Governance Models in Higher Education Institutions

Kakembo Aisha Annet

Faculty of Education, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Governance in higher education institutions (HEIs) is a complex, contested, and evolving domain shaped by political, economic, cultural, and historical contexts. This paper examines the diverse models of governance implemented globally, assessing their effectiveness, stakeholder participation, legal frameworks, and adaptation to local conditions. It investigates the shift from traditional and hierarchical models to participatory and relational governance systems, reflecting broader socio-political dynamics. Through comparative analysis and case studies, the paper identifies key challenges in governance transformation, particularly in post-colonial and developing contexts such as South Africa. The study emphasizes that governance is neither static nor universally applicable; rather, it requires context-sensitive strategies rooted in inclusivity, accountability, and institutional responsiveness. The future of HEI governance demands a balance between global trends and local realities to create structures that are democratic, equitable, and capable of supporting academic and societal advancement.

Keywords: Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), Governance Models, Institutional Effectiveness, Stakeholder Participation, Comparative Governance, Legal Frameworks, Africentric Governance.

INTRODUCTION

No institution can fully escape contestation over its governance mode; they are shaped by their political and economic contexts, influencing their missions and actions. Prevailing models of governance reflect broad ideological trends across regions. Contestation has highlighted the inadequacies of merging 'democratic' and 'quasi-democratic' models, leading to alternatives that better address these issues. The ideals of good governance vary widely depending on perspective, revealing unique challenges in governing higher education institutions. Even those founded on democratic principles do not guarantee acceptance of democratic governance. In democracies, higher education remains a contested arena among actors with differing values and motives. The discussion focused on governance contestation styles, including communication methods varying from direct to covert, and how terminology can hold different meanings for different actors, affecting contestation outcomes. Ultimately, these factors arise from specific political and economic contexts. Globally, the contentious nature of governance in higher education shows that the resulting governance is shaped not by chance or idealization, but by ongoing struggles among competing interests and values [1, 2].

Historical Perspectives on Governance Models

In considering governance models, it is important to acknowledge that these models are not static, but evolve over time. Defined as "the way in which a city or institution is governed," the term governance originates from the Latin word gubernare meaning "to steer or direct." In providing direction, governance delineates the goals, concrete structures and mechanisms related to management of a higher education institution. Subordinate concepts in governance models are management and leadership, which are interrelated. However, management and leadership do not overlap with governance. The term 'institution' generally denotes an academic institution at higher education level. The private or public status of such institutions is not regarded as relevant in this study, although each status has its distinct governance processes. Academic institutions are established on the basis of a charter or license, issued by the appropriate authority. This charter, normally an official document, grants the institutional governance body its full powers, defines objectives and knowledge, research and community outreach

focus in a broad sense, and indicates general characteristics of governance models, structure and size. Governance models are underpinned by laws, rules, and regulations. Historical governance developments must be highlighted when considering contemporary and future governance models in higher education institutions. The following sections will elaborate on how these developments may have influenced the shape and form of present-day governance processes and will highlight governance processes that are unique to higher education institutions. The first section will highlight the international perspective, in terms of historical perspectives on governance theory, models, and processes. This will be followed by a South African perspective, differentiating between historical governance developments and contemporary governance issues. In this respect, an attempt will be made to identify common South African governance challenges that may be informed by international developments [3, 4].

Types of Governance Models

An important issue in HE is the kind of governance model that best suits a particular environment and the type of institutions present in that environment. The difference in governance models worldwide could be ascribed to various factors. Since Europe was the cradle of the founding of universities, variants of the medieval university governance models, with appropriate adaptations, still being used today, are found there. Hence, the influence of centuries of historical or cultural (including artistic and architectural) developments, monarchical and ecclesiastical backgrounds, the formation of nation states, and later democratic parliamentary institutions. North America, on the other hand, was influenced more by the civil rights movements, English traditions, pre-colonial governance structures, and similar "new world" developments. Hence, the difference in philosophical and governance perspectives. The former is dominated more by "law", "process," and "policy", while the latter presents a more pragmatic "outcomes" approach, with greater emphasis on systems, people, and their interaction. It is often argued that a one-to-one relationship with Western models would have no positive impact on African institutions. The need for indigenous knowledge systems precludes the implementation of governance models developed elsewhere. Whatever their origins, they would need to be adapted to the specific culture, religion, history, economy, geographic location, properties, organization, and environment of their stakeholders (attitudinal) context. There is an urgent need to reverse the exodus and to employ Africentric leadership styles characterised by stewardship, co-leadership, and service to others [5, 6].

