

Management theories and their implications on private institutions in Uganda. A case study of Islamic University in Uganda

¹Balikuddembe Nasser

¹PhD candidate, Islamic University In Uganda

²Faculty of Management sciences

Abstract: *There has been much development and practice of western management theories in Africa especially in Uganda. Studies in management have been dominated by the literature on management theories in Uganda. The study provides a descriptive examination and traces the historical development of each school of thought, as well as its significance on management practice and limitations, Despite the fact that this study examined the emerging thoughts in contemporary management practice, a significant gap was identified as the depth of the literature on the practice of these management approaches in Islamic University in Uganda. To close this gap, the study analyzed the major components of each management theory and presented models of private institutions built on the same principles or approaches. Relying on historical and narrative analysis, the findings established evidence of practice of western management theories in Islamic University in Uganda. The study concluded that management practice in Uganda can be enhanced, if specific socio-cultural factors are given adequate consideration in the application of management approaches.*

Keywords: Management Theories, Management Practice, Uganda, Culture, Institutions.

Introduction

Although significant progress has been made several years in the evolution of management theories, the discipline has suffered from a deluge of several theories that may be more confusing in practice than direction (Koontz, 1980). Though the earlier work from classical theorists like Taylor, Fayol and Weber contributed significantly to developments in management practice (some still applicable today), it has become more clearer that confidence in the universal validity management theories in countries like United Kingdom (UK) and the United States of America (USA) is questionable. In this regard, Geert Hofstede's (1980, 1991) contribution to the applicability of management philosophies across cultures has lent some form of sanity to the body of knowledge by tackling the differences in relevance across regions as being attributable to cultural differences.

Hofstede (1980) defined culture as the pattern, ways of thinking, feeling and reacting, acquired and communicated mainly by symbols, amounting to the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts. As multinationals continue to extend their presence across various geographical regions, the limitations of existing management theories and practices are becoming increasingly obvious. Specifically, the applicability of modern management theories within the context of strongly defined African cultures has become the central focus of recent academic debates. Colonized Africa has proven a rather interesting object of study as it builds on the argument that differences in thinking and social action that exists across cultures are nothing more than mental programs developed in early childhood and reinforced in schools and organizations (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2005).

The introduction of these approaches to African countries, especially Uganda, has proved problematic because of difference in culture and values of Ugandans relative to the western countries where these approaches were developed. Environmental and socio-cultural factors also contribute to these differences (Fashoyin, 2005; George, Owoyemi and Kuye, 2012; George, Kuye, Onokala, 2012).

Management functions are fundamentally alike in any institution and at every institutional stratum, whether it is planning, organizing, motivating, leading, staffing or controlling. It has also been suggested that all managers and supervisors basically do the same thing, irrespective of the type of organisation or position within the organisation (Hick and Gullet, 1981). According to Koontz and O'Donnell (1980), this is referred to as universality of management and they emphasize that since management functions are universal, it consequently follows that such functions are transferable from institution to institution, and from one country to another. The universalisation and transferability of management approaches and its practice in Uganda have generated much interest. Many scholars are of the opinion that without these foreign approaches to management, organisations in Uganda will struggle to thrive while other writers believe that the consistent reliance on western management approaches have impeded the growth of indigenous management theories (Fashoyin, 2005; Osuntokun, 2001). Through this article therefore, the researcher intends to briefly examine the development of each management approach, the transferability and usage of these western management theories in Islamic University in Uganda, the relevance and limitation of each approach in Ugandan institutions and challenges thereof.

Research Methodology

This study is based on qualitative approach and it is analyzed using a narrative method that leaned more on the interpretivist approach rather than the positivist approach. This approach presupposes that the researcher can not assume a value-neutral stance or remain impartial, because he/she is always implicated in the phenomena being studied. Thus interpretivists try to comprehend the phenomena, as described by participants rather than testing through scientific standards of verification (Roth and Methta 2002). According to Geertz (1973), what we believe to be facts cannot be accurately objective since they are really “our own constructions of other people’s constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to” (Geertz, 1973:9). Based on this, the analysis can only be justified and measured by the merit of each case and the support of evidence put forth. Rieder (1985) believes the interpretivist approach seeks to appreciate issues through observation and in-depth interviews. Unlike the positivist approach which assumes that the existence of objective reality and facts, which can be known or approximated through verifiable research methods. Since the purpose of this paper is to observe and construct phenomena, the interpretivist method was deemed most appropriate. This study being descriptive, as well as historical, relied essentially on secondary information sources gathered by the researcher via many books, articles, group discussion and casual face to face interviews. Secondary data is preferred because, as a source of data collection, it is relatively inexpensive compared to primary source of data collection (Zikmund, 1984) and it does not require contact with respondents or subjects because it is historical and data already collected by previous researchers on the subject matter (Ember and Levinson, 1991). Secondary sources methodology helped to explain, to describe, validate findings and to infer from all findings having been validated to be true (Black and Champion, 1976).

