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**ABSTRACT**

This research compared and examined the management of University for Development Studies (UDS) and Presbyterian University College, Ghana (PUCG). The main objective was to compare, analyse and explain the differences and similarities in the management of the two selected public and private multi-campus universities in Ghana. To achieve the research objectives, the qualitative method and a comparative case study approach as well as an in-depth interview technique were employed for the study. In all, eight principal officers of the two universities were purposively selected and interviewed. The research findings revealed that there are no significant differences in the management structures of the two studied universities. The findings showed that both universities do not appoint senior or principal officers to manage the campuses and both universities do not also have any formula for the allocation of infrastructure. However, among other findings, it was revealed that unlike PUCG, UDS uses some percentages/ratios based formula for the allocation of funds. The study recommends the need for the appointment of senior or principal officers (Pro-Vice Chancellors (PVC) or Vice Presidents) as campus heads and place them as top management instead of lower management as found on the synthesised management structure. Finally, the study developed and proposed a standardised mathematical formula for the fair allocation of funds in the universities.
CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter covers the general introduction of the study. In this chapter, the background of the study, statement of research problem, research objectives, research questions, significance of the study, scope of the study, and organisation of the study are presented and discussed extensively. The discussions on chapter are crowned with a chapter conclusion which gives a summary of the entire chapter.

1.1 Background of the Study

The concept of multi-campus university system (MCUS) is not a new phenomenon in developed countries such as the United States of America and the United Kingdom. The multi-campus system (MCS) is widely practiced by both public and private universities across the globe. However, the system is still an emerging phenomenon in some parts of Asia and Africa. McGuinness (1991) observes that the MCS began to show up on the management or governance and administration of higher education as early as the turn of the 20th Century, but the formation and growth of the concept got strangled by the effects of the Great Depression. Notably, the MCS bounced back in the early 1960s (McGuinness, 1991; Lee and Bowen, 1971) and has since been strengthened and sustained over the decades. The system has now dominated the horizon of higher education and taking more than half of the total students who enrolled in public colleges and universities in the United States (Gade, 1993).
Besides, the MCS is prominent and extensively practiced in the United States by most of the universities and colleges there. Thus, in the United States, multi-campus university (MCU) is simply described as a university or a college with two or more campuses offering higher education and is governed and controlled by a single or centralised management and mission (Wu and Wu, 2013a). This places the responsibility for designing the organisational structures and spelling out clear division of tasks for the various campuses entirely upon the central management or administration of the MCU (Gumprecht, 2007). Again, locating the overall management responsibility of the MCUS, Ardis et al. (2013) explain that the central management or the main campus of the MCUS is responsible for determining and apportioning responsibilities and tasks among the various branches or campuses. Much more, French (2003) and Willoughby (2003) give an expanded and a holistic description of the operation of the MCUS by stating that the university is usually structured or organized around a centralised administration or management which is responsible for the overall coordination and management of the university as a whole, including the campuses, but with the exception of providing educational or teaching services. On the other hand, the campuses are responsible for all teaching services and take instructions from and report to the Central Administration (CA) as well.

Generally, the MCUS is regarded as a modern or a 21st Century model of higher education (Becker, 2015) that is increasingly gaining recognition and prominence among public and private universities in both developed and developing countries. The increase patronage of this system of higher education is essentially for the purposes of maximizing the use of the available limited resources; making higher or tertiary education more accessible and closer to both urban and rural communities and students; expanding educational facilities and market share; and also for
depopulating the main campus (Greenberg et al., 2008; Teferra and Altbach, 2004; Lynch, 2003; Bianchi, 2000). Again, the current trend can be attributed to the numerous strengths, benefits and advantages – such as the promoting of diversity; campus specialisation; national integration and cohesion; and also ensuring regional balance in the provision of higher or tertiary education to communities and students - that are identified with the MCS (Harman, 2006). The system through its centralised administration or management maintains the same quality, values, standards and mission across all the campuses without recourse to urban and rural segregation. It is therefore obvious that the successes, benefits and impact of MCUS to students, staff, management, society and the state are not in doubt.

Again, Johnstone (1999) explains that the campuses or branches of the university are often located some distance away from the main campus which is normally referred to as the CA. Generally, the multi or branch campuses systems are instituted to increase access and specifically to meet community needs for workforce development and education. Greenberg et al. (2008); Deakin University (2009); Sheth et al. (2013); Harman (2006); Elson-Green (2006); and Lynch, (2003) equally hold the view that MCUs in recent times increase access and equity to all students, communities and regions. They also explain that the MCUS promotes diversity among students, staff and community members; eliminates inequity in access to higher education in rural and isolated areas; and improves the lives and economic wellbeing of the indigents. The system also provides for the decentralisation of resources, facilities and services to the dispersed campuses or branches as they are geographically departmentalized (Griffith University, 2005; Scott et al., 2007). In view of this, American Association of University Professors (2006); Harman and Harman (2003); Willoughby (2003); and French (2003) explain that the MCU model allows for
the decentralisation of academic services, human resources and support facilities to the various campuses according to their specific needs, but ensures that the overall management of these resources and campuses is done by a centralised system – the CA.

Fei (2015) explains that under the centralised management system or the core campus unified management system, the branches or campuses are regarded or treated as subordinate units. Therefore, the core or main campus is responsible for policy formulation, development planning, coordination and distribution of resources (Liu and Lv, 2007; Pelfrey, 2012), and overall administrative and management issues. While the campuses are viewed as middle management that are responsible for the basic operation of teaching and researching and day-to-day management. The management structure of the MCUS according to Lee and Bowen (1971) facilitates to a large extent the achievement of multidimensional goals of education; and the proper coordination of higher education as compared to the autonomous single-campus university system (SCUS). Again, Ayers (2002) underscores the effectiveness of the MCS by stating that the branches or campuses epitomize the main campus of the university. He believes that notwithstanding the occasional marginalization of the branches or campuses, they are capable of initiating and triggering change easier than the centre of the organisation, in this case the CA or main campus. He also maintains that the peripheral units or campuses can generate and develop ground-breaking or cutting-edge ideas and programmes for the CA or main campus and thereby functioning as initiators in the institution or organisation.

It is therefore obvious that the MCUS has a lot of difficulties and challenges (Howell et al., 2003; Steedman et al., 2006) as well as some striking benefits (Langenberg, 1994) associated with its
operations. The MCUS normally presents such universities with complexities and complications in management, decision making, communication, financial administration and allocation of resources (Gewer, 2010; Ezarik, 2009; Liu and Lv, 2007; Steedman et al., 2006). Notwithstanding the management complexities of the MCUS, the continuous adoption of the system across the African Continent is overwhelming and intriguing. Perhaps, this is driven by the rapid proliferation of institutions of higher education on the African Continent. Thus, the MCUS has become an effective vessel for expansion and capturing a good proportion of the market. This, largely accounts for the increasing numbers of MCUs in the developing world, especially sub-Saharan Africa. For instance, countries such as Kenya, Nigeria, Zimbabwe, South Africa, Tanzania, and Ghana are expanding the frontiers of their higher education through the MCUS.

Thus, the MCUS in recent times is fast becoming the ideal structure for the operation or governance of universities in Ghana. For instance, the two new public universities, University of Health and Allied Sciences (UHAS) and University of Energy and Natural Resources (URNR), are both established and structured as MCUs. Besides, four of the ten public universities and seven private universities in Ghana are organized and run on the MCUS. However, University for Development Studies (UDS) and Presbyterian University College, Ghana (PUCG) are selected for the study because they have more campuses that are regionally dispersed. The University for Development Studies was established in 1992 and currently has four campuses across the Northern, Upper East and Upper West Regions; whereas the Presbyterian University College, Ghana (PUCG) began in 2003 and runs five campuses in the Eastern, Ashanti and Greater Accra Regions. The study therefore, seeks to explore and compare the management of the two
universities to ascertain the effectiveness of their governance structures; the processes involved in allocating their resources; and how services are delivered to both staff and students.

1.2 Statement of Research Problem

The MCUS is a 21st Century model of higher education (Becker, 2015) that is increasingly gaining recognition among public and private universities in both developed and developing countries. Under this system, French (2003) and Willoughby (2003) explain that the campuses report to a centralised administration or office which is responsible for the overall coordination and management of the entire university with the exception of providing educational or teaching services. Seemingly, the MCUS is mostly adopted and operated by public or private universities for the purposes of maximizing the use of the available limited resources; making higher or tertiary education accessible and closer to rural communities and students; expanding educational facilities and market share; and also for depopulating the main campus.

Again, Harman (2006) indicates that the MCUS encourages and promotes diversity, specialisation, national integration and cohesion, and also ensures regional balance in the provision of higher or tertiary education. The system through its centralised administration or management ensures that unified quality standards are maintained and applied across all the campuses without recourse to urban and rural segregation. Thus, the successes, benefits and impact of MCUS to students, staff, management, society and the state are not in doubt.

Moreover, the achievement of the core objectives and intended benefits of MCUs is mostly constrained and impeded by some broad structural and management complexities of the MCS.
Some of these management complications arise because MCUs are usually new; their campuses are located apart and managed by a centralised unit or administration from a distance; and there is no special funding for MCUs. Undoubtedly, the MCUS comes with complex and complicated governance or management structure as compared to the autonomous SCUS. Besides, Lee and Bowen (1971), Ezarik (2009), Greenberg et al. (2008) and Hlengwa (2014) explicitly explain that the MCU governance system is a complex scenario of which its management success depends highly on the charismatic leadership and aggressive management of the units, schools and faculties on the different campuses. Therefore, the success of the MCUs is largely dependent on the nature and quality of management that is in place.

In spite of the numerous and diverse benefits associated with the MCUS, both public and private MCUs in Ghana are yet to tap the full benefits of the MCS - basically due to the teething difficulties and complexities connected with its management. This triggers the study to examine and compare the management systems of selected public and private MCUs in Ghana to ascertain the extent to which these management systems influence the universities’ ability to realize their core objectives and mandates in this era of rapid proliferation of tertiary institutions in the country.

Although management is a very crucial factor in the success of the MCU, it has been observed from some available literature that there seems to be a dearth of scholarly work on the topic being studied. However, some of the studies sighted include “Study of Australian MCUs” authored by Scott et al. (2007); “Management of MCUs in American and its enlightenment on Chinese MCUs” credited to Wu and Wu (2013a); “A Study on Influencing Factors and Countermeasures in Management of MCUs” also by Wu and Wu (2013b); and “Problems Caused by the Management
of MCU in China” by Fei (2015). Furthermore, in the context of Africa and Ghana specifically, the study has not found or sighted scholarly works on the management of MCS or MCUs. Hence, this study to explore the management of public and private MCUs in Ghana by comparing University for Development Studies (UDS) and Presbyterian University College, Ghana (PUCG) to unearth the facts and also fill the scholarly gap identified.

1.3 Research Objectives
The general objective of the study was to compare the management systems of public and private MCUs in Ghana. Specifically, the research sought to:

1. Compare the current management structures of UDS and PUCG.
2. Examine the processes adopted in the allocation of resources in the two universities.
3. Examine the processes of delivering administrative services to both staff and students of the Campuses of the two universities.

1.4 Research Questions
To achieve the specific objectives, the research was guided by three questions to help unearth and ascertain the facts in the field. Thus, the study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Are there similarities and differences in the current management structures of UDS and PUCG?
2. How are resources allocated in the two Universities?
3. How are administrative services delivered to staff and students on the Campuses of both universities?
1.5 Significance of the Study

The research would craft and fashion out an efficient and effective management structure for both public and private MCUs, especially University for Development Studies (UDS) and Presbyterian University College, Ghana (PUCG), and other government and private agencies or corporations that are run on the multi or branch system in Ghana, Africa and beyond. The study would also make provisions to enable MCUs adopt and incorporate best management practices and models that are relevant and useful to these special crop of universities in the 21st Century. This would make the universities efficient and effective in accomplishing their core goals or mandates.

Again, the study would provide appropriate and efficient modalities for allocation, management and utilization of limited resources to ensure convenient access of higher education to potential students and communities across the country through the campuses. The research would also develop models or formulae for the allocation of resources to campuses and determine effective channels for service delivery to both staff and students across the dispersed campuses.

Besides, the study would provide relevant information to enable governing bodies of tertiary or higher education such as National Accreditation Board (NAB) and National Council for Tertiary Education (NCTE) streamline the operations, governing structure and arrangements of MCUs in the country. In addition, the study would serve as a guide to the government (Ministry of Education) to formulate and implement policies on the MCUS, since there is none in place. For instance, such policies would determine the location and specialisation of campuses to avoid over urbanization of tertiary education in the country.
Above all, the findings of the research would serve as a foundation upon which future researchers
could rely on to build further knowledge, since little attention is given to the area under study. This
would therefore add to and expand the literature on managing MCUs in Ghana, Africa and the
world at large.

1.6 Scope of the Study
The research was designed to examine and analyse the management of MCUs in Ghana by
comparing University for Development Studies (UDS) and the Presbyterian University College,
Ghana (PUCG). Thus, the study was guided by and confined to the three stipulated research
objectives identified. Again, the scope of the study was narrowed by developing and conducting
an in-depth investigation into the management of MCUs using case a study design and a qualitative
approach. This might limit the generalisation of the findings to other universities and institutions
unless in the case of a specific context and/or phenomenon.

1.7 Organisation of the Study
The research was organised into five major chapters. The first chapter represents the general
introduction and is labelled as Chapter One. This chapter covers the background of the study,
statement of research problem, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the
study, the scope of the study, the organisation of the study, and the chapter conclusion.

Chapter Two covers the literature review of the study. This chapter provides detail literature on
the theoretical framework; definitions, origin, relevance, management structure, typologies,
decision making, resource allocation, and challenges of MCUS; as well as a conceptual
framework; and a chapter conclusion.
Chapter Three presents the methodology of the study. This chapter discusses the Methods employed in the research. These include the research paradigm, the research design, the study area, target population, sample size, sampling techniques, data collection instrument, data management and analysis, ethical considerations, limitations of the study, and a chapter conclusion as well.

Chapter Four covers data analysis and discussion. Under this chapter, the data are presented, analysed, and discussed in accordance with the stipulated objectives of the research.

Lastly, Chapter Five comprises the Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations. Here, the summaries and conclusions of the research are drawn and recommendations made on the findings obtained.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter covers the theoretical framework of the study and a detail review of relevant literature. The literature review includes the concept and definition of multi-campus universities, history and origin of multi-campus universities, management structure and typologies of multi-campus universities, the functions and relevance of multi-campus universities, the nature of decision making in multi-campus universities, resource allocation, the weaknesses and challenges of multi-campus universities, as well as the conceptual framework and chapter conclusion. This chapter is aimed at providing the research with an in-depth theoretical knowledge and understanding of the topic.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

In the United States, the management structure of the MCUS is basically developed from the typical management pattern or model. This model has become an acceptable and a mainstream form of managing institutions of higher education in America. The management pattern or model has since evolved and widely adopted by private and state or public MCUs across the globe (Wu and Wu, 2013a). However, it is very necessary for the management of a MCU to thoroughly assess and select an appropriate organisational structure and a suitable management pattern or model to ensure the effective and efficient running of the entire system. The management pattern or model selected or developed for the running of the system must support and facilitate both internal management and external coordination. Thus, the concept of the management pattern or model has
been selected to serve as the underpinning and guiding theoretical framework for the research process.

2.1.1 Management Pattern or Model

Jin and Wang (2010) describe the management pattern as management model and identify three types of these models that are applicable in the management of MCUs. The three management models include: (a) article management model, (b) block management model, and (c) article and block combination model. They assert that some authors also describe and classify the management model in various ways some of which include: university-city model, satellite model and cross-regional-type model; and train model, business-type layout pattern, and mixed type. Besides, Fei (2015) uses management pattern instead of management model to describe and state his categories of management theories suitable for MCUs as (a) centralised management pattern, (b) decentralised management pattern, and (c) centralised and decentralised management pattern. Although the two management theories use different terminologies, they articulate the same concepts and phenomena as well as meaning.

Fundamentally, there are no differences between the two management theories proposed by Jin and Wang, and Fei as they both express the same concept and meaning. To bring out the similarities of the two management theories properly, they have been aligned and compared in Table 1 below.
Table 1: Management Model and Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Model</th>
<th>Management Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article Management Model</td>
<td>Centralised Management Pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Management Model</td>
<td>Decentralised Management Pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article And Block Combination Model</td>
<td>Centralised and Decentralised Management Pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fei’s management pattern for MCUs has been preferably chosen over the Jin and Wang’s management model for the study because it supports and facilitates both internal management and external coordination and also addresses the research questions precisely.

