

Bureaucracy Turned Botswaucracy? How Bureaucracy Is Abused in Educational Organisations in Botswana

Dama Mosweunyane

Department of Adult Education, University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana
Email: mosweunyane@mopipi.ub.bw

Received February 5th, 2013; revised March 13th, 2013; accepted March 20th, 2013

Copyright © 2013 Dama Mosweunyane. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Bureaucracy is the most important concept that has received prominence and used in most organisations in the world. In this paper it is argued that the concept is often abused by organisations, since it is not always followed strictly by those who claim to employ it in their organisational operations. In Botswana it would be argued in this paper that Bureaucracy has characterised most educational entities, but most often with disturbing flaws resulting from varying applications of the concept that are not influenced by what Max Weber prescribed. The emphasis in the paper is to demonstrate that there is a strong and unrelenting departure from the original conceptual base by educational organisations in Botswana, which falsify the concept. In some of the educational institutions in Botswana the concept is treated as home-grown than as exotic, and yet that position is not often pronounced explicitly to reflect the cultural influences that accompany bureaucracy in the Botswana context. The paper argues that if bureaucracy could be implemented by educational organisations in the way that Max Weber who is its founder prescribed, it would produce desired results such as the rising of productivity and professionalism within educational organisations in Botswana. The paper will further argue that what is referred to as bureaucracy within educational organisations in Botswana can best be termed Botswaucracy, which refers to Bureaucracy that has been customised or corrupted for use in Educational organisations in Botswana.

Keywords: Botswaucracy; Bureaucracy; Education; Efficiency; Productivity; Organisations

Introduction

Bureaucratic model is often abused by educational organisations in Botswana, which makes it not a panacea for addressing problems that they face, such as low productivity amongst the educationists and low performance by students. It is important to note that leaders in the education sector in Botswana often display autocratic tendencies and take unilateral decisions for their selfish ends that disadvantage their subordinates, claiming to be guided by the concept of bureaucracy. This confirms to be true the point raised by (Moyo, 1992: p. 21) that, modern history has shown that totalitarian regimes can easily avail themselves of the bureaucratic machine with tragic results. It has to be noted that the concept of bureaucracy which was comprehensively developed by the German Lawyer and sociologist, Max Weber (1864-1920) as noted by (Dale, 2000), has been misinterpreted both politically and by educational organisations, resulting in the concept failing to reform and strengthen educational and political organisations.

There is a very important point to be made here. Bureaucracy in educational organisations in Botswana has not responded accordingly even when it had become clear that there was a need for commercialisation of the education sector in the country. The quantification of work performance lagged behind, which made it difficult for educational organisations to appraise

their performances effectively and notice the negative effects caused by the exclusion of the junior staff members in the decision making processes in the education sector. This was partly due to what Mises as cited by Coyne (2008: p. 12) observed when the author averred that, government bureaucracies, which are non-profit by their very nature are unable to engage in economic calculations and therefore suffer from significant inefficiencies.

It has to be emphasized that bureaucracy has also served the pseudo democratic regime in Botswana, which is aristocratic, to foster agendas characterized by malversation or corruption for the benefit of a certain dominant clique. It has to be stated that due to non to less participation of some educationists in the decision making processes bureaucracy became most unpopular. This is partly because the exclusion of some educationists is informed by the unwillingness to release some vital information by their superiors for productivity to be enhanced.

As defined by Weber as cited by (Morphet, Johns, & Reller, 1982; Kamenka, 1989; Nutt & Backoff, 1992) bureaucracy is a pyramidal and hierarchical organizational structure, in which all power for making decisions flows from super ordinates to subordinates. It is important to note that the pyramidal and hierarchical nature of the concept had often been interpreted to mean that it should be abused by those in authority by denying their subordinates knowledge. This arrangement often generates

disgruntlement of some educationists because according to Wren, (1994: p. 8) why humans have survived is found in their ability to communicate and engage in group activities that require a marked degree of planning, cooperation, and coordination.

It is on the basis of militating against what Wren stated that bureaucracy in Botswana has not produced desired results in the education sector, but instead lessened the civility of the people within educational organisations by regarding them as less able to reason, think conceptually and communicate effectively. The students in tertiary institutions like in the Universities in Botswana, in most cases do not get involved in the decision making processes even on matters that directly affect them and decisions that are made are hardly ever communicated effectively. This is despite having structures like Student Representative Councils (SRCs), which are supposed to promote communication within their institutions. The rigidity which is unpopular with most people in the education sector in Botswana has often been correctly associated with bureaucracy. It is however the inconsistencies in applying the rules that render bureaucracy less favourable. The Bureaucrats are widely viewed as impartial, even omniscient, servants of the public good (Rowley, 2005: p. ix). This means they should not depart from taking any action that would add value on the organisation because Bureaucracy should at the end of the day benefit the organisations. Sticking to the dictates of bureaucracy in the manner that defeat the purpose for which the organisations exists cannot be condoned.

This paper will examine the main areas of bureaucracy to establish how they were negatively affected by the falsification and mortification of the concept in Botswana education sector.