Conceptual and Theoretical Background

Management Theory and Practice

Management as a discipline rests on two major components; theory and practice (Lawal, 2012). According to Stoner (1978), any manager who wants to remain relevant in management practice must be up-to-date on existing management theories. Daft (1986) opined that management theory is interested in facts and sound principles, which prescribe what to do to achieve desired outcome in the organization (practice). The relationship between management theory and practice could not have been better captured by Inyang (2008). He surmised that: "Management theory provides the basis for management practice, and the practice in turn helps to reinforce the development of management theory. Management practice therefore involves the translation of existing management knowledge and theories into action that will result in the achievement of the dual goals of organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Management practitioners and professionals are in the vanguard of management practice, and their practice provides the opportunity for reviewing existing management theories and even developing new ones. Management theorists and practitioners reinforce one another and are in a continuous process of interaction. The knowledge of both is required to improve our understanding of management in society". (Inyang, 2008:124-125).

According to McGregor (1987), theory and practice are always together and the understanding of one can help predict the other. He postulated thus: "Every managerial act rests on assumptions, generalizations, and hypotheses – that is to say, on theory. Our assumptions are frequently implicit, sometimes quite unconscious, often conflicting; nevertheless, they determine our predictions that if we do a, b will occur. Theory and practice are inseparable" (McGregor 1987:6). Management theory is therefore not only related to management practice but also benefits as practice of management is further developed. Miner (1980) makes the point that the more that is known about organisations and their methods of operation, the better the chances of dealing effectively with them. Understanding may be more advanced than prediction, but both provide the opportunity to influence or to manage the future. Theory provides a sound basis for action. However, if action is to be effective, the theory must be adequate and appropriate to the task and to improved organisational performance (Mullins, 2011).

Management Theories and its Classification

A number of theories have been presented in literatures constituting management theory and these theories have been postulated by writers from disciplines as diverse as sociology, science, philosophy, engineering, mathematics, psychology and many others. The attempt to summarise management into theories, principles and concepts is to aid organisational effectiveness (Lawal, 2012). Like all useful theories, according to Lawal (2012), management theory is not an end in itself but should rather serve as a means of improving managerial efficiency. In order to help recognize main trends in the development of management theory, it is typical to classify the work of scholars and writers into various approaches, based on their observation of organisations, their structure and management (Mullins, 2011). Attempts have been made by many scholars and writers to group or classify the various management theories into a distinct family. Categorisation of approaches may prove a straightforward task as Robbins and Coulter (2009) and Mullins (2011) identified four (4) main approaches each while it may also prove to be a much more expansive undertaking as Skipton (1983) attempted a classification of eleven (11) main schools of management theory. Whatever form of categorisation is adopted, it is possible to identify a number of other approaches, or at least sub-divisions of approaches, and cross-grouping among the various approaches. The choice of a particular categorisation is therefore largely at the discretion of the observer (Mullins, 2011).

Table 1: Classification of Management Approaches of Selected Authors

Author(s)	Classification	Observation
Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert (2004)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scientific Management School 2. Classical Organisation Theory School 3. The Behavioural School 4. The Management Science School (Quantitative) 5. The Systems Approach 6. The Contingency Approach 7. The Era of Dynamic Engagement 	*Separated Scientific from Classical School. *Identified New School (No. 7)
Cole (2004)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classical Theories 2. Bureaucracy 3. Human Relations and Social Psychological Schools 4. Systems and Contingency Approaches 5. Modern Approaches to Management 	*Separated Bureaucracy from Classical School.
Lawal (2012)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classical School of Management 2. Organic or Neo-Classical School (Human Relations and Behavioural Theories) 3. System and Contingency School 4. Dynamic Engagement Era 	* Agreed with Stoner et al. (2004) by Identifying New School (No. 4)
Robbins and Coulter (2009)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classical Approach 2. Quantitative Approach 3. Behavioural Approach 4. Contemporary Approach (Systems and Contingency) 	*Recognised Quantitative as a Management Approach
Jones and George (2003)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scientific Management Theory 2. Administrative Management Theory 3. Behavioural Management Theory 4. Management Science Theory (Quantitative Mgt, Operations Mgt, Total Quality Mgt) 5. Organisation Environment Theory (System and Contingency Approach) 	*Recognised Management Science as a Management Approach
Mullins (2011)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Classical Approach 2. The Human Relations and Neo-Human Relations Approach 3. The Systems Approach 4. The Contingency Approach 	*Grouped Scientific and Bureaucracy theories as Classical Approach

Source: Adaptation from various Authors' books; *Researcher's assessment 2023

Regardless of the method or technique adopted, categorization enables managers to choose from the different approaches, ideas or solutions which may best suit peculiar requirements of the situation at hand. For the purpose of this academic undertaking, the researcher will mainly rely on the categorisation effort of Mullins (2011), that is, classical approach, human relations and neo-human relations approach, systems approach and contingency approach; including era of dynamic engagement (Stoner et al., 2004; Lawal, 2012).

