Comparative Assessment of Leadership Style of Past Three Vice Chancellors of University of Agriculture, Makurdi

Gyanden Peter Kughur [1]; Bini B. Adiel[2]; Dennis Tumba[2]
Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, University of Agriculture, Makurdi Benue State, Nigeria
Corresponding Author: gyandenkugh@gmail.com

Abstract

The degree of complexity attendant in university administration is hardly to be encountered in any other organization with peculiarities which distinguish it from military, paramilitary and ministry. The vice chancellor in university is primarily concerned with how to manage resources allocated to them which requires constant teamwork and communication; however the situation is different in most of the universities. The study assessed leadership style of past three vice chancellors of University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Simple random sampling was used in selecting 16 respondents from four colleges, two departments, one directorate and one institute; primary data were collected using structured questionnaire. Results revealed that Gyang authoritarian 63.5%, Ayatse flexible 56.25%, Uza authoritarian 43.75%, on selected leadership attributes: Gyang 31.25% low level of accessibility, Ayatse 31.25% good financial resources management, Uza 37.5% financial transparency. On rate of violation of the University laws Gyang 62.5% violated laws concerning promotion, recruitment and admission. It is recommended that vice chancellors style of leadership should be service to the people since decision making in the university is different from what is obtainable in other organizations.

Keywords: Leadership, style, three vice chancellors, university of agriculture

1. Introduction

Leadership is an acknowledged component of the basic functions of management along with planning, organizing and controlling, leadership sometimes called directing or coordinating the process in achieving organizational objectives (Tamuno, 1987). Similarly, Marx (1933) Has been quoted by Herman (1977) wrote about rational organizations and initiated discussions of qualities of a leadership in an organization. He put it that a leader could be characterized in terms of the amount of direction and support that the leadership enjoys and provides to his followers. He categorized all leadership into four behaviour types, as followed: directing, coaching, supporting and delegating.

Leadership is a social influence process in which the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates in an effort to reach organization goals, a process whereby one person exerts social influence over other members of the group, a process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group of individuals in an effort towards goal achievement in given situations, and a relational concept involving both the influencing agent and the person being influenced (Herman, 1977).

Bhatti *et al*. (2012) identified three leadership styles which are autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire. According to Bhatti *et al*. (2012), a leader is a person who sees something that needs to be done, knows that they can help make it happens and gets started. A leader sees opportunity and captures it. He/she sees future that can be different and better and help others see that picture too. He/she is a coach, an encourager and is willing to take risks today for something better tomorrow. A leader is a communicator, co-ordinator and listener.

Buckner (1988) stated, leadership style is the way in which leaders relate to those around them, whether constituents, advisers, or other leaders – how they structure interactions and the norms, rules and

principles they use to guide such interactions. leadership style often results from those behaviour that were useful in securing the leader's first political success; these actions become reinforced across time as the leader relies on them to achieve the second, third, etc. successes.

Buckner (1988) belived, if the task is highly structured and the leader has good relationship with the employees, effectiveness will be high on the part of the employees. His findings further revealed that democratic leaders take great care to involve all members of the team in discussion and can work with a small but highly motivated team. Bales (1970) found a high submissiveness among workers in democratic organizations, but those in autocratic organizations expressed frustration and anger.

Buckner (1988) stated, democratic style of leadership is the most effective, but Bruffee (1993) pointed that effectiveness of group leaders is dependent on the criterion which was being used to assess leadership.

Based on Cohen and Wills (1985) workers who fell under pressure reported autocratic supervision on the part of their leaders. The leaders rarely allowed them to participate in the decision making. It was also reported that workers who were under stress also reported harsh supervision and control on the part of their leaders. Gender role also affects job tension. Strong feeling of community increases the flow of information among workers (Bruffee, 1993). Workers benefit from community membership by experiencing a greater sense of well-being and support (Cammen *et al*., 1983).

According to Ekong (2002), autocratic leadership may serve in terms of emergency and in cases where heterogeneous work force is involved and where the leader is wise, just and considerably in advance of the wisdom and understanding of the follower, the ideal leadership is autocratic. On the other hand, the democratic style of administration is where the leader would characteristically lay the problem before his or her own subordinate and invite discussion. The leader's role is that of conference style of administration, or chair rather than that of decision taker. He or she would allow the decision to emerge out of the process of group discussion, but instead of imposing it on the group as its boss, he or she applies joining style. What distinguishes this style from other persuasive styles is that there would be some situation in which each of the above styles are likely to be more appropriate than the others. This means that democratic leadership is more appropriate under similar conditions, where the nature of the responsibility associated with the decision is such that group members are willing to share it with their leader, or alternatively the leader is willing to accept responsibility for decisions which he or she has not made personally.