Bureaucratic Flaws

The bureaucratic model as developed by Marx Weber as cited by (Elwell, 1996), provides an ideal type for managing educational organizations which are built around the following guiding principles:

- Written rules and official records
- Hierarchy
- Impersonality
- Promotion based on achievement
- Specialized division of labour
- Efficiency

It is to be noted that due to the aforementioned guiding principles, bureaucracy is supposed to be implemented to foster productivity within organisations, including those that provide training such as schools. This means even where the concept gets modified to become more accommodative and receptive to demands, feelings and aspirations of employees, productivity should remain at the centre of any such action.

Bureaucracy should be employed as a germane model that can enhance the industriousness and harmony within educational organizations in Botswana. It should therefore be implemented with the view and understanding that it should avoid procrastination that affects the delivery of services. It should be employed to remove the barriers that are usually associated with it, such as those that have negatively affected investment in countries like Uganda (Wiegratz, 2009: p. 231). In Uganda for instance, Bureaucracy is often blamed for the delays that occur, which hamper investment in the educational sector of that country. It is important to state that the misconception of

associating the concept with procrastination is widespread amongst educational institutions, which are supposed to demonstrate the effectiveness of the concept. There is a strong perceived failure of the educational systems to be responsive, effective and efficient (Lawton et al., 1995: p. 22). This situation is often blamed on Bureaucracy, and yet the concept is not supposed to condone sluggishness and unproductive behaviour within organisations.

The most common problem associated with bureaucracy in Botswana is procrastination, which results in the denial of deserving population the necessary services that are supposed to come from educational organisations. In the educational organizations, such as secondary schools, it is often employed to make it difficult for the disgruntled workers and students to assess justice and fairness to tackle irrationality by superiors who autocratically impose their own non official decisions on their subordinates. This is because of the emphasise of bureaucracy on the hierarchy, which often makes it difficult for workers and students who are lowly placed to meet their senior officials who are in the zenith of the hierarchy. This often results in disgruntled workers not working productively, which undermines the bureaucratic dictate that advocates for the use of the hierarchy in promoting productivity.

The other problem associated with bureaucracy is the influence of politicians in the running of educational organizations in Botswana. This infiltration often undermines formalization of organizational processes and promotes sycophancy and the use of educational organizations to fulfil political agendas. For instance, schools and universities are often used by political elements to promote their political agendas, which sometimes result in disruption of classes due to strikes. In some instances, leaders of educational organisations, such as school heads, are not appointed on merit but on their affiliation to the ruling party. It is important to note that some adjustments to the concept are not always done in the interest of the educational organisations and yet bureaucracy is supposed to place organisations first before personal interests at all costs. Some adjustments though falsely referred to as influenced by bureaucracy they are politically motivated. This resonates with what (Jreisat, 1997) observed that, the predicament for managers in organizations is how to truly serve professional ethics, efficiency, and effectiveness by avoiding political corruptive influences and erratic as well as turbulent environments.

Written Rules and Official Records

The written rules are sometimes used to make it difficult for the teachers, lecturers, tutors and learners to disseminate knowledge on matters that they are conversant on and yet the rules under the bureaucratic system are not supposed to throttle communication that is necessary for organisational progress. It has to be indicated that bureaucracy can enhance productivity and industriousness, if it is employed with a deliberate aim of applying rules and regulations fairly, without any element of favouritism, nepotism, racism, malversation or any forms of discrimination. It is in most cases what can be blamed on human behaviour within organizations, such as schools and universities, which renders them chaotic structures that operate without reference to written rules. As noted by (Wren, 1994: p. 9), human beings require rules and a means to ensure the viability of organizations and such rules requires workers who fully understand them. That is why it is necessary according to (Canales &

Aguinaga, 1998: p. 1) for the employer to have educated people to ensure that they make sure the regulations are explained thoroughly and followed accordingly.

It has to be noted that the process of educating the employees to comprehend regulations is not always given priority in Botswana's educational organisations, which reinforces the habit of ignoring rules and regulations when taking decisions. Rules are often replaced by the use of discretion by the protagonists within educational organisations in Botswana, which result in unprofessional conduct by unscrupulous individuals who are charged with the responsibility to ensure that regulations and rules are followed.

The excuse that is normally given for side-lining both students and junior members of staff in the decision making process pertaining to the formulation of rules and communicating them is resource constraint or impecuniousness. The bureaucracy is at times used to justify imposition of rules and regulations on those at the bottom of the hierarchy, which in most cases is not done fairly. This compromises standardisation and fairness as well as taking decisions in the best interest of the organisations. For instance, the regulations are sometimes used in the Botswana education sector to compel junior officers who are not wanted in the cities and big villages by their superiors to go and work in less resourced rural areas. This goes against bureaucracy, which is supposed to eliminate any kind of emotional and other personal biases like love, hate and contempt (Ahmed, 1995: p. 20).

The other area where bureaucracy is used to justify imposition in educational organisations in Botswana is in the area of curriculum design. The curricula are usually imposed on the subordinates by their superiors, which allows for the maintenance of an education system that maintain the status quo, so that the rules and regulations benefit those who make them than the educational organisations. As noted by Freire as cited by (Hurtado, 2007: p. 75), it would be naive to think that the dominant classes will create a form of education that allows the dominated classes to critically perceive social injustice. It is important to note that by imposing regulations to serve the interest of a certain class that constitutes a departure from bureaucracy, which should put the interests of the organisations before those of the privileged.

