

Integrating Organizational Behaviour Models in Good Governance for Sustainable Development of Educational Institutions in Tanzania: Fact or Fiction?

Karoli John Mrema, PhD

Department of Educational Management and Policy Studies,
College of Education, University of Dodoma
karolymrema@gmail.com

Received November 15, 2018; Revised February 17, 2019; Accepted March 10, 2019

Abstract: *This paper investigated the integration of organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development of educational institutions in Tanzania. The study was conducted in one public university in Dodoma Region, Tanzania. The approach used in the study was qualitative employing single case study design. The respondents of the study were 35, that is, 10 academic staff and 25 students who were obtained through snowball sampling. Method of data collection was focus group discussions. Data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis. Results showed that intergration of autocratic model helps in making quick decisions, discouraging laziness among the employees, managing conflicts, building hierarchy of the authority and directing orders. Moreover, custodial model enables the employers to maintain employees security and welfare, creating conducive environment, reducing employees' turnover and building mutual relationship. Supportive model assists in involvement of stakeholders, building sense of belongingness, enhancing unity, encouraging innovation and enhancing of democracy. Finally, collegial model increases teachers satisfaction and adaptability, enhances innovations, and encourages teamworking. The study concludes that it is possible to integrate organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development of education institutions. The study recommends that efforts should be made to have holistic integration of these organizational behaviour models.*

Key words: Integrating, Models, Governance, Sustainable, Development, Behaviour

1. Introduction

The fundamental argument in this paper is that sociologists, psychologists and administrative theorists have not yet constructed appropriate intellectual models for analyzing organizational behaviours, and that the missing link is hindering research and good governance for sustainable development in educational institutions worldwide (Baldrige, 1971; Kreitner, Kinicki & Buelens, 2002; Nilsen, 2015; Smallman, 1996). Apart from that the number of papers bearing the terms 'sustainable development' and 'governance' in their titles have grown exponentially in the last decade or so (Ayre & Callway, 2013; Biermann, Stevens, Bernstein, Gupta, & Kabiri, 2014; Christopoulos, Horvath & Kull, 2012; Glasbergen, Biermann, & Mol, 2007; HOPE, 2005; Jordan, 2008; Kardos, 2012; Young, 2009).

Yet there is a complex social structure that generates conflict; there are many forms of power and pressure that affect the decision makers; there is a legislative stage in which these pressures are translated into policy; and there is a policy execution phase that eventually generates feedback with the potential conflicts in organizations (Abiodun, 2014; Baldrige, 1971; Bastedo, 2009; Brewer, Mitchell & Weber, 2002; Lumineau, Eckerd & Handley, 2015; Weinstein, Freedman, & Hughson, 2007). This being the case, the author thought to uncover the gap by integrating organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development in educational institutions in Tanzania.

In a society still in search for solutions for sustainable development, good governance has always been recognized to be a critical tool for advancing sustainable development

and a crucial element to be incorporated in sustainable development strategies (Kardos, 2012). Likewise, the variety of modes of governance can be captured between hierarchical governance and deliberative governance, depending on the degree of involvement of societal actors (Zeijl-Rozema, Corvers, Kemp, & Martens, 2008). Hence, integration of organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development in educational institutions is essential for effective management to take place. The applicability has more positive outcome compared to negative consequence that evolves in the course of implementation. However, from the outset, it is argued that there is no best model that can provide assurance of high productivity in educational organizations. This implies that the application of organizational behaviour models depend on the context. In this case, this paper argues that integration of these models is of great importance to achieve the goals set in the organization rather than relying on only one model as the previous manager did in their organizations.

Since independence in 1961, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania has recognized good governance as a critical element to enhance and sustain peace and stability, economic growth, social development and poverty reduction (Open Government Partnership, 2011). This is due to the fact that good governance is a set of responsibilities, practices, policies, and procedures exercised by an institution to provide strategic direction to ensure objectives are achieved and resources are used responsibly and with accountability. In education, good governance practices support schools by helping them manage their resources so they can deliver quality education (World Bank, 2018). Moreover, Tanzania cherishes good governance and the rule of law in the process of creating wealth and sharing benefits in society and seeks to ensure that its people are empowered with the capacity to make their leaders and public servants accountable (Tanzania Development Vision 2025). This shows that good governance implies the good management of all state institutions that ensures the adoption of nine principles within all institutions' policies and practices including efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, equity, rule of law, transparency, anti-corruption, accountability and participation of all stakeholders (Khodary, 2014). Adherences of such principles in education are likely to impact on the attitude, behaviour and performance in educational institutions.

