



DELEGATION: A TOOL FOR LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Violet Amiso ALASOMUKA
Department of Educational Management
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This study discussed delegation as an important tool for leadership effectiveness in Higher Education institutions. The study identified allocation of activities, assigning of responsibilities and position power/authority of delegate as constituents of delegation, crucial to leadership effectiveness. Three research questions and three null hypotheses guided the study. A target population of 200 academic staff members in two Higher Education Institutions in Rivers State was used. The two universities include Ignatius Ajuru University of Education Rumuolumeni and Rivers State University all in Port Harcourt. The simple random sampling technique was used to select 60 respondents. A questionnaire titled Delegation and Leadership Effectiveness in Higher Education institutions (DALEIHEI) was used to collect data from respondents. With the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21, descriptive statistics was used to answer the research questions. ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses. The study found out that delegating responsibility to staff members affords the leader more time to attend to other responsibilities saddled with the position and so is able to meet up targets thereby achieving institutional goals interpreted to be effectiveness. The study concluded that delegating assignments to staff members go a long way in helping a leader have an appreciable performance in the management of an institution. It therefore suggested that to achieve effectiveness in the management of higher education institution, the leader must delegate to staff members and then follow up with supervision.

Keywords: Leadership, Effectiveness, Delegation, Activities, Allocation, Responsibility, Assignment, Position Power, Delegate, Higher Education Institution.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Alasomuka, V. A. (2020). Delegation: A Tool for Leadership Effectiveness in Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management*, 2(1), 1-16.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of leadership in the management of institutions especially the higher education institutions can never be over emphasized because the responsibility of making the world better economically, socially, financially and otherwise to a great extent lies on the shoulders of these institutions. Therefore, the leadership of such institutions must be viewed and handled with great care and seriousness. The success or otherwise of an institution mirrored through the performance of the leader lies on leadership. In the opinion of Kotter (2012) leadership is viewed as a change agent and so it was advised that institutions of higher learning based on their objectives of transformation of not just the individual but also the larger society, must view institutional leadership as very important. The vice-chancellor as an academic leader represents the institution in all its official dealings. He is also in charge of providing the needed energy to set the institution on track; energy born out of deep seated personal conviction translated to motivating and building excitement in staff members. As a result, the leader is viewed to be a creator, executor and sustainer of ideas making his position very crucial to institutional success. In institutions of higher learning, leadership is basically a service or a channel through which educational objectives can be translated to achievement. The extent to which academic leadership in the universities yields to the prevailing ideology of management in particular and the implications for the concept of leadership itself was explored by Flanigan (2017).

Leadership at the institutional level was discussed in the context of higher education institutions having a general drive for increased efficiency and to develop strategies to arriving at various forms of quality assurance engineered by the vice-chancellor who is seen as the leader in this case and so is regarded as responsible for setting the key values and direction of the institution. Furthermore, the need to project higher education institutions as agents of change and transformation in the society gives the leadership the responsibility to make important decisions. Decisions that will affect not only the leadership but also the followership such as the students, the staff, the immediate and extended community and also other stakeholders on different things that concern them. Major decisions on resource generation and allocation, acquisitions, investments and disposals, recruitment and enrolment procedures, developing reward and punishment systems of academic and other staff including students, about the creation, closure and merger of departments, and about external roles and relationships among others are expected to be championed by the leader. On this premise, it is clear that the leadership of higher education is actually cumbersome and so for leaders in these institutions to succeed, they must apply some principles that will make their leadership effective one of which is the application of the principle of delegation. The leader definitely needs the support of other key members of staff to carry on effectively because going by all that have been enumerated, a single person called 'the leader' cannot attend to all (Allio, 2012).

The concept of leadership by delegation is therefore important in this study because the success of any institution of higher learning depends not only on the vision of the leader but also the cooperation and collective performance of the other staff members to achieve set goals of the institution. Cliffs (2010) saw delegation as the downward transfer of authority from a leader to the led. For the purpose of meeting set targets hence achieving institutional goals, institutional leaders today are encouraged to delegate authority which is the practice of empowering staff members making them feel free to contribute ideas and do their jobs in the best possible ways without inhibitions. Delegation helps increase performance as a lot of tasks are attended to simultaneously by different staff members hence increase in productivity translated to effectiveness for in the absence

of delegation, leaders tend to do all the work themselves and consequently delayed in achieving set goals.

