



International Journal of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management
Volume 3, Issue 4, pp. 582-609. 2021

ISSN: 2735-9220

www.ijilpm.com.ng



LEADERSHIP CLEAR DIRECTION AND THE EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN RIVERS STATE

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

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated leadership clear direction and the effective management of public universities in Rivers State. The study adopted a correlational design using a population of 4,200 and a sample size of 354. The study employed a structured questionnaire designed by the researcher, tagged: 'University Leadership and Management for Institutional Effectiveness Questionnaire' (ULAMIEQ). The face and content validities of the instrument were determined by two research experts in the department of Educational Management of the selected universities. The reliability of the instrument was .921. The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation, while regression was used to test the hypotheses at .05 significance level. The result from the study showed that clear direction of leaders does not significantly influence good planning, effective organization and adequate control of public universities in Rivers State. The study recommended among others that educational leaders should understand and make use of various strategies to clarify members of the institutions in running toward the direction of achieving set goals. Also, institutional leaders must be exemplary to work and study group members in life style and performance.

Keywords: Clear Direction, Institution, Effectiveness, Leadership, Management, Public, University, Rivers State.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Alasomuka, V. A. (2021). Leadership clear direction and the effective management of public universities in Rivers State. *International Journal of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management*, 3(4), 582-609.

Copyright © IJILPM 2021

INTRODUCTION

The interpersonal relationship between and amongst work group members is the focus of behavioral perspective and not a leader's personality, height or intelligence (Northouse, 2013).

Here, effective leaders are usually more concerned with achieving enhanced performance for higher productivity by creating a balance between driving work and attending to the personal concerns of group members for whom they are responsible. The gap provided by the trait perspective gave rise to studies in the other factors for leadership effectiveness, one of which is the behavioural factor. Scholars in leadership studies sought to identify specific behaviours of leaders which are responsible for their effectiveness or non-effectiveness. This shift in leadership research from the trait perspective gave rise to a focus on the leaders' disposition towards the job. Hernandez et al. (2011) said that the behavioral leadership perspective serves to provide an explanation to the specific approach(es) used by leaders to achieve goals. Scholars here are more concerned with identifying the differences in behavior between leaders which account for their effectiveness and non-effectiveness.

This can be explained with Maslow's theory of motivation which highlights humans hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's two-factor theory (theory X and Y). Both of these theories according to Klainberg and Dirschel (2010) belong to the behavioral leadership perspective. What leaders do, what they emphasize on and how they relate to work group members have been found to be of utmost importance to work group performance which leads to the success or failure of an institution (Hernon & Rossiter, 2007). Earlier behavioural leadership studies identified the autocratic, democratic and laissez-a-faire dimensions. However, recent behavioral leadership studies have evolved to include the situational dimension explaining the existence of behavior by situational interactions. Again, like the trait perspective, the behavioral leadership perspective also discovered that there is no one single behavior to exhibit to achieve success but a blend of different behavioural approaches as the situation demands. For this reason, leadership studies have further evolved to include the situational/contingent and integrative dimensions explaining the existence of leadership by situational interactions and team building through participation.

Research on institutional effectiveness has suggested that in the leadership and management of universities for the attainment of goals, a blend of various leadership approaches is very important. These approaches could be contingent /situational and integrative expressed through such dimensions as directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented as the case may be because effective leaders who manage universities for success are usually characterized by the performance of tasks and activities geared towards achieving not only academic excellence but also providing a conducive and safe environment, favorable working conditions for work group members, good interpersonal relationship between and amongst workers and management, credible and trustworthy management. To achieve these, the leadership focuses on creating a positive atmosphere for learning, mapping out strategies and executing same, coordinating developmental programs, supervising and supporting work group members by being involved (leadership by example) thereby engrafting the vision of the university in the consciousness of all concerned for goals achievement (Kruger, Witziers & Slegers, 2007).

Institutional effectiveness is thus related to Path-Goal theory which sees effectiveness in education as the extent to which educational means or processes result in the attainment of educational goals through focus on the quality of leadership and management (Owens, 2001). This means that as regards university leadership and management, it is not enough for the leader to concentrate on the teaching and learning process involving faculty and students alone but is obligated to also concern himself with other sectors of the university such as the relationship that exists between and amongst work group members, between work group members and

management, good working climate, safety from internal and external factors and generally enhancing good organizational culture to attain set goals which ultimately translates to institutional effectiveness. Therefore, to a great extent, the transformational ability of a university is dependent on the quality of leadership and management dynamics as engaged by the leader of such a university.

A commitment to lead according to Sterling and Davidoff (2000) may be an initial step to take in changing a negative situation to a positive one. However, for the actual change to occur, a conscious choice has to be made by the leader to take the necessary actions through adequate channels for success results. This is apt with the leadership and management of Ignatius Ajuru University of Education in Nigeria where in a space of a few years, the narrative of the entire institution from every angle was rewritten stemming from the leadership and management dynamics used by Prof. Ozo-Mekuri Ndimele. By his opinion, Bell (2002) believed that institutional leaders cannot bear the burden of school management all by themselves but can steer the institution to success through a combination of leadership dimensions with a blend of management dynamics such as planning, organizing, and controlling. This study will therefore look at contingent/situational and integrative leadership dimensions and management dynamics as they contribute to institutional effectiveness.

Statement of the Problem

The researcher observed over the years that in state-owned universities in Rivers State, the lack of competence of institutional leaders in managerial skills gives rise to the inability of work group members to complete tasks in record time and poor academic performance of learning group members which results to the inability of the institution to achieve pre-set educational goals. In the opinions of Broussard and Garrison (2004); Creemers and Reezigt (2005) and Capco (2007), for the achievement of success, the leadership of a university must go beyond using conventional means of leadership and management. The dimensions of leadership are many and varied and no one dimension is good enough to produce results. Therefore, the researcher in this study examined clear direction as among the different dimensions of leadership that is required as well as competence in managerial skills as a blend to producing required results thereby achieving success translating to institutional effectiveness. The focus of this research is therefore to explore clear direction dimension of leadership and management dynamics that can be engaged by institutional leaders in order to achieve institutional effectiveness.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how leadership dimensions influence management dynamics vis-à-vis clear direction for institutional effectiveness in public universities in Rivers State. Specifically, the study is intended to:

- Identify the influence of clear direction of leaders on good planning in public universities in Rivers State.
- Assess the influence of clear direction of leaders on effective organization in public universities in Rivers State.

- Evaluate how clear direction of leaders influence adequate control in public universities in Rivers State.

Research Questions

The following research questions provided direction for this study:

- How does clear direction of leaders influence good planning in public universities in Rivers State?
- How does clear direction of leaders influence effective organization in public universities in Rivers State?
- How does clear direction of leaders influence adequate control in public universities in Rivers State?

Hypotheses

To provide further direction to this study, three hypotheses guided the study:

- *H0₁*. Clear direction of leaders does not significantly influence good planning in public universities in Rivers State.
- *H0₂*. Clear direction of leaders does not significantly influence effective organization in public universities in Rivers State.
- *H0₃*. Clear direction of leaders does not significantly influence adequate control in public universities in Rivers State.

Significance of the Study

This study will be very significant to the leadership of higher education institutions such as the universities and others. The results of this study will provide institutional leaders some valuable insights to the immense positive contributions available to institutions of higher learning especially universities as they engage in the practice of blending varied leadership dimensions and competence in management dynamics to achieving positive results translating to institutional effectiveness. The findings will also inform the leadership of universities on means to ensuring improved leadership and management of the universities through policy and practice for the sole purpose of achieving institutional goals thereby achieving institutional effectiveness.

Scope of the Study

This study examined dimensions of leadership through clear direction and its relationship with management dynamics such as planning, organizing and controlling as employed by educational leaders especially of universities and how these employed dimensions and dynamics lead to the achievement of institutional goals hence contribute to institutional effectiveness.