Experience shows that emphasis to governance is crucial for education systems to fulfill their essential public education functions (Skopje, 2010). Komba (2017), drawing on the literature on educational accountability and the practices of public educational service provision in Tanzania affirms that the four approaches financial, regulatory, professional and participatory do not enhance positive students' learning outcomes. Without good governance in the education, the blooms of education and reforms will not fully and effectively trigger down to the poor and marginalized groups

(Khodary, 2014). Good governance helps to provide a more democratic and responsive system of school management, greater participation of all stakeholders, greater transparency in all school activities, including increased flow of information among all stakeholders strengthened accountability among stakeholders to improve school management; coordination among various levels of formal governance (World Bank, 2018). Education governance encompasses institutions and linkages among citizens, government officials and education service providers (Skopje, 2010). Ideally, good governance in education should have the traits of responsiveness and accountability, transparency, encompass engagement of citizens and the capacity of state actors (central and local government decision makers) to design and implement policies in education sector (Skopje, 2010). It is possible to embrace such principles in good governance for sustainable development.

In Tanzania, lack of appropriate governance in schools has been mentioned as one of the factors which contribute to poor performance (Sabas & Mokaya, 2015). Such situation precipitates the existence of poor governance in education system. This view is strengthened by MOEVT (2011) as cited by Sabas and Mokaya (2015), which contends that limited school management skills of some heads of schools and inappropriately use of funds which is not according to government guidelines and procurement processes due to lack of accountability, transparency and the failure to adhere to quality assurance mechanisms; affects daily running and academic performance of schools. For instance, higher education in Tanzania, like in many other Sub-Saharan countries, suffers from unavailability of quality teaching and learning resources due to lack of tradition, competence, and experience to develop such resources (Mtebe & Raisamo, 2014). Hence, good governance practices support institutions by helping them manage their resources so they can deliver quality education (World Bank, 2018). Improper good governance system in education organizations is likely to be an obstacle towards achieving sustainable development as well as development vision by 2025. Despite the outstanding efforts by the government of Tanzania in enhancing good governance for sustainable development, little has been translated into action, particularly in its institutions. There is also scanty of information regarding good governance for sustainable development in educational institutions in Tanzania (Komba, 2017; Sabas and Mokaya, 2015; World Bank, 2018). Such situation creates a missing link as what should be done differently to unravel the situation. Thus, the current study attempts to unpack the problem by integrating organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development of educational institutions in Tanzania.

2. Literature Review and Studies

This section covers literature review related to the study. It consists of organizational behaviour models and good governance for sustainable development.

2.1 Organizational Behaviour Models

Organizational behavioural practices gradually are evolving from an autocratic model of organizational behavior, to a custodial model, and then to a supportive model and a further refinement is a collegial model but each successive model serves higher-order needs and is more democratic (Davis, 1968). As the models have been originating, the changing employee needs with each model have been the stepping stone for the more productive and useful models (Sethna, 2016). These organizational behaviour models serve as the frameworks that help to explain why people behave in a particular way in the course of their interaction. In fact, models help to explain the complex idea in a clear manner (Gregory, 1986). They depend on the expression of the strategies and the behaviour of the workers or employees and the managers' style of managing (Sergiorannini, 1992). The applicability of organizational models depends on circumstances and behaviours existing in a respective organization.

Organizational behaviour models may also be described as frameworks that include lines of authority, power, communication duties, and resources allocation employed by the manager (Jex, 2002). They define organizations through its framework, including lines of authority, communications, duties and resource allocations and driven by the goals and serves as the context in which processes operate and business is done (Diane, 2018). These models show how individuals behave in the organization. All the models of organizational behaviour are broadly classified into four types: autocratic, custodial, supportive and collegial. This shows that managerial practices gradually are evolved from an autocratic model of organizational behavior, to a custodial model, collegial model then to a supportive model. Each successive model serves higher-order needs and is more democratic (Davis, 1968). Most of these models may be said to have emerged chronologically as each seemed to uncover the deficiencies of the previous one. To assume that any one of the models has been the best model is wrong as no model is hundred percent perfect but have been evolving all through the years with the changes in our perception, study and social conditions that have been affecting the human behavior (Sethna, 2016). Contextual environment is likely to determine a particular model in the organization.

