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The purposes of this study were to determine 1) the tasks that the Nigerian university vice-chancellor should perform personally, 2) the functions that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other university staff to achieve effective administration, 3) the factors that should be considered in the selection of a vice-chancellor, and 4) the criteria that should be considered in the evaluation of the vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness.

Chapter I includes a statement of the problem, purposes, research questions, background, significance of the study, definition of terms, limitations of the study, and basic assumptions. Chapter II is a review of related literature, and Chapter III presents information on the procedure followed in the collection and treatment of data. The analysis and evaluation of the findings are presented in Chapter IV; and the summary, findings,
implications, and recommendations of the study are presented in Chapter V.

The study revealed 1) eleven functions that the vice-chancellor should perform personally, 2) twenty-eight functions that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other university staff, 3) six factors that should be considered in the selection of a vice-chancellor, and 4) five criteria that should be considered in the evaluation of the vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness. The findings of this study appear to warrant the following recommendations. 1) Similar studies should be conducted in the next five years in order to identify possible opinion changes and possible new role emphases for the vice-chancellor. 2) This study should be replicated with faculty members as subjects.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The most common and the most serious system of mal-organization is multiplication of the number of management levels. A basic rule of organization is to build the least possible number of management levels and forge the shortest possible chain of command. Every additional level makes more difficult the attainment of common direction and mutual understanding. Every additional level distorts objectives and mis-directs attention. Mathematical "information theory" has a law that any additional relay in a communication system halves the "message" and doubles the "noise." Any "level" in an organization is a "relay." Every link in the chain sets up additional stresses and creates one more source of inertia, friction, and slack (20, p. 518).

Critical examination of the system of higher education in Nigeria shows that it is suffering from the type of mal-organization identified by Drucker (20). Malorganization in higher education in Nigeria appears in the form of what Drucker calls a "multiplicity of management levels," which makes it impossible to know who is in charge. Lack of clarity in the specific responsibility of principal officers in federal universities, unclear procedures for the selection of these officers, no description of the necessary qualifications that principal officers should possess before they are employed, and no criteria to be used in the evaluation of their job performance effectiveness are among the
most serious problems in the Nigerian higher educational system.

For effective administration, the managerial process in contemporary organizations is assigned to numerous persons who have the requisite training and competence to deal with any task in the organization. Descriptive labels are used to promote some degree of understanding of what these persons do and are expected to do. The levels in an organization are interconnecting links, and they should serve as vehicles for decision-making, communication, and authority delegation and, in general, for conducting the affairs of the organization (19). According to a management rule known as the span of control, such a managerial process dictates that a supervisor should have just the right number of people reporting to him so that he can effectively direct and control their activities (14, pp. 343-350). Similarly, in order to foster the clarity and the unity required in an organization, no subordinate should report to more than one supervisor, as stated in the management rule of unity of command. The responsibility and authority of each supervisor should be clearly delineated in writing, and authority should be commensurate with the responsibility imposed (16, pp. 89-90). In Nigeria, however, the responsibilities of vice-chancellors are not clearly identified, and individuals in support activities
are not given control over operations. The levels of authority should be kept to the minimum necessary to ensure control and unity in the organization (14, pp. 343-350).

A hierarchy establishes channels of authority and communication flow within organizations. Most activities and operations are made to flow on a horizontal as well as a vertical plane. The primary concern is how to identify the functions and responsibilities of each unit and position. The various methods of achieving this integration are the formulation of a) organizational manuals, b) organizational procedures, c) committees, and d) temporary structures such as task forces and ad hoc committees (14, pp. 343-350).

In other words, the complexity of modern organizations is such that no one manager, despite exceptional skills and knowledge, can resolve complicated business problems without input from specialists inside and outside the organization (13, pp. 12-15). Therefore, in the case of vice-chancellors in Nigerian universities, need exists for delegation of responsibilities (16, pp. 89-98).

Through such participation, employees increase their awareness of problems within the organization, become better acquainted with procedures, and, consequently, increase their commitment to the solution of those problems. Furthermore, groups are significantly more creative in
problem-solving than are individuals working alone, especially when simple tasks are involved (13, pp. 12-15), which is one of the main reasons for the formation and use of committees.

According to Donnelley (18), as a business organization—or any other organization—increases in size and complexity, the management process also becomes more complex and, therefore, more specialized and shared. The managerial structure then must reflect the greater degree of specialization on the horizontal or vertical levels or a combination of both, and the chain of command and accountability is based upon that structure. The managerial structure and the workers are divided into top management, middle management, first-line managers, supervisors, foremen, and non-managers, and the last of these groups is divided into blue-collar workers, salespersons, clerks, scientists, and so on (13, pp. 5-10). Authority and responsibility are reflected in position. First-line managers should be skilled in working with people. Almost all managers' success depends on their communication and technical skills and their ability to coordinate the activities of persons above and below them in the hierarchy (18, pp. 5-10).

Ideally, in organizations those who exercise managerial authority are accountable to an individual or to a group of people. Top management is accountable to the owners or their
representatives (e.g., stockholders, partners, a board of regents, a board of governors, or members of a governing council). In Nigeria, vice-chancellors are said to be the chief executives of their respective institutions. Yet, the vice-chancellor cannot act independently in the selection, employment, evaluation, or discipline of university officers and students. Instead the head of the federal government of Nigeria performs these tasks (18, p. 5).

The administrative structure of higher education in Nigeria is such that it is difficult to say who is in control or who represents the "owners" on federal university campuses. Every employee is expected to have some sort of responsibility, but ultimate authority rests with top management. Thus, accountability and authority are vertical, but responsibility can be both vertical and horizontal. According to Donnelley,

Descriptive labels help to understand what people do or are expected to do in an organization. The vertical dimension of management is defined, then, as the process by which the right to act and use resources within specified limits (authority) is delegated downward. As this is effectuated in practice, managers can be described in terms of the extent and limits of authority at their disposal. The delegation of authority also determines differences in on-the-job relationships among managers at the same level, that is horizontal specialization (18, p. 5).

No job description handbook currently exists for chief executives of Nigerian universities. This may be why
questions have arisen concerning what a vice-chancellor
does or should do to make higher education administra-
tion in Nigeria effective. Persons who are interested
in improving higher education administration in Nigeria
feel that, if vice-chancellors are to be successful, they
should possess certain qualifications that are essential
for the effective discharge of their jobs. In addition,
it is also believed that criteria should be developed
for evaluating the job performance of vice-chancellors
(50, pp. 1-4).

The act that established the University of Ibadan in
1962, later amended in 1972 and 1976, was to apply through-
out the Federation of Nigeria (48, p. 75). It provides
that the vice-chancellor shall, in relation to the univer-
sity, take precedence before all other members of the uni-
versity except the chancellor. The act further stipulates
that, unless otherwise specified, the vice-chancellor shall
have the general function of directing the activities of
the university (48, p. 36).

Familiarity with the administrative or management
functions of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and
controlling indicates that directing is a minor top manage-
ment function compared to planning and controlling. If
descriptive labels promote some degree of understanding
of what people do and are expected to do in an organization,
the University of Ibadan Act or the term "vice-chancellor," which is used to describe the chief executives of Nigerian universities, is of no help to an understanding of what the vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities do or are expected to do in practice.

Lack of clarity concerning what the vice-chancellor in a Nigerian university does or should do has made the office of vice-chancellor very unstable. Reflecting on this state of confusion, Uya (50) declared that the vice-chancellorship of a university is one of the hottest seats that anyone can occupy in the public life of Nigeria today (50, p. 1).

During a Visitation Panel held to investigate complaints about administrative problems at the University of Nigeria-Nsukka, Nwala stated that the powers given to vice-chancellors were too vast, asserting that the vice-chancellor has the destiny of his or her colleagues at his or her disposal and can make or mar them at will (51, p. 4). This may occur because the vice-chancellor takes advantage of the void that normally appears when no one is in charge.

The Ibadan Act specifies that the university senate shall organize and control teaching at the institution, be in charge of admissions and of disciplining students, and be responsible for the promotion of research at the university (48, pp. 34-35). Nowhere in the Ibadan Act
were the functions of the senate delegated to the vice-chancellor. By decree the Nigerian government set up the Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board (JAMB), which is now responsible for the admission of undergraduates to all of the federal universities in the country. This seems to represent a devestment of one of the powers of the vice-chancellor, and the government has bypassed the vice-chancellor by going out of its way to discipline students without reference to university authorities.

An example of this devestment is given by the government's acceptance of the Report of the Mohammed Commission of inquiry, which probed the circumstances leading to the death of several students after demonstrations at various universities, and by the government asking two vice-chancellors to resign. Then, the government ordered the councils of the universities and the governing board of the polytechnic in question to terminate the appointments of ten staff members, despite their existing contracts. The government unilaterally expelled and suspended without any guidance from the vice-chancellors whose students protested or were deemed to be involved in the crisis (35).

Commenting on this situation, Ojo (35) expressed disappointment at the government's taking such drastic action against staff and students without any reference to the authorities responsible for the affected individuals. The
Cookey Commission on the conditions of service of university staff also criticized the government's termination of university staff appointments, claiming that this action eroded the powers of university councils and, thus, interfered with university autonomy (35, pp. 56-57).

Current conditions in Nigerian higher education, including the multiplicity of personnel, agencies, and other bodies charged with the administration of Nigerian universities, has led to an overlapping of functions. Appendix A illustrates the relationships among the organizations and top administrators involved in university policy-making in Nigeria. The organizations presented in Appendix A have direct control of students, staff, or both, without reference to any individual university council, senate, chancellor, pro-chancellor, or vice-chancellor. The agencies and administrators whose policies can and do affect students and staff are a) the federal military government, through the cabinet office or the head of state; b) the federal Ministry of Education, through the federal Commissioner of Education; c) the National Universities Commission (NUC); d) the Federal Scholarship Administration Board (FSAB); e) the Student Loan Board (SLB); f) the federal Ministry of Establishment, through the Civil Service Board (CSB); g) the Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board (JAMB); h) the university governing council, through the chancellor or the
pro-chancellor; i) the university senate; j) the vice-chancellor and the deputy vice-chancellor; k) the registrar; l) the bursar; and m) the librarian.

The difficulties confronting academic leaders are many. A major problem is that these leaders are generally the least understood and thus the least appreciated of chief executives in organizations (8, p. 7), a situation that seemingly arises from a lack of understanding of what the chief executive officers of institutions of higher education do (8, p. 7). Another problem is academic evaluation, an issue complicated by the vagueness of academic goals (9, pp. 105-106). Most organizations have clear-cut purposes--business firms, for example, supply needed goods and services as a way of making profits, which is, in part, a measure of their success; government bureaus have tasks specified by law; hospitals try to overcome illness and injury; prisons try to rehabilitate criminal offenders; and so on--but, in contrast, the goals of a college or university typically comprise a long, evaluatively amorphous list of items such as teaching, research, serving the local community, administering scientific installations, housing students and faculty, supporting the arts, and attacking social problems. Even when goals are specified in concrete terms and put into operation, disagreement still results (9, pp. 105-106). Thus, the problem
is not only that academic goals are sometimes unclear but that they are sometimes strongly contested after they are made clear (9, pp. 105-106).

Commenting on this situation, Ebel (21, p. 81) advised chief executives in higher education to try to understand themselves and their roles in spite of the complex and changing nature of those roles. Atwell and Green (8, p. 7) pointed out that lack of appreciation for what academic leaders do is particularly due to the difficulty of defining exactly which functions these chief executives should delegate to other officers to achieve effective and efficient administration. Regarding higher education administration in general, Drucker (20) pointed out that the most pressing need is the identification of administrative ability to meet the specific challenges faced by higher education institutions. This is why Owen has called for the professional development of men and women charged with university administration (39, pp. 112-113).

Kenner has observed that, despite the fact that the university president is the key instrument for the institution's survival, the dysfunctional realities of the presidential office persist (29, pp. 177-180). Such dysfunctional realities and the increasing demands of leadership in higher education are partially responsible for the difficulty experienced by colleges and universities in
attracting and holding able persons as chief administrative officers.

In view of these problems, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) developed lists of functions that American college and university presidents are expected to perform and that will also constitute the basis for evaluating the job performance of these officers (42). The assumption is that defining the responsibilities of chief executives in higher education institutions will enable them to understand those responsibilities better (8, pp. 4-5).

According to Cleary (16, pp. 87-98), many problems in universities currently concern the relationship of responsibility to authority and the need to find answers to the question, "Who has authority and responsibility for university decision-making?" In addition, Atwell and Green have identified what they describe as "the problems of university presidency," namely, a) the process of choosing a college or university president, b) the demands made upon the president, c) the tendency of the faculty to criticize the administration when problems arise, and d) the problem of measuring what the president does in practice (8, pp. 4-5).

The problems identified by Atwell and Green (8) exist in Nigeria (Appendix B provides an example of the
vice-chancellor selection problem) (51, p. 4). Although a number of investigations have been conducted to identify the problems confronting higher education in Nigeria, no research has been done to date to pinpoint the specific functions that vice-chancellors in Nigerian universities should perform or the functions that they should delegate to other officers in order to achieve effective administration. In an attempt to find solutions to some of the problems afflicting Nigerian higher education, Okafor (36, pp. 133-159) conducted a study and found that there was constant interference by highly placed Nigerian politicians in the affairs of most of the country's universities. Such interference may be due to lack of a precise definition of the role of the chief executive officer in university administration in Nigeria. Situations like these are described as a crisis in contemporary Nigerian education, when government fails to live up to the expectation of promoting effective higher education administration (7, p. 8).

In addition to the need to develop lists of functions that university presidents should perform and those that they should delegate to other officers, the factors that should be considered in the selection of Nigerian university chief executives and the criteria that should be used in evaluating vice-chancellors' job performance effectiveness must be identified. The intent of the present study
is to address these problems in Nigeria as has been done in the United States and other developed countries in the past (26, pp. 4-5).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is related to a) the functions perceived by vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities and members of Nigerian university governing councils that vice-chancellors should perform and those that they should delegate to other officers to achieve effective administration, b) the factors perceived by vice-chancellors and other council members as important in the selection of Nigerian university chief executives, and c) the criteria that should be used in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of Nigerian university chief executives.

Purposes of the Study

The primary purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To identify the functions validated by experts in institutions of higher education in Nigeria as tasks that vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities should generally perform;

2. To identify the factors validated by experts in institutions of higher education in Nigeria as important in the selection of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities;
3. To identify the factors validated by experts in institutions of higher education in Nigeria as important in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities;

4. To develop a list of functions perceived by vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities as tasks that the vice-chancellor of a Nigerian university should perform to achieve effective administration;

5. To develop a list of functions perceived by members of university governing councils in Nigeria as tasks that the vice-chancellor of a Nigerian university should perform to achieve effective administration;

6. To develop a list of functions perceived by vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities as tasks that the vice-chancellor of a Nigerian university should delegate to other officers to achieve effective administration;

7. To develop a list of functions perceived by members of university governing councils in Nigeria as tasks that the vice-chancellor of a Nigerian university should delegate to other officers to achieve effective administration;

8. To develop a list of factors perceived by vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities as important in the selection of the vice-chancellor of a Nigerian university;
9. To develop a list of factors perceived by members of university governing councils in Nigeria as important in the selection of the vice-chancellor of a Nigerian university;

10. To develop a list of factors perceived by vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities as important in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of the vice-chancellor of a Nigerian university; and

11. To develop a list of factors perceived by members of university governing councils in Nigeria as important in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of the vice-chancellor of a Nigerian university.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to accomplish the purposes of this study.

1. What functions do experts in institutions of higher education in Nigeria expect that vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities should perform?

2. What factors do experts in institutions of higher education in Nigeria consider important in the selection of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?

3. What factors do experts in institutions of higher education in Nigeria consider important in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?
4. What functions do vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities perceive that they should perform in order to achieve effective administration?

5. What functions do members of university governing councils in Nigeria perceive that vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities should perform in order to achieve effective administration?

6. What functions do vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities perceive that they should delegate to other officers in order to achieve effective administration?

7. What functions do members of university governing councils in Nigeria perceive that vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities should delegate to other officers in order to achieve effective administration?

8. What factors do vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities perceive as important in the selection of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?

9. What factors do members of university governing councils in Nigeria perceive as important in the selection of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?

10. What factors do vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities perceive as important in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?
11. What factors do members of university governing councils in Nigeria perceive as important in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?

12. What relationships exist between the independent variables and the responses of the vice-chancellors and the council members to each item on the questionnaire?

13. Do any relationships exist between the participants' responses and their demographic characteristics (age, sex, and educational background)?

14. Are differences apparent in the mean responses of the vice-chancellors and the council members to each item on the questionnaire?

Background of the Study

The Nigerian Concept of the University

Although diplomas and certificates were awarded by post-secondary educational institutions in Nigeria as early as the 1930s, the history of higher education institutions in the country began in 1948. The Yaba Medical School was established in 1930 and the Yaba Higher College was established in 1932, although it did not open until 1934. Although these two post-secondary institutions granted diplomas and certificates in selected subjects, these did not satisfy the aspirations of the Nigerians who longed for university education in their country so that they could
earn degrees that would not be inferior to those awarded by universities in the United Kingdom and elsewhere (48, p. 23). Although the University of Nigeria-Nsukka, which came into existence in 1960, was Nigeria's first independent university, the University of Ibadan is accorded the designation of being the first university in the country; it came into existence in 1948 as a university college affiliated with London University and gained its academic independence to become a full-fledged university in 1962 (48, p. 27). The definition of a university in the Nigerian context is an institution of higher education that awards degrees in addition to diplomas and certificates (48, p. 23).

The Legal Status of Universities

Institutions of higher education in Nigeria are legal entities in that they are created by law--by federal law if they are federal universities and by state law if they are state universities (31, p. 24). The first Nigerian Constitution of 1954 made education a federal and state responsibility, although it did not prevent individuals or groups from owning or operating educational institutions; higher education was placed on the concurrent list (i.e., both federal and state governments were free to pass legislation affecting higher education).
Centralization

The centralization of higher education in Nigeria became permanent after the Report of the Ashby Commission, the first government-sponsored commission charged with providing advice on higher education, in 1959. After considering the nature of Nigeria's government, its culture, and its economic position, the Commission recommended that a) all universities should be national in outlook and subject to some central planning and direction and b) the bulk of capital grants and a proportion of recurrent funds should come from the federal government.

In a White Paper on the recommendations of the Ashby Commission report, the federal government proposed that, although each university, whether federal or regional, should have autonomy in the management of its affairs, the overall national interest should be safeguarded through the establishment of a) an Interregional Manpower Board, b) an All-Nigeria Academic Council, and c) a National Universities Commission. The National Manpower Board was established in 1962, but it has not been effective in exerting any significant influence on the planning of higher education in Nigeria (3, pp. 10-11; 30, p. 29). The Academic Council has never been established. The National Universities Commission was founded in 1962, but became a statutory body only in 1974 (3, pp. 10-11; 30, p. 39). Despite the centralization of
higher education after 1959, due to the failure of the government to set up a National Academic Council, many bodies now make policies that directly affect higher education in Nigeria.

The Nigerian Constitution and Higher Education

Section 17 of the Nigerian Constitution gives the government of the Federation of Nigeria full responsibility for ensuring the attainment of social order based on the ideals of freedom, equality, and justice. Section 18 provides that the government should direct its educational policies toward ensuring that equal and adequate educational opportunities are available at all levels. Section 20 enjoins the government to protect the Nigerian culture, and Section 22 stipulates that the Nigerian national ethic shall be discipline, self-reliance, and patriotism (24, pp. 27-28).

The Manpower Board was assigned the task of identifying Nigeria's manpower needs and assisting the nation's universities in meeting them (24, p. 14). This body was supposed to encourage consultations among universities, employers, and the government, but such consultations are not being effectively carried out today (24, p. 14). The National Universities Commission, the Educational Research Council, and the Nigerian Council for Science and Technology are responsible for identifying the areas of need and priority for
higher education and for advising the Nigerian government concerning them (24, p. 15). Yet, neither the National Universities Commission nor the federal government has formulated a general job description handbook for the vice-chancellors of all Nigerian universities. This is one of the reasons why the present study is important.

The National Universities Commission was supposed to serve as an advisory body, to act as an intermediary between the government and the universities, and to ascertain whether requests for money by universities were reasonable and appropriate (24, p. 16). The findings of a task force set up to find ways to improve higher education administration in Nigeria and seminars on the problems of higher education in Nigeria, held under the auspices of the federal government, led to the implementation of a National Policy on Education in 1977. In this document, the goals of individual institutions of higher education were made the responsibility of their faculty and administrators (23, p. 14).

In Nigeria, the team of university administrators is headed by the vice-chancellor, who is supposed to be responsible for administering the entire institution. The vice-chancellor is also responsible to and should derive his or her authority from the governing council of the university. This hierarchy began with the establishment of
the University of Ibadan in 1948, when the chief executive officer of the institution was called the principal. The chief executive officers of the University of Ibadan later came to be known as vice-chancellors, and that name was subsequently adopted by the chief executives of other Nigerian universities as well (1). Today, however, vice-chancellors are not selected by their university governing councils and senates.

**Developments in the Past Decade**

In 1975, the federal military government took over all of the universities in Nigeria. Immediately after the takeover, the government established more universities, abolished tuition fees, and fixed board and lodging charges, but government grants to the universities were not increased. Before 1975, universities had determined their own levels of tuition and other fees, and the government paid charges only for the students it sponsored (3, p. 20).

The federal government automatically became the sole source of funding for Nigerian universities after the takeover (23). The Nigerian Constitution provides the following for the administration of each university: a) the head of the federal government, who is known as the Visitor to the university, ratifies the appointment or termination
of the appointment of the vice-chancellor; b) each university has a chancellor, who is often a political appointee; c) the chancellor chairs the meeting of the university governing council, but in the absence of the chancellor the pro-chancellor chairs the meeting; and d) the university senate is chaired by the vice-chancellor.

Before the takeover of all universities by the federal government in 1975, each vice-chancellor was appointed by the governing council of the university in which he or she later assumed leadership, but since the takeover the council's role in the appointment of the vice-chancellor is merely advisory. Before 1975, in the process of choosing a candidate for the post of vice-chancellor, the particular university governing council and senate jointly recommended three candidates to the Visitor, who usually made the final decision. Often the candidates recommended were senior members of the university faculty in order to maintain the tradition of the institution. The government is not bound by law to choose any of the candidates recommended by the council and the senate but can instead appoint any person it considers fit (1, p. 2). This is currently the practice in all federal Nigerian universities, and it means that vice-chancellors can be chosen without any guidelines whatsoever. In addition to assuming the right to appoint vice-chancellors without the respective institutions' governing bodies' recommendations,
the government has taken other measures that have hurt Nigerian universities rather than helped them (3, p. 20).

First of all, in 1975, as previously noted, the government unilaterally abolished tuition fees charged by universities and fixed board charges at 15 kobo (k) per meal and lodging at 30 Niara (N) per year. In 1977, it was discovered that the economy could not bear the burden of these unrealistic policies, but the government continued to make tuition free, although it raised board charges to 50k per meal and lodging fees to N90 per session (3, p. 20).