2.1.2 Centralised Management Pattern

The centralised management pattern refers to a unified and a longitudinal leadership of the MCU where all the branches or campuses are coordinated under a main or central campus or a single management board. Hence, the various branches or campuses exist as subordinate units or institutions to the main campus of the university. The main or core campus is therefore responsible for policy formulation and implementation, coordination and distribution of all resources, development planning, admission and certification of students, and overall organisation and management of the university. Whereas, the campuses serve as middle management and are responsible for the coordination of teaching and learning, researching, and the day-to-day management of all the resources on the campuses through their respective campus heads and campus management or campus management committees. Much more, the strengths and advantages of the centralised management pattern include clear management responsibilities,
effective coordination of the centralised and decentralised units or campuses, integration of resources and campuses, and broad contribution to knowledge creation and multi-disciplinary research. However, it is associated with some drawbacks such as lack of commitment to the development plans of the campuses, large management range for the main campus to handle, and high operational cost and less efficient. (Fei, 2015; Jin and Wang, 2010)

2.1.3 Decentralised Management Pattern

The decentralised management refers to the lateral style of leadership or management of the MCUs. In this pattern, the branches or campuses exist as relative independent units under the main or core campus unified management of the university (Fei, 2015). Chen and Zhu (2007) state that the decentralised management pattern is suitable for the comprehensive university system which is normally made up of many disciplines and often poses management difficulties – it is usually a combination of universities. They explain that the main campus provides guidance in only major policy issues. Thus, this pattern usually has a small effective management span and gives the campuses full play initiatives, and is also very useful for development, teaching and learning, and researching. Besides, Jin and Wang (2010) explain that the management representing the highest level is often responsible for the unified macro-management of the entire university, while the campuses are responsible for their own management and development activities which are aimed at promoting the overall development of the entire university. Furthermore, the campuses under this pattern operate independently with relative more autonomy, have the drive and the energy to take initiatives, and also promote positive competition among the various campuses.
2.1.4 Centralised and Decentralised Management Pattern

This pattern is a combination of the centralised and decentralised management patterns where the campuses are established as dedicated management agencies which have some of the university’s students. The management system of the campuses or agencies is in accordance with the main campus system. Thus, the campuses are normally under the direct leadership of the main campus through management agencies known as management committees which manage the daily activities such as students’ affairs, logistics support, and administration. While the remaining activities such as teaching, scheduling and resource utilization must be executed in accordance with the main campus management system. Some of the advantages of this pattern include maximum use of limited human resources, and easy management. However, the pattern has some disadvantages which include the presence of only one fold of students on campuses, and less contact between different grades and different majors. (Fei, 2015)

Besides, Jin and Wang (2010) state that the intention of this model or pattern is not only for the benefit of the university's unified management, but also for providing or giving full play to the campuses to take their own initiatives. They add that much emphasis should not be placed on the distinct responsibilities and rights as that can derail management control and may reduce the efficiency of management, and affect the development of the entire university.

2.2 Definition of Multi-Campus University System

The concept of MCUS has been defined in different ways by various scholars and authorities in the field. However, these definitions have explicitly and precisely described the concept in a
coherent and a consistent manner without much disagreements. Some of these scholarly definitions are stated as follows:

Lee and Bowen (1971) define MCS by classifying some nine out of the then existing eleven systems as meeting and reflecting the concept. They therefore define the MCUS as one which has a well-coordinated management to govern the peripheral institutions, branches or campuses which are operated on the basis of providing community oriented higher education.

According to Wu and Wu (2013a), in the context of the United States, MCU is simply defined as a university or a college with two or more campuses offering four-year higher education and is governed and controlled by a single or centralised management and mission. Again, Scott et al (2007) give their definition of multi-campus institution in another dimension as a system that has three or more branches or campuses whereby the largest campus contains at most sixty percent (60%) of the total students’ population of the university. However, “a more stringent definition of multi-campus might include only universities with [fifty percent] 50% or less of total student load on the main campus” (Scott et al., 2007, p.2).

Similarly, Griffith University (2005), also defines MCUS as a university system that has more than two university or college campuses which are not just satellite campuses. It further explains that a MCS is an approach in which colleges or universities are geographically departmentalized and can be classified into three categories namely (a) the SCU; (b) the university with a main campus and one or more small satellite campuses; and (c) the MCU which comprise a number of dispersed campuses, and each has a considerable student population (Griffith University, 2005). In addition,
Fei (2015, p.60) states that “MCU means that there is a separate legal status and at least two geographically disjoint campuses”.

Besides, Dhliwayo (2014), American Association of University Professors (2006) and Willoughby (2003) give an elaborate definition of the MCUS by describing it as a system through which academic services, human resources and support facilities are decentralised to the dispersed branches or campuses based on their needs and specific requirements. However, they indicate that the overall management of all the resources is centralised at the main campus or the CA.

Again, Johnstone (1999) posits that under the MCS colleges and universities spread out to many locations and communities through multi-site campuses, branch campuses, satellite centres, and county centres. He however, states that the basic distinguishing characteristic of the MCS is the centralised governing or management structure operated by the main campus or CA. Besides, Charles (2009) and French (2003) also define MCSs as universities or higher education institutions whose operations are widely dispersed across two or more geographical areas or locations.

Much more, Dengerink (2001) defines the MCUS in the light of its main characteristics which include: campuses or branches are managed and coordinated by a main campus or a CA; campuses or branches as members of the MCU offer limited programmes; and the campuses or branches of a MCU are only members of the system and do not direct relationship between or among them.

Also, Creswell et al. (1985) in their definition identify five characteristics of a MCU as follows: public or private control of the system; a single or one governing board; branches or campuses in
the system are either single type or multiple type institutions that may be small or large; the system’s management, coordination and administration is the responsibility of the main campus or the CA; and the system or university is aimed at providing easy access of higher education to various people and communities.

Thus, the working definition of MCUS for this research is a public or a private university with two or more campuses or branches that are geographically dispersed to increase access of higher education and are controlled by a central management and a single mission.

2.3 Origin of Multi-Campus University System

Unlike the developed countries, such as the United States of America and the United Kingdom, where the MCUS concept was originated and practiced for decades; it is still an emerging concept and phenomenon in most parts of Asia and Africa. The MCS is widely practiced by both public and private universities across the globe.

According to McGuinness (1991), the MCS began to appear on the management or governance and administration of higher education as early as the turn of the 20th Century, but the formation and growth of the concept got strangled by the effects of the Great Depression. This notwithstanding, the MCUS bounced back in the higher education governance and management in the early 1960s (McGuinness, 1991; Lee and Bowen, 1971) and has since been strengthened and sustained over the decades. Hence, the assertion of Gade (1993) that the MCUS has now dominated the horizon of higher education and taking more than half of the total students who enrolled in public colleges and universities in the United States.
Again, Schwaller (2009) states that the multi or branch campus emerged in higher education as a unique system or entity few years after the Second World War. He adds that at the beginning of the 20th Century, most state assisted universities and campuses covered very limited geographical areas and offered a limited number of academic programmes as well. In addition, Billitteri (1997) and Labaree (2006) assert that the focus of universities and colleges shifted to the multi or branch or regional campus system of higher education to enable them meet the increasing demand for higher education after the war. They believe that this led to the expansion and broadening of academic or degree programmes offered by these universities or colleges to include more fields of study.

In United States, most public universities are formed or created through the university system, where a number of universities are merged into a single university or system, of one sort or another (Lane and Johnstone, 2013). Thus, the origins, histories, and nature of these systems usually vary widely as their formation or emergence is often influenced substantially by some political elements and decisions (McGuinness, 2013). Besides, McGuinness (1991) and Johnstone (1999) indicate that the variation in formation or emergence of MCSs is largely accounted for by numerous factors such as regional, political and economic forces, the desire for regulation and control of the growth of higher education, and the need to extend educational opportunities and facilities to uncovered areas or regions. They add that some of the university systems form as a result of institutional evolution.

Furthermore, Wu and Wu (2013b) state that MCUs are formed or developed through the following arrangements: (a) merging universities – where two or more independent colleges or universities
restructure by merging in a geographical scope for the purposes of expanded scope, improved strength, and optimized the use of resources regionally; (b) expanding universities – to expand the access and coverage of higher education, existing universities create and establish new campuses outside their original operational areas. This is often aimed at solving developmental challenges and increasing enrolment as well; and (c) hybrid MCUs – where colleges or universities establish multi-campuses by forming mergers and building new campuses as well. Thus, this kind of MCUs have the characteristics of both the merged and expanded MCUs.

2.4 Management Structure of Multi-Campus University System

Gumprecht (2007) explains that the MCUS places the responsibility for designing the organisational structures and spelling out clear division of tasks for the various campuses entirely upon the central management or CA of the university. Besides, placing or locating the overall management responsibility of the MCUS on the CA or management, Ardis et al. (2013) explain that the central management or the main campus is responsible for determining and apportioning responsibilities and tasks among the various branches or campuses.

Similarly, French (2003) and Willoughby (2003) explain that the MCUS is normally structured or organized around a centralised administration or management whereby the responsibility for the overall coordination and management of the university as a whole, including the campuses, resides in the main campus, whilst academic or teaching services are delegated to the campuses. Thus, the campuses take the responsibility for all academic and teaching services and also take instructions and directions from and as well report to the CA or management.
Again, a public and private MCU is usually made of a number of campuses or branches whereby each of these campuses has its mission; academic programmes; internal governing structures such as controls, policies and procedures; and is managed by a head that may be referred to as a campus head. However, the entire university is governed by a broad single mission, single management or central management that is presided over by single chief executive officer, usually referred to as the Vice Chancellor (VC) or President. This single or central management has the overall responsibility for the entire university by performing roles such as appointing staff; formulating policies; allocating resources among campuses; appointing campus heads and other heads of units in consultation with faculty; and approving missions and academic programmes of the campuses usually through the academic board (Johnstone, 2005).

However, Nel (2006) is of the view that since the campuses are geographically dispersed and separated from one another and the main campus, they are granted some reasonable level of autonomy in managing and coordinating their daily operations and activities, but they are expected to remain committed, as subordinate units and an integral part, to the overall or central and superior management or governance system. Also, Scott et al. (2007, p.2) identify three ways of organizing higher educational institutions geographically as follows: “(a) the Single-Campus University (SCU); (b) the university with a main campus and one or more small satellite campuses; and (c) the MCU comprising multiple geographically dispersed campuses, each with a substantial student load.”
2.5 Typologies of Multi-Campus University System

Schwaller (2009) and Dengerink (2001) identify and categorize MCUS with focus on the campuses or branches as follows: (a) Campuses which do not have separate accreditation and that offer programmes of the main or central campus. The campuses are usually operated at a distance from the main or central campus. Again, these campuses often do not have a board of control or any unique programmes and usually serve as geographical branches offering the same services as the main or central campus. (b) Campuses which have separate accreditation as a result of their creation or operations over time. They usually have distinct identities as well as independent or semi-independent boards of control and their own unique programmes. And (c) Campuses which are basically part of a system that does not have any central or main campus. This is found in some collegiate systems which often have numerous branches or campus, but do not have any main or dominant campus.

The MCUS therefore has a complex governance and management structure as the system normally embodies a number of campuses. To ease and facilitate the management and governance of the MCUS, scholars such as McGuinness (1991), McGrath (1990), and Creswell et al. (1985) categorize this class of university models into some typologies. The typologies are aimed at revealing the complexity and enhancing the understanding of this special breed of university system. These typologies are briefly explained below.

Firstly, McGuinness (1991) bases his typologies of the MCS upon its governing arrangements or structures. Thus, McGuinness categories the MCS into three governing structures that include: (a) Academically integrated multi-site institutions: This type of system according McGuinness, is
made of branch campuses or extended institutions of the main campus. As a result, the main campus policies and programmes are replicated on the branch campuses – in other words, the branch campuses do not have their own policies and programmes except those of the main campus. However, it is possible for the branch campuses to have their own chief executive. He likens this type of system to a single institution operating in several locations. (b) MCUs: Again, this category of the MCS is regarded as a research university that mounts and runs both research oriented programmes and some other four-year programmes. It is therefore seen as a research university which also has four-year institutions as well. The campuses or institutions under this type of system most often have their own internal missions, faculty and chief executive officers or heads, however, none of these heads can be the head of the entire system at the sometime. Here, the head and his staff are regarded as the academic heads or leaders of the system. And (c) Multi-campus or consolidated governance system. McGuinness, also states that the multi-campus or consolidated governance system has some similar characteristics with MCUs. However, the multi-campus or consolidated governance system can be identified by some three distinct characteristics which include: (a) The locus of academic leadership: The locus of academic leadership under the multi-campus or consolidated governance system emanates from the campus level and not form the system level as it is in the case of the MCUs. (b) The diversity of missions: The missions and the degree of prestige among constituent or branch campuses under the multi-campus or consolidated governance system have more variance than among institutions that are under the MCU. And (c) The origins of the system itself: Lastly, unlike MCUs which are formed with main campus and branch campuses; the multi-campus or consolidated governance system are mostly setup to annex or wing a stand-alone institution or system. (McGuinness, 1991)
Secondly, McGrath (1990) bases his typologies of the MCUS on the type of institutions that are found within the system. He therefore analyses and classifies the system into three groups of systems which he names as university systems. According to McGrath (1990), these university systems, for that matter, consist of the following: (a) Flagship dominant university system: This category of MCS is organized and controlled as a flagship university which is basically large and well-established. It may contain two or more small campuses that belong to the system and are regarded as branches of the flagship. (b) Small university system: This type of MCS is normally headed by a single administrative head who is responsible for the management and administration of the flagship and the branch campuses as well. Thus, the small university system usually contains a few number of campuses in addition to a single large campus. However, each of the campuses is managed and administered independently by a chief executive officer. Lastly, (c) Large university system: This type of university system is often large and typically statewide own that comprises many campuses which are mostly four-year institutions. This kind of university system does not necessarily qualify to be classified or regarded as a flagship institution. Again, large university system just like the small university system, has a separate chief executive officer who governs each of the campuses.

Lastly, Creswell et al. (1985) in outlining their typologies of the MCUS, place emphasis on four administrative and management or organisational characteristics. These include: (a) The control of the MCS, that is either publicly or privately controlled. (b) The span or jurisdiction of the governing board in place. For instance, MCS that is statewide will be placed under the jurisdiction of a state-level governing board. While the system that is not statewide will be under the jurisdiction of its own governing board. (c) The comparability of campuses that make up the
MCUS - that is either the MCU is heterogeneous or homogeneous. Heterogeneous system is one where the campuses have different missions or institutional mandates. Whereas homogeneous system refers to one in which campuses have same missions or institutional mandates. And (d) The administrative and management structure of the MCUS – that is whether the system is headed by a single or flagship chief executive officer (VC or President), or it is treated as separate entity and headed by its own different chief executive officer (VC or President).

2.6 Rationale for Multi-Campus Universities

Lee and Bowen (1971) state in their study at the time that the rationale for the MCUS has not been clearly or explicitly stated by any scholars in the field of study. They, Lee and Bowen, however reveal that there are some assumptions underlining the rationale of the system. These assumptions include:

1. The MCUS facilitates the accomplishment of multiple educational goals through the various campuses better than the SCUS.

2. The MCUS which consists of a group of campuses or institutions allows for effective coordination of higher education better than a system that is made up autonomous universities or campuses.

The assumptions or rationale of the MCUS is a reflection or an emphasis of the fundamental functions of this category of university system. According Lee and Bowen (1971, p.9) these functions include: “….to promote specialisation, diversity, and cooperation – a division of labour and alternative approaches to education in a coordinated, intercampus context”.
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2.7 Relevance of Multi-Campus Universities

Langenberg (1994) states that MCUS provides more benefits as against the single-autonomous university or the stand-alone institutions. He therefore indicates that the benefits of the MCUS can be assessed in the light of synergy, strategy, efficiency, accountability and integrity which are often lacking in the single-autonomous university system.

Thus, Langenberg (1994) briefly explains the benefits of the MCUS as follows:

1. Synergy – means the ability of a system (MCUS) to combine limited resources in order to provide opportunities that may not have been provided by an autonomous or independent institution (SCU).

2. Strategy – this refers to all the processes that are involved in the formulation or setting of common goals or objectives, allocating complementary responsibilities to the constituent institutions or campuses, and designing coordination plans. All these activities are often aimed at a mission for the entire system.

3. Efficiency – this explains how services are usually combined and arranged with an effort of eliminating or minimizing all possible duplications and their associated costs.

4. Accountability – this refers to the ability of the system (MCU) to ensure the actions of the individual institutions (campuses) meet the university-wide or system-wide standards.

5. Integrity – this is where the system (MCU) ensures that all the individual institutions or campuses are accountable for their all their actions and activities and as well protect the individual institutions or campuses from all kinds undue external interferences.
The MCUS through its centralised administration provides equivalent quality, values, and standards across all the campuses without resort to urban and rural segregation. This ensures that students and staff on the campuses in the rural areas enjoy the same services as the main campus in the urban area.