2.2 Autocratic model: This model has its roots in the historical past, and definitely became the most prominent model of the industrial revolution of 1800 and 1900s (Sethna, 2016). The central tenet under this model is power. This means that the individuals who have power to

command must have authority to do so. The model asserts that employees need to be instructed and motivated to perform, while managers do all the thinking (Sethna, 2016). Using this kind of model, it requires educational managers to possess dictatorship managerial style. This implies that the subordinates are required to follow the order given by the superior. Managers take decisions adhering to what is proposed by McGregor's theory X that people are irresponsible and need strict supervision (Clark & Wheel Wright, 1992). Therefore, the authority of the manager depends on the power to command. This kind of model imposes fear, threat and sanctions to the subordinates. This model limits innovation as the subordinates will be just following what is dictated rather than using their intellect. It is characterized by lack of effective communication as it is of one way. In an autocratic organization, people who manage the tasks have formal authority for controlling the employees to work under them whereby the lower level have little control over the work function so ideas and innovations not generally welcomed (Nelson & Quick, 2003). The employees under autocratic model feel insecure and frustrated leading to job dissatisfaction in the work places.

2.3 Custodial Model: This model emerged following the deficiencies of the autocratic model. Most of the managers' deficiencies are related to fear, frustrations, and insecurity could be covered by using custodial model. The basis of this model is the economic resources. The employees in turn are oriented towards security and benefits and dependence on the organization (Chakra, 1991). According to this model employees are rewarded in order to increase productivity in the organization. This model emphasizes economic reward, security, organization dependence and maintenance factors (Cooper & Locke, 2000). The employee gets motivated when he/she is rewarded. Using this model tends to increase the job satisfaction. This is due to the fact that employees' satisfaction is likely to increase performance which in turn impact in the organization productivity. Similarly, enhancing the welfare of employees as a result of rewards is likely to reduce turnover.

2.4 Supportive Model: The basis of this model is leadership with a managerial orientation of support (Anderson, 2010). The supportive model emphasis on motivated and aspiring leader and it is simply based on motivating staff through the establishment of the manager and employee relationship and the treatment that is given to employees on daily basis (Sethna, 2016). Supportive model bases on leadership and it believes that employees are active and supportive considering workers values, attitudes, desire and preferences (Greenberg & Baron, 1995). This model provides chance for subordinates to grow and accomplish their tasks effectively in educational organization, for example the head of school needs to open room for them in order to express their views on organizational related issues (Anderson, 2010). Therefore,

the head of school as a leader must play his or her role in organization to the maximum performance (Northhouse, 2007). This situation depends on the experience and training provided to the leaders in the organization.

2.5 Collegial Model: The basis of this model is partnership with managerial orientation of teamwork and it is extension of supportive model. Employees feel more inspired, motivated, and important and feel that what they are doing and what they think would be good for the organization, which goes beyond their personal achievements (Sethna, 2016). A collegial model emphasizes that power and decision-making should be shared among members of the organization and authority in the institution depends on specialist expertise and not position (Zulu, 2002). Collegial model suggests that teachers should play a participatory role in the management of a school (Awbery, 2013). Groups need to be sufficiently small to enable everyone to participate and members of the teaching staff should be treated as partners rather than as subordinates as this will encourage co-operative decision-making (Zulu, 2002). The professional development of the teaching staff has to be fostered as this will enhance the opportunities for teachers to become leaders and will also increase their sense of autonomy and interdependence (Singh, 2002). In turn, the employees feel more emotionally and psychologically part of the organization and become more responsible for their actions (Sethna, 2016). This kind of drive is likely to motivate employees intrinsically.

Collegial model requires understanding of organizational behavior and what it can explain about employee interactions help managers to understand how to deal with issues involving power and authority, resource allocation, support and teamwork (Zulu, 2002). Managers always try to make the employees feel the part of the project and the organization and give them all the support so that they can increase their efficiency and output (Sethna, 2016). Achieving collegiality in a school can be regarded as a process rather than happening because it demands various strategies that include the participation of the teaching staff in all affairs accompanied by a sense of belonging, mutual respect and self-evaluation in order to remove the belief that the principal is the expert in such matters (Singh, 2002). The limitations of the collegial model are decision-making is slow and cumbersome; the effectiveness of collegiality depends in part on the attitudes of staff if staffs actively support participation then it may succeed, if they display apathy it will fail (Zulu, 2002). Nonetheless, it depends on the skills endowed in those respective strategists who are responsible for the success or failure of educational organizations.

2.6 Good governance for sustainable development

The term “good governance” was used first by the WB in a report to Africa in 1989, whereby it identified poor governance as the main cause of the failure of SAPs and of the poor levels of economic growth in low income countries, especially in Africa (Robertson & Britain, 2007). It emerged as the remedy for poor development of WC by creating a more predictable stable environment for economic development (Origa, 2013). Nonetheless, the possibilities for good governance depend on institutional structures and the economic resources available for ensuring governance (Roy & Tisdell, 1998). It needs to be known that the vacuum left by the collapse of colonial empires has been filled by new forms of cultural and ideological imperialism conceived largely in the West by new imperialism in such notions as sustainable human development (SHD) and good governance, which in many ways are prescribed for poor countries by rich countries (Blunt, 1995). Good governance partnerships for sustainable development are supposed to provide a path out of poverty toward a better environment and a society with more democracy (Myers, 2017).