After board and lodging fees were raised, the students revolted, and the government swiftly quelled their insurrection. Before the disturbance was brought to an end, five students were shot by the police. The Mohammed Commission of Inquiry was instituted to investigate the incident, and when its report was issued two vice-chancellors and seven lecturers were discharged (3, p. 20).

In 1977, as a result of the Constitutional Amendment of May 31, by Decree No. 46, the military government placed higher education on the federal exclusive list, which meant that only the federal government had the right to establish universities in Nigeria. In the 1978/79 academic year, the government withdrew its increase in board and lodging fees, but the nation has paid heavily for that ill-considered action. Ajayi has declared,
A National Academic Council or some such central coordinating body is needed to take the management and financing of our universities out of the operations of partisan politics. It should be an autonomous policy-making body set up by law, with representatives of the different universities, federal and state authorities, and various professional and industrial groups. Members should be people knowledgeable about higher education, genuinely interested in the healthy development of the universities, sufficiently authoritative and influential to plan university development and secure finance for planned development. They should also be able to ensure that universities in their operations and management are made to serve the longer-term interests of the nation and not the immediate interests of parties in power (3, p. 20).

Centralization, the Court, and the Constitution

On March 30, 1983, in a case brought by Dr. Basil Ukaegbu against the Attorney General of Imo State, the Supreme Court of Nigeria decided that individuals or groups have the right to establish private universities. According to the Court,

Private agencies and individuals are free under our Constitution to establish universities without any law expressly against any such action or subject to any law passed by the National or State Assemblies for the purpose of regulating university education or setting for it a uniform standard (15, p. 18).

In December of 1984, however, the civilian government was again replaced by a military government in Nigeria. The government closed all private universities, and today there are still no private universities in Nigeria (15, p. 18).
The Nigerian government has been called upon to adopt scientific management or result-oriented administration in public universities to solve current problems (41, p. 10). Since colonial times the government has approached these problems by setting up commissions and agencies that it hoped would arrive at suggestions on how to improve higher education administration in Nigeria. The Academic Staff Union of Nigerian Universities offered several suggestions in a statement entitled "Nigerian Economic Crisis: The Way Out" (34, p. 14), and further proposals for improving educational administration are contained in the Harare Declaration (28, pp. 12-13).

**Specific Examples of Federal Government Actions to Deal with Higher Education Problems in Nigeria**

Before Nigeria became an independent nation, higher education matters were handled by the Colonial Office or the Inter-University Council for Higher Education Overseas. In 1948, the government of Nigeria set up the Asquitt and Elliott Commission on Higher Education, whose report led to the establishment of the University College of Ibadan in that same year. In 1959, a year before Nigeria gained its independence, the Ashby Commission was appointed. The report of that Commission was described earlier in this paper.
The most important accomplishment of the Ashby Commission was its recommendation concerning the creation of the National Universities Commission to carry out the planning of new universities, among other tasks. In fact, it is said that the Ashby Commission Report led to the founding of the Universities of Lagos, Ahmadu Bello, and Ife in 1962 (5, p. xii). The next commission to be formed was the Adebo Commission, which reported on salary review scales for workers, including academics.

In 1974, the Nigerian government commissioned the Udoji Public Service Review Commission to review the conditions of service of university staff, but the Commission recommended that they be considered by another body. The Cookey Commission was then set up by the government to carry out the review. In 1975, the Williams and Williams Panel was formed to look into the cause of the strained relationship between the government and the universities. A review of the university salary scale, which differed from the general civil service scale, was called for, and the implementation of this Salary Grading Exercise followed a threatened industrial action by the Academic Union of Teachers (AUT). The government later gave quit orders to two staff members who were accused of being involved in the threatened AUT action (6, pp. 35-36).
In 1978, the Mohammed Commission of Inquiry was set up to investigate the underlying causes--both remote and immediate--of the university crisis that was taking place at that time and the widespread unrest accompanying it. The Commission was to determine the part played by individuals and groups, to assess the extent of the damage and destruction done to life and property, and to make recommendations (6). In 1980, the Nigerian head of state, Usman Aliyu Shagari, ordered a Visitation to examine the relationship between the vice-chancellor of Lagos University, Professor Adadevoh, and certain statutory bodies of that university, especially its governing council, which complained that it was unable to cooperate with the vice-chancellor because it did not participate in his selection (10, p. 5).

In 1978, subsequent to the Report of the Mohammed Commission, after considering its recommendations, Nigerian President Shehu Shagari directed the federal Ministry of Education to submit proposals detailing the relationship among the universities, the National Universities Commission, and the Ministry of Education. The Committee on the Relationship between the Federal Ministry of Education, the National Universities Commission, and the Universities was set up, and recommendations were made and approved by the president, some of which were incorporated into the federal government's Policy Statement on Higher Education. These recommendations were as follows:
I. That the present role relationships between the universities, the National Universities Commission, and the federal Ministry of Education (which have been clearly set out in the laws establishing the universities and NUC) should remain and be strictly adhered to henceforth;

II. That policy matters should not be discussed during private visits of principal officers of the universities to the Visitor/head of state. Should such a discussion arise inadvertently, the principal officer of the university should ensure that a full report of the substance of the discussion is brought to the notice of the federal Minister for Education or the NUC, as appropriate, immediately thereafter;

III. That petitions by staff and students of universities should be directed first to the university council. All concerned are to stick to this procedure. Any such petitions sent direct to the Visitor will not be entertained and will merely be referred to the federal Ministry of Education;

IV. That the approved channel of communication between the government and the universities on matters of national interest will continue to be through the federal Ministry of Education;

V. That matters relating to the internal administration of the universities or to discipline should be addressed direct to the federal Minister for Education by the university council. In times of crisis, the university authorities should contact the Minister immediately and keep him informed of developments. On the other hand, universities should communicate direct with the NUC on all matters except those which do not fall within the responsibilities of the NUC, on which they may require the guidance of the federal Ministry of Education;

VI. That university councils are responsible for the welfare of the staff and students on the campuses and the principal officers of universities must therefore ensure that the councils are kept well informed on these matters;

VII. That there should be adequate consultations in the appointment of the principal officers
of the universities. In the case of vice-chancellors, it will be the responsibility of the council of the university to select three suitable candidates from among whom the president will ultimately appoint one. If he is not satisfied with any of the three, the first will be returned for the exercise to be repeated. Anyone appointed vice-chancellor on the basis of such a recommendation will be subject to being assigned to no other university except to the one that had nominated him/her. Existing legislations are to be amended shortly to reflect the foregoing directives;

VIII. That each university should have its own system of communication with the generality of its student population (2, pp. 2-4).

The Question of Clarity Concerning who Should Control Higher Education in Nigeria

With regard to the acts establishing federal universities—contrary to the president's observation about the clarity of these laws—the relationship among the universities, the National Universities Commission, and the Ministry of Education does not yet seem to be clearly defined. For example, the first principal officer of each university is not specified. The university principal officers identified by the University of Ibadan Act are the chancellor, the pro-chancellor, the vice-chancellor, the deputy vice-chancellor, the registrar, the bursar, and the librarian.

As for the issue of communication, staff and students who failed to use the university council as the appropriate communication channel were not required to reroute their petitions through it. The directive that the university
council is responsible for the welfare of staff and students on the campus and that the principal officers of the university must ensure that the council is kept well informed concerning it is counter to the university statute which gave the university senate the responsibility for such matters.

The Cookey Commission released its report on salary and conditions of service of university staff in 1980 (3, p. 21). In 1977, the government appointed an agency known as the Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board, which was solely responsible for the admission of secondary school graduates to post-secondary institutions (6, p. 28).

As things are today, the multiplicity of personnel, bodies, and agencies charged with the administration of a Nigerian university has led to an overlapping of functions. As previously noted, the head of the federal government of Nigeria is the Visitor to all federal universities and must make a Visitation to each university at least once a year. The Visitor's powers may be exercised on two grounds: a) misconduct, without an explanation of what constitutes such misconduct, and b) an officer's inability to carry out the tasks of his or her office or employment, and there seem to be no examples of what would constitute this inability.

Each university has a governing council charged with the general management of its affairs, and in particular the
council was given control of the university's property and expenditures. In short, the council has the power to do anything within its scope of authority which is calculated to facilitate the performance of the university's functions (48, p. 33). In some universities, the council was vested with power over the university's public relations, a job which is designated to be performed by the vice-chancellor on behalf of the university senate in most Nigerian universities (35, pp. 50-51).

The creation of the National Universities Commission (NUC) as a statutory agency in 1974 did not alleviate the problem of overlapping responsibilities; on the contrary, it worsened the confusion concerning who should have final authority in the administration of higher education in Nigeria. The NUC's functions are a) preparation of periodic master plans for the balanced and coordinated development of universities in Nigeria (including general programs to be pursued by the universities, recommendations for the establishment and location of new universities when and as necessary, and recommendations for the establishment of new faculties or post-graduate programs in existing universities and the approval or disapproval of proposals to establish such faculties or institutions) and b) undertaking periodic reviews of the terms and conditions of service of university staff and recommending to the Visitor
that a Visitation be made to a university when and as it considers such a Visitation necessary, without any guidelines regarding situations that would specifically warrant a Visitation and without any reference to the university governing council or senate (3, p. 17; 35, pp. 50-51). In addition to making Visitations, the head of government appoints the chancellors, pro-chancellors, and vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities.

In its unpublished report, the Mohammed Commission of Inquiry noted,

"... There is a certain amount of untidiness in authority and role relationships among the various agencies concerned with policy-making and execution in matters relating to university administration in Nigeria. The report further said that the NUC had encroached upon the powers of the universities in the day-to-day running of the universities (4, p. 18)."

Duplication of Effort among Agencies and Statutory Bodies that Hinders Effective Administration in Higher Education

The various agencies created by the government to make policies, regulate, or act as governing bodies were created by law; thus, they are statutory in nature. Although the National Policy on Education states that "the internal organization and the administration of each university will be left to that university" (25, p. 2), every statutory body
set up by the government seems to contravene this provision. Supporting this observation, the government has stated,

Government is aware that the traditional areas of academic freedom for the universities are (i) to select their students; (ii) to appoint their staff; (iii) to teach, select areas of research, and disseminate the results of such research; and (iv) to determine the content of courses. As long as these are in consonance with national objectives, they will be guaranteed to universities (3, p. 25).

Despite this statement, the old conditions persist. Before the creation of the administrative NUC, university affairs were handled by the office of the prime minister. The federal Commissioner for Education was later vested with the responsibility for higher education, and today the NUC carries the responsibility as a statutory body, yet the head of state will exercise Visitation powers, which means that university business continues to be directly handled by the cabinet office. This includes the appointment and removal of the principal officers of universities (6, p. 52).

In addition to the role of the head of state, it is not uncommon to find a vice-chancellor being given directives on the same issue by the Commissioner for Education and the Secretary to the Government of the Federation, making it impossible for the vice-chancellor to decide which one should be carried out. That situation, perhaps, explains why top university officials claimed that the federal Ministry of Education was not given a free hand
in the management of higher education in Nigeria because its officials lacked the experience and expertise necessary to control the universities effectively (31, p. 25).

This argument led in 1964 to the creation of the administrative NUC, which was given statutory powers in January, 1974, and began to function in April, 1975. The NUC was expected to have free rein in the management of federal universities, as indicated by the NUC staff chart presented in Appendix C.

The NUC's other functions are a) to secure the necessary cooperation of all parties that have interests in the planning and development of new universities, b) to assess the financial needs of the universities and try to secure the funds required, and c) to interpret government development needs to the universities and the universities' needs to the government so as to bring about a fusion of the two. In short, the NUC was given power to approve new universities and faculties and to add graduate programs to existing institutions, to review conditions of service of university staff, and to have access to universities' records. The NUC was given mandatory power for requisition of information; for regulation of budgeting in financial management, capital grants, capital development programs, and general programs to be pursued by the universities; and for recommendation to the Visitor that a Visitation be made to a university when and as the NUC deems necessary (3, pp. 17-18).
The conditions existing in Nigeria when the NUC came into existence, the functions it was expected to perform, federal government policy at that time, and the philosophies of the military leaders who were in charge of the Nigerian government made it impossible for the NUC to operate without conflicting with other statutory bodies such as university councils and senates and with the principal officers of individual universities (3, pp. 17-18). When the NUC was established as a statutory body, the federal government defined a new national policy on education. The government wanted to use education as a unifying force in Nigeria and to correct what it called the "imbalance in the accessibility of higher education throughout the country" (6, p. 52). The government began to insist on greater relevance of courses to the needs of Nigeria, directing universities to help in setting national goals. The NUC was given its own bank account and an expanded secretariat and had access to the head of the federal government of Nigeria directly through the cabinet office (6, p. 52) or indirectly through the federal Commissioner for Education (3, p. 17).

Apart from the difficult tasks to be performed by the new body, it was also expected to act with haste, although haste does not always produce the best atmosphere for rational planning. Within a few months of the NUC's beginning to function, the federal government accepted the
invitation of the then-East Central and Bendel States to take over the University of Nigeria-Nsukka and the University of Benin. In addition, on its own initiative, the government took over Ahmadu Bello University and the University of Ife, thus making all existing universities in Nigeria federal institutions. These takeovers appeared to have simplified the problems of coordination and planning, but, again, the NUC was given no time before the federal military government announced the establishment of four new universities at Sokoto, Maiduguri, Jos, and Calabar and three university colleges at Ilorin, Port Harcourt, and Kano. Then, before the NUC had time to act, the three colleges were declared full-fledged universities (1, p. 18).

These developments were not planned, and the NUC, which now had the statutory responsibility for preparing the periodic master plans for the balanced and coordinated development of universities in Nigeria, had its hands full trying to help the newly established universities get off the ground. According to Ajayi, "in the circumstances, it was the political and not rational planning that continued to exert influence on university development" (3, p. 18).

From the NUC's inception, it was inevitable that the body should conflict with other statutory entities. In fact, the government was already aware of that potential
problem; thus, in its unpublished report, the Mohammed Commission of Inquiry said that there was "a certain amount of untidiness in authority and role relationship among various authorities concerned with policy-making and execution in matters relating to university administration" (3, p. 18) and that the NUC had encroached upon the powers of the universities in their day-to-day operations. As a consequence of the centralization policy of the federal military government, the NUC was more inclined to assert its powers than to consult and establish broad bases for evolving policies on higher education. It therefore asserted dominance over university councils in determining conditions of service and general policies such as the structure of fees. The vice-chancellors of the newer universities still look to the NUC rather than to their own governing councils or senates for guidance and assistance even in formulating their internal policies (3, p. 18).

The NUC is composed of members and officers. The members, appointed by the head of state, represent all walks of life. A list of the present principal officers of the NUC appears in Table I. The membership of the NUC includes some professors, but representatives of vice-chancellors and others from the academic community are in the minority. For example, only two of the present principal officers of the NUC have doctorates (32, pp. 5-8).
TABLE I

PRESENT PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL
UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alhaji Yahya Aliyu</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mrs. E. C. Achukwu</td>
<td>Acting Director of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr. E. S. Sotimirin</td>
<td>Director of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr. Akin Akindoyemi</td>
<td>Director of Physical Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dr. Abel I. Guobadia</td>
<td>Director of Academic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professor Modilim Achufusi</td>
<td>Director, Washington, D.C. Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. M. K. A. Ibrahim</td>
<td>Director, Cairo Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr. A. G. Mukhtar</td>
<td>Director, London Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr. E. J. Akpan</td>
<td>Acting Director, Canada Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board (JAMB) was created in March of 1979 (6, pp. 46-47). Its sole purpose was to conduct student admissions to federal universities. The Federal Scholarship Advisory Board (FSAB) and the Student Loan Board (SLB) act independently
of the NUC and of individual university authorities (council, senate, and vice-chancellor).

The National Manpower Board has not yet developed a mechanism for communicating the needs of the community to the individuals responsible for policy-making in higher education in Nigeria, and this may be the cause of complaints about the proliferation of courses that are not helpful in solving Nigerian development problems and about the production of graduates who cannot find employment in a country that is still in dire need of high-level trained manpower.

The Nigerian government has recognized some of the problems affecting higher education. For example, in order to attract qualified individuals into the university system, the government realized that the conditions of service of those who work or teach in universities should be made more attractive, and it included university employees as members of the Federal Public Service under the federal Ministry of Establishment (6, p. 50).

In 1973, the Public Service Commission was formed to review the conditions of service of federal civil servants, including university employees. Although the Commission said that it did not have the time to examine the case of university workers thoroughly, the government included university workers in the Udoji Report, which was accepted
in 1974. Thus, universities were incorporated into the
Unified Public Service through "Harmonization."

In the face of a threat of industrial action by mem-
ers of the Association of University Teachers (AUT) and
protests against the proposal to introduce a National
Youth Service Corps Scheme, the government set up the
Williams and Williams Panel to look into the conditions of
service of university staff. The panel was comprised of
representatives of the civil service, the military, and
the private sector but included no members representing
the universities themselves.

The report of this panel did not favor university
workers, and the government could not meet even the few
conditions that were granted under the report. According
to Aminu, "the intractable shortage of operating grants
from the government made it impossible for the university
staff to enjoy even what they were entitled to under Har-
monization" (6, p. 35).

Not satisfied with what it had done so far to better
the conditions of service of university staff, the govern-
ment set up the Presidential Commission on the Review of
Salaries and Conditions of Service of University Staff
(the Cookey Commission), which made its report in 1981.
The report suggested a new University System Scale (USS)
of salaries and wages and called for a revision of existing
acts in order to restore the autonomy of university councils in the day-to-day administration of universities and in the appointment of all staff, including vice-chancellors (3, p. 21; 6, p. 36). Although the new USS has since been implemented, adverse economic circumstances made it impossible for the government to carry out all of the Cookey Commission's recommendations. In fact, recent government directives have sought to remove some of the benefits that university staff now enjoy.

The University of Ibadan Act, which created Nigeria's universities, specifies in broad terms their mission, which roles statutory bodies should play, who some of the functionaries are, and—very briefly—what each functionary should do. According to this act, the council is the governing body of the university and has control over its property and expenditures (48, pp. 32-34). The university senate has the general function of organizing and controlling teaching, overseeing the admission and discipline of students, and promoting research. The act also made the senate responsible for all matters relating to appointments of faculty, approval of courses, recommendations of persons to be awarded degrees (including honorary degrees), and the designation of individuals to be in charge of departments (48, pp. 34-35).
Apart from the statutory bodies, the following individuals either directly or indirectly play important roles in the operation of Nigeria's universities: the head of state, the Commissioner or Minister for Education, the Permanent Secretary of the federal Ministry of Establishment, the Director of the Public Service Commission, the chancellor, the pro-chancellor, the vice-chancellor, the deputy vice-chancellor, the registrar, the bursar, and the librarian. The chancellor and the pro-chancellor do not have offices on the university campus.

The head of state appoints Visitation panel members and makes decisions concerning the takeover of schools, using his Visitation authority. Such a Visitation is an inquiry recommended by the NUC or the university council to investigate any potential or existing crisis situation in a federal Nigerian university. The University of Lagos Act states,

The Visitor as often as circumstances may require, not being less than once every year, should conduct a Visitation of the university or should direct that such a Visitation be conducted by such persons and in respect of any of the affairs of the university according to the University of Lagos Act No. 3 of 1967, which was amended by Act No. 12 of 1972, Section 15 (49).

Prior to the creation of the NUC, the relationship between federal Ministry of Education officials and top university officers was not cordial because it was alleged by the former that the university administrators often
bypassed the Ministry when they needed advice on problems and went straight to the head of state (5, p. 48). In short, some university administrators used their personal influence or political position instead of going through normal bureaucratic channels in seeking solutions to their problems. The Ministry insisted that top university officers should utilize appropriate channels of communication because "Whenever complications arose from such actions, they [Ministry officials] were the ones to be called upon to sort things out" (6, p. 48). The Permanent Secretary of the federal Ministry of Education is expected to serve as the means of communication between the Ministry and the universities, but this is what the NUC was created to do.

The functions of the other university officers are not clearly defined. The chancellor takes precedence over all other members of the university and, when present, presides at all meetings of congregation held for conferring degrees and at all meetings of convocation (48, p. 32). In relation to the university, the pro-chancellor takes precedence over all other members of the university except the chancellor and except the vice-chancellor or deputy vice-chancellor when one of the latter is acting as chairman of congregation or convocation. When the pro-chancellor is present in the absence of the chancellor, he or she is the chairman at all meetings of the council (6, p. 32).
According to the University of Ibadan Act, in relation to the university the vice-chancellor takes precedence over all other members of the university except the chancellor and, subject to Section 3 of the act, except the pro-chancellor and any other person temporarily acting as chairman of the council. Subject to the provisions relating to the chancellor, the pro-chancellor, and the Visitor of the universities, the vice-chancellor has the general function of directing the activities of the university, in addition to any other functions conferred by the act or otherwise (48, pp. 34-36).

The deputy vice-chancellor acts for the vice-chancellor and holds office for two years. The registrar is responsible to the vice-chancellor for the day-to-day administration of the affairs of the university, other than academic and financial matters. The librarian is responsible to the vice-chancellor for the administration of the library of the university in accordance with regulations, and the bursar is responsible for the vice-chancellor for the day-to-day administration of the university's financial affairs. Other officers are appointed for such periods and on such terms as to the emoluments of their office as may be specified in the instrument of their appointment. Any questions concerning the academic or financial affairs of the university are resolved by the vice-chancellor rather than the senate (48, p. 48).
No staff is in charge of academic matters; although in the University of Ibadan Act the senate was given responsibility for academic matters, including the selection of teachers, this same function was assigned to the vice-chancellor as well. The Ibadan Act delegated administrative, financial, library, and bursary matters to some staff, but what about the numerous other functions that exist in an institution of higher education? Who performs them? Should the vice-chancellor perform them personally? Although Uehling (47) emphasizes the importance of teamwork, there is also the need for clarity in authority relationships.

The functions of the vice-chancellor and the university senate seem to overlap, and this may be why clashes of interest have sometimes arisen between some vice-chancellors and senates, despite the fact that the vice-chancellor is the chairperson of the senate. Although the vice-chancellor chairs senate meetings, the University of Ibadan Act does not delegate the duties of the senate to the vice-chancellor.

The position of vice-chancellor has been very controversial since Nigeria's first independent university was established in 1960. Nigerian university chief executives have been blamed for not doing enough to improve sources of funding for the universities. According to Ojo,
Efforts should be made to divest the vice-chancellor of some of his administrative schedules so that he can have more time devoted to fund-raising. But, if this is not possible, an officer of the status of a deputy vice-chancellor should be appointed for fund-raising (35, p. 62).

Ojo continues,

Efforts should be made also to recruit high-calibre men into the university bursaries to convince the public that any money donated to the university or any form of gift given would be wisely managed. This will spur people of goodwill to come to the rescue of the university with money and materials. With good management, properly audited accounts, and the recruitment of the right calibre of men to manage the services and commercial projects, much could be done to reduce the over-dependence on government subvention (35, p. 62).