Stakeholder Roles in Governance

This section examines the roles of stakeholders in HEI governance and their interactions within governance mechanisms. It assesses whether the governance model is multi-stakeholder or hierarchical, focusing on the interests and obligations of key groups such as government, councils, management, academic staff, and students. While all stakeholder groups have interests in academic governance, their levels of involvement vary, and not all interests may be equally represented. Some governance models have significant shortcomings and fail to address the academic challenges faced by institutions. The vision for a more representative and democratic governance structure remains underdeveloped, leading to imperfect governance in many HEIs. This imperfection manifests as either unrepresentative structures that inhibit stakeholder participation or governance designs that exclude academic communities. Concerns persist that government priorities dominate these processes. Since HEIs are not businesses, their governance must reflect their status as communities and how they interact with public interests. Hence, academic governance is shaped by the unique context of HEIs [7, 8].

Legal Frameworks Governing Higher Education

In recent years, different governance models have emerged in higher education systems across the world, along with the evolution of several new and emerging global trends affecting higher education. The varied population of students, the strength of civil society and democracy, the growth of private higher education, the inclination to instrumentalism, the embrace of commercialisation in higher education, and ever-optimistic views about new technologies to widen access to higher education have produced diverse governance models around the globe. Countries have now moved outside the comfort and safety of their inherited governance structures. Developments affecting higher education systems have proceeded in various, and with some exceptions, unexpected and unprecedented directions. Unswerving ideologies have almost vanished; policies on higher education, government institutions and hence governance have changed dramatically; an ever-growing number of players are involved in the design of governance for the sustenance and reproduction of these systems; and, in many countries, governance is now too far going to be reconstructed to efficiently service its higher education system. While expectations from studies on governance models in higher education will generally be advantages arising from students, they could also marginalize countries, jeopardize government institutions, and weaken government as a provider of national identity formation and robustness, and weaken civil society. A coherent and

comprehensive understanding of national higher education governance structures and how the social dynamics around them affect those structures and their output should take place as a priority. Within specific historical and social contexts, insights on typical evolution paths of governance structures in higher education systems in the world's countries should be sought [9, 10].

Impact of Governance on Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional governance is crucial for assessing the effectiveness of higher education institutions (HEIs). Researchers often inquire if governance structures are effective and fulfilling their purpose. However, vague definitions of institutional governance and effectiveness complicate these assessments. While scrutiny of governance in HEIs is increasing, systematic research on current governance practices and alternative structures is lacking. Institutional effectiveness, however, is understood in a narrower context, reflecting the alignment between various actors' aspirations and the adherence to rules and regulations governing governance processes. Effective governance encompasses social capital, partnerships, and accountability, aiming to achieve institutional goals properly. Successful school reform hinges on transforming institutional governance, which encompasses the norms, rules, and regulations that dictate governance structures. These can be formal (codified regulations) or informal (understood practices). Formal governance evolves slowly, often resisting change, while informal governance is more adaptable but can lead to inefficiencies or misuse. In the early development of HEIs, the lack of formal governance stunted their growth, highlighting the necessity of structured governance. However, the rise of formal governance led to rigidity and bureaucracy, making institutional governance less responsive to societal needs. This evolution necessitates the transformation of HEIs into more responsive entities. The impact of governance models on institutional effectiveness emphasizes the importance of revisiting foundational principles in national investments in higher education [11, 12].

