



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA
***DEANS' ROLES IN GOVERNANCE PRACTICES IN SELECTED
PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, PAKISTAN***

SHAKEELA SHAH

FPP 2016 23



**DEANS' ROLES IN GOVERNANCE PRACTICES IN SELECTED PUBLIC
UNIVERSITIES, PAKISTAN**

By

SHAKEELA SHAH

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

April 2016

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



DEDICATION

To my parents of blessed memory and for the courage, moral and financial support they have given me in life; to my teachers who made able to come at this level, to my supervisors who supported me to complete this journey.



Abstract of the thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

DEANS' ROLES IN GOVERNANCE PRACTICES IN SELECTED PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, PAKISTAN

By

SHAKEELA SHAH

April 2016

Chairman : Soaib bin Asimiran, PhD
Faculty : Educational Studies

University governance is about allocation of power, roles and responsibilities in university administration practices. There are perplexing questions on who should have the power, who should lead and govern the universities especially public universities. Unclear allocation of power and ambiguity of roles of stakeholders in the governance process especially the deans have made their roles ineffective.

The objective of this study was to examine the deans' roles and power allocated to them in governance practices in selected public universities in Pakistan. This study also explored how deans' roles are understood by various stakeholders as well as the extent of the deans' involvement in the governance process in the selected public universities.

This is a qualitative research and sixteen university stakeholders comprising deans, vice chancellors, pro vice chancellors, and directors of quality enhancement sections were interviewed using a semi-structured interview protocol to explore their understanding and interpretations about the governance process. The interviews lasted between 50 to 80 minutes and were recorded in a digital audio recorder. Data analysis was carried out in two phases. First, the interviews were transcribed and documents were analyzed accordingly. Second phase involved the thematic data analysis through open coding, axial coding and selective coding.

The results revealed the existence of strong policies developed by the government. However, according to the deans, there are no clear defined legislation until now, laws are outdated and not amended in line with the university development. Governance system was perceived as working on adhocism, following traditional rules, procedures and practices. The Chancellor and vice chancellor are the only authorities and have excessive powers as understood by the deans. It was felt that the system was over-centralized, governance framework was inadequate to meet the challenges of modern time and was strongly influenced by the government political aspirations.

In practice, there were differences in understanding and interpretations on the involvement of the deans in governance processes due to roles conflicts and roles ambiguity. The university top management perceived the deans as the academic leaders of the respective faculties, having the relevant power to decide for faculty affairs, but the deans regard themselves as powerless.

The study recommends that the present laws on university governance to be re-looked, the constitutional framework on university governance has to be amended and improved, and the allocation of powers as well as the deans' roles to be described clearly in the university constitution so that the future deans could functions effectively in the governance process.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

DEANS' ROLES IN GOVERNANCE PRACTICES IN SELECTED PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, PAKISTAN

Oleh

SHAKEELA SHAH

April 2016

Pengerusi : Soaib bin Asimiran, PhD
Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan

Governan universiti adalah berkaitan pengagihan kuasa, peranan dan tanggungjawab dalam amalan pentadbiran universiti. Terdapat persoalan yang membingungkan mengenai siapa yang harus mempunyai kuasa, siapa yang patut mengetuai dan mentadbir universiti khususnya universiti awam. Pengagihan kuasa yang tidak jelas dan kekaburan peranan pemegang taruh dalam proses governan terutamanya dekan telah menyebabkan peranan mereka tidak efektif.

Objektif kajian ini ialah untuk mengkaji peruntukan kuasa yang diagihkan dan peranan dekan dalam amalan governan universiti di universiti awam terpilih di Pakistan. Kajian ini juga menerokai bagaimana peranan dekan difahami oleh pemegang taruh, juga tahap penglibatan dekan dalam proses governan di universiti awam yang dipilih.

Kajian ini ialah kajian kualitatif dan enam belas (16) pemegang taruh yang terdiri daripada dekan, naib canselor, pro-naib canselor, dan pengarah bahagian penambahbaikan kualiti telah ditemu bual menggunakan protokol temu bual soalan separa berstruktur untuk menerokai pemahaman dan interpretasi mereka mengenai proses governan. Setiap temu bual mengambil masa 50 hingga 80 minit dan telah dirakam menggunakan peralatan rakaman audio. Analisis data melibatkan dua fasa. Pertama, rakaman temu bual telah ditranskrib dan dokumen telah dianalisis. Fasa kedua melibatkan analisis data tematik menerusi pengkodan terbuka, pengkodan paksi dan pengkodan terpilih.

Keputusan kajian menunjukkan kewujudan dasar-dasar yang kukuh yang dibangunkan oleh kerajaan. Bagaimanapun, menurut dekan-dekan yang ditemu bual, universiti awam tidak mempunyai peruntukan undang-undang yang ditakrifkan jelas sehingga kini, undang-undang terkebelakang dan tidak dipinda sejar dengan pembangunan universiti. Sistem governan dilihat sebagai dilaksanakan berdasarkan kepada *ad hocism*, mengikut peraturan, prosedur dan amalan tradisional. Hanya canselor dan naib canselor yang mempunyai otoriti dan kuasa yang berlebihan sebagaimana yang

difahami oleh dekan-dekan. Turut ditafsirkan bahawa sistem governan terlalu berpusat, kerangka governan tidak mampu untuk menghadapi cabaran masa kini dan sangat dipengaruhi oleh aspirasi politik kerajaan.

Dari segi amalan, terdapat perbezaan dalam memahami dan mentafsir mengenai penglibatan dekan dalam proses governan disebabkan konflik peranan dan kekaburan peranan. Pentadbiran atasan menyifatkan dekan sebagai pemimpin akademik di fakulti masing-masing dan mempunyai kuasa yang tertentu untuk memutuskan perkara-perkara di fakulti mereka, tetapi dekan-dekan berpandangan sebaliknya dan merasai mereka tiada kuasa berbuat demikian.

Kajian ini mencadangkan supaya undang-undang sedia ada berkaitan governan universiti dilihat semula, kerangka perlembagaan dalam governan universiti dipinda dan ditambah baik, dan pengagihan kuasa terhadap peranan dekan diperjelaskan dalam perlembagaan universiti agar dekan pada masa hadapan akan dapat berfungsi dengan berkesan dalam proses governan universiti.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to thank Allah (S.W.T) for giving me a life and good health which enable me to pursue this study. Next I would like to thank my parents of blessed memory. Next I would like to offer my sincere thanks to my Supervisor Dr. Soaib Bin Asimiran whose open policy, friendly disposition and critical thoughts all helped to shape this thesis to what it is today. Dr. Soaib was so helpful and committed that he would not wait for me to call him but took it upon himself to contact me on a regular basis to find out how I was progressing.

Next I would like to thank my two Committee members Prof Zaidatol Akmaliah Lope Pihie and Dr. Shamsuddin Ahmad who also exuded great interest in my work and offered very useful advice. They were fully committed to my committee meetings and responded to my communications and requests swiftly.

I would like to thank the Pakistan Government and University of Sindh, Jamshoro through the Higher Education Commission for granting me the Scholarship and study leave which enabled me to pursue this study in Malaysia. My sincere appreciation goes to all my esteemed respondents who managed to find time from their very busy schedules to grant me series of interviews. I am grateful for all your assistance.

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 08 April 2016 to conduct the final examination of Shakeela Shah on his thesis entitled "Deans' Roles in Governance Practices in Selected Public Universities, Pakistan" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Abu Daud b Silong, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Azimi b Hj Hamzah, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Ramli Basri, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Peter Walter Cunningham, PhD

Professor
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
South Africa
(External Examiner)



ZULKARNAIN ZAINAL, PhD

Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 28 June 2016

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of the Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Soaib b Asimiran, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Zaidatul Akmaliah Lope Pihie, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Shamsuddin b Ahmad, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

BUJANG BIN KIM HUAT, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other agree at any other institution
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules,, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other material as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name and Matric No.: Shakeela Shah (GS) 27417

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) were adhered to.

Signature: _____

Name of Chairman
of Supervisory
Committee:

Dr. Soaib b Asimiran

Signature: _____

Name of Member
of Supervisory
Committee:

Professor Dr. Zaidatul Akmaliah Lope Pihie

Signature: _____

Name of Member
of Supervisory
Committee:

Dr. Shamsuddin b Ahmad

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
APPROVAL	vi
DECLARATION	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.1.1 Challenges to University Governance	2
1.1.2 Background of the Study	5
1.1.3 Position of Deans in University Governance	8
1.2 Problem Statement	11
1.3 Objectives of the Study	12
1.4 Research Questions	13
1.5 Rationale of the Study	13
1.6 Scope of the Study	14
1.7 Significance of the Study	14
1.8 Limitations of the Study	15
1.9 Definition of Terms	16
1.9.1 Public University	16
1.9.2 University Governance	16
1.9.3 Power	16
1.9.4 Dean	16
1.9.5 Syndicate	17
1.9.6 Senate	17
1.9.7 Role	17
1.9.8 Challenges	17
1.10 Summary	17
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	18
2.1 Introduction	18
2.2 Overview of Governance	20
2.2.1 Governance as Structure and Process	20
2.2.2 Governance as Allocation of Powers	21
2.2.3 Challenges to University Governance	22
2.3 Power in University Governance	23
2.3.1 Ambiguity of Power	26
2.4 No one Model	27
2.4.1 Bureaucratic Model	28
2.4.2 Political Model	29
2.4.3 Collegial Model	30

2.4.4	Corporate Model	31
2.4.5	Academic Model	32
2.4.6	Shared Governance Model	34
2.5	Challenges to University Governance Structures	35
2.6	Role of Faculty in Governance Process	38
2.7	Role of Deans in Governance Process	39
2.7.1	Complex Position of Deans in University Governance	41
2.7.2	Challenges to the Deans	44
2.7.3	Role of Dean in Different Countries	45
2.8	The Structure of University Offices in Public Universities in Pakistan	47
2.8.1	The University Authorities	48
2.8.2	The Role and Powers of Deans in University Constitution	49
2.9	Theoretical Framework	50
2.9.1	Structural Theory	51
2.9.2	Researches utilizing Governance Structure	51
2.9.3	Role Theory	58
2.9.4	Researches utilizing Role	58
2.9.5	Lapworth's Model for Academic Participation	59
2.10	Modeling Framework	61
2.11	Summary	64
3	METHODOLOGY	65
3.1	Introduction	65
3.2	The Purpose Statement	66
3.2.1	Why Case Study	67
3.3	The Selection of Cases	69
3.3.1	Sampling Frame	71
3.4	Participant Selection	72
3.5	Instrument	72
3.6	Researcher's Qualification	73
3.7	Data Collection Procedures	74
3.7.1	Interviews	75
3.7.1.1	Interview Protocols	76
3.7.2	Documents Analysis	76
3.7.3	Research Objectives, Questions and Sources of Data	77
3.8	Data Analysis and Interpretation	78
3.8.1	Preliminary or during Data Collection Analysis	79
3.8.2	Managing Data	79
3.8.3	Transcribing the Interview	80
3.8.4	Analyzing Interviews	80
3.9	Validity and Reliability	81
3.9.1	Member Checks	82
3.9.2	Peer Examination	82
3.9.3	Interview Guide/Interview Protocol	82
3.10	Ethical Issues	83
3.11	Reducing Research Biases	83
3.12	Summary	83