The Classical Approach

Before the classical theories were developed, there were no clearly defined responsibilities, roles and tasks for workers and managers, which was largely due to the industrial revolution of late nineteenth century and the accelerated emergence of factories. No effective work standards existed and workers were placed on jobs with little concern of matching tasks with abilities or skills (Mullins, 2011; Cole, 2004; Robbins and Coulter, 2009). According to Stoner et al. (2004), skilled labour was in short supply and the only way to expand productivity was to raise the efficiency of workers. This led to the formulation of a body of principles known as scientific management.

Scientific Management

The primary concern of this school of thought was to increase productivity through greater efficiency. The earliest advocate of this school is Frederick W. Taylor while other notable contributors are Henry L. Gantt, Frank and Lillian Gilbreth and Harrington Emerson (Kuye, Gbadamosi and Adeoye, 2010; Lawal, 2012).

Federick Winslow Taylor (Taylorism)

Taylor was a machinist and later became a foreman and manager in the 1870s through 1890s. McFarland (1970) posited that Taylor was particularly disturbed by a lack of measured standards for defining the workers' tasks and systematic 'soldering' of workers on the job. He was determined to discover and enlighten managers, as well as workers on what constituted a "fair day's work" and a "fair day's pay" (Weihrich and Koontz, 1993). Using time study as his base, Taylor broke each job down into its components and designed the quickest and best methods of performing each component. He was able to establish how much workers should do with the equipment and materials at hand. Workers who were more productive were encouraged to receive or earn higher 'scientifically correct' rates (Stoner et al., 2004). Overall, according to Robbins and Coulter (2009), Taylor was able to define the 'one best way' for doing each job and he achieved consistent productivity improvements of 200 percent or more. His ideas and principles of scientific management spread within and outside USA and he became known as the father of scientific management.

Administrative Management

As scientific management was trying to increase efficiency of workers, administrative management was focusing on how to create an organisational structure with high efficiency and guidelines for managing complex organisations. The main contributor to this school of thought is Henri Fayol and others are Lyndall Urwick and E.L.F Brech (Cole, 2004; Lawal, 2012).

Henri Fayol

Henri Fayol made a major contribution to management by stating what he considered to be the key activities of any industrial undertaking. According to Kuye et al. (2010), Fayol categorised the activities into six and they are: technical activities (production), commercial activities (buying and selling, exchanging), financial activities (search for and optimum use of capital), security activities (safeguarding property and persons), accounting activities (providing financial information) and managerial activities (planning, organising, leading and controlling). In Griffin's (1993) view, Fayol was the first to identify the specific management functions of planning, organising, leading and controlling, and also provided a break-down of principles of management, which he thought could be applied to all business organisations, including industries. The fourteen principles are Division of Labour, Authority, Discipline, Unity of Command, Unity of Direction, Subordination of individual interests to common goal, Remuneration, Centralisation, Scalar Chain, Order, Equity, Stability of Tenure of Personnel, Initiative and Espirit de Corps. If Taylor has been referred to as the father of scientific management, then Fayol was the father of administrative management because he was the first to systematise it.

Bureaucratic School

The major proponent of this school of thought is Max Weber. He developed the concept of bureaucracy as a formal system of organization and administration designed to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. Weber was interested in how management could be more consistent and he believed that bureaucratic structures can help eliminate the variability in managers having different skills, experience and goals (Lawal, 2012). Weber believed that there was a need for strictly defined hierarchies in organisations which will be clearly governed by defined regulations and lines of authority, especially for goal-oriented organisations with many employees (Stoner et al., 2004). According to Mullins (2011), Weber noted that the definition of tasks and responsibilities within the structure of management gave rise to a stable administration and standardisation of work procedures in spite of changes to the actual office-holders. He knew the development of bureaucracies will be a means of introducing order and judiciousness in organisations. The main features of a bureaucracy as advanced by Weber (1947) are: Continuous organisation of functions bound by rules

- ✓ Specified spheres of competence, that is, appointment based on competence
- ✓ Hierarchical arrangement of offices (jobs)

- ✓ Appointment to offices are made on grounds of technical competence
- ✓ Separation of officials from the ownership of the organisation
- ✓ Official positions exist in their own right and job holders have no rights to a particular position and rules
- ✓ Decisions and actions are formulated and recorded in writing

Weber emphasized rationality, predictability, impersonality, technical competence, and authoritarianism. Stewart (1999) summarises Weber's features into four main categories as specialisation, hierarchy of authority, system of rules and impersonality. One feature which distinguishes bureaucracy from other types of organisations is the characteristic of impersonality. A bureaucracy should not only be impersonal but be seen to be impersonal (Stewart, 1999).