The bureaucratic model should be truly mechanistic as opposed to being organic, which led (Grant, 1999; Wren, 1994; Hawkins & Shohet, 2006) to echo that, bureaucratic organisations should be formalised to eliminate the features that characterise human societies and human behaviour. Due to the rigidity that defines bureaucracy; educational organisations such as schools are supposed to design curricula for enhance learning than to serve the interests of the privileged elite.

It has to be noted that in majority of cases in Botswana educational institutions societal influence is often entertained, which render them less objective. For example, school regulations can be compromised to cater for a student or a teacher who is bereaved, which allows for the use of the discretion of the leader or protagonist. This means similar situations can be dealt with differently, depending on the attitude of the individual in charge of a school or an educational institution.

Part of the problem that is common in Botswana's educational entities is that those people who take management positions in majority of cases do not receive any training to prepare them to actualise theories that are commonly employed, such as bureaucracy. This limitation often results in such officials gen-

erating rules and regulations that present bureaucracy as only characterised by coercion or as punishment centred or deliberately misinterpreting the pillars of the concept. Where elites within the educational entities are comfortable with the use of regulations, they tenaciously hold to them and do not do the same if their interests are jeopardised. This presents the educational organisations in Botswana as inconsistent and sometimes irrational, which is not concomitant with the concept of bureaucracy.

In some situations educational organisations refuse to yield in the use of the regulations blaming that rigidity on bureaucracy, which affects the degree at which educational organisations in Botswana become creative and innovative. It is important to note that under bureaucracy rules and regulations are not supposed to be compromised, but that should be done by experts who are aware of the outcome of such inflexibility. For instance, in Asia, Thailand has managed the bureaucratization of governmental roles and authority, which has allowed for the combined Western forms with conspicuously divergent traditional patterns. Educational organisations in Botswana in majority of cases deviate from bureaucratic prescriptions just like in Thailand, but this is usually by accident because the country does not have its own form of bureaucracy that could be described as traditional or locally brewed. The modifications that are made to the concept are not well guided and are not publicised. It has to be noted that most of the management development programmes are either conducted by foreigners with little understanding of the local contexts, or the trainees are sent abroad where the organisation and managerial contexts are radically different (Kiggundu, 1993: p. 171). It is important to mention that this arrangement has made educational organisations in Botswana less creative and in some cases irrelevant. It is this limitation that is partly responsible for lack of development of germane educational concepts for Botswana and the corruption of exotic concepts.

As stated by (Moorhead & Griffin, 1992: p. 511), it is worth noting that without creativity, organisations would not change, and their employees stagnate. The stagnation of employees and lack of change in organisations should be understood to relate significantly to the development of the educational organisations, which are vehicles through which Botswana can develop. It is indisputable that in a situation where organisations and employees do not devise appropriate strategies that can lead to change within them, development cannot be realised because alterations to the concepts such as bureaucracy will be haphazard and therefore inconsistent. According to Jaques as cited by (Pugh & Hickson, 1989), the organisation and control of bureaucracy can be designed so as to ensure that the consequential effects on behaviour are in accordance with the needs of educational organisations. It has to be admitted that education in Botswana has failed over the years to instil in its recipients the desire to formally change concepts such as bureaucracy. This is the weakness to which the underdevelopment of the education sector in Botswana can be attributed. It has to be admitted that changes on bureaucracy are not meant to benefit educational organisations, but instead are for personal goals, which militates against the motivation that led to the invention of the concept. Bureaucracy within the education sector in Botswana is therefore not ideologically responsive to challenges of transformation of educational organisations.

Bureaucracy and Orthodoxy

It is important not to ignore the Eurocentric and Americo-

centric influences that are conveyed through the organisational rules and regulations in Botswana, and how that contributes towards lack of positive change within the education sector. For instance, despite available evidence pointing to the fact that bureaucratic system started in Africa, African countries like Botswana are failing to modernise and contextualise the concept through its education sector. As pointed out by (Kamenka, 1989: p. 15), the first more stable, consistent and highly elaborate bureaucratic administration is that which governed ancient Egypt. It has to be noted that the Egyptian kind of bureaucracy was characterised by what in the modern day administrative system can easily qualify as corruption. The reason for this is because as observed by (Kamenka, 1989: p. 15), bureaucracy in Egypt emerged out of the royal household and did not display any association to the emergence of the concept. In the early period, high officials were sons, brothers, uncles, nephews and cousins of the king. This can be said to be closely related to what is prevalent within educational organisations in Botswana, which are characterised by favouritism based on corporate incest, nepotism and tribalism.

Bureaucracy in educational organisations in Botswana is also heavily influenced by the existence of informal traditional beliefs and cultural dictates, which are never acknowledged in its implementation. The regulations that govern educational organisations in Botswana ignore the blood relations, ethnic relations and power dynamics that exist within them. For instance, the use of this form of relations often disadvantages the minority groups that do not partake in the formulation of rules and regulations that govern the educational organisations. Basarwa (San or Bushmen) for example, struggle to get employment within the education sector in Botswana because there are dispersed, ill-treated and denigrated, which goes against what bureaucracy advocates for. According to Dale (2000: p. 133) Bureaucracy dictates that recruitment should be done according to professional criteria and impersonal norms. In Botswana as elsewhere in Africa, the educational system is largely incompatible with internal organisational needs (Mengisteab, 1996: p. 16). As much as the regulations provide some legal framework that could be employed to make the workers conform and conduct themselves professionally, they are often abused.