It focused on academic and administrative work group members of public universities. Geographically, this study was delimited to two state-owned universities in Rivers State: Ignatius Ajuru University of Education and Rivers State University Port Harcourt. In content, the study is based on leadership dimensions/approaches and effectiveness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Clear Direction

University leaders must give clear directions to members of the university on how to achieve objectives. These clarifications could be made through policy making, taking decisions and making clear the steps to taking such decisions.

Policy Making

Policies which are referred to as action plans designed to attain the set aims and objectives of the university are made to give clear direction to group members. Policies are documented statements and interpretations arrived at and agreed upon by all concerned and which guides the leader in making decisions. The management of the institution is therefore encouraged to avoid executing policies as rules by allowing some level of discretion when implementing because they only serve as a guideline (Prinsloo, 2003). Policies also serve as guidelines for the actions and behaviours of the work group members (Kruger & Steinmann, 2003). Policies are also formulated to address such aspects of the institution as academic activities, administrative affairs, material resources, human resources, finance, external elements and internal affairs that must be managed. Kruger and Van Deventer (2002) identified five steps in the policy process:

- *Policy formulation:* Here, the reason or purpose of the policy is defined, tentative outlines developed, actions and alternative courses of actions discussed, those to implement the policy and those to be affected by the policy identified and its effect on the quality of services rendered in the institution are determined.
- *Policy approval:* In this case the drafted policy is reviewed to ensure accuracy, brevity and comprehensiveness, the level of authority to be possessed by officer who should give the final recommendation and clearance for implementation is clarified, ascertained and understood by all.
- *Policy interpretation:* This refers to when the policy is meant to be given to members that it is meant for and ensuring that every such member gets a copy of it.
- *Policy implementation:* Here, administrative controls are clarified in the sense that ‘who is responsible and accountable for what’ is made clear including by what and whose authority the policy is to be implemented.
- *Policy review:* This simply refers to going over the whole process of the policy, its implementation, its effects either positive or negative on the quality of the system and revisiting it if there is a need based on the feedback received from the review process.

Universities are not static but dynamic as they are a part of continually changing environment so policies should not be a once-off action in leadership but should reflect this dynamism and continually be reviewed to meet the ever changing situations. It should be all encompassing by creating broad and general guidelines on the aims and objectives of the university based on values. The leader in the management of a university is greatly influenced by the policies put on ground as they serve as his guidelines for tasks execution (Spillane, White & Stephan, 2009). Therefore, the capacity for policy making should as a matter of importance be developed and its implementation process be tested (Vanhoof, Van-Petegem, Verhoeven, & Buvens, 2009).

Taking Decisions and Solving Problems

Taking decisions to solve problems aims at attaining institutional goals. In the view of Van Deventer (2003), taking decision involves making a choice between one or more alternatives. To solve a problem is to make and exercise a decision which will eliminate possible challenges in the process of trying to attain goals. The success of leadership and eliminating possible challenges is largely dependent on decisions taken effectively. Effectively taking decisions and solving problems are very important in the management of an institution such as the university because every dimension of management whether planning, organizing, or controlling comes with a challenge that a decision must be taken to give a solution to. Decisions must be taken on how to effectively execute actions earlier planned to be taken, the person to be responsible for the execution and the deadline for the execution (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991).

Taking decision can be said to be an attempt at solving problems. Van Deventer (2003) insisted that though the leader may not be able to consult every one whenever a decision is to be taken; involving work group members to participate in taking decision especially when it affects them is an important principle in the decision-making process. Here, participative management becomes very effective as:

- It results to quality decision because the sum of expertise, knowledge and information with a group, is always greater than that in any one individual.
- It provides for creativity in decision: When different work group members come together to deliberate on issues in order to take decisions, they tend to contribute more creatively because they bring in ideas from different perspectives, different frames of references and experiences thereby providing more workable solutions to the deliberated issues by arriving at effective decisions.
- It allows for acceptance: The involvement of work group members in taking decisions especially when it concerns them, gives room for the acceptance of the decisions by all involved which results to effective implementation.
- Decision understanding: Work group members work more as a team when they are involved in the decision making process because they operate on the same page as they all have an understanding of expectations.

Steps to Taking Decision

- Outlining the reason or purpose for the decision to be taken.
- Identification of possible challenges to having solutions.
- Providing alternative solutions in the event of challenges to originally thought out solutions.
- Evaluating the alternative solutions to arrive at the one that will provide the desired outcome.
- Communicating prospective members that may be affected by the chosen alternative solution and implementing it thereafter.

Ideally, the process of taking decision will include clear definition of problem, acquisition of required relevant information and identifying possible solutions to problems. Though it is not

always very easy to make decisions for solving problems, it is however preferable to not taking or making a decision at all which poses more danger (Kruger, 2003). By this it can be seen that taking decisions in the management of an institution such as the university involves making a choice between different alternatives in order to solve a problem. Therefore, as opined by Lawrence and Spillane (2008); Spillane, White and Stephan (2009), for the provision of an effective solution to problems as may be faced by the institution or university, the leader must have to work together with the work group members who will feel a sense of belonging and commitment to the needs of the institution and thereby give in their best to perform optimally to achieve institutional goals. From problem identification to considering alternatives to evaluating and deciding on a choice of solution right through the implementation stage and its effect on the problem to be solved, the whole process must be such to lead to the achievement of goals.

Management

Management in the context of this paper will be discussed in terms of good planning, effective organizing and adequate control. The tasks and activities involved in giving direction to members of an institution in this case an educational institution such as the university or one of its units is what is referred to as Management (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). As opined by Printy, Marks and Bowers (2009), management involves guiding the development, maintenance, and allocation of resources to achieve the goals of an institution. Similarly, Saleem (2010) said that guiding and directing a work group towards actualizing set objectives is what management is all about. Management is decision-making, planning, organizing and controlling the human and non-human resources of an institution. It is the process by which institutional leaders utilize institutional resources to achieve institutional goals in the most efficient manner (Barber, 2004).

As observed by Calitz, Fuglestad and Lillejord (2002), the focus of management must be the productive performance and positive outcome of the institution. Indeed, defining the expected performance for a desired outcome in an institution which from much indications is most important but most challenging, is the first task of management. Therefore in management, it is the leader's duty to think ahead of time (plan) to put the available resources together (organize) giving instructions to subordinates on how to put such resources to work and generally making sure all hands are on deck in carrying out assigned tasks (control).

However, despite the fact that it is a key duty for the leader to do all these, it is not meant for the leader to shoulder it all alone for these form part of the work of every member in the work group at one level or the other. As pointed out by Cranston and Ehrich (2005), management also refers to the collective effort of the different people in whose hands are placed responsibilities to carry out tasks geared towards the achievement of preset-goals. On the contrary, Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) are of the opinion that management is about a set of people at top positions seen as responsible for the achievement of institutional goals.

From these definitions it can be observed that management is actually the process of efficiently putting resources (human and non-human) together by both the leader and the led to enhance performance and optimize productivity for the achievement of institutional goals. The key to an effective institution is said to be a blend of leadership dimensions and management dynamics employed in such institution (Bezzina & Duignan, 2006). In the view of McNamara (2008), which is also a common view, management is about getting things done through others. For Bush and Bell 2002; Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana, (2004), it is making sure of achieving institutional goals seen as the channel within which the concept of leadership is subsumed.

Leadership and management skills possessed by a leader in the running of a university are very important as the effectiveness of such university is dependent on such skills (Prinsloo, 2009). As Reynolds, Creemers, Springfield, Teddlie and Shaffer (2002) described that for an educational leader to be effective he or she must possess such basic skills as conceptual, human relationship and technical skills. These skills help a leader in managing both human and non-human resources around which all activities in the university revolve.