Again, Harman (2006) notes that the MCU is associated with several benefits which include the promotion of diversity; specialisation of campuses; integration and cohesion of the nation; and also the provision of regional balance in extending higher or tertiary education to communities and students.

The MCUS is also able to maximize the use of the available limited resources to make higher or tertiary education accessible and closer to both urban and rural communities and students; to expand educational facilities and market share; and also to depopulate the main campus (Greenberg et al., 2008; Teferra and Altbach, 2004; Lynch, 2003; Bianchi, 2000). This would certainly provide an opportunity for all qualified students to access higher education conveniently.

Besides, the system provides for decentralisations of resources, facilities and services to the dispersed campuses as they are geographically departmentalised (Scott et al., 2007; Griffith University, 2005) and thus provides infrastructural base and development for such areas. This view is supported by American Association of University Professors (2006), Harman and Harman (2003); Willoughby (2003); and French (2003) when they explain that the MCU model allows for the decentralisation of academic services, human resources and support facilities to the various campuses according to their specific needs.
Apart from increasing access to higher education, MCUs perform an important additional role in providing community needs for workforce development. Thus, Sheth et al. (2013); Deakin University (2009); Greenberg et al. (2008); Harman (2006); Elson-Green (2006); and Lynch, (2003) assert that MCUs promote diversity among students, staff and the community members; eliminate inequity in access to higher education in rural and isolated areas; and above all improve the lives and economic wellbeing of the indigents.

2.8 Nature of Decision Making in Multi-Campus Universities

The literature review under this section covers concepts such as decision making, decision making in MCUs, campus autonomy from centralised administration and leadership.

2.8.1 Decision Making

Decision making is the process of making choices from alternative options for a future activity or action that is spanned over a period of time and across cultures (Garvin and Roberto, 2001). Notably, there are two basic types of decision making namely strategic decision making and operational decision making. Simon (1976) simply defines strategic decision making as the determination of the purpose and operational decision making as the implementation of the purpose.

Rausch et al. (2001) describe decision making as the process of using the appropriate participation method to perform a particular action by systematically following some predetermined basic principles or elements. They assert that decision making process is highly dependent on
relationships. Hence, the claim of Morgan (2003) and Wheatley (2003) that the success of organisations today is more dependent on relationship skills than in the past.

Womack and Podemski (1985) state that equal participation of all the campuses in the planning process of a MCUS is very important. They also state that missions and goals of the campuses in the MCUS must reflect or represent the needs of the individual communities they serve. Thus, the individual campuses must be granted some degree of autonomy to enable them take decisions that best fit their immediate environments.

According to Vroom (2000, p.85), “Under a wide range of conditions, increasing participation [of campus and unit heads] leads to greater 'buy-in,' commitment to decisions, and motivation to implement them effectively.” However, Daft and Marcic (2001) indicate that in spite of wide support for and participation in decision making, the process is often very slow and as a result reduces the decision making speed.

Contrary, Eisenhardt (1999), believes that a cohesive group that allows for multiple viewpoints will be able to resolve conflicts and is most likely to develop group intuition. She maintains that intuition is a major element for successful and effective leadership teams which may allow a group to speed up the decision making processes.

2.8.2 Decision Making in Multi-Campus Universities

It is the view of Dougherty (2001) that decision making has a significant influence on organisational or management structure. He posits that a highly differentiated organisation is more
susceptible to control than a hierarchical one which is less innovative. Again, he states that a highly integrated organisation will be innovative and more responsive, but may have control challenges (Dougherty, 2001). Hence, the assertion of Nadler and Tushman (1999) that an ideal organisational design features both integration and differentiation which have the ability to connect various units across functions in the organisation.

The decision making process or procedure in the MCU like most organisations depicts the top-down and bottom-up approaches of relationship between the CA or main campus and the campuses (Morgan, 2003; Wheatley, 2003). Generally, the university council is the highest decision making organ in the university which is responsible for making policy proposals for the management to formulate appropriate policies. Thus, decisions bordering on policy and management issues such as policy formulation, resource allocation, approving programmes, recruiting and staffing, admitting and certifying students are the preserve or responsibility of the central management or main campus (Massarik and Pei-Carpenter, 2002).

While, decisions relating to operational and implementation issues such as academic activities (teaching and assessment), mounting of programmes, internal or local operations and implementation of management decisions are also relegated to the campuses (Vroom, 2000; Kerr, 2001). In effect, the campuses through their campus management committees operationalise or implement the formulated policies and report to the central management, thereby providing for the distribution of the decision making function at all levels in the university (Worley, Hitchin and Ross, 1996). Besides, the campuses also make proposals on new programmes to the management for consideration and approval for their faculties and departments.
2.8.3 Campus Autonomy from Central Administration

Dhliwayo (2014) states that the campuses of a MCU would operate effectively and efficiently with or without unnecessary interference from the central governing board. He adds that although the campuses, like any subsidiary unit, are likely to operate effectively when the central campus, the higher organisation, issues directions and instructions to the campuses or lower institutions, it should be done with circumspection. These interferences or instructions may emanate from the state, the central governing board, and the VC or the President.

Thus, a reasonable level of institutional autonomy for the campuses is important for their smooth operations. However, this autonomy should be limited to decisions that the campuses have the power and authority to make and apply at their level. It is evident that granting autonomy to these campuses would lead to high responsiveness, flexible operations, and quick decisions making and hence make them effective and efficient. (Johnston, 1993; French, 2003; Harman and Harman, 2003)

2.8.4 Leadership

Leadership describes the issuance and demonstration of unambiguous goals or ideas and provision of a strategic direction with the aim of achieving institutional coherence and cohesion in an organisation (Northouse, 2007; Doyle and Smith, 2001). Thus, relating leadership to decision making, Eisenhardt (1999) states that in the past decision making was deemed basically as the ability of executives or management to critically analyse the organisation and its environment. Besides, she indicates that strategic decision making should not be restricted to only the top management or executives of the organisation. Thus, proper distribution of strategic decision
making in an organisation provides the opportunity for staff at all levels to contribute effectively to the decision making process (Worley et al., 1996). In spite of Worley’s et al. position, Massarik and Pei-Carpenter (2002) emphasise that leaders play a vital and a crucial role in determining whether to maintain or change existing cultures of their organisations.

Scholars of leadership identify three fundamental elements or components of leadership as concept as follows: (a) Relationship building skills – Wheatley (2003) and Morgan (2003) emphasise the importance of acquiring and building relationship skills as leaders to ensure effective interactions and decision making in the organisation. (b) Management of participatory decision making – Eisenhardt (1999) and Schein (1992) explain that the leaders must have the ability and skills to effectively manage participatory decision making and its relational facets as well. And (c) Management of paradoxes - Smith and Berg (1987), Stringer and Hudson (2008), and Johnson (1992) also state that leaders should have the ability and skills to manage paradoxes or divergences in their organisations effectively. For instance, they indicate that the leadership of a MCUS must be able to resolve conflicts between campuses that want autonomy and those that want centralisation.

2.9 Resource Allocation

The allocation or distribution of resources among the various campuses of the MCU is often a very difficult task for the CA or main campus. Thus, the contention of Liu and Lv (2007) that MCUs may face some difficulties or challenges in the allocation and sharing of financial, human and physical resources across their campuses. These may include financial, infrastructural, and human resources. For instance, Scott et al. (2007, p.19) illustrates that “If a university has six campuses
then its resources such as libraries, student laboratories, network infrastructure, student centres and other services must be replicated, or distributed in new ways known to be effective if quality is to be consistent. This requires a higher level of both staff and non-staff expenditure to ensure equivalent quality to students wherever they study.”

According to Dhliwayo (2014, p.326), “The fair sharing of resources and support in the multi-campus situation is a tricky issue.” Besides, Gaither (1999) explains that it is not possible for all the campuses to be of the same size and or have the same workloads, these likely differences usually make it extremely difficult for MCUs to share or distribute the limited resources fairly. It is therefore normal for one of the campuses to become large and control more resources or become well-resourced than the other campuses in the university. Hence, Blythe’s (2006) fear that the disproportionate ownership and control of resources by campuses may create competition among them and may result in suspicions, hatred, ill-feeling and discrimination among students and staff of the campuses. Thus, resource allocation among campuses is an important issue in MCUs and must be handled professionally and objectively. To overcome this challenge, MCUs should in consultation with the campuses design a criteria or a formula that is acceptable to all concern for the allocation of resources among them. This will avoid the possibility of skewing resources to one campus at the expense of the others.

Besides, Mathebula and de Beer (2003) reveal that staff of the main campus of the university often tend to downgrade and disrespect their fellow staff and programmes or activities at the campuses. This, often affect the fair or equitable distribution or allocation of resources to the campuses by the main campus. Hence, the assertion of Allison and Eversole (2008) and Gaskell (2011) that in
the MCUS, the branches or campuses usually suffer most in times of financial difficulties where budgets and costs are being cut or reduced. Obviously, the main campus which is mostly responsible for the allocation of the resources will allocate more to itself at the expense of the campuses.

2.10 Challenges of Multi-Campus University System

The rapid expansion of and demand for higher education over the past decades, where student enrolments are increasing in most universities or colleges, necessitates the establishing of new universities or colleges and opening of branches and campuses as well. However, the opening of MCUs or colleges poses some intriguing issues and difficulties that relate to accreditation of programme, communication between campuses and the main campus, resource allocation, service delivery, and organisational or governance structure. (Gregory, 2004)

Ebden (2010), Ezarik (2009), and Greenberg et al. (2008) state that the operations of the MCUS is often plagued with numerous complex challenges or difficulties in the fields of management, logistics, pedagogic, and economic. To surmount such difficulties in the MCUS, Stringer and Hudson (2008) and Ezarik (2009) propose that distributive and cooperative leadership styles must be adopted to help deal with these challenges and also ensure that unified standards and experiences are maintained across the campuses located in different cultural and geographical areas.

Thus, to understand the challenges and difficulties of the MCUS properly, the review focuses on the following: management challenges; Resource Challenges; ‘and Service Delivery Challenges.
2.10.1 Management Challenges

Leadership or management is key in the effective operation of the entire university and the individual campuses that are dispersed geographically (Steedman et al., 2006). Therefore, effective leadership is not only required at the main campus or CA, but also at the branch or campus level as well. These branches or campuses must be managed by efficient staff who may be referred to as campus managers or heads, or PVC who are normally appointed by the university governing board and mandated to oversee and manage all the campus activities such as implementing the strategic plan of university, ensuring the achievement of regional and local needs by the campus, and maintaining standards and prestige of the university at the campus level (Allison and Eversole, 2008; OCUFA, 2009). Again, the campus managers who are usually senior or principal officers in the university report directly to the VC (Davis and Kelly, 2006).

However, the campus heads or managers are obliged to take instructions and directives from the central governing board or the main campus thereby slowing their ability to expedite actions whenever necessary. Thus, the structural arrangement of MCUs is likely to result in a number of management and leadership related challenges (Johnstone, 1999; Nicolson, 2004). The campus management or leadership is mostly weakened and rendered ineffective as a result of routine interference from the central governing board in the management of the branches or campuses (Dhliwayo, 2014). Even though the regular interference of the central governing board is meant to ensure maintenance of unified standards and quality on the campuses (Joyce, 2010), it often lowers the morale of the campus leaders or managers and also makes them uninnventive. Again, Singh and Khanna (2011) observe that it is extremely difficult for the management of branches or campuses that are located in remote rural areas to develop structures that will ensure the maintenance of same
or similar standards and quality with the main campus which is mostly located in the urban area. This demand on campus managers or heads whose campuses are less developed and ill-equipped would frustrate and demotivate them as well.

Besides, the campus managers do not normally have the powers to recruit, promote or fire employees on their respective campuses. They equally do not have an oversight responsibility for formulating and developing policies for their campuses. However, due to the centralised nature of the MCUS, the central governing board or main campus is responsible for all issues relating to recruitment, promotion and dismissal of staff and all policy issues of the university (Massarik and Pei-Carpenter, 2002). Therefore, campus managers may not get very suitable persons recruited for their campuses and may also not be able to control and discipline uncooperative staff. Again, the campus managers would also face difficulties in operationalizing or implementing general policies as they may not be applicable to their situation or campus.

2.10.2 Resource Challenges

The MCUs are also challenged in the provision of equivalent or similar, affordable and accessible infrastructural facilities and resources across the various campuses (Bundy, 1998; Crevald, 2001; Lynch, 2003) to meet or match the standards and quality of the main campus. This poses a major challenge to many MCUs because they are often new and less resourced as compared to the traditionally old SCUs (Scott et al., 2007).

Again, Ezarik (2009) asserts that MCUs are often faced with difficulties in maintaining and ensuring consistency across all the branches or campuses of the entire university in order to make
the campuses attractive and competitive. Thus, most campuses normally fail to overcome this challenge because they do not often have the requisite facilities and opportunities as the main campus to attract both staff and students. This mostly places the campuses as second choice institutions (Allison and Eversole, 2008). Besides, Liu and Lv (2007) explain that MCUs may have some difficulties in allocating or distributing their limited resources (such as financial, human and physical resources) equitably across the various dispersed campuses.

In addition, Winchester and Sterk (2006) state that branches or campuses are often prone to some levels of marginalization, relegation, exploitation, fragmentation, duplication, inconsistency and inequity in the allocation and management of resources. They believe that these problems or challenges can be solved by instituting effective leadership or management systems; establishing efficient communication systems; and distributing resource equitably across all the campuses of the university.

Furthermore, Mathebula and de Beer (2003) reveal that staff of the main campus of the university often tend to downgrade and disrespect their fellow staff and programmes or activities at the campuses – this adversely affect the distribution of resources to the campuses. Additionally, Allison and Eversole (2008) and Gaskell (2011) note that in the MCUS, the branches or campuses usually suffer most in times of financial difficulties where budgets and costs are being cut or reduced. The campuses which are in rural areas will get drastic cost or budget cuts as compared to the urban-based main campus.
2.10.3 Service Delivery Challenges

The centralised nature of MCUs and their quest for standardisation, quality and uniformity do not permit the campuses to provide some essential administrative services to their staff and students. For instance, the central or main campus is responsible for the issuances of certificates, introductory letters, attestation letters, transcripts, and deferment letters to all students. It is also responsible for issuing and approving staff leaves, promotion, transfers, allowances, scholarships or sponsorships, and introductory letters. Thus, MCUs also have some basic difficulties in providing and delivering equivalent and quality standard services to students and staff on the various campuses (Freeman, 1998; Goussal and Lezcano, 2003).

Again, staff and students on the various campuses face difficulties in commuting to the main campus for essential administrative services, meetings, seminars and other programmes. According to Ebden (2010, p.268), “Logistical issues in scheduling activities across campuses, transportation and travel time for staff and students, and finding staff to work at remote campuses, all pose additional challenges.” This may discourage both staff and students from considering the campuses as attractive place of choice for work or studies.

Much more, MCUs are seriously challenged and constrained in providing effective academic services such as state-of-the-art teaching and learning environment that supports both on-campus and off-campus resources across the campuses (Kift, 2004). This kind of teaching and learning environment is meant to provide the students with rapid feedbacks, differing learning and cultural needs (Liu and Lv, 2007; Baecker et al., 2007), and expose them to different experiences just like their colleagues on the urban or main campus.
2.11 Conceptual framework of the study

Instituting an appropriate management structure in a MCU would enhance and facilitate effective coordination, cooperation, planning, leadership and communication in the entire university – that is the main campus and all the various campuses. This would therefore influence positively and significantly the allocation of resources (Human, financial and physical resources) among the dispersed campuses, and also the delivery of administrative services (recruitment, promotion/appointments, leaves, scholarships, certification, deferments, admissions, and others) to both staff and students on the campuses. In total, this would lead to equitable distribution of resources; maintenance of equivalent standards and quality; quick decision making; and easy access to administrative services by both staff and students across all the campuses. Again, this would equally make the campuses very competitive and attractive to both staff and students as they (the campuses) would be considered as first choice institutions instead of second choice ones. Thus, the relationship between the above variables has been illustrated and presented on a conceptual framework as in Figure 1 below:
Basically, the above conceptual framework demonstrates that the implementation of an appropriate management structure is likely to bring about effective and efficient coordination, planning, communication, decision making, leadership, resource allocation, and service provision in the entire university. In addition, the campus or campus management which is responsible for the day-to-day management and operations of the campus will also become more effective and efficient. This places the campus management at the middle-level on the management structure of the university as stated in the management pattern or model under the centralised management pattern.
2.12 Chapter Conclusion

The best fit definition or description of MCUs for this study is a university with geographically dispersed campuses which are dependent on the main campus or CA and are governed by a single broad vision and mission. Besides, the management structure or style required for the governance of a MCU is influenced by the description or definition assigned to it. Thus, the centralised management system, which is supported by the centralised management pattern, is used in the governance of this type of universities whereby the campuses are given limited or no autonomy to operate. Essentially, the management structure of the MCUs plays an important role in the allocation of resources and delivery of administrative services to the dispersed campuses. It also influences decision making, coordination, leadership, planning, communication, and cooperation as well.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents and explains the research methodology. It covers areas such as research paradigm, research design, the study organisations and target population. The sample size, sampling technique and sources of data collection as well as data collection instrument are also discussed here. The final part of the chapter discusses data management and analysis, ethical consideration and limitations of the study.