If longevity of office is a measure of success in a job, very few Nigerian vice-chancellors can be said to be successful. A cursory look at Table II shows that hardly any of the vice-chancellors at the twenty universities listed held office for more than four years. The first vice-chancellor of the University of Nigeria-Nsukka after the Civil War left office in the midst of an alleged strained relationship with the non-academic staff of the university.

The vice-chancellor of the University of Lagos was abruptly replaced in 1965 (3, p. 15), and, following the military coup of July, 1975, the vice-chancellor of Ahmadu Bello University was also suddenly removed (3, p. 17). In September of that same year, the vice-chancellor of the University of Nigeria-Nsukka was asked to resign and subsequently did so. Then, in November of 1975, the
### TABLE II

**CHANGES IN THE VICE-CHANCELLORSHIPS OF NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES, 1978-1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>1978/79</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1979/80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>Reappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>Prof. Tekena Tamuno</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. S.O. Olayide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>Prof. B.K. Adadevoh</td>
<td>11/1/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>Prof. Umaru Shehu</td>
<td>10/1/78</td>
<td>Prof. F.N. Ndili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>Prof. O.O. Akinkugbe</td>
<td>10/1/78</td>
<td>Dr. Ango Abdul-Iahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>Prof. C.A. Onwumechili</td>
<td>1/1/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabar</td>
<td>Prof. E.A. Ayandele</td>
<td>10/1/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos</td>
<td>Prof. E.U. Emovon</td>
<td>10/1/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>Prof. J.O.C. Ezeilo</td>
<td>10/1/78</td>
<td>Prof. I.H. Umar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiduguri</td>
<td>Prof. E.U. Essien-Udom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokoto</td>
<td>Prof. S.A.S. Galadanci</td>
<td>10/1/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilorin</td>
<td>Prof. Akin Adesola</td>
<td>10/1/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Harcourt</td>
<td>Prof. D.E.U. Ekong</td>
<td>10/1/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Prof. Adamu Bakiie</td>
<td>10/9/78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. A.O. Adekota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makurdi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. G. Igboeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owerri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. U.D. Gomwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abeokuta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1980/81</th>
<th>1981/82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>Reappointed</td>
<td>1980/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/80</td>
<td>Prof. Akin Adeola (1981)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/79</td>
<td>Prof. Wande Abimbola (1982)</td>
<td>(Reappointed, 10/1/82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/80</td>
<td>Prof. Afolabi Toye (1981)</td>
<td>Prof. S.J.S. Cookey (10/1/82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vice-chancellor of the University of Ibadan was uncere-
moniously removed by the federal military government.

On November 11, 1980, the Visitor of the University of
Lagos ordered a Visitation to evaluate the relationship
between the vice-chancellor and certain statutory bodies
of the university, the council, the senate, and the uni-
versity's academic staff (10, p. 1). The panel examined
the general and specific functions of the vice-chancellor
and those of the statutory bodies in order to ascertain
whether both sides had been interacting in a manner most
 conducive to the welfare of the university in particular
and of the public in general (10, p. 1).

In 1983, nine professors of the University of Nigeria-
Nsukka protested the reappointment of that university's
vice-chancellor on the grounds that the senate of the
university had not been consulted in the reappointment
exercise (3, p. 2). In 1984, a Visitation panel was com-
missioned to investigate alleged wrongdoing by the vice-
chancellor of the University of Nigeria-Nsukka. Ten aca-
demics initiated the petition. Their complaints centered
on poor management of funds, personality problems relating
to the vice-chancellor's disregard for the opinions of
other people, his avoidance of even positive criticism,
abuse of power, and use of influence to prevent the senate
and the council from exercising their statutory powers
(22, p. 8; 46, p. 1).
Of all the controversial issues surrounding the office of vice-chancellor, the most important are selection, appointment, and the criteria that should be considered in the evaluation of the vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness. The problem is fourfold: a) who should do the recommending?, b) who should make the final appointment?, c) what factors should be included in the selection procedures for a vice-chancellor?, and d) what factors should be included in the appraisal procedures for a vice-chancellor?

At one time, the head of state appointed only persons who had been recommended by the council and the senate of their universities as vice-chancellors, but today a vice-chancellor may be appointed without being recommended by either of these bodies, as evidenced by the two cases described below. On November 1, 1978, Professor B. K. Adadevoh was appointed by the Supreme Military Council to succeed Professor J. F. Ade Ajayi as the vice-chancellor of the University of Lagos; Ajayi had just been removed from office by the same authority following riots by students of Nigerian universities in April of 1978 and the submission of the report of the Mr. Justice Balonwu Commission of Inquiry into these riots. During the inquiry, in his memorandum entitled "Background to the Crisis" Professor A. F. Ogunye stated, "Professor Adadevoh was
appointed by the federal military government as vice-chancellor of the University of Lagos in November, 1978. The council of the University of Lagos, contrary to law, was not consulted on the appointment" (10, p. 5).

In a press statement carried by the Lagos Guardian on January 2, 1984, as noted earlier in this chapter, ten professors of the University of Nigeria-Nsukka protested the reappointment of Professor F. N. Ndili as their vice-chancellor, claiming that the university senate was not consulted in the reappointment decision (33, p. 2). In a denial of this allegation, the registrar of the university declared that the governing council of the university made the recommendation after taking into full consideration all of the relevant provisions of the University of Nigeria-Nsukka Act as well as other guidelines established by the federal government for the appointment or reappointment of vice-chancellors. In conclusion, the registrar said that it was the exclusive responsibility of the council to make appointment and reappointment recommendations (51, p. 4; see Appendix B).

Although the university senate was given responsibility for managing the university's academic affairs, the University of Nigeria-Nsukka Act was silent concerning the part that the senate should play in the selection of candidates for the position of vice-chancellor. Some members of
the academic community believe that leaders should be selected on merit; others think that the appointment of a vice-chancellor should be based on his or her qualifications and that the input of the senate is essential in determining what those qualifications should be (48, pp. 34-35). In order to enhance university autonomy, it is stressed that the appointment and removal of vice-chancellors by the head of state should be discontinued, since such decisions should be the function of the university council (35, p. 70).

According to the University of Ibadan Act, the vice-chancellor is appointed or removed by the Visitor acting after consultation with the council. The vice-chancellor holds office for four years and is eligible for reappointment for a second term of three years; thereafter, he or she is no longer eligible for appointment until at least four years have elapsed since he or she last held office as vice-chancellor. The vice-chancellor holds office on such terms regarding emoluments and the like as may be specified in the instrument of appointment (48, p. 60).

Concerning the problem of the criteria that should be used to evaluate the performance of a university chief executive, the pro-chancellor and chairperson of the University of Benin, Mrs. Tejumba Alakija, has stated,

In order to be successful, higher education needs capacities to deal with the planning for the
future, and to create a mechanism for correcting past failures. In addition, those charged with managing institutions of higher education should render selfless service, exercise a high degree of fairness in their dealings, be hardworking, courageous, and act with circumspection (40, p. 7).

The leaders of the Nigerian government believed that individuals who are responsible for managing higher education institutions should be aware of the need to use their internal administration, their philosophies and outlook, and the role they play or should play in fostering national unity, peace, progress, and national development (6, p. 28). According to Okudu, "The cornerstone of the whole edifice is the selection of the professoriate; there must be no hint of patronage in their appointment, and they must be the best minds available in Nigeria and abroad" (37, p. 60).

According to the senate of the University of Lagos, the "vice-chancellor should be able to enjoy the confidence, respect, and cooperation of his academic colleagues, the students, and the university community" (10, p. 7). In a memorandum submitted to a Visitation panel at Lagos University, Professor Ogunye declared that morality is necessary in public life (10, p. 6). Emphasizing the importance of communications skills, Akinkugbe said, "Communication seems to be the most crucial factor in smoothing relationships between all component units within the university" (37, p. 60).
Based on the directives of the university Visitor, when allegations are made against a vice-chancellor, as they were by Olaofe, the officials appointed to investigate the problem should try to determine whether the vice-chancellor is guilty of misconduct and/or inability to perform the functions of his or her office or employment (10, p. 2). The central administration of the University of Ibadan was blamed for the poor human relations said to exist at that institution. For instance, when the vice-chancellor of the university abruptly ended a meeting of members of the faculty senate and a committee of provosts and deans, the professors regarded this action as a manifestation of poor administrative practice (38, p. 11). In addition, the professors were not happy that their vice-chancellor was "leaning," in their words, toward Nigeria's National Party, the party that was currently in control of the federal government (38).

Continuing his criticism of the University of Ibadan's administration, Olaofe observed,

"With regard to the University of Ibadan, this period is characterized by perennial financial mess. There is lack of adequate financial records, huge overdrafts which showed the university's inability to live within its means, and the frequent use of unbudgeted casual labor (38, p. 11)."

Nigerian students made numerous protests against their universities. On February 9, 1983, students at
the University of Ibadan demonstrated against the university administration, protesting the communication gap between students and university authorities, the lack of priority given to student welfare (e.g., housing accommodations, food, and sanitation), and the non-inclusion of students in the decision-making process and stressing the need for the administration to pursue democratic principles (44, p. 8).

In an article entitled "The Challenge of Intellectual Leadership," Nwaoga suggested that "The promotion exercise should be removed from internal politics and should be done by the appropriate people." Nwaoga fears that the type of voting that currently takes place at the university appraisal committee stage is open to "influence" (22, p. 7).

**The Federal Government's and Nigerians' Views about Centralization of Higher Education Administration**

Many academics seem to have varied views about the question of centralization of higher education in Nigeria. Perhaps this is due to what Black (11) calls conflicting theories of education or what Brubacher (12) describes as philosophies of education. The government has its own reasons for centralizing higher education, so the question arises of who has the right reason for pursuing centralization or whether it is in fact beneficial to centralize higher education in a federal system.
In 1954, Nigeria adopted a federal constitution that divided the country into three regions: East, West, and North. At that time, higher education was placed on the concurrent list, which meant that both the federal government and the regional governments were free to establish and finance universities. In accordance with that policy, the then-Eastern regional government passed the University of Nigeria Act and sought assistance to finance the new institution. The other regions soon followed the Eastern Region's lead in seeking a means to open universities and assistance in financing them. In reaction to these developments, in 1959, the central government appointed the now well-known Ashby Commission to develop a policy that would enable the federal government to play a coordinating role and avoid what it called the "imbalanced development and wasteful duplication in higher education in Nigeria. The government said it wanted to prevent the type of regional rivalry that would not advance the course of higher education in Nigeria" (3, p. 10).

Meanwhile, in 1960, the then-Eastern regional government established the first independent university in Nigeria, the University of Nigeria-Nsukka. In 1963, the Ashby Commission issued its report, which proved to be perhaps the most important factor that advanced the course of centralization in higher education in Nigeria. The
Ashby Commission Report recommended that all universities in Nigeria should be national in outlook and should be subject to some central planning and direction, with the bulk of capital grants coming from the federal government. Aminu still wonders why the government imposed such an unnecessary burden upon itself when there was abundant evidence that it was unable to discharge the obligation (6, p. 42). In order to achieve its lofty objectives, the central government issued a white paper on the Ashby recommendations, proposing that, although each university—federal or regional—should have autonomy in the management of its affairs, the overall national interest should be safeguarded through the establishment by law of an Interregional Manpower Board, an All-Nigerian Academic Council, and a National University Commission (3, p. 11).

The National Manpower Board was established in 1962 but has not been effective in exerting any significant influence on the planning of higher education, and the Academic Council has not been established. The NUC was charged with the following functions: coordination, funding, receiving assistance for universities from any and all sources, recruiting teachers for the universities, planning the physical and academic development of present and future federal universities, and recommending to the Visitor when Visitation is necessary to solve problems in any
federal university (3, pp. 11-18). Although the NUC appears to be an agent of centralization, the idea of centralization in higher education predates the creation of both the administrative and the statutory NUC.

Yet, events in Nigeria since the passage of the country's first federal constitution in 1954 do not seem to support the development of centralized higher education. In 1966, the federal government was overthrown by the armed forces, and, in the same year, the new military government was itself overthrown. In 1967, the three-year Nigerian Civil War began, and the country was divided into twelve states. In 1975, the armed forces again toppled the military government, and in 1976 the country was split into nineteen states. A new constitution for Nigeria was passed in 1979, to be administered by a new civilian government, but, in December, 1983, that government was once again ousted by the armed forces, which later formed the present military government. Obviously, such a history of political change and unrest does not seem conducive to the implementation of central planning, but the various central governments that have controlled the country during the past three decades have nevertheless sought centralized higher education administration in Nigeria.

The questions that one must finally ask are "If centralization is possible, can it enable Nigerians to
solve problems that hinder effective higher education administration?" and "How can centralization help Nigerian universities to foster national unity, peace, progress, and development?" It has frequently been said that the federal government sought to centralize the channel of external assistance to avoid receiving aid that could be used to subvert the country. According to the government, "Blood money was unacceptable even for the universities" (6, pp. 28-29).

To justify centralization in higher education, the government also contends that, since it is the sole financier of federal universities, it is not only fair but also incumbent on the government to choose and appoint the persons it considers competent to oversee the day-to-day conduct and direction of the affairs of these universities (31, p. 27). This argument is similar to the reasons that the government offered in support of its decision to prevent universities from determining and charging fees and other levies for the services they render (6, p. 42).

The government has given four major reasons to rationalize its constant meddling in the affairs of the universities, whether public, state-owned, or private: a) the primacy argument, which states that the government must have some control over a Nigerian university; b) the grant argument, which states that, since any Nigerian
university must need some form of grant in one way or another, the government can attach "strings" to such grants; c) the accreditation authority argument, which states that the federal government can institute a system of accreditation in a wide range of academic and professional areas by creating regulatory bodies; and d) the handover argument, which states that, since some states were forced by financial difficulties to "hand over" their universities to the federal government in the past, the possibility exists for the repetition of that occurrence in the future, especially as some of these states are finding it difficult to pay the salaries of elementary and secondary school teachers (6, pp. 31-32, 53-55).

The central government has also cited other justifications for encroaching upon university governance. For example, during his inauguration as the chancellor of the University of Ibadan, Omo N'Oba Erediawu, the Oba of Benin, condemned what he called "The unhealthy rivalry among university lecturers for administrative posts. The situation necessitated the university Visitor to assume responsibility for selecting and appointing the vice-chancellors of federal universities" (22, p. 4).

The NUC could not be effective in seeking solutions on how to improve the higher education systems in Nigeria for many reasons. First, the twelve original NUC members
appointed were primarily Nigerian government officials, and not a single Nigerian academic was included, with the exception of Sir Eric Ashby, who was retained as honorary advisor. After its administrative inception, the NUC could not function effectively because it had no statutory powers, and it had to fight to uproot the Committee of Vice-Chancellors (CVC), which was made up of vice-chancellors of federal universities. Although the CVC described itself as a coordinating body that sought to protect the interest of its members and the welfare of students, it did nothing to support that claim.

Nwaoga believes that an appropriate body should be formed to undertake university appraisal for a staff promotion exercise that is not open to influence, in order to remove what he called "internal politics" (22, p. 4). According to the dean of the Faculty of Education at Bayero University,

Although Nigeria witnessed a short period of unprecedented physical development, that development has come to a halt. What are needed now are (i) a way to stabilize and consolidate to ensure proper organization and management of educational institutions and (ii) to improve quality and standards. The causes of slowdown in growth are lack of proper planning, ineptitude, apathy, low morality, corruption, greed, graft among leaders, lack of hard work and dedication to duty (45, p. 5).

Williams adds that neglect of engineering services in some Nigerian universities is part of the major problems facing institutions of higher education in Nigeria today (52).
Significance of the Study

The significance of any study may lie in the contribution that it makes to general knowledge and to knowledge in a particular field or in the fact that it promotes further research in the same area leading to greater knowledge. However, the significance of a study is also related to the acceptance of its findings. The federal government of Nigeria has already accepted the fact that education is a dynamic instrument of social, economic, and political change and that any policy regarding it should constantly be reviewed to ensure its relevance to national needs and objectives (24, p. 3). Therefore, one would think that the publication of the results of this study would prompt policy-makers in higher education in Nigeria to develop a general job description handbook for vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities and would also lead to the creation of general criteria for the selection and job performance evaluation of all vice-chancellors. Research on the factors affecting selection of Nigerian university vice-chancellors and the criteria that should be used to appraise their job performance is very limited, but guidelines for such selection and appraisal are available in many developed countries. The aim of this study is to produce a clear and precise list of the functions that vice-chancellors in Nigerian universities are to perform
and of those that they should delegate to other officers, a list of the factors that should be considered in the selection of vice-chancellors, and a list of the criteria that should be used in appraising vice-chancellors' job performance.

An updated list of specific functions that vice-chancellors in Nigerian universities should perform or delegate to other officers would enable future vice-chancellors to visualize clearly the full dimensions of their responsibilities. Such a list, jointly arrived at by academic leaders and members of the governing councils of federal universities, may well be used to create a comprehensive job description handbook for vice-chancellors. This is important in view of the sparse literature on the specific functions that vice-chancellors should perform or delegate and the growing controversy about vice-chancellors' efficiency and job performance effectiveness. It is necessary to discover through research what functions vice-chancellors should perform and what functions they should delegate to other officers in order to make possible a fair and just appraisal of their job performance effectiveness and efficiency.

This study may also provide some insight into the causes of turnover among chief executives of Nigerian universities, and it will identify the criteria on which the
selection of future vice-chancellors for Nigerian universities may be based. This is also necessary to end the dispute noted in Appendix B concerning who should participate in the reappointment of vice-chancellors.

**Definition of Terms**

*Administration*—The process of directing an organizational unit towards an effective realization of its stated goals and objectives.

*Administrative function*—Any one or combination of such duties as planning, organizing, staffing, directing, leading, and controlling.

*Administrator*—A person holding the position of president or vice-chancellor, vice-president or deputy vice-chancellor in any of the colleges and universities in Nigeria.

*Chancellors*—Political appointees who represent the Nigerian central government on the university campus when they chair the university council or on other occasions.

*Effectiveness*—Making the best use of available resources and opportunities.

*Efficiency*—Finding a better or less costly way of doing what is now being done.

*Factors*—Items affecting the findings of this study, especially control of universities by the federal government.
of Nigeria, personal characteristics of administrators (e.g., age, sex, or skill), institutional characteristics (e.g., size, the existence of unions, or the presence of renowned faculty), and the attitude of university lecturers.

Function or task—Any activity, either physical or mental, required in the performance of one's responsibilities.

Governing council—The highest policy-making and governing body of the university, which has the power to manage all matters including those not otherwise provided for, by, or under law in Nigeria.

Higher education institutions—Degree-granting colleges and universities in Nigeria.

Leadership—That part of a manager's job concerned with getting the best contribution from his or her subordinates and creating a climate in which they can do their best and for which the manager is held responsible.

Performance evaluation—The formal process whereby employees are reviewed periodically through the use of criteria and procedures adopted by the organization or institution to determine what and how well employees are doing within a defined role in the institution.

Productivity—Utilizing resources to the fullest extent possible in the provision of goods or services (i.e., "doing more with less").
Professional burnout--A breakdown in the relationship between the individual and the organization.

Vice-chancellors--The chief executive officers of Nigerian colleges and universities, who are responsible to their respective governing councils.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study are limited by the ability of the questionnaire to derive information pertinent to the researcher and by the willingness of the respondents to supply complete and accurate data. Mainly federally supported universities were surveyed, and only the position and functions of chief executives (vice-chancellors) of Nigerian universities and factors used in their selection and job performance evaluation were investigated. Research methods were chosen in light of the practical constraints of time and money, as indicated by Haller (27, p. 50).

Basic Assumptions

It is assumed that the respondents replied truthfully to the instruments used in this study and that their responses will not differ significantly from those of other Nigerians who know the functions and factors essential for effective university administration in their country. In the survey instrument, it is assumed that vice-chancellors in Nigerian universities are totally responsible for each
of the functions listed and that they perform those that they do not delegate.

Organization of the Study

The related literature is reviewed in Chapter II, and descriptions of the population, the sample, the instrument, and the procedures used to collect and analyze the data appear in Chapter III. The analysis of data is presented in Chapter IV, and Chapter V contains a summary of the study and its findings and the conclusions, implications, and recommendations of the research.


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Most of the literature reviewed in this chapter pertains to decentralized systems of higher education administration. The system of higher education in Nigeria is centralized, but some of the literature cited here seems to be relevant to the Nigerian situation, due, perhaps, to what has been described by some scholars as the universality of the art of administration. According to Wilson, "Although . . . activities may differ from one business to another or between enterprise and such other operations as governments, a university, or a church, the functions of the manager tend to be universal and common to all organized human activity" (40, p. 1). This statement, drawn from Koontz and O'Donnell, is representative of a school of administrative thought that has had substantial support for many years.

The major sources of information contained in this chapter are books, articles, research reports, Nigerian university catalogues, newspapers, and professional papers on management and administrative practices. The chapter is organized to present the perceived duties of a chief
executive officer/vice-chancellor, the factors that are usually considered in the selection and employment of vice-chancellors in Nigerian universities, and the criteria that should be used in the evaluation of Nigerian university chief executives' job performance effectiveness. The material is further organized under various headings relating to influences on effective administration; elements that are indicative of good or bad administration; the relationship between philosophy, education, objectives, good planning, politics, culture, and the constitution of a people; and the impact of these factors on effective administration.

Administration in General

With regard to administration in general, Atwell and Green defend the composition of the governing council by stating, "Realism about an institution's strength, weakness, resources, and potential is needed, and this can best be gained from the judgment of students, parents, faculty, and the external public" (4, p. 21). Generally, in administration, the delegation of responsibility is very important. Ebel notes, "By common agreement among presidents, their most prevalent administrative weakness is their inability to delegate work to others" (14, p. 116). Walker (39) believes that successful chief executives of institutions of higher education should be good
politicians. He also states that academic leaders should be familiar with the concepts of separation of powers, the divided character of authority, or constitutionalism and federalism. In brief, these concepts collectively state that successful governance depends on the consent of the governed. Individuals who manage in a democracy, according to Walker, see that decisions are made by the persons who will be affected by them and by the persons who will carry out the stipulations or the policies made (39). This is necessary in order to achieve effective administration.

Discussing effectiveness in higher education administration, Bolton (6, p. 69) emphasizes that delegation of authority and responsibilities should be clear. He points out that budgets are often regarded as the single most effective control device available to the manager, whose knowledge and application of modern budgeting techniques should be extensive. Finally, Bolton stresses that a good administrator should consider programs, plans, and costs when seeking ways to achieve meaningful results rather than relying on the traditional line-item method. In addition, some authorities in the field of management stress the importance, understanding, and application of management information systems and management by objectives (MBO) in achieving effective administration (13).
Many experts in higher education have identified major sources of administrative problems. Ebel (14, p. 7) is of the opinion that one of the causes of these problems is that most college and university administrators have not been trained in skills demanded of them by their positions, for they have neither planned for careers in administration nor studied others functioning successfully in similar roles. Ebel also states that there is a total lack of rational career plans for academic administrators and that those who manage do so simply by sheer intellect and instinct.