It is important to echo that legislations in the educational sector in Botswana regulations are often used to oppress those who are against sycophancy and ostentation, by those who abuse their power. As we appreciate that existence of regulations and rules can be instrumental in guarding against abuse of power by those in authority, we should also acknowledge that human nature, such as selfishness and hatred has often led to serious disregard for regulations in the education sector in Botswana. The promotions of staff in the education sector in Botswana often benefit those who are keen in maintaining the status quo than those who are creative, which asphyxiates growth. This position resonates well with what (Hooton, 1997) identified as a problem, when the author echoed that bureaucrats are not rewarded for creativity.

Bureaucracy has remained steadfast in undermining any voices of members of the organisations who do not wield power because of their subordinate positions. It has held tenaciously to the prescription that authority and responsibility should flow in a clear unbroken line from the highest executive to the lowest operative in the organisation. This arrangement has made power to be concentrated into the group and into the experts, which raises the important question about whose interests are

being served by the bureaucracy (Jackson, 1982). To answer this question, it is important to acknowledge that most educational organisations in Botswana are used for wealth accumulation by those in power. This includes political maggots that do not directly operate within educational organisations, but plunder resources from such organisations nevertheless. They influence the recruitment procedures so that their family members can benefit from the organisations. It is also this flaw of policies and procedures that continue to benefit the unscrupulous officials through consultancies and procurement tenders for services and products to the educational organisations. The regulations are only used to bar those who are to be ostracised from joining the fleecing clique. It is therefore disturbing that bureaucratic prescriptions are sometimes employed for personal gratification than for the benefit of the organisation.

Hierarchy

The bureaucracy model does advocate for a hierarchical arrangement in organisations, where duties of individual members of the organisation are clearly defined. According to (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979: p. 29) the school organisation has developed a clearly defined and rigid hierarchy of authority. The arrangement does embrace positions that are influenced by power and authority. As reflected upon by Weber as cited by (Morphet, Johns, & Reller, 1982; Hall, 1998) the positions in an organisation are arranged on the principle of office hierarchy and the levels of graded authority. As observed by (Kamenka, 1989; Glassman, Swatos, & Rosen, 1987) bureaucracy, aiming above all at efficiency, takes place on the basis of an impersonal, hierarchical structure of authority and a centrally controlled and supervised delegation of functions. As noted also by Maccoby as cited by (Northouse, 2013), the ideals of the bureaucratic social character are stability, hierarchy and autonomy, organisational loyalty, and striving for excellent. In Botswana the education sector does not always aim for efficiency through the use of hierarchical structures because junior members of staff can wield power that is derived from their social standing, such as their matrimonial relationship with those in power.

The hierarchical arrangement is supposed to entertain planning of activities within the organisation, which gets well supported by use of job descriptions, in which every member of the educational organisation is informed about what the organisation expects him/her to accomplish. The hierarchy should also place at the centre a lot of power and authority in the running of organisations. It should undermine the decentralisation process because the top officials are supposed to remain at the headquarters of educational organisations, which are in the cities. According to (Jacoby, 1973: p. 167) the bureaucracy tends to be concentrated in the capital cities and it represents decided centralist tendencies. The centralisation of authority and power is supposed to beal ways well guarded. However, this does not suggest that educational organisations should abuse this provision and become unproductive, resulting from their disregard for those stakeholders who are not at the centre of the educational hierarchy.

The educational organisations in Botswana use the hierarchical principle to abdicate their responsibilities in the rural schools, which are usually left with less resources, less committed teachers and demotivated learners. There is also lack of participation of some stakeholders, such as the ordinary people in the activities of the education sector in Botswana, which is in

compliance with what bureaucracy dictates. According to (Lewis & Lewis, 1983: p. 76), once the organisation has determined its basic mission, every part of it must be devoted to carrying out the tasks implied. There is no room for activities not related directly and rationally to the key objectives that have been identified by those at the top of the management hierarchy. It is important to note that, centralisation and control that is promoted through bureaucracy is inherent in hierarchy and process (Chambers, 1993: p. 65). In the case of Botswana, it is important to note that educational organisations do often ignore professionalism that is characterised by fulfilment of theoretical prescriptions because corruption sometimes takes precedence over everything else. For example, individual members of society can have much influence in the running of the schools because of their financial support to the schools.

Bureaucracy tends to result in oligarchy or rule by the few officials at the top of the organisation (Elwell, 1999; Mengisteab, 1996). In the case of educational organisations in Botswana it is not always the top officials who decide because power of decision making can be as a result of socio-economic and socio political positions, even of those people who are not education officials.