There are some of the criticisms on these styles of administration particularly autocratic and democratic styles that too much is devoted in black and white terms. This is because both the two styles of leaderships which are tasks oriented and relationship oriented styles are extreme, whereas in practice the behaviour of many leaders varies and falls within these two styles of leaderships. This has been substantiated by the contingency theorist who suggested that the ideal leadership behaviour varies along a continuum and that as one moves away from the autocratic extreme the amount of subordinate participation and involvement in decision taking increases. They also suggested that the kind of leadership represented by the democratic extreme of the continuum would rarely be encountered in formal organizations like University and Military (Ekong, 2002).

While the laissez-faire leadership, is which the leader takes a completely hands off policy with his subordinates and would be at the other extreme of the continuum with the general leader somewhere in the middle. Therefore, such kinds of leaders are regarded as liberal. The leader attempts to pass the responsibility for the decision making to the group and gives little or no direction and allowed group members to a great deal of freedom. The decision making process with this type of leadership is slow and there can be greater deal of freedom and back passing. As a result, the tasks may not be undertaken and the condition may become somewhat chaotic. This type of leadership uses his or her power very little, that is, if he uses it at all. Subordinates under this kind of leadership have high degree of independence in their daily operations. Therefore, such leaders highly depend solely on subordinates to sort their own goals and the means to achieve these goals.

Management style in the context of this study is simply defined as the peculiar or distinctive manner by which vice chancellors organize, control or direct affairs in their institutions (universities). The office of the Vice Chancellor is a position of power. With specific reference to university management and leadership, Guy (1998) identifies what he terms "collegiality" as opposed to "hierarchy" as alternative ways of organizing what goes on in institutions of higher learning. The collegial principle of academic self-government is founded on the belief that academicians on university campuses are primarily colleagues (some senior and junior), with the vice chancellor as *primus inter pares* (first among equals). This suggests a horizontal or approximately "flat hierarchy" and participatory management style that

uses committees in decision making in the university. Guy (1998) further maintains that collegiality is not incompatible with entrepreneurship but actually enhances efficiency and responsiveness, which in turn enhances civility and self-government.

Vice chancellors in Nigeria are invariably drawn from among the academic staff. They therefore have a defined constituency. It would be reasonable to expect serving vice chancellors to speak for and defend their constituency when faced with hash governmental policies. Most vice chancellors have tended to act as government agents or mere "law enforcement officers", thereby creating an unnecessary "us" and "them" divide in their university (Ekong, 2002).

1.1 Development of University Education in Nigeria

The history of university education in Nigeria started with the establishment of University College Ibadan (UCI) in 1948. UCI was an affiliate of the University of London (Ike, 1976). According to Ibukun (1997), the UCI was saddled with a number of problems at inception ranging from rigid constitutional provisions, poor staffing and low enrolment to high dropout rate. In April 1959, the Federal Government set up the Ashby Commission to advise it on the higher education needs of the country for its first-two decades. Before the submission of the report, the Eastern region government established its own university at Nsukka (University of Nigeria, Nsukka in 1960).

The implementation of the Ashby Report led to the establishment of University of Ife (now Obafemi Awolowo University) in 1962 by the Western region, Ahmadu Bellow University, Zaria in 1962 by the Northern region and University of Lagos (1962) by the Federal Government. Babalola *et al.* (2007) the University College Ibadan became a full-fledged university in 1962. This made UCI and University of Lagos the first two federal universities in Nigeria, while the other three universities were regional. In 1970, the newly created Mid-Western region opted for a university known as University of Benin. The 6 universities established during this period 1960-1970 are still referred to as first-generation universities in the country. Babalola *et al.* (2007) remarked that during the period of 1960-1970, universities in Nigeria were closely under the surveillance of the government. Appointments of lay members of council and that of the vice chancellor were political. In the third national development plan (1975-1980), the government established 7 universities in 1975. They were Universities of Calabar, Ilorin, Jos, Sokoto, Maiduguri, Port Harcourt and Bayero University Kano (Tella *et al.*, 2014).

