

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The effectiveness of student involvement in decision-making and university leadership: A comparative analysis of 12 universities in South-west Nigeria

Adesoji A. Oni* and Jeremiah A. Adetoro**

Abstract

This study examines student involvement in university leadership and decision-making and its impacts on leadership effectiveness in universities in Nigeria. The study uses a descriptive survey conducted among students and staff in all 12 of the public and private universities in South-West Nigeria.¹ The research findings indicate that there is a significant relationship between student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness. It also reveals that there are significant differences between decision-making with student involvement and decision-making without student involvement. Conversely, no significant difference was found in leadership effectiveness between decision-making in public and private universities. The study finally reveals that there is a significant relationship between the management-student relationship and teaching effectiveness. The results therefore show that, for leadership and teaching effectiveness to be improved in Nigerian universities, provision should be made for the adequate involvement of students in decision-making on important matters relating to university administration.

Keywords

Student representation; leadership; student politics; public higher education; private higher education; university governance; effectiveness; teaching and learning.

Background and introduction

Universities in Nigeria exist to achieve specific goals in teaching, learning, research, and the development of citizens, among others. In Nigeria, the functions of the university head, that is, the vice-chancellor, are to manage people, tasks and resources in order to achieve these goals. All the activities of the institution's management, whether working with the general public, the management ranks, academics, the board of directors, staff or the student

* Dr Adesoji Oni is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Educational Foundations, University of Lagos, Akoka-Yaba, Lagos. Email: aoluoni@yahoo.com.

** Dr Jeremiah Adetoro is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Educational Administration, University of Lagos, Akoka-Yaba, Lagos, Nigeria. Email: adetorojeremiah@yahoo.ca.

union, are ultimately meant to contribute to this end. In this process, both conscious and unconscious processes are involved. When these processes are conscious, decision-making is already evoked and is in use.

Decision-making is the process of identifying and choosing among alternatives based on values and preferences. It is synonymous with management. Nobert (1996) believes that control of a system is achieved through the use of feedback from the environment. He defines a system as a means of appreciating how organisation parts interact with their environment. Decisions made affect all parts in a system. For effective decisions to be made, every role player in the system needs to participate at one level or another. Thus, Mullins (2004) and Edem (1992) identify three levels of participation in a system, namely:

1. The technical level: Operational or processing level (the actual work, e.g. teaching);
2. The managerial level: Human resources; and
3. The community level: The Environment.

It suffices to say that decision-making is the kernel and an essential aspect of an organisation, including the school system, which determines the daily operations or activities of an organisation. Student involvement in decision-making is not well embraced and accepted in Nigerian universities as a result of the organizational structure and bureaucratic nature of our educational system. (Adeleke, 2000).

‘Student participation in decision-making’, according to Jeruto and Kiprop (2011), refers to the work of student representative bodies such as school councils, student parliaments and prefectorial bodies. It is also a term used to encompass all aspects of school (or university) life and decision-making where students may make a contribution informally through individual negotiation as well as formally through purposely created structures and mechanisms. It thus refers to participation of students in collective decision-making at school or class level and to dialogue between students and other decision-makers, and not only consultation or surveying student opinion (Ajayi, 1991). Student participation in decision-making in universities is often viewed as problematic owing to the fact that students may be viewed as minors, immature and lacking in the expertise and technical knowledge that is needed in making decisions regarding the university. Thus, student participation in decision-making is often confined to issues concerned with student welfare, with students not being involved in core governance issues (Fajana, 2002).

Oke, Okunola, Oni and Adetoro (2010) argue that most university-school administrators do not allow their students to participate in decision-making in their universities. They assert that the major problem confronting their universities is the alienation of students from decision-making. This present situation in our universities is described by Fletcher (2004, p. 18) as ‘tokenism and manipulation’ where students are given a voice but in fact have little or no choice about what they do or how they participate. There is no meaningful involvement of students in deciding some of the issues that affect them directly.

Despite the usefulness and relevance of student participation in decision-making in university management, it has been established that not all university administrators encourage and practise student involvement in decision-making in their university. Savage

(1968) points out that administrators vary greatly in the extent to which they encourage or allow other staff and students to participate in the decision-making process. Such variation may be due to an administrator's view concerning her/his roles and the staff members, as well as the confidence and trust an administrator has in the ability, sincerity, competence and performance of her/his subordinates. It needs reiteration here that decisions give rise to policies and plans, which, of course, are mere intentions when not implemented. The actual task of implementation rests with all the staff of an organisation. It has been argued that there should be participatory decision-making if the implementation is to be successful.

