Full Length Research Paper

Assessment of groups influence on management style as related to university governance

S. V. Irtwange[1]* and S. Orsaah[2]

[1]Department of Agricultural and Environmental Engineering, University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria.
[2]Department of Business Management, Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria.

The study was undertaken with the objective of assessing groups influence on management style as related to University governance with University of Agriculture, Makurdi as a case study from academic staff perspective. The management style of the Vice Chancellor of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi between the period September 3, 1996 to September 3, 2001 was determined using the Ohio State University and University of Michigan models. Based on a population of 269 academic staff, a sample size of 200 was selected using the purposive and random sampling techniques. Research questionnaire, interview and personal observations were employed as instruments for data collection. Analysis of data indicates that the Vice Chancellor was rated below desirable limits both on the considerate or employee centered management style (Cronbach alpha = 0.978) and on the initiating structure or production centered management style (Cronbach alpha = 0.968), indicating low concern for production and people, which answers to the impoverished management style of the grid model. Similarly, the reliability and internal consistency measures for groups influence and assessment of governance issues associated with management style adopted gave a Cronbach alpha of 0.991 and 0.984 respectively. Chi-square (χ^2) test at 5% level of significance showed that there is a relationship between the management style of the Vice Chancellor of University of Agriculture, Makurdi and some of the groups influences and problems associated with University governance. A computation of the mean scores indicated that the Vice Chancellor himself and the in-group were responsible for the management style adopted and the various problems that bedeviled the University such as poor morale of staff and poor attitude to work, psyche and culture of confrontation and strikes, bitterness over issues of promotion, financial crises in the system leading to difficulties in payment of salaries, allowances, staff claims, disbursement of loans, etc as at when due, several court cases of staff against Administration, cases of bounced salaries and other University cheques and inability to organize convocation. The study recommends that mere entry of positions held in curriculum vitae or resumes is not enough indication of good governance ability without reference to proven and verifiable indicators as to how well such individuals had performed or are performing.

Key words: Groups influence, management style, University governance

INTRODUCTION

Leadership and management are two terms that are often confused. Leadership is the ability to cope with change and influence a group towards the achievement of goals. The source of this influence may be formal, such as that provided by the possession of a managerial rank in an organization. Since management position comes with some degree of formally designated authority, a person may assume a leadership role simply because of a position he or she holds in the organization. But not all leaders are managers; nor, for that matter, are all managers' leaders (Ayatse, 2000). Just because an organization provides its managers with certain formal rights is no assurance that they will be able to lead effectively. Leaders establish direction by developing a vision of the future; then they align people by communicating this vision and inspiring them to overcome the hurdles. Management is about coping with complexity. Good management brings about order and consistency by drawing up formal plans, designing rapid organization

---

*Corresponding author. E-mail: svirtwange@yahoo.com. Tel: +234-803-5885567.

structures, and monitoring results against the plans. Managers use the authority inherent in their designated formal rank to obtain compliance from their organizational members. Management consists of implementing the vision and strategy provided by leaders, coordinating and staffing the organization, and handling day to day problems. Although separate definitions of the two terms are provided in literature, researchers and practicing managers frequently make no such distinctions. Most importantly, organizations need strong leadership and strong management for optimum effectiveness and performance. In todays dynamic world, leaders are needed to challenge the status quo, create visions of the future, and to inspire organizational members to want to achieve the visions. Managers are also needed to formulate detailed plans, create efficient organizational structures and oversee day to day operations (Robbins, 2000).

An understanding of leadership begins with the five competencies that leaders use to influence others: empowerment, intuition, self-understanding, vision and value congruence (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1996). Leaders also rely on five types of power: legitimate, reward, coercive, referent and expert (Koontz et al., 1984). Trait models of leadership were early attempts to identify the personal characteristics that make a leader successful. The characteristics studied included physical, social background, personality, and task-orientation (Robbins, 2000). Behavioral models of leadership provide a way of identifying effective leaders by their actions. The primary behavioral models are Theory X and Theory Y, which represent two quite different ways that leaders view their subordinates and thus manage them (McGregor, 1960); the Ohio State University and University of Michigan models, which identify two leadership styles (considerate and initiating structure - Ohio State) and two types of leader behaviors (production-centered and employee-centered-Michigan); the managerial grid model, which identifies various combinations of concern for people and production and the Scandinavian studies which captures 21st century development oriented leadership behavior that produces more satisfied employees (Robbins, 2000).

Hellriegel and Slocum (1996) opines that because the behavioral models have failed to uncover leadership styles that were consistently appropriate to all situations, contingency models of leadership have been devised. The principal contingency leadership models are Fiedlers contingency model which suggests that successful leadership depends on matching the demands of the situation to the leadership style; Hersey and Blanchards situational leadership model, which indicates that leaders must adapt their leadership style to the readiness level of their followers; Houses path-goal model, which holds that effective leaders clarify the paths, or means, by which subordinates can attain job satisfaction and perform well; and the leader-participation model, which suggests that leaders can choose

one of five leadership-decision styles, depending on the situation. Neocharismatic leadership theories such as charismatic, transformational and visionary leadership involves inspiring, and thereby motivating individuals to reach the leaders highest goals. There are emerging issues in leader-ship that have been shown to be positively related to job performance at all levels (Robbins, 2000). These include emotional intelligence and leadership, team leadership, moral leadership and cross-cultural leadership and, trust and leadership.

The term 'governance' is rather ambiguous but it is generally used when referring to the structure of relationships that bring about organisational coherence, authorise policies, plans and decisions, and account for their probity, responsiveness and cost-effectiveness. University governance is placed within the context of a wider debate about the management of higher education. The 'management' of a university involves the achievement of intended outcomes through the allocation of responsibilities and resources, monitoring of their efficiency and effectiveness, and good 'administration' – that is the implementation of authorised procedures and the application of systems to achieve the agreed results. It also involves good 'leadership'– identifying opportunities, setting strategic directions, and investing in and drawing on people's capabilities to develop organisational purposes and values.

A lot of researchers have carried out studies on governance issues as it affects the university system. Rasmussen (2000) has presented the demands for efficient university governance structures, to ensure the development of basic organizations which can produce short- and long-term high quality and successful research. Ekong (2001) concludes that there are no "pure" democratic arrangements in university governance. Meritocracy (rule by the most capable) and oligarchy (rule by a few) rather than democracy (rule by a majority of citizens) seem to be the political norm in the university setting. When asked what management style the 11 Vice Chancellors in the Ekong (2001) study would advocate (with the benefit of hindsight) for the effective administration of universities in Nigeria, eight of them (or 73%) indicated a style that would have doses of both authoritarianism and democracy. Mollis and Marginson (2002) observed the rise of business-style management inside Argentina and Australia Universities at the expense of participatory governance, the transformation of intellectual autonomy into corporate autonomy, and the reduction of diversity and academic independence, which policies and practices are used to advance neo-liberal agendas, often in contradiction with national traditions in higher education. Aina (2002) states that inadequate funding of the Universities has had profound effects on quality of teaching and research while Universities in Nigeria have been forced to embark on income generating projects in order to source alternative funds.

These commercial ventures being generated are fraught

with problems of management, including issues of accountability, profitability and sustainability. Shattock (2003) consi-dered the corporate-dominated and the academic dominated forms of university governance, and the extent to which the position of these models has fluctuated over time and argues that it is now time to move back to the concept of 'shared governance', but that this requires some reform of academic decision–making and that the corporate and the academic sides need to create machinery to realise effectively their respective contributions to university governance.

Sainta et al. (2003) states that the Government of Nigeria has initiated higher education policy reforms intended to bring its university system more in line with international good practices. These reforms seek to promote increased institu-tional autonomy, greater system differentiation, strengthened governance, and mechanisms for quality assurance. They seek to create a more flexible and responsive system of university teaching and research that, over time, will contribute increasingly to national innovation capacities, pro-ductivity gains and economic growth. Particular attention was given to issues of access, teaching/learning, finance, and governance/management. Durand and Pujadas (2004) observed that Argentine Universities like similar institutions all around the world are facing a complex and challenging environment that demands a more sophisticated leadership and the development of complex managerial skills and proposed that enhancing the quality of collective decision making and building more complex teams as a way to preserve collegiality in academic governance, can help the institutions to survive and succeed in a hostile context. Garland (2004) proposed ten core principles towards keeping a University governance system healthy as follows:

(1) The governance system should reflect the fact that universities are meritocracies.
(2) People who will be affected by a major decision have a right to be heard.
(3) All decision-making processes should lead to timely closure.
(4) Governance mistakes do not normally signify process failures.
(5) The authority to make a final decision should rest with the party ultimately responsible for that decision. However, the chain of accountability should extend to all who contribute toward the decision.
(6) An effective governance system never permits structural conflicts of interest.
(7) All deliberative bodies should have a clear agenda for each meeting, and the importance of that agenda should justify the time and resources spent deliberating it.
(8) Appeal procedures should be matched to the significance of the issue.
(9) Effective university governance requires that the faculty

role in governance be equitably distributed.
(10) A strong and effective governance system requires courage.