Comparative Analysis of International Governance Models

Governance models of higher education institutions (HEIs) around the world differ widely, driven mainly by their historical, socio-economic, political, and academic contexts. These models often reflect the degree of autonomy that the education sector enjoys, control over resources, and decision-making structures. For this comparative analysis, the focus is on the widely cited governance models by a predominantly European group of authors, which have been encountered in the literature. As it will be shown, different bureaucratic and managerial styles per governance model should be distinguished as well. As a way of introduction, the three dominant governance models as constructed by a predominate group of European scholars, namely: (1) the Anglo-American model or University of Cambridge tradition (2) the Continental European model or Prussian tradition, and (3) the Southern European model or Catholic University of Bologna tradition. Situated in the background of the latter models, the peripheral governance structures of higher education in the 4) former Soviet bloc or (8) reformist Korean tradition and the research and export-driven 'Chungho' model in (5 Taiwan-University of Canada tradition are described. For many developing countries, effective governance of higher education is an important precondition for further economic growth and social development. Insights into the HE governance structures and roles of the various stakeholders in established HE systems, such as those of the US and Australia, may stimulate domestic reforms, as will be illustrated for the cases of China and South Africa. In turn, insights into country-specific governance configurations, structures, and roles of the actors involved in dealing with the increasing demands for accountability may be useful for reviewing the governance arrangements and reporting procedures in the US and elsewhere. The widely cited governance models of higher education institutions (HEI) around the world exhibit vast differences, which are mainly attributable to their historical, socio-economic, political and academic contexts. These models often reflect the degree of autonomy that the education sector enjoys, control over resources, and decision-making structures [13, 14].

Challenges In Higher Education Governance

The comparative analysis of governance models in higher education institutions shows the radical difference between the Swedish and South African (SA) post-1994 experiences. These differences can be highlighted as follows: a) the different articulations of the right to higher education in the SA and Swedish constitutions and their convergence or non-convergence; b) different legislative and regulatory systems; c) different funding models; and d) the different historical experiences regarding the purpose of higher education. South Africa and Sweden serve as examples of two divergent governance models in higher education institutions. The Swedish model is a traditional public higher education system, while the SA model represents a developing country with a struggling public education system. Due to historical systematic inequities, SA has been challenged to deliver universal public services to its population and to redress these inequities in a historically divided society. The SA twin of socio-economic

justice and reconciliation poses unique challenges for the higher education system. Many countries, especially developing countries, experience both challenges and opportunities in governance and democratic transformation as a result of rapid political changes. Public higher education systems in these countries often have inherited political alignment and inequities, and strong affiliation to certain languages, cultures, and religions. In these systems, ways are sought to establish public higher education institutions that will serve all sections of society and be seen as fair by all. In these countries, the use and purpose of higher education is a topic of political debate, and the type and scope of public higher education systems in these countries are the subject of intense political scrutiny [15, 16].

Future Trends in Governance Models

In addition to international trends in higher education, some peculiar South African trends on governance models in HIE are noted. The redesign of governance structures has resulted in reduced governance power for Senate. There is a need for harmonization of formal governance reforms and tacit organizational governance patterns. There is a higher risk of cultural matching between internal governance institutions than between external governance institutions. A culture of managerialism in HIE has undermined the ability of middle management and governance actors to access and meaningfully contribute to governance processes. Even though they are crucial for good governance, they feel vulnerable, demotivated, and exploited. The hegemonic influence of dominant decision-makers has gravely undermined collegiality in high-power decisions (such as on mergers or the appointment of VCs). International debates have moved to the second generation of governance discourse, such as relational governance, which focuses on ontology and epistemology, what HIE is, and how its attainment is framed. However, many South African actors still participate in first-generation debates, resorting to prescriptions on governance principles, which are of limited local relevance. Governance principles require consideration of their local meaning and relevance. If improperly framed to accommodate local conditions, prospects of good governance can be undermined, especially if measures are based on the false assumptions that they enable compliant conformity and can be applied 'straight off the shelf,' without thoughtful consideration of context. With regards to 'strengthening' governance structures, actors rate their opportunities of influence positively on average, but dissatisfaction with the probability of effective governance is substantial. Governance restructuring can give the illusion of a designed future and increased decision-making input, but it can also lead to a 'loss of voice' where actors are curbed from engaging in governance-related activities altogether [17, 18].