BACKGROUND

The university as an institution of higher learning is constantly plagued with the challenge of good leadership and this has in more ways than one negatively impacted on the success of higher education institutions. The need for effective leadership in higher education institutions cannot be overemphasized as such institutions are set up to meet not just needs of individuals but also state, national, international and global needs. Leadership in higher education does not only prepare the institution for the future but also seeks to achieve quality in productivity as it provides the platform for enabling every staff member in the institution to develop a sense of belonging to a shared vision, imbibe a culture of innovation and continual advancement and having a feeling of responsibility in taking steps to ensure commendable contribution of their full potentials towards the vision of the institution and their work (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). The challenges of institutions of higher learning especially in the developing countries need better leadership to handle the pressures on them.

Institutions of higher learning must tackle the challenges they encounter by having what is called effective leadership. It is a known fact that regardless of how good a vision is and how brilliant its design is, without an effective leadership in place, it will not see the light of day (Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber 2009). As a result of its dependence on the professional competence of individuals, institutions of higher learning need a special system of leadership and effective leadership has been seen as the answer to institutional effectiveness. In the opinion of Blackmore (2011) without strong and effective leadership, no system of higher education institutional management can be effective. He points out that it is the responsibility of the leader, not only to express the concerns of the institution but also to give direction as the learning community looks up to the leader for direction. Therefore, the leader is the most important element in the driving of effective institutional governance (Blackmore, 2011). Becker (2013) identified the centrality of appropriate leadership in advancing an ethos of professionalism as leaders take on new responsibilities in the management of higher education institutions. Leaders should be keen on developing strategies to meeting targets through allocating activities, assigning responsibilities and giving position power and authority to members of staff in order to enhance productivity in the management of institutions of higher learning. All these can be smoothly and easily achieved if the leader applies the principle of delegation whereby other staff members are given a platform to contribute to the achievement of institutional goals.

Theories related to delegation and effectiveness has been propounded by different scholars in the leadership of institutions. McClelland (1988) used the needs theory to address achievement and power as important factors to consider in leadership by delegation. McClelland said that individuals with a strong desire to achieve usually derive satisfaction by asking for, accepting and performing credibly with tasks that are challenging. Therefore, members of staff who are eager to take up responsibilities which require creativity, ingenuity and hard work are referred to as achievement driven people. It has been observed that achievement driven staff members are always associated with a strong desire for improving their work situations by taking up more challenging tasks and working hard to achieve success because they feel fulfilled when the outcomes of their efforts are directly correlated with success. When staff members who are

achievement driven are given challenging tasks to accomplish, they become more productive as their expertise is considered and they are given authority to take decisions on the job and their enhanced productivity in turn provides for leadership effectiveness.

Also, there are those that have a strong desire to be in control of others' behavior to make them do things. Staff members who fall in this group are said to be power driven workers who do well in tasks that require teams to perform. Those in this group are very committed to their work as long as they are overseeing a group in performing a task. The mere act of having control over others and taking decisions over situations makes such persons accept related responsibilities and works tirelessly even in the face of risks, executing tasks and consequently discharging responsibilities. This gives them fulfillment hence their giving the institution enhanced quality productivity which translates to leadership effectiveness. Consequently, the assertions of this theory played out positively as they developed a process on how delegation should be carried out and so helped the study to carry out investigations on delegation and how it tells on leadership effectiveness.

Purpose of the study

This study sought to establish the fact that delegation is an effective tool to leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions. It specifically aimed at examining:

- The relationship between activity allocation and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions
- The relationship between assignment of responsibilities and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions
- The relationship between position power/authority and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

- What is the relationship between activity allocation and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions?
- What is the relationship between assignment of responsibilities and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions?
- What is the relationship between position power/authority and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions?

Hypotheses

To further guide the study, the following null hypotheses were formulated:

- There is no significant relationship between activity allocation and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions?