It is important to note that hierarchical arrangements for the fulfilment of societal tasks exist in Botswana, which is often based on age, socio-economic status and regimental segregation. For example, a son or daughter in most Botswana cultures is not allowed to give orders to his/her mother or father, which in the modern bureaucratic educational organisations is acceptable. The authority and power in modern educational organisations is supposed to be derived from policies and legislations, which are supposed to be followed by members of the organisations and other stakeholders. It has to be indicated that there is a clash when it comes to what the modern educational organisations believe in, as opposed to what is culturally entertained in Botswana traditional settings. For instance, Botswana educational organisations encourage the concomitant absence of a tradition of questioning, which combined with an essential top down traditional culture of acquiescence before one's superiors often undermine authority that is formal or organisational, where a position of authority is held by someone who is traditionally lowly regarded.

The modern organisations have removed the humane element in organisations by making organisations more formal through promoting their adherence to stipulated regulations and legislations. The regulations and legislations are supposed to be enforced by those who are on the top of the organisational hierarchy on their subordinates. It is conspicuous that the fusion of western approaches with Botswana traditional arrangements has not produced the desired results for the educational organisations in Botswana nor to Bureaucracy. This is because there is a deliberate departure from the bureaucratic stipulates, which is echoed by (Deva, 1986: p. M149, who airs that bureaucracy is expected to provide support to the ruling class, politically as well as economically. In the education sector, mostly in universities, bureaucracy is responsible for helping to maintain and legitimise the existing order, not to induce change. This is because educational institutions have ridiculously served to undermine documentation of organisational activities and separation of ownership of the organisations. For instance, an inducement to the education official in Botswana can be read as paying homage, than as an illicit corrupt practice that is punishable by law. So, it can be concluded that to a large extent

bureaucracy have been falsified and/or corrupted.

Impersonality

The strong conviction that Weber as cited by (Elwell, 1999; Martin, Knopoff, & Beckman, 1998) held was the separation of official activities from those that are personal, resulting from the rational legal authority that is anchored in impersonal rules that have been legally established. This means bureaucracy should be characterised by impersonal decisions, based on formal rules that are applied consistently. Emotional expressions are generally discouraged and are usually devalued as irrational. As further noted by (Moorhead & Griffin, 1992), bureaucratization is conceived as the tendency towards the complete achievement of the formal system, which ensures that employees make decisions in the best interest of the organisation rather than for their own interests.

It is important to appreciate the benefits that can be derived from impersonality in the running of the educational organisations in Botswana. It is so because impersonality emphasises standardisation and the use of policies and rules, which can be learnt by the employees. The rules and policies are supposed to provide some degree of objectivity in dealing with matters that affect the organisations, which is supposed to promote productivity. The rules and policies also promote standardisation, which according to (Chambers, 2003: p. 65) has a certain democratic uniformity, in which all are treated fairly. It has to be noted that though educational organisations in Botswana are regarded as bureaucratic, they are not always fair in the treatment of employees and trainees as rules are not always followed. For instance, teachers sometimes use their discretion to alter marks so as to maintain some established pattern. If a school in a rural area was to obtain an outstanding pass rate, such as ninety five (95%), an investigation of leaking of examination papers will be instituted.

The separation of what is official from what is personal, within educational organisations in Botswana, though it could help in curbing abuse of power is not always observed in the bureaucratic sense. As averred by (Moorhead & Griffin, 1992: p. 589), the rights and control of property associated with an office or position belong to the organisation, not to the person who holds the office. Botswana educational organisations do not only experience abuse of power, but that of property as well. For instance, schools buses and chairs can be used in the funeral arrangements of stakeholders, including relatives of senior officials. The use of organisational property is supposed to be characterised by the highest degree of accountability under the bureaucratic arrangement, which is not always observed by educational organisations in Botswana.

The influence of the bureaucratic educational organisations has promoted within them the design of policies to protect organisational properties from unscrupulous officials who may steal from the organisations. Impersonality is also pertinent as it is supposed to allow the organisations such as schools to operate even in situations where authority is delegated, because rules are supposed to be enforced without any personal influence or favour. However, properties belonging to educational organisations in Botswana are sometimes used for non-official functions by those who are supposed to protect them. This is possible because in majority of cases they are no mechanisms to immediately detect such abuse even where the organisations themselves are against it.

In the government schools in Botswana for instance, the financial regulations are supposed to be followed that prescribe how financial resources should be handled, which bars the keeping of money belonging to revenue collectors or their colleagues together with that belonging to the schools. However, schools in Botswana have had cases where some workers were arrested for fleecing money belonging to the schools and other educational institutions. For instance, the workers that are found with money in excess of what they are supposed to be having in their coffers do not always face disciplinary action, which is a departure from what is bureaucratic. As noted by (Heinz-Dieter, 1995), there should be few or no provisions for informal or for dysfunctions that could lead to unanticipated consequences or irrationality within organisations.

It is common within educational organisations for impersonality to be employed to promote rigidity within them, but it will be an exaggeration to believe that impersonality always informs action within educational organisations in Botswana. In the schools for instance, impersonality is sometimes flawed in the interest of stakeholders, such as parents of students, who may be playing an important function as members of the Parents Teachers Associations (PTAs). They are sometimes allowed to use properties belonging to the schools for religious purposes, such as for conducting religious sessions. This compromises accountability, which is important in bureaucracy. There is evidence to suggest that bureaucracy is not only compromised in Botswana educational organisations because as noted by Murphy (2009), there are academics who rail against the oppressive, panoptic can-like nature of accountability, emphasising the debilitating effects of quality assurance mechanisms on academic life. One way out of this impasse is to promote accountability agenda in the context of Max Weber's bureaucracy.