Prompted by concerns over the effectiveness of aid, the World Bank significantly stretched its policy frontiers by endorsing “good governance” as a core element of its development strategy (Santiso, 2001). The failure of SAPs cannot be attributed to lack of good governance alone because most developing nations were in crisis prior to SAPs. Adding SAPs to bad economies created more problems in planning for educational development. The WB significantly stretched its policy frontiers by endorsing ‘good governance’ as a core element of its development strategy (Origa, 2013). The Bretton Wood institutions (World Bank and IMF) believed that it is from those fundamental ingredients and principles that good governance for more sustainable development will grow (Dodson & Smith, 2003). Incorporating good governance for sustainable development requires taking into account collective goods, future needs and uncertain future development (Loorbach, 2007). Arguably, the extension of the conditionality of good governance added problems in low income countries. This is due to the fact that the conditionalities that accompanied SAPs were affecting the provision of services, including education, in developing countries.

The failure of SAPs was blamed not on the programmes themselves but on poor governments, corruption, secrecy, inefficient policy making, lack of accountability and disregard for the law (Robertson & Britain, 2007). Therefore, they argued that the concept good governance embraces the idea of efficient public services, respect for human rights and independent judiciary and legal framework, economic liberalism, the protection of private property, political pluralism, participation, administrative accountability, transparency and rule of law. The

components embraced under good governance would be practical if and only if there were efforts to harness and manage properly the abundant resources existing in developing countries and plough them back into economic and educational development.

3. Methodology

The study employed qualitative approach. Qualitative research is primarily concerned with understanding human beings' experiences in a humanistic, interpretive approach (Jackson, Drummond, & Camara, 2007). The study used this approach in order to get views and opinion on the possibility of integrating organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development. Another rationale for choosing this approach is due to researcher's intention of collecting narrative data, people's own words and records of peoples' behaviour (Taylor, Bogdan, & DeVault, 2015). The researcher chose those students and academicians with experience in leadership. The study used a single case study design. The rationale for choosing this design is that it makes the writer to have a deeper understanding of the exploring subject and it can richly describe the existence of phenomenon when the writer wants to study, for example, a person or a group of people (Gustafsson, 2017). The author also targeted at the group of academic staff and student teachers with experience in leadership of educational institutions. Additionally, single case study design was employed because it was conducted in only one public university in Dodoma Region, Tanzania.

The respondents of the study were 35, that is, 10 academic staff, 25 students who were obtained through snowball sampling. The rationale of using snowball sampling to obtain respondents was due to its suitability in accessing the hidden population of the academic staff and students with experience of leadership in educational institutions. Method of data collection was through Focus Group Discussions (FGD). This method was preferred as it provides opportunity gathering people from similar backgrounds or experiences together to discuss a specific topic of interest and understanding of the participants' perspective on the topic in discussion (Wong, 2008). Data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

This section provides the results and discussion about the intergration of organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development of educational instutions in Tanzania.

4.1 Autocratic model: In knowing the integration of of autocratic model in education organizations 33 out of 35 respondents through FGD disclosed the possibility of intergrating it in good governance for sustainable

development but 2 of the respondents were unaware if it can be intergrated. One of the respondent argued:

When quick decisions are needed, autocratic model of leadership is the most prominent one in the work environment. Under this model, managers make decisions without consulting others. By focusing on educational organizations, if the school face unprecedented fall of result in the mock examination then fast and quick decision are taken in order for the next final (NECTA) examination students may perform well by forcing the teachers in their responsibilities. For example, the manager can use this model to discourage laziness among the employees who are unwillingly to work or manage intrapersonal conflicts between subordinates and the manager which in turn undermines performance and goals of the organization.

Source: FGD, Group 3, University x

Another respondent stressed that autocratic model:

...provides hierarchy of authority in the organization-that means all positions in the organization are structured in the way that top management controls the lower level. This hierarchical form is applied in order to allow free passage of orders from higher to lower level. It is also effective when there is high pressure in the organization which demand immediate solution. For example, poor performance may require the head of school to use this model as it provides immediate solution to the existing problem. It is also effective during the time of emergency, for example unexpected power shock. Or a teacher who fails to meet deadlines, the head of school uses this model to manage such an employee in an educational organization.

Source: FGD, Group 5, University x.