- There is no significant relationship between assignment of responsibilities and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions?
- There is no significant relationship between position power/authority and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions

CONJECTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

Delegation as a tool for leadership effectiveness

Delegation refers to the act of giving control, authority, a job, and or duty to another person. It is the act of empowering another to act on behalf of one Webster Dictionary editorial team and Gove (2002). It is the giving of acting right, decision making right and performing right to another by a leader to achieve institutional goals. According to Gardner (2011) when provided with an opportunity to exercise self-direction and control through delegation, the staff member feels highly honored to be considered able, task competent and administratively important, and therefore works to prove the leadership right to have given him or her such opportunity. It can be seen here that certain levels of decisions can be taken without having to wait for the leader as flexibility is provided through delegation and this also offers a chance for self-direction of the staff members. Members of staff feel a deeper sense of responsibility and ownership of the institution when delegated to do something.

Delegation is an avenue for recognizing positive contributions of staff members by the leader who uses the opportunity to try out some new growth producing behaviors. Delegation in this study is looked at from the perspective of activity allocation, assignment of responsibilities and position power/ authority. Leadership effectiveness on the other hand refers to the successful influence over a workgroup by an individual who influences others despite the pressures from external and internal forces for the purpose of achieving institutional goals through the coordinated efforts of those who are led. This means that for influence to occur there must be some form of formal control of one person over a group of persons whose purpose for being influenced is for goals or pre-set targets to be achieved. Therefore, it goes to say that a team of people can be led to better coordinate their efforts.

Activities Allocation

A system by which institutions group activities into smaller units and make more persons feel and become responsible for carrying out such activities is known as delegation Bryan (2010). In the management and leadership of higher education institutions, delegation is practiced through the allocation of activities Fidler, Russel and Simkins (1997). This is done by decentralizing focal points of clustered activities. In the opinion of Chandan (1999), giving lower level staff members the consideration to make certain decisions relative to their roles and within the institution as a result of decentralization, they become more responsible and dedicated to their work as they feel honored in being given a level of authority to act on behalf of the institution. Again, they derive pleasure from the freedom given to them to make decisions which gives them a feeling of status and recognition resulting in loyalty, commitment and a sense of belonging. This affirms the fact that delegation of responsibilities through the allocation of activities positively impacts on performance because lower level staff members who are empowered to

make certain level decisions feel recognized thereby feeling important to contribute to the success of the institution and therefore may not want to disappoint the leadership that gave the authority. When this happens, the concerned staff members become proactive and open to new innovations which of course help in personal development. In delegation, the problem of administrative work over load is tackled because the work meant for the leader alone is by this system, distributed to and carried out by many persons.

Delegating authority according to Lunenburg (2010) indicates that there will be fewer tiers in the administrative structure of the institution. The span of control will be wider, and ideas will flow not just from top-to-bottom but bottom-to-top. An institution with a conventional practice will have flow of ideas and decision making from top-to-bottom and these ideas and decisions are then passed down to be enforced through rigid tiers of command which ultimately slows down performance and productivity because the lower level will always wait to receive instructions from the higher level before performing any task which would have been otherwise if they are empowered to take responsibility and perform tasks that are beneficial to the institution because then tasks will be performed with speed and precision to achieve institutional goals. For example, if a lower level staff member who is well experienced in attending to the needs of students is allocated the activities saddled with students' welfare then the leader will not be constantly tensed in expecting a riot breakout from the students because the staff assigned to that is taking charge and therefore the school or the leadership of the institution will not experience students' unrest. If there is no students' unrest, set goals will be achieved and if set goals are achieved then there will be institutional success which mirrors leadership effectiveness. Leadership of higher education institutions experience flexibility and speed in operations when it applies the principle of delegation as members of staff are given some level of authority to attend to some problems thereby stopping the flow of every problem to the top before a decision could be taken for resolution Musaazi (1998). In this case, delegation permits the making of decisions and action taking with speed and precision.

Assignment of responsibilities

Assigning responsibilities to individual or collective members of staff is an integral part of delegation. Regardless of the institution based on the position of a staff member, either upward or downward delegation from the leadership is required by the staff because as Carsten, Uhl-Bien, West and Patera (2010) observed, it is an integral part of the schedule of every member of staff. It is conventionally more common to assign responsibilities from bottom to down because the concept of delegating upwards is not popular. Assigning responsibilities help the leadership of an institution to harness the hidden potentials of staff members to benefit the institution as it is used to tap into the skills and resources not immediately visible within a staff or a group. When responsibilities are assigned to individuals or groups of workers, leaders burn out will be avoided, tasks will be performed, there will be less dependence on leaders for decision making and action taking slowing down productivity, team performance will be enhanced because everyone will have a sense of belonging and so feel responsible for the success of the institution by which actions skills development will be enabled.