Specialisation and Division of Labour

The specialisation of labour is an important component of bureaucracy, which as defined by (Mondy, Sharplin, & Flippo, 1988; Preston, 1987) means, the division of a complex job into simpler tasks so that a person or group may carry out only identical or related activities. To qualify specialisation as an important ingredient of bureaucracy, (Deva, 1986) indicated that most important strand in the legitimating of bureaucracy is its rationality, which is characterised by the use of specialised knowledge in the place of tradition or charisma. It is further explained by (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983: p. 29) that:

Organisations tasks are distributed among the various positions as official duties, there is a clear-cut division of labour among positions, which makes possible a high degree of specialisation, which in turn promotes expertness among the staff. This also enables the organisation to hire employees on the basis of their technical qualifications.

In the educational organisations in Botswana bureaucracy is used to justify the training of educational personnel in specific subject and has tremendous influence in their posting, transfers and promotions. However, implementation of specialisation in the education system in Botswana has been made to become divisive because educational organisations tend to be more compartmentalised and divided. This is enhanced through some negative behaviour, such as the use of jargon to undermine those who do not belong to a particular field or an area of expertise. For example, experts who are in the pure sciences such

as physics, biology and chemistry have often viewed themselves as more important to the educational organisations than educationists and those professionals in the social sciences. This behaviour is also reinforced by the government through the rewarding of such professionals for what they are, than for the contributions that they make to the educational organisations.

The use of fringe benefits that are drawn from the government, such as scarce skills allowance, serves to paralyse the fragile relationships within and between experts in educational organisations in Botswana.

It is important to note that some educational organisations, such as schools do not in any way promote cooperation or camaraderie through various strategies such as encouraging teachers to work in teams, which results in low performance of schools. It is important to also mention that the training of teachers in specific subjects is not always accompanied by the provision of competencies that promote working harmoniously together. This goes against what bureaucracy is supposed to enhance, which is the achievement of formulated objectives through partnerships where persons relate to each other on fairly equal basis (Dale, 2000: p. 134).

In case of educational organisations in Botswana, problems associated with lack of collaboration are common. These problems are identical with those identified by (Erichsen & Goldenstein, 2011) who pointed out that, collaborative work across disciplines presents challenges, as access to different fields requires engagement in a process of translation, which does not only include consuming knowledge from other fields, but also interacting with other disciplines' cultures and understandings that provide the context for that knowledge.

It is indisputable that professional specialisation leaves the specialist in possession of the necessary knowledge and skill to perform complex and meaningful activities (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983). However, the work of specialists in schools in Botswana can only add value if their work is brought into rational relationship with the work of others. It is important to admit that schools in Botswana operate in a way that reinforce and promote divisions in negative ways than in ways that promote collaboration, achievement of objectives through team efforts and sharing of knowledge by different technocrats and intellectuals.

Efficiency

Efficiency is important for any educational organisation that intends to succeed in its endeavours. This is because according to (Mondy, Sharplin, & Flippo, 1988; Apple, 1990) it is the proportional relationships between the quality and quantity of inputs and the quality and quantity of outputs produced through standardisation of procedures. It can therefore be safely concluded, at least with the influence of aforementioned definition that efficiency is associated with achievement of objectives that is realised through the use of minimal resources. It is in view of the importance of efficiency in organisations that it cannot be ignored if educational organisations are to succeed. Organisations that are focused and guided by the purposes that they are meant to accomplish cannot realise their objectives without attaching value on efficiency.

Despite the importance of efficiency, the word has often in majority of cases attracted mixed sentiments from management experts. As averred by (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983) the mod-

ern organisation is seen by some people as a marvel of accomplishment and efficiency, though others view the same modern organisations as a beast that dehumanises the spirit, cripple creativity, and warps the personality. The latter attribute of modern organisations can be safely attributed to their unwavering desire to achieve the necessary amount of efficiency. It is the desire to realise efficiency that has often provoked some management experts to attack bureaucracy for its dehumanising characteristics. The efficiency that the bureaucratic form of management is supposed to promote is often viewed as lacking because as noted by (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996; Dale, 2000: pp. 133-134): *Bureaucracy has the propensity to encourage lack of innovative ability (due to the rigidity of structures and procedures), narrow technical perspectives (linked to detailed specification of tasks and high specialisation of skills), inefficient resource use (because of cumbersome procedures or because contributions by individuals may not be clearly exposed in the maze of interactions), and difficult access to the organisation for outsiders due to high formality of relations).*

It is important gathering from Dale's contribution that the defeat of bureaucracy is often attributed to its disregard for the values associated with maintaining the autonomy of workers to apply their cognitive abilities in performing organisational tasks. Its rigidity is viewed as responsible for low productivity resulting from disgruntlement, which is a result of the treatment of workers as minors who can not make decisions without being coerced to do so.