Conceptual skills: These talk about the skills that an educational leader needs to ensure effective task execution in an institution like the university. For the leader to influence work group members for goals achievement, they must be able to make plans, (formulate policies, develop strategies for implementation, make certain decisions and proffer solutions to anticipated problems), organize and control the activities and affairs of the university. The leader here must first of all clarify roles and tasks for work group members in accordance with pre-set standards while focusing and emphasizing on the deadline for completion of the execution of such tasks to ensure effective delivery (University of Pretoria, 2010).

Conceptual skills have to do with the mental disposition of the leader to be able to manage the university not in parts but as one whole entity whereby he is able to integrate and coordinate all its activities and interests. The conceptual skills of an educational leader is first of all concerned with executing tasks effectively so he should focus on the achievement of pre-set aims and objectives by ensuring that tasks are defined according to set standards and completed on schedule (University of Pretoria, 2010). As a skill required for effectiveness, conceptual skills which are important in leadership and which can be gotten from formal education, conscious self-development and or experience, has to do with a leader's ability to analyze complex situations to identify the difference between cause and effect (Ross & Gray, 2006).

These by the argument of Mumford, Campion and Morgeson, (2007) are skills that have to do with the collection, processing and dissemination of information either orally or by written communication. Therefore, according to Robbins (2014), educational leaders need more of conceptual skills than technical skills, which are actually needed more by members of the work group. In fact, the position of the leader as the driver of performance for the achievement of goals have been found by Voges, Tworoger and Bendixen (2009) to be very important in the leadership and management of universities for effectiveness as it involves planning, organizing and controlling.

Human relationship skills: These are core skills needed by an educational leader in the leadership and management of an educational institution such as the university. Having or possessing the human relationship skills provides the educational leader the ability to guide and direct the actions and behaviours of the work group members through effective communication, motivation and the establishment of positive interpersonal relationships between the leadership and work group members and amongst work group members. This accounts for effective leadership (Brown, 2004). Again, these skills help the leader develop a positive and healthy relationship between the university and external elements such as the host community which provides for collaboration leading to success in the management of the university (Tam, 2007).

Human relationship skills possessed by a leader such as leadership abilities, individual skills and group skills enables an educational leader to effectively and positively influence work group members to effectively execute tasks and in record time to achieve success. The educational leader must be responsible to appropriately guide the work group members, motivate

them, create effective communication channels with them and establish positive and healthy interpersonal relationships with them while developing same amongst them based on mutual trust and respect in order to elicit willingness from them to perform tasks and complete such in record time to achieve the university goals. This is because the successful completion of tasks to a large extent depends on the human element.

Here, the educational leader must have the ability to work with other work group members in an appreciable manner whereby they will feel motivated and inspired to put in their best because of the trust they elicit from and have for the leader. The leader must possess good communication skills for the establishment of healthy interpersonal relationships among work group members and between work group members and the management team. The educational leader needs human relationship skills not only to promote a positive climate and culture that will orchestrate change in the university but also to create a positive relationship between the university and external elements such as the political, socio-economic and demographic elements as these are equally and dynamically interactive with the university (Owens, 2001).

Technical skills: An educational leader to be effective in the management of a university must as a matter of importance, also possess the technical skills required to establish procedures needed for the day-to-day running of the institution. Without this skill, the leader will definitely fall into daily chaotic situations orchestrated by confusion from the absence of operational procedures.

It is very important for an educational leader to effectively manage a university because the all-the-time state of any university is to a great extent dependent on the ability of the leader to manage effectively. Management is a cyclic process of planning, organizing and controlling which are thus the basic dimensions of operation. Achieving the goals of the university through effective planning, organizing and controlling is the core responsibility of any educational leader.

Planning

In managing educational institutions, planning as a dimension of operation is said to be the process of identifying the needs of the institution, determining the goals and objectives and defining the needed resources both human and non-human to perform the tasks needed to be done to get to the goals achievement at a target time (Okoji, 2014). One of the most important skills needed by a leader in the management of an educational institution is planning because it is the channel by which aims and objectives of the institution are set and clarified, policies are formulated based on well informed decisions leading to proffering solutions which are monitored while on execution and with feedbacks are re-evaluated for improvement to arrive at better results.

Planning in the leadership and management of educational institutions is so important that it can single handedly determine the success or failure of the institutional leader thereby impacting on the institution positively or negatively as the case may be (University of Pretoria, 2010). Planning therefore can be considered to be the most important dimension of operation for an educational leader as all other dimensions of operation are dependent on it. A leader must be committed to spending time when it comes to planning because a lot is expected to be achieved in the process of planning. The leader must be a critical thinker with a creative and innovative mind thinking ahead of time with a focus on what to do, how to do what is to be done, where it should be done, who should do what and why what is to be done should be done all geared towards the achievement of goals (van Deventer, 2003).

Planning entails creating a vision which is important for work group to run with. It entails re-designing a present situation to suit future purpose (Steinbacher & Smith, 2009). Hence, the findings of Keung (2008), explained that work group express zeal and satisfaction when the extra-time and energy demanded by planning and decision-making are balanced by real authority.

Planning simply means assessing the needs of the institution, creating a picture of what to provide for those needs to be met , putting strategies in place on how to bring the picture to reality, setting targets to what is needed to be done, harnessing all available resources to commit to getting results, monitoring and evaluating progress and going back to the drawing board if need be (DeChurch & Hass, 2008). The institutional leader seeks to clarify the goals of the institution by establishing the aims and objectives and the strategies to achieving them during the planning process.

The progress of performance towards attaining these aims and objectives are measured through the control process whereby the leader and others at different levels of authority are able to detect deviations and anomalies in the plan in time for corrections to be made to avoid failure (van Deventer, 2003). Therefore, an effective institutional leader is one who attains goals through constant monitoring and supervision of performance of planned activities.

Organizing

This is simply assigning tasks to work group members according to areas of ability and competence with the common aim of achieving institutional goals. It is the enabling of work group members to work as a team through a created structure for that purpose. Organizing involves putting mechanisms in place for the implementation of pre-planned tasks in an effective manner. It is concerned with the systematic coordination of several different tasks to be performed in the institution not discrediting the working relationship that exists between and amongst both the work group and the management (Shead, n.d.). It is about putting necessary activities together for the achievement of common objectives (van Deventer, 2003).

Organizing is very important in the management of an institution as it provides a structure for operation clearly defining tasks and responsibilities as well as those responsible and accountable for such tasks so that every individual feels that his or her actions and attitude towards given tasks play an important role in results achievement. Again, organizing establishes clear channels of communication which ensures prompt and adequate information to members of the work group as it concerns effective tasks performance bringing about synergy thereby reducing work load for individual members as activities are divided into parts for them.

As the organizing process involves an in-depth analysis of the work to be done, it creates a structure to systematically group different tasks, procedures and resources to enable work group members be familiar with their duties and responsibilities. By this structure, tasks and activities that are related are departmentally grouped together so that members in a field can perform related tasks with competence together as a team (Shead, n.d.). Organizing ensures that work group members in a particular department work together as a unit displaying competence by breaking and arranging tasks, assigning the right task to the right member and setting up a framework with which the tasks are to be done (van Deventer, 2003). Organizing addresses the following:

- What must be done? (needs identification)

- How should it be done? (coordination)
- Who should do what? (delegation)
- What is the result? (evaluation)

Here, it is important that all available resources to perform the tasks, work group members' willingness and competency, target time for tasks completion, communication channels for directives be all taken into consideration (van Deventer, 2003). With organizing, plans and strategies will be effectively implemented as it provides for a collective and all-encompassing structure (van der Merwe, 2003). In organizing, tasks and responsibilities must be delegated to the right group members. Delegating here simply refers to the distribution of portions of the total workload to other competent hands for speedy execution. This means that the leader is not held accountable for his own performance alone but also for the performance of those he has delegated the work to.