4	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	85
4.1	Introduction	85
4.2	Description of Universities and Interviewees	86
4.2.1	Brief Overview of Selected Universities' Governance Structure	86
4.2.2	Demographics of the Respondents	89
4.2.3	Documents were Referred	91
4.3	Constitutional Frame to describe the Roles and Powers of the Deans in Selected Public Universities in Pakistan	93
4.3.1	Governmental Role in Governance Policy	93
4.3.2	Understanding System Deficiencies	94
4.3.2.1	Inadequate Constitutional Framework	94
4.3.2.2	No defined Legislation	95
4.3.2.3	Centralized Laws	97
4.3.2.4	Challenges to University Governing Bodies	99
4.3.2.5	Ambiguity of Deans' Role in University Constitution	102
4.4	University Top Management Perception about the Deans' Role and Powers in Governance Practices	105
4.4.1	The Role of the Dean	105
4.4.1.1	Academic Leaders	106
4.4.1.2	Not Involved in University Administrative Tasks	108
4.4.1.2.1	Faculty Matters	109
4.4.1.3	Faculty Governance	110
4.4.1.3.1	Implementers of Appraisal and Development of Faculty	112
4.4.1.4	Power from Authority	114
4.4.1.5	Equal Participation in Syndicate	116
4.5	Deans' Perception about their Roles in Governance Practices	117
4.5.1	Dealing with Differences of Understanding of Position	117
4.5.2	Academic Head of Faculty	120
4.5.2.1	Faculty Affairs	122
4.5.2.2	Student Affairs	124
4.5.3	Meager Role in Decision Making Process	125
4.5.4	Anomalous Participation in Syndicate	126
4.5.5	Complex Roles without any Power	128
4.6	Challenges faced by the Deans in Governance Practices	129
4.6.1	Role Conflict	129
4.6.1.1	Conflicts between Deans and Chairmen	131
4.6.1.2	Dean and Pro-Vice Chancellor	132
4.6.1.3	Conflicts in Governance	134
4.6.2	Political Influence	135
4.6.2.1	Internal and External Pressure	135
4.6.3	Autocratic Approach of Governance Practices	137
4.7	Discussion	140
4.7.1	System Deficiencies	141
4.7.1.1	Inadequate Constitutional Governance	141

	Framework	
	4.7.1.2 Centralized Governance Laws	144
	4.7.1.3 Ambiguity of Dean's Role in University Constitution	145
	4.7.1.4 Dealing with Differences of Understanding of Position	146
4.8	Summary	149
5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	150
5.1	Summary	150
5.2	Conclusion	151
5.3	Theoretical arguments and Practical Issues in Practice Governance	153
	5.3.1 Structural Theory	153
	5.3.2 Role Theory	155
5.4	Implications of the Study	156
5.5	Recommendations	157
5.6	Recommendations for Future Research	158
	REFERENCES	160
	APPENDICES	177
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	192
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	193

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Main Governing Bodies of Public Universities	70
3.2	Research Objectives, Questions and Sources of Data	78
4.1	Demography of the Respondents	91



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Deans' Role in Governance Process	41
2.2	Key Elements of Good Governance	56
2.3	Flexible Model for Academic Participation	60
3.1	The Process of Case Study	69
3.2	Sampling Framework of the Study	71
4.1	Hierarchy of Key University Stakeholders of Public University	88
4.2	Public University Authorities	89
4.3	The Age Range and Gender of Respondents	90
4.4	Findings of the Study	92

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAUP	American Association of University Professors
AGB	Association of Governing Boards
ACE	American Council on Education
HEC	Higher Education Commission
UMG	University Management Group
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This study ventures to investigate the governance issue in two selected public universities of Pakistan because as yet no exhaustive attempt has been made. Hence, in this dynamic society things need be reviewed for better and substantial output. In this chapter relevant literature about governance has been explored to address the issue in the right context.

It is aimed at creating a theoretical framework which would help the researcher to obtain informed data analysis in respect of proper/potential for this study. Compilation of different researchers and studies of the forerunners happens to be obligatory for a worthwhile attempt to study the problem. Before undertaking the research it deems fit to explore and understand what the term governance itself means.

Generally, the term governance happens to be a process of decision making within the framework of legality to the distribution and delineation of authority. It functions among various units within a larger entity for the legal allocation of power in decision making in university involving various governance structures (Balderston, 1995; De Boer, 2002; Mehnaz, David et al. 2014). In this respect, it assigns the access to the concerned persons either to direct or to restrain influencing the process of decision making (McCauley, 2002; Corcoran, 2004). As such, the distribution of power and authority is the main purpose of governance which is needed to address the issues of growth, sustainability and development of the institution to its ultimate goal (Lusk, 1997). It has also been noted that the meaning given to the governance has been still vastened which has further excessively enhanced its spectrum thus having different genealogy. It is also viewed that governance means different modes of coordinating individual actions (Mayntz, 2003).

As discussed above, the governance has been elaborated and viewed from different angles like structures, legal relationship, authority, patterns, rights and responsibilities and decision making pattern. All of them contribute to establish the concept of governance. There is no single or general definition of governance it has spread rapidly because changing social theories (Stoker, 1998; Bevir, 2012). Its canvass is so broad and it is replete with different aspects which exist simultaneously in its process. There exist both formal and informal groups participating in decision making activity by means of structures and process. They have inter relationship as well as intra relationship along with groups and even individuals. It weaves complex affairs making it a multifaceted activity. Ultimately, it calls for logical and natural balance to make the institution a driving force destined to achieve the desired output (AAUP, 1995; Carnegie Commission of Higher Education, 1973).

Since, it is a complex process the researchers have warned that it must be handled carefully because it is a delicate issue which requires efficiently analyzed, skillfully evaluated to aptly improve because it addresses the ground realities of a structure of relationship which determines authorized policies, plan and decisions the way how universities are operated (Lizzio & Wilson, 2009; Collis, 2004; Gallagher, 2001; Lee & Land, 2010). It concerns all the key groups without discrimination of independent, vulnerable or low status role. Hence, it is pre requisite on the part of the institutions to device, communicate and implement strategies in unambiguous terms according to Acts provided for governing body or board etc that manages the university affairs (Gallagher, 2001).

Multifarious opinions in respect of governance make it more complex and this state of affairs have been extended beyond past four decades. Consequently the prospective process of the governance has been affected (Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Gayle, Tewarie et al. 2003). On the other hand, when put into practice there happens inconsistency that makes a difficult task due to confusion in theory. The discrimination is often affected. The matter of roles, responsibilities and authority needs be treated delicately for prospective governance activities. It has been observed that miscommunication, misconception or even misplacement impedes as they are shared in the formative work of structure. Position, power and responsibility have important implications for worker satisfaction and organizational effectiveness (Sarros et al., 1998). Therefore, making decisions without clear and generally accepted comprehension create a vacuum if there is ambiguity about roles, power and responsibility (Lusk, 1997).

1.1.1 Challenges to University Governance

A university governance, such as, is regarded as a set of rules concerning authority and power related to the performance of a university's activities directed towards a set of common goals (De Boer, 2002). The challenges to university governance have emerged due to imposition of certain changes either externally or internally. These have encompassed from the growth rate to the legal status and impact of new governmental policies, theories and practices (Ackroyd & Ackroyd, 1999; Bevir, 2012). Over last three decades a considerable change has been noticed in the mode of governance in many public sector universities (De Boer, Enders et al. 2007). There is challenge to device out suitable and need oriented system of governance. It is generally believed that there should be worthwhile adjustment in governance structure and in order to strengthen the sources as well as guarantee development procedures need be formulated (Gale, Tewarie et al. 2011; Ackroyd & Ackroyd, 1999).

However, due to emerging challenges the governance structure is facing remonstrations (Gayle, Tewarie et al. 2011). It may be admitted that some trends have existed which are positive moves to enhance effective system of governance such as: decentralization which offers primary steps that can influence and strengthen executive role for prompt decisive action. Through this strategy all small autonomous subunits within authority participate to bring the decision to the desired goal. Simultaneously, there exists another move that aimed at finding additional ways like increasing number of persons in the

system of governance so that it may become more effective and meaningful (Liesensky, 1971).

The practice of setting different models of governance with different structures have also made it complicated that who may be entrusted to carry through governance process in the capacity of stake holder. Such as, there is bureaucratic model which is for concentration of institutional power at the top of hierarchy, gradually descending from top to lower level of organizational leaders distributing lesser and lesser power as well as decision making ability (Garrison, 2010). This model is termed as top down approach. Whereas, Baldrige, Curtis et al. (1974) are against it on the pretext that it is a rigid form of organization. As against that it is admitted fact that academic organizations are fluid/ flexible so this model cannot match it. Secondly, bureaucracy works through command which is a binding on the employees whereas professional employees need autonomy at their work.

Weber is criticized by Angiello (1997) that he himself was a leading bureaucratic theorist because on the one hand he is influenced by his bureaucratic background and on other hand the milieu played role to develop his concept in this regard. Secondly, the term bureaucracy is generally implied to complex organizations that are reluctant to allocate responsibility clearly. The hard and fast rules of bureaucracy along with specific cases of blundering officials, slow process of operation, buck-passing of conflicting directions and duplication of efforts hinder allocation of responsibility to work effectively and efficiently. As a result, the entire control remains in the hands of a few (Bendix & Roth, 1971; Angiello, 1997).

Bureaucratic model happens to be top-down approach which assigns greatest portion of institutional power to those at helm of affairs and its share is descending to the lower level with lesser power in the policy making (Garrison, 2010). Perrow et al. (1986) call it unresponsive, inflexible and inefficient. Bennis (1989, 1969) also criticizes that in it adequate personal growth and development is not allowed because in such institutions administrators dominate over all and faculty and departmental autonomy is over lapped and the cultural and administrative conflicts between faculty and staff will increase (Gayle, Tewarie et al. 2003; Waugh, 2003).