Nur-Awaleh and Mtegha (2005) examines the application of shared governance structure and leadership styles in African Universities, specifically at Mzuzu University in Malawi and Amud University in Somali land and provided recommendations for African Universities who are faced with similar problems of shared governance with valuable data regarding governance and leadership and further provided information about the ways in which Universities governance can be modified to increase the success of higher education institutions. First, he/she will need Faculty Councils and Senates that are representative. Delegating powers to a Faculty Council and senate promotes shared governance by limiting top down directives. Second, there should be a broader representation on the council. This is a buffer between the institution and the external bodies to which the university is accountable. Such a body should not just include political appointees but also members from the private sector. Third, there should be a transparent, logical and well understood set of rules for budgeting and accounting because these have an enormous influence on the operation and performance of the university. Rules should encourage flexibility, stability and transparency. Bureaucracy results in inefficiency and waste. Fourth, there should be data for decision-making. Without data and information, the leader, even if he/she is transformational, cannot make effective decisions. These include data on teaching, student achievement, research performance, institutional finance status and so on. Such data should be shared with faculty instead of being kept as 'confidential' by the administrators and the leader. Fifth, the Vice Chancellor has to be elected instead of being appointed because he/she may lack wide support, hence diluting the sense of shared governance. Sixth, faculty quality is the most important determinant of the overall quality of a higher education institution. Nepotism, tribalism and inbreeding are enemies of faculty quality. Faculty and administrative staff should be rewarded for their performance rather than length of service. Finally, leaders need to realise that there is more to gain with transformational style of leadership and shared governance.

Motta and Bolan (2008) carried out research in which a group of deans from a large private institution in Brazil gave their self-assessment of their academic and managerial skills. The results revealed that they tend to have a high perception of their managerial skills, even though they have no previous managerial experience or formal training. This underlines that senior academic administrators cannot simply assume that deans, by the nature of their work envi-ronment, are proficient in managerial skills; neither that they can easily identify inadequacies nor have them self-corrected. To accomplish the necessary institutional changes

changes to face the complexities of the current globalized education market, a new assessment culture has to be implemented in the academic environment. Melo et al. (2008) described the research design that has been chosen to study the relationship between governance structures and performance style management systems in universities. The complexity of the research topic, which brings together two different bodies of literature- on governance and on performance management systems - is addressed by using a case study design and a multimethod approach involving document analysis, interviews and a survey. Lizzio and Wilson (2009) investiga-ted student participation in university governance and observed that role ambiguity was the greatest challenge reported by student representatives, and the overall effectiveness of the role was perceived to be reliant on the willingness and ability of academic managers and staff to engage in constructive dialogue with students. It is argued that universities need to adopt a more proactive approach to the development and support of student leaders and representatives.

The purpose of the study includes:

(1) To determine the management style of the Vice Chancellor of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi between the period September 3, 1996 to September 3, 2001.
(2) To determine the various groups influences on the management style adopted and
(3) To determine whether there is a relationship between the management style adopted and the various problems that were associated with University governance during the period.

Neave (1998) identifies what he terms "collegiality" as opposed to "hierarchy" as alternative ways of organizing what goes on in institutions of higher learning. The collegial principle of academic self-government is founded on the belief that academicians on university campuses are primarily colleagues (some senior and others junior), with the Vice Chancellor as primus inter pares.

This suggests a horizontal or approximately "flat hierarchy" and participatory management style that uses committees in decision making. Ekong (2001) carried out a study on management styles in Nigerian Universities under military rule and the challenges of democracy in which management style in Nigerian Universities is defined as the peculiar or distinctive manner by which Vice Chancellors organize, control or direct affairs in their institutions. Ekong (2001) notes that the office of the Vice Chancellor is a position of power and questions how they have utilized their powers in the control and allocation of resources, how they have exercised power over their colleagues and what power protection tactics they have employed in order to perpetuate themselves in office and to what consequences? However, there are rare studies related to groups influences on management styles adopted by Vice Chancellors on the one hand and the various challenges associated with University governance on the other. The study therefore proposes the following hypotheses:

(1) There is no group influences on the management adopted by the Vice Chancellor of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi between the periods of September 3, 1996 to September 3, 2001.
(2) There is no relationship between the management style adopted and the various problems that were associated with University governance during the period.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology followed in the collection of research data to enhance the study includes area of the study, sampling design, construct measurement and data analysis. The study was carried out in August, 2002.

Area of study

The Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Nigeria forms the area of the study. The University which was established on January 1, 1988 has the tripartite mandate of "teaching, research and extension services". Through this mandate, the University is supposed to among other things train manpower that is consistent with the requirements of an integrated research extension system. The University runs undergraduate and postgraduate programmes.

Sampling design

The academic staff of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi makes up the population for this study. The academic staff strength stands at 269 made up of 70 graduate assistants, 37 assistant lecturers, 52 lecturers II, 44 lecturers I, 44 senior lecturers, 5 associate professors and 17 professors spread across eight colleges with twenty two departments, two centers and the university library as at August, 2002. A sampling plan was developed to ensure that appropriate respondents are included in this study. This study applied the formula suggested by Bowerman et al. (2004) to calculate the sample size:

$$N = p(1-p)x\left(\frac{Z_{a/2}}{B}\right)^2$$

Where; N = sample size, $Z_{a/2}$ = confidence level and B = tolerance.

For this study, p = 0.5 as what Bowerman et al. (2004) suggested to achieve a normal distribution, $Z_{a/2}$ = 1.96 by setting confidence to be 0.05, and error tolerance = 0.07. Therefore, the sample size is determined to be ≥ 196. For the purpose of this study, the sample size of 200 was therefore considered adequate. The non-probability purposive sampling technique was used to screen out those academics that joined University of Agriculture, Makurdi after the tenure of the Administration being studied. Thereafter, the random sampling technique was used, after stratification of the population according to departments to ensure that all departments are represented in the sample. In the University, even though responses may be affected by personal biases, beliefs and values based on race, tribe, religion, age, sex, academic status, political inclinations, etc there was no need for stratification along those lines. Stratified random sampling here simply connotes careful and methodical selection from the population to ensure probability for equal chance and reduce possibility of bias entering selection of the sample.

Construct measurement

In this study, there are three major constructs: Management style, groups effect on management style and assessment of various problems of the University. The research questionnaire used in this study to measure the considerate or employee centered management style and the initiating structure or production centered management style was based on Ohio State University and University of Michigan Models. The instrument used has 22 questions arranged in 5-point Likert-type scales. Responses were made on a scale ranging from 1 (Never), 2 (Seldom), 3 (Sometimes), 4 (Often) and 5 (Always). The responses of the academic staff provided a measure of the Vice Chancellor's considerate or initiating structure management style. To measure the considerate management style (CS), 12 questionnaire items were adopted:

CS1 He took time to explain how a job should be carried out
CS2 He explained the part that members were to play in the team
CS3 He made clear the rules and the procedures for others to follow in detail
CS4 He organized his own work activities
CS5 He let people know how well they were doing
CS6 He let people know what was expected of them
CS7 He encouraged the use of uniform procedures to getting things accomplished
CS8 He made his attitudes clear to others
CS9 He assigned others to particular tasks
CS10 He made sure that others understood their part in the group
CS11 He scheduled the work that he wanted others to do
CS12 He asked that others follow standard rules and regulations

To measure the initiating structure management style (IS), 10-questionnaire items were adopted which provided a measure of the management style by academic staff:

IS1 He made working on the job more pleasant
IS2 He got out of his way to be helpful to others
IS3 He respected others' feelings and opinions
IS4 He was thoughtful and considerate of others
IS5 He maintained a friendly atmosphere in the team
IS6 He did little things to make it pleasant for others to be a member of the team
IS7 He treated others as equals
IS8 He gave others advance notice of change and explained how it will affect them
IS9 He looked out for others' personal welfare
IS10 He was approachable and friendly towards others

The instrument used for measuring the groups effect (GE) on manage-ment style adopted by the Vice Chancellor has 8 items arranged in 5-point Likert-type scales. Responses as to the responsibility for the making of the management style adopted by the Vice Chancellor were made on a scale ranging from 1 (False), 2 (Somewhat false), 3 (Neither true nor false), 4 (Somewhat true) and 5 (True).