As explained by Capco (2007), effective delegation is usually methodical and meaningful. Therefore, since the leader will be held responsible for the performance of the work group members, he must clearly define the tasks, the expected results from the tasks, the target time for the completion of the tasks and communication channels to deal with uncertainties (Viljoen & Möller, 1992). He must also set standards and involve group members in certain level of decision making concerning the achievement of the institutional goals because then the work group members will feel as part of the entire process and so work tirelessly to actualize their decisions and plans.

The leader must constantly motivate group members to improve on skills so that his own work will also be simplified because when group members are competent in their tasks performance, the leader is less anxious of expected outcomes. He must also always be on top of his game by constantly monitoring progress and asking for feedbacks, making changes where necessary from time to time and giving heartfelt commendations for jobs well done. Once these have been taken care of by the leader, he has invariably set all parts of the institution to function efficiently like a system that it is (van Deventer, 2003). Without organizing, the leadership of the institution cannot execute plans put in place so organizing is a very important dimension in the management of educational institutions for effectiveness. A very important feature related to organizing is coordination. Coordination as described by van Deventer (2003), is the division of workload into specialized units and monitoring these units closely in relation to each other for enhanced productivity. For coordination to be effective, viewpoints must be reasonable and sound, work group members must have the right attitude, and there must be mutual confidence, good planning, competence, consistent integration of work group activities, a positive team spirit leading to high morale. All of these can be attained when the work group members trust the leadership and are happy with it (van Deventer, 2003). Coordinating in the management of universities aims at developing and promoting team spirit and work which brings about cooperation among group members thereby ensuring that the policies put in place are applied in unity and the goals of the university are attained.

Coordination as a feature related to organizing in management can be influenced by the structure of the institution which determines the framework of all lines of command, communication channels and relationship patterns all of which must be integrated into a harmonious composite result. Even, curriculum tasks may be delegated as a means of task distribution, the complexities of school leadership and management warrant the coordination of curriculum tasks, because it increases job performance through synchronization, the development

of work group members' cohesion through warm relationships and the creation of team spirit to achieve curriculum effectiveness in the university. All principles and techniques outlined in planning and organizing as dimensions of management are also focused on and applied simultaneously in coordination. In addition to the principles and techniques of problem-solving and decision-making, coordination also makes use of the following for effectiveness to be achieved:

Management meeting: This is very important to be done on a regular basis of weekly or fortnightly and sometimes at emergency as situation demands. This should be with top-to-down, down-to-top and horizontal communications because it ensures effective planning, organizing coordinating, guidance and control of all activities of the institution. These meetings at regular intervals will be used to continually coordinate planned activities, provide feedback on completed activities and evaluate completed activities for achievement of goals.

Group members meeting: This could be done informally every day before tasks performance begins. This meeting is a channel for reminding every member of the work group of the expectations for the day and the days to come and to encourage high performance geared towards pre-set goals achievement. Here again, those in charge of coordinating the affairs of each work group unit can acknowledge the contributions of members and encourage them to do better (Prinsloo, 2003). Fullan (2009), said that some of these meetings can be held at least once in a month to address issues of correlation and coordination of the pace of all workgroup members, discuss academic challenges, clarify administrative matters and give constant re-orientation on expectations to all concerned.

If these patterns are adhered to, policies will be well interpreted and uniformly applied, work activities will be synchronized, team spirit and team work will be developed because work group members would have a feeling of responsibility for performing tasks delegated to them and derive satisfaction from enhanced productivity and so accept accountability for achieving success. Fullan (2009) observed that sharing the vision of the institution, using clear direction approach, with development of work group members, aligned academic frameworks, evaluation, and provision of work materials, substantial and sustained success can be achieved in universities.

Controlling

Controlling as one of the dynamics of management is a process by which academic activities are assessed and regulated, work group performances are evaluated progressively to check deviations and enforce corrections by educational leaders to achieve educational goals (Barber, 2004). Though there are similarities in controlling and planning, controlling differ from planning in the sense that while controlling is done during or after activities, planning is done before the activities begin (Rue & Byars, 2007). Controlling as a dimension of management dynamics is regulatory in nature because it provides the platform for actual implementation of plans set for execution and therefore is said to be complimentary to planning. It reveals deviations in plans and indicates if there is any need for plans revisiting based on contingent factors (Cronjé, Du Toit, Motlatla & Morrais, 2004). Controlling as a dimension of management dynamics helps in the collection of information for performance evaluation using preset criteria for performance.

Controlling which is a continuous process, is also used to decide on the next line of action in the plan. In the plan, there is a need for a change in plan. It is important because it functions as a tool for measuring the overall performance of the university (Shead, nd.). For controlling to be effective, there is a need for the synergy of planners and controllers because often times, they are not the same people. The controlling dimension of management dynamics helps the leader in identifying areas of the plan that need to be revisited during execution either for adjustment of plans or a total discard of plan and the formulation or setting of a new plan (Shead, n.d.). van Deventer (2003), identified four steps in the process of controlling which are:

- Establishing standards and criteria including processes to measure performance. This must be done meaningfully and accepted by all involved.
- Constantly measuring or evaluating performance in order to identify areas for correction in time to avoid failure.
- Comparing results derived from the evaluation with set standards to ensure that performance matches set standards.
- Taking corrective measures in the case of shortfalls identified. This should be constructive in order to bring performance up to standard.

van Deventer (2003) also identified some requirements which he considered important for control to be effective. Such requirements are:

Flexibility: Control must not be rigid but flexible enough to allow for changes, exceptions and eventualities.

Adaptability: Measures of control should be adaptable to the tasks and activities to be performed by the workgroup members at different levels of authority.

Correctability: There must be a clear process of correction for anomalies detected in the course of execution of tasks.

Clarity in standards and procedures: Both the leader and the work group members must clearly understand the purpose, function, standards and procedures of the managerial control to avoid misconceptions on the side of the work group members and abuse on the side of the leader.

Control must be based on position power: The leader should exercise control based on the formal authority vested on him as the leader and must be based on the tasks assigned (accompanying responsibility and accountability) not on personal convictions. The following important guidelines were also given by van Deventer (2003) to ensure effective control:

- Clear and specific instructions should be given as the expected standard, procedures for performance and evaluation criteria are set by these instructions.
- Guidelines on a flexible, achievable and acceptable criteria should be drawn and established during the planning stage which should involve all concerned.
- Feedbacks on performance and expectations must constantly be given to work group members either in written form when necessary or in oral form as the situation demands in order to check deviations and improve performance.

- Evaluation carefully planned must be carried out continually to improve performance of not just the individual work group members but also the university as a whole.
- Corrective measures on deviations from pre-set plans must be taken as quickly as possible to forestall repetition of same mistakes which may negatively impact on the effectiveness of the university.

Controlling is exercised to correct mistakes in the execution of tasks and to enhance effective performance of the work group members to attain goals (van Deventer, 2003). Therefore, it is important that the leader give regular feedbacks on performance to work group members so that they can constantly compare their performance to pre-set standards and make positive adjustments where necessary. By this, it is evident that effective controlling is not only concerned with completing tasks but also with the work group members responsible for carrying out the tasks and so it is important that the education leader recognizes and appreciates positive performance and address shortfalls with quick corrective measures. Having discussed all these, the relationship between leadership and management can be examined to ascertain how both concepts can contribute to institutional effectiveness.

The difference between the concept of leadership and that of management has been reviewed by many different scholars (Earley & Weindling, 2004). As observed by Ololube in Ololube (2018), leadership and management are two overlapping but distinct concepts both of which are very important to institutional effectiveness and improvement. The fact that the two concepts overlap and are both important for the success of an institution has been attested to by (Darr, 2011, Tomlinson, 2004, Bush & Bell 2002, Wallace & Paulson 2003). Findings on leadership and management by the Office for Standards in Education (OfStEd, 2003) indicate that strong leadership and good management are very important in the pursuit of institutional success as there is a strong connection between the quality of leadership dimensions and management dynamics of the leader and the outcome of performance of the led.