These universities are referred to as second generation universities. The third generation universities were established between 1980s and early 1990s. They are Federal Universities of Technology in Owerri, Makurdi, Yola, Akure and Bauchi. Other state universities were established in Imo, Ondo, Lagos, Akwa Ibom, Oyo and Cross River States (Anyamele, 2004). The fourth generation universities are those ones established between 1991 to date. They include many state universities, Nigerian Open University and private universities (National Universities Commission, 2012).

1.2 Structure of University System in Nigeria

The university system in Nigeria is not fundamentally established to differ from the system that operates in universities elsewhere having been evolved from the traditions of universities in Europe and America. Nayaya (1987) posits that there are functional bodies such as National Universities Commission (NUC), Joint Admission and Matriculation Board (JAMB), committee of vice-chancellors (CVC) that were established to serve as a buffer between the government and the universities. The NUC is to over-see and ensure a balanced development and growth of university education and responsible for the execution of policies, funding as well as day-to-day running of the universities. Government policies are channel to the universities through the national universities commission. The individual governing council initiates policies according to the respective laws of such institution and implement such policies. The objectives of the university are very clear as defined in the law and the means by which these objectives are achieved are also clearly and categorically spelt out while, government whether federal or state maintain the supremacy in the areas of funding as the proprietor of such university (NUC, 2012).

Thus, the assumption was that in matters of policy formulation and implementation, the organizational interest (university) is supposed to be the supreme. This is because, since the process of policy formulation in the university is achieved through complex structure from the head of departments, deans, other principal officers, vice chancellor and the senate. Although, the role played by the vice chancellor is very significant. As a result, most university laws specify that the vice chancellor must be competent at all times to advice the council on matters affecting finance and the policies of the university. The policies are generally accepted because they went through democratic process such is the official university system (NUC, 2012).

Jega (2009) pointed out that Nigerian universities are in many fundamental aspects, far

below standard of what a university ought to be. This, he added, has not always been so, because Nigerian universities had their glorious days of decency, respectability and intellectual prowess. Since the mid-1980s, the university system witness almost exponential, unplanned growth and development, in the context of underfunding, neglect condition of service, poor infrastructural development, dilapidated facilities and above all poor governance.

The modern university system comprises a variety of communities based on the wide range of academic disciplines and functions involved therein. Its internal behaviour constitutes a very complex organism shaped by many hands. This implies that its entire life is extensively shaped by its internal logic, habits and dynamics. It is also influenced by the challenges, constraints and pressures bearing upon it from within and the outside environment. The university is therefore made up of people with different backgrounds almost certainly having different needs, skills, talents, aspirations, visions, missions and status. They also probably possess and pursue different interests, values, competencies, knowledge, and behavioural styles. This also means that members of this complex social organization could exhibit different pre-emption and aggressions (Audu-Oppong, 2014).

Vice chancellors in universities are primarily concerned with how to manage resources allocated to them. They manage budgets, personnel and policy; shape institutional priorities and practices; coordinate and communicate. Administration in the university also requires constant teamwork and communication (Duze, 2012).

All over the world, universities are recognized as centres of excellence, where knowledge is not only acquired, but also disseminated to those who require it. They are formal institutions set up by the society to be centres of learning, rich ideas and ideals. Benjamin (2001) observed that universities are ivory towers, where instruction is given and received without harassment and undue influence from the outside world. Thus, the universal idea of the university is a community of scholars, free to pursue knowledge without undue interference from any quarters (Banjo, 2001).

In the same vein, Hannah (1998) postulated that universities are enterprises that produce and distribute a public good, which is knowledge. Salter (1983) stated that knowledge production is the focus of universities and that the production of knowledge has always focused on teaching and research.

Also Clarke and Edwards (1980) recognized the high level of respect and trust bestowed on the university system in this way: ''universities have since their medieval beginnings, been founded to preserve the positive heritage of society''. They are committed to promote society's corporate well being and advancement by refining the ability of its members to select reasons and understand by enquiring into and seeking to explain the development and function of man as part of the natural world and by acting as guide and critic in those areas which can be informed by a university's resources of knowledge and specialized skills. University is a complex institution that requires highly organized and effective administrator in order for it to deliver on its objectives. The vice chancellor is therefore, the Chief Executive Officer charged with both administrative and academic functions (Duze, 2012).