In the case of Botswana educational entities it is not the application of bureaucracy that is responsible for its underperformance. It is instead the inconsistencies in its application that is responsible for its demotivating effects. For instance, personnel in educational organisations are not always exposed to the same treatment because of personal judgement or corruption by some senior officials. It can therefore be concluded that bureaucracy is not bringing results to organisations because it is marred by actions that do not always ascribe to its principles. The educational organisations in Botswana are not purely bureaucratic because they are submerged in personal relatedness that influences some decisions. It has to be noted that Bureaucratic efficient organisations are high task oriented and are low on personal relatedness (Hawkins & Shohet, 2006).

As noted by (Jreisat, 1999: p. 234) organisations do not exist in a vacuum; their environments have critical effects on every aspect of their performance. The political, legal, economic, and cultural elements of society exert a variety of pressures and influences on the management of organisations. In view of the points raised by Jreisat, it can be safely concluded that those organisations that do not parry off the pressures in the environments where they operate, such as those in Botswana, will continue to compromise on their employment of concepts such as bureaucracy.

Promotion and Rewards

The bureaucratic approach calls for a systematic arrangement that is deliberately entertained for rewarding productivity. As indicated by (Moorhead & Griffin, 1992: p. 589) the selection and promotion of organization members should be based on technical competence and training. Favouritism, nepotism, and friendship are specifically excluded from the process of selection and promotion. The workers are supposed to be remuner-

ated according to their contributions to the organisations. The well-stipulated objectives in an organization, such as schools are supposed to help in reducing favouritism; nepotism and other related managerial flaws in rewarding or promoting employees.

It is important to allude to the fact that in Botswana educational organisations have often discriminated against their employees, which is anti-bureaucratic because according to (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1983), the bureaucratic model should allow the women and youngsters who are within educational organisations to ascend to the positions of power and authority, because promotions should be done on merit, such as on seniority and by achievement. But Botswana women have for ages been discriminated against in schools and other institutions of learning. This is in the light of what (Bray, Clark, & Stephens, 1986: p. 59) observed when they stated that, "in most African societies old people have a higher status than young ones and males have a higher status than females". The bureaucratic model is supposed to allow even those people who will otherwise not be considered for certain positions, like women, to be given the opportunities through promotions. However, it has to be noted that Botswana educational entities are characterized by gender discrimination because bureaucracy is heavily abused and corrupted within them.

It is important to note that the scholarships as well as promotions are sometimes done in exchange for sexual favours within educational organisations in Botswana. This is what writers like (Findsen & Formosa, 2011) refer to as "phallogocentric".

The bureaucratic model, if well employed, can best handle the crisis that currently exists in most Botswana educational organizations, which as a result of discriminatory tendencies are unproductive. Some of the employees get promoted because of their loyalty to those who are in the political offices. It is interesting that (Bray, Clarke, & Stephens 1986: p. 101), though not African, have noticed that, "African philosophy tends to define people in terms of the social context to which they belong, and this has important implications for the nature and goals of education". In a condition that is reflected, the workers are not divorced from their societies, which often result in their social standing influencing what happens to them at the work place. This is despite the prescription that bureaucracy should distance workers from their social context.

The educational organizations are supposed to be objective and develop the curricula, which provide guidance on which courses to be offered. It can then be used to influence the appraisal of the employees, which may affect negatively or positively their rewards or promotions. This bureaucratic arrangement is supposed to motivate the workers since even those who do not meet the criteria for promotion get to know why they are not considered. It is a motivating factor for workers to be informed about guiding principles that are employed for their promotions and other rewards. It is important to highlight that the manipulation of bureaucratic principles in the Botswana education system has made it possible for those in power to disadvantage some educationists with impunity.

The bureaucratic model does value the use of promotion and rewards for those employees who perform outstandingly, not those who are related in whatever way to those with the power to reward. It is as a result of this arrangement that productivity get fostered, as the workers perform their duties knowing that they will be rewarded or promoted on merit not because of socio-economic, socio-political or socio-cultural factors.

The use rewards and promotions to make people work provide a framework from which those who want to be rewarded can excel or invest their time on what they are expected to do. For instance, the university has also well-defined grades that students can receive depending on their performance academically. However, it has to be indicated that Botswana educational organisations including universities have in some cases had educationists that base their grading on ethnicity, age, sex and social relations. Some educational organizations are still phallogocentric as women are rewarded for their “positive responses” to advancements by their superiors. This has served to undermine and mortify bureaucracy, which has now become a concept that is negatively perceived by those who are victimised under its falsification.

Conclusion

This paper pointed out that educational organisations in Botswana claim to be employing the concept of bureaucracy in their efforts to realise their objectives and yet they are marred with the abuse of the concept. It is this rather common practice and pretentious manifestation that has made the concept to be negatively received in some educational organisations in Botswana. However, it can be safely concluded that the concept of bureaucracy has been turned into what can be termed Botswana cracy. This is because of the modifications that are not published that are made to the original concept that was founded by Marx Weber to enhance performance within the organisations. The concept is not always applied in the manner that promotes productivity because the human element in some instances influence decisions in non-scientific ways.

It can be safely concluded that bureaucracy is abused and falsified by the unscrupulous individuals within educational organisations in Botswana to fulfil their selfish agendas. This development has made the concept to be viewed with strong negativity mostly by those people who do not wield any administrative and managerial powers.