GE1 Vice Chancellor Himself
GE2 Governing Council
GE3 Principal Officers
GE4 Senate
GE5 Committee of Deans and Directors
GE6 In-group
GE7 Out-group
GE8 Unions

The instrument used for assessing the various governance issues (GI) of

the university as related to the management style adopted by the Vice Chancellor has 10 items arranged in 5-point Likert-type scales. Responses as to whether the management style adopted by the Vice Chancellor was responsible for the identified problems in the University were made on a scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Not sure), 4 (Agree) and 5 (Strongly agree).

GI1 Poor morale of staff and poor attitude to work
GI2 Psyche and culture of confrontation and strikes
GI3 Office accommodation problems
GI4 Large number of broken down vehicles
GI5 Poor maintenance of staff quarters and student hostels
GI6 Bitterness over issues of promotion
GI7 Financial crises in the system leading to difficulties in payment of salaries, allowances, staff claims, disbursement of loans, etc as at when due
GI8 Several court cases of staff against Administration
GI9 Cases of bounced salaries and other University cheques
GI10 Inability to organize convocation during the period.

The sources of data were from both primary and secondary. The survey approach was adopted in this study (Osuala, 1993). The main instru-ments used were a combination of close-ended or structured form and open-ended or unstructured form of research questionnaire, personal or participant observation and unstructured type of interviews were reliable and valid information in the form of verbal responses was required to further throw more light on responses. The questionnaire was designed to ensure that it was capable of bringing out the required information for the study. Whereas some of the responses were either dichotonomous, scaling or multiple choice responses, the respondents were required to supply the words in response to other questions put forward by the researchers.

Data analysis

Data was analyzed by arranging the responses obtained from the questionnaires against each research question. All the responses were analyzed, processed and presented using research tables and simple percentages that gave valid results of the population that was studied (Irtwange, 2002). The Likert interval scale used permitted respondents to express their preference or choice from a continuum of options and being an interval scale permitted some arithmetical manipulations. Cronbach alpha (a) which is a measure of squared correlation between observed scores and true scores is a measure of reliability in terms of ratio of true score variance to observed score variance. It tests the internal consis-tency of each management style, the group effects and assessment of governance issues. According to Robinson and Shaver (1973), if a is greater than 0.7, it means that it has high reliability and if a is smaller than 0.3, then it implies that it has low reliability. To test the research hypotheses, Chi-square (x^2) technique was used. Microsoft Excel 2007 was used for descriptive statistics of questionnaire items for determination of management style, the groups effect and assessment of governance issues while SPSS 16.0 for Windows was employed for reliability measurements. The weakness and strength of the research procedure and instruments relates to the fact that management style, the groups' effect and assessment of governance issues was based on the perception of academic staff.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The data collected from the population sample through the data collection instruments was presented, analyzed

Table 1a. Characteristics of respondents (200 respondents).

Characteristics	Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	163	81.5
	Female	37	18.5
Age	20 - 30 years	19	4.5
	31 - 40 years	78	39
	41 - 50 years	83	41.5
	51 - 60 years	29	14.5
	>61 years	1	0.5
Marital status	Married	174	87
	Single	23	11.5
	Others	3	1.5
Highest educational qualification	Bachelors degree	32	16
	Masters degree	99	49.5
	Doctorate degree	69	34.5
Employment period	Before September 3, 1996	134	67
	After September 3, 1996	66	33
	After September 3, 2001	0	0
Academic status	Professor/Librarian/Research professor	9	4.5
	Associate professor, Deputy librarian/Principal research fellow	3	1.5
	Senior lecturer/Principal Librarian/Senior research fellow	37	18.5
	Lecturer I/Senior librarian/Research fellow I	45	22.5
	Lecturer II/Librarian I/Research fellow II	44	22
	Assistant lecturer/Librarian II/ Research assistant	29	14.5
	Graduate assistant/Assistant librarian/Graduate assistant	33	16.5

discussed under the following subheadings: Classification of respondents, determination of management style of the vice chancellor, groups influence on management style adopted by the vice chancellor and management style and the various governance problems of the University. The defense of the vice chancellor which is encapsulated in the end of tenure report is presented. In addition, the processed data has been presented in form of percentages and relevant information computed so as to easily compare, contrast and evaluate the data in order to reject or accept the formulated research hypotheses and draw conclusions.

Classification of respondents

The classification of respondents is shown in Tables 1a, b. The gender analysis shows that 81.5% of the 200 respondents were male while 18.5% were female. This seems to be consistent with the dominance status of male academics in the Nigerian University system. Age distribution analysis of academics in the University of Agriculture, Makurdi shows that out of 200 respondents, 4.5% were ≤ 30 years, 39% between 31 - 40 years, 41.5%

between 41 - 50 years and 14.5% between 51 - 60 years. Only 0.5% fell within the age bracket of 361 years. Considering the retirement age of 65 years for academics (or even if it is increased to 70 years), this age distribution is one of the major strengths of the University and should be of interest to management.

The analysis of the marital status of the respondents indicates that 174 or 87% of the respondents were married while 23 or 11.5% were single. The widows and divorcees considered as others constituted a mere 1.5% of the population sample. However, how well these academics manage their families cannot be determined but being managers of some sort, are well able to assess an individual's management style. Of the 200 respondents, 16% had Bachelors degrees, 49.5% had Masters Degrees while 34.5% were Doctorate degree holders. Information such as this is very important to a manager in planning staff development programmes. The purpose of determining the period respondents joined the services of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi was to ensure the effectiveness of the nonproba-bility sampling technique initially adopted. However, since the researchers had a comprehensive list of all the academics in the University with information on date

Table 1b. Characteristics of respondents (200 respondents)

Characteristics	Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Crop production	16	8
	Soil science	8	4
	Agricultural extension and communication	7	3.5
	Agricultural economics	13	6.5
	Forestry production and utilization	4	2
	Social and environmental forestry	2	1
	Wildlife and range management	7	3.5
	Fisheries and aquaculture	7	3.5
	Animal production	17	8.5
	Food Science and technology	9	4.5
	Home economics	7	3.5
	Agricultural engineering	16	8
Department	Civil engineering	8	4
	Electrical and electronics engineering	6	3
	Mechanical engineering	12	6
	Biological sciences	8	4
	Chemistry	7	3.5
	Physics	7	3.5
	Agricultural and science education	9	4.5
	Maths/Statistics/Computer science	10	5
	Remedial and general studies	7	3.5
	Veterinary medicine	2	1
	Seed technology centre	1	0.5
	University Library	6	3
	Centre for food and agricultural strategy	4	2
	Yoruba	19	9.5
	Igbo	35	17.5
	Igala	18	9
Tribe	Tiv	61	30.5
	Idoma	34	17
	Igede	13	6.5
	Others	20	10

of appointment, no such error was committed. The analysis therefore shows that 67% or 134 of the 200 respondents were employed before the commencement of the Administration being assessed while 33 or 66% were employed by the administration being assessed. It is the opinion of the researchers that those who were massively employed towards the end of that Adminis-tration and who actually reported after its expiration were not qualified to comment on the management style of the vice chancellor between September 3, 1996 and September 3, 2001. Most staff of the College of Veterinary Medicine, which was established shortly before the exit of the vice chancellor (himself a professor of veterinary medicine) fell under this category.