Corroborating Ebel's opinion, Atwell and Green (4) comment that there are two types of higher education administrators--academic and non-academic--and that, unfortunately, the academic administrator's training is just now beginning to receive attention. This training, in Atwell and Green's view, should cover such areas as marketing, strategic planning, legal issues, and the use of computer models. The non-academic administrator's training, in contrast, is better developed, including such areas as finance, housing, and physical plant management. Atwell and Green further state,

The irony of leadership in higher education is that there is no formal training for leadership development. Lifelong learning is more available to students and the community than those who provide it. The consequence of such a situation is that there is little opportunity for professional renewal as is found in business or the military (4, p. 12).
Commenting on the training of higher education administrators, Bolton (6, p. 69) states that, although the old administrative track of scholar-teacher-administrator and eventually chief executive remains viable, a well-recognized, discrete, learnable academic discipline in management and administration now exists that higher education administrators should master.

In order to discharge their functions successfully, academic leaders have been reminded that some problems associated with higher education administration are environmental. Kenner (20, p. 177) warns that everything in higher education has been changing—the environment, students, curriculum, and even faculty. In the past, presidents engaged in teaching and preaching, but, for the most part, this is no longer true. The nature of the academic leader's work and responsibility has also changed in that the president is no longer able to govern unilaterally or to administer all the intricate details of college operations personally. Kenner concludes that students and faculty now participate in college affairs and that presidents can be leaders, arbiters, and motivators, but no longer absolute rulers.

Kenner (20) observes that, in the past, presidents provided direction through argument and reason, but today, to secure the stability and health of their institutions,
these academic leaders must pay particular attention to such diverse factors as market analysis, production control, labor relations, and financial management. Kenner declares,

"Survival is the key word, and even the need for academic freedom shall not be allowed to obscure this. The chief executive should be concerned with budgets—surpluses or deficits or rather profit or loss. The role of university presidents is that of an outspoken advocate for unified objectives, and not merely as caretaker. All those whose duty it is to lead their organizations or institutions have many things in common. They must share power, delegate responsibilities, and they must provide regular channels for feedback (20, p. 177)."

Kenner (20) also warns that, although chief executives should be concerned with values, goals, standards, and methodology, they must first and foremost become generalists and provide an atmosphere in which specialists can function and interact for the benefit of the total "corporate organism." Finally, he states that the chief executive's traditional job is strategic planning, budgeting, and directing people.

In his discussion of the relationship between academic and non-academic staff, Bolton (6) observes that "would-be" college administrators should be aware of the existence of paranoia among some members of the academic community concerning the application of management techniques in higher education administration. Administrators and faculty have an unfavorable view of each other; faculty
think that administrators are not concerned with matters of intellect and beauty and, thus, with the real purpose of the educational institution. Administrators, on the other hand, according to Bolton, think that faculty are underworked and unproductive spendthrifts and, therefore, are out of touch with the "real world" (6, p. 65).

Simmons (35, p. 176) believes that future presidents should learn how to deal with costs, productivity, and management and should understand that 75 to 80 per cent of the budget in higher education is spent on personnel. The second major cost, according to him, is energy and maintenance. For most presidents, costs, productivity (doing more with less), and management are new conditions that need careful scrutiny. Unless these leaders, whether or not they have been educators, view themselves as managers, they will have only a slight chance for survival as college presidents.

With regard to factors that should be considered in effective higher education administration, Uehling (4, pp. 29-30) declares that a candidate for the office of president should be evaluated on character, personality, and style. Some of the desirable attributes for a presidential candidate, in Uehling's view, are, in order of importance, a) integrity, b) intelligence, c) fairness, d) the ability to reason, e) a high energy level,
f) willingness to work hard, g) the ability to work independently while part of a team, h) the ability to be loyal, and i) possession of the need for power and authority versus the desire for task completion.

In conclusion, Uehling (4, pp. 29-30) makes the following observations: a) the job of a president is coaching, directing, and leading an administrative team; b) the purpose of a team is to effect the changes and strategies needed for implementation of institutional goals; c) building a team requires that every activity be defined clearly and its purpose well stated; d) strategy for change should be suggested while calling for input from all constituencies; and e) discussions should be held with the administrators selected to implement strategies.

Cope (12, p. 110) postulates that the role of president is that of a mediator whose duty is to hold the constituencies of a university loosely together while trying to move the whole enterprise ahead inches at a time. In addition, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities agrees that, "Although the president listens to the voices of all constituent groups, it must be recognized that he functions primarily as the administrative arm of the board and that all legal governing authority resides with the board" (36, p. 8).
Dressel (27, pp. 376-400) notes difficulties in determining what administration is, the complexity of delineating the power of administrators, the lack of clear and generally accepted criteria of success in job performance, and the fact that administrators often purposely communicate in ambiguous ways. Miller (26, pp. 80-81) states that performance should be evaluated against expectations, which implies that a job description handbook that is current and reasonably specific should be provided. Stauffer (37, p. 99) wonders whether higher education can recruit and retain administrators with needed qualities of judgment and leadership, given the present conditions and prospects in the field, the nature of selection and recruitment procedures, and the prevailing rewards and incentives.

Reflecting on the needs of higher education in general, Owen (31) concludes that there is a call for systematic investigation of the perceived professional development needs of individuals employed in specific senior level administrative positions such as chief executive officer, executive vice-president, chief academic officer, and chief student affairs officer (31, p. 112). Searching for the factors that influence higher education administration, Genova (24, pp. 4-5) conducted a study that found that the role and leadership styles of a university chief
executive are affected by the following factors: a) the age of the institution, b) the caliber of the faculty (experienced or inexperienced), c) the sources of funding, and d) the prevailing social, political, and economic conditions.

In addition, Cope (12, pp. 110-111) comments that a university president must be imaginative and risk-taking, able to deviate from tradition, and able to promote and defend such deviations. He states that presidents use metaphors on the grounds that they have tremendous power to establish new social realities and that they give life and meaning to what was formerly perceived only dimly and imprecisely.

The president should view the institution as a whole and should be able to decentralize authority so as to accommodate the differences in mission and outcome among many distinct entities. This decentralized authority may be called responsibility centers, reserve school systems, or management centers. According to Cope (12, p. 3), the university president should have complete administrative, managerial, and academic competence and an unimpeachable record of professional advancement. In addition, the president is required to demonstrate fairness, initiative, usefulness, dependability, respect for others, loyalty, endurance, imagination, tact, diplomacy, and a bright, inquiring mind.
The problem areas that must be resolved if the office of the presidency or vice-chancellorship is to be preserved include the process of choosing the president. The procedures now used in selecting university presidents are completely counterproductive. Presidents are often selected by the secretive "old boys network" rather than through group effort and consensus (12, p. 5). The person selected is often non-provocative, but soon it dawns on those involved in the selection that what the office requires is not bland, noncommittal leadership.

University presidents should be agents of change and progress. They should understand their own strengths and weaknesses, personal style, and preferences for involvement, and they need a portfolio of skills, some of which they already possess and some of which they will obtain from others. They should select subordinates whose biases and predilections are similar to their own. They should carefully weigh the nature of tasks to be delegated while retaining the budgeting function or delegating it to their immediate subordinates. The relationship between staff and line administrators must be fully stated in a job description handbook.

Staff members must be assessed or evaluated. Matters affecting personnel should be given top priority, and the timing of such decisions is important to achieve
effective results. For personnel matters, decision areas include a) no change in personnel but change in job description, organization, or both; b) replacement of personnel; or c) insisting on improvement in performance of present personnel (12, p. 22).

Uehling (4, pp. 29-30) emphasizes that openness, communication without fear of reprisal, problem-solving capacity, and an ability to search for alternative solutions are the hallmarks of effective administrators. Such behavior as withholding information, destructive competition, belittling talks, and taking sides has no place in institutions whose purpose is to see that all members work together.

Once presidents are appointed, their basic function is to educate changes. The president then manages an educational institution or business whose product is education. Kenner warns that college presidents must view themselves as managers: "Also, unless colleges replace those who fail, and then secure the services of competent chief executives, the colleges themselves will have slight chance for survival" (20, p. 177).

Kenner (20, p. 180) is of the opinion that an examination of the real developing world, rather than old images, will show that the functional imperatives of college presidents and corporate presidents are becoming very similar.
The truth, then, is the recognition that effective management techniques do exist and that they can be mastered by any responsible administrators who devote their time and talents to doing so (20, p. 180).

Sources of Administrative Problems

One of the sources of problems affecting chief executive officers in institutions of higher education is the selection process. Both the old secretive, authoritarian, "old boy method" and the newer over-democratizing method requiring the participation of all and sundry now being advocated seem not to have reduced the difficulty of selecting the most qualified candidate for the job.

The next source of administrative problems for college presidents is the demands made upon them. The president's role is, to some extent, to convert the often contradictory, seldom harmonious demands made by the various constituencies of the university into shared values and common commitment, and to do this in a financial and political context in which a serious error can lead to disaster (4, p. 4). The result is a sense of isolation which contributes to presidential burnout (4, p. 6).

Yet another problem is the articulateness of the faculty. All faculty are prepared to publish when a problem arises even if they have not published in years. In view of this fact, the president should avoid the use
of the more obvious form of politics—the pitting of block against block—in favor of enlightened consensus.

In terms of strategy, the president must be a consummate politician, but this complex balance of qualities may not be recognized by the current search-and-screen procedures for selecting a college president (4, p. 7). Measurement may also be problematic. In any event, the president should have courage, the power to persuade, highly developed communication skills, and the ability to apply all of these traits in an environment that shifts and changes from day to day and from week to week.

Leadership and managerial development in academe will be successful when sociologists, psychologists, educational researchers, and financial experts are fully engaged in the process.

The appointment of a president immediately is accompanied with expectations about change and progress. Change has to be introduced as soon as possible, otherwise it may be hard to introduce these changes, as delay in appointing administrators who will carry out tasks will result in loss of opportunities (4, p. 21).

Ebel (14) has identified several qualities that characterize a good administrator and enable the administrator to be effective in carrying out his or her duties: a) fairness, b) respect for others and their opinions, c) sensitivity and tact (the ability to spare and smooth the feelings of others, to reconcile and mediate, and to
preserve the best effects of courtsey and civility), d) compassion and mercy, e) responsiveness to serve, f) willingness to lead, g) capacity for taking care of details, h) firmness in adhering to higher goals, i) ability to marshall one's own energies successfully, and j) ability to make the most of the work of others (14, p. 96).

Ebel (14) is also of the opinion that the job performance of administrators should be evaluated on certain factors, namely, a) communication, b) decision-making; c) operations; d) delegation of responsibilities; e) problem-solving; f) relations with students and colleagues; g) public relations; h) quality of administration; i) relevance of education provided; j) meeting the needs and aspirations of faculty, students, and community; k) providing education that is development oriented; l) innovation that is capable of meeting the needs of rapid economic development; and m) emphasis on science, technology, and laboratory work.

According to McManis and others (25), university administrators should further be evaluated on the following factors: a) ability to make plans that integrate academic, physical, and financial affairs in a comprehensive plan; b) production of a plan that assesses the needs of the institution, the various constituencies of the institution, and the community in which the institution is
situated; c) ability to examine the mission of the institution in the light of its needs with the hope of reaffirming or modifying that mission; d) ability to develop goals and objectives derived from the institutional mission to ensure that the resulting academic, physical, and financial plans are in consonance with these goals and objectives; e) ability to translate goals and objectives into administrative and programmatic objectives; f) involvement of the persons who are to implement plans in the planning process itself; g) ability to evolve a management process that coordinates, directs, and monitors activities to achieve goals and objectives; h) seeing that decisions reached at all levels result in actions, activities, and/or directions that materially contribute to the realization of these goals and objectives and other supporting plans; i) institutionalization of equitable allocation of limited financial resources among competing programs on the basis of institutional and programmatic objectives which set the standard of such equity; j) clear statement of and adherence to operating policies and procedures; k) clear reporting of relationships so that they are understood by all; l) delegation of responsibility and commensurate authority to the lowest practical level; and m) development of executive and supporting staff at all levels to provide them with the requisite knowledge, skills, and abilities to
function effectively in their current positions and to prepare them for higher level positions (25, p. 7).

According to Ebel (14), a bad administrator exhibits pomposity, bluster, false modesty, obsequiousness, and insipidity. Such an administrator's true modesty is often based on lack of achievement or competence. The bad administrator is indecisive, evasive, and rigid and manifests ignorance and narrowness of vision or experience (14, pp. 99-100).

Commenting on some of the other problems of which would-be administrators should be aware, Ebel states,

By common agreements among presidents, their most prevalent administrative weakness is their inability to delegate work to other members of the academic community. The other danger is clearly that of neglecting the welfare of some members. The next problem is the administrator's encroachment upon authority already delegated to other staff (14, p. 116).

In addition, according to Ebel,

The ability of college professors to become academic administrators and thus to adapt to new responsibilities covers a whole range of adaptive behavior. Such behavior ranges from equivocation with which administration is regarded to specific evasions that go with these academic administrators trying to please their administrative superiors and former colleagues (14, p. 1).

Administrators' difficulties may become serious because

Most college and university administrators have not been trained in skills demanded of them as educational executives; they have neither planned for careers in administration nor studied others functioning successfully in similar roles (14, p. 7).
Finally, Ebel declares, "Ideally, presidents, deans, and faculty should think, speak, and act wisely and together. Although there is no sure path of development to these ends, there should be more definable means of preparing and training college administrators than now exists" (14, p. 7). Commenting on this ideal, Benis, an authority on organized development and former president of the University of Cincinnati, has said, "I am more and more surprised with the almost total lack of a rational career plan for academic administrators" (14, p. 7). Administrators should remember that, when their sense of what is important coincides with the faculty's, harmony results, but, when this fails, friction arises (14, p. 15).

Numerous categories of administrative activities have been identified. The administrator's role can be exercised in any or all of the following forms:

1. Correspondence;
2. Scheduling;
3. Cataloguing;
4. Report and questionnaire preparation;
5. Budgeting;
6. Promotion;
7. Tenure procedures;
8. Announcement making;
9. Memos;
10. Telephone queries and responses;
11. Matters of physical space and equipment and their upkeep;
12. Advising;
13. Anticipating;
14. Authorizing;
15. Calling and conducting meetings;
16. Defending (his/her, superiors' and subordinates') actions;
17. Discussing;
18. Enlisting;
19. Expediting;
20. Forgetting;
21. Gathering;
22. Honoring;
23. Identifying;
24. Initiating;
25. Justifying;
26. Knowing;
27. Listening;
28. Meddling and monitoring;
29. Neglecting;
30. Opposing;
31. Pleasing, pacifying, and placating;
32. Questioning;
33. Rationalizing;
34. Teaching;
35. Understanding;
36. Voting;
37. Waiting; and

Other duties and responsibilities of chief administrative officers include

1. Choosing the right priorities;
2. Identifying one's own strengths and weaknesses, inclinations and aversions;
3. Developing skill and care in dealing with people;
4. Choosing faculty;
5. Delegating authority;
6. Getting work done;
7. Acquiring, using, and communicating information;
8. Supporting and motivating oneself and others;
9. Planning and involving others in planning;
10. Maintaining a philosophical (base) center;
11. Keeping the door open;
12. Taking risks; and
13. Making decisions (14, pp. 70-71).

Two of the dilemmas of administrators are determining the demarcation between the use of personal dominance and the use of a socialized type of leadership and walking the line between taking no initiative (and being regarded as
no leader) and taking too much (and being labeled a dictator). Concerning the use of power, Lord Acton's warning is still valuable: "Administrators should always remember that power tends to corrupt. Absolute power corrupts absolutely" (I4, pp. 114-115).

Robert Greenleaf wrote in his book Servant Leadership that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by "the led" to the leader, in response and in proportion to the "clearly evident servant stature of the leader" (I4, pp. 114-115).

The advice given is that the chief executive in a higher education institution should be able to answer these questions: Should the primary responsibility of an administrative superior and the authority of the institution be to the faculty or to the students? Should responsibility be defined from the top down or from the bottom up to safeguard against the abuse of power? In all cases, shared authority seems to be accepted by faculty members (I4, pp. 114-115).

Individuals' Views of Education and How They Affect Educational Administration

Education is sometimes seen in terms of its developmental effects on the individual who receives it. Advocates of the progressive school of thought think that education should be child-centered and that it should be
structured to develop the receiver physically, mentally, socially, and morally. Generally, from the time of the Sophists in Greece in the fifth century B.C., as Bagley pointed out in 1938,

Educational theories have often emphasized either interest, freedom, immediate needs, personal experience, psychological organization, and pupil initiative, or effort, discipline, remote goals, race-experience, logical sequence, and teacher initiative (5, pp. 317-318).

According to Brubacher, education should be regarded as a means of social reform, and it uses persuasion as its first line of attack. In an autocratic society, education emphasized drill and obedience at the expense of initiative and criticism. One's native endowment was supposed to dictate the role one played in the world, and, because those who rule were supposed to do so by rising above their own immediate private interests, education was thought to enable the individual to make this adjustment better (7, pp. 362-364).

The democratic view of education is that education is a sort of freedom. Teachers are expected to encourage qualities of initiative, enterprise, self-reliance, and perseverance in their pupils. But, according to the Nigerian Academic Staff Union of Universities, "Education has to do with the search, acquisition, and use of knowledge and the use of such knowledge for the benefit of society. It is the strongest weapon in the struggle for
Nigeria's economic, political, and cultural independence" (17, p. 14). In order to acquire such knowledge, the university and the state should allow a free interplay of different opinions in the pursuit of learning, and such education should be free (29, p. 14).

Educational Philosophies and Their Relationship to Educational Planning and Policies

Many philosophies of education have been advanced under governments ranging from dictatorships and monarchies to democratic systems, but upon examination they seem to fall into two major categories, traditional and contemporary. Traditional views include essentialism and perennialism, whereas the contemporary view borders on progressivism.

Essentialists believe in subject matter since the mind is considered prominent in learning content. Their belief is that reality is embodied in things or physical objects and that, therefore, the emphasis in teaching should be on quantititative aspects of education. Traditionalists are more or less idealists who feel that knowledge is gained by intuition, revelation, and authoritarianism. For them the development of abilities for remembering, reasoning, and comprehending is important (19, pp. 354-357).

The foundation of the perennialist educational view is in the work of St. Thomas Aquinas, who believed that faith and the rational powers of man are the instruments of
knowledge. The view expressed by Aquinas is that learning helps one to reason and aids in character training and, consequently, the formation of morality. The contemporary or progressive view is that the emphasis in education should be placed on learning how to think rather than what to think (19, pp. 354-357).

Related to the philosophies of education are the views that individuals have of education itself. Furthermore, the goals or objectives of education in various societies are invariably linked to their peoples' definition of education. Thus, a survey of these definitions of education is in order.

A people's philosophy of education is often based on their culture, their individual needs and aspirations, the needs of their government, and their natural tendency towards freedom. Nigerians, as a people, have a well-documented hunger for education. They regard education both as a means to an end and, in some cases, as an end in itself. For instance, based on an account in The Guardian newspaper in Lagos, "A few years ago, people were amazed to read about a twenty-two-year-old Nigerian student in the U.S. who after trying unsuccessfully to raise money to complete his degree course, offered one of his kidneys for sale" (18, p. 9).
The absence of a working philosophy of education is due to an incorrect definition of education. A philosophy is needed for each of the three stages of education—namely, elementary, secondary, and university—because they serve three different needs and each requires a separate philosophy and definition.

Elementary education should be seen as a right of each individual citizen, and such education should be free. Where resources exist, secondary education should also be free. Higher education should be used to meet national, research, and community needs, and it should be funded by those who want or can afford it. Sound elementary and secondary education provides the basis for sound higher education.

The lack of individual philosophies for the various stages of education in Nigeria may be responsible for poor educational planning. In the 1950s, for example, the then-Eastern regional government and Western government initiated free elementary education, but it was soon discontinued in the East due to lack of funds. In the 1970s, free secondary education was instituted throughout the Federation of Nigeria, but, again, the project was discontinued due to financial difficulties. In 1976, Nigeria introduced free Universal Primary Education (UPE), but it, too, was discontinued. Today the government pays tuition and fees for college students at the undergraduate level. Yet,
in an article entitled "Crisis in Contemporary Nigerian Education," a writer in The Guardian lamentingly said,

Only recently, the federal military government pledged its commitment to the goal of eradicating illiteracy by 1992. Yet, the action of the same government seems to contradict its utterances. The various governments of the Federation are now cutting back on the extent of their commitment to education. Institutions are being merged or closed; bursaries and subsidies are being abolished; higher fees are now being charged at virtually all levels. The obvious effect of these measures will be to make education more expensive and so limit people's access to it (18, p. 13).

Experience, then, shows that good strategic planning should be preceded by a well-researched philosophy of education. Although it is generally agreed that a system of education is closely linked to the national needs and aspirations of a people, these should never be the sole basis for rational planning in education. Education should be available to meet the needs of the recipients, and the constitution of the people should be the basis for a rational policy on education. The culture of the people should also be integrated into the educational system.

For example, in the basic structure of Nigerian universities today, many titles (e.g., chancellor, pro-chancellor, vice-chancellor), procedures, and ceremonies of university life all had their origins in the medieval university with its love of pageants and robes, features of an integrated culture that have found much favor with Nigerians (30, p. 9). The medieval university was an
establishment for teaching and learning, not for research; it was suspicious of science and experimentation. The scientific revolution of the seventeenth century and many developments in the physical and natural sciences during the eighteenth century took place outside universities, largely through the encouragement of learned societies and academies of science. Hence, a clamor arose in the early nineteenth century for new types of universities that would integrate the spirit of science and scientific inquiry and patronage of the mechanical and industrial arts into the medieval universities.

Present reforms in higher education everywhere gained great impetus beginning in 1811, when the University of Berlin was established. Following its humiliating defeat by France, the Prussian government made educational reform the cornerstone of its rehabilitation program. Education from the elementary to the university level was financed by the state, and the state promoted religious freedom, academic and personal freedom, and freedom to pursue scientific inquiry. Thus, the present emphasis on teaching, research (publications), and community service emerged (30, pp. 12-13, 18).

Nigerians seem to have understood the need to evolve a new philosophy of education and the need for a body to be responsible for such planning, but their present
university councils have been besieged by many problems. For example, the councils are accused of having members who are not elected on the basis of their competence to make a meaningful contribution to the improvement of higher education administration. Members do not attend council meetings because they live far from their universities, there is general apathy among members in matters of academe due to their incompetence, and members would rather attend ceremonies instead of meetings called to discuss problems affecting their universities. This is a situation which has led some university vice-chancellors to seize the opportunity to act autocratically in academic and administrative matters. Ojo has, therefore, called on the Nigerian government to create a National Academic Council that can plan the development of university education for the country as a whole (30, p. 21).

Comparative History of American Higher Education Systems and Their Applicability to the Improvement of Higher Education Administration in Nigeria

Both the American and the Nigerian systems of higher education inherited characteristics of British classical or elitist traditional education, but both have also pursued equality of educational opportunity for their citizens. American higher education began in 1636, with the founding of Harvard College (22, p. 4431); the first institution of
higher education in Nigeria was Yaba College, established in 1932, and the first Nigerian higher education institution to award degrees as well as diplomas and certificates was the University of Ibadan, established in 1948.