Bureaucracy has now come to be most often associated with waste of time, imposition of instructions and decisions from those in authority to fulfil their own agendas. Bureaucracy is not often presented formally by all those individuals who claim to be employing it on their educational pursuits. It is concluded that though bureaucracy is employed by different players in different ways, those players do not always acknowledge the deliberate adjustments that they make on the concept to suit their varying agendas. It is this situation that has made bureaucracy less attractive to the junior members of staff and students within educational entities in Botswana. It is indisputable that Bureaucracy should be characterised by obtrusion of decisions by those who are legitimately empowered to do that and this should be applied objectively. It has to be pointed out that Botswana educational organisations do compromise in their employment of the concepts, which result in corruption, nepotism, tribalism and other unfavourable behaviours that mortify the concept.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, F. (1995). *Bureaucracy and development: Administration*. New Delhi: Manata Publications (P) Limited.
- Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Bray, M. Clarke, P. B. & Stephens, D. (1986). *Education and society in Africa*. London: Edward and Arnold.
- Chambers, R. (2003). *Whose reality counts? Putting the first last*. London: ITDG.
- Coyne, C. J. (2008). The politics of bureaucracy and the failure of post-war reconstruction. *Public Choice*, 135, 11, 22.
- Dale, R. (2000). *Organisations and development*. London: Sage Publications.
- Deva, S. (1986). Bureaucracy and development. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 21, mm149-mm155.
- Dionne, E. J. (2001). Political hacks v. bureaucrats: Can't public servants get some respect? *The Brookings Review*, 19, 8-11. doi:10.2307/20080968
- Elwell, F. (1999). *Cultural materialism: A sociological revolution*. Westport, CT: Praeger Press.
- Erichsen, E. A. & Goldenstein, C. (2011). *Fostering collaborative and interdisciplinary research in adult education: Interactive resources guides and tools*.
- Findsen, B., & Formosa, M. (2011). *Lifelong learning in later life: A handbook on older adult learning*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. doi:10.1007/978-94-6091-651-9
- Glassman, R. Swatos, W. & Rosen, P. (1987). *Bureaucracy against democracy and socialism*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Griffin, M. (1992). *Organisational behaviour*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Gruger, J. E. (1987). *Controlling bureaucracies*. London: University of California Press.
- Hall, R. H. (1998). *Organisations: Structures, processes, and outcomes*. London: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Hawkins, P., & Shohet, R. (2006). *Supervision in the helping professions*. London: YHT Ltd.
- Heinz-Dieter, M. (1995). Organisational environments and organisational discourse: Bureaucracy between two worlds. *Organisational Science*, 6, 32-43.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (1996). *Management of organisational behaviour*. London: Prentice-Hall International.
- Hooton, C. G. (1997). *Executive government. Presidential administrations and policy changes in the federal bureaucracy*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Hurtado, C. N. (2007). The continuing relevance of Paulo Freire's ideas. *Adult Education and Development*, 69, 51-78.
- Jackson, P. M. (1982). *The political economy of bureaucracy*. Oxford: Philip Allan Publishers.
- Jacoby, H. (1973). *The bureaucratization of the world*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jones, G. L. (1984). Excellence in education and management. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 3, 248-254. doi:10.2307/3323935
- Jreisat, J.E. (1999) *Public organization management*. London: Praeger Publishers.
- Kamenka, E. (1989). *Bureaucracy*. Oxford: Blackwell, Inc.
- Kiggundu, M. N. (1993). The challenges of management development in Sub-Saharan Africa. In P. Blunt, M. L. Jones, & D. Richards, (Eds.), *Managing organisations in Africa: Readings, cases, and exercises*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lawton, S. B., Freedman, J., Heather-Jane, R., & Easton, S. T. (1995). *Busting bureaucracy to reclaim our schools*. Ottawa: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Lewis, J., & Lewis, M. (1983). *Management of human service programs*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Martin, J. Knopoff, K., & Beckman, C. (1998). An alternative to bureaucratic impersonality and emotional labour: Bounded emotionality at the body shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 429-469.
- Mengisteab, K. (1996). *Globalisation and autocentricity in Africa's development in the 21st century*. Eritrea: Africa World Press, Inc.
- Mondy, R. W., Sharplin, A., & Flippo, E. B. (1988). *Management: Concepts and practices*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.
- Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (1992). *Organisational Behaviour*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Morphet, E., John, R., & Reller, T. (1982). *Educational organisation administration*. London: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
- Murphy, M. (2009). Bureaucracy and its limits: Accountability and

- rationality in higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30, 683-695. doi:10.1080/01425690903235169
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Nutt, P. C., & Backoff, R. W. (1992). *Strategic management of public and third sector organisations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Preston, L. M. (1987). Freedom and bureaucracy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 31, 773-795. doi:10.2307/2111224
- Rowley, C. (2005). Introduction. In C. Rowley (Ed.), *The selected works of Gordon Tullock* (pp. ix-xvii). Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1983). *Supervision: Human perspective*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Wiegatz, J. (2009). *Uganda's Human Resource challenge*. Kampala: Foundation Publishers.
- Wren, D. A. (1994). *The evolution of management thought*. Oklahoma: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.