The detailed analysis of the academic status shows that of the 200 respondents, 4.5% were professors or their equivalent, 1.5% was associate professors or their equivalent, 18.5% were senior lecturers or their equivalent, 22.5% were Lecturers I or their equivalent, 14.5% were Lecturers II or their equivalent while 16.5% were Graduate Assistants or their equivalent. The academic status of the 200 respondents was heaviest in the middle with 44.5% (Lecturers I and II), followed by the bottom with 31% (Graduate Assistants and Assistant Lecturers) and lastly the top with 24.5% (Senior Lecturers, Associate Professors and Professors). This information is important to management in terms of recruitment and promotion of academic staff in the University. The department-wise distribution of respondents shows that out of the 200 respondents, 8.5% were from the Department of Animal Production, 8% each from the Departments of Crop Production and Agricultural Engineering, 6.5% from Agricultural Economics, 6% from Mechanical Engineering, 5% from Maths/Statistics/Computer Science, 4.5% each

from Food science and Technology and Agricultural and Science Education. Others were 4% each from Soil Science, Civil Engineering, Biological Sciences, 3.5% each from Agri-cultural Extension and Communication, Wildlife and Range Management, Fisheries and Aquaculture, Home Economics, Chemistry, Physics and Remedial and General Studies, 3% each from Electrical and Electronics Engineering and University Library, 2% each from Forestry Production and Utilization and Centre for Food and Agricultural Strategy (CEFAS), 1% each from Social and Environmental Forestry and Veterinary Medicine while respondents from Seed Technology Centre (STC) constituted 0.5%. When viewed side by side the total academic staff population of 269, the respondents constitute 74.35% of the population. The researchers strived to attain the same percentage across all the departments apart from College of Veterinary Medicine, majority of whose staff assumed duty after September 3, 2001. An important factor in management is culture. A university is supposed to be an international community of scholars where you find people from various parts of the world. A good manager must have information on the different cultures represented by the different tribes in the university environment. The distribution of respondents on the basis of tribal affiliations shows that of the 200 respon- dents, 30.5% were Tiv, followed by the Igbos who constituted 17.5%. The Idomas followed with 17%, the Yorubas 9.5%, the Igalas 9% and the Igedes 6.5% while other tribes made up 10%. It is interesting to know that the Hausas were classified as others as there was only one contract staff of Hausa extraction in the University of 269 academic staff strength. In managing University of Agriculture, Makurdi, a reflection of federal character in appointments may ensure stability in the system. This also shows that the Nigerian Universities are fast ceasing to be universal in terms of global distribution of staff due to poor funding and remuneration as Benue State alone (Tiv, Idoma and Igede) constituted 54% of the respondents. No wonder the term "localversities" is now being used to describe a typical Nigerian University.

Determination of management style of the vice chancellor

The assessment of respondents on the initiating structure management style scale based on grouped scores frequency distribution was as follows: 12 - 20 (11%), 21 - 28 (21.5%), 29 - 36 (46.5%), 37 - 44 (13%), 45 - 52 (7%) and 53 - 60 (1%). A score of 347 would indicate that the management style of the vice chancellor can be described as high on initiating structure. This means that the vice chancellor was able to plan, organize, direct and control the work of others. However, a further analysis of the results shows that only 2% of the respondents scored the vice chancellor within desirable limits on initiating structure while

98% returned scores below 47 on the 60 point scale. The reliability test using Cronbach alpha gave 0.968 for 183 items as 17 of the component variables had zero variance and were removed from the scale. Generally, if a is greater than 0.7, it means that the construct has high reliability. Wu (2005) states that the generally accepted guideline is 0.6, which further confirms the reliability of the measurement items.

The assessment of respondents on the considerate management style scale based on grouped frequency distribution analysis was as follows: 10 - 18 (39.5%), 19 - 26 (36.5%), 27 - 34 (16%), 35 - 42 (7%) and 43 - 50 (1%). The analysis shows that 76% of respondents scored the Vice Chancellor between 10 - 26 on a 50 point scale. A score of 340 would indicate that the vice chancellor was a consi- derate leader. A considerate leader is one who is concerned with the comfort, well-being and contributions of others. A further analysis of the results shows that only 1.5% of the respondents scored the Vice Chancellor 340 on considerate management style while 98.5% scored him below 40 on the 50 point scale. The reliability test using Cronbach alpha gave 0.978 for 198 items as 2 of the component variables had zero variance and were removed from the scale.

Generally, managers rated 347 on initiating structure management style and 340 on considerate management style tended to be in charge of higher producing groups than those whose management style is the reverse. In the case of the vice chancellor of the University of Agriculture between the period September 3, 1996 to September 3, 2001, the verdict of academics in the University is that he was unable to plan, organize, direct and control the work of others which are the major functions of management, neither was he concerned with the comfort, well-being and contributions of others. This means no concern for production and no concern for people.

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of questionnaire constructs for determination of management style. The mean, also called average, is the most commonly used measure of central tendency and is as the sum of all the scores divided by the total number of scores. The standard deviation is the square root of the variance; it represents an average measure of the amount each score deviates from the mean. Smaller standard deviation means the distribution of scores are clustered close to the mean and the mean has less error. Skewness characterizes the degree of symmetry of a distribution around its mean. Positive skewness indicates a distribution with an asymmetric tail extending towards more positive values (skewed to the right). Negative skewness indicates a distribution with an asymmetric tail extending towards more negative values (skewed to the left). Zero values indicate symmetrical distribution. Kurtosis characterizes the relative peakedness or flatness of a distribution compared to the normal distribution. Positive kurtosis indicates leptokurtic distribution. Negative kurtosis indicates platykurtic distribution. Zero values indicate normal or mesokurtic distribution.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of questionnaire items for determination of management style, the groups effect and assessment of governance issues (n = 200).

Constructs	Items	Mean	Standard deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
Considerate structure management style	CS1	2.595	0.946	0.285	0.065
	CS2	2.66	0.999	-0.532	0.207
	CS3	2.305	1.099	0.156	0.793
	CS4	3.085	1.168	-0.869	0.063
	CS5	2.11	0.966	-0.328	0.386
	CS6	2.725	1.107	-0.412	0.383
	CS7	1.975	1.029	-0.286	0.748
	CS8	2.595	1.117	-0.699	0.327
	CS9	3.365	1.085	-0.882	0.018
	CS10	2.38	0.938	-0.078	0.390
	CS11	2.94	1.054	-0.491	-0.061
	CS12	2.995	1.286	-1.104	-0.019
Initiating structure management style	IS1	1.855	0.958	0.346	0.883
	IS2	2.24	1.095	-0.651	0.462
	1S3	2.085	1.129	0.202	0.932
	1S4	2.33	1.061	-0.174	0.402
	IS5	2.33	1.085	0.401	0.815
	IS6	2.49	1.178	-0.239	0.705
	IS7	1.515	0.839	2.332	1.682
	IS8	1.895	1.053	-0.436	0.785
	IS9	2.095	0.970	-0.928	0.309
	IS10	2.415	1.033	-0.694	0.120
Groups influence on management style adopted by the Vice Chancellor	GE1	1.17	0.471	23.185	3.996
	GE2	3.515	1.449	-1.634	-0.170
	GE3	3.560	1.298	-1.370	-0.293
	GE4	3.655	1.369	-1.227	-0.460
	GE5	3.185	1.386	-1.486	0.133
	GE6	2.34	1.488	-0.883	0.776
	GE7	3.325	1.303	-1.421	0.011
	GE8	3.85	1.231	-0.915	-0.674
Assessment of governance challenges of the university as related to the management style adopted by the vice chancellor	GI1	4.46	0.896	2.593	-1.807
	GI2	4.29	0.866	0.694	-1.163
	GI3	3.335	1.285	-0.923	-0.375
	GI4	3.985	0.948	0.118	-0.863
	GI5	3.955	1.053	-0.389	-0.771
	GI6	4.47	0.769	3.969	-1.770
	GI7	4.62	0.727	4.761	-2.210
	GI8	4.355	0.896	1.700	-1.440
	GI9	4.47	0.750	2.592	-1.524
	GI10	4.53	0.850	4.470	-2.152

Table 3. Group effect on management style adopted by the vice chancellor (percentage in parenthesis).

Group definition	True (%)	Some what true (%)	Neither true nor false (%)	Some what false (%)	False (%)	Mean score*
Vice chancellor himself	172 (86)	26 (13)	2 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4.85
Governing council	11 (5.5)	61 (30.5)	29 (14.5)	9 (4.5)	90 (45)	2.47
Principal officers	7 (3.5)	54 (27)	25 (12.5)	47 (23.5)	67 (33.5)	2.44
Senate	13 (6.5)	41 (20.5)	32 (16)	30 (15)	84 (42)	2.35
Committee of deans and directors	15 (7.5)	75 (37.5)	24 (12)	29 (14.5)	57 (28.5)	2.81
In-group	82 (41)	52 (26)	16 (8)	17 (8.5)	33 (16.5)	3.67
Out-group	9 (4.5)	64 (32)	34 (17)	38 (19)	55 (27.5)	2.67
Unions	5 (2.5)	39 (19.5)	21 (10.5)	51 (25.5)	84 (42)	2.15

*Comparison mean for the 5-point scale = 3 and lies between the boundaries 2.95 and 3.05.
Source: Research Survey (Irtwange, 2002).