The Human Relations and Neo-Human Relations Approach

This school of thought emerged as a result of the many criticisms of the classical approach, especially because it focused on tasks, productivity and organisational structure rather than people. During the early part of the 20th century, especially as a result of the great depression in the 1920s and 1930s, more attention shifted to employee behaviour and social factors at work. This led to the human relations and neo-human relations (behavioural) approach (Mullins, 2011; Kuye et al., 2010).

The Human Relations Approach

This approach developed as a result of focus on the human side of management and it sought to understand how social and psychological dynamics interacted with the work environment in influencing productivity and performance, thereby creating effective human relations (Stoner et al., 2004).

The Hawthorne Experiment

The human relations approach, which is sometimes referred to as neo-classical approach, is built around the research work of Professor Elton Mayo and his colleagues at the Western Electric Company's plant in U.S.A, between 1924 and 1932 and this work has been known as the Hawthorne experiment (Robbins and Coulter, 2009; Mullins, 2011). According to Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), both of whom were part of the Hawthorne set of experiments, the research centered on the effects of physical working conditions on worker productivity and efficiency. The researchers concluded that additional concern given to the workers, and evident interest in them shown by management, were the core factors for the higher productivity. This, according to Mullins (2011) has become known as the 'Hawthorne Effect'.

The Neo-Human Relations (Behavioural) Approach

The result of the Hawthorne experiment led to more interest from researchers in the social sciences with background in sociology, psychology and anthropology, and they relied on more sophisticated research methods to explain what motivate employees at work. These researchers known as 'behavioural scientists' or 'behaviourists' built the platform for new management theory ideas and a major focus was the adjustment of the employee's complex character within the work organisation (Stoner et al., 2004; Mullins, 2011; Lawal, 2012). Contributors to this approach, according to Mullins (2011) are Abraham Maslow, Douglas McGregor, Frederick Herzberg, Rensis Likert, David McClelland and Chris Argyris.

The Human Relations Approach

This approach developed as a result of the focus on the human side of management and it sought to understand how social and psychological dynamics interacted with the work environment in influencing productivity and performance, thereby creating effective human relations (stoner et al, 2004).

The Hawthorne Experiment

The human relation approach, which is sometimes referred to as the neo-classical approach, is built around the research work of Elton Mayo and his colleagues the western Electric company's plant in U.S.A, between 1924 and 1932 and his work has been known as the Hawthorne experiment (Robbins and Coulter, 2009; Mullin,2011).

According to Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), both of whom were part of the Hawthorne set of experiments, the research centered on the effects of physical working conditions on worker productivity and efficiency. The researchers concluded that additional concern given to workers, and evident interest in them shown by management, were the core factors for the higher productivity. This, according to Mullins (2011) has become known as the 'Hawthorne Effect'.

The Systems Approach

The classical approach was concerned about the organisation, structure and productivity while the human relations approach was concerned about people, satisfaction and relationships.

However, the systems approach attempts to strike a balance between these two earlier approaches and it persuades managers to see the organisation both as a whole and as part of a larger environment (Mullins, 2011). The systems approach sees the organisation as an interdependent, unified system composed of interrelated sub-systems or parts, rather than separate entities (Stoner et al., 2004). According to Mullins (2011), the systems theory was first used in the physical and natural sciences by a biologist named Ludwig Von Bertalanffy but the subject has been developed by other contributors, especially Chester Barnard and Mary Parker Follet (Lawal, 2012). A system is defined as an established arrangement of parts that are interrelated and interdependent for the purpose of accomplishing particular or predetermined objectives (Jones and George, 2003). A typical organisation as a system will usually have such sub-systems (departments) as production, marketing, finance, sales, accounts and operations or customer service.