It seems, however, that not very many Nigerian universities encourage student involvement in decision-making, and, even among the few vice-chancellors who try it, fewer still understand the basic principles of student involvement in decision-making. This is evidenced in the many staff strikes and student demonstrations in Nigerian universities, which are caused by faulty decision-making (Tonga, 1997). The state of the art of decision-making therefore seems to be defective in Nigerian universities, owing to the way decisions are imposed on students, as evidenced even in the structure of the university system (see Appendix III). The lack of effectiveness results in cases of stress, tension, frustration, isolation, selfishness, and conflict between staff and management, between students and staff, between students and management themselves, among staff themselves, and in the management rank and file (Salisu, 1996). The Nigerian student unions thus often complain about the lack of involvement of students in decision-making. Consequently, wrong decisions are made on issues involving student admission, student housing, tuition fees, allowances, students' general welfare, and disciplinary matters.

Buttressing the need for involvement of students in decision-making, Alani, Isichei, Oni and Adetoro (2010) highlight the need to include students in the school's decision-making process. Oke et al. (2010) further argue that failure to involve students in decision-making in the schools can lead to difficulty in the planning and implementation of school goals, which can degenerate into inadequacies in respect of human, material, financial and physical resources. Representation of students in university decision-making, according to Luescher-Mamashela (2013), is one of the main ways in which universities engage with students, listen to them, and involve them in their internal decision-making processes. Empirical studies indicate that the representation of students in decision-making at the institutional level is close to universal (Salisu, 1996; Mullins, 2004). However, there is considerable variability between and within institutions so far as representation at lower organisational levels (e.g. faculty, school/department and course levels) and across different issue-based governance domains (e.g. teaching and learning, students' social issues, and staffing) (Luescher-Mamashela, 2013).

Oyediji and Fasasi (2006) observe that, while some leaders would want to take decisions without involving subordinates, others would want to encourage participatory decision-making. This trend abounds in Nigeria universities, both private and public, whereby students have little or no say in decision-making concerning academic and administrative matters. Meanwhile, there is that conviction that students' decisions are less prone to favouritism than decisions made by the leadership alone, which will have far-reaching effects on its academic and

administrative achievements (Fajana, 2002). Moreover, Ajayi (1991) states that the importance of student involvement in decision-making in universities cannot be overemphasised owing to its spill-over effect on the overall academic achievement of students. Ejiogu (1995) is of the opinion that educational leaders are expected to be equipped with the academic knowledge and professional skills to enable them to cope with changes in teaching and learning situations, coupled with the administrative demand for efficiency and effectiveness. That is why, in the US and UK higher education systems, formal student involvement in university decision-making became an established feature of university governance, not only in student affairs governance, but also with respect to certain aspects of teaching and learning as well as institution-wide strategy and planning (Luescher-Mamashela, 2013).

The value of actively involving students in decision-making can generally be described from one of three perspectives:

- Functional: How does student involvement in decision-making benefit the university?
- Developmental: How does student involvement in decision-making benefit the students?
- Social: What are the benefits to society of student involvement in decision-making?

In addition, it can be argued that student participation in university decision-making processes is part of an emerging and related discourse on education for democracy (Tenune, 2001) and universities as sites of citizenship (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont & Stephens, 2003). Thus, student involvement in decision-making in their university may facilitate their introduction to democratic ideals and practices.

Research has therefore indicated that student involvement in decision-making has various related benefits. A benefit of effective participation is that students will find it easier to accept decisions in which their representatives have had input as participants. They are also more likely to understand the motives for an otherwise objectionable policy and to appreciate that the motives were not malicious, even in the case of mistakes. Obondo (2000) observes that, if students are involved in making decisions about salient issues concerning their lives, they are likely to identify with the outcomes of such processes, and colleges with institutionalised participation will experience less student-related administrative problems. If governance is shared, students then feel more positive about college goals and objectives (Obondo, 2000). Obondo further asserts that, in the transformation of universities, students should be involved. A student association represents an important resource in university efforts to confront challenges as they arise. Student representatives have been noted to have the capacity to diffuse potential conflicts. This they can do through regular meetings with their members and the university administration, and by designing a mechanism for regular communication, thereby restraining their colleagues from engaging in unnecessary conflict (Obondo, 2000).