Groups influence on management style adopted by the vice chancellor

The analysis of the various group's contributions to the adoption of the low concern for people and production management style of the vice chancellor was based on the following group definitions: Vice chancellor himself, governing council, principal officers, senate, committee of deans and directors (CDD), in-group, out-group and staff unions. The results are presented in Table 3. The reliability test for this construct measurement using Cronbach alpha gave 0.991 for 200 items as none of the component variables had zero variance. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of questionnaire constructs for determination of groups influenceon the management style adopted by the Vice Chancellor. Using the Chi-square table, the critical value at 0.05 level of significance and 28 degrees of freedom is 41.3372. That is, $\chi^2_{tab.}$ = 413372. Whereas $\chi^2_{cal.}$ = 885.3849 > $\chi^2_{tab.}$ = 41.3372, the decision therefore is to reject the null hypothesis that there is no groups influence on the management style adopted by the vice chancellor of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Since the null hypothesis H_o has been rejected, it means that the alternate hypothesis H_1 which states that there is groups influence on the management style of the vice chancellor of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi and the management style adopted is accepted. It was the summarized opinion of the respondents that the manage ement style could be blamed largely on the vice chancellor himself and the In-group as indicated by the mean scores of 4.85 > 3.05 and 3.665 > 3.05 respectively (see Table 3). Interviews with some of the respondents further gave some insight into the findings of the study. Most respondents humorously put it that since the vice chancellor was a professor of veterinary medicine; he had no knowledge of how to manage human beings. Whether this explains why Ano concern for people@ remains to be determined as this may not be generally true of all veterinary medicine professors in management positions. On the contri-bution of the governing council in the making of the vice chancellors style of management, it is important to note that the vice chancellor operated without a governing council for the better part of his tenure and many issues relating to staff welfare were left undone under the pretext that there was no governing council. Even when the council was put in place by the Federal Government of Nigeria, it was alleged that decisions of the governing council were usually set aside by the vice chancellor and the council had no moral strength to call the vice chancellor to order because most of them were not willing to loose out in the award of contracts. Most of the principal officers during the period were not substantive and since they were looking forward to confirmation of their appointments, they had to play along and in some cases, benefitted from the management style of the vice chancellor. The allegations of the emasculation of senate against the vice chancellor was borne out of the fact that most senate members were his appointees and were supposed to display absolute loyalty. There were allegations of people being cowed down when decisions of the vice chancellor which became synonymous with those of senate were being challenged. The minutes of senate meetings were seldom read and this gave rise to conflicting senate decisions on issues as there were no official reference documents. Decisions on matters brought before senate were taken based on "the wisdom or mood of senate" at the time. During the period, CDD gradually took over the functions of senate. They could close and reopen the University at will. Some respondents interviewed were of the view that the CDD allowed itself to be used and should share in the blame of whatever went wrong in the university during the period. The vice chancellor is neither a dean nor a director but in the University of Agriculture, Makurdi, the vice chancellor is the chairman of CDD, a committee that the vice chancellor is not a member. Perhaps in the future the CDD could be changed to a committee of principal

Table 4. Assessment of the various problems of the university (percentage in parenthesis).

Problem definition	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Not sure (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)	Mean score*
Poor morale of staff and poor attitude to work	131 (65.5)	47 (23.5)	7 (3.5)	14 (7)	1 (0.5)	4.47
Psyche and culture of confrontation and strikes	99 (49.5)	70 (35)	19 (9.5)	12 (6)	0 (0)	4.28
Office accommodation problems	43 (21.5)	60 (30)	44 (22)	31 (15.5)	22 (11)	3.36
Large number of broken down vehicles	64 (32)	90 (45)	24 (12)	22 (11)	0 (0)	3.98
Poor maintenance of staff quarters and student hostels	78 (39)	66 (33)	28 (14)	26 (13)	2 (1)	3.96
Bitterness over issues of promotion	119 (59.5)	64 (32)	13 (6.5)	2 (1)	2 (1)	4.48
Financial crises in the system leading to difficulties in payment of salaries, allowances, staff claims, disbursement of loans, etc as at when due	149 (74.5)	40 (20)	3 (1.5)	8 (4)	0 (0)	4.65
Several court cases of staff against administration	117 (58.5)	57 (28.5)	19 (9.5)	7 (3.5)	0 (0)	4.42
Cases of bounced salaries and other university cheques	119 (59.5)	64 (32)	16 (8)	1 (0.5)	0 (0)	4.51
Inability to organize convocation during the period	141 (70.5)	46 (23)	4 (2)	9 (4.5)	0 (0)	4.60

*Comparison mean for the 5-point scale = 3 and lies between the boundaries 2.95 and 3.05. Source: Research Survey (Irtwange, 2002).

officers, deans and (CPODD) since succeeding vice chancellors have refused to relinquish their chairmanship of this particular committee.

Each manager normally assembles his own team referred to as the in-group. Many of the respondents believe that if the people close to the vice chancellor were giving him the right advice, he would have succeeded. The out-group represents the opposition which was very strong especially as one of the contestants had acted as vice chancellor and was purportedly presumed to have won before decision was taken otherwise by the federal government. It is also alleged that the in-group blocked every chance of the out-group being carried along through spurious security reports and this led to a serious divide which in most cases was reduced to tribal politics.

No wonder the spades of court cases between staff and administration. Nearly all the dismissed staff won their court cases and was reabsorbed into the system even before the expiration of the vice chancellors tenure. It is believed by some respondents that if the Unions had insisted on the rule of law from the beginning, they would have helped in instilling discipline in the management of the affairs of the University by the vice chancellor. Strikes were used effect-tively by the Unions to get things done correctly. When the Unions discovered that the option of strike was the only way to get things done including payment of salaries, strikes be-came the in-thing leading to a culture of strikes on campus. The strike tool was discovered too late into the administration and so not much could be done to correct the mismanagement of the past hence the myriads of problems being faced in perpetuity by the University.

Management style and the various problems of the University

The result of an analysis of whether the various problems which bedeviled the University of Agriculture, Makurdi and continues to torment the University were really traceable to the management style of the Vice Chancellor during the period September 3, 1996 to September 3, 2001 is presented in Table 4. The reliability test for the construct measurement using Cronbach alpha gave 0.984 for 170 items as 30 of the component variables had zero variance and were removed from the scale. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of questionnaire constructs for assess-ment of governance issues of the University as related to the management style adopted by the Vice Chancellor. Using the Chi-square table, the critical value at 0.05 level of significance and 36 degrees of freedom is 50.9643 (by extrapolation). That is, $\chi^2_{tab.}$ = 50.9643. Whereas $\chi^2_{cal.}$ = 434.9281 > $\chi^2_{tab.}$ = 50.9643, the decision therefore is to reject the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the management style adopted and the various problems that were associated with University governance during the period. Since the null hypothesis H_o has been rejected, it means that the alternate hypothesis H_1 which states that there is a relationship between the management style adopted and the various problems that were associated with University governance during the period is accepted.

Of the 200 respondents and based on a mean score of 3.0 on the 5-point scale, the respondents strongly agreed that the management style of the vice chancellor was res-

ponsible for poor morale of staff and poor attitude to work, psyche and culture of confrontation and strikes, bitterness over issues of promotion, financial crises in the system leading to difficulties in payment of salaries, allowances, staff claims, disbursement of loans, etc as at when due, several court cases of staff against administration, cases of bounced salaries and other University cheques and inability to organize convocation during the period.

It was common to see staff come to work very late and close very early and when challenged to say in Pidgin English Amorale dey low@ meaning "morale is low". It is believed that a situation where even salaries could not be paid except a strike option was used encouraged the incessant strike actions experienced in the University during the period. It was very common for Unions to embark on strike one day after 25th of every month if salaries were not paid.