Higher education in the United States has made extraordinary progress in growth, student population, contributions to technological advancement, research, and publications, whereas higher education in Nigeria has yet to reach its adolescence. The United States has a population of well over 230 million people, compared to about 100 million in Nigeria (28, pp. 37-38), but the United States has about 4,500 institutions of higher education and Nigeria has only twenty-five.

Both the United States and Nigeria operate under federal systems of government. In the United States jurisdiction over education was placed in the hands of the individual states by the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution (22, p. 4233). In Nigeria, higher education has been placed on the exclusive and concurrent legislative lists; in other words, both the federal and state governments legislate and control higher education, in accordance with the provisions of the 1979 Nigerian Constitution.

Nigeria has no private institutions of higher education—all universities are owned by either the federal government or state governments. In contrast, the United
States has no federal universities but does have government-supported research institutions and state colleges and universities in addition to private universities operated by individuals, religious organizations, and groups of individuals. In the United States, education is free of federal government intervention, but in Nigeria such intervention in higher education is widespread and highly problematic.

The board of regents in U.S. higher education institutions is called a regulating body, but its counterpart in Nigeria, the governing council, is called the governing board of a university. In the United States, members of the board of regents are appointed by state governors, but in Nigeria members of the governing council are appointed by the head of the federal government (for federal universities) or by state governors (for state universities). University presidents in the United States are appointed by their boards of regents, but in Nigeria the head of the federal government (for federal universities) or state governors (for state universities) appoint the institutions' chief executives.

In the United States, the U.S. Department of Education coordinates the activities of the agencies involved with education, but in Nigeria the federal Ministry of Education, the National Universities Commission, the Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board, the governing council
and senate of each university, the Ministry of Establishment (which controls the Public Service Board), and the Cabinet Office all can and do make regulations--independent of each other--that affect the administration of higher education in Nigeria. This has led to confusion in knowing who has responsibility for and authority and control of higher education in Nigeria.

The autonomy of private institutions in the United States was reinforced by the Datmont College Case of 1819, in which the courts gave legal sanction to the principle of non-interference by ruling that a state cannot alter a charter after it has been granted without reasonable cause (Trustees of Datmont College vs. Woodward, 4 Wheat 518, 4 L. Ed. 629, 1819). From that time on, American educators adopted a policy of self-assessment and self-regulation, primarily through a system of voluntary institutional and program accreditations and through national studies on educational policies.

Basic standards for the evaluation of institutions of higher education were formulated in the United States. Eight post-secondary commissions later emerged, and these were recognized by the Commissioner for Education as bodies qualified to grant institutional and program accreditations (22, p. 4232). In contrast, no such body currently exists in Nigeria to undertake institutional and program
accreditations. Therefore, institutions of higher education in Nigeria lack self-assessment as well as mandatory assessment or regulation.

The Confusion Concerning Centralization, Government Intervention, University Autonomy, Academic Freedom, and Governance in Higher Education in Nigeria

Government representatives' reasons for constant intervention in the internal operation of federal universities in Nigeria are numerous (15, p. 3). Paramount among these reasons are a) to use higher education to protect the country's national interests and security; b) to maintain standards or quality in education (although the government has no accreditation standards and no body to carry out this task); c) to bridge the gap between educationally advantaged and educationally disadvantaged parts of the country; d) to salvage unviable institutions that should not have been established in the first place; e) to use higher education to promote national unity or end tribalism, which the Nigerian constitution has so far failed to do; f) to provide funds for the universities, which have been structured so as to be a financial liability of the federal government for an indeterminate period; and f) to meet a national goal of providing equal opportunity for every Nigerian to obtain a university education, a goal which has not been achieved even by some industrialized
nations; and h) to produce the high-level manpower so desperately needed in Nigeria, although this objective could be achieved without government intervention in the internal administration of the universities (11, pp. 42-44).

When each of the above reasons is critically examined, it can quickly be seen that few of the functions that the government performs cannot be delegated to other persons or bodies, without adversely affecting administration. Government intervention is, therefore, not a desideratum or a sine qua non for the success of an institution of higher education in Nigeria. Government financial involvement in education can be justified because the government collects taxes and other revenues from people and thus appropriates resources that should normally be at the disposal of the citizens (17, p. 4), but in so doing it is expected to provide social services to them. This responsibility, however, is not an adequate reason why the government should interfere in the day-to-day operation of an educational institution.

In spite of government interventions in the governance of university administration, the NUC recently made a passionate appeal to the federal government.

All the foregoing considerations therefore compel us to appeal to Government to take a serious view of these developments and to take steps as a matter of urgency to introduce competent legislation which would reduce chaos to order and set out purposeful guidelines for university development.
Experience in this matter clearly shows that what is needed is competent legislation to regulate the mode whereby universities could be brought into being as well as the standardisation of minimum standards and a system of accreditation of both the institutions and their programmes (10, p. 17).

In answer to this call, the then-Chief of Staff of the Supreme Headquarters of the Nigerian army said that the federal military government had directed the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, in consultation with the NUC, to examine the issue of establishing guidelines for accreditation of new universities and other institutions of higher learning. He also said that, in view of the projected cost of education in Nigeria for 1983-84 and 1987-88, no private universities would be established at this stage of Nigeria's educational development and that the government had therefore promulgated a decree to abolish all private universities now existing in Nigeria and to forbid the establishment of new ones in the foreseeable future (10, p. 18 (i), (ii)).

Private universities in Nigeria were closed, despite the fact that the NUC, the Nigerian federal government's physical and academic planning agency, praised the opening of private universities as an important event. According to the NUC,

If therefore private agencies and individuals wish to offer their contributions, the more welcome they would be. Further yet, privately sponsored universities would not expect government financial contributions and would, we expect, be economical
in their operations, without, we hope, pinching kobo at the expense of academic excellence. If therefore private universities exhibit greater efficiency in financial management, the universities sponsored by governments would have something to learn from at least in that area. For these reasons and more, we welcome private universities (10, pp. 8-9).

The issues of centralization, university autonomy, national interest, protection of educational standards, and academic freedom are linked to finances in Nigeria. The government claims that it is the only organ capable of financing higher education in Nigeria and that, therefore, it should be the final judge in these matters. Yet federal ability to finance higher education is certainly not unlimited, and this has prompted well-meaning citizens to call on the government to reexamine the problem of higher education in Nigeria.

In a complete analysis of the problem of centralization, academic freedom, and the funding of federal universities, Aminu (11) said,

Although Government has been making efforts to meet the financial needs of federal universities, yet the universities are experiencing their worst period of financial crisis. Government took these financial commitments without an evidence of prior costing of these commitments. Decisions are made on the basis of politics and this renders financial planning within the system untenable (11, pp. 41-42).

For example, government involvement in assessing university fees and charges resulted in serious problems. Until 1975, in the presence of oil wealth, the government directed
universities not to review fees and charges without prior approval, and the universities agreed. Then, in 1976, the head of state announced the abolition of tuition fees and fixed board charges at 15k per meal and lodging fees at N30 per session. The university system was not considered when this decision was made, nor was it the result of rational planning. The universities were not compensated for their loss of revenue, and in 1977 the government found that its policy was unrealistic. Yet, the universities still were not asked to make recommendations, and the government continued to make tuition free for undergraduate students while charges for board and lodging were raised to 50k per meal and N90 per session, respectively.

In April of 1978, students revolted and clashed with security forces, and in the ensuing violence five students lost their lives. When the Mohammed Commission of Inquiry's report on the incident was released, two vice-chancellors and several lecturers were dismissed, and a number of students were expelled.

When the civilian government was restored in 1978, it became clear that the government could no longer finance the universities at a level that would enable them to provide quality education. The government was therefore called upon to allow the universities to return to the 1975 practice of determining and charging their own fees
and levies for the services they rendered, based on a contract between students and their sponsors on one hand and the universities on the other. In conclusion, Aminu said,

It can be concluded from the evidence revealed by this overwhelming pattern, that in the area of university funding, the performance of centralization has left much to be desired in spite of genuine efforts. Government clearly brought plenty of unnecessary problems on itself and on the universities. One of the first needs is to rationalize government commitment so that no commitment is entered into without the likely financial resources to support it. The people need to be courageously weaned off the idea of getting quality education for nothing. The universities also need to be encouraged and left free to try their hands at ingenious ways of funding themselves, including the freedom to charge for their services (11, p. 42).

The questions of autonomy and academic freedom seem to be two issues that neither the government nor academics have clearly defined. The general opinion among many outside academic communities is that, if the possibility for absolute freedom for individuals in the society is remote, why should it be offered to members of the university community? In any case, university autonomy is a matter of degree; the mere fact the government funds these universities and formulates the guidelines by which they operate makes it impossible for them to enjoy such absolute freedom.

Other reasons why absolute autonomy for Nigerian universities is a remote expectation include the government's association of national security with the existence
of institutions of higher learning, meddling in politics by academics and students, the use of university facilities to further the course of political orientations by members of the academic community, and the need for use of the head of state's Visitation powers to promote Nigerian social norms of maintaining justice and fair play in national life.

According to Aminu,

University autonomy is not a prerequisite to academic freedom. Although Government has on some occasions interfered in some areas like admission, appointment of principal officers, financial management, petitions, and such other areas that have important political repercussions of which Government claims to affect peace, order, and good government, academic freedom derived from the freedom of speech and of opinion clauses in the Constitution has not been directly challenged in Nigeria. People conduct their research as they like, interpret their findings as they deem fit, and publish where they choose. These publications are adequately recognized and rewarded by promotions, honors, and Merit Awards. It is indirectly that freedom can be affected through non-availability of research funds. But if the allegations of scandal, fraud, and maladministration made by academics against their administrative colleagues are investigated by outside authority, the same academics might start again to cry that their academic freedom is being violated (11, pp. 43-44).

Members of the academic community complain that their freedom is adversely affected in many ways, such as interference in the internal governance of the universities through the use of the Visitation powers of the head of state and government appointment of principal officers of the university council. Academics want to be the final
judge in matters relating to the admission and discipline of students, curriculum development, and evaluation of the performance of their colleagues for appointment, promotion, reward, and discipline. They also want to fully participate in decisions relating to financing of the university. Some of these areas have been recognized as matters concerning which the universities should be the best judge.

However, some of the statements made by academics either as individuals or in groups seem to support the view that even they are not completely clear in their view of the role that the government should play to make higher education administration in Nigeria efficient and effective. In a recent communiqué, the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) said that the present 70 per cent illiteracy rate in Nigeria was unacceptable; since education was the strongest weapon in the struggle for the nation's economic, political, and cultural independence, this high illiteracy rate was a major obstacle to the rapid development of the economy (17, p. 14). The ASUU then rejected what it called the wrong notion on the part of government that its funding of education is an act of grace, adding that the wealth of the nation which the government manages is collectively produced by the working people. The ASUU continued,

No government has the right to deny the people the use of their wealth to provide education. The economy, although in crisis, is capable of providing education for all. The scarcity of resources that
Government complains of is due to reliance on corrupt contractors and officials executing projects. Consequently, the conference condemned the introduction of fees and levies by various governments but expressed solidarity with the National Association of Nigerian Students (NANS) in its efforts to defend the people's right to education (29, p. 14).

Had it not been that the ASUU called for a new social order, it would be impossible to see how its wishes could be implemented. Education from the elementary to the university levels does not have to be free before Nigeria achieves economic, political, and cultural development. Furthermore, the ASUU's call for free education for all runs counter to the demands by Nigerian academics that they be allowed to determine and charge their own fees and other levies. One can hardly understand how students can achieve the difficult task of defending the people's right to free education without resorting to revolts, which the government regards as opposed to peace and order in the country. Government and the members of the academic community need a great deal of education before they can work together to achieve the goals of higher education in Nigeria.

Commenting on academic freedom and how the existence of private schools can help to guarantee such freedom, Brubacher states,

Academic freedom is an excellent illustration of a freedom which involves both the propositions "from" and "to." The teacher must be free "from" influence which prevents his stating the truth as he sees it, but he must also be thoroughly competent in his field "to" investigate the truth. The basis for
such competence generally rests in part on a sound liberal education. Such education should be free, that is, no economic barrier to its acquisition. It is this freedom which is incorporated in the idea of a "public" school, in the United States, a school open and free to all. The irony of this philosophy is the assumption that there are unlimited resources and that it seems unfair to give equal opportunities to youth of unequal abilities (7, pp. 362-364).

The case for private schools is that, if the state government were the only agency for education, it might become totalitarian and the individual might stand in the shadow of its tyranny. But, in a pluralistic state, one is free to turn to schools maintained by churches or other private agencies as an alternative to state or public education. The guarantee of freedom to private schools, however, should be followed by guarding against barriers growing up between them and public institutions. Any factors--socioeconomic class, race, religious creed, and the like--that interrupt the free flow of communication between people are inimical to the best interest of democracy. In a democracy, society not only exists in and by communication but is rated by the level of freedom in communication (7, pp. 362-364).

Critical Administrative Problems Facing Higher Education in Nigeria

A survey of the literature on higher education in Nigeria, the reports of commissions set up by the Nigerian government to investigate and recommend methods of improving
higher education administration, and the opinions of academics and others who are knowledgeable concerning higher education, leads to the identification of the following as the critical problems facing higher education in Nigeria today: a) absence of a philosophy of education among those who are charged with the administration of Nigerian institutions of higher education, b) lack of a strategic plan for education in general and for higher education in particular, c) lack of consideration of how to obtain the necessary human and material resources to fund the type of education needed, and d) the interference of politics in the selection of vice-chancellors and in the evaluation of their job performance effectiveness. The Nigerian National Development Plan of 1981-1985 is an example of such a government document containing policies formulated without good planning. The plan states in part,

By deliberate policy, federal Government decided that within the 1981-1985 development plan period, it would expand university facilities such that each of the nineteen states of the Federation would have a federal university within its borders. Where a university is established in pursuit of this policy, it will be a university devoted to teaching and research in the sciences and technology to provide a base for the technological and industrial take-off of the country's economic programmes. Federal plans included the establishment of an open university to cater for those who could not obtain university education through the conventional campus-based programmes (11, p. xiv).

Following the implementation of this policy, many secondary schools, health centers, teacher training centers,
colleges of education, and technical institutions became universities overnight; existing universities were expanded; and new universities of technology were founded. Before the plan period ended, some of the new universities were either closed or obliged to merge with other institutions. Many academics were not paid for months. Schools were closed so that university authorities could decide on increases in board rates to enable them to compensate for dwindling government financial support (11, p. xiv).

The plan is failing, to some degree, because it did not include all of the parameters, criteria, and participants, nor did it consider political, legal, psychological, economic, and personnel issues in setting objectives or in formulating a growth policy. No extrapolation of the past and present was conducted to predict future needs in the area of higher education, empirical analysis was not used to explore relationships, and computer simulation of problems to study the many factors involved in them was not undertaken. A holistic approach was apparently not used, and planners failed to think of scenarios expressed in probabilistic terms to enable them to build up familiarity, improve understanding, and explore opportunities in the relatively uncharted territories of the future.

An emphasis was placed on equality of opportunity, but it was not based on clear ideas concerning the level
of education where such equality is possible or even worthy of being pursued as a policy. Centralization of education continues to be pursued in utter disregard of the fact that Nigeria is a federal system and that educational development in the Federation cannot be achieved simply by centralization because the Nigerian government has neither the funds nor the personnel to do the job. The reality that in a capitalist system only the existence of a two-tiered structure for education--both public and private--will bring about the competition that would ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the management of Nigerian institutions of higher education seems to have been disregarded. A mistaken notion prevails that education confers a sense of patriotism and fairness on individuals in dealing with matters that would benefit their fellow citizens, in the absence of detailed written guidelines on how to achieve these two virtues.

In support of the idea that leaders in education be given a sort of national code of conduct or some official guidelines to help them in their duties, Aminu has observed,

The educated man is not, as one might presuppose, detribalised. In fact, he tends to be retribalised in order to be in the position to corner a greater than a fair share of the national resources for himself and his ethnic constituency. With this background, it is, therefore, unrealistic to expect to rely solely on an educated man's patriotism where, without any enforceable guidelines, he has to choose between his ethnic or cultural group and others in an area like education. Some people can do it, but
...only because of their inherent sense of fair play, and not because of their education (11, p. 34). Also, according to Gowon, most Nigerian intellectuals have not been guided in their actions by the ideals and aspirations commonly shared by learned men in other countries (11, p. 82).

Employment contracts for academic leaders which assure them that the length of their tenure will depend on their productivity, efficiency, and good conduct would enable them to develop a sound growth policy founded on a good philosophy of education. Thus, they would be able to decide whether to maintain, modify, or abandon the policy, based on the extent to which it served or failed to serve the interests of the individuals, groups, and community that the institution was supposed to serve.

The accusations of fraud and misuse of power that have been leveled against some vice-chancellors in Nigerian universities should be properly investigated. It is likely that these abuses could be reduced if academic leaders maintain a high sense of morality, and familiarity with management techniques can help these chief executives to be more successful in their jobs.

Many individuals have tried to enlighten the Nigerian public on the type and possible causes of some of the difficulties facing higher education today. In a recent article entitled "Towards Realistic Education," Abasilim
diagnosed the general problems of the Nigerian educational system and concluded,

The problems associated with Nigerian education include expansion without planning, planning without reliable data (census data), miseducation, providing education that does not meet the needs of the community, centralization of education, lack of use of computer and the trained statisticians. Money per se is not the problem with Nigerian higher education. The financial problems are losses due to wastage and fraud and inflation. Many Nigerians seem to think that every governmental programme is yet another opportunity to loot the nation. The other issue of financing relates to problems of finding money to pay teachers, overpayment of salaries, leave allowances, and promotions and inadequate classrooms, equipment, laboratories, and teachers' supplies (1, p. 5).

Evidence that the government recognized some of these problems appeared in the Mohammed Commission Report, one of whose recommendations was that the federal Commissioner of Education should establish a code of conduct or appoint a committee to define the concept of academic freedom and submit the committee's report to the government for consideration and approval. Unfortunately, however, the members of the ASUU rejected this proposal, asserting that such a code of conduct would stifle the universities' initiative in determining their own procedures for self-management and self-monitoring. The ASUU blamed what it called

the unwarranted government intervention in the affairs of the universities, especially through the National Universities Commission (NUC) and the activities of some leaders of the universities (these are academics also) who tend to lobby government agents for support in their pursuit of selfish and parochial interests within the universities (2, pp. 21-22).
The ASUU regarded the appointment of vice-chancellors by the government and the imposition of these vice-chancellors on the academic community as improper. As for conditions of service, the ASUU complained that the universities should be allowed to negotiate these conditions so as to eliminate frustration among lecturers and ease recruitment, and declared that the government should refrain from usurping the power of university councils to negotiate the appointment contracts of their staff or that of the senate and the faculty to assess the academic merits of university teachers and the content of academic programs (2, pp. 21-23).

Management as an applied science has evolved from and sometimes uses sociology, psychology, philosophy, mathematics, statistics, and—now—computers. Scientific management was pragmatic and task oriented and used a method that was rooted in science, measurement, observation, and analysis. Frederick W. Taylor of the United States and Henri Fayol of France were among its early proponents. The central goal of management at that time was efficiency in large corporations, but more recently management has been regarded
as a human relations tool that stresses communication, leadership, and interpersonal relations, particularly between employees and their superiors. Studies relating to job satisfaction, morale, productivity, conflict resolution, and improvement techniques are stressed. Because management now uses behavioral and quantitative tools, it is more inductive, more experimental, more vigorous, and more complete (24, pp. 11-18).

According to Koontz, persons who are called upon to manage should understand that management, unlike law, is not a science based on precedent since future situations exactly resembling those of the past are unlikely to occur. A positive danger is inherent in relying too much on experience and the undistilled history of managerial problem-solving for the simple reason that a technique found to be useful in the past may be far from an exact fit for a somewhat similar situation in the future (23, pp. 56-66). This is the reason why academic leaders are advised to carry on continuous self-improvement in order to keep abreast of new management techniques that may help them to become better administrators.

Several approaches to the art of management now exist that administrators should examine to update their knowledge of modern management and administration techniques. Among them are a) the empirical, case, or Ernest Dale's
comparative approach; b) the interpersonal behavioral approach; c) the group behavior approach; d) the cooperative social system approach; e) the sociotechnical systems approach; f) the decision theory approach; g) the communications center approach; h) the mathematical or management science approach; and i) the operational approach. A knowledge of these approaches may help an administrator to be more effective than he or she would otherwise be in the difficult task of leadership.

Theory is considered essential because it is looked upon as a way of organizing knowledge and experience so that practice can be improved through research, empirical testing of principles and techniques, and the teaching of fundamentals (23, pp. 56-66). The application of behavioral, statistical, and mathematical tools led to the application of management knowledge in non-business fields such as education, government, and health care (24, pp. 1-5). These new management techniques can be of assistance to practicing administrators who wish to be effective in discharging their duties. However, the question of how authority for responsibility is to be shared among administrators is another important problem of leadership.

The Questions of Ultimate Authority and How to Evaluate Performance

The questions of ultimate authority and how to evaluate the performance of managers are, perhaps, the two most
important problems of modern administration. Some management theorists have offered guidelines on how to attempt to solve these problems. Kicks (21) says that, whatever the form of business, society grants ultimate authority to the owner of the property (resources) utilized in the firm. But the problem is how to evaluate the job of top management. Difficulty in evaluating the performance of top managers arises from the fact that there is no sequence of activities or the sequence of activities cannot be clearly identified.

Top management is, however, expected to be innovative. Innovation is the application of new ideas in technique and organization which would bring about changes in the functioning of an organization. Next, top management should be concerned with both the sequence and direction of communication (21, pp. 19, 39-41). Organizations are now being managed by groups of individuals in the form of committees or panels of experts, so academic administrators should have a rationale for the use of such groups if they plan to employ them.

Interacting Work Groups

One interacting work group that is often utilized in universities is the committee system; another is the board of directors or regents or governing council. In general, who should be members of committees? Andrews (3) advises
that only persons who are both interested and qualified should be recruited as committee members. He believes that committees are shaped by their leadership, their composition, and their assigned function (3, p. 30). Much (27) believes that creativity can be served by utilizing the immense potential of a well-put-together board. The variety of experience, points of view, and technical and general knowledge and the quality of judgment present in a well-composed board can be an invaluable asset to any organization.

Of course, one may ask why committees should be used in the first place. According to Kicks, when an organization process exists that cuts across departments and is therefore not within the domain of any single chain of command, a committee is often established, consisting of representatives from all of the units involved. The predominant use of committees is to attain "interest representation" (3, p. 30). Temporary structures such as task forces and ad hoc committees are made up of individuals drawn from various departments. Both are used to deal with current problems or special projects. The difference between a task force and an ad hoc committee is that the former is often full-time while an assignment to an ad hoc committee is often temporary, according to Carlisle (9, p. 343).
The functions of the board of directors is sometimes different from those of task forces, ad hoc committees, or other types of committees found in a university. Kicks says that the area to be covered by a board includes the identification of the identity and mission of the organization and the direction that the organization will take in order to keep pace with a fast-changing world. The board aids in making decisions relating to the type of innovation that will make the organization's strategies successful (3, p. 30).