Another model was suggested on political concept it is designed on the pattern of political approach used in dynamic decision making process. It is suggested to help constraints regarding university governance. The political theories take birth from the designs of interest groups conflicts variation of values, power and influences settled by negotiation and bargain (Baldrige, 1971a). On this basis Baldrige wants the universities adopt political process instead of bureaucratic process which is designed to work through bureaucratic mechanism (Sufean & Asimiran, 2010). In the opinion of Kezar & Eckel the structural form of governance process is made to address the issues of improvement and effectiveness in order to guarantee the ultimate functioning of the university (Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Sufean & Asimiran, 2010).

As a matter of fact a university is neither a bureaucracy nor a collegium entity. There exists an exercise of team work of individuals and naturally difference of values and conflicts is must among them. There exist key variable person who influence informal process that plays critical role in policy making process. Even political contest usually occurs in the universities (Gayle, Tewarie et al. 2011).

The collegium model or community of scholars is philosophically based on self governance (Baldrige, 1971a). The community of scholars is supposed to manage administration of the matters on their own. This model gives free hand to college and university to work practically (Richardson,1975). To Bess, the concept of collegiality has many meanings like some call it a set of norms shaping the academic culture others call it a decision making structure whereas some call it a pattern of interaction among faculty and administration (Angiello, 1997).

Yet another model is named corporate is about the way power is exercised over corporate entities (Tricker, 2015). This governance structures or practices do not address all the issues of companies at all times. Point of concern is that even in academic model academic community is involved in decision making process (Lanning, 2006; Kaplan, 2004; Piland & Bublitz, 1998). Though one can trace out its similarity with shared governance to some extent, yet shared governance model stands exclusively for participatory decision making (Lanning, 2006; Tierney & Minor, 2003).

The same idea is promoted by Loyola University Chicago report (2002) it states that because all the individuals are essential to the governance of an institution everyone needs to expedite in smooth run of universities. Same view is reflected by Baker-Brown (2011) she argues that to operate the universities as a democracy the administration, faculty and governing voice of all parties should be allowed to participate in the process of decision making. In many countries, the formal powers of university leaders and managers have increased at the expense of more collegial or participative modes of governance (Eurydice, 2008).

The essence of all previous elaboration happens to be the governance structure which has generally been a point of discourse. The real challenge to university governance structure is the allocation of power. If the allocation of power is unclear the ambiguity of the roles of stakeholders in governance process poses a challenge. Irrational power allocation or unclear, misunderstood or misconceived stakeholders in the governance process fall short of the desired goals and virtually fail to deliver goods. Structures in universities are the tools that make the stakeholders to steer in the right direction of decision making. The distribution of power is made on the basis of the capacity of stakeholders in governance process. Through law the role and contribution of the bodies responsible for decision making in universities is devised out in a better way. The relevant power and sphere of authorities and definition of roles and responsibilities would contribute to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness (Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Asimiran & Sufean, 2012).

According to Rosovsky (1991) universities are complex structure where power remains an issue. Therefore, power remains a decisive issue in the face of crisis (Heaney, 2010). The fact is that power itself being delicate issue becomes ambiguous (Birnbaum, 1992). The use of power generally brings strong psychological transformation in the behaviors of the people (Bedeian, 2002). If power remains ambiguous it affects the organization hence, it is meticulous which needs extreme care in the attending details and needs to be legitimate (Stoker, 1998).

However, in order to run the institutions effectively governance happens to be a process that allocates power and authority to the individuals. This is an important phenomenon to define line of authority, roles and procedures (Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Asimiran, 2009). Well understood roles and responsibilities guarantee better governance and better understanding is a best means to pave the path to effective governance (Gayle, Tewarie et al. 2011). Unclear role makes the stake holders low profile (Boffo et al., 2008). Therefore, defining the role of stakeholders and power allocation plays pivotal role culminating in efficient and effectiveness governance.

It is thus of prime importance to establish or refine a document to define role and responsibilities avoiding any ambiguity because it would affect governance to a great extent. This discourse makes one potential view that the power relation between the deans and the registrar may enhance the capacity of leadership to be exercised at all levels in the university and ensures the effectiveness of governance (Mignot-Gerard, 2010; Wolverton, Wolverton et al. 1999; Lusk, 1997).

1.1.2 Background of the Study

Pakistan's educational history elongates over the span of 64 long years (Parveen et al., 2011). The education system faces many well-known problems (Mehnaz, David et al. 2014). It is admitted fact that the type of education delineates the shape of a state and its future is brightened thereby that serves as a road map that how to bring upon future generation to lead the state of Pakistan (Jinnah, 1947) but still the lack of cohesion as well as proper distribution in the system of education after 57 years of emergence as sovereign state has been a major barrier (Kazmi et al. 2005).

Universities being traditional seat of higher education play classical role to preserve, transmit and increase knowledge either in advanced or developing countries (Iqbal, 2004). So far as developing country like Pakistan is concerned the major source of provision of higher education is public sector universities. Higher education in Pakistan is beset with many problems. These issues need be addressed on priority basis. The most alarming issues that are faced by the universities are a flawed framework, inefficiency and ineffectiveness, governance loop holes, management designs and practices unable to deliver goods as well as problematic nature of design and defective delivery of services, poor governance and lack of autonomy and academic freedom (Isani, 2001; Iqbal, 2004; Memon, 2007; Haider, 2008; Akhtar & Kalsoom, 2012; HEC, MTRF II, 2011-2015).

In this respect, the World Bank Report (1992, p.6) can be cited that has pinpointed that the process and procedures in education in Pakistan has flaws in respect of higher education system which reads:

“The higher education sector in Pakistan manifests four institutional deficiencies. Their resolution is a necessary, although insufficient, precondition for significant and sustained improvement assignment of powers of governance, coordination, and oversight diffuses ultimate responsibility. It is unclear who is in charge and who should be held accountable; consequently, effective planning and management are impossible. Excessive centralization of authority and bureaucratic rigidity, both within and across institutions, produces stultifying uniformity; all institutions work to the lowest common denominator performance.”

The World Bank Report has warned to resolve four institutional deficiencies like power of governance, coordination, oversight and responsibility. It is imperative that in whom the charge is invested to be taken responsibilities and accountable for effective planning and management; which as yet sees impossible for excessive centralization of authority, rigid bureaucracy and lack of uniformity. Decision making within universities has in many ways become more centralized the foremost reason is that the concerned people are not fully aware of their roles and responsibilities and how effectively they can perform their duties (De Boer & Goedegebuure, 2009; Akhtar & Kalsoom, 2012).

It is authority that is untitled to make decisions regarding fundamental policies and practices in many critical areas of universities. It requires the competence on the part of bodies to conduct smooth run of university matters (Anwar et al. 2008). Apex level bodies like syndicate, senate, academic council, faculties and board of studies in universities take decisions. Besides there exist vice chancellor, registrar, deans, director they need to participate in all matter of decision making in the capacity of statutory bodies (Matthai et al. 1992).

Unfortunately, in Pakistan by and large decisions in the universities are taken on the basis of tradition which is reluctant to allow a degree of autonomy to all the members in respect of decision making (Anwar et al. 2008). Despite the passage of six-plus decades still the shred of governance and managerial structures of universities prevailing in the country during British occupation (Obaid, 2006). Hence, some of the decisions are really difficult to make because of the complexity of situation. There is hardly any consistent and logical procedure, which executive bodies adopt in taking decisions (Verma & Agarwal, 2003). However, the government of Pakistan had reservations regarding the performance of universities. The government felt extreme need to consider the prevailing system of governance in the universities.

Realizing the task force was established in 2002 to review the university education system but later hardly any research has touched this area. Since the chief determinants of higher education in respect of quality of higher education the Task Force primarily reviewed how the universities function. The task force at the outset drew the attention

on the function of universities as they are the apex forum to determine the quality of higher education. The report expressed serious concerns in respect of university governance in respect of effective governance, structures and practices. Autocratic and centralized system of governance is practiced in public universities in Pakistan which hampers the governance process. Various short falls have affected developments, growth and sustainability of universities; the main reason being lack of cooperation and coordination between governing bodies and academics. It was recommended to create an enabling environment for professionals by restructuring governance of universities. Too many weaknesses are found in the structure of main governing bodies i.e senate and syndicate vice chancellor works as an executive head who chairs the syndicate and academic council as such single person accountability is questionable (Task force report, Pakistan, 2002; Steering committee report on higher education, Pakistan, 2002).

Power is found ambiguous and decision making is centralized in the hands of the vice chancellor (Task Force Report, 2002). Centralized system greatly hampers the efficiency and effectiveness of delivery service (Shah, 2003). The growing differentiation within profession has changed the picture (Sporn, 2007). As such, the process of governance of public universities is found inadequate. However, the stake holders of Pakistan expressed reservations in respect of effective governance structures and practices in public universities in Pakistan (Task Force Report, 2002).

The embarrassing loophole in the governance as pinpointed by the Task force happens to be the case of deans. They are appointed by the chancellor inanity for academic responsibilities. Their role is not defined clearly (Task force report, 2002) whereas Gallos (2002) takes dean for a middle manager. On the other hand, most of the studies of university governance show the extent of faculty role in governance process and its involvement has positive effects (Tierney & Minor, 2003). Eckel (1999) states the core decisions typically cannot be made and implemented without the consent of multiple interest groups. Deans are seen on almost all hands as bridge between administration and academia. Eckel's study shows that when three universities involved their deans in hard decision making process and got sustainable and need-oriented decisions. The deans being expert in their field of work informed and assisted the president and provosts of universities who could boldly declare the closure of education programs which the deans recommended. Their reports prepared on factual grounds and situation articulated logically put the governance process on right track. The three universities have maintained their status to take all the stakeholders on board specially the deans who are given due responsibility to join hands with administrators and the hard decisions are taken logically.

Apparently, the dean's role in the capacity of academic head is also very important. On the contrary, in Pakistan all major decisions are done without significant input and participation from educational stakeholders. Whereas, steering committee on higher education, Pakistan (2002) suggested that participation of faculty in decision making is of prime importance. Dean is head of faculty and he links administration with academic department. Therefore, it calls for clear understanding of the role and power of deans in the governance process of university.