Similarly, Wood (1993) conducted a study in three colleges on faculty, student and support-staff participation in governance and found out that these groups constituted valuable sources of information on decisions. Respondents were found to be positive about student participation and the ability of students to make significant contributions to the

quality of decisions (also see: Zuo & Ratsoy, 1999; Menon, 2005). However, he further argues that students may not be in a position to effectively represent the interests of their groups if they have no place on university boards. This would simply promote the interests of a specific group, which may lead to conflict.

Greg (1998) defines involvement in decision-making as creating an environment in which people have an impact on decisions and actions that affect their jobs. Staff and student involvement in decision-making is not a goal per se. Rather, it is a management and leadership philosophy about how people are most enabled to contribute to the improvement and the ongoing success of their work in the organisation. According to Melvin (2004), involvement is conceived in terms of a process of dialogue, decision-making and action-taking (DDA) regarding particular changes under way in a school.

The main goal of university-based decision-making is to ensure that there is student involvement to accomplish the university's mission through its strategic plan. Buttressing this view, Onyene (2002) argues that decision-making is more or less an administrative behaviour directed toward articulation and actualisation of the goals and objectives of the school. In other words, it involves a particular kind of leadership style. In this respect, Orest (1999) indicates the importance of the school climate not only as a determining factor in the type of educational programme carried out within the school, but also in terms of the close relationship between school climate and leadership. Leadership styles may characterised as autocratic, laissez-faire or democratic. The style of leadership and school climate are therefore determining factors for staff and student involvement in decision-making which can lead to leadership effectiveness or ineffectiveness in overall university performance.

As a result of the foregoing, there have been calls for increasing the extent of inclusion of students in decision-making in Nigerian universities, owing to the frequent occurrences of student unrest, student militarism, cultism, and gangsterism in the sector. Proponents of student participation in decision-making have justified their support for this idea on the premise that decisions in a school affect students in latent and manifest ways. Largely, they are recipients of final decisions (Sushila & Bakhda, 2006); hence, recommendations made by students may be very constructive and, if approached in the right manner, could make a positive contribution. In this way, students' rejectionist tendencies with regard to decisions imposed upon them by university management would change to ownership and acceptance of decisions arrived at with their participation. Thus, persistent agitation by students highlights the urgent need for student involvement in decision-making, as it is believed that, if students were part and parcel of decision-making, they could ensure that their interests are adopted in the administration of universities. Nonetheless, despite laudable student agitation in this regard, not much research has been conducted to find out how far, or to what extent, students are involved in decision-making in Nigerian tertiary institutions; the role and contribution of students in university decision-making in Nigeria are relatively neglected areas of inquiry. This study therefore investigates the extent of student involvement in decision-making and its impact on leadership effectiveness in universities in South-west Nigeria with a view to filling the knowledge gap between the theory and practice of participatory university management.

Statement of the problem

The governance of the university has not been smooth since its inception all over the world (Tonga, 1997). In Nigeria, in particular, university management has been faced with various challenges since early 1980s, including high rates of youth restiveness, poor academic performance, examination malpractices, increasing conflict on campus, and indiscipline among students in universities across the country. Moreover, part of this scenario is that Nigerian students have resorted to cultism, riots, robbery, cybercrime, theft, prostitution, hooliganism, and drug abuse, and have shown a general lack of interest in academic matters during the course of their university education (Alani et al., 2010). In some cases, the situation deteriorated to the extent where government was forced to close down some universities to enable law enforcement agencies to re-establish law and order. Many researchers believe that these problems indicate leadership deficiencies, as a result of which university managements prove ineffective in ensuring academic excellence, providing good communication network, motivating both teachers and students, and even enforcing discipline among students (Salisu, 1996).

There is therefore increased urgency to think of ways to give recognition to all actors affected by university decision-making. Are these lapses in decision-making, which culminate in strikes and a strained student–management relationship, the result of the incompetence of decision-makers? Or are they due to the nature and structure of universities? Could the problem be inherent in the nature of the decision-making process? Or could some other factors be responsible? The thrust of the present study is to investigate the extent of student involvement in decision-making and how it impacts on university effectiveness in South-west Nigeria’s universities with a view to advancing suggestions on how to improve governance practices for the purpose of bringing about more efficiency in the administration of these universities.