3.1 Research Paradigm

Research paradigm explains and addresses the philosophical assumptions and dimensions within which a study examines and presents issues or ideas. Thus, a research paradigm consists of a set of fundamental assumptions, understanding, and beliefs on the perception of the world that informs and guides the thinking and behaviour of the researcher in drawing conclusions (Jonker and Pennink, 2010). Besides, Neuman (2011), Saunders et al. (2009) and Creswell (2009) categorically state that the first important issue to consider in conducting a research in social science is the determination and selection of an appropriate research paradigm – as it forms the basis for framing and understanding social phenomena.

Thus, the interpretivist or constructivist paradigm, which emphasises that the understanding of the social world is influenced by the experiences and subjective meanings that people attach to it, was adopted for this study. The interpretivist paradigm provides a favourable interaction and dialogue between the researcher and the participants or respondents of the study. Besides, the interpretivist
paradigm draws exclusively from qualitative data which offers rich descriptions of social phenomena or construct. (Wahyuni, 2012).

Unlike the positivists and post-positivists, interpretivists adopt and use narratives for the analyses and description of a particular social issue or reality that is being studied. This helps the researcher to provide specific and detailed accounts of the phenomenon being studied (Neuman, 2011). According to Wahyuni (2012), interpretivist paradigm helps researchers to study and uncover the inside perspectives or the real meanings of social issues or phenomena from their respondents or participants properly. He also indicates that the interpretivist researchers usually assume the insider perspective that is studying the social reality or phenomenon from the perspective of the participants or the people themselves. Thus, the data collection and analyses were extensively influenced by the experiences and values of both the respondents or participants and the researchers.

Based on the strengths and suitability of the qualitative approach with respect to the interpretivist paradigm, the study therefore employed the qualitative approach for the collection and analysis of data. The qualitative approach refers to variety of data collection and analysis processes and techniques that involve the use of structured, semi-structured and open-ended interviews. Besides, the qualitative approach is essential in providing realistic data and holistic view of the topic under investigation (Patton, 1980). The qualitative approach does not focus on a specific question, but on a philosophy or paradigm, open-ended inquiries and participants’ perspectives (Dudwick et al., 2006; Neuman, 2006). The basic strength of the qualitative approach is that it helps the researcher to probe deep into values, beliefs, and assumptions and also gain a full appreciation of an
organisation or society. It facilitates the understanding of the factors that drive or influence behaviours. Contrary to the quantitative approach, the qualitative approach provides the participants or respondents with broad and open-ended questions that allow them to explain the issues thoroughly and properly without restrictions. (Dudwick et al., 2006; Neuman, 2006; Yauch and Steudel, 2003)

3.2 Research Design

To achieve the objectives and purpose of the study, the researcher needs to be guided by a plan or a strategy accordingly (Babbie, 2001). Again, Cohen et al. (2007) explain that the research design is shaped and guided by the notion of fitness for purpose and the purpose of the research determines the methodology and the design of the study. Since the study was investigating the management of MCUs in Ghana, the case study approach was deemed more appropriate as it allowed for deep probe and analysis into a particular issue or phenomenon. The case study design allows for an in-depth investigation into a specific, or a real-life phenomenon or case in its natural context and requires the active involvement of both the researcher and the participants (Yin, 2012; Gall, 2005; Yin, 2003).

Based on the overall importance and effectiveness of the case study method in public administration research, the comparative case study research design was employed for this study. According to Kaarbo and Beasley (1999, p. 372), “The comparative case study is the systematic comparison of two or more data points (‘cases’) obtained through the use of the case study method”. Campbell (2010) explains that comparative case study examines in detail the context and features of two or more instances of specific phenomena. He adds that the goal of comparative
case study is to discover differences, similarities, or patterns across the cases. Thus, the adoption and usage of the comparative case study research design permitted and assisted the study to delve deep into the management of UDS and PUCG in Ghana.

3.3 The Study Organisations

The study was conducted in UDS and PUCG which are both organised and managed as MCUs in Ghana.

The UDS was established in 1992 by the Government of Ghana to “blend the academic world with that of the community in order to provide constructive interaction between the two for the total development of Northern Ghana, in particular, and the country as a whole” (PNDC Law 279, Section 2). According to Effah (1998), “The UDS was borne out of the new thinking in higher education which emphasizes the need for universities to play a more active role in addressing problems of the society, particularly in the rural areas”. The university has four campuses, seven Faculties, one Business School, one Medical School, one Graduate School, and three Centres. These campuses are spread across the three Regions in Northern Ghana. Specifically, Wa Campus is located in the Upper West Region; Navrongo Campus is situated in the Upper East Region; and Tamale and Nyankpala Campuses are in the Northern Region (UDS, 2016a).

This study focused on the CA which is located in Tamale; the Wa and Navrongo Campuses which are located in Wa and Navrongo respectively as the study areas with respect to UDS.
The PUCG was established in 2003 in fulfilment of the decision and initiative of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Ghana in 1996. The PUCG was created in “response to the challenge presented by the high demand for student admission in Ghanaian Universities (low access), the perceived lowering of academic standards and the erosion of moral and ethical values in the Ghanaian Society” (PUCG, 2016a). The university as part of its mandate would tailor and “relate its programmes to the developmental needs of Ghana in the 21st Century and beyond, in terms of training, research, extension and service. It will identify and fill important niches in the development of higher education in the country” (PUCG, 2016a).

Besides, the university has five campuses which are dispersed across three regions in southern Ghana as follows: Okwahu and Akwapem Campuses both in the Eastern Region; Asante-Akyem and Kumasi Campuses both in the Ashanti Region; and Tema Campus, in the Greater Accra Region. However, the CA which is located in Abetifi-Kwahu, the Tema Campus which is also located in Tema, and the Asante-Akyem Campus which is sited in Agogo were selected for the study.

3.4 Target Population

The target population represents or defines the total number of possible units or elements that are included in a study (Gray, 2004). Thus, the target population for this research included all the principal officers (VCs/Presidents, PVCs/Vice Presidents, Registrars, Directors, Heads-Managers of Campuses, and Deputy/Senior Assistant Registrars) of public and private MCUs in Ghana. These principal officers are normally involved in the management and decision making process of the entire university and the various dispersed campuses. Also, the officers had acquired ample
experiences through practice in their respective functional and managerial roles and were therefore very relevant for the study as they would be able to supply the right responses on the topic studied.

3.5 Sample Size

The sample size of the study comprised ten principal officers who are involved in the management of the universities. Thus, five respondents were drawn from each of the universities for an in-depth interview. The detailed analysis of the total respondents for the study included six principal officers drawn from the CA – that is, three respondents (VC/President, PVC, and Registrar) from each of the selected universities and four Campus Heads – that is, two Heads from each of the universities.

Basically, a sample size of ten was selected for the study to avoid data saturation and replication. Thus, the sampled respondents would be able to supply adequate and sufficient responses that would be devoid of repetitions and duplications. Data saturation has been explained by Bowen (2008) and Miles and Huberman (1994) as a point in qualitative data collection where data are replicated or diminishing returns is experienced when new data are added or introduced. Hence, the introduction of the eleventh and twelfth or additional respondents would result in dilution of the data. For that matter, the estimation of an adequate sample size is directly related to and influenced by the concept of data saturation (Marshall et al., 2013).

For instance, in phenomenological studies, various scholars suggest different ranges of sample sizes some of which include six to eight (Crabtree and Miller, 1999), six to ten (Morse, 2000), and six (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). However, in case studies, Yin (2013) suggests at least six sources of evidence or number of respondents. In addition, Creswell (2007) proposes a range of three to
five interviewees per case study. This buttresses the sample size of ten chosen for the study is appropriate and within an acceptable range in qualitative studies.

Contrary, Patton (2002) explains that there are no hard rules for selecting a sample size in qualitative study or inquiry. Thus, the selecting of a sample size is mostly dependent on what the research wants to achieve, the purpose of the study, the usefulness of the study, the level of credibility, and the availability of time and resources.

3.6 Sampling Technique

The study used purposive sampling technique, which is a non-probability sampling technique, to select the UDS and the PUCG, as public and private MCUs respectively. This technique was used because these universities as compared with others have more structured campuses which are dispersed across at least three regions in the country. Besides, purposive sampling technique was also employed to select all the key informants who are directly involved in the management of the universities to respond to the interview.

3.7 Sources of Data Collection

In conducting this study, both primary and secondary data were sourced and used process. Whereas primary data refer to all those that were obtained from the field at first-hand for the study, secondary data on the other hand include all those data that were obtained from available and already known sources (Hox and Boeije, 2005). Thus, secondary data were obtained from books, journal articles, reports, speeches, periodicals, newspapers, and magazines – these included soft or hard copies. The primary data for the study were obtained and gathered by interviewing the
respondents or participants identified for the research, while the secondary data were obtained by acquiring and reading print materials from the Balm library, the UGBS library, UG Bookshop and personal collections and/or retrieving and reading electronic materials from Balm’s online library, UDS and PUCG websites, googlescholar.com and other search engines.

3.8 Data Collection Instrument

In order to address the research questions, the study relied largely on primary data. Thus, interviews were used to obtain the relevant responses from the respondents on the problem that was being investigated. Interview is simply a conversation between the researcher and the participant or respondent of the study (Boeije, 2010). Therefore, an interview guide (see Appendix 1) that contained structured and open-ended interview items was used to obtain the responses from the participants of the study. To ease and facilitate the analysis and interpretation of the data, all the interviews were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed.

3.9 Data Management and Analysis

Miles and Huberman (1994) explain that qualitative data analysis consists three main stages or processes namely; data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. Data reduction is about summarising and simplifying the data collected by selectively focusing on some parts of these data. Thus, the data reduction is meant to shape, sort, focus, discard and organise the data in a way that will allow for final conclusion to be drawn and verified. Data display organises and assembles the reduced data into figures or tables to ease the understanding of the results. Similarly, Patton (2002) states that to make sense of the large volume of texts and/or audio data
gathered, the researcher needs to carefully examine and interpret the data by identifying themes and patterns for the analysis.

Thus, the data or responses collected from the field through the interviews were appropriately grouped, summarized and analysed under various headings or themes that led to the drawing of conclusions.

3.10 Ethical Consideration

The study was conducted in line with best ethical practices and standards in social science research. To avoid plagiarism and academic dishonesty, all ideas, scholarly works, and materials used in this study were properly cited and acknowledged appropriately. Besides, all the data collected or obtained from the interviewees were factually presented and interpreted as reported by them. The researcher had not falsified, massaged, cooked or manipulated any aspects of the data gathered to fit his personal expectations or aspirations (Miller, 1998).

Besides, the respondents or participants were properly informed about purpose of the study to enable them decide on whether to participate or not. Therefore, the participants or respondents were not induced or deceived to participate in the study. The respondents were allowed to independently and voluntarily choose to participate in the study based on their personal conviction.

In addition, the rights and dignity of the respondent were properly protected to allay the fear of being exposed or victimised. Again, the privacy and emotions of the respondents were respected throughout the research process (Clark and Sharf, 2007). Also, assurance of anonymity and
confidentiality for the respondents who did not want to be identified in the study was provided (Haverkamp, 2005; Shaw, 2003). The interviews and audio-recordings were coded to ensure that the identities and privacy of all the respondents were protected.

Finally, most respondents are usually uncomfortable when their conversation is being recorded and are likely not to provide the right or complete responses to the questions posed. Therefore, the express consent of the respondents was sought (Byrne, 2001; Allmark et al., 2009) before the interview was audio-recoded. The reasons and purpose for the audio-recording were made known to the interviewee or respondent. Further, the recording device was made accessible to both the respondent and the researcher – this was to give the respondent the opportunity to pause or control the device when he did not want an aspect of the conversation to be recorded.

### 3.11 Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study involve the challenges or difficulties that restricted the researcher from conducting an exhaustive study. According to Osuala (2007) and Yin (2003), limitations refer to any constraints in the research process that might limit or not allow the researcher to make generalization from the findings obtained.

Therefore, the use of case study research design for this study would limit the generalization of the research findings (Osuala, 2007; Yin, 2003) – because the findings would not be suitably applicable to other MCUs apart from UDS and PUCG. The use of the case study design facilitated an in-depth investigation into the problem studied, but limited the findings to the institutions selected for the study.
Again, a sample of size of ten respondents for the study might not be a fair representation of the target population which involved the principal officers of public and private MCUs in Ghana. However, the sampled respondents included all the key informants involved in the management of the selected universities for the study. Besides, the selection of the qualitative method limited the study from covering more respondents like the quantitative method. Thus, although the findings of the study would be very relevant to the selected MCUs, they might not be applicable to the rest of the MCUs that were not included.

Also, qualitative research demands and consumes a lot of time of both the respondent and the interviewer as the physical presence and commitment of both parties is required in most cases (Marshall et al., 2013). Since the respondents were principal officers of the universities and as such had busy schedules, the researcher was not able get two of them (the VC of UDS and the President of PUCG) who were part of the sample population to respond to the interview which resulted in eighty percent (80%) coverage of the respondents.

Finally, due to time and resource constraints the study could not be expanded to cover all the campuses of the selected universities. The resources available were inadequate to support a large sample population as well many research settings. Hence, the application of the purposive sampling technique in selecting the study population and settings to maximise the use of the limited resources.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents, analyses and discusses the data collected from the field through in-depth interviews where eight respondents were interviewed. The data were also presented and analysed in three main themes, namely: management structure of the universities, allocation of resources in the universities, and delivery of administrative services, in accordance with the research objectives and questions. Besides, the responses obtained were further analysed and discussed under sub-themes by comparing and eliciting the similarities and differences between the management systems of the two universities.

4.1 Management Structure of the Universities

This section covers the analysis and discussions on sub-themes such as principal or key officers of both universities, synthesised management structure, benefits of the management structure, challenges of the management structure; decision making in the universities; and campus heads. The sub-themes were derived from both primary and secondary data in line with research objective one, namely a comparison of the current management structures of the Universities.

4.1.1 Principal Officers of Both Universities

On record, it was observed that the composition of principal officers in PUCG includes “the Council Chairman, President, Vice President, Registrar, Librarian, Finance Director, Deans of faculties and students, and Heads of Department (HODs)” (PUCG, 2016b). While, the UDS classifies the Chairman of University Council and the VC as principal officers and the PVC, the
Registrar, the University Librarian, the Finance Officer, and the Director of Works and Physical Development (WPD) as other or key officers (UDS, 2016b). Thus, on record, PUCG has an extended composition of principal officers as compared to UDS.

In practice however, it was revealed from the responses of all the eight respondents that the distinction between the principal officers and the key officers is not often highlighted. For instance, one of the respondents from UDS, RRU states that:

“...... the key officers of the university apart from the Chairman of council, the key officers are the VC, PVC, and the Registrar, but management can be extended to include the Finance Officer, University Librarian, and the Director of WPD.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016).

Similarly, a respondent from PUCG, RDA also states that:

“......the President, the Vice President, the Registrar, the Finance of Director, the Director of Library and the Director of Internal Audit then we have the university council that is the highest decision making body......” (RDA, Monday, 9th May, 2016).

Thus, the analysis and comparisons of the responses of all the respondents from both universities reveal the composition of the principal and key officers as presented on Table 2 below.
Table 2: Composition of Principal Officers in UDS and PUCG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UDS</th>
<th>PUCG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Chair</td>
<td>Council Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>Director of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Auditor</td>
<td>Director Internal Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of WPD</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Director of Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldwork (May, 2016)*

From the table above, it is observed that both universities, in practice, have the same composition of principal and key officers with the exception of the Director of WPD which is included in the case of UDS. Therefore, the make-up or design of the principal and key officers of the two universities is fundamentally the same.

4.1.2 Synthesised Management Structure

It is observed from the responses that the management structure of MCUs is not entirely different from that of the SCUs. This is supported by one of the respondents, when he states that:

“Generally, this is the structure for almost every university, it does not matter whether it is a one-campus university or a MCU.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

The above view is held and expressed by most of the respondents. Basically, the only difference between the two university systems is the extended management responsibility of the campuses in the MCUs. Thus, the principal and key officers who constitute the core management of the MCUs
are responsible for the coordination and management of the various campuses to ensure congruence of the objectives and mission of the entire university (Ardis et al., 2013; Gumprecht, 2007; Willoughby, 2003).