Case Studies of Successful Governance Models

This exploration defines effective governance models in research universities, detailing their essential characteristics and showcasing admirable examples. The focus is on illustrating successful governance rather than reviewing alternatives, recognizing institutional diversity. Various governance models emerge from four ideal types, emphasizing good governance discussion rather than prescriptive replication. Successful models prioritize the common good, acknowledging interdependence with society while maintaining their intellectual mission. Key elements of effective governance include inclusive annual dialogues that broaden participation, with public reasoning distinctive to each institution. Authority exercised by governing bodies is accountable to the academic community yearly, with self-reviews assessing institutional priorities, duties, and accountability. Governance is rarely viewed as an oversight challenge by external authorities like national governments, yet such models should be publicly maintained, steering educational institutions. Accountability and consequences for governance abuse must be enforced; otherwise, these models become illusory. External authorities must provide governance models, limited to the intended institutions, understanding that the discussed characteristics are not absolute but exist in varying degrees across universities. Institutions can enhance their governance by acknowledging implementable aspects, leading to progress. While recognizing existing strengths, it is important to understand that further advancement remains achievable in effective governance practices [19, 20].

Best Practices in Governance

A major issue with current theories of regime change is their tendency to be overly broad or excessively specific, limiting their applicability to particular cases. Recent governance structures have emerged around three modes that represent a continuum for various regimes—a governance thermometer. More democratic forms arise when histories of principled, passionate, and compassionate governance are prevalent. It is assumed that certain governing actors aim to manage a democratic process within a South African higher education institution. Current governance measures highlight dangers and responses. In South African universities, academics are governed by an executive committee and various committees. A significant threat to academic governance is the recent co-option of a senior scholar by the Vice

Chancellor for compliance. Defensive actions have included organizing academic meetings to show unity and scrutinizing positions on governance, signaling a need for a sustainable alternative governance model. Historically, processes ensuring institutional compliance involved careful negotiation, were broadly understood, and didn't necessitate drastic actions for checks and balances. There's a pressing need for an overarching model to create viable alternatives and restore proper governance processes [21, 22].

CONCLUSION

The governance of higher education institutions is not merely an administrative or managerial concern—it is fundamentally political and deeply contextual. As this study has shown, no single governance model can be universally applied across all institutional or national contexts. Historical legacies, stakeholder dynamics, socio-political structures, and cultural values play critical roles in shaping governance structures and their effectiveness. Comparative insights reveal the diversity of governance traditions and their variable outcomes, highlighting the importance of adapting models to specific environments. In particular, the South African experience underscores the challenges of reconciling inherited structures with democratic aspirations and inclusive participation. Moving forward, the focus must shift toward relational and context-sensitive governance that prioritizes accountability, inclusivity, and alignment with institutional missions. Future reforms should not be rooted in prescriptive templates but in reflective, participatory processes that acknowledge local needs and global aspirations. Only through such balanced approaches can HEIs evolve into more just, resilient, and effective institutions.