Assigning responsibilities provides a platform which leads to a systematic identification and development of leadership skills for future assignments and tasks. It provides an opportunity for talented and skilled members of staff to take up advanced roles and bigger responsibilities.

Assigning responsibilities provides platforms for staff to develop skills they originally do not have because in order to prove their competence in the assigned role, efficient staff member will go the extra mile to learn how to perform the role assigned to him and then get better at the job so much that he can begin to carry out a super-ordinate's responsibility where such super-ordinate does not have the required time to do it. When responsibilities are assigned, the leader is left with more time to plan and coordinate to enhance productivity. The leader actually exploits the expertise of the staff where he lacks expertise and still save his time when he delegates by assigning responsibilities. New and different responsibilities leads to staff members being spurred for enhanced productivity as the load of responsibility is more equally shared among more staff members and so they become more aware of the broad functioning of the institution (Student Organization Centre, 2003). With delegation, staff productivity is increased as they better understand the workings of the institution. The leader's act of delegating by assigning responsibilities simply reveals his confidence and trust on the staff to deliver and so the staff reciprocates by developing a constructive sense of responsibility. Tasks are performed quickly and efficiently when responsibilities are assigned to staff that have the technical know-how.

It has been observed that the desire for self-esteem and needs fulfillment motivate members of staff to contribute more towards achieving the objectives of the institution. Therefore, staff members get the freedom to self-direct their activities and assume responsibilities for self-fulfillment. When members of staff are given a voice in the affairs of the school through the assigning of responsibilities, they develop a sense of ownership of the institution and this makes them pour their being into their work which results to quick and efficient performance.

Position power/authority

The power or authority one is allowed to exercise over others in a work environment by reason of the office the person holds in an organization (institution) is referred to as position power. It is also called legitimate power because it is backed up by the legal authority placed on the office of the officer so it can be said to be an authority delegated to the office holder by a formal constitution of an institution. The success of an institution especially that of higher education is determined not by structures and technologies but by the people working in it because the quality of the products (students) to a large extent is dependent on their input Kyarimpa (2010). On this note if an assignment is given to a member of staff that has no position power to drive the assignment, tasks will not be performed hence non achievement of institutional goals but if assignments are given to those with position power to make things happen, instructions will be followed to the latter by subordinates who will be cautious not to go against rules and regulations especially of insubordination thereby always ready to perform tasks to meet set targets and achieve institutional goals. Higher education institutions are constantly seeking for improvement as the need to meet global challenges through their objectives keep rising as a result, there is the rising need also for competent hands that are highly charged and motivated to care for the products (students). Members of staff in higher education institutions should be empowered with position power because they are the reservoir of knowledge and so are central to the competitive advantage of the institution and because they are people of no mean education, they are usually more critical to the development and execution of strategies Kyarimpa (2010).

To achieve institutional goals, a leader must engage the members of staff with position power especially because institutions today have gone beyond autocratic and bureaucratic

structures but are now characterized by flat hierarchical structures and multi-skilled workforce. The teaching, learning and researching exercise which is the bane of higher education institutions is lubricated by the oil of empowerment and institutional success today is highly related to the empowerment of talented human capital. Empowering staff members with position power gives the leader a broader orientation that leaves him with more time to focus on other emerging opportunities. A basic characteristic of a successful leader is shared leadership which by interpretation means delegation where every member of the group is responsible for the achievement of goals and a characteristic of a successful institution is that staff members are significantly empowered with decision making and task executing authority. This results into strong growth potential of members of staff, effectiveness of the leader and success of the institution. Being given authority (position power) alongside responsibility according to Bryan (2010) makes the job most pleasurable. In the opinions of Gebremedhin and Schaeffer (1999) when members of staff have no power of control over situations they feel out of place and become stressed. As talents are recognized and enhanced through the delegation of position power, staff members are self-motivated to stretch beyond their normal performance rate because they have the authority to take decisions on the tasks allocated to them as supervisors.