It was further stressed by another respondent:

That autocratic model is used to emphasize punctuality of students, teachers and non-staff. This is because the heads of schools have power to command, and giving orders in schools. For example, a head of school can order all the students come to school at 6:00 am everyday or

can order all teachers to conduct class session early in the morning as well as non-staff member to perform their duties at the right time and the right place. It is also applied in shaping and re-shaping the behaviours students, teachers and non-staff members.

Source: FGD, Group 1, University x.

The extracts reveal that intergration of autocratic model helps in taking quick decisions, discouraging laziness among the employees, managing conflicts, building hierarchy of the authority, during high pressure and emergency, emphasizing pactuality among people in the organization, provide orders, shaping and reshaping the behaviours. One of the respondents through FGD argued.

4.2 Custodial Model. Moreover, all the respondents through FGD disclosed the possibility of intergrating custodial models in educational organizations. One of the respondents stressed:

Since this model is economically based, the employees in schools are mainly teachers and they are oriented security and benefits and dependent on government or private employers. The managers motivate teachers in schools by giving them financial incetives in order for them to perform well. It is successful applied in creating competitive environment among worker in their respective departments. It is also a good model for building partnership among managers and their employees, by giving teachers positive working environment like security, houses, breakfast, meals and transport. It is applicable in enhancing employees retention by improving their welfare.

Source: FGD, Group 4, university x.

Another respondent had this opinion:

This model is also applied by leaders to motivate workers with low expectation in the work place. It emphasizes employee mutual relationship in the organization. When there are enough resources, the leader improves the interrelationship between subordinates and even department by supplying enough requirement to each of them. Hence, reducing the possibilities of conflict that arise out of resources. The heads of schools use this model as the means of raising performance in schools by rewarding the employees. The model is

applied in the school with poor working condition like shortage of infrastructures which weakens the effective functioning of schools. This model can be applied to improve the working conditions in order to increase performance in schools. It is also used when there is establishment of the new project in school. In this case, the manager can use money to pay the workers in the project.

Source: FGD, Group 3, University x.

It was further stressed:

It is used to improve economic security for teachers through wages and other benefits in order to create teachers loyalty and motivation. It is also used to improve performance of teachers so as to maintain their position and be promoted over time by providing a financial incentive such as financial bonuses and benefits for good performance. It is also applicable to create self sustained environment that actually negates the concept of teamwork, which in some competition can be created where teachers strive for the best performance on an individual basis only. This model is used to provide ongoing strong financial benefits for its teachers, otherwise the teachers will be demotivated and look for better opportunities elsewhere.

Source: FGD, Group 2, University x.

With regards to custodial model, the extracts show that intergration of organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development enables the employers to maintain employees security and welfare, creates motivation, create conducive environment, reducing employees turnover, building mutual relationship, minimizing organizational conflict and establishment of new projects.

4.3 Supportive model: Furthermore, all (35) respondents disclosed that it is possible to intergrate supportive model in good governance for sustainable development in educational institutions. The respondent stressed as follows:

This model is applicable in establishing partnership in schools. It is applied in the situation whereby the leadership involves different stakeholders. This is due to the fact that the situation needs opinions from several people. This model allows people

to participate in various activities in order to feel the sense of participation and the work involvement. It enables people to have the sense of belonging, especially the subordinates in the work place.

Source: FGD, Group 1, University x.

It was also stressed:

This model is applicable to improve unity and cooperation in organizations. This is to the fact that this model assumes that workers are not passive by nature and resistant to the organization needs but they are so by the inadequate support of the employees. Hence, if there is enough support of the employees it accelerates them to work effectively in a cooperative manner. It also aims at improving the unity in the organization. In order for the organization to be productive, there must be cooperation among different stakeholders in the organization. It is also used during the process of planning demanding the manager to get ideas from others. It is also used to improve the cognitive skills of the employees. In this case, when different individuals provide their ideas, for instance, in the meeting different people emerge with new ideas due to the contribution of others and use those ideas in developing the organization.

Source: FGD, Group 4, University x.

It was also revealed by another respondent that:

It encourages innovation to workers as they are stimulated to improve their personal skills due to the free platform provided to the subordinates without close supervision. By allowing the workers to improve their talent or skill in performing activities, it increases organization productivity. It is mostly applicable when workers are self motivated. This is due to the higher desire of accomplishing different tasks in the organization. It is mostly applicable when workers status and recognition are observed. This situation provides an atmosphere for participation among workers as well as enhancing democracy in the organization. It is also used during delegation of power. This means the division of power among the

workers in different departments. It is also useful during crisis or conflict periods.

Source: FGD, Group 3, University x.