Study objectives

The objectives of this research are therefore as follows:

1. To identify the leadership styles used in private and public universities in Nigeria;
2. To assess the influence of student involvement in decision-making on universities’ effectiveness;
3. To examine the difference in leadership effectiveness between decisions made in public universities and decisions made in private universities in South-west Nigeria; and
4. To examine the relationship between the management–student relationship and teaching effectiveness in public and private universities in South-west Nigeria.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are tested in the course of this study:

1. There is no significant relationship between student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness in Nigerian universities.

2. There is no significant difference in decision-making with student involvement and decision-making without student involvement.
3. There is no significant difference in leadership effectiveness between decisions made in public universities and decisions made in private universities in South-west Nigeria.
4. There is no significant relationship between the management-student relationship and teaching effectiveness in public and private universities in South-west Nigeria.

Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive-survey design. An attempt was made to determine the relationship between student involvement in decision-making and universities' effectiveness in both public and private universities in South-west Nigeria. The population of the study comprises all 134 universities in Nigeria, students and staff (in all the public and private universities). The sample for the study comprises 1 750 students and staff drawn from 12 selected public and private universities in the six states that make up South-west Nigeria, namely Lagos, Ogun, Oyo, Osun, Ondo and Ekiti. The method used for sampling students and staff was the simple random technique for selecting the participants and the universities.

The research instrument used for the study was a questionnaire. The questionnaire was made up of two sections. Section A comprised participants' personal data while Section B comprised 20 statements. Each participant had the opportunity of choosing one of four options to agree or disagree with a statement: strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) and strongly disagree (SD). The statement items were designed to determine the perception of students and staff with regard to the relationship between student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness. The items are presented in the appendix. Prior to conducting the survey, the questionnaire was given to colleagues, who provided suggestions and comments on the appropriateness of the items. Their suggestions were taken into consideration for validity purposes before the researchers made the final corrections to the questionnaire and conducted the survey.

The reliability of the research instrument was ascertained by conducting a pilot study using universities not included in the study. This was done to ensure that results could be generalised to other universities that were not included in the main study. To pre-test the reliability of the research instrument employed in the study, the researchers gave out the questionnaire to 100 participants who did not take part in the study and a test-re-test reliability coefficient of 0.67 was established.

Ahead of surveying, the researcher sought the permission of the respective university authorities to conduct the research. Assistant researchers were recruited from among graduate students of the University of Lagos. The assistant researchers were adequately briefed about the objective of administering the questionnaire. Participants were encouraged to express their views about each of the statements. All the administered copies of the questionnaire were completed.

The collected data were analysed using frequency tables, percentages, and t-test and Pearson product-moment correlation statistical tools. The t-test was used to determine the

significant difference in decision-making with student involvement and decision-making without student involvement, as represented in Hypothesis 2; as well as the significant difference in leadership effectiveness between decisions made in public universities and decisions made in private universities, as per Hypothesis 3. The Pearson product moment correlation statistical tool was used to test the relationship between student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness, as well as the relationship between the management–student relationship and teaching effectiveness in the sampled universities. The copies of the questionnaire were scrutinised to ensure that they were properly completed by the participants. The responses from each participant were based on proportion and percentages, which were used to analyse the data. Also, the t-test statistical tool used showed whether or not there was had any significant difference between the observed frequencies and the participants’ set of expected frequencies.

Results

Student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness

Hypothesis 1 (H_{o1}): There is no significant relationship between student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness in Nigerian universities.

Table 1: Student involvement in decision-making, and leadership effectiveness

Variables	N	\bar{x} (Mean)	SD	Df	r-Cal	r-tab	Remark
Student involvement in decision-making	1 750	$\bar{x} = 20.63$	11.47	1,748	0.549	0.195	Significant
Leadership effectiveness		$\bar{y} = 11.22$	8.97				

$p < 0.05$

The results presented on Table 1 show the relationship between student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness in universities in Nigeria. The results reveal that there is a significant relationship between student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness in both public and private universities in Nigeria. This is evident from the fact that the r-calculated value of 0.549 is found to be greater than the r-critical (r-table) value of 0.195. This implies that regular involvement of students in decision-making by the universities authorities was found to enhance leadership effectiveness in Universities in South Western Nigeria.