Reviewing the current processes of management and governance of universities of Pakistan the Task Force concluded that “universities cannot afford to resist from the political pressures, governmental, bureaucratic or any other untoward access that feared to affect university work inside as well as outside. The senate and syndicate being inefficient and ineffective (Lakha, 2002), decision making is centralized and vice chancellor is left with indecipherable executive powers (Anwar et al. 2008). Again, it speaks for lack of mutual communication between administration and academic staff which however would rise unrest and mismanagement (Core, 1977; Hendrickson et al. 2013).

1.1.3 Position of Deans in University Governance

It is unique status of universities that power for decision making lies at the bottom rather than at the top (Clark, 2001; Booth, 1982). The office of deans is extremely important and the question of deans’ participation in governance process is of prime importance. Deans are not watchmakers but they are supposed to interact with all the constituents groups. The deanship becomes muddled because the bigger groups deem themselves a part of whole hence demand to play the role, has become more demanding, more senior, more strategic, more complex and more managerial in nature, though within the overall context of academe (Matczynski et al. 1989; De Boer & Goedegebuure, 2009). Deans serve two masters at a time. They are supposed to balance the senior administrators as well as faculty which they head and join both as bridge (Rosser et al., 2003). They have too many jobs off and on they are called upon to solve intricate problems (Tucker & Bryan, 1991) along with discharging duties as academic heads of faculties they have dual duty to play middle man between faculty and administration like vice chancellor, registrar etc. but this office faces role conflict and ambiguity (Booth, 1982).

However, the ambiguous role of the deans prove that they are caught between two fires either administrator or faculty which makes them walk on tight rope (Feltner & Goodsell, 1972). Bridging this gap between these two worlds seems particularly challenging (De Boer & Goedegebuure, 2009). As such, the role of the deans is potentially stressful because of conflicting pressures and they are expected to combine academic expertise with managerial competence whereas their autonomy is reduced substantially (De Boer & Goedegebuure, 2009; Carvalho & Santiago, 2010; Bolton, 2000).

Deans are traditionally under pressure like involvement in development particularly an academic setter as well as liaison between the faculty professors and the administration (Mercer, 1997). It calls for reviewing and defining the role and power of deans considering that they have utmost academic as well as administrative authority both in the faculty (Neumann & Neumann, 1983).

There emerged contested areas of both practice and enquiry due to the way universities are governed. In addition the ambiguity of power and role of different parties affect the governance process so much so that confusion arises regarding practice and enquiry. It is also a point in question that deans as middle management are side lined to the extent

that even the law remains unclear of their status. Their powers as leaders are further confused and curtailed (Feltner & Goodsell, 1972). Thus, ambiguity about their responsibilities makes a vacuum in the entire process.

This state of affairs in Pakistan reflects like the practice in French universities. There since 1970s law remains silent about the reinforcement of deans' role and power. It has been noted that even well accepted legitimate decisions consented by a large number of academic along with administrative staff could hardly be implemented in action for the major cause. The deans were not involved in decision making process (even though they were informed once the decisions were taken) (Mignot-Gerard, 2003).

It leaves one with no option but ask why the role of dean is often unclear even though the office plays synthesizing role between the administration and faculty. Ambiguity is the root cause that impedes effective performance (Booth, 1982). Further, Booth says that with nominal information the ambiguity of role creates conflict which makes the role of dean perplexed. Thus, there happens uncertainty of the extent of the responsibility that affects the expectations of others in respect of their role. Clark's judgment lays stress on the need for 'strengthen steer core' it means central managerial groups must serve the cause of balancing collegial authority and managerial authority. Their joint efforts and blending act will bring harmonious situation to work at its maximum. Deans serve as bridge between both entities.

Hence, it needs be strengthened rather than left to remain a passive participant. One the contrary, they need be assigned key role in the middle. Maximum benefit of their proper position need be availed transcending the culture of divide between administrators and academics which in turn not only would make a component (dean) inactive but also hamper the smooth and prospective run of the institution (Huy, 2001; Dearlove, 2002).

Almost every researcher has declared the dean as an important component of the governance. Some call him bridge between faculty and administration, some take for middle manager, the other names him the mediator or responsible for the caliber of academic employees, for many he is binding source, for many he backbone and at its peak he is termed as dove of peace. Despite such status contrary to the fact for want of clarity of his role and power remain ineffective. It is injustice not to define clearly role and power of this crucial backbone of the university. Though administration of faculty is directly headed by him who makes him competent to handle and solve the problems by taking suitable decisions.

It is matter of concern that why as yet not only the deanship is studied but even misunderstood in the academy. Too much has been explored by the scholars about organization and governance but the role those who lead to support the organization have generally either been missed or ignored. The office of the dean in no case be neglected or over looked or left undefined from the point of view of better university governance. It is therefore, the importance of deans' position suggests that more research needs to be done in this area as deans serve critical institutional roles (Wolverton,

Wolverton et al. 1999; Morris, 1981; Gmelch, Wolverton et al. 1999a; Twombly, 1992; Gallos, 2002).

Hawkes and Rose over forty years ago reached to the conclusion that there is no such thing as a “standardized dean” (Andersen & King, 1987). The deanship had been so important that a number of administrators over a period of years occupied this post. Even then there remains a matter to be resolved as to what specific duties are associated with deanship. This needs be enumerated systematically. One of the reasons regarding absence of comprehensive job description is that the position of deanship like roles and responsibilities of other academic leadership have neither been considered seriously nor attended by the researchers by and large (Dejnozka,1978; Applegate & Book, 1989).

In 1981, McCarty and Young considering the extent of the role of dean they take it as an extension to the presidential role. As such, they associate three duties to be performed by the dean; such as (a) the aims and objectives of education (b) selection of faculty, and (c) preparation of budgets (McCarty and Reyes, 1987). But with the passage of time not only the three duties have been overlapped but even the responsibilities and tenure of, satisfaction with and commitment to the position have illogically swapped (Gmelch, Wolverton et al. 1999a; Gmelch et al., 1999b). As such, the role of the dean has become complicated one. They have to address both issues of faculty interests and constituent group demand by mediating between them (Matczynski et al. 1989).

Ten functions are described by Neumann & Neumann (1983), which are mostly described pertaining to deans. They have bifurcated their duties in two categories ranging from inside activities to outside activities which belong to the dean’s office. The inside activities pertain to six basic management functions: 1. the worthwhile process of decision making, 2. working out suitable condition for faculty members, 3. balancing the work load in respect of teaching, 4. promotion of faculty, 5. recruitment of faculty for smooth run, 6. addressing student issues. Regarding the outside activities four functions have been stipulated such as: 1. to represent the unit in the university joining in general cause of institution, 2. simultaneously representing the unit outside the university connecting it with the society as a whole, 3. to obtain resources in university, 4. to obtain resources outside the university.

Deans need staying power to preserve and function effectively because they have middle position in administrative hierarchies by dint of being mediators between administration and faculty (Wepner et al., 2008). Faculty members want to be considered for consultation and involvement in the matters that affect the policy. The ‘final say’ responsibility rests with the dean (Dejnozka,1978). This is also considered by most researchers that in warring factions the role of dean plays as a dove of peace whose intervention in destructive turbulence solicits the matters amicably (McCarty & Reyes, 1987).

Mignot-Gerard (2010) study shows that deans at present perform their duties only doing research considering their role as short term function. A fundamental problem deans

face is in the separation of executive and academic functions (Sarros et al., 1998). This state of affairs calls for reviewing deans' status. This is important issue of enquiry (McCarty & Reyes, 1987). Those deans who have succeeded in their role are by dint of their ability to adjust amicably compromise in right direction and communicating the institutional sense clearly. On the other hand those who fail to perform properly they generally misconceive the situation and lay stress upon non issues or even work on weak programs as such, lack of understanding of the role leads to conflict and frustration (Maczynski et al. 1989; Montez & Wolverson, 2000).

The discussion thus far has provided a general picture of the concept of governance related challenges on the public sector universities of Pakistan. The next sections highlights what actually is the research area for the present study therefore statement of problem is discussed below.

1.2 Problem Statement

Misunderstanding and misinterpretation of roles and authorities have always created perplexing problems in governance process. Who should have the power, who should best make the decisions and how power should be balanced and distributed have always been an issue of prime concern (Gayle, Tewarie et al. 2011).

It leads to determining and defining carefully the line of action and allocation of power. The role of those in whom power and authority is invested is very important therefore power needs be divided proportionally with clearly defined roles. Nevertheless, these problematic issues about governance have continuing relevance (Gerber, 2014). As such, ambiguity of role and power are assumed to impact overall performance and job dissatisfaction (Koustelios et al. 2004; Kretek et al. 2013). In addition, role conflicts over governance sometimes lead some of the players like faculty, presidents and trustees to say and do things that are not in the best interests of themselves or of their institutions (Pierce, 2014).

It is therefore, effective governance calls for clarity of roles, power and line of authority of various constituents (Hendrickson et al. 2013). It is important to stress the need for keeping the universities enable to govern effectively. Those who govern and enjoy authority must understand the extent their role and powers that must be divided accordingly (Clark, 1986; Lusk, 1997; Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Sporn, 2007; Stefano, 2008; Wepner et al., 2008; Gayle, Tewarie et al. 2003, 2011).

Who should have the power to govern in the universities is still unclear. Very often this balance is achieved by very accurately defining the different areas of responsibility (Applegate & Book, 1989; Sporn, 2007). Ambiguous phenomenon and unclear roles give an incentive to many constituencies to struggle for power, authority and influence. The win win situation of competition affects the entire framework of governance (Benjamin, Carroll et al. 1993; McConnell & Mortimer, 1978). As such, the issues that

who should have rights to decision making and participation has frequently occurred in the universities (Kaplan, 2004).

Likewise, in public universities in Pakistan the role and power of the dean, who is expected to communicate and someone in the middle between faculty and administration remains undefined and unclear (Task force report, Pakistan, 2002 p-19; Montez & Wolverton, 2000). Whereas, the conflicts are possible if the role and functions of the dean are not clear. It is very important to recognize academic freedom and clarifying their roles (Kapel & Dejnozka, 1979; Haider, 2008; Hendrickson et al. 2013). As such, the clear comprehension of relationship between the assigned governance role and powers guarantees effective governance performance (Gayle, Tewarie et al. 2011).

Though, in Pakistan, universities and their governance systems have been subject to break-point change since 2002, but there is hardly any research which has focused this area. The potential problem of ambiguity of role and power and its relationship to governance effectiveness is the focus of this study. This research may be an initial attempt to explore the areas of improvement. Exploring previous literature it has been noted that no such attempt have been made therefore this study would fill the gap in the limited literature specially in the context of Pakistan. As, there is gap in literature, to conduct research in the area of university governance aiming at improvement of university governance system virtually it would add to the significance of the study. This would pave the path to need-oriented university governance system in Pakistan particularly public sector universities that after more than five decades have not shown positive developmental results. As such, none of Pakistan's 50+ public universities come even close to being a university in the real sense of the world (Iqbal, 2004; Hoodbhoy, 2009).