University administration places a high value on integrity; effectiveness and efficiency particularly as embodied in the stewardship role of vice chancellors who have the challenging task of managing resources within a complex environment of university policies and national regulations and should be held accountable and recognized for performance. Today, university vice chancellors in Nigeria are faced with challenges of managing increasing student enrolments, growing educational opportunities, implementing new technologies, responding to workplace demands and at the same time, maintaining standards. It has therefore become important for university vice chancellors to accept their responsibilities and understand that they are to be held accountable for falling sound practices. As such, for university administration to be effective, best practices and standards must be followed (Tella *et al*., 2014).

Vice chancellors have responsibilities for ensuring that best practices and standards are followed and upheld in all areas of endeavour in the university. These responsibilities include staffing, management, sourcing for funds, resourcing, auditing, supervising, monitoring and evaluation of service quality standards among others. The major function of a vice chancellor in a university is to lead. The Universities Miscellaneous Provisions Act (as amended) states that ''there shall be a Vice Chancellor of the University, who shall be the principal academic and executive officer of the University and ex-officio chairman of the Senate, and who shall in the absence of the Chancellor confer degrees and other academic titles and distinctions of the University'' (NUC, 2012).

He is the leader of the university. It is therefore incumbent upon him to lead, to influence, to induce and to inspire people in the university. Leadership is the ingredient of effectiveness on the part of the vice chancellor if the university is to be successful. This is because effective leadership is a

characteristic of a leader, the style of leadership, the characteristics of the subordinates and the situation surrounding the leadership environment.

1.3 Problem Statement

The past three Vice Chancellors assessed served University of Agriculture, Makurdi as follow, Professors: E.O. Gyang, 1996-2000; J.O.I. Ayatse, 2002-2007 and D.V. Uza, 2007-2012. Universities exist for acquisition, conservation and transaction of knowledge and its application to the affairs of man. The most active agents are the staff and the students. The administrative structure is to provide the necessary base and the right type of atmosphere that makes teaching and learning possible. There is no doubt at all that university is different from the civil service. The inner working of the administration of a university are however, marked different from those of other types of organizations. Employee performance includes executing defined duties, meeting deadlines, employee competency, and effectiveness and efficiency in doing work.

As a result of the rapid expansion of the university system, arising from the 1979 constitution and the identification of higher education as the most powerful instrument for social reforms by Longe commission of 1980, there has been proliferation of universities in Nigeria. This may have led to the appointment of vice chancellors with a little or no administrative experience to man the ever increasing universities. This may have led to the problems of poor management of personnel and resources in university system. The National Universities Commission (NUC) in its 2002 report on the state of university education in Nigeria reported that universities in Nigeria perform below expectation (Okebukola, 2002).

Some stakeholders in the university system alleged poor performance of vice chancellors of many universities in Nigeria. This problem of poor performance according to Bolarin (2006) and Babalola (2008) have led to poor academic performance of students, examination misconduct and over population of students to mention but just a few. The end results are escalating incidence of cultism, indecent dressing, indiscipline and fraudulent acquisition of results and poor staff motivation among others. This situation calls for assessment of administrative effectiveness of vice chancellors in university system whose roles are to manage available human, material and financial resources in order to achieve the goals of the government, the university system and the public.

The vice chancellor is essentially the manager of the university and his function in the university is to ensure he operates the system in a manner to carry his constituency along. This can be achieved by running open system, promoting dialogue and arriving at consensus in decision-making. Today, most vice chancellors operate on the tripod of ethnicity, materialism, religious, cultural, god-fatherism or pressure groups identity. The styles of leadership exhibited by vice chancellors must fall in conformity with good style of leadership. For example, the autocratic style of leadership is located solely within the province of a leader. The autocratic assigns tasks provide facilities and direction without consultation with his subordinates or individuals carrying out the work. Such leadership employs either positive or negative approaches. However, if the approaches used to stimulate and influence others are grounded primarily based on fear and force even though as put forward by Blake (1985) that; despite the short coming of autocratic leadership, it still has positive side.

People are managed rather than forces. The vision, dedication, and integrity of managers determined whether there is management or mismanagement. Most vice chancellors, their choice tends to be between managing and damage. Some vice chancellors reform, others deform. It is in this respect that the human angle to management becomes crucial. The critical factors in the management of authority in Nigerian universities are the leadership qualities and management skills of the executive of the institutions, namely the vice chancellor. The concept of running higher institutions should shift from administration to management (Baikie, 2009).