Decision-making with and without student involvement

Hypothesis 2 (H_{o2}): There is no significant difference in decision-making with student involvement and decision-making without student involvement.

Table 2: Difference in decision-making with student involvement and without student involvement

Variables	N	\bar{x} (Mean)	SD	Df	r-Cal	r-tab	Remark
Decision-making with student involvement	1 750	$\bar{x}_1=16.14$	SD1 = 6.74	1 748	2.49	1.98	H _{o2} rejected
Decision-making without student involvement		$\bar{x}_2=17.09$	SD2 = 8.55				

$p < 0.05$

The results in Table 2 reveal that the r-calculated is 2.49, while the r-tabulated gives 1.98 at $p < 0.05$ and 1 748 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis H_{o2} is therefore rejected. This means that there is a significant difference in decision-making that involves students and decision-making that does not involve students in South-west Nigeria’s universities.

Leadership effectiveness in public and private universities in South-west Nigeria

Hypothesis 3 (H_{o3}): There is no significant difference in leadership effectiveness between decisions made in public universities and decisions made in private universities in South-west Nigeria.

Table 3: Difference in leadership effectiveness between decisions made in public and private universities

Variables	Leadership effectiveness						
	N	\bar{x} (Mean)	SD	Df	r-Cal	r-tab	Remark
Decisions made in public universities	1 750	$\bar{x}_1 = 3.04$	SD1 = 1.39	1 748	1.31	1.98	H _{o3} accepted
Decisions made in private universities		$\bar{x}_2 = 2.17$	SD2 = 1.20				

$p < 0.05$

The results in Table 3 show that the r-calculated is 1.31, while the r-critical (table) is 1.98 at $p < 0.05$ given 1 748 as the degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis H_{o3} is hereby accepted. This implies that leadership effectiveness in both public and private universities in South-west Nigeria is the same based on either decisions made in public universities or decisions made in private universities in South-West Nigeria.

The management–student relationship and teaching effectiveness

Hypothesis 4 (H_{o4}): There is no significant relationship between the management–student relationship and teaching effectiveness in public and private universities in South-west Nigeria.

Table 4: The management–student relationship and teaching effectiveness

Variables	N	\bar{x} (Mean)	SD	df	r-Cal	r-tab	Remark
Management–student relationship	1 750	$\bar{x} = 18.98$	13.28	1 748	0.547	0.195	H ^{o4} rejected
Teaching effectiveness in public and private universities		$\bar{x} = 10.38$					

$p < 0.05$

Table 4 shows that the calculated r-value of 0.547 is greater than the table value of 0.195 given a 0.05 level of significance and 1 748 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis H_{o4} is therefore rejected. There is therefore a significant relationship between a cordial management–student relationship and teaching effectiveness in public and private universities in South-west Nigeria.

Discussion of findings

The study revealed that there is a significant relationship between student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness in South-west Nigeria's universities. The study also revealed that there is a significant difference in decision-making with student involvement and decision-making without student involvement. Furthermore, it showed that there is no significant difference in leadership effectiveness between decisions made in public universities and decisions made in private universities in South-west Nigeria. Finally, there is a significant relationship between the management–student relationship and teaching effectiveness in public and private universities in South-west Nigeria. The results therefore show that, for leadership and teaching effectiveness to be guaranteed in Nigerian universities, provision must be made for adequate involvement of students in decision-making on important matters relating to university administration.

The findings of this study are therefore similar to those of Jeruto and Kiprop (2011), who studied student participation in decision-making in terms of the work of student representative bodies such as school councils, student parliaments and perfectorial bodies. The findings are also in line with those of Oke et al (2010), who assert that the major problem confronting our universities is the alienation of the students from decision-making, and the position of Ajayi (1991), who states that the importance of student involvement in decision-making in universities cannot be over-emphasised due to the spill-over effect on the overall academic achievement of students.

Summary, recommendations and conclusion

On the basis of data collected through a survey of staff and students in public and private universities in six states of South-west Nigeria, this study has shown that regular involvement of students in decision-making by university authorities has the potential to enhance leadership effectiveness of university administrations in universities in South-west Nigeria. The results of the study also show a significant difference in decision-making that involves students and decision-making which does not involve students. Moreover, a cordial management-student relationship significantly affects teaching effectiveness in public and private universities in South-west Nigeria's universities. Conversely, the study has revealed that there is no significant difference between leadership effectiveness in public and private universities in South-west Nigeria. These results therefore suggest that university authorities and management should endeavour to involve students in their decision-making, whether or not the universities are private or public entities. Furthermore, attempts should be made to ensure that students participate in all matters of interest that are meant to improve the teaching effectiveness of academic staff. A cordial relationship and mutual understanding between the student body and university authorities will enhance the smooth administration of universities in Nigeria and thus provide for a more peaceful environment that guarantees teaching effectiveness.