Somehow, many of the benefits that trickled down to staff were made possible only through a struggle and therefore strike became the most effective weapon of getting lawful benefits from management. The University of Agriculture, Makurdi had a lot of problems with office accommodation for academic staff. For example, out of those 53 lecturers in the College of Agricultural Engineering and Engineering Technology, less than 30% had office accommodation. Good management involves planning recruitment consistent with physical infrastructural development. A situation where lecturers operated from their homes did not make them available to students. A trip around mechanic villages in Makurdi metropolis showed a lot of University of Agriculture, Makurdi vehicles completely broken down or held by mechanics who claimed they had not been paid by the University. Since the Transport Office is directly under the Vice Chancellors Office, it is hoped that good management would have saved the University from such embarrassments. During the period between September 3, 1996 and September 3, 2001 there were alleged cases of poor maintenance of staff quarters and student hostels. Staff members who live in University accommodation paid economic rates and it was agreed that the monthly recoveries would be put into renovating the University houses, but it never happened. The maintenance of student hostels, some respondents alleged, was a conduit pipe through which money was siphoned from the system whereby most maintenance activities were done merely on paper. The issue of bitterness over promotion was the subject of strike action by academic staff of the University. It was possible for recommendations made by Departments and Colleges based on prevailing guidelines to be overturned by appointments and promotions committee and new guidelines set immediately for assessment of staff. The Vice Chancellor is the Chairman of this apex Committee.

The University of Agriculture, Makurdi was well known for financial crises leading to difficulties in payment of salaries, allowances, staff and contractors claims, disbursement of loans, etc as at when due. It was alleged that at the expiration of that Administration, the University was put in the red to the tune of more than half a billion naira. Most respondents in an interview claimed that the Ag. Bursar of the university was responsible for the financial recklessness in the system. However, others claimed as having heard the Ag. Bursar blames it on the fact that he was serving in acting capacity and there was a limit to the authority he could assert if he was still interested in his job. It was therefore clear that the Ag Bursar preferred to effectively play along than oppose the vice chancellor. What about the several court cases of staff against University Administration? Was the management style of the vice chancellor responsible? Most of the court cases bordered on disciplinary matters without due process and arbitrary termination of appointments. It is interesting to note that many of these staff members won their court cases and were restored. At the inception of the succeeding Administration most of the cases were settled out of court while those who were not happy with the out of court settlement terms were still in court.

A lecturer, for example, who was wrongly terminated came back and was paid salaries in excess of one million naira for doing nothing during the more than one year period. Some used the period of their termination to acquire higher degrees and upon reinstatement demanded for regrading. In the early days of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi staffs were accorded respect across counters in Banks. University LPOs were as good as cash and members of the public felt free to do business with University staff. It was alleged that during the period of this study, it was very common for salaries and other University cheques to bounce. Some Banks even refused customers from lodging University of Agriculture, Makurdi cheques into their bank accounts as the cheques were not worth more than the paper upon which they were written. Good management would mean that cheques issued by the University to staff and contractors were cash backed. Throughout the five year period, the management of the University was unable to organize convocation ceremonies. The effect of non issuance of certificates to students on account of no convocation cere-monies could only be imagined than told. Loss of jobs, staff audit and postgraduate admission problems, non registration with professional bodies, etc were the results.

All this governance issues associated with management style which was influenced by the Vice Chancellor himself and the In-group had the tendency of introducing a culture of ineptitude and non performance. Bartell (2003) defines university culture as the values and beliefs of internal stakeholders (that is, administrators, faculty, students, board members and support staff), based on tradition and communicated verbally and nonverbally. Values and beliefs are thought to greatly influence decision-making processes at universities (Bartell, 2003) and shape individual and organizational behaviors. Fralinger and Oslon (2007) states that

through observation of building architecture, campus facility maintenance, and student interactions and attire, one can tell a great deal about the university culture and those University leaders are increasingly becoming more aware of the concept of culture and its significant role in university change and development.

Culture can lead to successful governance through trust between managers and employees. An effective university culture teaches and exhibits appropriate behavior, motivates individuals, and governs information processing; these components of culture can shape internal relations and values. Strong values can give rise to beliefs about preferred modes of conduct and desirable objectives. The university can be thought of as an intricate web, where the role of managers is to link components of the web together, which include internal (domestic and foreign undergraduates to graduate, professional, and continuing education students) and external (those in the surrounding community, the political jurisdiction, granting and accrediting agencies, unions and the press) stakeholders that are diverse and play extra-ordinary roles. The vice chancellor was therefore unable to institute a desirable culture required of any university system.

The Vice Chancellor reports

To conclude discussion on this study, it becomes important to capture some aspects of the vice chancellors end of tenure report that are related to the study (UAM, 2001) as follows:

I was appointed vice-chancellor of University of Agriculture, Makurdi on 2 September, 1996. What is contained in this report represents what I encountered and the modest efforts that have gone into solve some of the problems.

Governance

By now, it is clear to every person concerned that in many areas of governance, no sound foundation was laid when the university changed over from being the campus of University of Jos to University of Agriculture, Makurdi. It appears that the perception that Universities of Agriculture were unique and different from the conventional universities was carried even to the level of governance and this was reflected in many areas of university governance. Examples are:

Recruitment: It appears university administration went all out to avoid recruiting staff from other universities in Nigeria. Most of the academic staff recruited this time, for example, came from research institutes, civil service, river basin authorities, Colleges of Education and Colleges of Agricul-

ture, that is, anywhere but conventional universities. In fact, when I assumed leadership of the university, I discovered that not more than three to four academic staff had held similar positions in other universities. This was to have profound effect on the relationship between students and academic Department on one hand and students and administration on the other hand. It was easy to make students believe that the vice-chancellor, for example controlled teaching and examination matters, whereas the correct position is that departments and colleges are responsible for planning, delivery and evaluation of their lectures with Senate only providing general guidelines and approval to matters emanating from colleges and departments. This was also to affect areas like the implementation of course credit system and general perception of the role of administration in University governance.

Composition of senate: For very strange reasons, profess-sors holding chairs in the university are not members of senate of university of Agriculture, Makurdi and since members of senate are literally appointees of the vice-chancellor this made it difficult to separate senate from the vice chancellor. To many staffs and students, decisions of senate, for example, were perceived as decisions of the vice chancellor. This contrasts sharply with the practice in other Nigerian Universities where all Professors holding chairs are members of senate and thus maximizing the decision-making powers of senate and also providing continuity, which senate needs badly.

Bursary: Between 1998 when the university was established, to the end of the life of the first administration of university of Agriculture, Makurdi, the university did not have a Bursar or even an acting Bursar. One of the principal accountants was made to perform the actions of an Acting Bursar for the period of seven (7) years. It is easy that the absence of an acting Bursar, let alone a substantive Bursar made it impossible for the Bursary to function properly. Even the basic elements of University financial administration like the use of vote book, store requisition were not in use. It was therefore no wonder that by September, 1996, the university was in arrears of preparation of final accounts for over two years. One can go on and on giving these examples. The system of governance that existed can best be described as a systemless system and this covered key areas like promotion, financial management, examinations regulations, etc.

Situation on ground when I assumed office as vice chancellor

The prevailing conditions in the university when the present administration assumed office on September 3, 1996 were

both pathetic and chaotic in terms of major components of university governance.

Staff: Administration inherited staff whose morale was very low due to alleged virtual neglect in terms of staff welfare provisions. Top university functionaries who had been appointed to direct the affairs of the university allegedly pre-occupied themselves with issues that would only perpetuate their offices to the neglect of staff welfare matters. Some staff appeared to owe allegiance to personalities rather than the university. Staff promotions were in some cases, stalled for many years. Transportation services to staff where they existed at all had collapsed, with the result that many staff resorted to reporting very late to duty. The junior staffs were the most hard hit since the university did not provide residential accommodation for this category of staff on campus or in the town. This situation created personnel instability arising from very high personnel turn-out. The effects were obvious. An acute shortage of manpower in vital areas like engineering, food technology, Mathematical Science, Agricultural Economics and Extension and administration was experienced. Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) embarked on strike from April, 1996 and by September, 1996, the academic life of the university had not yet been restored.

Students: The present administration inherited students without a leader or a forum to co-ordinate their activities. The students transition committee which was formed with members drawn from the colleges was not recognized by the generality of students. In addition to this, the prolonged ASUU strike had affected students badly. They had remained for months without teaching and learning. Many students subsequently resorted to employment of unorthodox means to pass their examinations. The failure rate was consistently very high. Others for want of counseling from their lecturers, indulged in anti-social practices such as cultism.

What was surprising was that many members of staff were confirmed to belong to these secret cults. The university campus and in particular, the students hostels were filled with cultists. In fact the University did not know the exact number of persons in the hostels. The danger posed by secret cult was real. The insecurity of life and property on the campus prevailed. This situation rendered proper admini-stration of students almost impossible. Following the violent students demonstration of June 11, 1994, some students were expelled on account of adverse security report on them. The affected students took the university to court and the matter was still in court in September, 1 996 when I assumed duty as Vice chancellor.