Leadership Effectiveness

A successful exercise arrived at through the coordinated efforts of staff members by the influence of an individual, which results in accomplishing one or several goals is referred to as leadership effectiveness. By this it can be assumed that for influence to occur there must be some form of formal control by an individual over a group of individuals who have a common pre-set target to accomplish. It also assumes that a team of staff members can be led to better coordinate their efforts and for a leader to be able to exert such influence on others, he must have control and be in charge because it is only then that he can achieve pre-set goals. However, though the earliest studies on leadership focused on the leader as an individual vested with the authority to do and undo, more recent studies have found out that leadership especially in institutions of higher learning is not about an individual but a process by which an individual coordinates or influences others to carry out activities designed to achieve institutional goals. Therefore effective leadership in institutions of higher learning is no longer dependent on a single individual called the leader but on the processes employed by the individual to make other members of staff willing to partner in the pursuit of institutional goals achievement (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm & Mckee, 2014).

This more recent focus on the concept of leadership effectiveness has made more sense to devolve some parts of the leadership role to individual team members who have the expertise or ability to perform them which is leadership by delegation. Leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions can also be seen from the angle of how well the leader is able to direct the activities of the members of staff through proper delegation. By this the members of staff are allowed to take initiatives and set their own targets and goals by determining their mode of operation in performing tasks to achieve goals. This process certainly encourages self-direction and only needs proper supervision to stay on track. Again, leadership effectiveness is seen from the leader's ability to coordinate the efforts of the members of staff both as individuals and as a team of workers or a workgroup. Here, the leader identifies the skills and abilities of individual staff members, groups them into teams and delegates accordingly so that individuals work in

well-coordinated, cooperative, efficient and effective ways to get tasks done thereby giving minimal or no room for leader intervention because delegation is done by recognizing technical expertise.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Demographic Profile

For the purpose of this study, the target population consists of academic members of staff of Higher Education institutions within two (2) universities in Rivers State. The two universities include Ignatius Ajuru University of Education Rumuolumeni and Rivers State University all in Port Harcourt. The total population was estimated at 200 academic staff. A sample of 60 academic staff members was used as sample size for the study. Demographic information of respondents was obtained by the use of a self-designed instrument titled Delegation and Leadership Effectiveness in Higher Education institutions (DALEIHEI) Questionnaire. It was revealed through the respondents' information that delegating authority by allocating activities, assigning responsibilities and position power of delegates, a leader can achieve effectiveness in the management of Higher Education institutions.

Instrumentation

A 20 - item instrument was developed to measure leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions through the principle of delegation. On a four point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 4 (totally agree), participants were asked to indicate their opinion level on the relationship between delegation and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions. This scale was made up of activities allocation, assignment of responsibilities, position power of delegate and their relationship with leadership effectiveness. The instrument was in two parts of 'A' and 'B'. Section 'A' of the instrument was developed to obtain demographic information on the respondents viz-a-viz Gender, Age, Number of years in service and status as academic staff while section 'B' addressed the variables under study.

Data Analysis

Data collected on this study was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. With the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), descriptive statistics was used for the data analysis where the data was presented by use of mean and standard deviation. The hypotheses were tested using ANOVA.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between activity allocation and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions?

Table 1: Answer to Research Question one

S/N	item	N	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Staff work optimally when activities are allocated to them	60	2.4167	.88857	Disagree
2.	Staff feel responsible for institutional success if activities are allocated to them	60	2.7833	1.19450	Agree
3.	Staff feel recognized when they are given specific tasks to perform	60	2.7167	1.13633	Agree
4.	Staff are motivated to meet targets with activities given to them.	60	2.1667	.80605	Disagree
5.	Staff are always willing to outperform because of specific tasks given to them	60	2.0000	1.14980	Disagree
Total		60	2.41		

Table 1 above shows in item 1 that the respondents disagreed that they work optimally when activities are allocated to them, with mean score of 2.42 and SD .889. In item 2, mean score of 2.72 and STD 1.196 shows that the respondents agreed that staff feel responsible for institutional success if activities are allocated to them. Item 3, mean score of 2.72 and STD 1.136 indicates that respondents equally agreed that staff feel recognized when they are given specific tasks to perform. Item 4, mean score of 2.17 and STD .8051 indicate that the respondents disagreed that staff are motivated to meet targets with activities given to them. Item 5 mean score of 2.000 and STD 1.149 shows that the respondents disagreed that staff are always willing to outperform because of specific tasks given to them.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between assignment of responsibilities and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions?