The Contingency Approach

Previous management theories and approaches assumed that their principles or processes were universally applicable in managing organisations. It was later discovered that the opposite is exactly the case. A small organisation, for instance, will require a different approach compared to a large and complex organisation (Robbins and Coulter, 2009). The contingency approach, which is sometimes called the situational approach, arose as a result of this and those who argue in favor of this approach affirm that there is no best management approach and 'it depends' on the circumstances or situation. Managers should take so many factors of the present situation into account (contingencies), before making a decision and they should act on those parts that are crucial to the situation (Cole, 2004; Mullins 2011). According to Robbins and Coulter (2009), the popular contingency variables to consider when faced with different situations are environmental uncertainty, organisation's size, routineness of task technology and individual differences.

Era of Dynamic Engagement / Emergent Approaches

Current or Contemporary management approaches have taken over the field of management and managers need to take these approaches into consideration as they strive to excel in the competitive business environment. According to Stoner et al. (2004), human relationships and time are compelling management to alter traditional approaches in the light of steady rapid changes. Due to the flurry of new and emergent management theories, Stoner et al. (2004) refer to it as the era of dynamic engagement and observed six different themes as quality management, inventing and re-inventing organisations, new organisational environments, culture and multiculturalism, ethics and social responsibility, and globalisation and management. Other new approaches identified by Cole (2004) and Lawal (2012) are finding competitive advantage, improving strategic thinking, consumerism, corporate governance, e-business management, entrepreneurship and knowledge management.

Management Experience in Uganda - Historical Perspective

Pre-Colonial Management Practice in Uganda

According to Mofope, 2013 Western scholarly conceptualisation has often implied that indigenous African, like Ugandan management theories and philosophies are at worst, non-existent and at best simply 'underdeveloped'. Thus, there have been an influx of 'developed' management theories into Uganda, which have been detrimental to the development of indigenous Ugandan management theories (Gbadamosi, 2003). Many Ugandan scholars believe this postulation is ridiculous and have attempted to set the record straight by giving details of pre-colonial management practices in Nigeria (Yesufu, 1982; Ubeku, 1983; Ifechukwu, 1994, 2010; Eze, 1995; Osuntokun, 2001; Gbadamosi, 2003; Fashoyin, 2005; Inyang, 2008; George et al., 2012). Prior to the advent of the colonialists, there was a paternalistic employment relations system in place, which was principally based on traditions, culture and agricultural economy of the people. This shows that management practice in Uganda was strong and thriving (Ubeku, 1983; George et al., 2012). It is therefore absolutely incorrect to say there was no management practice in Uganda in the precolonial era, as the erosion of African and Ugandan management thought system was due to the colonial adventure (Osuntokun, 2001).

Management according to Values and Culture

According to Ifechukwu (2010), the management practice in Uganda just like in Nigeria depicted decision-making by consensus and managerial style showed a genuine concern for people and production. This was possible because philosophy and practice was based on Ugandan core values, which are respect for elders and tradition, consensus, co-prosperity or social mutual concern, extended family, paternalism, competition, human relations orientation and hero-worship (Ifechukwu, 2010). These core Ugandan values, including religion as identified by Oghojafor, George and Owoyemi (2012), are observable among all the more than 200 Ugandan ethnic groups, especially the major tribal groups of Baganda, Basoga and Batooro. Effective management and administration could not have been possible in Buganda Kingdom, Busoga Kingdom or Tooro Empire, for example, if there was no application of these core values (Ifechukwu, 1994).

Transfer of Management Practice: Example of the British Voluntarist Employment Relations Practice

According to Adeniyi, 2014 it cannot be emphasized enough that management in Africa, and indeed Uganda, is strongly linked to and rooted in cultural beliefs and traditions. Needless to say colonialism in Uganda disrupted the people's cultural beliefs and traditions, as well as its management philosophies and practices (Eze, 1995; Fashoyin, 2005). Every individual is a product of a particular culture, system and beliefs and such individual will have patterns of thought, feelings and behaviour, which have been acquired or learnt by being a member of a society. This acquisition or learning is done at early childhood because of the inclination to observe, learn and act at that age (Hofstede, 2001). While attempting to explain the meaning of culture, Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) suggested that culture is comparable to the way computers are programmed and described it as the 'software of the mind' or according to Hofstede (2001), the collective programming of the mind. Hofstede (2001) and Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) concluded that these peculiar patterns of thoughts, feelings and actions, which are well 'programmed' in an individual's mind, will have to be unlearned before learning a new and totally different thing. Such was the fate that befell Ugandans when the Colonialists arrived. The imperialists 'forced' Ugandans to 'unlearn' their established patterns and natural way of life since childhood, in order to learn and assimilate their own new patterns and processes, through techniques such as the British Voluntarist Employment Relations Practice. This forced assimilation over many decades, led to a transfer of alien management practices and the gradual decline of indigenous management thoughts and practices (George et al., 2012).