Under supportive model, the extracts show that intergration of organizational models in good governance for sustainable development is applicable when establishing new school that demanding support from different stakeholders, building sense of belongingness, enhancing unity and cooperation, enhancing cognitive skills of employees, encouraging innovation and enhancing of democracy.

4.4 Collegial model: As regards to collegial model, all (35) respondents through FGD disclosed that it is possible to intergrate this model in good governance for sustainable development. It was argued:

It is used to increase teachers satisfaction and adaptability. It builds good relationship among teachers leading to high level of instructional provision in schools. It is also used as the means of enhancing innovation in school which in turn impacts on the teaching and learning in schools. This model is applied in organization where labour relations are good. For example, in the school context, this model is applied when the head of school has good relationship with the subordinates. This makes the head of school to involve teachers in decision making through staff meeting where school matters are discussed.

Source: FGD, Group 5, University x.

Another respondent was of the view that:

Under this model, teachers are comfortable to work as a team in facilitating school activities such as academics, sports and games as well as environmental activities. In this model, teachers can share responsibilities in dealing with the students discipline. For instance, due to good relationship, a teacher on duty can share responsibilities with his/her colleagues to deal with late comers on that particular week so as to maintain punctuality among the students. In sports, the responsible teacher can share responsibilities with his/her colleagues to enhance students to participate actively in different sports competetions. This model is more useful in organization with enough resources. The teachers are likely to share their ideas as

well as duties and collaborate in their activities in teaching process due to availability of resources needed in the school. If the school has enough books the class master and academic can organize with subject master to ensure the effective use of those books by the students in order to improve performance.

Source: FGD, Group 1, University x.

It was also disclosed that:

Collegial model can be applied in school where there is stability among staff members. When staff members are stable within a certain organization, it means that there is little or no misunderstanding between them. It increases accountability among the staff. Accountability requires unity, love and interaction among the staff members. So if the headmaster or the headmistress can succeed to organize, probably the staff will increase responsibility of the teacher and thus students performance at school. The headmaster and headmistress is oriented towards team performance while each employee is responsible for his task and towards each other. Increase transparency in decision making.

Source: FGD, Group 2, University x.

Finally, the extracts show that integration of collegial model in good governance increase teachers satisfaction and adaptability, build good relationship, enhances innovations, encourages teamworking and increases accountability among the staff

Generally, the study found that it is possible to intergrate organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development in educational institutions in Tanzania. This was attested in all of the four models as follows: As regards to the autocratic model, the study found it is possible to intergrate it in good governance for sustainable development when taking quick decisions, discouraging laziness among the employees, managing conflicts, building hierarchy of the authority, when there is high pressure and emergency, emphasizing punctuality among people in the organization, provide orders, shaping and reshaping the behaviours.

The results support the views of Sethna (2016) who argued as the values are changing the model is giving place to the modernized thinking, in many organizational setups, it is still proving a useful way to get things done, especially when

the employees are being motivated to fulfill physiological needs or whenever there are organizational crises. Results on autocratic model are also in consonant with theory of X assumption of McGregor which states that employers do not take responsibility and managers have to supervise over their work to obtain desired results (Clark & Wheel Wright, 1992; Sethna, 2016). This model can also be compared to the Likert system in which use of punishment, force, fear or threats and discouraging innovation are sometimes are used as means to get the results from the employees (Nelson & Quick, 2003; Sethna, 2016).

With regards to custodial model, the study found that intergration of organizational behaviour models in good governance for sustainable development enables the employers to maintain employees security and welfare, creates motivation, create conducive environment, reducing employees turnover, building mutual relationship, minimizing organizational conflict and establishment of new projects. The findings are in line with other studies which emphasize that employees are oriented towards their welfare and security (Chakra, 1991; Copper & Locke, 2000; Sethna, 2016). Under supportive model, the study found that intergration of organizational models in good governance for sustainable development is applicable when establishing a new school that demands support from different stakeholders, building sense of belongingness, enhancing unity and cooperation, enhancing cognitive skills of employees, encouraging innovation and enhancing of democracy. The findings are in line with Sethna (2016), who argued that the model is simply based on motivating staff through the establishment of the manager and employee relationship and the treatment that is given to employees on daily basis. Results support the previous studies which disclosed that employees are active and supportive (Anderson, 2010; Greenberg & Barron, 1995; Northouse, 2007).