Absence of governing council: A major vacuum in university governance existed due to absence of governing

council between January 1, 1996 and September 3, 1996 when I assumed duty as vice-chancellor. This vacuum was to persist till July, 2000 before a governing council was constituted. The University Administration had to depend on approval and guidance of the Honorable Minister and the frequent changes at Garki, Abuja made it very difficult to get reasonable guidance, especially how to deal with disciplinary matters that had accumulated over the past one year or so. The fact that there was a prolonged delay in appointment of the vice chancellor and the deputy vice chancellor had acted as a vice chancellor for very long time, naturally a group of staff close to the acting vice chancellor resented my coming from outside formed cleavages to harass me out of office within six (6) months of my tenure. When this strategy failed, the same group resorted to advising me wrongly to mess me up and discredit my Administration.

As a father to all, I resorted to wooing the staff by appointing them as heads of department, directors, etc. It was under this scenario that I appointed (name withheld by the authors) and later (name withheld by the authors) as dean of students; (name withheld by the authors) as director of centre for food and agricultural strategy (cefAS) and as head of department, Agricultural Economics and merged two directorates and appointed (name withheld by the authors) as the head. These wooing gestures were, how-ever, never reciprocated as this group of staff has continued to appose my administration in anyway possible.

Relations with the communities in the catchment area: Despite the fact that the university has a mandate to cover many areas in its catchment area, the relationship between the university and the host community prior to the present administration was anything but cordial.

This strained relationship led to incessant cases of theft on the campus, especially on the university farm. Open hostilities often occurred between the host community and the university even at government level. Cordial relationship with the rest of the catchment areas outside the host community was almost nonexistent. The presence of the University was not felt to the extent that most government agencies and people in the catchment state believed that the University of Agriculture, Makurdi had no relevance to their communities.

This was the prevailing scenario at university of Agriculture, Makurdi, when I assumed duty as vice-chancellor on 3 September, 1996.

Steps taken

In order fully address the unsatisfactory conditions I met on ground, I quickly introduced marching management techniques that would rectify the maze and pave way for rapid development and progress of the University. These

techniques are:

Administration; open door philosophy: Confronted with the uphill task of restoring confidence in staff and students, the host community and the general catchment area of the university, mobilizing all human and material resources available towards purposeful development of the university, I deliberately adopted open door policy of administration. The doors to my office and residence were literally open to all and sundry without discrimination despite repeated security advice to the contrary.

By this gesture, I extended the hand of friendship to all sections of the university community and accorded individual members of staff and students the freedom to make their views on the administration of the University known without fear of intimidation or reprisal. The open-door policy is a style of administration in which the vice chancellor lends a listening ear to all and sundry in his desire that no single member of the community suffers psychologically because of lack of access to administration to express his or her worries or even emotions. Accordingly, I institutionalized open door policy of administration in the following ways:

1. Principal officers meeting

Since assumption of duty in September, 1996, I have held over 175 meetings of principal officers at which major issues of University governance are tabled and discussed. Principal officers of the university utilize this forum to discuss issues affecting general administration of colleges, department and units and from time to time, invite university functionaries who have contributions to make-on such matters.

2. Committee of deans and directors (CDD)

Over 75 meetings of the committee of deans and directors have been held since my assumption of duty in September, 1996 to look at critical matters affecting the smooth administration of the University. Deans and Directors utilize the freedom afforded them at this forum to speak on any issue of relevance to University governance and useful suggestions are usually made for onward transmission to Senate or direct implementation by Administration.

3. Senate

The university senate is a functional organ in the administration of any university. Since September, 1996, over *55* meetings of senate have been held where all academic matters and general issues pertaining to the administration of the University are discussed. Membership of senate include Deans, Directors, Heads of Department,

representatives of congregation, professors, etc which caters for the variety of issues that the wisdom of senate has to address in the overall interest of the university. Mr. chairman, senate under this administration has been meeting at the rate of 2 times a month. The vice chancellor routinely reports on cash received from the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and rural development, contract awards and progress of work on each one; reports on Committee of Vice Chancellors and other meetings of principal officers and the committee of deans and directors meetings.

4. Congregation

My administration has regularized meetings of congregation which draws its membership from all members of staff who possess recognized university degrees. This forum serves as another vital avenue for congregation to elect its representatives to council, senate and other committees in a democratic process of free and fair elections. The university administration has always found the views expressed by members of congregation useful in the running of the University.

5. Formation of UAM parents-teachers association

Sequel to the students' rampage of 24 and 26 January, 1999 and the outcome of the report of senate panel on the rampage, concerned parents of students of the university visited the vice chancellor. The dire need for a standing parents-teachers association for University of Agriculture, Makurdi (UAM) came to the fore during the dialogue that took place between the parents and Administration. Consistent with our open-door policy, the university administration inaugurated a committee to ensure the formation of University of Agriculture, Makurdi, parents-teachers association as a means of involving parents and teachers, at that level, in the life-styles and education of their children in the University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Both parents and teachers have applauded this innovation in University governance.

6. Outreach to other catchment areas

Realizing that we have mandate to cover as many areas in our zone as possible, we have embarked on visits to areas outside our immediate catchment areas to familiarize them with the mission and mandate of University of Agriculture, Makurdi (UAM). This has taken us to palaces of the Emir of Lafia in Nasarawa State, the Chiefs in Shendam and Lantang; Emir of Wase in Plateau State as well as Aku Uka of Wukari in Taraba State. Feedbacks we have been receiving from these areas are very, very encouraging. All of them lamented that they were made to believe that UAM had no relevance to their communities. In all cases, they requested for establishment of farm centres in their

localities. We have gone into dialogue with the Government of Benue State for the take over of Yandev Agricultural Research Extension and Otobi farm centre. These had been envisaged to serve as research centres for the university to better cover the different cropping zones. It is also my belief that the university needs to have its presence felt at the old Riyom Agricultural Centre in Plateau State. During our short tenure, we have received the host state government and we remain grateful to them for the modest achievements we have made which were outlined in my address on the occasion of the 10th Anniversary of the University. We still remain aware of our national area and today, Mr. Chairman, this University is by far the most nationalistic of all the Universities of Agriculture as was testified by the Federal Character Commission at Abuja.

The bursary

The bursary department was also not spared in the numerous problems that infested the various units of the university. Perhaps it is necessary to point out here that since its inception, the University of Agriculture, Makurdi has never had a university bursar. As one of the most sensitive units of the university, there was an urgent need to see to it that bursary department was quickly re-organized to address the problems that hindered its smooth operations and subsequent adequate discharge of its functions to the university.

   Among the glaring problems noticed in the department included sizeable cash payments for services rendered, prevalent culture of IOUs which outstanding amount totaled fourteen million naira (N14m), non-preparation of final accounts by more than two years and the non-introduction of the Unified Accounting System (UAS) was not adopted at all! In view of these lapses, I set up two Com-mittees and their findings and recommendations enabled me to re-organize the bursary with re-sounding success in the following, among others:

(1) Institutionalization of the culture of payment by cheque of all amounts exceeding N50.00.
(2) Bringing the final account up to date.
Institutionalization of and the adoption of the vote book and store requisition voucher system;
(3) Institutionalization of internal budget hearing sessions to allow concerned units have a say in arrangement of funds allocated to them; and
(4) Computerization of the Bursary Department.

Let it be known that the introduction of these changes was not aimed at criticizing or discrediting any one but to bring the Bursary into conformity with the existing guidelines. It is also my intension to commence preparation of final account for the 2000/2001 financial year as soon as the books are

closed at the end of June, this year with a view of completing the auditing of these accounts before I leave in September.

Funding; A word on funding

The University depends nearly entirely on subventions from Federal Government through the Federal Ministry of Agriculture. One interesting feature of budgeting is that Vice Chancellors of Universities of Agriculture are all allowed to defend their budget up to Federal Ministry of Finance level. This is not true of other Universities in the country. It is no wonder that the Universities of Agriculture were better funded than conventional Universities and Universities of Technology under National Universities Commission (NUC). Since the coming of democracy, funding to Universities, especially to Universities of Agriculture has taken a turn for the worse as money received is inadequate to pay salaries let alone for services; I would like to hope that now that government is completing actions aimed at returning of sanity to our University system, by instituting Visitation Panels for all Federal Universities, appointing Governing Councils to all Universities and granting University autonomy to our University, the issue of funding will be adequately addressed.