Furthermore, there has not been much written about the roles, powers, and responsibilities of deans about their involvement in governance process related to governance effectiveness. This study aims to investigate deans' role, power and level of involvement in governance process in two selected public universities in Pakistan. The data of the study would provide a better source for comprehending the particular issue of deans' role and how it is connected to the effective governance process.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

- (i) To investigate the role and power allocated to the deans in the university constitutional framework with regard to governance practices in selected public universities in Pakistan.
- (ii) To examine the understanding of Deans' role in governance practices in selected public universities in Pakistan.
- (iii) To examine the challenges of deans in decision making and in governance practices in selected public universities in Pakistan.

1.4 Research Questions

1. How is the constitution framed to describe the roles and powers of the deans in selected public universities in Pakistan?
2. How does the universities top management perceive the deans' role and powers in governance practices in selected public universities in Pakistan?
3. How do deans perceive their roles in governance practices in selected public universities in Pakistan?
4. What challenges are confronted by the deans in governance practices in selected public universities in Pakistan?

1.5 Rationale of the Study

Rationale of the study offering sound reasons is needed to justify the attempt of this study. The fore most is the very fact that there hardly exists a serious effort on the part of researchers that have exclusively considered the importance of governance system in the public sector universities in Pakistan. Whereas, it is hard fact that higher educational institutions in Pakistan have yet to go a long way to bring the universities in line with international criteria, along with maintaining growth, development and sustainability. In this respect, this attempt may be an important initiative if not the first one in this regard. For sure no significant research precedes this venture as far as governance structure in the public sector universities in Pakistan is concerned.

An authentic document available on the subject of the performance of public sector universities in Pakistan is Task Force Report, 2002. It has reviewed six educational policies followed by the educational conference 1947. In addition two reports i.e (a) World Bank UNESCO Task Force Report (2000) on Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise, and (b) World Bank Report (1990) Higher Education and Significance Research for Development of Pakistan. The participants of these reports included people from all walks of life besides, officers, teachers, students, educationists and parents in order to collect facts and figures regarding universities functions in Pakistan. These reports have expressed dissatisfaction about the system of governance in the public sector universities in Pakistan.

The task force report (2002) mentions that there are too many weaknesses in respect of senates and syndicates function. The most affecting one has been identified as imbalance of governance system from function and the responsibilities of management. This state of affairs calls for thorough study of the governance system. If governance system is put on the right track it would ensure actualization of the aims and objectives. It has been expressed and felt on various forums including the Task Force Report that the process of management and governance of the universities in Pakistan has no strategy to escape the political, governmental, bureaucratic and other untoward influences that hamper the regular function of universities either internally or externally.

According to Shattock (2002,2008), governance issues like the role of stakeholders, the outer pressures on governance structure and the significance of shared governance. Thus, the research on this topic is of prime importance. In view of the controversy regarding sharing of power and authority involved in governance such as trustees, senior administrators, there is acute need to examine their governance structure. This suggests positive research in response to the aspect of distribution of authority and power.

Different studies have been conducted in countries like UK, Netherlands, France, Germany, Italy, USA and Switzerland indicating no systemization of governance structure. As far as, Pakistan is concerned rarely such study has been conducted. Even in Asian countries like Hong Kong, Singapore, Thailand and Malaysia governance issues have been studied and explored. Therefore, it is high time to make such study in Pakistan so as to address the issue of governance system in Pakistan. There is dearth of studies on the part of local scholars regarding university governance therefore this study is being done with an aim that it will be highly purposeful and prospective and relevant attempt to focus on the governance system in public universities in Pakistan.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study focuses on the dean's role in governance practices in two selected universities in Pakistan. It's a case study of particular aspect of university governance. It explores the status of the deans in public universities. Two universities have been selected because in Pakistan framework of management regarding alignment of roles and governance practice is almost similar.

The study meant to bring the views of the deans as well as top management. It was further supported with authentic official documents. This highlighted system vacuum in terms of law. This practice gave space to individuals to expedite governance on adhocism. The aim of this study is not generalisation but its finding would hopefully provide an example to the policy makers and stakeholders that even in biggest and oldest universities governance work is done on personal wish and individual style.

Moreover, the human aspect emerging from this study has great contribution to structural theory in the context of Pakistan that further supports the finding of Kezar & Eckel's (2004) study. This study has also enhanced Clark's 'strengthening steering core' including both central managerial and faculty leadership to reconcile the managerial values with academic ones (Cai & Kohtamaki, 2014).

1.7 Significance of the Study

This study would contribute to the discussions on current practices regarding university governance practices in selected public universities in Pakistan and suggest the better solution to the ensuing challenges in the rapidly progressing world. Like society cannot be left stagnant harping on the traditional lines; universities which are the apex avenue of educational excellence, experience and skill must undergo scrutiny and innovation

for further betterment. It would open vistas and provide food for thought to the educational elite and the authorities at the helm of affairs to put the university on the right track.

The governance system is the very base of university performance. This study would therefore, explore and sort all the possible means to strengthen the governance system to the extent of making the universities a prospective and profitable enterprise that provides the efficient and effective individual.

The founding elite of Pakistani universities were left with no choice but following the British legacy of traditionalism. But over a period of six decades vast changes have occurred throughout the world in the field of education and specially in the field of system of governance many new theories have emerged and experienced for example most focus is on involving all key stakeholders in governance process specially academics. Nations have prospered a great deal from the efforts of those researchers. However, in our country Pakistan there seems dearth of innovation and things have almost been left untouched. Quest for innovation, improvement and novelty has opened the new areas of advancement to the mankind. Pakistan cannot afford isolation in the competitive phenomenon of survival of the fittest.

It is the need-oriented study to highlight the short falls in governance practices because governance structure is of initial importance to address the issue positively. This study would be significant from the point of view as there are a lot of ambiguity in power sharing within the institutions and their decision making bodies such as: syndicate and senate. In this whole scenario the deans are left for academic responsibilities only. Thus, study conceives the position of deans as a bridge between governing bodies and faculties and explores the extent of a dean's role. This may be a turning point in governance process for improving governance in the public sector universities. This study was conducted in two public universities in Pakistan and it was not meant to generalize but it could be related to other situation.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

Like all other studies, this one also entails many limitations. The fore most among them is time limit which is three years. For all practical reasons the stipulated period of time for completing this study is not enough. In order to complete on time the research has to squeeze out every drop of relevant information. Therefore, the researcher has to try her utmost to finish the project using all the possible means. It is like treading on a tight rope to tackle the task yet the researcher is confident to make a breakthrough which would serve as food for thought for future research.

There is scarcity of relevant material because in Pakistani context very rare attempts have been made in the current field of research. The field of education has generally been overlooked or given lesser importance comparing to other fields like agriculture, I.T etc. Again in the field of education the subject of university governance system has

been given least importance. By and large, the researcher endeavors exceptionally to search out as much as from every possible source.

To get relevant documents and information like minutes of governing body meetings is the main concern of this study. The university documents are generally treated as confidential. The access to them is denied on one pretext or the other. The current law and order situation throughout the country has been deteriorating therefore travelling from one place to another runs a risk. However, the researcher would use alternate means to expedite her efforts to overcome these obstacles.

1.9 Definition of Terms

The definitions have been explained and delineated from different angles as mentioned in respective literature. These terms would lead to comprehend this research.

1.9.1 Public University

Established vide the university code formulated in accordance with the university constitution in 1974. Public university receives funding from the government to manage its affair to promote the cause of education as per national and international needs they have their autonomic powers to take decisions.

1.9.2 University Governance

It serves for a road map how a university manages and organizes its functions. It is the structure and process to function. It is a set of procedures that distributes power and authority to individuals who expedite their power and authority prudently within the parameters of the rules, regulations and statutes.

1.9.3 Power

It is the extent of an individual to run the institution to the desired aims. Power is allocated to individuals in accordance with university code. It also refers to the individuals' adequacy to allow the legal as well as informal aspiration regarding relation with others. Power ensures the status of the concerned official to steer the institution to the ultimate goal of higher education.

1.9.4 Dean

Dean is the head of Faculty to run its affairs. Having responsibilities to look after academic matters and connect faculty to central administration.

1.9.5 Syndicate

The syndicate enjoys the access of exercising the general supervision and overall management functions of the university. Thus, it avails the status of the governing body once decisions are taken by syndicate cannot be challenged so it is the strongest governing body in the universities.

1.9.6 Senate

Senate deals with academic side of the university. It includes the members from faculty, students, staff and administration. It concerns annual budget and approval of policy matters. Reveal

1.9.7 Role

It entitles to expedite at what precise time and who should exercise what and where. In which situation she/he should act. It describes how should behave (interact) within specified rules. As such, it pertains to the post not person occupying post temporarily.

1.9.8 Challenges

Worthwhile adjustment and strengthening of sources and university development is hindered. Simultaneously, prompt decisive action of the governing bodies and faculty role in governance process is jeopardized.

1.10 Summary

This chapter has presented an over view of the research project. The first section consists introduction, the background of the study illustrated practiced of university governance structure in public universities in Pakistan. Then, the statement of problem focused specific problem and significance of the study to fill the gap. Research objectives, questions are proposed. Finally, limitations of the study and terms employed in this study are defined.

REFERENCES

- Ackroyd, P., & Ackroyd, S. (1999). Problems of university governance in Britain: is more accountability the solution? *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 12(2), 171-185.
- Ahearn, F. L. (1997). A Day in the Life of a Dean. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 1997(98), 9-20.
- Ahmed, S. N. (2008). The role of Governance and its influence on quality enhancing mechanism in Higher Education. *RESEARCH JOURNAL of THE INSTITUTE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION KARACHI-PAKISTAN*, 3(1), 145.
- Akhtar, M. M. S., & Kalsoom, T. (2012). Issues of Universities' Governance in Pakistan. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 22(2), 81-94.
- Ali, S., & Tahir, M. S. (2009). Reforming education in Pakistan—tracing global links. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 3(15), 1.
- Andersen, D. G., & King, J. P. (1987). The Dean of Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(5), 9-12.
- Angiello, R. S. (1997). *Organization theories and governance in higher education: An analysis of the literature*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University.
- Anwar, M. N., Yousuf, M. I., & Sarwar, M. (2008). Decision Making Practices In Universities Of Pakistan. *Journal of Diversity Management (JDM)*, 3(4), 19-26.
- Applegate, J. H., & Book, C. (1989). Associate and assistant deans of education: Careers and responsibilities. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(6), 5-9.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1994). On organizational learning. *Organization Studies-Berlin-European Group for Organizational Studies-*, 15, 460-460.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. (2013). *Introduction to research in education* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Asimiran, S. & Hussin, S.,(2012). *University Governance: Trends and Models*. Kuala Lumpur: Printed by: University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Asimiran, S. (2009). *Governance of Public Universities in Malaysia*. Ph.D. Unpublished thesis. University of Malaya.
- Aurangzeb, D. (2012). Good Governance in Universities/DAIs and its Impact on Quality of Education in Pakistan. *Universal Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, No.10.