Discussion

Management

In Uganda the spread of various imported theories and approaches to management have been evident and most organizations show adherence to the influence of foreign approach one by one. However, the possibility to see more than one foreign management approach being combined to achieve organizational goals in Islamic University in Uganda.

Scientific Management Approach

A number of higher institutions of learning, Islamic University in Uganda included tend to rely on the ideology of scientific management and customizing it achieve the best out their workers by designing incentive systems which are based on output. A good number of staff of the University earn extra income through excess load payments, supervision of student's research work and Internship. These are targets that must be met for the staff to earn extra and they surely add value to the quality and productivity of the University.

Relevance and Criticisms / Limitations of Scientific Management

As observed by Cole (2004), the rational approach to work by scientific management enables tasks and processes to be measured, it allows workers to be paid by achievements and tasks accomplished, it makes sure each worker earns equitably to work done and it ensures massive increase in productivity. A university staff is required to meet particular targets and this helps him/her to increase his/her productivity. Scientific management writers wrote at a time of industrial reformation and the emergence of large, complex factories with new forms of technology. The main concern was with the efficiency of both workers and management. The scientific management theory has laid the foundation in management theory upon which related thoughts are built (Mullins, 2011). This school of thought is also responsible for the development of a system of wage and incentives via the differential wage payment and bonus system. Despite of increased productivity, this school of thought is criticised for paying little or no attention to workers' welfare. Emphasis was placed on efficiency and production and little focus was on working conditions. This led to the opposition of this approach by workers and labour unions (Stoner et al., 2004). In terms of Islamic University in Uganda, this turns out to be true and it's not surprising that staff at the university are under immense pressure to meet university targets. Its more worrying for many female staff of the university as they have families to run yet they need to work extra hours in order to be able to earn extra income in form of excess load.

Administrative Management Approach

This approach which is based on Fayol's principles, is mostly used by the Uganda police force especially where there is no internal or external aggression or combat. Some of his principles which at a great extent apply to the Uganda Police force include authority, discipline, unity of command, centralization and order.

Relevance and Criticisms / Limitations of Administrative Management

According to Stoner et al. (2004), it was generally believed that managers are born, not made but we have since learnt through this school of thought that management is a skill like any other and can be taught if the underlying principles are understood. Administrative management

has managed to develop basic management processes, procedures and principles which managers can adhere to in order to achieve sound organisational structures and success (Kuye et al., 2010). It turns out to be true about the Uganda Police force as there is basic procedural requirements when one joins the police force to write a statement irrespective of the complaint. According to Kuye et al. (2010), this approach is only suitable for simple and stable organisations and not for today's dynamic and complex organisations. Some of the universal procedures and principles suggested in Administrative Management are also not relevant in some settings. It has to be noted that the reason as to why the Ugandan Police force has evolved over the last decades, it's because this approach suits it as a simple and stable organization.

Bureaucracy Approach

This approach is more prominent in the public sector especially in government ministries, departments and Agencies referred to as civil or public service. All the principles postulated by Max Weber are all present in the public service, including "maintenance of formal written documents and extensive filing systems" as observed by Adebakin, Gbadamosi and Akpor-Robaro (2010:441).

Relevance and Criticisms / Limitations of Bureaucratic School

It is evident that in organizations bureaucracy takes the lead in aiding specialization of structures and ensures the predictability and stability.

Many of the large and complex modern organisations have had more need for Weber's bureaucratic principles (Lawal, 2012). When it comes to Uganda, almost all large organization especially reputable Universities such as Islamic University in Uganda practice one form of bureaucracy or the other. Green (1997) argues that there is still a place for bureaucracy in parts of most large organisations. The use and implementation of tried and tested procedures assist to ensure necessary ideals and ethics, and that necessary functions are implemented on a consistent and fair basis. Without doubt the most criticized of all the classical approach to management is the bureaucratic school.

Argyris (1964) argues that bureaucracies contain the mental growth of the individual and cause feelings of failure, frustration and conflict. Employee initiative may be stifled and there may be a lack of flexibility or adaptation to changing

According to Crozier (1964), bureaucracy implies an organisation that cannot correct its behaviour by learning from its errors because of its rigidity, inflexibility and static format. In his own criticism of Weber's thoughts, Thompson (1961) said it created 'bureaupathology' in organisations. He (1961) believes that bureaucratic structures permit counter-productive personal insecurities to flourish and that the same managers try to protect their authority and position by detached, detrimental behaviour.

Human Relations / Neo-Human Relations Approach

A typical example of human and neo-human relations approach is found in most religious organizations such as Islamic University in Uganda and in most Islamic founded organizations. These theories emphasize informal relationships, communications, uniqueness of individuals and motivation rather than monetary incentives.