Finally, it was disclosed that integration of organizational behaviour model in good governance increase teachers satisfaction and adaptability, build good relationship, enhances innovations, encourages teamwork, increases accountability among the staff. This study is supported by the views of Sethna (2016), who argues that with this model the manager is oriented towards team performance while each employee is responsible for his task and towards each other; they are more disciplined and work as per the standards set by the team and in this setup employees feel fulfilled as their contribution is accepted and well received.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

The study concluded that it is possible to integrate organizational behavioral models in good governance for sustainable development in accordance with unity identity whole principle-whereby each model is applied depending on the context to form the whole in the management of an educational organization. Nonetheless, it needs to be known

that knowledge, skills and attitudes are rapidly changing worldwide. This demands new ways of managing behaviour of people in the organization so that people can stay in organization that value them morally despite what they are earning in the organizations. Organizations are in the era that demands managers to show trust and respect to the employees. The study recommends that efforts should be made to have holistic application of these organizational models as they contribute to good governance of educational institutions in Tanzania. Additionally, educational managers should be flexible in order to be in a position to apply organizational behaviour models.

References

- Abiodun, A. R. (2014). Organizational conflicts: Causes, effects and remedies. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 3(6), 118.
- Anderson, (2010). Successful school leadership: Linking with learning and achievement, London: Penguin Press
- Awbery, C.(2013). Collegiality as a leadership strategy within 21 century education: A single case study, Doctor of education thesis, University of Birmingham, UK.
- Ayre, G., & Callway, R. (2013). *Governance for sustainable development: a foundation for the future*. Earthscan.
- Ayre, G., & Callway, R. (2013). *Governance for sustainable development: A foundation for the future*. Toronto: Earthscan.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1971). Models of university governance: Bureaucratic, collegial, and political. Retrieved from <https://scholar.google.com/scholar.model+of+organizational+behaviour+&ocq>
- Bastedo, M. N. (2009). Conflicts, commitments, and cliques in the university: Moral seduction as a threat to trustee independence.
- Biermann, F., Stevens, C., Bernstein, S., Gupta, A., & Kabiri, N. (2014). *Integrating governance into the sustainable development goals* (No. 3). UNU-IAS.
- Blunt, P. (1995). Cultural relativism, 'good' governance and sustainable human development. *Public Administration and Development*, 15(1), 1-9.
- Brewer, N., Mitchell, P., & Weber, N. (2002). Gender role, organizational status, and conflict management styles. *International journal of conflict management*, 13(1), 78-94.
- Chakra, B.S.K. (1991). *Management by values: Towards cultural congruence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Christopoulos, S., Horvath, B., & Kull, M. (2012). Advancing the governance of cross-sectoral policies for sustainable development: A metagovernance perspective. *Public Administration and Development*, 32(3), 305-323.
- Clark, K. & Wheel Wright, S.(1992). Organizing and leading, *California Management Review*, 9-28, Spring
- Davis, K. (1968). Evolving models of organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 11(1), 27-38.
- Davis, K. (1968). Evolving models of organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 11(1), 27-38.
- Diane, C.(2018). What is organizational model? Retrieved from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com>
- Dodson, M., & Smith, D. E. (2003). Governance for sustainable development: Strategic issues and principles for Indigenous Australian communities. ANU, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR).
- EDUCBA, (2016). Best 5 organizational behaviour model. Retrieved from <http://www.educba.com/organizational-behaviour-model/>
- Glasbergen, P., Biermann, F., & Mol, A. P. (Eds.). (2007). *Partnerships, governance and sustainable development: Reflections on theory and practice*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gordon, D. I. (2005). Organizational conflicts of interest: A growing integrity challenge. *Pub. Cont. LJ*, 35, 25.
- Greenberg, J. & Baron, R.A. (1995). *Behaviour in organization understanding and managing the human side work*. 5th Ed. New Delhi: Prentice Hall
- Gregory, M. (1986). *Organization behaviour*. North West University: Houththon University
- Griggs, D., Stafford-Smith, M., Gaffney, O., Rockström, J., Öhman, M. C., Shyamsundar, P., ... & Noble, I. (2013). Policy: Sustainable development goals for people and planet. *Nature*, 495(7441), 305.
- Gustafsson, J. (2017). Single case studies vs. multiple case studies: A comparative study. Academy of Business, Engineering and Science Halmstad University Halmstad, Sweden
- HOPE, K. R. (2005). Toward good governance and sustainable development: The African peer review mechanism. *Governance*, 18(2), 283-311.
- Ikedu, A. A., Modesto Veludo-de-Oliveira, T., & Cortez Campomar, M. (2005). Organizational conflicts perceived by marketing executives. *EJBO-Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies*.
- Jackson, R. L., Drummond, D. K., & Camara, S. (2007). What is qualitative research? *Qualitative research reports in communication*, 8(1), 21-28.
- Jordan, A. (2008). The governance of sustainable development: taking stock and looking forwards. *Environment and planning C: Government and policy*, 26(1), 17-33.