Thus, all the respondents in responding to the question on the management structure of the universities acknowledged the campus management as part of the entire structure. In describing the management structure of UDS one of the respondents, RPV stated that:

“It involves so many, if you like, set ups we have the VC’s Office, Registry, Finance Office, Internal Audit Unit, WPD Unit all these comprise management. So when we say management these are the units and of course the PVC is in the VC’s office. So when you go down from the managerial level you have the [Deans-In-Charge] (DICs) for all campuses and the Deans before you get to the HODs. So for me, that is the structure.” (RPV, Monday, 11\textsuperscript{th} April, 2016).

The above explanation of the management includes all the Principal Officers at the centre and the Campus Heads as well as the HODs at the campuses. Similarly, another respondent, RDT describes the management structure of PUCG with respect to the lines of reporting by stating that:

“………. we have the CA at Abetifi where we have the President, the Vice President, the Registrar, the Deputy Registrar; and then on the campuses which are now corresponding to faculties we have Deans, so all these Deans report to the Vice President to the President and then on each of the campuses is an Assistant Registrar and also an Accounting Assistant. The Assistant Registrars report to the Registrar and the Accounting Assistant reports to the Director of Finance who is located in Abetifi. Now, within each faculty or campus we have a number of departments which are headed by HODs. So that is the management structure.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6\textsuperscript{th} April, 2016)

The Principal Officers represent the central management unit which controls most management decisions and functions in the universities. Thus, the Principal Officers are responsible for the overall management of the universities. RDT explained the management structure by stating that:
“At the management level, usually is the President, the Vice President, the Registrar, the Finance of Director, the Director of Library and the Director of Internal Audit, that is when you go to the head office, but when you want the decision making at the entire campus management level then you will add the Deans and HODs, they are also part the management team.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Thus, the various descriptions attributed to the management structure of the two universities by all the respondents have been synthesised into an organogram in Figure 2 below.
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**Figure 2: Synthesised Management Structure the selected Universities**

*Source: Fieldwork (May, 2016)*
The above organogram describes the relationship between the principal or key officers of the universities. This relationship is clearly described and demonstrated by RDW as:

“It starts from University Council [or Council Chair] down to the VC, the PVC, then we have some other officers directly answerable to the VC and the PVC: Internal Auditor, Librarian, Director of Works, Registrar and Finance Officer. Then, below the PVC we now have the Deans and they are all responsible to the VC, if it is academics through the PVC, if it is administrative straight to the VC………… The DICs [or Campus Heads] like the other Deans are of equal status……. Then, below the Dean you have the HODs down to the students.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

Besides, in explaining the functional relationship between the principal or key officers in the management structure, RRU posits that:

“……. top management is here [CA], but they work with the DICs of the various campuses. The DICs of the various campuses are coordinating the activities of all the faculties on those campuses that is the decentralisation. Faculty Deans also have HODs so there is further decentralisation down. So the HODs are also responsible for running the departments with the help of the lecturers.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Again, from the synthesised management structure above, the Council (Chair) is responsible for providing leadership, making policy proposals, and overseeing the overall operations of the university. The Council Chair and the VC or President are the key officers responsible for contractual engagements and thus represent the Executive Management. Then, the Central Management or Administration which represents the Top Management is charged with the overall management function of the entire university and the campuses (Ardis et al., 2013; Gumprecht, 2007; Creswell et al., 1985). And the Campus Management which represents the Lower Management is responsible for the day-to-day management and operations of the campus and the coordination of teaching and learning activities on the campus as well (Fei, 2015; Jin and Wang, 2010).
Notably, all the respondents confirmed that the management system of the two universities is a combination of the centralised and decentralised management models or patterns. This is in consonance with Fei’s (2015) third management pattern which is a combination of both centralised and decentralised management patterns under the theoretical framework. Thus, the management systems of both universities is mixed – that is they blend the elements and features of both the centralised and decentralised management patterns. For instance, a respondent, RRP simply describes the management system of the MCUs as:

“I will say it is a mixed type of arrangement.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Similarly, RDW explains that the management system operated by the MCUs is mixed where the features of the centralised and decentralised management systems are applied concurrently. He adds that certain management decisions are taken at the campus level, but that most decisions are taken at the centre or CA. Hence, the assertion of RDN and RDW that the campuses are given of limited decentralisation or autonomy to operate. RDN expressed that:

“There is very little decentralisation in the sense that every little thing you have to go to the centre, even though the Deans can take certain decisions on behalf of the VC within their faculties. The DIC is also given some level of freedom of operation within the campus, but most of the times he needs to seek approval from the VC and the PVC.” (RDN, Friday, 13th May, 2016)

Furthermore, all the respondents acknowledged that there is some level of decentralisation in the management structures of their respective universities, but the amount of it granted to the campuses is the contention. Therefore, RDT and RDA believe that the management system of the MCUs is partially decentralised by citing the accounting system.
“It has features of the two, it is not wholly decentralised. The campuses are not as at now wholly decentralised. The campuses run an imprest system monthly.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Besides, on the part of RDA, he explains the amount of decentralisation granted the campuses with respect to their day-to-day spending and operations. He states that the management system of their university is not wholly centralised because some aspects of decision making and governance have been ceded to the campuses. He has in relation to his position by stating that:

“…they have given us some of the powers, they have given us an account that we only operate on imprest basis. So, our day-to-day spending on fuel is within the power of the campus, but major payments are forwarded to the head office for processing. Yes, it is a mixed management system.” (RDA, Monday, 9th May, 2016)

The above responses buttress the views of Dhliwayo (2014), American Association of University Professors (2006); Harman and Harman (2003); Willoughby (2003); and French (2003) that the management structure of MCUs provides for some level of decentralisation of academic services, resources, and daily administration to the campuses, while the overall management of all the resources and the entire university is centralised at the CA. Again, the responses equally confirm Nel’s (2006) view that the geographically dispersed campuses which are separated from one another and the main campus, are granted some reasonable level of autonomy in managing and coordinating their daily operations and activities, but they are expected to remain committed, as subordinate units and an integral part, to the overall or central and superior management or governance system.
4.1.3 Benefits of the Management Structure

The respondents identified innovation, coordination, participation, effective decisions and effective governance as the benefits and strengths of the management structure or system of the MCUs. Thus, explaining the benefits of the management structure with respect to promoting innovation in the universities, one respondent explains that:

“…...the reason why we do semi-decentralisation is to empower the other campuses: so that they can take activities of their work such as teaching activities; so that they can be very innovative, but if you want to make everything centralised then they cannot be very innovative.” (RVP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

RPV also explains the benefits or strengths of the management structure in relation to participation and blend by indicating that:

“It promotes participatory kind of governance, so that everybody takes part; and efficiency – with the mixture, you get the advantages of centralised and mix with the advantages of decentralised you are in the midway and that is very good.” (RPV, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Besides, RPV underscores the importance and significance of the decentralised management system in promoting integrated and participatory governance in the MCUs. He observes that contributions are drawn from the campuses whenever major decisions are made in the university. Hence, his assertion that:

“……...different campuses contribute to achieve one kind of goal where the Deans and DICs play very significant roles. So it makes the work even much smoother rather than management getting people to go to Navrongo or Wa to find out their problems.” (RPV, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Again, the management structure of MCUs promotes effective decision making by involving all the key officers at the various campuses. This ensures that the decisions are well-informed and also represent the views of all the relevant stakeholders in the management various management
levels of the university. RRU believes that contributions from the lower management enrich the quality and effectiveness of management decisions.

“........having the DICs of the various campuses being part of the management structure or feed into the management structure, the reason is that you cannot have adequate and very reliable information at the top that will help you take effective decisions if you do not have the inputs from those who are on the ground.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Besides, coordination of daily operations in MCUs is effective and enhanced because of the appointment of Campus Heads to manage the day-to-day affairs of the campuses on behalf of the VC or the President of the university. Thus, the Campus Heads take full responsibility of their campuses and report to directly to the appropriate officers at the CA. The respondents explain that the management of the university is aimed at promoting and facilitating effective coordination of the entire university in terms development, administration, and financial management.

Also, it has been revealed that the management structure facilitates and promotes effective governance in the universities. Under the MCU management, the roles of Principal Officers are clearly defined and the line of authority established to ensure that the responsibilities and authority of any officer are not in doubt. This arrangement promotes effective delegation and reporting at the various levels of management.

“Given the enormity of the workload, the VC has a representative on each campus to take care of certain [campus or] faculty business, but serious university business is referred to the CA or to the VC for approval.” (RDN, Friday, 13th May, 2016)

It is observed that the above responses of the participants are supported by the benefits of combined management pattern or model which include maximum use of limited resources, easy and effective
management, unified and coordinated management, and as well as provide some allowance for the campuses to take their own initiatives (Fei, 2015; Jin and Wang, 2010).

4.1.4 Challenges of the Management Structure

In spite of the benefits of the management structure of the MCUs, several challenges were identified on the structure by all the respondents. It is realised from the responses that there are no significant differences in the challenges encountered by both universities. For instance, all the eight respondents identified slow decision making, difficulties in coordination, and costly to operate as major challenges of the management structure. The respondents also stated other challenges that include: travelling to main campus, uneven distribution of resources, communication difficulties, unclear functions and role conflicts. Thus, the challenges hampering the affective and efficient management of both public and private MCUs are the same. Some selected responses gathered from the participants on the challenges of the management structure of MCUs are presented below.

In responding to the challenges of the management structure of MCUs, RPV notes that:

“Yes, sometimes the roles and functions are not clearly defined. It brings misunderstanding and conflicts, it leads to delays in taking decisions, and it is also expensive due to the movement and transportation.” (RPV, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

It was found that restricting the autonomy and authority of the campuses by the CA has impeded the ability of the Campus Heads to take and implement key decisions quickly. The Campus Heads are often required to obtain approval from the centre before taking any major action. This practice, according to RDW, poses operational difficulties to the managers of the campuses.
“……. you have to consult the centre, I mean the autonomy isn’t there, we are not given any might to operate everything financially, even promoting your programmes you have to refer to the centre. Unequitable allocation of resources is a major something [challenge] because leadership often uses discretion without regard to other issues.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

It was also the contention of RDT that the major management challenges that militate against the efficient operations of their university include:

“……. uneven resource distribution, it makes administration expensive, and slow decision making because of the involvement of an expanded group of people.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Besides, RRP identifies the challenge of implementing the right decisions, the duplicating of staff, and high cost as the fundamental setbacks of the efficient management of the university. He asserts that:

“Implementation of the decision becomes a problem, you cannot be there all the time to see whether they are doing the right decisions. It is also costly to operate in terms of finance, and then the need for infrastructure. Staff numbers are unduly increasing because of duplication in a way.” (RRP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Thus, it is observed from the responses obtained that the lower management at the campus level is often incapacitated by the above challenges than the top management at the CA. This is supported by Winchester and Sterk (2006) in their assertion that campuses are often prone to some levels of marginalization, relegation, exploitation, duplication, inconsistency and inequity in the allocation and management of resources. Again, Jin and Wang (2010) caution that the mixed or combined management pattern or model often emphases hierarchy, structure, and responsibilities thereby affecting effective management control and as well reducing efficient management at all the levels. The top management need to grant a reasonable level of autonomy to allow the lower management to operate efficiently.
4.1.5 Decision Making in the Universities

Majority of the respondents noted that the main actors in decision making in both universities include the principal and the key officers and to some extent the lower managers. They acknowledge that the decision making process in both universities is participatory as stakeholders at the various levels are often involved in the process. This confirms the view of Womack and Podemski (1985) that equal participation of all the campuses in the planning process of the MCUS is very important for effective decision making. Similarly, Morgan (2003) and Wheatley (2003) explain that the decision making process in MCUs depicts the top-down and bottom-up approaches of relationship between the CA and the campuses.

Responding to a question on the category of officers responsible for decision making in the university, RRP simply states that:

“……of course, the President is the overall principal decision making body, and the chief disciplinary officer in the system.” (RRP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

However, RDW thinks that the VC or the President is not the only overall principal officer in the decision making process and explains that:

“In every university there are two principal officers. The two principal officers are the ones that can commit the university that is, the Council Chairman and the VC. Now, in addition to these principal officers we then have other key officers the Registrar, PVC, Director of WPD, Librarian, and Finance Officer and to some extend the DICs.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

Another respondent, RRU underscores the importance of participatory decision making and the bottom-up decision making approach in their university by explaining that:
“So, if you have Deans and DIC of the various campuses feeding into your management decision is good for you because they will be bringing to you issues that are right on the ground so your decisions will be decisions that are informed by the real situation on the ground.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Similarly, RDT acknowledges and confirms in the statement below that decision making in their university is participatory, but his description reflects the top-down approach:

“…… critical management decisions are made by the President, the Vice President, the Registrar, and the Director of Finance depending upon the nature of them……. If the decision has to do with a specific campus, then the Dean of that campus will be brought in.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

The responses obtained from the participants are also in agreement with Massarik and Pei-Carpenter’s (2002) assertion that the university council is responsible for making decisions on policy proposals and the top management is responsible for the overall decisions making function of the entire university. While, decisions relating to operational and implementation issues are handled by the lower management at the campuses (Vroom, 2000; Kerr, 2001).

All the respondents of both universities unanimously stated that decision making is participatory; and either top-down or bottom-up approach depending on the issues under consideration. It must be stated that the above method and approaches for decision making in the universities pose some management challenges to all the actors. For instance, RVP lamented that:

“At times taking a decision is very slow – people travel from all these places [campuses] to work on something because of our multi-campus nature.” (RVP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

In addition, RPV equally bemoaned there are often delays associated with the decision making process in the university by stating that:
“Sometimes too it delays because the centre taking a decision before it reaches the periphery [campuses] there is some amount of delay.” (RPV, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

It is therefore evident from the responses and the assertions of Johnston (1993), French (2003) and Harman and Harman (2003) that granting a considerable amount of autonomy to the campuses would make them more responsive, flexible, and above all decisive in managing their affairs and operations effectively and efficiently.

4.1.6 Campus Heads

Allison and Eversole (2008) and OCUFA (2009) indicate that campuses need to be managed by efficient staff who may be referred to as Campus Managers or Heads, or PVCs, or Vice Presidents who are normally appointed by university’s governing board and mandated to oversee and manage all the campus’ activities. Again, Davis and Kelly (2006) note that the Campus Managers are usually senior or principal officers in the university and thus report directly to the VC or the President.

Although all the respondents of both universities agreed that their Campus Heads are normally appointed from the Deans where they are more than one, they provided different designations for their Campus Heads. Thus, in the case of the UDS Campus Heads are referred to as DICs, while the PUCG refer to them as Deans. In contrast to the assertion of Davis and Kelly (2006), it is also observed from the responses that both universities do not appoint senior or principal officers to manage the campuses and as such the Campus Heads do not report directly to the VC or President in most cases. Besides, it has been noticed that both universities have not included the position of Campus Heads in their respective statutes. This, a respondent, RDW refers to by stating that:
“DIC is not in the university statutes. So, once it is not there, there is no clear cut methodology in getting that place. So people [management] use their own discretion.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

Another respondent explains that:

“The university is still evolving and as a result, the campuses are now corresponding to faculties and the Deans who are appointed for the faculties serve as the Campus Heads.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Currently, the PUCG has one faculty and one Dean per campus with the exception of the main campus where there are two faculties and two Deans. Thus, under the single-faculty campus situation, the Dean becomes the Campus Head by default as well. The PUCG needs to draw some lessons from the UDS with respect to their transition from a single-faculty campus to multiply-faculty campus, even though they still have some setbacks. This is contained in the statement of RDW below:

“Now, we have a MCS, when we had one Dean per campus it was not complicated, but now we have multiple Deans per campus that has necessitated the introduction of the DIC. But the interesting thing is that the other Deans are not answerable to the DIC. The DIC like the other Deans are of equal status, it is just for convenience that they think that one dean should be coordinating the affairs of the campus....... So, it is an arrangement of convenience.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

It is also observed that both universities acknowledged the need to appoint senior or principal officers to manage the campus in future. For instance, RDA indicated that:

“If you look into our statutes it is stated that every campus in future should have a Vice President so that the President can be at the head office.” (RDA, Monday, 9th May, 2016)

Similarly, another respondent, RDW also stated that:
“We just say that the campuses should be turned into colleges with just a Provost [as the Head], so that even the local Deans should be responsible to him and only the Provost will now be responsible to the VC, I think that will be the best solution.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

The current arrangement at the campuses of both universities does not give the Campus Managers or Heads sufficient authority and power to enable them manage the campuses effectively and efficiently. This is partly due to the fact that the Campus Heads are not senior or principal officers or among the top management.

4.2 Allocation of Resources in the Universities

This section analyses and discusses sub-themes such as allocation of funds, allocation of infrastructure, recruitment, and allocation of staff. These sub-themes are generated from both primary and secondary data under research objective two, which is to examine the processes adopted in the allocation of resources to Campuses.