Table 2: Answer to Research Question 2

S/N	item	N	Mean	SD	Remark
6.	Staff feel fulfilled when handling responsibilities given to them.	60	1.1000	.30253	Disagree
7.	Staff learn more and perform better when given responsibilities	60	2.6500	1.17639	Agree
8.	Being assigned responsibility makes staff feel responsible for achievement	60	1.7833	1.05913	Disagree
9.	Individual skills are harnessed through the assignment of responsibilities.	60	2.7833	1.99305	Agree
10.	Workload is reduced as it is shared through delegation of responsibilities.	60	2.6000	1.46212	Agree
Total		60	2.18		

Table 2 above showing item 6 with mean score of 1.1000 and STD of .30253 indicates that the respondents do not agree with the fact that staff feel fulfilled when handling responsibilities given to them. Item 7 with a mean score of 2.6500 and STD 1.17639 shows that the respondents are not in agreement with the fact that Staff learn more and perform better when given responsibilities. With a mean score of 1.7833 and STD 1.05913 item 8 shows that the respondents disagreed that being assigned responsibility makes staff feel responsible for achievement. Item 9 having a mean score of 2.7833 and STD 1.99305 shows that the respondents

agreed that individual skills are harnessed through the assignment of responsibilities. In item 10, mean score of 2.60 and STD 1.46212 the respondents agreed that workload is reduced as it is shared through delegation of responsibilities.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between position power/authority and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions?

Table 3: Answer to Research Question 3

S/N	Item	N	Mean	SD	Remark
11.	Lack of authority to sanction defaulters frustrate the job	60	2.7667	1.22636	Agree
12.	Lack of authority hinders the execution of good ideas for the institution.	60	1.1500	.36008	Disagree
13.	Staff perform well when given the authority to execute tasks.	60	2.1500	1.17639	Disagree
14.	Having authority to make certain level of decisions allows for precise performance	60	2.750	1.9989	Agree
15.	Delegated authority makes room for innovation	60	2.7833	1.99305	Agree
Total		60	2.32		

Table 3 above shows in item 11 that the respondents agreed that lack of authority to sanction defaulters frustrates the job with mean score of 2.7667 and SD 1.22636. In item 12, the mean score of 1.1500 and SD 36008 shows that the respondents disagreed with lack of authority being a hindrance to the execution of good ideas for the institution. In item 13 the mean score of 2.15 and SD 1.17639 shows that the respondents disagreed that staff perform well when given the authority to execute tasks. Item 14 having a mean score of 2.75 and SD 1.9989 shows that the respondents agreed that having authority to make certain level of decisions allows for precise performance. Item 15 with a mean score 2.78 and SD 1.99305 shows that the respondents agreed that delegated authority makes room for innovation.

Testing of Hypotheses

The hypotheses were tested using the Analysis of Variables (ANOVA) at the significance level of .05.

H01: There is no significant relationship between activity allocation and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions.

Table 4: Testing of Hypothesis 1

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Item1	Between Groups	6.473	2	3.237	4.600	.014
	Within Groups	40.110	57	.704		
	Total	46.583	59			
Item2	Between Groups	14.000	2	7.000	5.685	.006
	Within Groups	70.183	57	1.231		
	Total	84.183	59			
Item3	Between Groups	11.654	2	5.827	5.147	.009
	Within Groups	64.529	57	1.132		
	Total	76.183	59			

Item 4	Between Groups	2.267	2	1.134	1.792	.176
	Within Groups	36.066	57	.633		
	Total	38.333	59			

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between assignment of responsibilities and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions.

Table 5: Testing of Hypothesis 2

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Item 6	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.034	.854
	Within Groups	5.397	58	.093		
	Total	5.400	59			
Item 7	Between Groups	36.007	1	36.007	45.756	.000
	Within Groups	45.643	58	.787		
	Total	81.650	59			
Item 8	Between Groups	41.620	1	41.620	98.274	.000
	Within Groups	24.563	58	.424		
	Total	66.183	59			
Item 9	Between Groups	.350	1	.350	.351	.556
	Within Groups	57.833	58	.997		
	Total	58.183	59			

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between position power/authority and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institution.