The university system needs strong leadership styles that stimulate the employee performance. Many Nigerian universities today are face with problems such as poor innovation, low productivity and inability to meet performance targets. The outcome of this study would be of tremendous benefits to government as management style of some of the past vice chancellors of University of Agriculture, Makurdi will be identified. Federal and State governments would find useful and sufficiently the findings of the research to concentrate more on areas of felt needs for the appointment of vice chancellors in universities.

Researchers would make use of the findings to carry out further research in relevant areas to the best interest of the society. The findings of the study will be used by researchers to advance certain recommendations that will reduce the poor management style in the university system. The findings will also help policy makers to formulate good policies that will be use in selection of vice chancellors in Nigerian universities.

2. Materials and Methods

The Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Nigeria forms the area of the study. The university which was established on January 1, 1988 has the tripartite mandate of teaching, research and extension services. Through this mandate, the university is supposed to among other things train manpower that is consistent with the requirements of an integrated research extension system. The establishment of Universities of Agriculture came into effect on lst January 1988 following a demerger process that resulted in simultaneous coming on stream of the two Universities of Agriculture located in Makurdi in Benue State, and Abeokuta in Ogun State. A third one located in Umudike in Abia State was established in 1992. The Federal Government of Nigeria had by the end of 1983 established seven new Universities of Technology, four of which were rationalized in 1984 by merging them with, and as campuses of bigger and more established Universities as a cost saving measure. Following the initiatives and reports of the National Universities Commission (NUC) on the establishment of Universities of Agriculture, the government carefully reviewed the situation against the background of the success stories of Agricultural Universities worldwide and decided to opt for converting the two campuses at Makurdi and Abeokuta into full fledged specialized Universities of Agriculture. The university runs undergraduates and postgraduates. The population of the study comprises all the staff of University of Agriculture, Makurdi that were employed before Professor E.O. Gyang left office as Vice Chancellor. Four Colleges, one Institute, one Directorate, Registry and Bursary Departments were purposively selected based on their establishment before Professor E.O. Gyang left office as Vice Chancellor. The Colleges selected were Agronomy, Agricultural Economics and Extension, Animal Science and Engineering also staff from Bursary, Directorate of internal audit, Registry and Institute of Food Security (Cooperative Extension Centre). In each of the College, Department, Directorate and Institute selected, ten (10) staff each were selected using snowball technique based on their employment before Professor E.O. Gyang left office as vice chancellor, thus giving a total of 80 respondents. Primary and secondary data were collected; primary data were collected using structured questionnaire. Secondary data were collected from documents, proceedings, journals and periodicals. Data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages and mean.

3. Results and Discussion

Results in Table 1 show frequencies and percentages of leadership style of the past three different vice chancellors, for Gyang, authoritarian, 62.5%; flexible, 25% and liberal and democratic 12.5%. For Ayatse, authoritarian, 12.5%; flexible, 56.25%; liberal/democratic 25% and others (dispositional), 6.25% and for Uza, authoritarian, 43.75%; flexible, 25%; liberal/democratic 25% and others (dispositional) 6.25%. For Gyang, (62.5%) and Uza majority (43.75%) of the respondents indicated that they were authoritarian. Authoritarian leadership is a kind of leadership style that is exhibited by the military and the paramilitary organizations, where the highest in rank in the organization feel he is superior over others and issues commands which are then executed without any complain.

This kind of leadership is not good for people in the university where there are different types of people pursuing different interest and the vice chancellor is expected to consider himself among other colleagues as been equal. This finding contradicts Guy (1988) who observed that academicians on university campuses are primarily colleagues (some senior and junior), with the vice chancellor as *primus inter pares* (first among equals). This suggests a horizontal or approximately "flat hierarchy" and participatory management style that uses committees in decision making in the university. Furthermore, Mgbekem (2004) observed that a good vice chancellor must not be authoritative, realistic, fearful, vindictive and selfish in his dealings. He must learn how to delegate authority and back it up with power and then seek the cooperation of his staff, students and the public in his administration.

For Ayatse, the highest 56.25% observed his flexible style of leadership. Flexible leaders are people who pay attention to other peoples' views before making decision. Flexibility is of various degrees; high level of flexibility of a leader could mar the achievement of such a leader as he would easily be bent in terms of decision by people who may not wish him well on one hand, on the other hand, if the level of flexibility is moderate, the leader would not be bent by people that are close to him. The best leadership style in the university is wide consultation which is usually done starting at the departmental level to the Senate of the university.