According to Much (27), the key roles or activities of the board of directors are a) keeping informed, b) accepting management action, c) advising management, d) approving management action, e) judging management, and f) directing management. In a business organization, the board of directors should support new innovation, creativity, and new opportunity and take bold risks if the technology, money, and people necessary for success in the ventures in question are available. The board seeks new market opportunities and customers and compares the company's capabilities with its weaknesses. The board can extend management's constrained view of the world and bring stimulation and new ideas to executives conditioned by their company's experience to stereotyped policy-making and behavior.
The importance of an enlightened board lies in its identification of viable corporate strategy. The goals of such a strategy are as follows: a) to identify and facilitate the process for choosing among alternatives; b) to accomplish an intelligent overview of the feasibility of the objectives; c) to assess the impact of proposals on capital, appropriation, new research and development, and facility expansion or acquisition; d) to evaluate management with regard to any problems that have been identified in the past; and e) to join management in sharing the risk for decisions it approves.

In all cases, a good chairperson is essential. A good chairperson provokes productive discussions and identifies the debatable issues. Among committees in particular, the problem today is that there is often no committee to investigate problems of ethical conduct (3, p. 30).

Interacting group members are employees of the organization, and understanding the behavior of the work group is an important way of knowing how to deal with people to enable them to make their best contribution to their organization. Members of a group use group interaction to verify their opinions and compare their abilities. Through the work group, the individual attains identification, recognition, and self-esteem and, in the end,
realizes a sense of power, self-control, and protection. This process perpetuates social and cultural values through pressures on members to conform with group norms. Apart from fulfilling the affiliation need, work groups a) reduce anxiety, b) contribute to overall job satisfaction, c) lead to worthwhile goals and activities, d) help in getting the job done, e) socialize new workers, and f) become a source of training, especially for new workers (8, pp. 12-15).

However, groups sometimes create problems for an organization. Some of the drawbacks of work groups include the following: a) emotive decision problems (win/lose situations), b) technical-factual decision problems, c) policy/planning problems, and d) crisis decision problems. According to some research findings, the main shortcoming of interacting work groups is that they tend to inhibit creative thinking and discourage innovative ideas. Other drawbacks of groups include a) the pressure to conform, b) dominance, c) solution-mindedness, d) conflicting secondary goals, e) in-group loyalty, f) group-think (concurrency-seeking that dominates a cohesive group and tends to override the realistic appraisal of alternative courses of action, g) invulnerability (a sense of an unwarranted security that overrides obvious dangers), h) rationale (a characteristic of the group that makes
members overlook negative feedback), i) morality, j) stereotypes, k) pressure, l) self-censorship, m) unanimity or sometimes an illusion of unanimity, and n) mind-guards. In spite of these drawbacks, it has been found that groups are more effective than individuals if a task is fairly simple and has only a few steps. But individuals are likely to be more proficient when value judgments and difficult multiple problems are involved.

To achieve group effectiveness a) the problem must be identified, b) group members must be carefully chosen, c) the meeting agenda must be composed and distributed to members early but not so early that the date and time of the meeting may be forgotten, and d) the decision process must be chosen so as to arrive at the most single effective decision process. After proper definition of authority and careful selection of group members, the next important factor to consider is the nature of leadership.

According to some research findings, groups need two types of leaders or a leader that can incorporate the two leadership orientations: task and interpersonal. Task-oriented leaders are those whose primary concern is to get the present task accomplished. To achieve their objective they simply direct people and are not greatly concerned with their morale. But the interpersonal-oriented leader
is concerned with the maintenance of a warm climate, the promotion of trust, and respect among workers as well as with task completion.

The best situation, in general, is one in which a leader tries to achieve what is often described as "the right mix" of both task orientation and boosting the morale of the employees he or she leads in order to make a decision without provoking interpersonal conflict. Thus, administration should be part bureaucratic, collegial, and political to accommodate the views, interests, and inputs of its various constituencies (16, p. 133). To ensure creative discussion and to reduce biases or avoid "group-think"--a circumstance in which too much ready agreement or solidarity occurs, precluding discussion of all the sides of an issue--many organizations add outsiders, called "devil's advocates," to decision-making groups, except in crisis conditions.

Determining a workable size for the group is also important. Five is generally accepted as a minimum and seven as a maximum number of members for a meaningful and effective small group discussion.

If a group decision calls for a meeting, members should be given a meeting agenda. In formulating the agenda, background information concerning the purpose of the meeting, the stages through which the meeting will move, and what
should be accomplished (without a hint of possible solutions) should be included.

When the group meets, the next consideration is what decision technique will be most appropriate for the situation, considering the time-frame and the nature of the problem to be solved. At least five distinct decision-making techniques are now recognized: a) ordinary group procedure, b) brainstorming, c) statistical aggregation, d) the Delphi technique, and e) nominal group technique (NGT) (28, pp. 55-62). Using any of these techniques, the decision-maker must list all of the goals to be accomplished, determine priorities, and consider cost, time, his or her commitment to the issue, and the importance of cohesiveness of group members before selecting a decision strategy (28, pp. 55-62).

The task of managing an organization is not easy. The question is, "What does a leader need to know about an organization whose leadership he is about to assume?" According to authorities in management, "If you want to know an organization, ask for its manual." The organizational manual often describes the functions and responsibilities of each unit (functional specialization). It contains a) primary and subsidiary charts showing the formal organization as established, with functional statements specifying the activities that are to be conducted in each unit;
b) specification of formal authority relationships and descriptions of the primary management positions; c) an outline of management philosophy; and d) company or organizational objectives and the principles that comprise the organization's "creed."

The functional statements in the manual are designed to ensure that all work is covered. Second, it is assumed that the segregation of functions and duties will be useful in arriving at the mix and balance necessary to achieve organizational objectives. Organizational manuals also often outline organizational procedures or regulations. These procedures are established in order to assign appropriate responsibility to each organizational unit and to sequence their activities.

Corporate Leaders' Thinking on Leadership in General

According to corporate leaders, a good leader undertakes a massive delegation of operating responsibilities to allow time for strategic leadership. He or she understands the importance of communication, realizing that increased communication among groups is beneficial. Chief executives have two major functions: organizational planning and serving as an information reception center. They are to keep informed about social, political, economic, and scientific trends. A knowledge of such trends enables the
chief executive to answer such questions as "In what direction is the organization going now? In what direction should the organization be going? Is the organization continuing in an appropriate direction, or should something be done to change this direction?"

According to Rock (34), the problem in defining what chief executives do is that

In many large organizations, lower-level jobs have detailed, concise, up-to-date job descriptions; but these become scarcer as job levels ascend until, at the very top, job descriptions often do not exist, especially for that of the chief officer. Even where a job description of the chief executive officer exists, it may provide only a vague representation of the position (34, p. 31).

In an attempt to help define the functions, duties, and roles of chief executives, Mintzberg comments,

Top managers or chief executives of organizations have many different roles to perform. As organizational figureheads, they must represent their organizations in a variety of social, legal, and ceremonial matters. As leaders, they must ensure that organization members are properly guided in relation to organizational goals. As liaisons, they must establish themselves as links between their organizations and factors outside their organizations. As monitors, they must assess organizational progress. As disturbance handlers, they must settle disputes between organization members. And as resource allocators, they must determine where resources will be placed to best benefit their organizations (34, pp. 31-32).

In addition, the corporate chief executive must satisfy the company's shareholders or stockholders, its employees, the community in which it is located, its suppliers, and the government. Who do university presidents in general
have to satisfy? Do they have to satisfy the board of regents or council of the university, the faculty, the students, the government, or the community in which the institution is located? If the chief executive fails to meet the needs of any of these entities, does he or she fail in his or her responsibilities?

According to Thomas A. Murph, the chairman and chief executive officer of General Motors Corporation,

The CEO's job hasn't changed, only people's expectation of it. Business still has to satisfy customers because, if you don't have customers, you don't have business. In satisfying customers, you've got to have products. You have got to compete in the marketplace, and you've got to make a little money in the process because that's what the stockholders expect you to do. At the same time, you have to relate to the problems of the communities in which you live. You have to do the things that you're expected to do: You have to be a good citizen. Too, the business corporation was not destined to be a democratic institution. It was intended to be a task-oriented or problem-solving organization with a relatively narrow purpose (32, p. 77).

Reginald H. Jones, chairman and CEO of General Electric Company, has stated, "Tomorrow's successful managers will be those who swim as comfortably in the societal waters as their predecessors swam in the waters of technology and finance" (32, p. 78). But, in the view of Irving S. Shapiro, DuPont's chief executive,

The old-timers of management see public issues as nuisances, but the times have passed them by. The most effective managers today recognize that the world has changed; their jobs have changed. Either you're going to understand what the
Finally, C. Peter McColough, chief executive of Xerox Corporation, declares, "After all, the CEO is neither the owner nor the ultimate boss. He is a member of the board. He is most likely chairman of that board and he runs the meetings. But his chances of 'running' the board are diminishing. The board is the CEO's boss" (32, p. 79). McColough also notes that some people have the impression that there are no controls over a corporation but that these people are ignoring the many agencies that keep corporations within a maze of legislation and regulations. They may be unaware that the board of directors must ensure that corporation policies are consistent with the law and that management conduct is ethical.

Stressing what he considers to be the most important functions of a corporate leader, McColough says that he devotes most of his internal time at Xerox to producing programs, looking forward as much as ten years in the areas of technology, organization, and public relations. He notes that his other functions relate to strategy and plans (32, p. 79).

Conclusion

The review of related literature on the duties of chief executives and the factors that can enable them to
be effective in their jobs may be summarized in the biblical injunction that much is expected of the person to whom much is given. Thus, chief executive officers who are expected to be good leaders are expected to be good followers as well.

As generalists, the roles of leaders can be characterized as directing operations and managing people. In carrying out the former task, they must keep a watchful eye on the budget; in accomplishing the latter, the CEO is expected to possess some skills and to use those skills that he does not personally possess but which are possessed by others through the delegation of functional authority. The most important of these skills are the ability to plan, facility in labor relations, communication ability, and the capacity to delegate authority.

The first problem regarding the chief executive concerns determining how the most qualified candidates for the job can be recruited and selected. The next problem is finding the best rewards and incentives to attract the best minds available, and the last problem is achieving fairness in evaluating the CEO's job performance.

From the Nigerian perspective, a major problem in the recruitment and selection of chief executives of institutions of higher education can be ascribed to the absence of a detailed job description handbook for CEOs. Another
difficulty is related to the introduction of politics into the recruitment and selection exercise. Vice-chancellors also fail to understand that their success depends to a large degree on their ability to manage people and funds (33, p. 1).

Nigerians inside and outside the academic community seem to be divided in their opinion of the best way to make higher education available to those who need it and how to procure the resources necessary to finance that education. The other bone of contention between the government and Nigerian academics is in the area of governance and the rationale for centralization in higher education. The resolution of these problems is important because they have a deleterious influence on the effective administration of higher education in Nigeria.

The irony in educational administration is that even confidence, courage, a reputation for fairness and respect for the opinions and actions of others, professional competence, tact, sensitivity, mercy and compassion, and the possession of capacities for dealing successfully with people do not automatically guarantee success.

Curiously, inside and outside academic settings, confidence and competence, qualities that would seem necessary to the performance of any responsibility, may work against a person's being selected for an administrative position. As Aristides could be too just and so be banned from Athens, so can prospective administrators who show too much confidence, even that which is based upon genuine competence (14, p. 95).
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter gives detailed information on the methods and procedures employed in completing the study. Specifically, it covers the selection and description of the population and sample, the development of the survey instrument and its use, and the procedures employed for the analysis and presentation of data.

Sample

The sample was drawn from among the fifteen non-technological universities in Nigeria listed in Table III, all but two of which were federal institutions. The locations of these universities are shown in Appendix D. The target population of the investigation was comprised of the vice-chancellors and other council members of these universities. These two groups were selected for the study in order to obtain the views of officials supposed to be knowledgeable concerning higher education matters. Many council members are academics.

The average university council has between eight and ten members, as shown in Appendix E. On the average, therefore, the fifteen universities would have a combined
### TABLE III

**UNIVERSITIES FROM WHICH THE STUDY SAMPLE WAS DRAWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Number of Faculties/Departments</th>
<th>Enrollment for 1981/82 (Projected)</th>
<th>Location (Former Region of Nigeria)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Ibadan</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nigeria-Nsukka</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ife</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadu Bello University</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos University</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Lagos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos University</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Benin</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Mid-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabar University</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilorin University</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiduguri University</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sokoto</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayero University at Kano</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Port Harcourt</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imo State University</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bendel State University</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Mid-West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: National Universities Commission, "Expansion of University Education in Nigeria," occasional publication, Vol. I, No. 1 (Washington, National University Commission [Washington office], January, 1982), pp. 38-40. The listings of the years in which the universities were founded and their locations in the former regions of Nigeria were added by the researcher.*
total of approximately 150 council members. Questionnaires were sent to 155 council members; 99 of them (66 per cent) returned completed instruments.

No vice-chancellor may hold office for more than seven consecutive years, so there are many ex-vice-chancellors in Nigeria. For this reason, questionnaires were sent to 25 past and present vice-chancellors rather than only to the current vice-chancellors in the universities surveyed. Nineteen vice-chancellors (76 per cent) returned the questionnaire, exceeding the 50 per cent response rate goal set for this subgroup of the sample. Of the total sample of 180 officials surveyed, 118, or approximately 66 per cent, returned completed questionnaires.

Instrument

The instrument used in the study was a survey questionnaire developed from a review of literature on higher education administration. More specifically, the instrument was developed from a review of previous dissertations done in the area of higher education administration by Clayton (1), Dowdle (2), Moore (4), Nwaeke (5), Owen (6), and Wilson (7) relating to the functions of university chief executives and criteria for the evaluation of their job performance. Resources in the North Texas State University microfilm unit and the Texas Woman's University library were also used. Nigerian university catalogues were
examined, and a list of the functions that Nigerian vice-chancellors were presently expected to perform was assembled.

Haller (3) justifies the use of questionnaires as acceptable survey instruments, commenting that a questionnaire is perhaps best suited to measuring attitudes, opinions, and values. This is especially true when the questionnaire is perceived by the researcher as the proper instrument for collecting demographic information and for understanding rather simple facts about social systems such as schools, their environments, or the size of their libraries.

The instrument employed in this study was divided into three major parts. Part I dealt with the functions that vice-chancellors should perform or delegate to other officers to achieve effective administration, Part II dealt with factors that should be considered in the selection of vice-chancellors, and Part III dealt with the criteria that should be used in the appraisal of the job performance of vice-chancellors in Nigerian universities.

Each question in the instrument had five possible responses, which were weighted 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. In Part I of the instrument the responses ranged from "always delegate" (1) to "never delegate" (5). The responses in Parts II and III ranged from "very important" (1) to
"not important" (5). A copy of the instrument appears in Appendix F.

After the first draft of the questionnaire was completed, it was submitted to a panel of six experts in the area of higher education in Nigeria for the purpose of testing the instrument's content validity. These experts, all of whom held graduate degrees, were academics from the universities of Nsukka, Ibadan, Lagos, and Benin. Four of them were professors. The positions held by the experts were Director of the National Universities Commission Washington office, secretary of a college of medical sciences, senior lecturer in management, professor of political science, professor of anthropology, and senior lecturer in history.

The experience of the panel members was a major consideration in their selection. Some had had more than ten years' experience in respective universities. Of particular importance was the participation of the director of the NUC's Washington office since the NUC is responsible for advising the Nigerian government on matters pertaining to higher education.

The panel members were asked to examine each item in Part I of the instrument to determine whether it described a valid, distinctive, and appropriate university function. In Part II, the panel members were asked to examine each
factor and decide whether it should be considered in the selection of vice-chancellors, and in Part III they were asked to determine whether each of the evaluation criteria should be used in the appraisal of vice-chancellors' job performance in Nigerian universities. Each item identified by a majority of the panel members was retained in the instrument. Items not identified by the majority of the experts were deleted from the instrument. Appendix G presents the letter to the panel of experts.

Pilot Study

The reliability of the validated instrument was assessed by means of a pilot study during which the instrument was administered to twenty persons from the universities representing the population that ultimately took part in the main study. The pilot study was carried out in Nigeria by the researcher before the full-scale study was conducted.

A test-retest method was used, in which the twenty participants completed the questionnaire and then, two weeks later, completed it again. The purpose was to ascertain whether any significant difference would appear between the participants' first and second responses to the questionnaire items.

The two sets of responses from each participant were coded on IBM computer forms. All of the collected data for
The pilot study were then analyzed using the SPSS-X statistical language and the North Texas State University computer to compare the two sets of item responses for consistency. Responses were compared for 61 function items, 12 selection factor items, and 10 evaluation criteria items, all of which were regarded as reliability variables. Using the statistical language called the Model Subcommand of Split and a scale called Test, equal-length Spearman-Brown reliability was determined. The correlation coefficient of the Spearman-Brown statistic was found to be .88. This correlation coefficient was used to establish the reliability of the instrument. No modifications were made in the questionnaire as a result of the pilot study. A copy of the letter sent to the pilot study participants appears in Appendix H.

Procedures for Collection of Data

Before the researcher traveled to Nigeria, letters signed by the chairperson of the Division of Higher Education within the College of Education at North Texas State University were sent, requesting the permission of each vice-chancellor to allow the researcher to conduct a study involving the personnel of the university and soliciting the assistance of the registrar. Copies of these letters appear in Appendix I. A copy of another letter addressed to each registrar, secretary to vice-chancellor, and
director of academic affairs who helped to organize the distribution and collection of the completed questionnaires in each university appears in Appendix J.

The researcher also traveled to Nigeria with a letter of introduction from his major professor identifying him as a bona fide student of North Texas State University. A copy of this letter appears in Appendix K. These letters undoubtedly authenticated the importance of the study and, thus, helped to enhance the cooperation that the researcher received while gathering data. Letters of participation received from seven of the fifteen universities surveyed appear in Appendix L.

The letters to the vice-chancellors and registrars were sent about two months in advance of the researcher's arrival in Nigeria to be sure that they would precede him. In addition, a copy of the survey instrument was sent to each of the vice-chancellors of the fifteen universities involved in the study approximately one and a half months before the researcher arrived in Nigeria to ensure that they had enough time to complete the questionnaire.

Upon his arrival in Nigeria, the researcher personally distributed copies of the instrument to the registrars' offices. In some universities, the secretary to the vice-chancellor undertook to deliver the questionnaires and to subsequently collect them, when completed, from
the respondents. Thus, the registrars' and vice-
chancellors' offices played an important role in the suc-
cessful collection of the data.

A period of two weeks was necessary to complete the
delivery of the instruments to the universities, and more
than two weeks were required to travel to each of the
universities to collect the completed instruments. The
researcher visited some of the universities more than
once before all questionnaires were completed. In some
instances, personalized letters were written to partici-
pants encouraging them to complete and return the instru-
ment.

The questionnaire was the principal vehicle used for
the collection of data. A copy of the questionnaire and
a cover letter were enclosed in an envelope addressed to
each participant, and the envelopes were hand-delivered
by the researcher to the registrar or other designated
university official, who then delivered the questionnaires
to the members of the university council. Some of the
council members were university staff, and others were
representatives of the general public. Some question-
naires were personally handed to the respondents by the
researcher, who subsequently collected the completed
questionnaires from them. A copy of the cover letter that
accompanied the instrument appears in Appendix M.
Procedures for Analysis of Data

As for the pilot study, the data collected in the survey were coded on IBM computer forms, and the coded data were then entered into a tape by the staff of the North Texas State University Computing Center. With the help of NTSU computer consultants, the data were analyzed using SPSS-X statistics and the MUSIC computer language. The computer printout contained frequency distributions and percentages. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to further analyze the data.

The computer-generated information, which was used in producing the tables in Chapter IV, was required to answer some of the research questions posed in Chapter I. Through the use of the computer, some of the questions were answered with frequencies, means, and the delineation of relationships between various group mean responses.

Research questions, 1, 2, and 3 dealt with the establishment of the instrument's validity; questions 4, 5, 6, and 7 dealt with the functions that should be performed by vice-chancellors or delegated to other officers, in the opinion of the respondents. These questions were answered with frequencies and percentages generated by the computer. Questions 8 and 9 dealt with factors that should be considered, in the respondents' opinion, in the selection of vice-chancellors, and questions 10 and 11 dealt with
factors that should be considered, in the respondents' opinion, in the evaluation of vice-chancellors' job performance effectiveness. These questions were also answered with frequencies and percentages.

Questions 12 and 13 dealt with the relationships between various independent variables and demographic characteristics and the respondents' rankings of the items on the questionnaire. Finally, question 14 dealt with the relationship between the vice-chancellors and other council members with regard to their mean responses. A t-test was computed to determine the significance of the differences in mean responses of the study participants, and analysis of variance was used to determine the differences in the mean responses of more than two groups. A level of significance of .05 was established for the analysis and interpretation of the data collected.

Presentation of Data

The data collected and analyzed are presented in lists or in tabular form. Functions that vice-chancellors are expected to perform and those they should delegate to other officers are listed, as are factors that should be considered in the selection of vice-chancellors and criteria that should be considered in the evaluation of vice-chancellors' job performance effectiveness. The presentation of data appears in Chapter IV, and the summary,
findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations of the study are presented in Chapter V.

**Conclusion**

Meaningful improvement in university administration may be achieved through a clear definition of the functions of vice-chancellors. Identification of the factors that should be considered in the selection of university vice-chancellors is important, and a clear definition of the criteria that should be used in the evaluation of vice-chancellors' job performance is a major step in arriving at a fair appraisal of the productivity of university officers. It is hoped that the findings of this study may lead to improvement in university administration in Nigeria.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present information related to the perceptions of Nigerian universities' governing council members (vice-chancellors and non-vice-chancellors) concerning a) the functions that Nigerian university vice-chancellors should perform and those that they should delegate to other officers in order to achieve effective administration, b) the factors that should be considered in the selection of vice-chancellors, and c) the criteria that should be used in the evaluation of vice-chancellors' job performance effectiveness. Frequencies, means, standard deviations, and percentages were used in analyzing the data. In addition, inferential statistics such as Kendall's Tau B and t-tests were used to reveal any significant relationships between the survey participants' responses and selected independent variables.

The data obtained in the survey of Nigerian university governing council members are presented in the context of the research questions for this study. A two-tailed t-test was used to detect differences in means between the two subgroups of the sample, regardless of the direction of
those differences (2, p. 80). When the t-value was significant, it appeared that the means of the two subgroups were not equal.

Research Question 1

Research question 1 asked, "What functions do experts in institutions of higher education in Nigeria expect that vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities should perform?" Sixty-one function items were validated by experts from Nigerian universities and subsequently included in the survey instrument. These functions are listed below, classified in four major categories: academic affairs, business, general institutional support, and student services.