Table 6: Testing of hypothesis 3

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Item 11	Between Groups	21.923	2	10.961	9.352	.000
	Within Groups	66.810	57	1.172		
	Total	88.733	59			
Item 12	Between Groups	3.541	2	1.771	24.564	.000
	Within Groups	4.109	57	.072		
	Total	7.650	59			
item13	Between Groups	62.478	2	31.239	92.874	.000
	Within Groups	19.172	57	.336		
	Total	81.650	59			
item14	Between Groups	21.065	2	10.532	11.963	.000
	Within Groups	50.185	57	.880		
	Total	71.250	59			

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Table 4 above, hypothesis one which shows f-value of 40.306, p-value of $.04 < .05$ indicate that there is a significant relationship between activity allocation and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. The position of the respondents appears to mean that the respondents opined that activity allocation

leads to effectiveness in the management of higher education institution. The stance of the respondents aligns with Chandan (1999) who stated that giving lower level staff members the consideration to make certain decisions relative to their roles and within the institution as a result of decentralization, they become more responsible and dedicated to their work as they feel honored in being given a level of authority to act on behalf of the institution. Again, they derive pleasure from the freedom given to them to make decisions which gives them a feeling of status and recognition resulting in loyalty, commitment and a sense of belonging. This affirms the fact that delegation of responsibilities through the allocation of activities positively impacts on performance because lower level staff members who are empowered to make certain level decisions feel recognized thereby feeling important to contribute to the success of the institution and therefore may not want to disappoint the leadership that gave the authority.

Table 5 above, hypothesis 2 showing f-value of 34.688 and p-value of $0.35 > .05$ implies that there is no significant relationship between assignment of responsibilities and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions. The null hypothesis is therefore sustained. The respondents posit that assignment of responsibilities does not necessarily lead to effectiveness of management in higher education institutions. The benchmark of the respondents contradicts the stance of Student Organization Centre, (2003) stating that with delegation, staff productivity is increased as they better understand the workings of the institution. The leader's act of delegating by assigning responsibilities simply reveals his confidence and trust on the staff to deliver and so the staff reciprocates by developing a constructive sense of responsibility. The respondents benched on the fact that other factors other than the delegation may determine effectiveness of leaders. Regrettably, the stance of the respondents contradicted that of Gardner (2011) who said that when provided with an opportunity to exercise self-direction and control through delegation, the staff member feels highly honored to be considered able, task competent and administratively important, and therefore works to prove the leadership right to have given him or her such opportunity.

Table 6 above in hypothesis 3 shows f-value of 36.10375 and p-value of $.000 < .05$ shows that there is a significant relationship between position power/authority and leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. The respondents are of the opinion that position power leads to leadership effectiveness. The stance of the respondents is twined by Kyarimpa (2010) stating that the success of an institution especially that of higher education is determined not by structures and technologies but by the people working in it because the quality of the products (students) to a large extent is dependent on their input. On this note if an assignment is given to a member of staff that has no position power to drive the assignment, tasks will not be performed hence non achievement of institutional goals but if assignments are given to those with position power to make things happen, instructions will be followed to the latter by subordinates who will be cautious not to go against rules and regulations especially of insubordination thereby always ready to perform tasks to meet set targets and achieve institutional goals.

CONCLUSION

Though the earliest studies on leadership focused on the leader as an individual vested with the authority to do and undo, more recent studies have found out that leadership especially in institutions of higher learning is not about an individual but a process by which an individual

coordinates or influences others to carry out activities designed to achieve institutional goals. The relationship between delegation and leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions was investigated in this study. The study established that leadership effectiveness in the management of higher education institutions is to a great extent dependent on how activities are allocated, how responsibilities are assigned and the level of authority the leader and or any delegate is allowed to exercise. From the findings of this study it was observed that in higher education institutions staff members are highly motivated to outperform their average level of performance whenever they are given specific tasks to perform because they feel a sense of self-worth in feeling they are considered good enough to be entrusted with activities designed to achieve institutional success.

On the contrary, for assignment of responsibilities, the study found out that members of staff do not actually feel honored and fulfilled that their skills and abilities are considered good enough to be harnessed and so do not even feel recognized being entrusted with responsibilities geared towards achieving institutional success. Finally it was discovered that in the management of higher education institutions, leadership effectiveness cannot easily be achieved in the absence of position power and authority which the leader or other level delegates must have to be able to make different level decisions for prompt actions to be taken to proffer solutions to challenges and arrive at a win situation thereby achieving institutional success. Therefore, since leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions is dependent on allocation of activities, assignment of responsibilities and the position power and authority of the leader or delegate, there is the need for leaders to embrace the culture of doing these appropriately to achieve effectiveness.