Endnote

1. University of Lagos, Lagos; University of Ibadan, Ibadan; Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife; University of Agriculture Abeokuta; Federal University of Technology, Akure; Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti; Lead City University, Ibadan; Covenant University, Ota; Lagos State University Ojo Lagos; Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye; Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti; Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomosho.

References

- Adeleke, I.O. (2000). *Administration of Higher Education*. Lagos: Sunray Press.
- Ajayi, O.A. (1991). Leadership style in institutions of higher education: A contingency approach. *Management in Nigeria: A Journal of the Institute of Management*, 4(2), pp. 11-22.
- Alani, A., Isichei, F.M., Oni, A.A., & Adetoro, J.A. (2010). Student involvement in decision-making and principals' effectiveness in private secondary schools in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 7(2), pp. 319-333.
- Aluede, O.O. (1995). *Factors Influencing Student Unrest in Tertiary Institutions in Edo State of Nigeria*. PhD Thesis. University of Benin, Benin-City, Nigeria.
- Aluede, O.O. (2001). Factors influencing student unrest in tertiary institutions in Edo State of Nigeria. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 24(3), pp. 10-26.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Edem, D.A. (1992). *Introduction to Educational Administration in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Ejiogun, A.M. (1995). *Readings in Organizational Behaviour in Nigeria*. Lagos: Literamed.

- Fajana, O. (2002). *Some Aspects of School Leadership*. Ibadan: Education Industries.
- Huddleston, T. (2007). *From Student Voice to Shared Responsibility: Effective Practice in Democratic School Governance in European Schools*. London: Citizenship Foundation.
- Jeruto, T.B., & Kiprop, C.J. (2011). Extent of student participation in decision-making in secondary schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(21) (Special issue), pp. 92–99.
- Junaid, I.O. (2012). Teaching and learning processes in monitoring and evaluation. Paper presented during Lagos-Eko Capacity Building Project for Secondary School Teachers and School Administrator. (Unpublished paper)
- Luescher-Mamashela, T.M. (2013). Student representation in university decision-making: Good reasons, a new lens? *Studies in Higher Education*, (38)10, 1442-1456. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2011.625496
- Magadla, M. (2007). *The Role of the Learner in the School Governing Body: Perceptions and Experiences of Principals, Educators, Parents and Learners*. MEd thesis: University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.
- McGrath, E.J. (1970). *Should Students Share Power?* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Melvin, S. (2004). *Staff Involvement in Decision-making*. London: Heinemann. pp. 71-93.
- Menon, M.E. (2005). Students' view regarding their participation in university governance: Implication for distributed leadership in higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 11(2), pp. 167-182. DOI: 10.1080/13583883.2005.9967145
- Mullins, L. J. (2004). *Management and Organizational Behaviour*. (7th ed.). New Delhi, Prentice-Hall.
- Obondo, A. (2000). *Politics of Participatory Decision-making in Campus Governance*. Kenya: Faculty of Education, University of Nairobi.
- Oke, G.G., Okunola, P.O., Oni, A.A., & Adetoro, J.A. (2010). Relationship between vice-chancellors' leadership behaviour and work behaviour of lecturers in Nigerian universities: Implication for leadership training for vice-chancellors. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 8(1), pp.123-139.
- Onyene, V. (2002). *Dynamics of Institutional Management towards Administrative Competence*. Lagos: Vita-Nasco.
- Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research: Research for Social Scientists and Practitioner Researchers* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Salisu, A. Y. (1996). Leadership Styles of Rectors : Implication for Staff Development and Turnover in Federal and State Polytechnics in Northern Nigeria. M.Ed. Thesis. Ahmad Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Sushila, P., & Bakhda, M. (2006). *Management and Evaluation of Schools*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Tenune, H. (2001). *Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility: United States Study*. Philadelphia: International Consortium for Higher Education Civic Responsibility and Democracy.
- Tonga, A.M. (1997). *The Role of Public Relations in Conflict Resolution*. Master's thesis. Nigeria: University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Zuo, B., & Ratsoy, E.W. (1999). Student participation in university governance. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*. 29(1), pp. 1-26.

