



Identifiers & Pagination:

Year: 2025
Volume: 16
First Page: 12
Last Page: 16
Publisher ID: 22205187.16.12

Correspondence: Taha Nazir PhD,
Researcher, Worker, and Journalist.
Thomson Reuters - ID N-5730-2015 |
ORCID ID - orcid.org/0000-0002-5308-6798 | <https://tahanazir.com>

Citation:

Taha Nazir (2023). The Bureaucratic Control and Authoritarian Governance of University Teaching Staff via Attendance Recording Systems: Potential Impediments to Academic Innovation, Excellence, and Research Freedom in Developing Countries. Pharm Rev. Vol. 16. 2025. P. 12-16.

Conflict of interest:

Author accepts all potential conflict of interest.

Funding:

The authors received no direct funding.

Ethics approval:

No ethical approval needed for this work.

Consent for publication:

Author is agreed to publish this article.

Editorial

The Bureaucratic Control and Authoritarian Governance of University Teaching Staff via Attendance Recording Systems: Potential Impediments to Academic Innovation, Excellence, and Research Freedom in Developing Countries

Taha Nazir

1. Editor-in-Chief, Pharmaceutical Review. ISSN 2220-5187 | <http://pharmaceuticalsreview.ca> | <https://pharmaceuticalsreview.com>
2. Ex-President - Pharmacist Federation (Pakistan). <http://pharmacistfed.wordpress.com>

[ORCID](#) | [Publons](#) | [ResearchGate](#) | [Scopus](#) | [Academia](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Google Scholar](#) | [Loop Frontiers](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Scinapse](#)

Running title: Healthcare system and pharmaceutical patient care.

Keywords: Academic governance, faculty autonomy, bureaucratic control, attendance systems, higher education policy, research freedom, institutional ethics, accountability frameworks.

Note: This manuscript was developed using advanced artificial intelligence tools, digital data repositories, information databases, and contemporary software applications.

Abstract

This paper examines the emergence of bureaucratic and surveillance-based mechanisms in the governance of university teaching staff across developing countries. It argues that the proliferation of attendance recording systems—such as biometric tracking, RFID-based verification, and digital monitoring platforms—reflects a profound structural shift from collegial academic governance to managerial authoritarianism. While such systems claim to enhance accountability, they often erode intellectual autonomy, constrain research freedom, and weaken the intrinsic motivation essential for scholarly excellence. Drawing upon organizational theory, institutional isomorphism, and behavioral accountability frameworks, the paper analyzes how surveillance-oriented governance displaces ethical self-regulation and peer responsibility with mechanical control. The study concludes by proposing an alternative model of *trust-based, outcome-oriented, and ethically informed accountability* that safeguards academic freedom while maintaining institutional integrity.

Introduction: Bureaucratic Surveillance Is Reshaping the Academic Landscape

Across much of the developing world, universities are undergoing an administrative transformation characterized by increasing surveillance, record-keeping, and attendance-based evaluation. Once viewed as self-regulating institutions grounded in trust, modern universities are now governed through managerial systems that equate physical presence with performance (Altbach, 2016; Marginson, 2017).

This review explores how attendance-based control mechanisms, while introduced for efficiency, have produced **authoritarian governance cultures** that restrict innovation and scholarly independence. It positions this phenomenon within broader debates on academic freedom, neoliberal governance, and the ethical limits of managerial oversight.

Theoretical Framework: From Academic Autonomy to Organizational Control

The bureaucratic control of university faculty can be understood through three interrelated theoretical lenses:

1. **Organizational Control Theory** suggests that over-monitoring reduces intrinsic motivation and creativity, leading to compliance rather than engagement (Ouchi, 1979; Deci & Ryan, 2000).
2. **Institutional Isomorphism** explains how universities adopt corporate and Western governance models to achieve legitimacy, often without adapting them to local cultural or ethical contexts (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).
3. **Behavioral Accountability Models** emphasize that sustainable responsibility stems from professional ethics, peer evaluation, and self-regulation rather than surveillance (Bovens, 2007).

Together, these frameworks illuminate how managerial control systems distort academic behavior, producing conformity and disengagement instead of quality and innovation.

The Historical Ethos of Academic Freedom and Its Bureaucratic Subversion

Academic freedom historically protected intellectual inquiry from external interference, allowing faculty to pursue truth beyond bureaucratic limits (Karran, 2009). The exemption of professors from attendance tracking was rooted in this trust-based ethos, acknowledging their professional conscience as a safeguard against negligence.

However, in many developing contexts, that trust has deteriorated into unregulated absence and administrative laxity, prompting overcorrection through mechanistic attendance systems (Shattock, 2014). Rather than restoring professional responsibility, such systems reduce faculty to **subjects of managerial surveillance**, replacing ethical autonomy with administrative obedience.

The resulting structure mirrors what Foucault (1977) termed “*disciplinary power*”—a system of observation and control that normalizes conformity through constant visibility.

Administrative Hierarchies and the Vacuum of Academic Responsibility

Despite their appearance of authority, university hierarchies—comprising Heads, Deans, and Vice Chancellors—often lack genuine regulatory capacity. They manage procedural compliance without ensuring intellectual engagement.

This imbalance between **authority and accountability** has encouraged coercive attendance enforcement as a substitute for leadership. Studies reveal that such systems generate procedural conformity at the cost of academic depth and collegiality (Teelken, 2012; Musselin, 2018). The transformation of academic leadership into administrative management marks a cultural departure from the collegial model that traditionally sustained innovation and shared governance.