Results in Table 2 indicate leadership attributes on Gyang, low level of accessibility, 31.25%; financial resources management, 18.75%; equitable access to resources by staff, 18.75; communication effectiveness, 18.75%; staff satisfaction, 6.25% and level of staff motivation, 6.25%. For Ayatse, financial resources management, 31.25%; staff satisfaction, 25%; equitable access to resources by staff, 18.75%; low level of accessibility, 12.5%; communication, effectiveness, 6.25% and level of staff motivation 6.25%.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents based on Selected Leadership Style of the past Vice Chancellors

Leadership style	Professor E.O. Gyang		Professor J.O.I. Ayatse		Professor D.V. Uza	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Authoritarian	50	62.5	10	12.5	35	43.75
Flexible	20	25.0	35	56.25	20	25.0
Liberal/democratic	10	12.5	20	25.0	20	25.0
Others (Dispositional)	0	0	5	6.25	5	6.25
Total	80	100	80	100	80	100

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents by Selected Leadership Attributes of the past Three Different Vice Chancellors (Gyang, Ayatse and Uza)

Attribute	Professor E.O. Gyang		Professor J.O.I. Ayatse		Professor D.V. Uza	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Low level of accessibility	25	31.25	10	12.5	5	6.25
Financial resources management	15	18.75	25	31.25	15	18.75
Equitable access to resources by staff	15	18.75	15	18.75	30	37.5
Communication effectiveness	15	18.75	5	6.25	10	12.5
Staff satisfaction	5	6.25	10	25.0	10	12.5
Level of staff motivation	5	6.25	5	6.25	10	12.5
Total	80	100	80	100	80	100

Attributes of leadership on Uza, low level of accessibility, 6.25%; financial resources management, 18.75%; equitable access to resources by staff, 37.5%; communication effectiveness, 12.5%; staff satisfaction, 12.5% and level of staff motivation, 12.5%. For Gyang, a meagre (31.25%) proportion of the respondents stated low level of accessibility. Accessing leaders especially in Africa is a very difficult task as one has to pass through a lot of procedures before accessing people in leadership position. People in leadership position need time to concentrate on different issues related to the people they lead. However, it does not mean they should not receive and entertain visitors.

Difficulty in accessing leaders is a form of security adopted by people in leadership position to prevent people who may not have very important issues to discuss with a leader but would want to always pay a visit. Frequent visits to leaders by the people they lead is a way of distraction. If leaders are frequently distracted by visits; they may not be able to treat important matters with dispatched. However, when accesses to leaders by the people they lead become very difficult, people become disenchanted with such leaders. For Ayatse, a reasonable proportion (31.25%) of the respondents reported financial resources management. Financial resources management is one of the key attributes of leaders if they must be successful in building trust among members they lead but not the only attribute expected by people in leadership position in organizations. For

Uza, a reasonable (37.5%) proportion of the respondents stated that there was equitable distribution of resources during his tenure.

In the present educational system, the university vice chancellor is a representative of staff of the university and is held responsible for most of the activities in a university where he/she is a vice chancellor. The vice chancellor is therefore, the overall head of the university with the responsibility to man the administration and the entire operations of the university. This finding corroborates Okecha (2008) who reported that the vice chancellor is the administrative head, a manager, a community/public relations officer, a supervisor as well as an instructional leader, a curriculum innovator and a catalyst towards planned educational revolution.

In another way, Chike-Okoli (2009) stated that effectiveness of a leader, who is also an executive, depends on how his leadership personality or style interacts with the situation in which he operates. Effective leadership therefore, gives direction to the efforts of staff in their desire to accomplish the goals of the organization in which they belong. In a university system, there may be many professors but only one person is appointed as a leader of the university who is the vice chancellor. Once he is appointed vice chancellor, he becomes a leader of the university first among equals and he carries with him certain attributes.

Similarly, Cameron and Wehtton (2001) vice chancellor support staff members to work

through university problems and arrive at best solutions. When subordinates and supervisors or team members make mistakes, rather than reprimand them, they are instead helped to learn from their mistakes. This according to them has no restrictions and is not affected by the type of institution (either conventional or specialized university) involved.