Leadership dimensions cannot be separated from good management dynamics and vice versa for effectiveness because institutions need both to be successful as effective institutions are a product of both (Bush & Bell 2002; Huber, 2004). However, in trying to create a form of distinction between leadership and management, Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2004) said that leadership is providing vision, direction and support in an institution while management is ensuring that the pre-set institutional goals are achieved. In the opinions of Moorosi and Bush (2011), if institutions are to be effective, then leadership and management should be given same value of attention for objectives to be achieved for they are both of equal importance as the scholars also said that in performing the tasks on their day-to-day schedule, leaders cannot distinguish between when they are leading and when they are managing because in practice, they are simply trying to ensure compliance to directives and focusing on achievement of goals.

Effective leaders are leaders who influence people to willingly get work done for the attainment of goals, act as channels of communication, as mediators for negotiating differences, resolving conflicts and making decisions. Responsibility and accountability are two concepts associated with leadership and management for the actualization of aims and objectives.

Responsibility

This refers to the allocated or assigned work to a work group member which invariably translates to the person's duty by reason of the member's field of expertise. This assigned task may not

necessarily be done by the person but can be delegated to other members who also have the expertise to do it and hold them responsible for results. Expertise of the work group member is very important here because goals must be achieved and that depends on the relevant knowledge and skills of the member on the assigned task for which the member is responsible (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). It is also observed that taking responsibility as an educational leader means providing for the development of work group members and ensuring that latest strategies and technologies to aid the achievement of goals are put in place.

Accountability

An educational leader must be accountable to be effective. Accountability simply means having the duty to give an account of executed tasks based on pre-set standards and criteria (Perry & McWilliam, 2007). With accountability the duty to act by performance or behavior in accordance with pre-set standards is placed on an individual as an obligation. Therefore, both the leader and the work group members are expected to account for their actions in consonance with the expectations of pre-set standards in specific situations (Nieuwenhuis, 2007).

Leaders according to Kyriakides, Demetrious and Charalambus (2006) are especially required to display professionalism in judgment towards discharging their duties. However, they are not only accountable to the external stakeholders but also the internal stakeholders such as the work group members and the learners for quality service delivery to be ensured (Joubert & Prinsloo, 2009). The effectiveness of both the leader and the work group members among other factors is also based on their answerability and blame acceptance. From all indications, the two concepts of leadership and management are inter related and are geared towards realizing the success of the institution. Therefore, the essence of management and leadership in an institution is hinged on effectiveness.

Institutional Effectiveness

Teodorovic (2011) found out that factors that lead to effectiveness in educational institutions are rarely investigated in developed nations as evidenced by the fact that only about three to four times were recorded for such in more than a hundred studies on effectiveness. To this effect, scholarly works on institutional effectiveness through leadership and management have been reported in bits and pieces hence this study seeks to initiate a holistic investigation into leadership dimensions and management dynamics employed by institutional leaders resulting to institutional effectiveness.

Furthermore, the multi dimensions of educational institutions such as external elements and internal affairs comprising of academic excellence, administrative affairs, material resources, human resources, financial resources, institutional climate and culture embedded with change cum innovation and conflict management have not been so dug into in studies as the issue of effectiveness relating to efficiency has been (Jansen, 1995). However, it is important to look at institutional effectiveness as initiated by leadership and management dynamics as it relates to institutions in African countries as they have peculiarities in the context of regional conditions. This will help in identifying factors that are unique in deciding the effectiveness or otherwise of an institution (Guoxing, 2007).

The concept of effectiveness has been defined from different perspectives by different scholars. In the view of Bridges (2003), effectiveness refers to the attainment of objectives and goals of an institution. For Cele (2005), since the primary objectives of an institution is the

moulding of individuals to good conduct and achievement of academic excellence, institutional effectiveness means achieving that. For Levin and Nolan (2000), it is attaining good educational results and for Verdis, Kriemadis, and Pashiardis (2003), it is the level of achievement of goals by an institution in comparison to other institutions having the same goals for achievement as he said that an effective institution is only defined as such in terms of specific conditions.

In the views of Wiepking and Maas (2009), institutional effectiveness is dependent on the available human, material and financial resources. According to Higgins, Hall, Wall, Woolner, and McCaughey (2005), an institution is said to be effective if the results of performances positively goes beyond target expectations. Earlier studies of institutional effectiveness as observed by Saleem (2010), focused more on variables such as teaching, learning, management, learner motivation and community involvement. However, in adding to this, Tagliacollo, Volpato, and Junior (2010) said it should also include the variables of classroom behaviour, learner participation and attitudes toward learning. From the reviewed studies of different scholars, it can be seen that institutional effectiveness is defined from different perspectives for while some focus on academic achievement, others focus on academic achievements and external factors or elements while others are concerned with institutional effectiveness being a product of available human, material and financial resources.

METHODS

Research Design

The study adopted a correlational research design. This research design provides for describing, measuring and establishing a relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables as it aims to accurately and systematically describe a population, situation or phenomenon whereby it can answer what, where, when and how questions but not why questions. It can use a wide variety of research methods to investigate one or more variables.

Population for the Study

The target population for this study was made up of both academic (teaching) and non-academic (administrative) work group members of state-owned universities such as Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt and the Rivers State University, Port Harcourt whereby one thousand four hundred and forty three (1,443) comprising of nine hundred and eighty four (984) academic and four hundred and fifty nine (459) non-academic work group members was drawn from Ignatius Ajuru University of Education Port Harcourt while a total of two thousand seven hundred and fifty seven (2,757) comprising one thousand five hundred (1,500) academic and one thousand two hundred and fifty seven (1,257) non-academic work group members was drawn from the Rivers State University, Port Harcourt. A total of four thousand two hundred (4,200) work group members therefore, constituted the population of the study as detailed in the table below:

Table 1: Population Distribution

S/N	INSTITUTION	ACADEMIC	NON-ACADEMIC	TOTAL
1	Ignatius Ajuru University of Education	984	459	1,443
2	Rivers State University	1,500	1,257	2,757
Grand Total				4,200

Source: University Bursary Unit, September, 2019

Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample size for this study was 354 respondents comprising 78 academic (teaching) and 46 non-academic (administrative) work group members of Ignatius Ajuru University of Education and 156 academic (teaching) and 74 non-academic (administrative) work group members of Rivers State University, Port Harcourt. The sample size of 354 respondents was arrived at using Krejcie and Morgan (1970).

Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument for the study was a structured questionnaire designed by the researcher. It was tagged: ‘University Leadership and Management for Institutional Effectiveness Questionnaire’ (ULAMIEQ). The first part of the questionnaire contained demographic information such as gender, age bracket, qualification and position (designation) of the respondents while the other parts contained information on structured responses from respondents on the subject matter. The study adopted a modified 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1-4 having 4-Strongly Agree = (SA), 3-Agree = (A), 2-Disagree = (D) and 1-Strongly Disagree = (SD).

Validity of the Instrument

To ensure face and content validities, the researcher issued out copies of the questionnaire to two experts in the Department of Educational Management who made valued corrections before it was administered.

Reliability of the Instrument

To establish the reliability of the study, the researcher subjected the questionnaire items to Crumbach Alpha testing using SPSS version 23. The reliability test result of the study is .921 which shows that the instrument used for the study was highly reliable see table 2.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
.921	40

Method of Data Collection

The researcher and two assistants administered copies of the research instrument (questionnaire) to respondents in the stated institutions and made sure that the questionnaires were accurately and appropriately completed. This was achieved through the administration of the instrument at various offices of faculty in the selected universities.