- Jordan, A. (2008). The governance of sustainable development: Taking stock and looking forwards. *Environment and planning C: Government and policy*, 26(1), 17-33.
- Kardos, M. (2012). The reflection of good governance in sustainable development strategies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 1166-1173.
- Khodary, Y. (2014). Towards good governance in basic education. Accessed from <http://www.socialcontract.gov.eg/media/MediaCenter/cfac>
- Komba, A. A. (2017). Educational accountability relationships and students' learning outcomes in Tanzania's public schools. *SAGE Open*, 7(3), 2158244017725795.
- Kreitner, R., Kinicki, A., & Buelens, M. (2002). *Organizational behaviour*. London, UK: McGraw Hill.
- Le Blanc, D. (2015). Towards integration at last? The sustainable development goals as a network of targets. *Sustainable Development*, 23(3), 176-187.
- Loorbach, D. (2007). Transition management: New mode of governance for sustainable development. London: Sage
- Lumineau, F., Eckerd, S., & Handley, S. (2015). Inter-organizational conflicts: Research overview, challenges, and opportunities. *Journal of Strategic Contracting and Negotiation*, 1(1), 42-64.
- Meadowcroft, J. (2007). Who is in charge here? Governance for sustainable development in a complex world. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 9(3-4), 299-314.
- Mtebe, J. S., & Raisamo, R. (2014). Challenges and instructors' intention to adopt and use open educational resources in higher education in Tanzania. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 15(1).
- Myers, G. A. (2017). Disposable cities: Garbage, governance and sustainable development in urban Africa. Routledge.
- Nelson, D.L. & Quick, J. (2003). *Organizational behaviour: Foundations, realities and challenges*. 4th Ed. South West Ohio: Prentice Hall
- Nilsen, P. (2015). Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. *Implementation science*, 10(1), 53.
- Northhouse, P. (2007). *Leadership, theory and practice*. New York: SAGE publishers.
- Open Government Partnership (2011). Tanzania open government partnership action plan 2012- 2013 (draft for consultation. Accessed from <http://www.twaweza.org>
- Origa, A. M. (2013). Factors influencing headteachers' financial management in public primary schools in Kisumu Municipality, Kenya. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Robertson, S. L., & Britain, G. (2007). Globalisation, education and development: Ideas, actors and dynamic. London: DfID.
- Roy, K. C., & Tisdell, C. A. (1998). Good governance in sustainable development: the impact of institutions. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 25(6/7/8), 1310-1325.
- Sabas, J & Mokaya S.O (2015). the influence of governance systems on students performance in public secondary schools in Karatu District, Tanzania, *International Journal of Science and Research* Volume 5 Issue 10, October 2016, 1595-1598
- Sachs, J. D. (2012). From millennium development goals to sustainable development goals. *The Lancet*, 379(9832), 2206-2211.
- Santiso, C. (2001). Good governance and aid effectiveness: The World Bank and conditionality. *The Georgetown public policy review*, 7(1), 1-22.
- Shrifian, L. (2011) Collegial management to improve the effectiveness of managers, organizational behavior in educational institutions. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 29 (2011) 1169 – 1178
- Singh, P. (2002). Collegiality in education: A case study. *African Journal of Education*. 22(1) 56 – 64
- Skopje,(2010). Good governance in education, accessed from [https://www.seeu.edu.mk/files/research/undp/Good_governance in education pdf](https://www.seeu.edu.mk/files/research/undp/Good_governance_in_education.pdf).
- Smallman, C. (1996). Risk and organizational behaviour: a research model. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*, 5(2), 12-26.
- Taylor, S. J., Bogdan, R., & DeVault, M. (2015). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource*. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Van Zeijl-Rozema, A., Cörvers, R., Kemp, R., & Martens, P. (2008). Governance for sustainable development: a framework. *Sustainable Development*, 16(6), 410-421.
- Weinstein, H. M., Freedman, S. W., & Hughson, H. (2007). School voices: Challenges facing education systems after identity-based conflicts. *Education, citizenship and social justice*, 2(1), 41-71.
- Wong, L. P. (2008). Focus group discussion: A tool for health and medical research. *Singapore Med J*, 49(3), 256-60.
- World Bank,(2018). School governance. Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org>
- Young, O. R. (2009). Governance for sustainable development in a world of rising interdependencies. *Governance for the Environment. New perspectives*, 12-40.
- Zulu, D.T. (2002). Collegial management in Gcewu secondary school, Kwazulu-Natal: An investigation with particular reference to staff perceptions. Master of Education Dissertation, Faculty of Education, University Natal, South Africa.