4.2.1 Allocation of Funds

Majority of the respondents stated that allocation of funds to the campuses is basically driven by the needs of the campus, and the student numbers. Besides, some other respondents indicated that the distribution of funds could also be influenced by lobbying skills, the nature of programmes, and the availability of funds. Thus, one of the respondents enumerated the following factors as influencing the allocation of funds:

“We look at the infrastructure needs, then they also look at numbers – student numbers, then they also look at strategic programmes like medical school if you are talking of numbers they do not have numbers, but the allocation there is always big.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

Again, another respondent also identified the factors influencing the allocation of funds to include:
“The nature of the need, the exigence of the need, the resource availability, and the lobbying ability of officers.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

All the four respondents selected from the PUCG categorically stated that the university does not employ and use any formula in the allocation of funds to the campuses. From the responses, it can be inferred that the respondents are desirous for a formula to be applied in the distribution funds, but RDT explains that:

“The reason is that we are still growing and some of the campuses are still developing. We do not have enough resources in terms of revenue generation and therefore if you have a laid down formula that is rigid it will disadvantage studies.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

However, all the four respondents drawn from the UDS stated the university uses a formula for the distribution of funds to the campuses. The respondents described the composition and application of the formula, but it was clearly demonstrated by RDN as stated below:

“Now the formula which has been in use for the past three years or so looks at a percentage across board all the academic facility user fees are put together then a percentage is allocated for disbursement to the faculties, then a flat percentage of this percentage shared equally among the faculties and schools, then after the remaining percentage is shared according to the number of students that you have. For instance, they may keep let’s say 50% of all the total amounts collected as academic facility user fees 50% may be kept in the CA then the remaining 50% is available for disbursement to all the faculties and schools then this 50% let’s say 40% is shared equally among all schools and faculties which means that whether you have students or not you will get something then the remaining 60% of the 50% is now shared according to students numbers so, there is some level of cross subsidisation to take care of faculties which don’t have many students. Again, 7% of the total amount of each of the faculties is taken for the general administration of the campus.” (RDN, Friday, 13th May, 2016)

Thus, upon a critical examination of the above description and illustration of the UDS’ formula, the following mathematical formula has been formulated:
\[ TF = RC + W_1 \frac{(TF - RC)}{n} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(100 - W_1\right) \frac{n_i}{N} (TF - RC) \]

**Figure 3: Proposed Formula for Allocation of Funds**

*Source: Fieldwork (May, 2016)*

Where:

- **TF** = total fees
- **TF − RC** = amount available for disbursement to faculties
- **RC** = \(w_0TF\) (amount retained by the centre – for Central and Campus management)
- **\(W_0\)** = the percentage of total fees retained by the centre
- **\(W_1\)** = the percentage of the amount available for disbursement that is shared equally
- **n** = the number of faculties
- **N** = the total number of students
- **\(n_i\)** = the number of students in the \(i^{th}\) faculty

Notwithstanding the existence and application of a formula in the allocation of funds in MCUs, as asserted by Allison and Eversole (2008) and Gaskell (2011) that the campuses usually suffer most in times of financial difficulties where budgets and costs are to be cut or reduced. This is obvious because the CA is always responsible for the allocation funds and hence will allocate more to itself at the expense of the campuses. Hence, confirming the view of Dhliwayo (2014), Liu and Lv (2007) and Gaither (1999) that achieving fair distribution of resources in MCUs is a major challenge.

Thus, the PUCG must take a cue from the UDS to reduce or avoid the current arbitrary and discretionary allocation of funds to the faculties and schools. However, it has been observed that the formula used by the UDS has not made sufficient provision for allocation of funds to the campuses or the office of the campus heads.
4.2.2 Allocation of Infrastructure

Although all the respondents agreed that the allocation of infrastructure is fundamentally driven by the needs of the campuses and faculties, majority of them also identified factors such as student numbers, availability of funds, and new programmes as influencing the allocation of infrastructure as well. However, few of the respondents also stated discretion of the top management as one of the factors. For instance, RDW responded unequivocally that:

“It is based on discretion of the people [management] at the top there.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

Another respondent, RPV in responding to the question on the factors considered in the allocation of infrastructure states that:

“......... we just look at the needs for those things and our WPD will go and do some quantity estimates and funds are made available. It depends on the needs of the faculties and the timing.” (RPV, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Besides, in identifying the factors influencing the allocation of infrastructure to campuses, RDT responded that:

“It will all depend still on the need for those resources and availability of funds.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

However, all the respondents of both universities confirmed that there is no formula used for the allocation of infrastructure to the campuses. This revelation, intriguing though, the participants gave various reasons in support of the current practice. For instance, a respondent, RPV stated that:
“It will be difficult. So if we have a formula, I do not think it will augur well for efficient allocation of resources. As in that case, we do not have, we only spend within our resources. I think that is the most important thing.” (RPV, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

One of the participant also responded to situation by indicating that:

“The reason is that we are still growing some of the campuses are still developing. We do not have enough resources in terms……...” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

In addition, another respondent noted in his response that:

“For establishing infrastructure, there is no formula. But it is based on need, so that is the general formula – is based on need of the various campuses approved by the Development Committee (DC).” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Following the assertion of Dhliwayo (2014), Liu and Lv (2007) and Gaither (1999) that achieving fair distribution of resources in MCUs is a major challenge, it is therefore imperative for both universities to consider devising a formula or equitable ways for the allocation infrastructure to the campuses. The management of the universities can be guided by the illustration of Scott et al. (2007, p.19) which shows that “If a university has six campuses then its resources such as libraries, student laboratories, network infrastructure, student centres and other services must be replicated, or distributed in new ways known to be effective if quality is to be consistent.”

4.2.3 Recruitment

It is the view of the respondents that recruitment in their universities is not conducted entirely by any one particular individual or officer, but through a participatory and consultative process involving all the relevant stakeholders, such as Sectional Heads, Deans, and HODs. Again, the respondents of both universities acknowledged the vital role of the Registrar in the recruitment
process as the Chief Administrator of the university, but emphasised that the final selection is normally done by an appropriate committee. Hence, the explanation of RDT of the recruitment process in the university is anchored on the appointment committees.

“We have two appointment committees: one for senior members, and one for senior and junior staff. So it will be referred to the appropriate committee for interviews and recommendations.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Besides, RRU gave an elaborate and detailed descriptions of the entire recruitment process by emphasising that the recruitment process is handled by the Registrar, but the appointment of an applicant is determined by the appropriate appointment and promotion committee. According to him,

“……. we have Appointment and Promotion Board (A&P) which is for senior members, and Appointment and Promotion Committee (APC) for senior and junior staff. The Deans determine the qualifications and need for applicants before the appropriate appointment committee invites them for the interview.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Again, RDN in his response also testified that the recruitment process is participatory because it involves the Deans and HODs of the respective faculties and departments the applicants are recruited for, but thought otherwise about the effectiveness of the participation.

“……. sometimes you have an application letter on your desk you have not worked on and the applicant has been invited for interview.” (RDN, Friday, 13th May, 2016)

However, it has been revealed that the campuses do not have the authority to conduct recruitment because staff are normally recruited into the university and not the campus. Thus, the overall responsibility for recruitment resides with the CA or top management through centralised appointment committees. For instance, RDT stated that:
“We have one centralised appointments committee. We don’t have campuses doing appointments.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

The above statement of RDT is corroborated by RRU when he also stated that:

“…… as I said, the A&P I mentioned is one A&P for all the campuses.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Also, another respondent, RRP highlighted that staff are recruited into the university by stating that:

“We pick them into this university and then we indicate that your first appointment is at the university or at this department, so they are recruited into the university, but they are not recruited to the campuses in the first instance.” (RRP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

It has therefore been deduced from the responses that although the campuses or faculties play significant roles in the recruitment process of the university, they do not have the powers or authority to recruit directly by themselves. Thus, the campuses or faculties determine the suitability of applicants, make recommendations, and partake in interviews. For instance, RPV in his response asserts that:

“They identify suitable candidates, they prepare them and then we interview them together with them [the campuses] and then the registry then recruits and appoints.” (RPV, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Similarly, RRP is also of the view that the campuses or faculties contribute to the recruitment process because:

“They vet the candidates whether they are suitable because if the person is going to be a lecturer in any programme then we expect the HOD to look at the application to see if the person is suitable. And then during the interview that particular head will prepare to ask the right questions, and to help us determine the suitability of the individual.” (RRP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)
On the part of RRU, he explains that the participation of the campuses or faculties in the recruitment process is essentially for teamwork. Hence, his assertion that:

“The role they play is to recommend to the A&P the suitability of the candidate looking at his qualification whether they require the candidate or not.......... It is clearly a teamwork between the centre and the faculties. It is teamwork. The VC is the Chairman of the A&P, Academic Board has a representation on the A&P, the Dean and the HOD of the person who is going to be interviewed sit on it. They have total involvement in recruitment, but just that a Dean cannot sit down and do his own recruitment. But the Dean has the right to determine who he wants to work with in his faculty that is it.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Thus, from the above responses, all the respondents of the two universities agreed that the campuses, faculties and departments are involved in the entire recruitment process. This makes the recruitment process transparent and participatory. Again, it is evident from the various responses on recruitment that the centre or top management does not single-handedly perform the entire recruitment function, but coordinates and approves the final decisions determined by the all the stakeholders. Consequently, major decisions on staffing such as recruitment, transfers, promotions, demotions and dismissals must be sanctioned by the central management (Massarik and Pei-Carpenter, 2002).

4.2.4 Allocation of Staff

The allocation or posting of staff, most especially administrative staff, to the various campuses has always been a very difficult task for the CA or management. Liu and Lv (2007) explain that MCUs usually have some difficulties in allocating or distributing their limited resources such as human resources equitably across the various dispersed campuses. The respondents stated that base on the needs of the campuses, staff are recruited for them or transferred to them:
“The allocation of staff to the campuses are based on the needs of the campuses and the request made by the campuses. These two are important even if they need and they do not tell us we do not know. It applies to both academic and administrative.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

“The vacancy would have been declared by a particular campus, so the appointment is made for that particular campus and once you are appointed, your appointment letter will indicate the campus to which you are being appointed for. However, there is the possibility of somebody to be transferred from one campus to the other when the need arises.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

“For administrative staff you can be transferred or recruited at the head office and sent to the campuses. When it comes to the academic, staff are recruited based on their skills and speciality relating to a specific campus, but administrative staff can just be reshuffled.” (RDA, Monday, 9th May, 2016)

Even though the respondents believe that staff are allocated to the campuses based on their needs and requests, the CA is likely to retain most of the best recruits and send a few and a low-grade recruits, especially, administrative staff, to the campuses. This is supported by the assertion of Mathebula and de Beer (2003) that staff of the main campus of the university often tend to downgrade and disrespect their fellow staff and programmes or activities at the campuses. Thus, placing the campuses as second choice institutions (Allison and Eversole, 2008). The campuses therefore serve as centres for disciplinary transfers while the CA serves as a centre for reward transfers.

4.3 Delivery of Administrative Services

The analysis and discussions under this segment comprise delivery of administrative services to staff; delivery of administrative services to students, communication, movement to the centre, students’ complaints, and staff complaints and conflicts. These sub-themes are developed from both primary and secondary data and are the core variables of research objective three, which
examines the processes of delivering administrative services to both staff and students of the Campuses.

4.3.1 Delivery of Administrative Services to Staff

The nature and arrangements of MCUs whereby most of the core services are normally centralised at the CA, require staff on the various campuses to satisfy the bureaucratic procedures on the campus level as well as those at centre before they can access such services. All the respondents of the two universities acknowledged and agreed that staff on the campuses need to follow the management structures in order to access some core services at the centre. Thus, one respondent, RVP explains the process of obtaining core administrative services by remarking that:

“You have to apply through your HOD or Assistant Registrar to the campus head to the CA. The reason is that you cannot jump the hierarchy, you have to administratively pass through the person you are directly working under before you send it to the person higher, but higher people like the Deans apply directly to CA.” (RVP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Again, another respondent, RPV in his response describes the process of accessing administrative services by staff on the campuses by stating that:

“In all cases, they will have to apply through their immediate bosses or DICs and the registrar will cross check that based on the records he has and if the candidate is okay then they will just grant it. Yes of course is a system. It makes it more, if you like, transparent and fair.” (RPV, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

In addition, RDT gave an elaborate description of the process and procedure that staff on the campuses need to go through to get some essential administrative services delivered to them by the CA by explaining that:
“Promotion, leave and sponsorship are centralised, so if you qualify you put in an application routed through your HOD through the Dean of your faculty to the Registrar or to the Vice President if you are an academic staff, but if you an administrative staff it goes straight to the Registrar. it is best practice to route everything through your immediate supervisor.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Thus, the formalisation of the processes and procedures in delivering administrative services to staff on the campuses has been acknowledged by the respondents of both universities as essential. This will ensure provision and delivery of equivalent and standard services to staff on the various campuses as argue by Freeman (1998) and Goussal and Lezcano (2003) in their studies. However, Jin and Wang (2010) caution that the excessive emphasis on hierarchy or bureaucratic structures may affect the efficiency in delivering such core administrative services.

4.3.2 Delivery of Administrative Services to Students

The structure of MCUs also gives the responsibility of providing some essential administrative services to students on the campuses to the CA. Notably, just like the staff on the various campuses, the students are also required to satisfy the bureaucratic procedures at the campus level as well as those at centre in order to enable them access such services. All the respondents of the universities agreed that students on campuses also need to follow the structures available to obtain administrative services that are not provided at the campus level, but at the centre. Thus, one respondent explained the process of providing administrative services to the students by stating that:

“That is also routed through the campus to the head office, for example, if a student from a particular campus needs a transcript, he makes a request and the request is sent to the assistant registrar or the coordinator of the particular campus to the centre. Their participation and involvement is necessary because they are managing them [the students] at that level. So, their involvement and their recommendation is very critical. This will ensure the security of the systems, facilities, and even the control.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)
In explaining the process and the type of administrative services that are either provided by the campus or the centre to the student:

“The faculties don’t issue any transcripts. Introductory letters of certain forms can be obtained in either the department or faculty. For instance, if you need a letter of introduction to be able to do industrial attachment you don’t need to go the registrar, but if you need a letter of introduction for may be a visa you take it from the centre. We also issue result slips or statement of results to students at the faculty level. Certificates too are centred for security reasons. I think basically to ensure that the certificates are secured, there is no impersonation and alteration.” (RDN, Friday, 13th May, 2016)

Again, another respondent, RRU in describing the process and the kind of administrative services provided by the centre or the campus to the students explained that:

“If you need to know your results you don’t come here the faculty can help you, but of course official transcript is as important as a certificate nobody can give it to you at the faculty you must come here because that one is authentic and must come from the right place of the university that is the academic affairs. Knowing your results and getting your result slip are done at the campuses, your certificate and the final academic transcript are given out here at the centre.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

The above responses are also supported by the view of Goussal and Lezcano (2003) that in spite of the challenges, MCUs strive to provide equivalent and standard administrative services for the students on the various campuses.

4.3.3 Communication

Gregory (2004) identifies communication between campuses and the main campus or head office as one of the major setbacks in the effective management of MCUs. Due to the geographically dispersed nature of the campuses of MCUs, there is the need for them to devise innovative and efficient ways of transmitting information across the entire university. The participants in their
responses named various means or channels through which information is transmitted to staff and students on the dispersed campuses.

One of the respondents identified notice boards, verbal announcements, websites, emails, and express postal service to communicate with both staff and students of the university. In order to achieve efficiency and effectiveness in the communication system of the university, he stated that:

“A variety of these channels are used to ensure quick responses or delivery of information.” (RRP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Besides, another respondent, RRU in his response explained the importance of sending information through hard copies as against soft copies and also emphasised the need for using combined channels to ensure effectiveness by commenting that:

“If the information has to do with the entire university the Registrar normally disseminates that information and he does that by a letter, sometimes by email, and sometimes by phone calls. Sometimes the Registrar will combine two or three of these, that is how we send information. But the phone call will not be on record. So we combine it with what is going to be on record for authenticity and verification in future whoever that wants to look at it can do so. Thus, we have to combine that with speed, if we have to tell them we have to use the phone calls apart from these phone calls we document a lot of the information.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

Again, one of the respondents identified airwaves, notice boards, emails, WhatsApp messaging, text, and phone calls as the main channels used in transmitting information to both staff and students of the university. He stated that:

“They have not dropped any of them, they are using all for convenience and effectiveness.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)
It is deduced from the responses of the participants that both universities use electronic and traditional means or channels in the dissemination of information to both staff and students across the various campuses. The respondents also agreed that management normally uses a combination of two or three of the channels available to transmit information to the campuses to ensure effective and efficient communication in the universities.