Method of Data Analysis

The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation at the 2.5 mean criterion arrived at by the calculation: $4+3+2+1=10/4=2.5$, while the hypotheses were tested using Regression at .05 significance level. This method was adopted due to the large number of the sample size. The study adopted both descriptive and inferential statistical tools to analyze the data. The information retrieved from the questionnaire was summarized in their groups and, mean and standard deviation was used to answer the research questions. Inferential statistical tool of regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses at the level of significance .05. aided with SPSS Version 23.

RESULTS

Demographic variables of Respondents

Table 3: Demographic Variables of Respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	195	55.7	55.7	55.7
	Female	155	44.3	44.3	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	
Age	21-30	26	7.4	7.4	7.4
	31-40	67	19.1	19.1	26.6
	41-50	89	25.4	25.4	52.0
	Over 50	168	48.0	48.0	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	
Education	OND/NCE	44	12.6	12.6	21.7
	HND/BSC	56	16.0	16.0	37.7
	MASTERS	82	23.4	23.4	61.1
	Ph.D and Others	136	38.9	38.9	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	
Position	Academic Staff	197	56.3	56.3	56.3
	Non-Academic Staff	153	43.7	43.7	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	

The respondents were males while 155(44.3%) of the respondents were females all of which make up the total respondents of the study. Table 3 above showed age of respondents that 26(7.4%) of the respondents were within 21-30 years of age, 67(19.9%) of the respondents were within 31-40 years of age, 89(25.4%) of the respondents were within 41-50 years of age while 168(48.0%) of the respondents were over 50 years of age. The information above indicates that the respondents are the right people to give the needed answers for the study. Table above

indicates that most of the respondents have acquired their Ph.D. with response rate at 136(38.9%) while that of Masters was with response rate of 82(23.4%). The next frequency category is the HND/B.Sc. category with respondents rate of 56(16.0%) followed by that of OND/NCE having a response rate of 44(12.6%) and finally the School Certificate category with a response rate of 32(9.1%). The Table above indicates the present position of respondents who were interviewed and responses drawn from 197(56.3%) of the respondents are academic staff and 153(43.7%) of the respondents are non-academic staff. These showed a high knowledge of respondents involved in the study.

Research Question 1: How does clear direction of leaders influence good planning in universities in Rivers State?

Table 4: Showing statistics of mean and standard deviation on the influence of clear direction of leaders on good planning in universities in Rivers State.

s/n	items	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Management brings policies in line with its mission statement	1.9200	1.22696	Disagreed
2.	Management has a schedule for each year	1.2109	.40833	Disagreed
3.	Management invites work group members for meetings before major decisions are taken	2.4473	1.23398	Disagreed
4.	Management organizes trainings and workshops on how to achieve set goals	1.885	1.1780	Disagreed
5.	Tasks are always delivered within management set time line	2.0127	1.19113	Disagreed
Aggregate Mean		1.89		

Table 4 above shows item 1 with a mean score of 1.9200 and SD 1.22696 which implies that the respondents disagreed that management brings policies in line with its mission statement. In item 2, a mean score of 1.2109 and SD .40833 showed that respondents disagreed that management has a schedule for each year. In item 3 mean score of 2.4473 and SD 1.23398 equally proved that respondents disagree that management invites work group members for meetings before major decisions are taken. In item 4 mean score of 1.885 and SD 1.1780 showed that respondents disagreed that management organizes trainings and workshops on how to achieve set goals and item 5 with a mean score of 2.0127 and SD 1.19113 indicated that respondents disagreed that tasks are always delivered within management set time line. Thus, the aggregate mean of 1.89 < 2.5 showed that majority of the respondents disagreed on the assumption that clear direction of leaders influences good planning in universities in Rivers State.

Research question 2: How does clear direction of leaders influence effective organization in universities in Rivers State?

Table 5: Showing statistics of mean and standard deviation on the influence of clear direction of leaders on effective organizing in universities in Rivers State

s/n	Items	Mean	SD	Remark
6.	Work group members operate within the annual schedule	1.4418	.67433	Disagreed
7.	Work group members work in line with the general guidelines provided	1.8855	1.18105	Disagreed
8.	Work group members do all their tasks with reference to specific management guidelines	1.3400	.70053	Disagreed
9.	Tasks are completed in record time whenever there is proper guidance	2.4473	1.23398	Disagreed
10.	Proper coordination of activities result to achievement of success	1.9236	1.13625	Disagreed
Aggregate Mean		1.80		

Table 5 above in item 6 mean score of score of 1.4418 and SD .67433 implies that the respondents disagreed that work group members operate within the annual schedule. Item 7 having a mean score of 1.8855 and SD 1.18105 showed that the respondents disagreed that work group members work in line with general guidelines provided. In item 8 mean score of 1.3400 and SD .70053, respondents disagreed that work group members do all their tasks with reference to specific management guidelines. In item 9 the mean score of 2.4473 and SD 1.23398 indicates that the respondents disagreed that tasks are completed in record time whenever there is proper guidance. Item 10 having a mean score of 1.9236 and SD 1.13625 implied that the respondents disagree that proper coordination of activities result to achievement of success. Thus, 1.80 < 2.5 implied that the respondents do not agree that clear direction of leaders influence effective organizing in universities in Rivers State.

Research Question 3: How does clear direction of leaders influence adequate control in universities in Rivers State?

Table 6: Showing statistics of mean and standard deviation on the influence of clear direction of leaders on adequate control in universities in Rivers State

S/N	items	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Management provides check list for all operations	2.0127	1.19113	Disagreed
2.	Progress to tasks is usually monitored by the supervisors	1.3727	.48397	Disagreed
3.	Supervisors often assist work group members when they make mistakes	1.9200	1.22696	Disagreed
4.	Management does not allow activities outside the annual budget	1.1727	.37836	Disagreed
Aggregate Mean		1.62		

Table 6 above with item 1 showing a mean score of 2.0127 and SD 1.19113 implies that the respondents did not agree that management provides check list for all operations. Again, item 2 with a mean score of 1.3727 and SD .48397 shows that the respondents disagreed that progress to tasks is usually monitored by the supervisors. Similarly item 3 having a mean score of 1.9200 and SD 1.22696 showed that the respondents disagreed that supervisors often assist work group members when they make mistakes. In item 4 the mean score of 1.1727 and SD .37836 proved that the respondents also disagreed that management does not allow activities outside the annual

budget. Thus, the aggregate mean of 1.62 <2.5 proved that the respondents did not agree that clear direction of leaders influence adequate control in universities in Rivers State.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Clear direction of leaders does not significantly influence good planning in universities in Rivers State.

Table 7: Regression Analysis of testing of hypothesis 1

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.864 ^a	.746	.744	.62377		
ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression		623.914	4	155.979	400.876	.000 ^b
Residual		212.056	345	.389		
Total		835.971	349			
Coefficients ^a						
Items	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error				
14. Management brings policies in line with its mission statement	-.254	.080		-3.185	.002	
Management has a schedule for each year	.368	.032	.351	11.423	.000	
15. Management invites work group members for meetings before major decisions are taken	.478	.023	.462	21.251	.000	
16. Management organizes trainings and workshops on how to achieve set goals	.041	.070	.022	.589	.556	
17. Tasks are always delivered within management set time line	.523	.031	.500	17.133	.000	

Table 7 above shows r-value of .864^a, r-square value of .746, r-square adjusted value .744, error estimate of .744, p-value of .112 > .05 implies that clear direction of leaders does not significantly influence good planning in universities in Rivers State. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted.

Hypothesis 2: Clear direction of leaders does not significantly influence effective organization in universities in Rivers State.