Solutions and Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based on the findings, discussions and conclusion of this study:

- Higher Education institutions should develop a culture of allocating activities to members of staff in order to consistently and efficiently improve on the general administration process.
- Leadership of Higher Education institutions should identify abilities and harness skills of staff members in order to improve and sustain on efficiency and quality in the institution.
- Higher Education institutional leadership should give some key staff members the formal authority to make some level of decisions as this significantly impacts on leadership effectiveness.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Although this study delved into the relationship between delegation and leadership effectiveness which translates to institutional success especially in Higher Education institutions, it will be commendable for other researchers to also look into the relationship between other principles of leadership such as directing, coordinating, supervising and controlling and how they affect leadership effectiveness in institutions of higher learning. The study can also be carried out in other institutions of learning such as polytechnics, professional training institutions, Colleges of Education and secondary schools.

REFERENCES

- Allio, R. (2012). Leaders and leadership: Many theories but what advice is reliable? *Strategy & Leadership*, 41, 4-14.
- Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F., & Weber, T. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421-449. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych>.
- Becker, G. (2013). The competitive edge of moral leadership. In S. Rothlin, & P. Haghirian (Eds.), *Dimensions of Teaching Business Ethics in Asia*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 9-28.
- Blackmore, J. (2011). Leadership in pursuit of purpose: Social, economic and political transformation. *Transformative Leadership: A Reader*, 409, 21-36.
- Bredeson, P., Klar, H., & Johansson, O. (2011). Context-responsive leadership: Examining superintendent leadership in context. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 19, 1-28.
- Bryan, J., (2010). *What is meant by departmentalization?* Brickstone Square: Andover Helium.
- Chandan, J. S. (1999). *Organizational behaviour*. New Delhi: Publishing House.
- Cliffs, N. (2010). *Concepts of organizing*. Wiley Publishing, Inc.
- Day, D., Fleenor, J., Atwater, L., Sturm, R., & Mckee, R. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 63-82.
- Fidler, B., Russel, S., & Simkins, T. (Eds.) (1997). *Choices for self-managing schools: Autonomy and accountability*. London: Philip Chapman Publishing.
- Flanigan, J. (2017). Philosophical methodology and leadership ethics. *Leadership*, 1-24.
- Gardner, H. (2011). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York: Basic Book.
- Gebremedhin, G. T., & Schaeffer, V. P. (1999). *Leadership challenges for effective management*. Dublin: Black Hall.
- Gove, B. P., & The Merriam Webster's Editorial staff (2002). *Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language*. Massachusetts: Merriam Webster Inc., Publishers.
- Kotter, J. (2012). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2012). The leadership challenges: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations. *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Willy Brand.
- Kyarimpa, M., (2010). Delegation and job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in Mukono district: A case study of Mukono Town Council schools. A Masters thesis. Makerere University: Kampala, Uganda.
- Lunenburg, F. (2010). Leader-member exchange theory: Another perspective on the leadership process. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 13, 1-5.
- McClelland, D. (1988). *Human Motivation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carsten, M., Uhl-Bien, M., West, B., & Patera, J., (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 543-562.
- Musaazi, J. C. S (1998). *The theory and practice of educational administration*. London: Macmillan Publishers.
- The student organisation development centre (2003). *Delegation*. {Hyperlink "http://www.ed./Dept/SOAR/lead/Quickref/

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Leadership: The ability of an individual to influence a group of workers to perform tasks with a view to achieving a common goal.

Effectiveness: An evidence of appreciable output being linked with the utilization of resources, both human and material in higher education institutions.

Delegation: This is the act of giving control, authority, a job, and or duty to another person.

Activities: Things that are done as work by a member of staff or a group of staff members aimed at accomplishing a goal.

Allocation: The act of dividing work into units and giving out to members of staff with the aim of holding them accountable for its success or otherwise.

Responsibility: This refers to a duty or task given to a member of staff which is required of the staff member to do and of which he must be accountable

Assignment: The act of giving a specific task or work to a member of staff to do.

Position power: The formal authority or power one is allowed to exercise over others in a work environment by reason of the office the person holds in an institution

Delegate: A member of staff chosen by a leader to perform a task on behalf of the leader

Higher education institution: An place earmarked and designed for more advanced learning where teaching, learning and research activities take place.