REFERENCES

1. Kruck A, Heinkelmann-Wild T, Daßler B, Hobbach R. Disentangling institutional contestation by established powers: Types of contestation frames and varying opportunities for the re-legitimation of international institutions. Global Constitutionalism. 2022 Jul;11(2):344-68. cambridge.org
2. Lange T, Villarreal PA, Bärnighausen T. Counter-contestation in global health governance: The WHO and its member states in emergency settings. Health Policy. 2023 May 1;131:104756.
3. Amaral A, Jones GA, Karseth B. Governing higher education: Comparing national perspectives. Governing higher education: National perspectives on institutional governance. 2002;2:279-98.
4. García-Peñalvo FJ. Avoiding the dark side of digital transformation in teaching. An institutional reference framework for eLearning in higher education. Sustainability. 2021 Feb 13;13(4):2023.
5. Ahmed G, Al Amiri N. the Transformational Leadership of the Founding Leaders of the United Arab Emirates: Sheikh Zayed Bin Sultan Al Nahyan and Sheikh Rashid Bin Saeed Al Maktoum. International Journal of Technology Innovation and Management (IJTIM). 2022 May 25;2(1). gaftim.com
6. Rachmad YE. The Governance of Shared Responsibility: A Philosophical Approach. The United Nations and The Education Training Centre. 2023 Apr 11.
7. Mohamed Hashim MA, Tlemsani I, Matthews R. Higher education strategy in digital transformation. Education and Information Technologies. 2022 Apr;27(3):3171-95. springer.com
8. Imran R, Fatima A, Salem IE, Allil K. Teaching and learning delivery modes in higher education: Looking back to move forward post-COVID-19 era. The International Journal of Management Education. 2023 Jul 1;21(2):100805. nih.gov
9. Zhang L, Carter Jr RA, Qian X, Yang S, Rujimora J, Wen S. Academia's responses to crisis: A bibliometric analysis of literature on online learning in higher education during COVID-19. British Journal of Educational Technology. 2022 May;53(3):620-46. nih.gov
10. Akour M, Alenezi M. Higher education future in the era of digital transformation. Education Sciences. 2022 Nov 4;12(11):784.
11. Abdelaziz S. The relation between good governance and improving performance in the higher education-HE-Institutions. Business and Management Studies. 2022;8(2):24.
12. Alenezi M. Digital learning and digital institution in higher education. Education Sciences. 2023 Jan 13;13(1):88.
13. Divjak B, Rienties B, Iniesto F, Vondra P, Žižak M. Flipped classrooms in higher education during the COVID-19 pandemic: findings and future research recommendations. International journal of educational technology in higher education. 2022 Feb 28;19(1):9. springer.com
14. Eager B, Brunton R. Prompting higher education towards AI-augmented teaching and learning practice. Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice. 2023 Aug;20(5):1-9. open-publishing.org

15. Figueiró PS, Neutzling DM, Lessa B. Education for sustainability in higher education institutions: A multi-perspective proposal with a focus on management education. Journal of Cleaner Production. 2022 Mar 10;339:130539.

16. Al-Rahmi AM, Al-Rahmi WM, Alturki U, Aldraiweesh A, Almutairy S, Al-Adwan AS. Acceptance of mobile technologies and M-learning by university students: An empirical investigation in higher education. Education and Information Technologies. 2022 Jul;27(6):7805-26. researchgate.net

17. Salazar JM, Parcerisa L, Villalobos C. UNESCO's Global Governance in the School Education: A Scoping Review. Revista Española de Educación Comparada. 2025 Jan(46):343-64. researchgate.net

18. Abedin WA, Coulibaly BS, Ghanem HA, Prasad E, Uy MA. Reforms for a 21st century global financial architecture. Special report. 2024 Apr 8.

19. Meuleman L. Public administration and governance for the SDGs: Navigating between change and stability. Sustainability. 2021 May 24;13(11):5914.

20. Zygmuntowski JJ, Zoboli L, Nemitz P. Embedding European values in data governance: A case for public data commons. Internet Policy Review. 2021;10(3):1-29.

21. Wessels JS, Sadler E. Conflict of interest: The case of a non-decision-making committee at a South African public higher education institution. The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa. 2021 Jun 28;17(1):12. td-sa.net

22. Arowosegbe JO. African universities and the challenge of postcolonial development. Africa. 2023 Dec;93(5):591-614.

CITE AS: Kakembo Aisha Annet (2025). Governance Models in Higher Education Institutions. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, 7(2):110-115