- Aurangzeb, D & Asif, K. (2012). Good Governance in Universities, and Prospects of Employment for the Students: Evidence from Pakistan. *Universal Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 2(11), 86-103.
- Aziz, M., Bloom, D. E., Humair, S., Jimenez, E., Rosenberg, L., & Sathar, Z. (2014). *Education system reform in Pakistan: why, when, and how?* : IZA Policy Paper.
- Babbie, E. (2002). *The basics of social research* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Baker-Brown, C.(2011). An analysis of the shared governance practices in the Jamaican community college system: Faculty perspectives. Ed.D. Unpublished dissertation, Morgan State University, United States -- Maryland.
- Balderston, F. (1995). *Managing Today's University: Strategies for Viability, Excellence, and Change*, 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1971a). Models of University Governance: Bureaucratic, Collegial, and Political. ERIC Pub.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1971b). *Academic governance: Research on institutional politics and decision making*: McCutchan Pub. Corp.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1971c). Power & conflict in the university: Research in the sociology of complex organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Baldrige, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G. P., & Riley, G. L. (1974). *Alternative models of governance in higher education*: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, School of Education, Stanford University.
- Baldrige, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G. P., & Riley, G. L. (1977). Alternative models of governance in higher education. *Governing academic organizations*, 128-142.
- Bargh, C., Scott, P., Smith, D., & Boccock, J. (2000). *University leadership: The role of the chief executive*: Open University Press Buckingham.
- Bedeian, A. G. (2002). The dean's disease: How the darker side of power manifests itself in the office of dean. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1(2), 164-173.
- Bell, J. (2001). Doing Your Research Project: a guide for first-time researchers in education and social science. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 25(1).
- Bendix, R., & Roth, G. (1971). *Scholarship and Partnership: Essays on Max Weber*: (pp. 129-155). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Benjamin, R. W., Carroll, S. J., Gray, M. J., Krop, C. S., & Shires, M. (1993). *The redesign of governance in higher education*. Rand.

- Benjamin, R., and Carroll, S. (1998) "The Implications of the Changed Environment for Governance in Higher Education." In W. Tierney (ed.), *The Responsive University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bennis, W. (1969). Beyond bureaucracy. *Society*, 2(5), 31-35.
- Bennis, W. (1989). Why Leaders Can't Lead: The Unconscious Conspiracy Continues. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bevir, M. (2012). *Governance: A very short introduction* (Vol. 333): Oxford University Press.
- Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent development in role theory. *Annual review of sociology*, 67-92.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How Colleges Work. The Cybernetics of Academic Organization and Leadership*: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104.
- Birnbaum, R. (1989). The cybernetic institution: Toward an integration of governance theories. *Higher Education*, 18(2), 239-
- Birnbaum, R. (1991). The latent organizational functions of the academic senate: Why senates do not work but will not go away. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 423-443.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). How Academic Leadership Works: Understanding Success and Failure in the College Presidency: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Birnbaum, R. (2004). The end of shared governance: looking ahead or looking back matter. *New Direction for Higher Education*, 127.
- Blau, P.M. (1973). *The organization of academic work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Boffo, S., Dubois, P., & Moscati, R. (2008). Changes in university governance in France and in Italy. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 14(1), 13-26.
- Bolton, A. (2000) *Managing the Academic Unit, Managing Universities and Colleges: Guides to Good Practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Booth, D. B. (1982). The Department Chair: Professional Development and Role Conflict. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10, 1982.
- Boyko, L., & Jones, G. A. (2010). The roles and responsibilities of middle management (Chairs and Deans) in Canadian universities *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management* (pp. 83-102): Springer.
- Bradshaw, P., & Fredette, C. (2008). Academic governance of universities: reflections of a senate chair on moving from theory to practice and back. *Journal of Management Inquiry*.

- Cai, Y., & Kohtamäki, V. (Eds.). (2014). *Transformation of Higher Education in Innovation Systems in China and Finland*. University of Tampere.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973, April). *Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Carvalho, T., & Santiago, R. (2010). New Public Management and 'Middle Management': How Do Deans Influence Institutional Policies? *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management* (pp. 165-196): Springer.
- Chaudhry, I. S., Malik, S., Khan, K. N., & Rasool, S. (2009). Factors Affecting Good Governance in Pakistan: An Empirical Analysis. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 35 (3), 337-346.
- Clark, B. (2001). The entrepreneurial university: new foundations for collegiality, autonomy, and achievement. *Higher Education Management*, 13(2).
- Clark, B. R. (1964). *Faculty organization and authority*: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California.
- Clark, B. R. (1986). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*: University of California Press.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Surrey: Pergamon.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1989). *Research methods in education* (3rd ed.). London.
- Cohen, M. D., & James, G. March (1974). Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. *New York et al.*
- Collis, D. J. (2004). The paradox of scope: A challenge to the governance of higher education. *Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm*, 33-76.
- Corcoran, S. (2004). Duty, Discretion and Conflict: University Governance and the Legal Obligations of University Boards. *Australian Universities Review*, 46(2), 8.
- Corcoran, S. (2004). Duty, Discretion and Conflict: University Governance and the Legal Obligations of University Boards. *Australian Universities Review*, 46(2), 8.
- Crellin, M. A. (2010). The future of shared governance. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2010(151), 71-81.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*: Sage Publications, Inc.

- De Boer, H. (2002). Trust, the essence of governance? *Governing higher education: National perspectives on institutional governance* (pp. 43-61): Springer.
- De Boer, H., Enders, J., & Schimank, U. (2007). *On the way towards new public management? The governance of university systems in England, the Netherlands, Austria, and Germany*: Springer.
- De Boer, H., & Goedegebuure, L. (2009). The changing nature of the academic deanship. *Leadership*, 5(3), 347-364.
- De Boer, H., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, V. L. (2004). *New public management – New styles of management? From general ideology to the realities of being a dean in universities*. Paper presented at the 17th conference of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers, Enschede, the Netherlands, 17–19 September, 2004.
- Dearlove, J. (2002). A continuing role for academics: The governance of UK universities in the Post-Dearing Era. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(3), 257-275.
- Dejnozka, E. L. (1978). The dean of education: A study of selected role norms. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dill, D. D., and Helm, K. P. (1988) "Faculty Participation in Policy Making." In J. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. New York: Agathon.
- Douglas, E. (2002). *Qualitative Analysis. Practice and innovation*. London: Routledge.
- Duderstadt, J. J. (2004) "Governing the Twenty-First-Century University: A View from the Bridge." In W. G. Tierney (ed.), *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance: Negotiating the Perfect Storm*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dykes, A. R. (1968). Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making. Report of a Study. ERIC
- Eckel, P. D. (1999). The role of shared governance in institutional hard decisions: enabler or antagonist? *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(1), 15-39.
- Eckel, P. D. (2000). The role of shared governance in institutional hard decisions: enabler or antagonist? *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(1), 15-39.
- Edwards, M. (2003). Review of New Zealand Tertiary Education Governance. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

- Eisenhart, M. A. (1991). *Conceptual frameworks for research CTRCA: Ideas from a cultural anthropologist; implications for mathematic education researchers*. Paper presented at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting, North American chapter of the international group for the psychology of mathematics education.
- English, F. W. (2006). *Encyclopaedia of educational leadership and administration*: Sage publications.
- Eurydice (2008) *Higher Education Governance in Europe: Policies, Structures, Funding and Academic Staff*. Brussels: Eurydice.
- Fagin, C. M. (1997). The leadership role of a dean. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 1997(98), 95-99.
- Feltner, B. D., & Goodsell, D. R. (1972). The academic dean and conflict management. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 692-701.
- Fish, S. (2007). Shared governance: Democracy is not an educational idea. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 39(2), 8-13.
- Fulton, O. (2003). Managerialism in UK universities: Unstable hybridity and the complications of implementation *The higher education managerial revolution?* (pp. 155-178): Springer.
- Gallagher, M. (2001). Modern university governance: A national perspective. *The idea of a university*, 49.
- Gallos, J. V. (2002). The dean's squeeze: The myths and realities of academic leadership in the middle. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1(2), 174-184.
- Gallos, J. V. (2009). Reframing Shared Governance. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 18(2), 136.
- Garrison, M.S. (2010). Models of academic governance and institutional power in Southern Baptist related liberal arts colleges and universities. Ph.D. Unpublished dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, United States -- Kentucky.
- Gayle, D. J., Tewarie, B., & White Jr, A. Q. (2003). *Governance in the Twenty-First-Century University: Approaches to Effective Leadership and Strategic Management*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series: Wiley Subscription Services, Inc., A Wiley Company, Jossey-Bass.
- Gayle, D. J., Tewarie, B., & White Jr, A. Q. (2011). *Governance in the Twenty-first-century university: Approaches to effective leadership and strategic management: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* (Vol. 14): John Wiley & Son.