Table 8: Regression Analysis of testing of hypothesis 2

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.736 ^a	.542	.538	.80256		
ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	414.746	4	103.686	160.977	.000 ^b
	Residual	351.038	345	.644		
	Total	765.784	349			
Coefficients ^a						
Items	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error				
18. Work group members operate within the annual schedule	.710	.099		7.180	.000	
19. Work group members work in line with the general guidelines provided	-.148	.062	-.088	-2.368	.018	
20. Work group members do all their tasks with reference to specific management guidelines	.806	.047	.842	17.274	.000	
21. Tasks are completed in record time whenever there is proper guidance	.061	.038	.059	1.612	.107	
22. Proper coordination of activities result to achievement of success	-.355	.035	-.358	-10.134	.000	

Table 8 above shows r-value of .736^a, r-sqaure value of .542, adjusted r-square value of .542, estimated error of .80256, p-value of .025<.05 which implies that clear direction of leaders does significantly influence effective organizing in universities in Rivers State. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 4: Clear direction of leaders does not significantly influence adequate control in universities in Rivers State

Table 9: Regression testing of hypothesis 3

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.769 ^a	.591	.588	.76411		
ANOVA ^a						
Items		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	460.118	3	153.373	262.683	.000 ^b
	Residual	318.793	346	.584		
	Total	778.911	349			
Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	
	B	Std.				

		Error			
23. Management provides check list for all operations	-1.011	.146		-6.916	.000
24. Progress to tasks is usually monitored by the supervisors	.340	.111	.138	3.080	.002
25. Supervisors often assist work group members when they make mistakes	-.142	.044	-.147	-3.266	.001
26. Management does not allow activities outside the annual budget	2.413	.086	.767	27.976	.000

Table 9 above shows r-value of .769^a, r-square value of .591, adjusted r-square value of .588, standard error estimate of .76411, p-value of .001<.05, which shows clear direction of leaders does significantly influence adequate control in universities in Rivers State. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

DISCUSSION

Clear Direction and Good Planning

The answer to research question 1 showed that the respondents did not agree that clear direction of leaders influence good planning in universities in Rivers State. The tested hypothesis 1 result showed that clear direction of leaders does not significantly influence good planning in universities in Rivers State. The position of the respondents implies that clear direction of leaders does not influence good planning in universities in Rivers State. Cele (2005) differed by stating that an educational leader must give clear directions to members of the university on how to achieve objectives. These clarifications could be made through policy making, taking decisions and making clear the steps to taking such decisions.

These policies and decisions are formulated and made to address such aspects of the institution as academic activities, administrative affairs, material resources, human resources, finance, external elements and internal affairs that must all be managed (Kruger and van Deventer 2002).

Clear Direction and Effective Organizing

The respondents disagree that clear direction of leaders influence effective organizing in universities in Rivers State in research question 2. However, the tested hypothesis 2 showed that the clear direction of leaders does significantly influence effective organizing in universities in Rivers State. The stance of the respondents shows that clear direction of leaders influences effective organizing in universities in Rivers State. Pickens and Eick (2009), supported clear direction and effective organizing in universities in Rivers universities stating that work group members with clearly stated direction leads to an increase in effective organization as it improves cognitive and behavioural uprightness resulting to conceptual understanding. Ololube, Elechi and Uriah (2018) observed that the quality of relationship between the leader and the led, the quality of the environment the work group members find themselves working and the level of satisfaction they derive from their job are factors that greatly influence work group performance. Leaders who have the interest of the work group members at heart usually inspire them to discover their potentials by channeling their energy and passion towards their strengths (Bowman, 2007).

Clear Direction and Adequate Control

Answer to research question 3 showed that the respondents did not agree that clear direction of leaders influence adequate control in universities in Rivers State. Result of tested hypothesis 3 showed that clear direction of leaders does significantly influence adequate control in universities in Rivers State. The position of the respondents indicates that clear direction of leaders influence adequate control in universities in Rivers State. In congruence with the stance of the respondents, Barber, (2004) stated that controlling is one of the dynamics of management is a process by which academic activities are assessed and regulated, work group performances are evaluated progressively to check deviations and enforce corrections by educational leaders to achieve clearly directed, educational goals. However, there were similarities in controlling and planning, controlling differ from planning in the sense that while controlling is done during or after activities, planning is done before the activities begin (Rue & Byars, 2007).

CONCLUSION

This study evaluated direction of leaders and the effectiveness of institutions. The study concluded that clear direction of leaders was identified to be a necessary leadership tool that leads to attainment of organizational objective since it aids in planning, organizing and control.

Thus, the dynamic support of institutional work group members translates to high performance if effective planning, organizing and control of human and material resources in the leadership and management of educational institutions like the university system are adequately done. Consequently, for a leader and indeed the leadership of universities to succeed in the attainment of university goals, in combination with leadership clear direction as a management strategy enhances effectiveness.

Recommendations

Following the results from the study, the under listed recommendations are made:

- Educational leaders should understand and make use of various strategies to clarify members of the institutions in running toward the direction of achieving set goals.
- Institutional leaders must be exemplary to work and study group members in life style and performance.
- Educational leaders should employ participatory strategy to engage members of the institution in task delivery. Forceful control should be discouraged by university leadership.

REFERENCES

- Barber, M. (2004). The virtue of accountability: System re-design, inspection, and incentives in the era of informed professionalism. *Journal of Education*, 185(1), 3-7.
- Bezzina, M., & Duignan, P. (2006). Distributed Leadership: The theory and practice. *CCEAM Annual Conference, Hilton Cyprus Hotel, Lefkosia, Cyprus, 12-17 October, 2006, 1-11.*
- Bowman, R. F. (2007). How students can be motivated: A misplaced question? *The Clearing House*, November to December, 81-86.

- Bridges, W. (2003). *Managing Transitions: Making the most of change*. Nicholas Brealey.
- Broussard, C. S., & Garrison, M. E. B. (2004). The relationship between classroom motivation and academic achievement in Elementary-School-Aged children. *Family and Consumer Science Research Journal*, 33(2), 106-120.
- Brown, R. (2004). *It's Your Fault: An Insider's Guide to Learning and Teaching in City Schools*. Teachers' College Press.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2002). *School leadership: Concepts and evidence*. National College for School Leadership.
- Calitz, L., Fuglestad, O. L., & Lillejord, S. (2002). *Leadership in Education: Productive learning cultures*. Heinemann.
- Capco, J. (2007). Never Enough Time? How delegation can help. *Prentice management*, 32-33.
- Cele, N. (2005). Effective schools operating with amazing (dis)grace of human resources strategy, policy and practice: A South African case. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*: 8(3), 223-236.
- Cranston, N., & Ehrich, L. (2005). Enhancing the effectiveness of senior management teams in schools. *Leadership and Management*, 3(1),79-91.
- Creemers, B. P. M., & Reezigt, G. J. (2005). A comprehensive framework for effective school Improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 16(7), 407-424.
- Cronje, G., Du Toit, G. S., Motlatla, M. D. C., & Morais, De K. (2004). *Introduction to Business Management*. Oxford University Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World. What teachers should learn and should be able to do*. Jossy Bass.
- Darr, K. (2011). *Introduction to Management and Leadership Concepts, Principles, and Practices*. Jones & Barlett Learning.
- DeChurch, L. A & Haas, C. D. (2008). Examining Team Planning Through an Episodic Lens: Effects of deliberate, contingency and reactive planning on team effectiveness. *Small Group Research*, 39(5), 542-568.
- Donald, D., Lazarus, S. & Lolwana, P. (2004). *Educational Psychology in Social Context*. 2nd Ed. Oxford University Press.
- Earley, P., & Weindling, D. (2004). *Understanding School Leadership*. Paul Chapman.
- Fullan, M. (Ed.) (2009). *The Challenge of Change: Start school improvement now*, 2nd ed. Corwin Press.
- Guoxing, Y. (2007). Research evidence of school effectiveness in Sub-saharan Africa. EdQual Working Paper No 7. University of Bristol.
- Hernandez M., Eberly M.B., Avolio B. J., & Johnson M. D. (2011). The loci and mechanism of leadership: Exploring a more comprehensive view of leadership theory. *The leadership quarterly*, 22(1), 1165-1185.
- Hernon, P., & Rossiter, N. (2007). *Making a difference: Leadership and Academic Libraries*. Libraries Unlimited.
- Higgins, S., Hall, E., Wall, K., Woolner, P., & McCaughey, C. (2005). *The Impacts of School Environment: A literature review*. The Design Council.
- Jansen, J. D. (1995). Effective schools? *Comparative Education*, 31(2), 181-200.
- Joubert, R., & Prinsloo I. J. (2009). *The law of education in South Africa*. Van Schaik.
- Keung, C. C. (2008). The effect of shared decision-making on the improvement of teachers' job development. *New Horizons in Education*, 56(3), 31-46.