Surveillance Mechanisms and Their Impact on Faculty Motivation

Empirical research consistently shows that excessive monitoring undermines motivation, morale, and creativity. According to Deci and Ryan's (2000) **self-determination theory**, external control reduces intrinsic interest in meaningful work. Faculty subject to attendance enforcement often experience moral fatigue, disengagement, and diminished research output (Henkel, 2010).

Moreover, bureaucratic presence metrics fail to capture intellectual contribution, peer mentoring, or the nonlinear nature of creative work. As Bourdieu (1988) argued, the academic field thrives on symbolic capital—reputation, originality, and intellectual contribution—not on procedural compliance.

Institutional Imitation and the Misplaced Pursuit of Managerial Legitimacy

In developing nations, many universities emulate Western models of efficiency—introducing attendance dashboards, biometric systems, and performance indices—without adapting to the socio-cultural contexts of local academic work (Mok, 2016). This phenomenon, described as *institutional isomorphism* (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), results in **performative accountability** rather than authentic reform.

Such systems often deliver the illusion of modernization but erode collegial governance. Faculty members report increased bureaucratic workloads, reduced autonomy, and a sense of alienation from the university's intellectual mission (Deem, Hillyard, & Reed, 2007).

Ethical Accountability and Peer Governance as the Foundations of Academic Responsibility

True academic accountability originates not from surveillance but from ethics, community trust, and peer recognition. Studies of successful higher education systems—such as in Finland, Canada, and Singapore—demonstrate that professional ethics and collegial review outperform mechanical control in ensuring quality (Altbach & Salmi, 2011; Välimaa & Hoffman, 2008).

Ethical accountability systems rely on **self-assessment, transparent peer review, and mentorship-based evaluation**, ensuring both integrity and autonomy. Such practices cultivate an environment where freedom and responsibility coexist productively.

Attendance-Based Bureaucracy and the Erosion of the University as a Community of Inquiry

When presence becomes the metric of performance, the intellectual purpose of academia is displaced by procedural compliance. The culture of inquiry that once defined universities is replaced by a culture of oversight.

This dynamic transforms universities into **hierarchies of obedience**, where innovation, interdisciplinary collaboration, and risk-taking are discouraged (Giroux, 2014). As a result, higher education institutions lose their identity as spaces of creativity and become instruments of administrative reproduction.

The Global Evidence: Reconciling Accountability with Autonomy

Evidence from internationally ranked universities reveals that accountability and autonomy can coexist when guided by ethical and data-informed governance. The **National University of Singapore (NUS)** employs performance analytics that assess research impact and mentorship rather than attendance.

University College London (UCL) uses quality-enhancement frameworks focused on outcomes. **MIT** integrates digital research logs to track faculty engagement transparently but non-coercively (Marginson, 2017).

These models demonstrate that *data need not dominate; it can inform*. The difference lies in whether systems are designed to cultivate reflection or enforce conformity.

Discussion and Policy Implications

The review reveals that attendance-based bureaucratic systems, while designed to ensure accountability, have become **instruments of authoritarian governance**. Their widespread adoption reflects a crisis of trust and leadership in higher education.

Policy reform should thus aim to rebuild ethical trust rather than expand administrative control. Three critical directions emerge:

1. **Empower Academic Leadership:** Departmental Heads and Deans must be granted legitimate authority to evaluate faculty performance through mentorship, peer dialogue, and qualitative assessment rather than coercion.
2. **Institutionalize Ethical Accountability:** Replace attendance metrics with self-assessment portfolios, peer reviews, and evidence-based reports documenting teaching, supervision, and research activity.
3. **Use Technology Responsibly:** Employ digital platforms as facilitators of transparency, not as instruments of surveillance. Ethical technology design should respect privacy, autonomy, and academic dignity.

A balanced model—integrating *ethical self-governance, intelligent data systems, and participatory policy-making*—can restore harmony between autonomy and accountability. Without such reform, developing-country universities risk entrenching managerial authoritarianism that suppresses creativity and erodes intellectual culture.

Conclusion

The bureaucratic control of university faculty through attendance recording systems represents a deeper transformation in the governance of knowledge. While framed as modernization, it reflects a loss of trust, autonomy, and scholarly purpose.

To preserve innovation and academic excellence, universities must transcend the logic of surveillance and rediscover the ethics of self-governance.

True accountability in academia is measured not by **presence but by purpose**, not by **compliance but by contribution**. The future of higher education depends on institutions that trust their thinkers, value their teachers, and protect the sacred space of intellectual freedom.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (2016). *Global perspectives on higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities*. World Bank.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Stanford University Press.
- Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447–468.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education, and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities*. Oxford University Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books.
- Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism’s war on higher education*. Haymarket Books.
- Henkel, M. (2010). *Changing knowledge and higher education*. Routledge.

- Karran, T. (2009). Academic freedom: In justification of a universal ideal. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(3), 263–283.
- Marginson, S. (2017). The worldwide trend to high participation higher education: Dynamics of social stratification in inclusive systems. *Higher Education*, 72(4), 413–434.
- Mok, K. H. (2016). The quest for world-class status and university governance reform in Japan and Malaysia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 49, 126–135.
- Musselin, C. (2018). New forms of academic work and career. *European Review*, 26(S1), S37–S46.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1979). A conceptual framework for the design of organizational control mechanisms. *Management Science*, 25(9), 833–848.
- Shattock, M. (2014). *Managing successful universities* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Teelken, C. (2012). Compliance or pragmatism: How do academics deal with managerialism in higher education? *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(3), 271–290.
- Välimaa, J., & Hoffman, D. (2008). Knowledge society discourse and higher education. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 265–285.



©2025 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license. You are free to: Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially. The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms. Under the following terms: Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. No additional restrictions: You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.