**Academic Affairs**

1. Faculty recruitment and appointment
2. Administration of university faculty training program
3. Curriculum development
4. Preparation of examination timetable for faculty
5. Decisions on student/faculty relationship
6. Approval of tenure (confirmation of appointment and promotion of faculty)
7. Attendance at committee meetings relating to academic matters
8. Administration of student examinations
9. Management of data bank for student final examinations
10. Management of faculty library
11. Distribution of loans, grants, and subsidies to faculty
12. Administration of academic office
13. Resolution of faculty grievances with the administration
14. Management of faculty budget
15. Control of university staff school (elementary and secondary schools for faculty children)
16. Control of student affairs office
17. Management of academic board of studies
18. Administration of the university congregation (crisis deliberation and resolution body)
19. General university administration
20. Administration of faculty welfare/housing

Business

1. Recruitment of administrators
2. Recruitment of non-academic staff
3. Administration of non-academic staff training program
4. General personnel administration
5. Budget development
6. Budget administration
7. Salary administration
8. Financial report preparation
9. Administration of federal programs
10. Physical facilities management
11. Inventory control functions
12. Control of purchasing supplies and equipment board
13. Control of tender board
14. Control of contract awards board
15. Preparation of audits
16. Management of private funds for investment

General Institutional Support

1. Participation in governing council meetings
2. Participation in faculty social functions
3. Participation in community activities
4. Resolution of matters relating to employee relations
5. Public relations functions
6. Raising private funds for the institution
7. Management of continuing education programs
8. General institutional planning activities
9. Institutional research
10. Official travel relating to university functions
11. Participation in university ceremonies
12. Presiding over senate meetings
13. Presiding over congregation (assembly) meetings
14. Presiding over appointments and promotion board meetings

Student Services

1. Suspension of students who violate school rules
2. Readmission of suspended former students
3. Administration of student housing/accommodation
4. Management of student food service
5. Administration of university health center
6. Resolution of student grievances with the administration
7. Resolution of problems between students and faculty
8. Conducting drives to raise funds for scholarships
9. Directing alumni affairs
10. Control of student government
11. Control of emergency situations such as student unrest

Research Question 2

Research question 2 asked, "What factors do experts in institutions of higher education in Nigeria consider important in the selection of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?" Twelve selection factors were considered important by experts from Nigerian universities and were subsequently included in the survey instrument. These factors are listed below.

1. Personality
2. Type or field of training
3. Experience in university administration
4. Nationality
5. Clear definition of the selection process
6. Duration of appointment
7. Appointment for specified time period
8. Selection by the individual university governing council
9. Advertisement of vacancy for the position of vice-chancellor
10. Qualifications including scholarship, the possession of administrative skills, and some experience in the job
11. Past achievements
12. Financial reward commensurate with that in other sectors of the economy
Research Question 3

Research question 3 asked, "What factors do experts in institutions of higher education in Nigeria consider important in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?" Ten criteria were considered important by experts from Nigerian universities and were subsequently included in the survey instrument. These factors are listed below.

1. Fairness
2. Integrity
3. Communication ability
4. Coordination ability
5. Sensitivity
6. Possession of management skills
7. Productivity
8. Efficiency
9. Routine
10. Flexibility

Research Question 4

Research question 4 asked, "What functions do vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities perceive that they should perform in order to achieve effective administration?" As indicated by the frequencies and percentages derived from each vice-chancellor's response to the function items on the questionnaire, nine functions were identified as the tasks that the vice-chancellor of a Nigerian university should perform. These functions are listed in Table IV. Eighteen of the 19 vice-chancellors participating in the survey (95 per cent) identified
TABLE IV

FUNCTIONS PERCEIVED BY VICE-CHANCELLORS AS TASKS THAT THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SHOULD PERFORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over senate meetings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of emergency situations such as student unrest</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in faculty social functions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension of students who violate school rules</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmission of suspended former students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of faculty grievances with the administration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over congregation (assembly) meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over appointments and promotion board meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of the university congregation (crisis deliberation and resolution body)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presiding over senate meetings as a function that the vice-chancellor should perform, and 17 (89 per cent) identified control of emergency situations such as student unrest as a function that the vice-chancellor should perform. The vice-chancellors identified only 15 per cent of the 61 functions in the survey instrument as tasks that the vice-chancellor should perform.
Research Question 5

Research question 5 asked, "What functions do members of university governing councils in Nigeria perceive that vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities should perform in order to achieve effective administration?" The 11 functions perceived by governing council members (vice-chancellors and others) as tasks that the vice-chancellor should perform personally either were identified as such by at least two-thirds of the 118 respondents or were among the functions that the respondents did not identify as tasks that should be delegated to other staff members of the university. These functions are listed in Table V. The tasks most frequently cited as those that the vice-chancellor should perform were controlling emergency situations such as student unrest, identified by 112 respondents (95 per cent); participation in governing council meetings, identified by 109 respondents (92 per cent); and presiding over senate meetings, identified by 100 respondents (85 per cent).

Table VI presents the 12 functions identified by university council members other than vice-chancellors as tasks that the vice-chancellor should perform. The function chosen most frequently by these officials as a task that the vice-chancellor should carry out personally was
TABLE V
FUNCTIONS PERCEIVED BY VICE-CHANCELLORS AND OTHER UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS AS TASKS THAT THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SHOULD PERFORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of emergency situations such as university unrest</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in governing council meetings</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over senate meetings</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of faculty grievances with the administration</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension of students who violate school rules</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmission of suspended former students</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General university administration</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of tenure (confirmation of appointment and promotion of faculty)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over appointments and promotion board meetings</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over congregation (assembly) meetings</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of the university congregation (crisis deliberation and resolution body)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

controlling emergency situations such as student unrest, identified by 95 of the 99 respondents (96 per cent); followed by participation in governing council meetings, identified by 93 respondents (94 per cent); and resolution of faculty grievances with the administration, identified by 83 respondents (84 per cent). The function identified
TABLE VI
FUNCTIONS PERCEIVED BY UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS OTHER THAN VICE-CHANCELLORS AS TASKS THAT THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SHOULD PERFORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of emergency situations such as student unrest</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in governing council meetings</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of faculty grievances with the administration</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over senate meetings</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension of students who violate school rules</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General university administration</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of tenure (confirmation of appointment and promotion of faculty)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over appointments and promotion board meetings</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmission of suspended former students</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over congregation (assembly) meetings</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of the university congregation (crisis deliberation and resolution body)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of loans, grants, and subsidies to faculty</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

by the smallest number of non-vice-chancellor council members was distribution of loans, grants, and subsidies to faculty, cited by only 66 respondents (67 per cent).

The 12 functions identified by council members other than vice-chancellors as tasks that the vice-chancellor should perform comprise 20 per cent of the 61 validated university functions in the survey instrument.
Research Question 6

Research question 6 asked, "What functions do vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities perceive that they should delegate to other officers in order to achieve effective administration?" Twenty-four functions were identified by the vice-chancellors participating in the survey as tasks that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other officers. These tasks are presented in Table VII.

**TABLE VII**

FUNCTIONS PERCEIVED BY VICE-CHANCELLORS AS TASKS THAT THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SHOULD DELEGATE TO OTHER OFFICERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of university staff school (elementary and secondary schools for faculty children)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of student affairs office</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of examination timetable for faculty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of student examinations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of non-academic staff training program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial report preparation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of federal programs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of continuing education programs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional research</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of student food service</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of university health center</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of data bank for student final examinations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General personnel administration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of purchasing supplies and equipment board</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of student housing/accommodation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of student government</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of academic board of studies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of faculty budget</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing alumni affairs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of non-academic staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary administration</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of audits</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 19 of the vice-chancellors (100 per cent) cited control of university staff school (elementary and secondary schools for faculty children) as a task that should be delegated, and 18 (95 per cent) cited control of the student affairs office. Curriculum development, preparation of examination timetable for faculty, administration of student examinations, administration of non-academic staff training program, financial report preparation, administration of federal programs, management of continuing education programs, institutional research, management of student food service, and administration of university health center were each identified by 17 vice-chancellors (89 per cent) as functions that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other officers.
Research Question 7

Research question 7 asked, "What functions do members of university governing councils in Nigeria perceive that vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities should delegate to other officers in order to achieve effective administration?" Twenty-eight functions were identified by at least two-thirds of the council members (both vice-chancellors and others) participating in the survey as tasks that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other university staff. These functions are presented in Table VIII. One hundred sixteen of the 118 council members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of university staff school (elementary and secondary schools for faculty children)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of examination timetable for faculty</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of data bank for student final examinations</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of university health center</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of faculty library</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of academic office</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of student food service</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of student examinations</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control of student affairs office</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of continuing education programs</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory control functions</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial report preparation</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities management</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of student housing/accommodation</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of non-academic staff</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General personnel administration</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of student government</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of audits</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of academic board of studies</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing alumni affairs</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of federal programs</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional research</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of purchasing supplies and equipment board</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of faculty welfare/housing</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary administration</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of private funds for investment</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of faculty budget</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(98 per cent) cited control of university staff school as a task that should be delegated, and 114 (97 per cent) cited preparation of examination timetable for faculty. Curriculum development, management of data bank for student final examinations, and administration of university health center were each identified by 113 respondents (96 per cent) as functions that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other officers.
Twenty-six functions were identified by council members other than vice-chancellors as tasks that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other officers. These tasks are presented in Table IX. Preparation of examination timetable for faculty and control of university staff school were each cited by 97 of the 99 non-vice-chancellor council members (98 per cent) as tasks that should be delegated; curriculum development and management of data bank for student final examinations were each cited by 96 respondents (97 per cent), and management of faculty library and management of student food service were each cited by 95 respondents (96 per cent).

TABLE IX
FUNCTIONS PERCEIVED BY UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS OTHER THAN VICE-CHANCELLORS AS TASKS THAT THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SHOULD DELEGATE TO OTHER OFFICERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of examination timetable for faculty</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of university staff school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(elementary and secondary schools for faculty children)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of data bank for student final examinations</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of faculty library</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of student food service</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of student examinations</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of continuing education programs</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 8

Research question 8 asked, "What factors do vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities perceive as important in the selection of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?" Seven items were identified by the vice-chancellors participating in the survey as factors that should be considered in the selection of the vice-chancellor. These factors are presented in Table X.
### TABLE X

**FACTORS PERCEIVED BY VICE-CHANCELLORS AS IMPORTANT IN THE SELECTION OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement of vacancy for the position of vice-chancellor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past achievements</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in university administration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear definition of the selection process</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reward commensurate with that in other sectors of the economy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications including scholarship, the possession of administrative skills, and some experience in the job</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most important factors, cited by all 19 of the vice-chancellors (100 per cent), were advertisement of vacancy for the position of vice-chancellor and past achievements. Personality, experience in university administration, and clear definition of the selection process were each identified by 16 of the respondents (84 per cent) as important in the selection of the vice-chancellor.

**Research Question 9**

Research question 9 asked, "What factors do members of university governing councils in Nigeria perceive
as important in the selection of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?" Six items were identified by the council members (both vice-chancellors and others) participating in the survey as factors that should be considered in the selection of the vice-chancellor. These factors are presented in Table XI. The most important factor,

**TABLE XI**

FACTORS PERCEIVED BY VICE-CHANCELLORS AND OTHER UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS AS IMPORTANT IN THE SELECTION OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications including scholarship, the possession of administrative skills, and some experience in the job</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear definition of the selection process</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past achievements</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reward commensurate with that in other sectors of the economy</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in university administration</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cited by all 118 of the council members (100 per cent), was qualifications including scholarship, the possession of administrative skills, and some experience in the job. One hundred twelve respondents (95 per cent) cited clear definition of the selection process, and past
achievements and financial reward commensurate with that in other sectors of the economy were each cited by 109 respondents (92 per cent) as important in the selection of the vice-chancellor.

Six items were identified by council members other than vice-chancellors as important in the selection of the vice-chancellor. These factors are presented in Table XII. The most important factor, cited by all 99 of the non-vice-chancellor council members (100 per cent), was qualifications including scholarship, the possession of administrative skills, and some experience in the job.

| TABLE XII |
| FACTORS PERCEIVED BY UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS OTHER THAN VICE-CHANCELLORS AS IMPORTANT IN THE SELECTION OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications including scholarship, the possession of administrative skills, and some experience in the job</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past achievements</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear definition of the selection process</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reward commensurate with that in other sectors of the economy</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in university administration</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ninety-four respondents (95 per cent) identified past achievements, 93 respondents (94 per cent) identified clear definition of the selection process, and 92 respondents (93 per cent) identified financial reward commensurate with that in other sectors of the economy as important in the selection of the vice-chancellor.

Research Question 10

Research question 10 asked, "What factors do vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities perceive as important in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities?" Eight items were identified by the vice-chancellors participating in the survey as criteria that should be used in the evaluation of the vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness. These criteria are presented in Table XIII. Fairness, integrity, and communication ability were each identified by all 19 of the vice-chancellors (100 per cent) as important criteria in evaluating the vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness. Eighteen respondents (95 per cent) cited productivity as an important criterion, and 17 (89 per cent) cited coordination ability.
Research Question 11

Research question 11 asked, "What factors do members of university governing councils in Nigeria perceive as important in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities? Nine items were identified by the 118 council members (both vice-chancellors and others) participating in the survey as criteria that should be considered in the evaluation of the vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness. These criteria are presented in Table XIV. Fairness and integrity were each cited by 117 respondents (99 per cent) as important criteria, and communication ability was identified by 116 respondents (98 per cent).
TABLE XIV

CRITERIA PERCEIVED BY VICE-CHANCELLORS AND OTHER UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS AS IMPORTANT IN THE EVALUATION OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR'S JOB PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication ability</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination ability</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of management skills</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine items were identified by university council members other than vice-chancellors as criteria that should be considered in the evaluation of the vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness. These factors are presented in Table XV. Integrity and coordination ability were each cited by 98 of the 99 non-vice-chancellor council members (99 per cent), and communication ability and efficiency were each cited by 97 respondents (98 per cent) as important criteria in evaluating the vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness. Ninety-six respondents (97 per cent) identified productivity as an important criterion, and 95 respondents (96 per cent) identified sensitivity.
Research Questions 12 and 14

Research questions 12 and 14 asked, "What relationships exist between the independent variables and the responses of the vice-chancellors and the council members to each item on the questionnaire?" and "Are differences apparent in the mean responses of the vice-chancellors and the council members to each item on the questionnaire?"

Table XVI presents the significant relationships between the mean response scores of vice-chancellors and those of other council members for the functions that the vice-chancellor should perform or delegate to other officers. Table XVII displays significant relationships between the mean response scores of vice-chancellors and those of
TABLE XVI

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN RESPONSE SCORES OF VICE-
CHANCELLORS AND OTHER UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS CONCERNING
FUNCTIONS THAT THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SHOULD PERFORM AND
THOSE THAT SHOULD BE DELEGATED TO OTHER OFFICERS OF
THE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Vice-Chancellors</th>
<th>Non-Vice-Chancellors</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of examination timetable for faculty</td>
<td>1.526</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of university health center</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of data bank for student final examinations</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of faculty library</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of audits management of continuing education programs</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of emergency situations such as student unrest</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of student examinations</td>
<td>4.421</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>4.687</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of student food service</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>0.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.739</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Vice-Chancellors</th>
<th>Non-Vice-Chancellors</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of student housing/accommodation</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>1.576</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in community activities</td>
<td>3.368</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>3.232</td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of faculty grievances with the administration</td>
<td>3.842</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>4.242</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at or below the .05 level.

*Separate variance estimate; the value for the final item is a pooled variance estimate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Vice-Chancellors</th>
<th>Non-Vice-Chancellors</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in university administration</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at or below the .05 level.

*Separate variance estimate.
other council members for selection factors (it should be noted, however, that, after calculating the binomial using a factorial method for the values in this table, it was found that the significance levels occurred by chance since the calculated level of significance was greater than .05), and Table XVIII shows significant relationships between the mean response scores of vice-chancellors and those of other council members for evaluation criteria.

Research Question 13

Research question 13 asked, "Do any relationships exist between the participants' responses and their demographic characteristics (age, sex, and educational background)?" Cross-tabulation and the use of Kendall's Tau B statistics revealed some significant relationships between the study participants' responses and their age and between their responses and their educational background or academic qualifications. These relationships are presented in Table XIX and Table XX. Only two of the 118 respondents were women; thus, no assessment of relationships between the study responses' and their sex could be investigated.

In Table XX, although a significant relationship appeared to exist between the participants' responses on eight function items and their educational background
TABLE XVIII

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN RESPONSE SCORES OF VICE-CHANCELLORS AND OTHER UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS CONCERNING CRITERIA THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE EVALUATION OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR'S JOB PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Vice-Chancellors</th>
<th>Non-Vice-Chancellors</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication ability</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at or below the .05 level.

*Separate variance estimate.
TABLE XIX

SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN STUDY PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES AND THEIR AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of tenure (confirmation of appointment and promotion of faculty)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of university faculty training program</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of non-academic staff</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions on student/faculty relationship</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General personnel administration</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary administration</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing alumni affairs</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection Factor

Personality                                                            .00
Financial reward commensurate with that in other sectors of the economy .03

Evaluation Criterion

Flexibility                                                           .01

or academic qualifications, no cause and effect conclusions could be drawn. The relationship in each case was not due to chance occurrence, but an investigation of cause and effect would require a separate study. When a binomial was calculated for the selection and evaluation factors in Table XX, however, the resulting level of significance was greater than the .05 level generated by the computer. This means that the relationship that appeared to exist between these factors and the participants' educational background or academic qualifications was due to chance.
TABLE XX
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN STUDY PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES AND THEIR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OR ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of continuing education programs</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of student grievances with the administration</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General personnel administration</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of data bank for student final examinations</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of administrators</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General institutional planning activities</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional research</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of student government</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reward commensurate with that in other sectors of the economy</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear definition of the selection process</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past achievements</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Criterion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau B was chosen as the statistical tool for analysis because it appeared to be adequately sensitive. Due to the large volume of data generated in the survey, significance was measured in both direction and intensity. Negative relationships were not used in determining significant relationships. The level of significance was set at .05.
Summary

This chapter has presented the results of the data collected by means of a survey questionnaire. The volume of data collected was large in view of Borg's observation that school administrators are often reluctant to admit the deficiencies of their institutions and therefore fail to return questionnaires in which these deficiencies might be revealed (1, p. 308).

Frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, Kendall's Tau B, t-tests, and ANOVA were derived from the SPSS-X program, and the program was analyzed using the North Texas State University MUSIC computer. Relationships were investigated using Kendall's Tau B, t-tests, and ANOVA.

Using the frequencies and percentages of the responses from Nigerian university governing council members, the functions that a Nigerian vice-chancellor is expected to perform and the functions that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other officers were identified and listed. Factors that should be considered in the selection of the vice-chancellor and criteria that should be used in the evaluation of the vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness were also identified and listed. A detailed summary of the study and its findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research are presented in Chapter V.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purposes of this study were to determine the tasks that the vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities should perform personally, the functions that vice-chancellors should delegate to other university staff, the factors that should be used in the selection of vice-chancellors for universities in Nigeria, and the criteria that should be used in the evaluation of vice-chancellors' job performance effectiveness.

A questionnaire was developed by the researcher. Through the assistance of a panel of experts and through a pilot study, the questionnaire was refined. The sample for the study was 118 participants, made up of 19 vice-chancellors and 99 members of Nigerian university governing councils.

The data generated by the study were analyzed using percentages and frequencies. Kendall Tau II analyses yielded significant differences between the responses of vice-chancellors and those of other university governing council members with respect to some items on the survey.
instrument. T-test analyses yielded significant relationships between participants' responses and their educational background.

Findings

The major findings of this study, based on the views of vice-chancellors and other members of Nigerian university governing councils, are as follows. The findings are based solely on the data obtained from the respondents in this study.

1. Eleven functions that a vice-chancellor should perform personally were identified in the study. These functions are control of emergency situations such as student unrest, participating in governing council meetings, presiding over senate meetings, resolution of faculty grievances with the administration, suspension of students who violate school rules, readmission of suspended former students, general university administration, approval of tenure and promotion, presiding over appointments and promotion board meetings, presiding over congregation meetings, and administration of university congregation.

2. Matters affecting students and faculty were given high priority by the respondents. They gave highest priority to control of emergency situations such as student unrest (95 per cent), participating in governing council meetings (92 per cent), presiding over senate
meetings (85 per cent), and resolving faculty grievances with the administration (85 per cent).

3. The vice-chancellors participating in the study identified nine functions that a vice-chancellor should perform, council members identified eleven functions, and council members other than vice-chancellors identified twelve functions.

4. The vice-chancellors identified twenty-four activities, council members identified twenty-eight functions, and council members other than vice-chancellors identified twenty-six tasks that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other officers in the university.

5. All council members, and council members other than vice-chancellors, identified six factors that should be considered in the selection of a university vice-chancellor.

6. The council members indicated that a vice-chancellor should not be selected on the basis of nationality.

7. The respondents felt that the duration of a vice-chancellor's appointment should not be specified at the time of appointment.

8. The vice-chancellors indicated that vacancies for vice-chancellor positions should be advertised.

9. All of the respondents thought that the qualifications for the position of vice-chancellor should include
scholarship, the possession of administrative skills, and some experience in the job.

10. Based on the opinion of the respondents, the five major criteria, in order of importance, upon which a vice-chancellor should be evaluated are fairness, integrity, communication ability, coordination ability, and productivity.

11. The views of vice-chancellors and other council members were significantly different at or below the .05 level of significance.

12. The views of vice-chancellors and other council members were significantly different with respect to two selection factors: personality and experience in university administration.

13. The views of vice-chancellors and other council members were significantly different with respect to three evaluation criteria: fairness, communication ability, and integrity.

14. The vice-chancellors as a group did not include the possession of administrative ability as a factor on which a vice-chancellor should be evaluated, but vice-chancellors and other council members agreed on all other factors that should be used in the evaluation of a vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness.
Limitations

The limitations of this study were the following.

1. The responses to the survey instrument were based upon the perceptions of the respondents, so some of these responses may have been biased. For example, perceptions may have been influenced by a positional bias produced by the instrument or by a respondent's desire to give a socially acceptable answer.

2. Due to the nature of the Nigerian university's organizational structure, variations with regard to the official presentation of the instrument may have occurred which also may have biased some responses because of their authority halo effect upon the respondents.

3. The study may be limited by the self-selection of respondents.

4. The roles and responsibilities of vice-chancellors are changing. Therefore, the findings of this study may not be generalizable across time periods.

5. The study dealt neither with the question of who should be involved in the selection and employment process for vice-chancellors nor with that of who should evaluate vice-chancellors' job performance effectiveness.

6. The study did not address the issue of what field of study will ensure an individual's success in administering a university in Nigeria.
7. The study did not deal with the responsibilities that vice-chancellors have to their deans and other university administrators under their authority.

Conclusions

The major findings of this study led to the following conclusions.

1. Of the sixty-one functions that a Nigerian vice-chancellor is expected to perform, only eleven were viewed by the respondents as tasks that the vice-chancellor should perform personally.

2. Only twenty-eight of the functions were regarded by council members as tasks that a Nigerian university vice-chancellor should delegate to other officials of the institution in order to achieve more effective administration.

3. Five factors are considered to be very important in the selection of a vice-chancellor. These factors are personality, academic qualifications, experience in the job, clear definition of the selection process, and job incentives and rewards.