Results in Table 3 reveal financial transparency for the past three vice chancellors, that is, Ayatse, 50%; Uza, 37.5% and Gyang, 12.5%. Majority (50%) indicated that Ayatse displayed a high level of financial transparency among the past three vice chancellors. Display of financial transparency is very essential for the progress of any organization. Many people in position of leadership hardly display a little level of financial transparency. Many of our leaders after few years of their stewardship, if accounts of organization they led are audited, so many financial recklessness are identified. It is good for leaders to be financially transparent. Financial transparency is one of the key ingredients that help in building trust between leaders and their followers. The findings confirms Mullins (2010) who reported that financial achievement must be related to the achievement of some purpose, objectives or tasks to the performance of the process of administration including the best financial practices for the execution of work in the university, this is because the university system has all the expertise for performance of its functions. Similarly, Daft (2003) administrative effectiveness results from a combination of personal attributes and dimensions of the vice chancellors' job in meeting the demands of the situation and satisfying the requirements of the university.

Table 3. Distribution of Respondents by Financial Transparency of the past Vice Chancellors

Vice Chancellor	Frequency	Percentage
Professor J.O.I. Ayatse	40	50.0
Professor D.V. Uza	30	37.5
Professor E.O. Gyang	10	12.5
Total	80	100

Results in Table 4 show frequencies and percentage of rate of violation of university laws that is, Gyang, 62.5%; Uza, 25% and Ayatse, 12.5%. A major (62.5%) proportion of the respondents stated that Gyang violated the university laws: promotion, recruitment and admission more than any other vice chancellor in the study. Laws are most of the times violated because other people might have violated law(s) and gone without punishment which set the precedence that laws are usually violated in public

offices without the violator of the law been punished. In Nigeria, many people feel they are above the law as such, they violate laws without restriction. In the university system, the visitor to the university who could the president or governor for Federal or State universities has the power to constitute visitation panel to investigate the administration of past university vice chancellors periodically. However, when such committees or panels are constituted, they carry out their functions and reports are submitted to the visitor to the university and nothing is done about it. Therefore, visitation panel set by the visitor to the university is seen as mere academic exercise, which makes vice chancellors to violate laws to the level they choose. This finding corroborates Camoy (2000) who observed that the duties of the vice chancellor is to ensure that all members of staff used and follow agreed procedures, expects everyone to comply properly to lay down rules. When a tradition of leadership is already strongly entrenched in an institution, all university staff are expected to work and be effective within the established norms of their universities.

Table 4. Distribution of Respondents According to Rate of Violation of laws: Promotion, Recruitment and Admission

Vice Chancellor	Frequency	Percentage
Professor E.O. Gyang	50	62.5
Professor D.V. Uza	20	25.0
Professor J.O.I. Ayatse	10	12.5
Total	80	100

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The University system is in dire need of leaders, ones who inspire people not through words but by serving them, the cutting edge is the old fashioned idea of leadership through service. The whole human race desperately needs these outstanding people who really attend to others and are beacons of hope in our search for a society where justices, fairness, care for the weaker members of our communities and love flourish. It is recommended that vice chancellors style of leadership should be service to the people since decision making in the university is different from what is obtainable in the military, paramilitary and ministry.

References

1. Adu-Oppong, A. A. (2014). Strengthening Quality Assurance: The Role of University Administrators. Current Research Journal of Social Sciences 6(4): 134-137

2. Anyambele, S. C. (2004). Institutional management in higher education: a study of leadership approaches to quality improvement in

university management: Nigerian and Finnish cases. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis submitted to the Department of Education, University of Helsinki.

3. Babalola, J. B. (2008). Modeling Nigeria university system for effective learning and global relevance: past, present and perspective. (p. 75). A Wemark Publishers. Jerry Commercial Productions, Calabar, Nigeria.

4. Babalola, J. B., Jaiyeoba, A. O. and Okediran, A. (2007). University autonomy and financial reforms in Nigeria: historical background, issues and recommendations from experience. In: J. B. Babalola and B. O. Emenemu (eds). Issues in higher education: Research evidence from sub-sahara Africa. Lagos: Bolabay Publications.

5. Baikie, A. (2009). The evolving crises in the Credibility of Nigerian's Ivory Towers Deregulation and Funding of Universities. The National scholar. Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU). 6(1):25-34.