- Gerber, L. G. (2001). "Inextricably linked": Shared governance and academic freedom. *ACADEME-BULLETIN OF THE AAUP*-, 87(3), 22-24.
- Gerber, L. G. (2014). *The rise and decline of faculty governance: professionalization and the modern American university*: JHU Press.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*: Longman White Plains, NY.
- Gmelch, W. H. (2003). Deans' Balancing Acts: Education Leaders and the Challenges They Face. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
- Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Sarros, J. C. (1999a). The academic dean: An imperiled species searching for balance. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(6), 717-740.
- Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., & Wolverton, M. L. (1999b). The Education Dean's Search for Balance. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington, DC).
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The qualitative report*, 8(4), 597-607.
- Government of Pakistan. (2002). *Steering Committee on Higher Education*, Islamabad.
- Grbich, C. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*: New Delhi: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Gunne, M. G., & Mortimer, K. P. (1975). *Distributions of authority and patterns of governance*: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University.
- Haider, S. Z. (2008). Challenges in higher education: Special reference to Pakistan and South Asian developing countries. *Nonpartisan Education Review*, 4(2).
- Hartley, J. (2002). *Supplemental or shadow governance structures? The promise and peril of task forces during times of change*.
- Heaney, T. (2010). Democracy, shared governance, and the university. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2010(128), 69-79.
- Hendrickson, R. M., Lane, J. E., Harris, J. T., & Dorman, R. H. (2013). *Academic leadership and governance of higher education: A guide for trustees, leaders, and aspiring leaders of two-and four-year institutions*: Stylus.
- Higher Education Commission, (2011-15) Higher Education Medium Term Development Framework II (MTDF-HE II),
- Hodgkinson, H. L., & Meeth, L. R. (1971). *Power and authority*: Jossey-Bass.

- Hoepfl, M. C. (1997). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education researchers. *Journal of Technology Education* 19(1): 47-63.
- Hoodbhoy, P. (2009). Pakistan's Higher Education System—What Went Wrong and How to Fix It. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 48(4), 581-594.
- Hussin, S., & Asimiran, S. (2010). *University governance and developmental autonomy*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Islam and Higher Education.
- Huy, Q. N. (2001). In praise of middle managers. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(8), 72-81.
- Ingram, R. T. (1993). *Governing Public Colleges and Universities. A Handbook for Trustees, Chief Executives, and Other Campus Leaders*: Jossey-Bass Inc., 350 Sansome St., San Francisco.
- Iqbal, A. (2004). *Problems and prospects of higher education in Pakistan*. University of Arid Agriculture, Rawalpindi.
- Isani, U., & Virk, M. (2001). Higher education in Pakistan. *Unpublished dissertation, National*. Prr.hec.gov.pk
- Ishak, N. M., & Bakar, A. Y. A. (2014). Developing sampling frame for case study: challenges and conditions. *World Journal of Education*, 4(3), 29.
- Jensen, D. (2001). A theoretical model for examining the link between governance and philosophy in higher education. *Interchange*, 32(4), 395-417.
- Jones, S. R. (2002). Writing the Word: Methodological Strategies and Issues in Qualitative Research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(4), 461-473.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kapel, D. E., & Dejnozka, E. L. (1979). The education deanship: A further analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, 10(2), 99-112.
- Kaplan, G. E. (2004). Do governance structures matter? *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2004(127), 23-34.
- Kaplan, G. E. (2006). Institutions of academic governance and institutional theory: A framework for further research. *HIGHER EDUCATION*., 213-281.
- Kazmi, S. W., & Quran, H. (2005). Role of education in globalization: A case for Pakistan. *SAARC Journal of Human Resource Development*, 90, 107.
- Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university*: Harvard University Press.

- Kerr, C. (1963). *The uses of the university*: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kerr, C. (1984). *Presidents make a difference: Strengthening leadership in colleges and universities: A report of the commission on strengthening presidential leadership*: AGB.
- Kerr, C. (1994). *Higher education cannot escape history: Issues for the twenty-first century*: Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kezar, A. (2000). *ERIC trends*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. www.eriche.org.
- Kezar, A. (2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes? *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2004(127), 35-46.
- Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges: A synthesis of the literature and examination of a future agenda for scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education*, 371-399.
- Koustelios, A., Theodorakis, N., & Goulimaris, D. (2004). Role ambiguity, role conflict and job satisfaction among physical education teachers in Greece. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(2), 87-92.
- Krettek, P. M., Dragšić, Ž., & Kehm, B. M. (2013). Transformation of university governance: on the role of university board members. *Higher Education*, 65(1), 39-58.
- Krupar, K., & Cook, S. L. (2010). The Voiceless Majority: A Pair of Docs on Paradox and Changing Demographics in the American Professorate Related to Shared Governance. *Online Submission*, 37.
- Lakha, S.K. (2002). *Higher Education in Pakistan: Towards reforms Agenda*. Draft report.
- Lanning, Patrick M. (2006). The implementation year of shared governance at a Vanguard community college. Ed.D. Unpublished dissertation, Oregon State University, United States -- Oregon.
- Lapworth, S. (2004). Arresting decline in shared governance: Towards a flexible model for academic participation. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 58(4), 299-314.
- Larsen, I. M., Maassen, P., & Stensaker, B. (2009). Four basic dilemmas in university governance reform. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 21(3), 1-18.
- Lee, L. S., & Land, M. H. (2010). What University Governance Can Taiwan Learn from the United States? *Online Submission*, 9.
- Lichtman, M. (2010). *Understanding and evaluating qualitative educational research*: Sage Publications, (p. 108-138).

- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lisensky, R. P. (1971). The Management Dilemma: Shared Authority. The Management Challenge: Now and Tomorrow. Putting It All Together: The Management Team. *NACUBO Professional File*, 2(3), 6.
- Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2009). Student participation in university governance: the role conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on departmental committees. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(1), 69-84.
- Loyola University Committee on Shared Governance. (2002). Shared governance white paper. Retrieved from the Loyola University Committee website: <http://www.luc.edu/governance/addendum1.shtml>
- Lucas, C. J. (2006). American higher education: A history. *Palgrave Macmillan*.
- Lusk, D. C. (1997). Southern Baptist higher education: a study of presidents and trustees with regard to governance activity perceptions and preferences.
- Maassen, P. (2000). The changing roles of stakeholders in Dutch university governance. *European Journal of Education*, 35(4), 449-464.
- March, J. G. (1986). How We Talk and How We Act: Administrative Theory and Administrative Life. In T. J. Sergiovanni, & J. E. Corbally (Ed.), *Leadership and organizational culture* (pp. 18-35). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance, and reinvention in Australia*: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, J. L. (1993) "A Preliminary Theory for Explaining the Effective Leadership of Academic Deans" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin).
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Matczynski, T., Lasley, T. J., & Haberman, M. (1989). The deanship: How faculty evaluate performance. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(6), 10-14.
- Matthai, R.J., Pareek, U. and Rao, T.V. (1992). *Management Process in Universities*. Oxford & IBH Publishing Company Private Ltd., New Delhi.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach: An interactive approach* (Vol. 41). Sage.
- Mayntz, R. (2003). New challenges to governance theory. *Governance as social and political communication*, 27-4
- McCarty, D. J., & Reyes, P. (1987). Organizational Models of Donald J. McCarty Governance: Academic Deans' Pedro Reyes Decision Making Styles. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(5), 2-8.

- McCarty, D. J., & Young, I. P. (1981). *Stress and the academic dean*. In P. G. Altbach & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *Higher education in American society* (pp. 269-285). New York: Prometheus.
- McCauley, L. M. (2002). Perspectives on Governance in Community Colleges Using Different Organizational Models.
- McConnell, T. R., & Mortimer, K. P. (1971). The Faculty in University Governance. ERIC
- McCormick, R. E., & Meiners, R. E. (1988). University governance: A property rights perspective. *JL & Econ.*, 31, 423.
- Meek, V. L. (2010). *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management* (Vol. 33): Springer.
- Meek, V. L., Goedegebuure, L., & De Boer, H. (2010). The changing role of academic leadership in Australia and the Netherlands: Who is the modern dean? *The changing dynamics of higher education middle management* (pp. 31-54): Springer.
- Memon, G. R. (2007). Education in Pakistan: The key issues, problems and the new challenges. *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 47-55.
- Mercer, J. (1997). Fund raising has become a job requirement for many deans. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 43, July 18, p. A31.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*: Jossey-Bass Inc Pub.
- Middlehurst, R. (2004). Changing internal governance: A discussion of leadership roles and management structures in UK universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 58(4), 258-279.
- Mignot Gerard, S. (2003). "Who are the actors in the government of French universities? The paradoxical victory of deliberative leadership.". *Higher Education*, 45(1), 71-89.
- Mignot-Gérard, S. (2010). Presidents and Deans in French Universities: A Collective Approach to Academic Leadership *The Changing Dynamics of Higher Education Middle Management* (pp. 119-143): Springer.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*: Sage.
- Millett, J. D. (1968). *Decision making and administration in higher education*: Kent State University Press Kent.
- Millett, J. D. (1978). *New structures of campus power*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*: Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Montez, J. M., Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2003). The roles and challenges of deans. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 241-266.
- Montez, J., & Wolverton, M. (2000). The Challenge of the Deanship. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA).
- Moodie, G.C. & Eustace, R. (1974). Power and authority in British universities.
- Morris, V. C. (1981). *Deaning, middle management in academe*: University of Illinois Press.
- Mortimer, K. P., & McConnell, T. R. (1978). *Sharing Authority Effectively: Participation, Interaction, and Discretion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Musselin, C. (2007). Are universities specific organisations. *Towards a multiversity*, 63-84.
- Neumann, L., & Neumann, Y. (1983). Faculty perceptions of deans' and department chairpersons' management functions. *Higher Education*, 12(2), 205-214.
- Obaid, Z. (2006). Public University as a Political Arena: A Case Study of University of Peshawar, Pakistan.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). Validity and qualitative research: An oxymoron? *Quality & Quantity*, 41: 233-249.
- Onwunli, A. U., & Agho, A. O. (2004). Faculty opinion on shared authority: A Nigerian national survey. *Higher Education*, 48(4), 397-418.
- O'Reilly, B. (August 8, 1994). *What's killing the business school deans of America*. *Fortune*. 64-68.
- Parveen, A., Rashid, K., Iqbal, M. Z., & Khan, S. (2011). System and Reforms of Higher Education in Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(20), 260-267.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed)*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Perrow, C. (1979). *Complex organizations: A critical essay*. (Second ed). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Perrow, C., Wilensky, H. L., & Reiss, A. J. (1986). *Complex organizations: A critical essay (Vol. 3)*: McGraw-Hill New York.