4. Council members selected eight factors for evaluating vice-chancellors. They are fairness, integrity, managerial capability, communication ability, coordination ability, productivity, sensitivity, and flexibility.
5. Less emphasis was placed on a leader's mere possession of academic qualifications than on characteristics such as diligence.

6. Council members perceived that the nationality of a candidate for vice-chancellor is not an important factor in that candidate's selection or rejection.

Recommendations

Recommendations of the Study

The recommendations of this study are as follows.

1. It is recommended that the vice-chancellor delegate authority for the performance of certain responsibilities to other members of the university staff.

2. It is recommended that vice-chancellors be evaluated on the basis of their management practices.

3. It is recommended that certain selection factors such as fairness and integrity guide the decision-making of vice-chancellors.

4. It is recommended that a "guide list" of all activities that vice-chancellors are expected to perform be placed in an appropriate document and made available at the time of a vice-chancellor's employment.

5. It is recommended that the "guide list" include selection factors and evaluation criteria so that university chief executives may have an idea of the importance that council members attach to those selection factors and
to enable these executives to know in advance the standards upon which they will be evaluated.

6. It is recommended that the selection factors identified by council members and vice-chancellors of universities in Nigeria be considered by the Nigerian government in the selection of future vice-chancellors.

7. It is recommended that the evaluation criteria obtained from council members of Nigerian universities be used in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of Nigerian university vice-chancellors.

Recommenda tions for Future Research

Recommendations for future research are the following.

1. Similar studies should be conducted in the next five years in order to identify possible opinion changes and possible new role emphases for the vice-chancellor.

2. This study should be replicated with faculty members as subjects.
APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONS AND TOP ADMINISTRATORS INVOLVED IN UNIVERSITY POLICY-MAKING IN NIGERIA*

*Source: Prepared by the researcher.
APPENDIX B

AN EXAMPLE OF PROBLEMS IN THE SELECTION OF
UNIVERSITY VICE-CHANCELLORS*

PRESS RELEASE

THE VICE-CHANCELLORSHIP AND THE SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA, NSUKKA

The attention of the University of Nigeria Administration has been drawn to a recent Press Statement carried on page 2 of the Lagos GUARDIAN newspaper edition of 2 January 1984, alleging non-adherence to established procedure in the re-appointment of Professor F.N. Ndili as the Vice-Chancellor of the University by the Governing Council of the University. The statement alleged specifically that the Senate of the University was not involved in the re-appointment process. The statement was signed by nine professors out of a total of 85 full professors of the University, 72 of whom are Nigerians. The Senate of the University of Nigeria itself is made up of over 170 top academics.

Ordinarily, the University Administration would not have bothered to react to the statement by this rather negligible fraction of Senate members. It is however important to correct the wrong impression which the reading public may have gathered from the statement.

1. The Governing Council of the University took into full consideration, the relevant provisions of the University of Nigeria Act as well as other guidelines laid down by the Federal Government for the appointment or re-appointment of Vice-Chancellors of Nigerian Federal Universities in recommending to the Visitor the re-appointment of Professor F.N. Ndili as Vice-Chancellor of the University for a second term.

2. It is totally incorrect to say that the Senate of the University was not involved in the re-appointment of Professor F.N. Ndili as Vice-Chancellor of the University.

3. Even though the above provisions make it the exclusive responsibility of Council to recommend appointment or re-appointment of a Vice-Chancellor, the Governing Council of the University, before recommending the re-appointment of Professor Ndili as Vice-Chancellor, took strong note of the overwhelming support for, and praise of Professor Ndili’s programmes and actions as Vice-Chancellor of the University during his first term of four years by the University Senate, Congregation, Convocation and the entire University Community, as well as the Alumni of the University. There is abundant evidence in the records of the University to testify to this recognition of Professor Ndili’s very good performance.

4. Both Government, Senate, Congregation and Convocation representatives in Council acclaimed Professor Ndili’s good performance in his first term of four years and were unanimous in recommending his re-appointment for a second term of three years.

5. Professor F.N. Ndili is the first Vice-Chancellor to be re-appointed for a second term since the inception of the University of Nigeria. The ovation with which the announcement of his re-appointment was received at the 19th Convocation Ceremony of the University held on 17th December, 1983, was indicative that the Governing Council of the University made the people’s choice.

6. The University Administration has already embarked on its second phase of development of the University. It calls on all well-wishers of the University, including the nine professors, to join hands in making the University of Nigeria a worthy citadel of learning.

U.O. UMEN
Registrar & Secretary to Council.

9 JANUARY, 1984
Ref: UN/RC. 155A
APPENDIX C

NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION STAFF CHART
APPENDIX D

MAP OF NIGERIA SHOWING THE LOCATIONS OF THE FIFTEEN UNIVERSITIES PARTICIPATING IN THE SURVEY*

APPENDIX E

COMPOSITION OF VARIOUS UNIVERSITY GOVERNING COUNCILS*

New list for boards of institutions

A new list of the Governing Council of the various institutions of higher learning in the State has been released.

According to the Press Secretary to the Governor, Mr. Egbesah Iwere, the current list substitutes the former which is said contained some anomalies.

College of Technology Nekede, Owerri Governing Council:
- Prof. A.N.U. Njoku Obi - Chairman
- The Principal, Cotech - Member
- Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Science and Technology - Member
- The Director of Education - Member
- Dr. E. N. Ezie - Member
- Dr. C. I. Nwachukwu - Member
- Mrs. Enugu Oke - Member
- Two representatives of Cotech Academic Board - Member

Colleges of Agriculture, Umuahia, Owerri Council:
- Mrs. Adelasi Abia - Chairman
- Principal, College of Agriculture - Member
- Prof. M. O. Osu - Member
- Dr. E. N. Ezie - Member
- Two representatives of the Students Union of Cotech - Member

Imo State University Governing Council:
- Rev. Prof. S. N. Nwagbara - Chairman
- Vice-Chancellor - Ex officio Member
- The Secretary to the Government - Member
- Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education - Member
- Dr. V. B. C. Iheji - Member
- Prof. I. N. Osu - Member
- Two representatives of the University Senate - Member

Other appointments have been made by the Governor, Mr. A. I. Iwueze, in the following capacity:

- The Registrar, Imo State University - Member
- The Governor, Mr. A. I. Iwueze - Member
- The Secretary, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development - Member
- The Secretary, Ministry of Science and Technology - Member
- The Secretary, Ministry of Education - Member
- The Director of Education - Member
- The Principal, Cotech - Member
- The Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Science and Technology - Member
- Two representatives of the University Senate - Member

According to an official statement issued in Owerri yesterday, December 5, by Dr. C. A. Duru, Mr. Don O. Njiriokwo has been appointed Director of the IYO.

The statement was signed by the State Commissioner for Information, Culture, Youth and Sports, Dr. C. A. Duru.
APPENDIX F

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Information regarding individual and institutions will not be identified singularly in the results of this study. Also, only the doctoral committee, the computer analyst, and the researcher will have access to the individual questionnaires.

Response Instructions: Record your response directly on these pages by filling out the information below. If I do not personally collect this questionnaire from you, please, mail your filled questionnaire with the attached self-addressed stamped envelope within one week, to the Registrar’s Office of your University.

PERSONAL DATA:

1. How long have you held an administrative position?
2. How long in current position?
3. Highest earned degree held?
4. Institution’s name:
5. Respondent’s title:
6. Academic or Professional area of highest degree earned: Business Administration, Environmental Design, Engineering, Education, Social Sciences, Arts and Science, Law and Medicine other - in all cases specify:
7. Do you have confirmation of appointment-tenure? No. Yes.
8. Age: ...
9. Sex: ....
10. Nationality - (a) Nigerian (b) Foreigner
11. Marital Status: Single Married Widowed (check one)
12. Students population of your institution:

THE ROLE OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR IN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITY AND THE FACTORS ESSENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION AS PERCEIVED BY VICE-CHANCELLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY GOVERNING COUNCILS.

It is designed to survey your perceptions on: (1) the functions the vice-chancellors of Nigerian Universities perform and those they should delegate to other officers, and (2) the factors that should be considered in the selection of vice-chancellors and (3) the criteria that should be considered in the evaluation of the job performance of vice-chancellors of Nigerian Universities.

Many functions of vice-chancellors have been listed in Part 1 under four major function categories such as Academic Affairs, Business Affairs, General Institutional Support and Student Services. For each function under the four categories, please indicate what a vice-chancellor should delegate to other officers to achieve effective administration.
The Role of the Vice-chancellor in the Nigerian university and the Factors Essential for effective administration as perceived by the vice-chancellors and members of the Governing Councils of the Nigerian universities.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

INFORMATION SHEET FOR THE RESPONDENTS

Please indicate your reaction by circling the appropriate number on the right-hand margin, the item that constitutes a distinctive, appropriate university administrative function that the vice-chancellor should delegate to other officers to achieve effective administration, assuming the vice-chancellor should perform what he or she does not delegate to other officers.

PART I
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Half the Time</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty recruitment and appointment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administration of university faculty training programme such as study leave, learned conferences, and sabbatical leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preparation of examination time table for faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Decision on student/faculty relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Approval of tenure (confirmation of appointment and promotion of faculty)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attendance of committee meetings relating to academic matters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administration of student examinations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Management of data bank for student final examinations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Management of faculty library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Distribution of loans, grants, and subsidies to faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Administration of academic office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Resolution of faculty grievances with the administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Management of faculty budget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Control of university staff school (elementary, &amp; secondary schools for faculty children)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Control of student affairs office
17. Management of academic board of studies
18. Administration of the university congregation (crisis deliberation and resolution body)
19. General university administration
20. Administration of faculty welfare/housing

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS
GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

1. Participation in governing council meeting
2. Participation in faculty social functions
3. Participation in community activities
4. Resolution of matters relating to employee relations
5. Public relations functions
6. Raising private funds for the institution
7. Management of continuing education programmes
8. General institutional planning activities
9. Institutional research
10. Official travelling relating to university
11. Participation in university ceremonies
12. Presiding over senate meetings
13. Presiding over congregation meetings
14. Presiding over appointments and promotion board meetings
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

STUDENT SERVICES

1. Suspension of students who violated school rules
2. Re-admission of suspended old students
3. Administration of student housing/accommodation
4. Management of students' food services
5. Administration of university health center
6. Resolution of Students' grievances with the administration
7. Resolution of problems between students and faculty
8. Conducting drives to raise funds for scholarships
9. Directing alumni affairs
10. Control of student government
11. Control of emergency situations such as student unrests

PART II

FACTORS CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL FOR THE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE OF THE FUNCTIONS OF VICE-CHANCELLORS OF NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES THAT THEY SHOULD CONSIDERED IN THE SELECTION OF VICE-CHANCELLORS OF NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES.

Please circle the number on the right-hand margin which best describes your reaction to each item as an appropriate or important factor that should be considered during the selection of vice-chancellors of Nigeria universities.

SELECTION FACTORS

1. Personality
2. Type of field of training
3. Experience in university administration
4. Nationality
5. Selection process
6. Duration of appointment
7. Appointment for specified time period
8. Selection by the individual university Governing Council
9. Vacancy for the position of vice-chancellor advertised

FACTOR
very important
important
moderately important
slightly important
not important
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
10. Qualification for the position should include scholarship, the possession of administrative skills and some experience in the job.

11. Past achievements very important

12. Financial reward for the position should be in line with those of similar position in the economy.

PART THREE

Please, circle the number on the right-hand margin which best describes your reaction to each item as an appropriate or important factor that should be considered in the evaluation of the job performance effectiveness of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities.

JOB EVALUATION FACTORS

1. Question of fairness
2. Question of integrity
3. Communication Ability
4. Co-ordination ability
5. Sensitivity of administrator
6. Possession of management know-how
7. Productivity
8. Efficiency
9. Routine
10. Flexibility

1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
1  2  3  4  5
APPENDIX G

LETTER TO PANEL OF EXPERTS
Dear Respondent:

The concern over what is generally described as executive burnout and over the frustrations experienced by chief executives of higher education institutions as a result of what is said to be the lack of appreciation for what they do, have led to numerous studies in developed countries. The aim of these studies has been to find solutions to these problems.

One of the results of these studies has been the creation of lists of distinctive categories of academic and administrative functions that university chief executives should be held specifically responsible for. This has become necessary in the face of growing demands that organizations specify what their chief executives do in practice. The demand is made notwithstanding the fact that, in general, the responsibility for administering their entire organizations rests with them.

In keeping with this demand, specific functions have been identified as functions that chief executives of institutions of higher education could delegate to other officers to achieve effective administration. Also, factors that should be considered in the selection and job appraisal of university chief executives have equally been identified in these developed countries.

This study is aimed at addressing similar problems that exist in Nigeria. It is my belief that there is a need to develop scientifically, list of academic and administrative functions that Nigerian vice-chancellors should perform and those they should delegate to other officers to achieve effective administration.

In an effort to establish the validity of the enclosed questionnaire, you are respectfully requested to serve as a member of a panel of judges composed of those who have considerable knowledge or experience in university administration in Nigeria. You are asked to respond to the questionnaire in the following manner.

1. Please record your reaction to the validity of each item on Part I of the attached questionnaire by circling the appropriate number on the left margin. If the item is clear and appropriate (valid) to the instrument, circle 1; if the item is questionable or you are undecided concerning the validity of the item, circle 2; but if the item is not clear nor appropriate (not valid) to the instrument, circle 3.

2. Also, would you please do the same for the items dealing with the factors that should be considered in the selection of vice-chancellors and the criteria that should be used in the evaluation of vice-chancellor's job performance effectiveness provided in Parts II and III of the instrument respectively.
3. Space is provided at the end of the questionnaire for any additional functions or factors that you can think of. Any comments that you would like to make, would be appreciated.

It is recognized that the demands for your time are many; however, your response to this study would serve as very invaluable first step in the completion of this study. An abstract of the results of the survey will be forwarded to you upon completion of the study.

Sincerely yours,

Felix Chima Ugwonali

Doctoral Student,
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 75203
U.S.A.
APPENDIX H

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS IN THE RELIABILITY TEST
Dear ..........,

As a doctoral candidate in Higher Education Administration, I am conducting a study under the supervision of Dr. John Eddy at North Texas State University. The study is designed to examine the perceptions of Nigerian universities' vice-chancellors and members of the Governing Councils of Nigerian universities or their specific representatives, of the role of vice-chancellors in the universities and the factors that should be considered in their selection and in the evaluation of their performance. Your help is much needed in order for me to complete the study.

Enclosed is a questionnaire designed for the study. Please, as one who has been involved in university administration for a long time, you are requested to complete the questionnaire and return it to the registrar's office of your university within one week. After one week, another copy of the same instrument shall be sent to you for completion, to enable us determine the reliability of the instrument.

Finally, please, feel free to make any suggestions that may help to improve the instrument.

Your early response to this request will be highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Felix Chima Ugwonali
Doctoral Student
North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 75203
U.S.A.
APPENDIX I

LETTERS TO VICE-CHANCELLORS AND REGISTRARS
September 27, 1984

The Vice-Chancellor

Dear Sir:

Please assist Mr. Felix C. Ugwonali who is returning to Nigeria in the next three weeks to conduct doctoral dissertation research in your university.

Mr. Ugwonali is a Nigerian doctoral student at North Texas State University. His dissertation topic is THE ROLE OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR IN THE NIGERIAN UNIVERSITY AND FACTORS ESSENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION AS PERCEIVED BY VICE-CHANCELLORS AND MEMBERS OF GOVERNING COUNCILS OF NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES.

Thank you in advance for your very valuable assistance in this important project.

Sincerely,

W. A. Miller, Chair
Division of Higher/Adult Education
September 27, 1984

The Registrar

Dear Sir:

Please assist Mr. Felix C. Ugwonali who is returning to Nigeria in the next three weeks to conduct doctoral dissertation research in your university.

Mr. Ugwonali is a Nigerian doctoral student at North Texas State University. His dissertation topic is THE ROLE OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR IN THE NIGERIAN UNIVERSITY AND FACTORS ESSENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION AS PERCEIVED BY VICE-CHANCELLORS AND MEMBERS OF GOVERNING COUNCILS OF NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES.

Thank you in advance for your very valuable assistance in this important project.

Sincerely,

W.A. Miller, Chair
Division of Higher/Adult Education
APPENDIX J

LETTER TO PERSONNEL WHO PARTICIPATED
IN QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION
Dear Registrar/Secretary to Vice-Chancellor,

I am a Nigerian graduate student in the United States. I am conducting a study to determine a list of functions that vice-chancellors should perform and those they should delegate to others, the factors that should be considered in the selection and the criteria that should be used in the evaluation of job performance effectiveness of vice-chancellors.

I need your assistance to complete this study. Accompanying this letter is an instrument for the study. Please, could you deliver each instrument to these categories of people:

1. The chancellor
2. The vice-chancellor
3. The deputy vice-chancellor
4. The Registrar
5. The Bursar
6. Faculty members of the university
7. Other members of the university
   Governing Council
   Governing Council

I will be back to Nigeria at the end of September or early October. The completed questionnaire should be left with you. I collect it as soon as I return. More copies of the instrument will be brought on my return.

Finally, I need your help without which the completion of this study will be very difficult. I use this opportunity to thank you for your cooperation in advance. You could use number to identify respondents who returned and those who failed to complete the questionnaire. Thanks.

Yours Sincerely,

Felix Chima Ugwonali,
Doctoral Student,
North Texas State University,
Denton, Texas 76201, U.S.A.
APPENDIX K

LETTER FROM RESEARCHER'S MAJOR PROFESSOR
September 18, 1984

To Whom It May Concern:

I am the major dissertation professor for Mr. Felix Chima Ugwonali, of Amandugba in Imo State, who is a doctoral candidate in higher education administration at North Texas State University. I authorize his doctoral dissertation research to be conducted during his short stay within Nigeria.

This letter certifies that Mr. Felix Chima Ugwonali is a doctoral student completing his dissertation under me. He has my permission to travel to Nigeria to collect data for his doctoral dissertation in the fall semester of 1984. Mr. Ugwonali is expected back to North Texas State University to complete his doctoral study.

Thank you for your cooperation on this important matter.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

John Paul Eddy, Ph.D.
Professor of Higher Education

jm
APPENDIX L

LETTERS OF PARTICIPATION FROM SEVEN UNIVERSITIES
The Chairman,
Division of Higher and Adult Education,
North Texas State University,
Denton, Texas 76201,
U. S. A.

FELEX CHIMA UGWONALI'S QUESTIONNAIRE

This is to certify that the University of Calabar participated in completing some questionnaires of your doctoral student, Mr. Ugwonali.

Dr. Ewa U. Eko
DIRECTOR OF ACADEMIC PLANNING
The Chairman,
Division of Higher and Adult Education,
North Texas State University,
Denton, Texas 76201,
U. S. A.

Dr. David E. Anyiwo
Planning Officer

UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT

Vice-Chancellor:
PROF. S. J. S. COOKEY
BA., Ph D. (Lond.)
Telephone: (084) 334400/334351/331085
Telegrams: University Phareourt
Telex: 61183 Phuni

OFFICE OF
THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

Ref: UPH/VC.P/1

The Chairman,
Division of Higher and Adult Education,
North Texas State University,
Denton, Texas 76201,
U. S. A.

SURVEY OF THE ROLE OF VICE-CHANCELLORS IN
NIGERIAN-ASSISTED CITIES

This is to certify that the Central Planning Department
of the University of Port Harcourt participated in the above
study conducted by your student, Mr. Felix C. Ugonadi.

We are glad to have been given the opportunity to
contribute to this important effort and look forward to more
opportunities for cooperation.

Thank you very much.

Dr. David E. Anyiwo
Planning Officer
29 November 1984

The Chairman
Division of Higher and Adult Education
North Texas State University
Denton
Texas 76201
U. S. A.

FELIX CHIA UGWENALI'S QUESTIONNAIRE

This is to certify that the Imo State University
participated in completing some questionnaires of
your doctoral student, Mr. UgwenaLa.

F. E. Nwanke
Assistant Registrar (VC)
The Chairman,
Division of Higher and Adult Education,
North Texas State University,
Denton,
Texas 76201,
U. S. A.

FELIX CHIMA UGWONALI'S QUESTIONNAIRE

This is to certify that the University of Nigeria participated
in completing some questionnaires of your doctoral student,

Mr. Ugwonalii.

S. K. AGEUGBA,
Deputy Registrar (Records).
Ref: VC/AD

04 December 1984

The Chairman
Division of Higher and Adult Education
North Texas State University
Denton
Texas 76201
U S A

FELIX CHIMA UGWONALI'S QUESTIONNAIRE

This is to certify that the University of Ibadan participated in completing some questionnaires of your doctoral student, Mr Ugwonali.

Olu. A. Ogunsanwo (Dr.)
Principal Assistant Registrar
Office of the Vice-Chancellor
ILE-IFE - NIGERIA

4th December, 1984.

The Chairman
Division of Higher and Adult Education
North Texas State University
Denton
Texas 76201
U S A.

FELIX CHIKA UGWONALI'S QUESTIONNAIRE

This is to certify that the University of Ife participated in completing some questionnaires of your doctoral student, Mr. Ugwonali.

M. O. Akinbowale
for Principal Assistant Registrar
Registrar's Office.
10th December, 1984

Mr. Felix Chima Ugwonali
3409 W. Illinois 2/228
Dallas, Texas 75211
U. S. A.

Dear Mr. Ugwonali

Please find enclosed two completed questionnaire forms in connection with your doctoral research.

The remaining forms will be forwarded on completion by the respective members of Council.

Yours sincerely

A.S. AKENZUA (MRS.)
Principal Assistant Registrar
(Vice-Chancellor's Office)

Enc.

ASA/SEQ"
APPENDIX M

COVER LETTER FOR SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Dear...........

Attached is a questionnaire which is part of a study on the functions of vice-chancellors of Nigerian universities and factors essential for effective higher education administration in Nigeria. The purpose of this study is to develop a list of specific functions that vice-chancellors should perform and those they should delegate to other officers in order to achieve greater effective administration. Also, factors that should be taken into consideration when selecting vice-chancellors and those that may be used in the evaluation of the job performance of a vice-chancellor for a Nigerian university may be determined through this study.

A similar study has been done in the United States of American and other developed countries. This study is an attempt to find ways to improve higher education administration in Nigeria although it is very essential for the completion of my doctoral programme.

I am conducting this study under the direction of Dr. John Eddy of the Department of Higher Education at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas. Your response to this questionnaire is important. Most of the questions require a single check mark, however, space is provided for your comments. Please, feel free to use each of these spaces.

Complete confidentiality will be maintained. No individual participants or their institutions will be identified in the study. Identification of individual response is only necessary to keep track of those who did not return their completed questionnaire.

Completed questionnaire may be left with the Office of the Registrar of your respective university. Alternatively, completed questionnaire will be collected by me in person. Use the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope to return the survey instrument to the Registrar's Office of your university from where I collect it.

I count on your co-operation.

Sincerely,

Felix Chima Ugwonali
Doctoral Student,
North Texas State University
Denton, Tx. 76201, U.S.A.
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