6. Bales, R. F. (1970). Interaction process analysis. Mass: Addison-Wesley, 509.

7. Banjo, A. (2000). In the saddle: A Vice Chancellor's Story. In: Y. Lebeau and M. Ogunsanya (eds). The Dilemma of Post-Colonial *Universities*. Ibadan: IFRA/African Book Builders.

8. Benjamin, S. A. (2001). Perspective on University autonomy and the sustainability of higher education in Nigeria. Proceedings of the 12th General Assembly of the Social Science Academy of Nigeria, 21-28.

9. Bhatti, N., Maitlo, G.M., Shaikh, N., Hashmi, M.A. and Shaikh, F.M. (2012). The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job satisfaction, International Business Research. 5(2): 2 192–201.

10. Blake, R. R. (1985). The Managerial Grid III. Houston, TX: Gulf.

11. Bolarin, T.A. (2006). Examination malpractice in Nigeria higher institutions of learning: Methods, causes, implications and remedies. In J.A.Agantha, (Ed). Higher education in Nigeria. Lagos: Nigerian academy in Education.

12. Bruffee, K. A. (1993). Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence and the authority of knowledge. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 125.

13. Buckner, J. C. (1988). The development of an instrument to measure neighbourhood cohesion. American Journal of Community Psycholo gy, 16(6): 771-791.

14. Cameron, K. S and Whetton, D. A. (2001). Administrative effectiveness in higher education. Review of higher education, 9: 23-27.

15. Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G. D., & Klesh, J.R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler, P. H. Mirvis & C. Cammann (Eds.), Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices (pp. 71-138). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

16. Camoy, M. (2000). Globalization and higher education in perspective education. 18(3):30-40.

17. Chike-Okoli, A. (2009). Leadership for organizational effectiveness. In: J.B Babalola and A.O Ayeni, (Eds), Educational management theories and tasks. Lagos. Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Limited.

18. Clarke, A. and Edwards, L. (1980). The Williams committee of inquiry into education and training in Australia: Recommendations for Universities. Higher Education, 9(5): 495-528.

19. Cohen, S. and Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support and offering hypothesis. Psychology Bulletin, 98: 310-357.

20. Daft, R. L. (2003). Management *(*sixth edition) Ohio: Thompson –South-Western.

21. Duze, C. O. (2012). Managing role conflict among university administrators in Nigeria Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS) 3 (2): 162-169.

22. Ekong E. E. (2002). Management styles in Nigerian universities under military rule and the challenges of democracy: how democratic can university management be? Accra: Association of African Universities.

23. Guy, N. (1998). Collegiality: to resist or to reform? IAU Newsletter, May, 44(1):3.

24. Hannah, R. L. (1998). Merging the intellectual and technical infrastructures in higher education: The internet example. The Internet and Higher Education, 1(1): 7-20.

25. Hermann, M. (1999). Assessing leadership style: trait analysis. Social science automation, Inc. Pp. 2-4

26. Ibukun, W. O. (1997). Educational management: theory and practice. Ado- Ekiti: Green Line Publishers.

27. Ike, V.C. (1976). University development in Africa, the Nigerian experience. Ibadan: Oxford University Press. international seminar, A.B.U. Zaria.

28. Jega, A. M. (2009). Towards resolution of the crisis in the Nigerian University system. The national scholar. ASUU Kaduna, March.

29. Marx, K. (1933). Selected Works of Karl Marx. N. Y.: International Publishers.

30. Mgbekem, S. J. A. (2004). Management of university education in Nigeria Calabar: UNICAL Press.

31. Mullins, L. J. (2010). Management and organizational (sixth edition). Great Britain: Pretice Hall.

32. NUC. (2012). National Universities Commission, Annual Report, Abuja: NUC.

33. Okebukola, P. (2002). The state of university education in Nigeria, Abuja: National Universities.

34. Okecha, S.A. (2008). The Nigeria University: An ivory tower with neither ivory nor tower, Owerri: Edu-Edy Publications.

35. Salter, B. (1983) Contract research: universities and the knowledge market, Higher Education Review, 15: 729.

36. Tamuno, T. N. (1987). Management of Universities in Nigeria: a look at the past, present. American research institute for policy development, December, available at http://dx.doi.org/10.15640

37. Tella1, C. M., Mbaya, P. Y. and Liberty, S. M. (2014). Comparative leadership styles of accountability in the University of Maiduguri. Journal of Administrative Sciences and Policy Studies, 2(2): 31-48.