- Peters, B. G., & Pierre, J. (2000). *Governance, politics and the state*: St. Martin's Press: New York.
- Pfeffer, J. (1993). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*: Harvard Business Press.
- Pierce, S. R. (2014). *Governance Reconsidered: How Boards, Presidents, Administrators, and Faculty Can Help Their Colleges Thrive*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Piland, W. E., & Bublitz, R. F. (1998). Faculty perceptions of shared governance in California community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(2), 99-110.
- Platt, G. M., & Parsons, T. (1970). Decision-making in the academic system: Influence and power exchange. *The state of the university*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2010). Generalization in quantitative and qualitative research: Myths and strategies. *International journal of nursing studies*, 47(11), 1451-1458.
- Pullen, B. with Abendstern, M. (2004) *A History of the University of Manchester 1973—90*: Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Pusser, B., & Ordorika, I. (2001). Bringing political theory to university governance: The University of California and the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 15.
- Ramo, K. (1997). Reforming Shared Governance: Do the Arguments Hold Up? *Academe*, 83(5), 38-43.
- Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Richardson, R. C. (1975). *Reforming college governance*: Jossey-Bass.
- Rosovsky, H. (1991). *The university: An owner's manual*: Taylor & Francis. Routledge.
- Rosser, V. J. (2004) 'A National Study on Midlevel Leaders in Higher Education: The Unsung Professionals in the Academy', *Higher Education* 48: 317-37.
- Rosser, V. J., Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (2003). Academic deans and directors: Assessing their effectiveness from individual and institutional perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(1), 1-25.
- Russell, B. (1949). *The impact of science on society*: AMS PRESS, INC. New York, N.Y. 10003.

- Rytmeister, C., & Marshall, S. (2007). Studying political tensions in university governance: A focus on board member constructions of role. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 13(4), 281-294.
- Sarbin, T. R. (1954). Role theory. *Handbook of social psychology: Theory and Method* (pp. 223-258) Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Sarros, J. C., Gmelch, W. H., & Tanewski, G. A. (1998). The academic dean: A position in need of a compass and clock. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 17(1), 65-88.
- Schriver, J. M. (1995). *Human Behavior and the Social Environment: Shifting Paradigms in Essential Knowledge for Social Work Practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schuler, R. S., Aldag, R. J., & Brief, A. P. (1977). Role conflict and ambiguity: A scale analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 20(1), 111-128.
- Schuster, J., Smith, D., Corak, K., & Yamada, M. (1994). *Strategic academic governance: How to make big decisions better*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Basic Books.
- Senior, V., Smith, J. A., Michie, S., & Marteau, T. M. (2002). Making sense of risk: an interpretative phenomenological analysis of vulnerability to heart disease. *Journal of health Psychology*, 7(2), 157-168.
- Sensing, T. (2003). The role of the academic dean. *Restoration Quarterly*, 45(1/2), 5-10.
- Shah, D. (2003). Country report on decentralization in the education system of Pakistan: Policies and strategies. *Islamabad: Academy of Educational Planning and Management, (Islamabad), Ministry of Education*.
- Shattock, M. (2002). Re-Balancing Modern Concepts of University Governance. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(3), 2
- Shattock, M. (2006). *Managing good governance in higher education*: Taylor & Francis.
- Simplicio, J. S. C. (2006). Shared Governance: An Analysis of Power on the Modern University Campus from the Perspective of an Administrator. *Education*, 126(4), 6.
- Sizer, J. (1988). In Search of Excellence—Performance Assessment in the United Kingdom. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 42(2), 152-161.
- Smith, D. (1999). Burton R. Clark 1998. Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation. *Higher Education*, 38(3), 373-374.

- Sporn, B. (1999). *Adaptive university structures: An analysis of adaptation to socioeconomic environments of US and European universities* (Vol. 54): Jessica Kingsley Pub.
- Sporn, B. (2007). Governance and administration: Organizational and structural trends *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 141-157): Springer.
- Stake R.E (2000) „Case Studies“ Ch.16 of Denzin and Lincoln (ed) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* 2nd edition, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Case Studies* (2nd ed.): Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*: Guilford Press.
- Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: five propositions. *International social science journal*, 50(155), 17-28.
- Stroup, H. (1966). *Bureaucracy in higher education*: Free Press New York.
- Taggart, G. J. (2004). *A critical review of the role of the English funding body for higher education in the relationship between the state and higher education in the period 1945-2003*. EdD, Dissertation, University of Bristol.
- Tapper, T., & Salter, B. (1992). *Oxford, Cambridge, and the changing idea of the university: the challenge to donnish domination*: Open University.
- Task Force on Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan. (2002). www.hec.gov.pk/mediapublication/HECpublication/documents
- Taylor-Powell, E., Renner, M., & Service, U. o. W.-.-E. C. E. (2003). *Analyzing qualitative data*: University of Wisconsin--Extension, Cooperative Extension.
- Tierney, W. G. (2004). *Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm*: JHU Press
- Tierney, W. G. (2005). When Divorce is Not an Option: The Board and the Faculty. *Academe*, 91(3), 43-46.
- Tierney, W. G., & Minor, J. T. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report*. Los Angeles: Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis.
- Trakman, L. (2008). Modelling university governance. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(1-2), 63-83.
- Tricker, R. B. (2015). *Corporate governance: Principles, policies, and practices*: OUP Oxford.
- Trow, M. (1997). The chief of public universities should be civil servants, not political actors. *Chronicle Higher Education*.

- Tucker, A., & Bryan, R. A. (1988). *The Academic Dean: Dove, Dragon, and Diplomat*: ERIC.
- Tucker, A., & Bryan, R. A. (1991). *The Academic Dean: Dove, Dragon, and Diplomat*: second edition, Macmillan publishing company, New York, N.Y. 10022.
- Turner, D. W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The qualitative report*, 15(3), 7
- Twombly, S. B. (1992). The process of choosing a dean. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 653-683.
- Ugboaru-Anyanwu, G. E. (2009). *Improvement growth and leadership in higher education: A case study of Rowan University*. Capella University.
- University of Sindh Code. (2014). The University of Sindh Code, published by Authority, October, 2014, 2nd ed.
- University of Sindh Code. (1999). The University of Sindh Code, published by Authority, July, 1999, 1st ed.
- University constitution of Liaquat University of Medical Sciences. (2014). Unpublished, 1st ed.
- University of Agriculture Code. (1977). The University of Agriculture Code, published by Authority, 1977.
- University of Karachi Code. (1962). The University of Karachi Code, published by Authority, May, 1962.
- Usman, S. (2014). Governance and higher education in Pakistan: what roles do boards of governors play in ensuring the academic quality maintenance in public universities versus private universities in Pakistan?. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3(2), p38.
- Waugh, W. L. (2003). Issues in university governance: More “professional” and less academic. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 585(1), 84-96.
- Wepner, S. B., D'Onofrio, A., & Wilhite, S. C. (2008). The leadership dimensions of education deans. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(2), 153-169.
- Wicke, M.F. (1963). Deans: ‘Man in the middle.’ The study of academic administration. Boulder, Colo: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education.
- Williams, D., Gore, W., Broches, C., & Lostski, C. (1987). One faculty’s perception of its academic governance role. *Journal of Higher Education*, 58, 6.

Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Gmelch, W. H. (1999). The impact of role conflict and ambiguity on academic deans. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80-106.

World Bank Report,(1992 p. 6-8). *Higher Education and Scientific Research: Strategy for Development and Reform country department, 1. Population and human resources division, Europe, middle East and North Region.*

Yin, R. K.(2003). *Case study research: Designed methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage. York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

<http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/CEB97E71-9F75-4EBD-BE95-940B7D7D6883/0/evaluation.pdf>

<http://www.brecorder.com/muhammad-ali-jinnah/quotes-of-quaid-e-azam/38136message-to-all-pakistan-educational-conference-in-1947-.html>

<http://unesco.org.pk/education/teachereducation/files/National%20Education%20Policy.pdf> www.hec.gov.pk

<http://www.interface.edu.pk/students/Sep-09/Education-policy-implementation-level.asp>

<http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2015/04/24/city/islamabad/issues-of-governance-plague-universities-says-hec-chairman/>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Brief Profiles of the 16 Respondents

University A

UA Adm 1: is male with an age range of within 70 to 72. He is a vice chancellor. He has over 40 years experience as an academician and administrator.

UA Adm 2: is male between the ages of 55 and 57. He is pro-vice chancellor and syndicate member. He is professor and among the senior professors and has over 20 years experience overall in administration and academic side.

UA Adm 3: is male between the ages of 42 to 45. He is Associate Professor in deptt of xxxx. He is director of quality assurance department of the University. He has over 10 years experience. He is responsible solely for quality matters and supervises a team of quality management officers at the quality assurance central office of his university as well as coordinates quality management activities at the faculties and other establishments in the university.

UA Aca 1 is female between the ages of 57 to 58. She is dean of Faculty of xxxxx and acting pro-vice chancellor of main campus. She is professor and has over 20 years experience.

UA Aca 2: is female between the ages of 56 to 57. She is dean of Faculty of xxxxx and chairperson of deptt: xxxxx. She is professor and has over 22 years experience. She has got third tenure as dean it means she is working as dean over 7 years.

UA Aca 3: is male between the ages of 50 to 52. He is dean of Faculty of xxxxx. He is professor and has over 20 years experience. His field of specialization is urdu literature.

UA Aca 4: is male between the ages of 52 to 55. He is dean of Faculty of xxxxxx. He is professor and has over 20 years experience. His field of specialization is business administration.

UA Aca 5: is male between the ages of 55 to 57. He is dean of Faculty of xxxxx. He is professor and in last syndicate committee he was syndicate member and was representing deans. He has over 25 years experience. He is working as dean over 8 years this time he has third tenure of deanship.

UA Aca 6: is male between the ages of 52 to 57. He is dean of Faculty of xxxxx. He is professor in deptt xxxxx and has over 20 years experience.

University B

UB Adm 1: is male between the age of 56 to 58. He is a vice chancellor of the university. He is vice chancellor over seven years in the same university. He has over 22 years

experience as a medical doctor and surgeon. He is advisor of Chancellor/ Governor of the province for the quality of education in the province.

UB Adm 2: is male between the age of 52 to 55. He is pro- vice chancellor of the university. He has over 20 years experience as a medical doctor he is professor. He did his graduation from Canada. This is second syndicate that he is still member.

UB Adm 3: is male between the ages of 62 to 65. He has about 30 years experience in the administrative settings. Before working in University B twice he was registrar in University A as registrar over 10 years.

UB Adm 4: is male between the ages of 45 to 48. He has about 12 years experience in the administrative settings out of which he has spent 2 years on quality management responsibilities which are mainly coordination and supervision. He is director and currently is responsible for the overall quality assurance management in his university.

UB Aca 1: is male between the age of 52 to 55. He is dean of the Faculty of xxxx. He is professor and has over 20 years experience as a medical doctor and surgeon.

UB Aca 2: is male between the age of 50 to 55. He is dean of the Faculty of xxxxx. He has over 18 years experience, he is professor.

UB Aca 3: is female between the age of 50 to 52. She is dean of the Faculty of xxxxxx. She has over 17 years experience. She is professor.