Madras

Truby, K. (2003). Short-Order Teachers: The Joys and Frustrations of the University Lecturer. *ADFL Bulletin,* 34 (2), 42-44

Tuyisenge, J.P. (2017, February 22nd). Uruhuri rw'ibibazo muri za Kaminuza zo mu Rwanda, *Igihe.com*, Available at http://www.igihe.com/amakuru/u-rwanda/article/uruhuri-rw-ibibazo-muri-kaminuza-y-u-rwanda

University of Rwanda Official website, *www.ur.ac.rw*

USAID (2015). *Change Management Best Practices Guide: An Additional Help for ADS Chapter 597*, Available at https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/597saj.pdf

Veniger, K. A. (2016).University Teachers' Opinions about Higher Education Pedagogical Training Courses in Slovenia. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal,* 6 (4).

Vogel, L. R. (2012). Leading with Hearts and Minds: Ethical Orientations of Educational Leadership Doctoral Students. *Values and Ethics in Educational administration*, 10 (1), 1-12

West, R. (2005). Time for a change: Putting the Transtheoretical (Stages of Change) Model to rest. *Addiction,* 100 (8), 1036-1039.

Yılmaz, D. & Kılıçoğlu, G. (2013). Resistance to change and ways of reducing resistance in educational organizations. *European Journal of Research on Education*, 1 (1), 14-21