Relevance and Criticisms / Limitations of the Human Relations and Neo-Human Relations Approach

The fundamental relevance of the human and neo-human approach is that it recognizes the individuality and uniqueness of each staff of the university and it seeks to understand what motivates staff to achieve more in terms of productivity. Unlike the classical approach which looked at relationship between tasks, jobs and workers from a mechanistic perspective, the neo-human relations approach sees workers as very important organizational resources and emphasizes individual attitude and group processes (Crainer, 1998; Kuye et al., 2010). Another key impact of this theory is that it has led to a change in managers' attitude towards workers.

Instead of coercion, force or intimidation from management and supervisors, many organizations now rely more on language of thanks, appreciation and engagement, as well as improved welfare, recognition and inclusiveness in decision making. In Islamic University in Uganda, emphasis has been to encourage staff to serve God and humanity by becoming workers

The motivation is gradual promotion to become a Fellowship leader, Deacon or Pastor. Most of these 'workers' are not motivated by financial benefits but by opportunities to build informal relationships and become leaders. A major criticism of the human and neo-human relations approach is that it is not accurate or exact about its ability to foretell human behaviour (Kuye et al., 2010). Ethnographers believe people behave differently under certain circumstances and so, behaviour is hard to predict.

Silverman (1970) and Lawal (2012) considered this approach to management to have a unitary frame of reference, narrow organisational perspective, simplistic and insufficient scientific method and over-simplified theories.

Limitations of this study and Areas for Further Research

The attempt in this article was to identify the various management theories practiced in Islamic University in Uganda and it was difficult to get an objective assessment without empirical data and analysis. A study of this nature should go beyond the limits of books, articles, informal group discussions and casual face to face discussions and interviews. Instead, more emphasis can be put on the use of surveys and questionnaires administered on selected organizations, professional managers and staff. This would help in yielding quite interesting findings. It would also be more appropriate to include some selected organizations in future analysis and discover more Ugandan organizations that use all the identified management theories.

The researcher tried to look at the issues as objectively as possible, however the use of interpretivist approach leaves room for bias simply because the observation and construction of phenomena is largely based on opinion of the researcher. This therefore means that irrespective of the fact that the researcher tried to be objective, a little bias due to patriotism for one's country (Uganda) might flock in.

Conclusion

It can be urged that since management actually involves the managing of human resources, financial resources, time resources and material resources, the various approaches to management are actually looking at the same thing but from different perspectives. This is what makes management a complex activity. A dynamic organization in the 21st century involves planning, organizing, motivating, leading and coordinating and once all this is in perspective then it can be concluded that its well managed.

A methodical understanding of the various approaches to management as elucidated above, as well as each theory's limitations and relevance, and how it influences the achievement of organisational goals is imperative for managers. However, due to the fact that every human group in Uganda has evolved different indigenous management practices that is suitable to its environment based on culture, such foreign theories must be placed in Ugandan perspective, that is, consideration for intrinsic socio-cultural factors, if they are to be complied with religiously by workers and accurately effective in achieving set organisational objectives. Irrespective of the adoption of these western approaches by majority of Ugandan organisations, effort must be made like the Japanese, to borrow western technology to accelerate development whilst retaining traditional and cultural values in management (Ifechukwu, 2010). Indigenous management approaches, which are rooted in Ugandan culture and a blend of foreign management approaches should be developed to bring out the best in Islamic University in Ugandan staff.

References

- Adebakin, M.A, Gbadamosi, A. and Akpor-Robaro, O.M. 2010. 'Selected problems of comparative management and administration'. In Ogundele, O.J.K (eds). Comparative management and administration: A book of readings. Lagos: Concept Publications. pp. 437-453.
- Amoah-Mensah, A. 2013. Strategic resources and performance of rural SMEs. *International Journal of Business and Social Research*, 3(4): pp. 106-119.
- Argyris, C. 1964. Integrating the individual and the organization. John Wiley & Sons.
- Black, J. A. and Champion, D. J. 1976. Methods and issues in social research. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cole, G.A. 2004. Management theory and practice, 6th Edition. London: Bookpower/ELST
- Crainer, S. 1998. Key management ideas: Thinkers that changed the management world, 3rd edition. Financial times prentice hall.
- Crozier, M. 1964. The bureaucratic phenomenon. London: Tavistock
- Daft, R. L. 1986. Organizational theory and design, 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ember, C. R. and Levinson, D. 1991. The substantive contributions of worldwide cross-cultural studies using secondary data. *Behavior Science Research*, 25(1-4): pp 79-140.
- Eze, N. 1995. Human resource management in Africa: Problems and solutions. Lagos: Zomex Press.
- Fashoyin, T. 2005. Management in Africa. *Lagos Organization Review*, 1(1): pp 43-45.
- Gbadamosi, G. 2003. HRM and the commitment rhetoric: Challenges for Africa. *Management Decision*, 41(3): pp 274-280.
- Geertz, C. 1973. 'Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture'. In Geertz, C. (ed) *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books. pp. 3-30