Strikes

One cannot conclude this report without a word about strike. Infact, one cannot say anything about University of Agriculture, Makurdi (UAM) without referring to some strike or demonstration. The University has experienced more strikes than most Universities twice its age. Each Union has honored all calls for national strike with vigor that is characteristic only of this University. The students, for example, hold the most unenviable record for the most violent demonstrations in history of students' unionism in Nigeria. History of all the demonstrations and strikes will reveal the following scenario:

(1) After the strike or demonstration, everyone is at loss as to the real reasons for the mayhem. The reasons advanced are so stupid that even the perpetrators of the riot are ashamed of stating them;
(2) They always have an external component;
(3) They revolve around money or power;
(4) No one is ever really punished;

Soon after the culprits are identified, there arises a do not punish committee both internal and external to the university, to ensure that no one is punished; and they will go to any extent to ensure this.

I am worried

Much earlier in my career as an academic, I realized the untold harm that the military in government has inflicted on the affairs of this nation. In one of my speeches in this University, I had a cause to say that, the greatest harm the military in government has inflicted to Nigerian nationhood is not that they have looted the nation's treasury; they have! It is not even that they have destroyed the customs; yes they have. But to my mind, the greatest harm the military in government has inflicted on Nigeria, especially the Nigerian university system is, they have made us to believe anything and everything is possible. I also said then that, sooner or later, someone will come along willing to throw enough funds at Nigerian University system as President Obasanjo's government is doing now; the indiscipline prevalent in our University will be more difficult to overcome. Indiscipline is at the foot of every important problem I have encountered as Vice Chancellor of University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Sadly enough, in my four and half years as vice chancellor of University of Agriculture, Makurdi, I have seen no much tool that has helped me to effectively fight this monster. For without discipline, no meaningful learning or research can take place in any institution. Mr. Chairman, Sir, one can give it any name, intimidation, harassment, tribalism and anti-South or anti-North, records will show that no act of indiscipline has been reported to this Administration and we failed to take all the approved measures at disposal. Let me express my deep appreciation to all those who gave me moral support to fight lawlessness in this University. This is the challenge I will like to leave for council and the next administration. Praise belongs to almighty God! I thank you all and may God bless you".

   The report of the vice chancellor corroborates the findings of this study and further provides a balanced view as it reflects an attempt to explain the role of groups, manage-ment style and associated governance issues during the period. The lessons from the report clearly indicates that the universities as autonomous entities are assuming many of the gover-nance responsibilities previously held by the government even though they are still being regulated by the government or governmental bodies. The universities are now also held accountable for their behavior in new ways: they must respond appropriately to the needs of society; they must demonstrate that the public funds they receive are being responsibly used; and they must maintain standards of excellence in teaching, research and extension, the primary mission and mandate of the universities. Increased autonomy and the accompanying accountability would bring about many changes which mark a shift away from traditional modes of academic self-government in a closed community of scholars. New models of governance that redistribute responsibility, accountability, and decision-making power among the respective external

and internal stakeholders must be adopted for increased productivity. There has been an inference in public discourses that universities need greater business compe-tency and corporate style management in their management and governance structures. Some canvass that professional management experts be appointed to manage universities while the professors should concentrate on imparting knowledge to their students. However, where there are problems in the management and decision-making processes within universities necessitating such thinking, it has been the failure of senior management to consult appropriately or to present information in a truly transparent manner. Improvements in university governance will come through improved participation of internal stake-holders (staff and students) and by improving transparency, building better participatory structures with staff and students, and redefining external membership of governing councils to encompass a wider range and diversity of stakeholders and communities.

CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATION

In the course of the study, it has been found that:

(1) The management style adopted by the vice chancellor of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi between the period September 3, 1996 to September 3, 2001 was characterized by Ano concern for production and no concern for people@.
(2) There is a relationship between the management style and the various groups influences. The study concludes that the management style adopted was traceable to the vice chancellor himself and the in-group
(3) There is a relationship between the management style and the various problems associated with university governance, which problems bedeviled the university during the period with attendant carryover effects.

The study recommends that administrative experience should not be based on listing of positions held in curriculum vitae or resumes but proven and verifiable statements of how well persons in management positions have performed in such exalted positions of governance. Having served as a vice chancellor should not be the basis for appointment into higher positions especially if there was no significant value addition during the tenure of such individuals.

REFERENCES

Aina OI (2002). Alternative Modes of Financing Higher Education in Nigeria and the Implications for University Governance. Afr. Dev. 27(1-2): 236-262.
Akpa A, Angahar P (1999). Essentials of Research Methodology. Aboki Publishers - A Division of Aboki Holdings Ltd, Ilupeju, Lagos, Nigeria.

Ayatse JOI (2000). MGS 601 - Management Practice Lecture Notes for MBA Students. Department of Business Management, Benue State University, Makurdi.

Bartell M (2003). Internationalization of universities: a university culture-based framework. Higher Educ. 45: 43-70.

Bowerman BL, O'Connell RT, Orris JB (2004). Essentials of business statistics. North America: McGraw-Hall.

Durand J, Pujadas C (2004). Self-Assessment of Governance Teams in an Argentine Private University: Adapting to Difficult Times. J. Tertiary Educ. Manage. 10 (1): 27-44

Ekong EE (2001). Management Styles In Nigerian Universities Under Military Rule And The Challenges Of Democracy: How Democratic Can University Management Be? http://www.aau.org/studyprogram/pdfiles/Ekong.pdf

Fralinger B, Oslon V (2007). Organizational Culture at the University Level: A Study Using the OCAI Instrument. J. College Teach. Learn. 4(11): 85-98

Garland JC (2004). 2004 State of the University Address. Autumn Semester 2004 and the kickoff of Miami University's 196th academic year.

Hellriegel D, Slocum JW (1996). Management. 7th Edition. South - Western College Publishing. USA.

Irtwange SV (2002). Impact of Management Style on Academic Staff Performance: Case Study of University of Agriculture, Makurdi. An unpublished MBA project. Department of Business Management, Benue State University, Makurdi - Nigeria.

Koontz H, O=donnel C, Weihrich H (1984). Management. McGraw-Hill International Book Company, Japan.

Lizzio A, Wilson K (2009). Student participation in university governance: the role conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on departmental committees. J. Stud. Higher Educ. 34 (1): 69 – 84.

McGregor D (1960). The Human Side of the Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill. pp. 33-58.

Melo AI, Sarrico CS, Radnor Z (2008). Research design for analysing the relationship between governance structures and performance management systems in universities. Reflecting Educ. 4 (2): 68-81.

Osuala EE (1993). Introduction to Research Methodology. Africana FEP Publishers, Nigeria.

Rasmussen JG (2000). Changes in Organizing and Managing Research in Universities: Reconstruction or Rediscovery. J. Tertiary Educ. Manage. 6(4): 271-287.

Robbins SP (2000). Organizational Behavior. 9th Edition. Asoke K. Ghosh, Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd, M-97, Connaught Circus, New Delhi - 110001.

Robinson JP, Shaver PR (1973). Measures of psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Sainta W, Hartnettb TA, Strassnerc E (2003). Higher Education in Nigeria: A Status Report. Higher Educ. Policy (16): 259-281.

Shattock M (2003). Re-Balancing Modern Concepts of University Governance. Higher Educ. Q. 56(3): 235-244.

UAM (2001). The Vice Chancellor (name withheld by authors) Reports. September 1996 - September 2001. Information and Publications Unit. University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Onaivi Printing and Publishing Company Ltd., Makurdi, Nigeria.

Vieira da Motta M, Bolan V (2008). Academic and Managerial Skills of Academic Deans: A self-assessment perspective. J. Tertiary Educ. Manage. 14(4): 303-316.

Wu WY (2005). Business research methods (2nd ed.) Taiwan: Hwa Tai Publishing.

Mollis M, Marginson S (2002). The Assessment of Universities in Argentina and Australia: Between Autonomy and Heteronomy. Higher Educ. 43(3): 311-330.

Neave G (1998). Collegiality: to resist or to reform? IAU Newsl., May. 44(1): 3.

Nur-Awaleh MA, Mtegha DM (2005). Shared Governance and Leadership in African Universities: Experiences from Mzuzu University, Malawi, and Amoud University, Somaliland. Afr. Dev. 30 (1-2): 34-52.