4.3.4 Movement to the Centre

It is observed that most university-wide meetings, programmes, and events are normally held at the main campus or CA. This obliges the staff and students on the various to often move to the centre to partake in such meetings and events. It has been noticed from the responses gathered from all the participants that most of the meetings are held at the centre because it is the symbol of the university where university business is conducted and where the principal and key officers are located. Thus, in explaining the events, meetings and reasons that compel the staff on the campuses to travel to the centre, one of the participants stated that:

“Staff travel to attend meetings which involve the entire university and statutory committee meetings at the centre. Any meeting that involves the President is normally held at the head office, so everybody will have to travel there.” (RDT, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Another respondent in his response emphasised the need to always hold certain meetings at the CA because it is the symbol and centre for university business by remarking that:

“It depends on the kind of committee it is, we invite them [staff at the campuses] to come and we have the meeting here if the need be. The centre is for university business. The centre is a symbol of the entire university so that is why we have the meetings here most of the time. Meetings that can be held on the various places we go there and have the meetings.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)
One of the participants noted that most of the meetings in the university are normally held at the CA and therefore recounted in his statement that:

“……. apart from just campus-based meetings all university-wide meetings take place at the centre Because that is the centre……. We always go there.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

The statements of the above participants have been corroborated by another respondent who also stated emphatically that:

“They [staff of the campuses] must be here for events and sub-committees. All ad hoc committee and permanent committee meetings are held here. Meetings involving the President, the Registrar, and the Vice President are held here.” (RRP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

Similarly, all the respondents of the two universities indicated that unlike the staff, there is hardly any mass movement of students from the campuses to the CA for meetings organised by the central management. They however, acknowledged that student leaders are always invited to participate in meetings that are meant for fixing school fees as well as meetings of committees that have the students’ representatives on them.

It was observed that mass movement of students to the CA or other campuses occurs during Students’ Representative Council (SRC) meetings or activities, but not often at the instance of the central management.

“We have SRC, they have been going to have meetings for the students, but it is not on one campus they rotate as we also do sometimes.” (RDA, Monday, 9th May, 2016)

Thus, staff and sometimes students on the various campuses are compelled to commute to the main campus for essential administrative services and meetings as well as other public programmes and
activities. As stated by Ebden (2010), that staff and students on the various campuses spend some reasonable amount of time commuting or travelling to the main campus to participate in meetings and events.

### 4.3.5 Students’ Complaints

It is observed from the answers of the participants that both universities have enough structures in place to resolve students’ complaints, especially those that have to do with their general welfare. Therefore, most of the complaints are normally dealt with at the campus level, while those that cannot be handled at that level are referred to the CA for the top management to address. This buttresses the statement of one of the respondents that:

> “With students’ complaints, about 80 to 90% are resolved at the campuses. We have Assistant Dean of Students who is responsible for SRC and all students’ associations at the campus level. So, we have a Dean of Students at Abetifi [the CA] or the main campus.” (RDA, Monday, 9th May, 2016)

In addition, another participant in his response highlighted the nature and the processes involved in resolving complaints emanating from the students by explaining. He explained how such complaints are to be routed through the Vice Dean of Students, the Campus Head, and the Deans.

> “General welfare complaints are routed them through the Vice Dean of Students at the campus to the Dean of Students at the CA. The DIC [or Campus Head] is only notified about it. However, academic complaints are regarded as individual or personal issues that should be routed through the HODs to the Deans in writing.” (RDW, Tuesday, 26th April, 2016)

Thus, from the responses gathered, it can be deduced that in both universities most of the complaints from students are resolved at the campus level. This is as a result of the structures and
channels that have been put in place on the campuses, especially the establishment of the Office of the Vice Dean of Students at the campus level.

4.3.6 Staff Complaints and Conflicts

The arrangement of the MCUs also has some implications on the quick resolution of staff complaints and conflicts emanating from the campuses. For instance, an affected staff would have to follow and satisfy all the bureaucratic processes at the campus level before getting the complaint to the top or centre, especially, where the campus management fails to provide any solution. It was observed from the responses that general staff complaints and conflicts and sometimes individual complaints can be routed through staff associations or unions, where they exist, for resolution. Besides, individual staff complaints and conflicts can be resolved by the campus or faculty management or addressed at convocation, and or sent directly to the centre in writing for resolution. Thus, one of the respondents in his response stated that:

“We do not have bodies like Teachers and Educational Workers Union (TEWU), Federation of Senior Staff Association of Ghana (FUSSAG), and we do not have bodies like Ghana Association of University Administrators (GAUA). We hold regular convocation meetings where senior members’ issues are discussed and we also have junior and senior staff body where their complaints are discussed. Individually, they [staff] can write straight to the Registrar or to the President.” (RRP, Wednesday, 6th April, 2016)

However, another respondent indicated ardently that most staff complaints and conflicts are usually resolved through their associations and unions by revealing that:

“Well, mostly they do that through the unions. We have unions like TEWU, GAUA, UTAG and all that. They channel their complaints through the unions to management for addressing.” (RPV, Monday, 11th April, 2016)
Again, another respondent expressed an entirely different view on the processes available for the staff to use for the resolution of their complaints and conflicts in the university. He has stated that all staff with general or personal complaints should first resort to the management hierarchy or internal mechanisms for resolution. However, if this fails, the Dean can present the issue on behalf of the affected person or persons to the centre for resolving.

“If it is a general complaint that a staff has with the university, he or she can use the academic board, the executive committee, and convocation — especially the senior members for redress.” (RRU, Monday, 11th April, 2016)

It is therefore observed the responses that PUCG does not have staff associations or unions and as such does not use them for the resolution of staff complaints and conflicts, but normally uses internal structures and systems for that purpose. However, it has been noticed that UDS uses both staff unions and internal structures to address staff complaints and conflicts.

4.4 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter presented and discussed the findings of the study. Thus, on research question one, the findings were presented and discussed under principal or key officers of both universities; synthesised management structure; benefits of the management structure; challenges of the management structure; decision making in the universities; and campus heads. Also, the findings presented and discussed on research question two included: allocation of funds; allocation of infrastructure; recruitment; and allocation of staff. And research question three covered delivery of administrative services to staff; delivery of administrative services to students; communication; movement to the centre; students’ complaints; and staff complaints and conflicts.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the research findings and the conclusions drawn from the findings of the research. It also presents recommendations based on the major conclusions drawn. The recommendations are meant to improve the governance systems and to ensure efficient distribution of resources and services in the universities. Thus, the chapter is presented in three main parts. The first part consists a summary of the main findings under the three research objectives which are themed as management structure of the universities; allocation of resources in the universities; and delivery of administrative services. The second part presents the conclusions drawn from the findings of the study. With the final part recommending measures towards the effective and efficient management of the universities.

5.1 Summary

This section presents a summary of the main research findings under the three main themes that had been identified already.

5.1.1 Management structure of the universities

The first research objective compared the current management structures of UDS and PUCG. This was achieved by using the qualitative research method to collect and process the data for the study. Thus, the summary of the main findings under this theme are presented as follows:
• **Principal or Key Officers of both Universities**

It was realised from the findings that in the case of PUCG, the composition of principal or key officers on record differed from what was being practiced. However, in practice, both universities have similar composition of principal or key officers with the exception of the Director of WPD which is included in the case of UDS.

• **Synthesised Management Structure**

The findings revealed that the management structure of MCUs is not entirely different from that of the SCUs. However, the only difference between the two university systems is the extended management responsibility of the campuses in the MCUs. Thus, the findings showed that in both universities the campus management has been factored into the entire management or organisational structure (see Figure 2).

It was also evident from the findings on the management structure that the Council Chair and the VC or President are the key officers responsible for contractual engagements and thus represent the Executive Management. Then, the Central Management or Administration which represents the Top Management is charged with the overall management function of the entire university and the campuses (Ardis et al., 2013; Gumprecht, 2007; Creswell et al., 1985). And the Campus Management which represents the Lower Management is responsible for the day-to-day management and operations of the campus and the coordination of teaching and learning activities on the campus as well (Fei, 2015; Jin and Wang, 2010).
The findings also confirmed that the management system or structure of the two universities is a combination of the centralised and decentralised management models or patterns. This was in consonance with Fei’s (2015) third management pattern (see Table 1) under the theoretical framework.

The findings equally revealed that the management structure of the universities allows for some level of decentralisation of academic services, resources, and daily administration to the campuses, while the overall management of all the resources and the entire university is centralised at the CA. Again, it was also confirmed that the management of the geographically dispersed campuses which are separated from one another and the main campus, would need some reasonable level of autonomy and authority to effectively and efficiently manage and coordinate their daily operations and activities. This would require the movement of the campus manager or head from the lower management level to the top management level in the management structure (see Figure 2).

- **Benefits of the Management Structure**

  The research findings identified innovation, coordination, participation, effective decisions and effective governance as the benefits and strengths of the management structure of the universities. It was revealed that the decentralised nature of the management structure of the universities allows the campus heads to be innovative and responsive in the operations of their respective campuses.

  Besides, the findings also established that the management structure promotes participation of the lower management in the management of the entire university. All the Campus Heads, Deans, and HODs at the campus level are able to contribute to the overall management process of the
university thereby promoting participatory governance. It was again found that the management structure of the universities is efficient because of the mixed management system where the benefits of both the centralised and decentralised systems are abound.

Again, it was evident from the findings that the management structure promotes effective decision making in for the universities by having the various campus heads taking part in the management process. Also, the findings showed that the management structure facilitates effective coordination and establishment of authority by allowing the campus management to take care of campus businesses, while the top management takes care of university-wide businesses. This promotes effective and efficient governance in the universities.

The research findings on the benefits of the management structure of the universities are supported by Fei’s (2015) and Jin and Wang’s (2010) combined management pattern or model.

- **Challenges of the Management Structure**

Some of the challenges identified include slow decision making; difficulties in coordination; costly to operate; uneven distribution of resources; communication difficulties; unclear functions; and role conflicts. It was found that there are no significant differences in the challenges encountered by both universities. Thus, the challenges hampering the effective and efficient management of both public and private MCUs are the same.

Again, the research findings revealed that the management of the universities is faced with delays in decision making either from the centre to the periphery or vice versa. This is compounded by
the participatory decision making approach that is prominent in the universities where most of the participants will have to travel from the various dispersed campuses to the centre before a decision can be taken.

Another revelation was that the top management finds it very difficult to coordinate the activities of the various campuses from the centre. When it comes to the implementation of the decisions the top management will not be there directly to supervise and ensure that the right instructions are carried out. Thus, top management’s desire to oversee and coordinate all the activities of the entire university, gives the campuses very limited autonomy to operate.

In addition, it was found that unclear definition of roles and functions of officers bring about misunderstandings and conflicts, for instance, in the case of the DIC who is of the same status as the other Deans. This also affects the ability of the DIC or Dean to effectively manage the various categories of staff that are found on the campus as they (the staff) are serving as representatives of some of the key officers at the centre.

Also, the research findings established that the management system of the universities is very expensive to operate in terms of financial, human and physical resources. This is reflected in the duplication of infrastructure and Staff, and the frequent movements from the campuses to the centre. Significantly, all these make the management of both universities very expensive.

Above all, allocation of resources in the universities was found as one of the major difficulties that the management is faced with. As confirmed by Dhliwayo (2014), Liu and Lv (2007) and Gaither
(1999) that achieving fair distribution of resources in MCUs is a major challenge. Thus, it was revealed that there are issues of unequitable allocation of resources in both universities studied.

- **Decision Making in the Universities**

The research findings established that the principal and the key officers and to a large extend the lower managers in both universities are the main actors in decision making. It was also found that the decision making process in both universities is participatory as all the various levels of management are often involved in the process. As buttressed by Womack and Podemski (1985) that equal participation of all the campuses in the planning process of a MCUS is very important. It is equally emphasised by Morgan (2003) and Wheatley (2003) that the decision making process in MCUs depicts the top-down and bottom-up approaches.

However, the research findings showed that decision making in both universities is often very slow because of the distances between the centre and the various campuses. Thus, campus heads spend a reasonable amount of time to travel to the centre to make decisions and a decision coming from the centre will take some time to get to the campuses for implementation.

Hence, the suggestion of Johnston (1993), French (2003) and Harman and Harman (2003) that a considerable amount of autonomy be given to the campuses to make them more responsive, flexible, and above decisive in managing their affairs and operations effectively and efficiently.
• Campus Heads

The findings of the study established that in both universities campus heads are normally appointed from the Deans where they are more than one. However, it was found that in UDS they are referred to as DICs, while in PUCG they are simply referred to as Deans. Again, it was equally established that both universities do not appoint senior or principal officers to manage the campuses and as such the Campus Heads do not report directly to the VC or President in most cases. It was also found that both universities have not stated the position of Campus Heads in their respective statutes. Thus, the current arrangement is based on discretion and convenience.

It was also revealed that unlike the UDS, the PUCG has one faculty and one Dean per campus with the exception the main campus where there are two faculties and two Deans. Thus, under the single-faculty campus situation, the Dean becomes the Campus Head by default as well. Again, it was ascertained that in the case of the UDS where there are multiple-faculty campuses led to the introduction of the DIC, but the other Deans are not answerable to him because they are of equal status.

It was equally discovered that both that both universities acknowledged the need to appoint senior or principal officers to manage the campuses in future. Thus, the plan of PUCG is that each campus in future would be managed by a Vice President, whereas the plan of UDS is that each campus would be managed by a Provost. This would fulfil the assertion of Davis and Kelly (2006) that the Campus Managers are usually senior or principal officers in the university who report directly to the VC or the President.
The findings proved that the current arrangement at the campuses of both universities does not give the Campus Managers or Heads sufficient authority and power to enable them manage the campuses effectively and efficiently. This is partly due to the fact that the Campus Heads are not senior or principal officers or among the top management.

5.1.2 Allocation of resources in the universities

The second research objective examined the processes adopted in the allocation of resources in the two universities. This was achieved by using the qualitative research method to collect and process the data for the study. The summary of the main findings under this theme are presented as follows:

- **Allocation of Funds**

  The findings of the study showed that allocation of funds in the universities is influenced by the needs of the campus, student numbers, lobbying skills, the nature of programmes, and availability of funds. It was also discovered that contrary to the UDS, PUCG does not use any formula in the allocation of funds. Thus, it was established that the formula used by UDS to disburse school fees or funds is based on percentages where a portion is shared equally and another based on student numbers. This is consistent with the findings of Scott et al. (2007) on ‘funding allocation formula’. The UDS’ formula is therefore applied in manner that would ensure some level of cross subsidisation so that faculties with few students are taken care of.

Again, the findings also revealed that the management of PUCG does arbitrary and discretionary allocation of funds to the faculties and schools since there is no formula to guide them. It was also
established that although the UDS applies a formula in the allocation of funds, the amount or percentage allotted to the campuses or the office of the campus heads is not sufficient.

Notwithstanding the existence and application of a formula, it was also ascertained that in both universities, the CA or management is responsible for the allocation of funds and hence would allocate more to itself at the expense of the campuses, especially, in times of financial difficulties where budgets and costs are to be cut or reduced (Allison and Eversole, 2008; Gaskell, 2011). Hence, confirming the position of Dhliwayo (2014), Liu and Lv (2007) and Gaither (1999) that achieving fair distribution of resources in MCUs is a major challenge.

- **Allocation of Infrastructure**

The research findings proved that both universities allocate infrastructure based the needs of the campuses and faculties. Factors such as student numbers, availability of funds, and new programmes were also found as influencers of allocation of infrastructure. It was also confirmed that the discretion of the top management is another factor. It was also revealed that both universities do not apply any formula for the allocation of infrastructure to the campuses and faculties. The findings identified the reasons for the nonexistence of the formula to include: difficult to apply, inadequate resources, and evolving structures.

This is contrary to the suggestion of Scott et al. (2007) that MCU must replicate or find new efficient ways of consistent distribution of its physical resources such as libraries, student laboratories, network infrastructure, and student centres to the campuses. Although Dhliwayo
Liu and Lv (2007) and Gaither (1999) also acknowledged the difficulties in achieving fair distribution of resources in MCUs.

- **Recruitment**

The findings of the study uncovered that recruitment in both universities is not conducted entirely by any one particular individual or officer, but through a participatory and consultative process involving all the relevant stakeholders, such as Sectional Heads, Deans, and HODs. Again, another revelation confirmed that the Registrar plays vital role in the recruitment process as the Chief Administrator of the university, but emphasised that the final selection is normally done by an appropriate committee. It was also found that both universities have two appointment committees: A&P for senior members, and APC for senior and junior staff.

Besides, the findings established that the campuses do not have the authority to recruit because staff are normally recruited into the university and not the campus. It was also confirmed that the overall responsibility for recruitment resides with the CA or top management through centralised appointment committees (A&P and APC). However, the Deans and HODs determine the suitability of the applicants and recommend to the appropriate appointment committee for interview in which they sit in as well.