George, O., Kuye, L. and Onokala, U. 2012. Culture and management practices are siamese twins: The case of employee relations practice in Nigeria (Cadbury Nigeria Plc) and the United Kingdom (Cadbury Worldwide UK). *Business and Management Review*, 2(2): pp 9-22

George, O., Owoyemi, O. and Kuye, L. 2012. Impact of Hofstede's (1980, 2001) 'Software of the mind' on the transfer of management practices: The case of the transfer of the British voluntarist employment relations practice to Nigeria. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 3(4): pp. 56-64

Green, J. 1997. Is bureaucracy dead? Don't be so sure. *Chartered Secretary*, January ed., pp. 18-19.

Griffin, R.W. 1993. *Management*. London: Houghton-Mifflin Company.

Hick, H.G. and Gullet, C.R. 1981. *Manangement*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Hofstede, G. and

Hofstede, G. J. 2005. *Cultures and organizations, software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Ifechukwu, J.A.O. 1994. *Business management: Principles and practice*, 2nd ed. Lagos. pp. 77-78.

Ifechukwu, J.A.O. 2010. *African approach to management: Notes Toward a Theory*. Lagos.

Inyang, B. J. 2008. The challenges of evolving and developing management indigenous theories and practices in Africa. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 3(12): 122-132

Jones, G.R. and George, J.M. 2003. *Contemporary management*. London: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Koontz, H. and O'Donnell, C.O. 1980. 'Management'. In Hicks, H.G. and Gullet, C.R. *Manangement*, New York: McGraw-Hill. pp. 9-10

Kuye, O.L., Gbadamosi A. and Adeoye A.O. 2010. 'Theories of comparative management'. In Ogundele, O.J.K (eds). *Comparative management and administration: A book of readings*. Lagos: Concept Publications. pp 71-87.

Lawal, A.A. 2012. *Management in focus*. Lagos: Sahanit Nigeria Limited.

McFarland, D. 1970. *Management : Foundations and principles*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

McGregor, D. 1987. *The human side of enterprise*. Penguin.

Miner, J. B. 1980. *Theories of Organizational Behaviour*, Dryden Press.

Mullins, L.J. 2011. *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*, 3rd Edition. Prentice Hall. Financial Times. pp. 41-76

Oghojafor, B., George, O. and Owoyemi, O. 2012. Corporate governance and national culture are siamese twins: The case of Cadbury (Nigeria) Plc. *International Journal of Business and Social Scienc*, 3(15): pp. 269-278.

Osuntokun, J. 2001. Some thoughts on traditional African idea of management. *The Journal of Cultural Studies*, 3(1): pp. 99-107.

Rieder, J. 1985. *Canarsie: The Jews and Italians of Brooklyn against liberalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Robbins, S.P. and Coulter, M. 2009. *Management, custom ed*. New York: Pearson

Roethlisberger, F. J. and Dickson, W. J. 1939. *Management and the worker*. Harvard University Press.

Roth, W.D. and Mehta, J.D. 2002. The Rashomon effect: Combining positivist and interpretivist approaches in the analysis of contested events. *Sociological Methods Research*, 31, pp. 131-173.

Silverman, D. 1970. *The theory of organisations*, Heinemann.

Skipton, M. 1983. *Management and the organisation*. *Management Research News*, 5(3): pp. 9-15.

Stewart, R. 1999. *The reality of management*, 3rd edition, Butterworth-Heinemann.

- Stoner, J. 1978. Management. New York: Longman Publishers.
- Stoner, J.A.F, Freeman, R.E. and Gilbert, D.R. 2004. Management, 6th edition. India: Pearson.
- Thompson, V. 1961. Modern Organization. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Ubeku, A.K. 1983. Industrial relations in developing countries: The case of Nigeria. London: Macmillan Press.
- Weber, M. 1947. The theory of social and economic organisation. The Free Press.
- Wehrich, H. and Koontz, H. 1993. Management: A global perspective, 10th ed. McGraw Hill Inc.
- Yesufu, T. M. 1982. The dynamics of industrial relations: The Nigerian experience. Ibadan: University Press Limited.
- Zikmund, Z. 1984. Symmetry of domain pairs and domain twins. Journal of Physics, 34(9): pp. 932-949.