- Klainberg, M., & Dirschel, K.M. (2010). *Today's Nursing Leader: managing, succeeding, excelling*. Jones & Barlett Learning.
- Kruger, A. G., & Steinmann, C. F. (2003). The organizational climate and culture of schools. In Van Deventer, I and Kruger, A.G. (Eds.). *An Educator's Guide to School Management Skills*. Van Schaik.
- Kruger, A.G. & Van Deventer, I. (2003). (Eds.). *An Educator's Guide to School Management Skills*. Van Schaik
- Kruger, A. G. (2003). Instructional Leadership: the impact on the culture of teaching learning in two effective secondary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 23(3), 206-211.
- Kruger, M. C., Witziers, B., & Slegers, P. (2007). The impact of school leadership on level factors: Validation of causal model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 18(1), 1-20.
- Kyriakides, L., Demetrious, D., & Charalambous, C. (2006). Generating criteria for evaluating teachers through teacher effectiveness research. *Educational Research*, 48(1), 1-20.
- Lawrence, D. B., & Spillane, J. P. (2008). Problem-solving processes of expert and typical school principals: A qualitative look. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(5), 435-468.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large scale reform: Effects on students, teachers and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and Improvement*, 201-227.
- Levin, J. & Nolan, J. (2000). *Principles of classroom management: A professional decision making model* (3rd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Lunenburg, F. C. & Ornstein, A. C. (1991). *Educational Administration: Concepts and practices*. Wadsworth.
- Mcnamara, R. (2008). *Non-profit Management Guidelines*. <https://www.catarina.udlap.mx/udla/tales/documentos/lco/.../appendicel.pdf>.
- Moorosi, P., & Bush, T. (2011). School leadership development in Commonwealth countries: Learning across boundaries: ISEA, 39(3), 59-75.
- Mumford, T. V., Campion, M. A., & Morgeson, F. P (2007). The Leadership Skills Strapalex: Leadership skills requirements across organizational level. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 154-166.
- Nieuwenhuis, J. (2007) (Ed.). *Growing Human Rights and Values in Education*. Van Schaik.
- Northouse, P. (2013). *Leadership Theory and Practice*. Sage.
- Office of Standards in Education (OfSteD) (2003). *Leadership and Management: What Inspection Tells Us*. June. Crown Copyright.
- Okoji, O. O. (2014). Influence of leadership styles on community development programmes' implementation in rural communities of Akwa Ibom State Nigeria. *International Multidisciplinary Journal*, 8(2), 83-95.
- Ololube, N. P. (2018). Does core qualities of principled leaders regulate educational leadership and management? In N.P. Ololube (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management*. 8-27. Pearl.
- Ololube, N. P., Elechi, S. K, & Uriah, O. A. (2018). Educational leadership and management (ELM): Institutional leaders' value functions for effective management of universities. In N.P. Ololube (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management*. 111-133. Pearl.

- Owens, R. G. (2001). *Organizational Behaviour in Education*. Prentice-Hall
- Perry, L., & McWilliam, C. E. (2007). Accountability, responsibility and school leadership. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 7(1), 32-43.
- Pickens, M., & Eick, C. J. (2009). Studying, motivational strategies used by two teachers in differently tracked science courses. *The Journal of Educational Research*, May/June, 102(5), 349-362.
- Prinsloo, I. J. (2003). Communication skills. In Deventer, I and Kruger, A. G (Eds.) *An Educator's Guide to School Management*. Van Schaik.
- Prinsloo, I. J. (2003). Leadership and motivational skills. In Kruger, A. G and Van Deventer, I. *An Educator's Guide to School management*. Van Schaik.
- Prinsloo, I. J. (2009). Leadership and management of learning in education: *A Study Guide (LBL) 880 for M.Ed Leadership*. Department of Education Management and Policy Studies, University of Pretoria.
- Printy, S. M., Marks, H. M., & Bowers, A. J. (2009). Integrated Leadership. How principal and teachers share transformational and instructional influence. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19, 504-532.
- Reynolds, D., Creemers, B., Sringfield, S., Teddlie, C. & Shaffer, E. (2002). *World Class Schools: International perspectives on school effectiveness*. Routledge.
- Robbins, S.P. (2014). *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice Hall.
- Ross, J. A. & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational Leadership and Teacher Commitment to Organizational Values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 179-199.
- Rue, L. W. & Byars, L. (2007). *Supervision: Link to productivity* (9th Ed.). McGrawHill.
- Saleem, F. (2010). Development of School Effectiveness Model. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*, 4(2), 166-183.
- Shed, M. (n.d). The Definition of Management. [www.leadership501.com/ definition-](http://www.leadership501.com/definition-)
- Spillane, J. P., White, K. W. & Stephan, J. L. (2009). School principal expertise: Putting expert-aspiring principal differences in problem-solving processes to test. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8(8), 128-151.
- Steinbacher, D. & Smith, A. (2009). SH and E Strategic Planning: A maturity-critical approach to continuous improvement. *Professional Safety*, October, 30-36.
- Sterling, L. & Davidoff, S. (2000). *The Courage to Lead: A whole school development approach*. Juta.
- Tagliacollo, V. A., Volpato, G. L. & Junior, A. P. (2010). Association of student position in classroom and school performance. *International Research Journal*, 1(6),198-201.
- Tam, F. W. (2007). Rethinking school and community relations in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21(4), 350-336.
- Teodorovic, J. (2011). Classroom and school factors related to students? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 22(2), 215-236.
- University of Pretoria (2010). *Education Management 1*. Distance Education Unit.
- van der Merwe, H. N. (2003). *Organizing, delegating and controlling school activities*. In Van Deventer, I, & Kruger, A.G (Eds.). *An Educator's Guide to School management*. Van Schiak.

- van Deventer, I. (2003). *Organizing, delegating, coordinating and controlling school activities*. In Van Deventer, I. & Kruger, A.G (Eds.). *An Educator's Guide to School management*. Van Schaik.
- van Deventer, I. (2003). Visualising and Planning Skills. In. I van Deventer and Kruger, A.G. (2003) (eds.). *An Educator's Guide to School Management Skills*. Van Schaik.
- Vanhoof, J., Van Petegem, P., Verhoeven, J. C. & Buvens, I. (2009). Linking the policy making capacities of schools and quality of school self-evaluations: *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 37, 667-686.
- Verdis, A., Kriemadis, T. & Pashiardis, P. (2003). Historical, comparative and statistical perspectives of school effectiveness research: Rethinking educational evaluation in Greece. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 17(4), 155-169.
- Viljoen, J. & Moller, T. (1992). *School Management Course 1*. Via Afrika.
- Vogues, K. E., Tworoger, L. C & Bendixen, M (2009). The role of organizational template in radical change. *The Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 14(3), 27-48.
- Wiepking, V. U. & Maas, I. (2009). Resources that make you generous: Effects of social and human resources on charitable giving. *Social Forces*, 87(4), 1-24.