The findings also showed that in the case of both universities the campuses, faculties and departments are involved in the entire recruitment process. Hence, making the recruitment process transparent and participatory. It was evident from the findings that although the centre does not solely perform the entire recruitment function, it coordinates and approves the final decisions. As
asserted by Massarik and Pei-Carpenter (2002) that major decisions on staffing such as recruitment, transfers, promotions, demotions and dismissals must be approved by the central management.

- **Allocation of Staff**

It was ascertained from the research findings that in both universities staff are mostly allocated to the campuses and faculties based on their needs and the requests they made. This applies to both academic and administrative staff. It was also found that administrative staff are normally transferred or recruited at the head office and sent to the campuses, but academic staff are recruited based on their skills and speciality relating to a specific campus or faculty.

Again, it was discovered from the findings that although staff are allocated to the campuses based on their needs and requests, the centre is likely to retain most of the best recruits and send a few and a low-grade recruits, especially, the administrative staff, to the campuses. As confirmed by Mathebula and de Beer (2003) that staff at the centre often tend to downgrade and disrespect their fellow staff on the campuses. This places the campuses as second choice institutions (Allison and Eversole, 2008). The campuses therefore serve as centres for disciplinary transfers, while the CA serves as a centre for reward transfers.

**5.1.3 Delivery of administrative services**

The third research objective examined the processes of delivering administrative services to both staff and students of the Campuses of the two universities. This was also done by employing the
qualitative research method to collect and process the data for the study. The summary of the main findings under this theme are presented as follows:

- **Delivery of Administrative Services to Staff**

According to the findings of the study, in both universities staff on the campuses need to follow the management structures or hierarchy in order to access some core administrative services at the centre. It was revealed that staff on the campuses who require administrative services such as leave, promotion, and sponsorship would have to apply through their HOD or Assistant Registrar, through the Dean then to the Registrar or the VC or President at the CA. The process is meant to ensure transparent and fair operations. However, the Deans in this case apply directly to the Registrar or the VC or President.

It was also ascertained that promotion, leave and sponsorship are centralised in both universities. Hence, the formalisation of the processes and procedures in delivering these services to staff on the campuses to ensure transparency and fairness. Although Jin and Wang (2010) caution that the overreliance on hierarchy or bureaucratic structures may affect the efficient delivery of such basic administrative services.

- **Delivery of Administrative Services to Students**

The findings of the study established that in both universities, students on the campuses also need to follow the bureaucratic structures available to obtain administrative services that are not provided at the campus level, but at the centre. It was also found that students who require services such as deferment of programme, introductory letter for visa, certificates, and transcripts could
obtain them from the centre through their HODs or Assistant Registrars to the Dean and then to the Registrar.

It was found that the requests from students for such services must be routed through the campus or faculty heads to the head office because they are directly dealing with them (the students) and hence their recommendation is very critical. The findings also revealed that these services are centralised to ensure security and control, maintain equivalent standard, and avoid impersonation and alteration. Thus, buttressing the view of Goussal and Lezcano (2003) that in spite of the challenges, MCUs strive to provide equivalent and standard administrative services for the students on the various campuses.

- **Communication**

The research uncovered that both universities use electronic and non-electronic means or channels to transmit information to staff and students on the various dispersed campuses. The channels include: notice board system, platforms on website, emails, verbal and radio announcements, WhatsApp platforms, text messages, phone calls, and express posts for hard copies. It was also confirmed that both universities normally combine two or three of these channels to ensure proper and quick delivery of information to the widely dispersed campuses which are distant from each other and the CA.

It was also found that the universities blend both traditional and modern channels in transmitting information to both staff and students on the campuses to make sure that all the recipients have easy and convenient access to such information. It is also aimed at ensuring effective and efficient
communication in the universities. Hence, removing the communication difficulties between campuses and the main campus as identified by Gregory (2004).

- **Movement to the Centre**

The findings ascertained that in both universities most university-wide meetings, programmes, and events are normally held at the CA. This obliges the staff and students on the various campuses to often move to the centre to partake in such meetings and events. It was also found that the CA is the symbol of the university where university business is conducted and where the principal and key officers are located. Thus, academic board or senate meetings, statutory committee meetings, ad hoc committee meetings as well as some programmes or events are normally held at the centre. It was also established that meetings involving the VC or President and sometimes the key officers are mostly held at the CA.

The findings also confirmed that in both universities there is hardly any mass movement of students from the campuses to the CA for any meetings at the instance of management. However, it was revealed that students’ leaders also travel to the centre for committee meetings that they have representation and meetings on fees fixing.

The above findings partly confirmed the view of Ebden (2010) that staff and students on the various campuses spend some reasonable amount of time commuting or travelling to the main campus to participate in meetings and events.
• **Students’ Complaints**

The study found that in both universities there are adequate structures in place to resolve students’ complaints, especially those that have to do with their general welfare. Thus, revealing that most of the complaints are normally dealt with at the campus level, while those that cannot be handled at that level are referred to the centre to address. This is as a result of the structures and channels that are on the campuses, especially the establishment of the Office of the Vice Dean of Students at the campus level. It was also found that the complaints are often routed through the SRC through the Vice Dean of Students at the campus to the Dean of Students at the centre depending on the nature of the complaint. However, with academic or individual cases, the students write through their HODs or Assistant Registrars through the Deans to the centre.

• **Staff Complaints and Conflicts**

It was found that general staff complaints and conflicts and sometimes individual complaints are routed through their staff associations or unions, where they exist, for resolution. The findings identified TEWU, FUSSAG, UTAG, and GAUA as the main staff unions. Besides, it was revealed that individual staff complaints and conflicts could also be resolved by the campus or faculty, or addressed at convocation, and or sent directly to the centre in writing for resolution.

Therefore, the findings showed that PUCG does not have staff unions and as such does not use them for the resolution of staff complaints and conflicts, but normally uses internal structures or hierarchy for that purpose. However, it was confirmed that UDS uses both staff unions and internal structures or hierarchy to address staff complaints and conflicts.
5.2 Conclusion

The study establishes that there are no significant differences in managing both universities in spite of the differences in their ownership and governance structures. In practice, both universities have similar composition of principal and key officer. Again, unlike the UDS, PUCG does not have a Director of WPD whose responsibility is to ensure effective and efficient management and development of physical resources in the university.

The management structure of the universities is not entirely different from that of the SCUs because it is a general structure used by almost every university. However, the management responsibility of UDS and PUCG is extended to all their campuses. Thus, the management or organisational structure of the two universities has been synthesised into a model structure (see Figure 2). This allows for some level of decentralisation from the centre to the campuses. However, the decentralisation does not give the campus heads reasonable level of autonomy and authority to effectively and efficiently manage and coordinate their daily operations and activities.

Even though the management of both universities acknowledged innovation, coordination, participation, effective decisions and effective governance as the benefits and strengths of the management structure; they also enumerated some of the challenges of the structure as slow decision making, difficulties in coordination, costly to operate, uneven distribution of resources, communication difficulties, unclear functions, and role conflicts.

In both universities, Campus Heads are normally appointed from the Deans where they are more than one. Again, both universities do not appoint senior or principal officers to manage the
campuses and as such the Campus Heads do not report directly to the VC or President in most cases. The universities have not stated the position of Campus Heads in their respective statutes. Thus, the current arrangement is based on discretion and convenience. Under a single-faculty campus situation, as found in the PUCG, the Dean becomes the Campus Head by default as well. On the part of UDS, where there are multiple-faculty campuses, a DIC is appointed to manage the campus, but the other Deans are not answerable to him because they are of equal status. Both universities acknowledged the need to appoint senior or principal officers to manage the campuses.

The allocation of funds to the campuses is influenced by the needs of the campus, student numbers, lobbying skills, the nature of programmes, and availability of funds. Allocation of funds to the campuses in PUCG is basically influenced by the above factors because they do not have or use any formula to that effect. However, UDS uses a formula for disbursement school fees or funds to the campuses. The formula provides for some level of cross subsidisation to ensure that even faculties with few students are taken care of. In addition, in both universities allocation of infrastructure to the campuses and faculties is also influenced by the needs of the campuses and faculties, the student numbers, availability of funds, new programmes, and largely the discretion of top management. Again, in both universities, academic and administrative staff are mostly allocated to the campuses and faculties based on their needs and the requests they made. The administrative staff, in this case, are normally transferred or recruited at the head office and sent to the campuses, but the academic staff are recruited based on their skills and speciality in relation to a specific campus or faculty. Although staff are allocated to the campuses based on their needs and requests, the centre is likely to retain most of the best recruits and send a few and a low-grade
recruits, especially, the administrative staff, to the campuses. The campuses therefore serve as centres for disciplinary transfers, while the CA serves as a centre for reward transfers.

To ensure transparency staff on the campuses who want to access centralised administrative services such as leave, promotion, and sponsorship in either of the universities would have to follow the management structures or hierarchy. Additionally, students on the campuses also need to follow all the bureaucratic structures available on the campuses in order to obtain administrative services that are not provided at the campus level, but at the centre.

The universities use both electronic and non-electronic channels to transmit information to staff and students on the various dispersed campuses. Normally, because of the peculiar nature of the universities a combination of two or three of the channels are employed to ensure proper and quick delivery of information to the widely dispersed campuses which are distant from each other and the CA.

In both universities, most university-wide meetings, programmes, and events are normally held at the CA. For instance, academic board or senate meetings, statutory committee meetings, ad hoc committee meetings and public lectures are held there. This obliges the staff and students on the campuses to often travel to the centre to partake in such meetings and events.

In UDS, general staff complaints and conflicts and sometimes individual complaints are routed through their staff unions or internal structures for resolution. However, PUCG does not have staff unions and as such uses only internal structures for the resolution of staff complaints and conflicts.
5.3 Recommendations

The management of MCUs across the globe is still a complex and a pervasive exercise because of their peculiar nature and composition as opposed to the traditional SCUs. These management complexities and difficulties in MCUs are more entrenched or pronounced in the developing world, of which Ghana is part, where basic resources are woefully inadequate and direly lacking. Hence, the urgent need to develop workable governance systems and structures to ensure effective and efficient management and usage of the inadequate resources and services available in these unique crop of universities. The following recommendations have been made based on the research findings:

As practiced in the UDS, PUCG should also take the initiative to introduce and appoint a Director of WPD to handle and manage all the issues relating to physical resources and development in the university. This would ensure effective and efficient planning, management and development of physical resources or infrastructure in the university.

UDS and PUCG should decentralise some reasonable level of autonomy and authority to the Campus Heads to enable them effectively and efficiently manage and coordinate the daily operations and activities of the campuses. Therefore, the Campus Heads in both universities should be moved from the lower management level to the top management level on the management structure (see Figure 2) to increase their independence and authority. In order to achieve this, the universities should appoint senior or principal officers (PVCs or Vice Presidents) as Campus Heads who would report directly to the VC or President. Again, the universities should formalise
the position of Campus Head by including it in their respective statutes. This would assist them to move away from the current arrangement of discretion and convenience.

To reduce the travelling risks, travelling costs, and productive time lost through the frequent commuting of staff from the campuses to the CA to attend meetings and functions, both universities should acquire and install videoconferencing devices to effect that. This allows staff to actively participate and contribute in meetings at the CA from their respective campuses without travelling. The challenge of slow decision making would also be solved.

Although the UDS applies a formula in the allocation of funds, the amount or percentage allocated to the office of the Campus Heads for the management of their campuses is not sufficient. Thus, the amount or percentage of the Campus Heads should be included in the amount or percentage retained by the CA and a percentage of which shared among the campuses according to their student numbers. The UDS and PUCG should adopt and apply the mathematical formula (see Figure 3) derived by the study from the percentages or ratios based formula of the UDS for the allocation of funds. Also, both UDS and PUCG should always collate the infrastructural needs of all the campuses for a period of three years and with the help of the Campus Heads place them on a scale of preference based on urgency. This would replace the arbitrary and discretionary allocation of infrastructure in the two universities.

Again, UDS and PUCG should design packages and schemes aimed at developing the campuses squarely to become attractive to both staff and students to consider as first choice institutions instead of second choice ones. This would also reverse the situation whereby staff at the centre
often tend to downgrade and disrespect their fellow staff on the campuses (Mathebula and de Beer, 2003). Therefore, the campuses would no longer serve as centres for disciplinary transfers.

Finally, the PUCG should encourage the formation of staff unions in the university to facilitate the resolution of staff complaints and conflicts properly, especially, those that have to do with the general welfare of the staff.

The research findings are very relevant and have extensive implications for the advancement of theory, knowledge, and future research. Besides, the research would contribute significantly to future research; to theory development; and to knowledge expansion.

**Contribution to Future Research**

The study used comparative case study to analyse the management of UDS and PUCG which are both MCUs and are located in the Northern and Southern Ghana respectively. Thus, if the study is replicated in other African countries, especially, those that have operated the MCUS for a longer period, it is very likely to produce different results or findings. Thus, future research can compare the management structures of MCUs with collegial SCUs in Ghana to find out if there would similar findings or results. Again, future research can focus on the application of Information and Technology Communication (ICT) in managing MCUs in Ghana.

**Contribution to Theory**

The research would make significant contribution to theory and provide frameworks and models that would have positive impact on practice as well. The study reviews theories and model in MCU
management which include the works of Jin and Wang (2010) and Fei (2015). Also, the study provides a conceptual framework; a synthesised management structure of MCUs; and a mathematical formula for the allocation of funds. These models simplify and aid the understanding of the management systems in the universities and can equally be applied in other studies as well as practice.

**Contribution to Knowledge**

The implications of the study can be found in its contribution to and expansion of knowledge as it provides sound explanation and analysis by comparing the management of public and private MCUs. The study also contributes to the body of knowledge by providing an in-depth and a comprehensive review and discussion of some studies and theories on the management structure of MCUs. Again, the recommendations provided by the study would serve as a guide for policy makers, Ministry of Education, NGOs, academics, students, and above all, provides verifiable experiences for the UDS and PUCG.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Interview Guide

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA BUSINESS SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND HEALTH SERVICES
MANAGEMENT

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

My name is Amatus Dinye, an MPhil Public Administration final year student in Department of Public Administration and Health Services Management under University of Ghana Business School. In partial fulfilment of the requirement for the award of my MPhil Degree, I am conducting a study on ‘Managing Multi-Campus Universities in Ghana: A Comparative Analysis of University for Development Studies (UDS) and Presbyterian University College, Ghana (PUCG)’. Thus, the interview is basically meant to help me obtain and collect data on the topic being studied. The interview is scheduled to last for 20 to 25 minutes. Naturally, the data obtained from you and your institution shall be confidentially handled or kept and shall be used for academic purpose only. Thank you for accepting to be interviewed.

Background of Respondents

Name of University: ........................................................................................................

Designation of Respondent: .........................................................................................

Workstation of Respondent: ...........................................................................................

SECTION A: Management Structures of the University

1. Please describe the management structure of the university?

........................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................

2. Give three (3) reasons for operating the management structure?
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3. Kindly outline four (4) Challenges of the management structure?

4. Please identify the category of officers responsible for the management and decision-making in the university?

4(a) Please give two (2) reasons for your answer?

5. Explain the methods use in appointing campus heads?

6. What is the designation of the Campus Heads in your university (e.g. campus managers, Pro-vost, Pro-vice Chancellor etc.)?

SECTION B: Resource Allocation in the University

1. What three (3) factors are considered in the allocation of funds to the campuses?
2. Do you have a specific formula for the allocation of funds to the campuses? (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]
   2 (a) If ‘Yes’ please state the formula and explain?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   2(b) If ‘No’ please give the reasons why? ………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. What three (3) factors are considered in the allocation of infrastructure (Lecture Halls, Office Accommodation etc.) to the campuses?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Do you have a specific formula for the allocation of infrastructure to the campuses? (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]
   4(a) If ‘Yes’ please state the formula and explain?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   4(b) If ‘No’ please give the reasons why? ………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. Who is responsible for recruiting staff for the university? ………………………………………
   Please explain your answer: ………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   5(a) Who is responsible for recruiting staff for the campuses? …………………………………
6. What role do the campuses play in the recruitment process?

7. How are staff allocated to the campuses?

SECTION C: Delivery of Administrative Services to Staff and Students of the Campuses

1. How do staff on the campuses access administrative services such as leave, promotion, sponsorship, allowances etc.?

1(a) Please give reasons for your answer?

2. How do students on the campuses obtain administration services e.g. transcripts, certificates, introduction letters, deferment etc.?

2(a) Please give reasons for your answer?
3. State the media use in transmitting information to staff or students on the campuses?

3(a) Please explain reasons for your answer?

4. Please name the type of meetings staff on the various campuses must attend at the main campus? Explain why?

4(a) Please name the type of meetings students on the various campuses must attend at the main campus? Explain why?

5. Explain how complaints from students on the campuses are addressed by the main campus?

5(a) Explain how complaints and conflicts from staff on the campuses are addressed and resolved by the main campus?

Thank you for your cooperation and time.