Appendix I: Student questionnaire

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LAGOS, NIGERIA
STUDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Participants,

Please respond to these items provided by putting a tick (✓) against your responses. The items are mainly for research purposes. Your responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Yours faithfully,

A.A. Oni (Ph.D.) & J.A. Adetoro (Ph.D.)

Section A: Biodata of Participant

1. Age range

16-20 []

21-25 []

2. Gender

Male []

Female []

3. Course of study _____

4. Level _____

5. Type of iniversity: Public [] Private []

Section B

Please tick (✓) as an indication of whether you agree or disagree with the options presented in the column below.

Key: Strongly agree [SA]; Agree [A]; Disagree [D]; Strongly disagree [SD]

S/N	Item description	SA	A	SD	D
1.	Students should not participate in decision-making in the university.				
2.	Decision-making ought to be the priority of the university management.				
3.	Participation of students in decision-making of the university involves them in the day-to-day running of the university.				
4.	Students get demoralised when they are not involved in decision-making in the university.				
5.	Participation of students in decision-making will enable them to implement some of the decisions of the university effectively.				
6.	Students feel they belong when they are involved in the decision-making.				
7.	To boost students' productivity, they should be allowed to partake in the decision-making process in the university.				
8.	Getting students to partake in decision-will affect their academic activities.				
9.	Students should remain in the classroom and not get involved in the decision-making process.				
10.	Students should not be involved in decision-making, which is the managerial attribute of university management.				
11.	The university management should operate an open-door policy in the school.				
12.	Vice-chancellors who operate closed-door policies in the school are not friends of their students.				
13.	Students are not trained to take decisions in the management of the university.				
14.	Students who are involved in decision-making in the university work with great zeal.				
15.	To motivate students, they must be involved in the decisions made in the university.				
16.	Students tend to develop an 'I don't care' attitude if they are not involved in decision-making in the university.				
17.	Students' academic achievement is high when their universities' managements involved them in university activities of a management nature.				
18.	Students perform better if they are involved in decision-making in the university.				
19.	Students do not like non-participation in decision-making in the universities.				
20.	Students do not bother much about participation in decision-making in universities.				

Appendix II: Staff questionnaire

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LAGOS, NIGERIA
STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Participants,

The following questionnaire is aimed at eliciting information from staff in the university on students' involvement in decision-making and universities' leadership effectiveness in South-west Nigeria. Your honest and prompt responses to the items are hereby solicited. Please note that your anonymity and the confidentiality of your responses are fully guaranteed. You need not provide your names.

Yours faithfully,

A.A. Oni (Ph.D.) & J.A. Adetoro (Ph.D.)

Section A: Bio-Data of Participant

Please tick (✓) where appropriate:

1. Name of university _____

2. Type of university : Public [] Private []

3. Gender
Male []
Female []

4. Age range
23-30 years []
31-38 years []
39-46 years []
Above 46 years []
Above 53 years []

5. Highest qualification
NCE/ND []
HND/BA/BSc []
MA/MSc./MBA/MPA []
Ph.D. []

6. Status
Teaching staff []
Non-teaching staff []

Section B

Below are four options to choose from the questionnaire. Tick (✓) in the column that strongly expresses your feelings.

Key: Strongly agree [SA]; Agree [A]; Disagree [D]; Strongly disagree [SD]

S/N	Item Description	SA	A	SD	D
1.	Your university management allows students to give their opinions on university administration.				
2.	Your university management encourages students to take part in the school programme.				
3.	Students are actively involved in the university leadership programme.				
4.	Your university management is always annoyed when students contribute ideas to university governance.				
5.	Students always look forward to meetings between themselves and universities' authorities so as to contribute their ideas.				
6.	Your university's management accepts students' opinion at any point in time.				
7.	Students take part in decision-making whenever the university has a problem.				
8.	Your university vice-chancellor allows students to exchange ideas freely without fear.				
9.	My university vice-chancellor is happy whenever any student contributes his/her opinion on university problems.				
10.	My vice-chancellor's leadership style can move the university forward.				
11.	My vice-chancellor's presence in any student activities arouses a sense of fear.				
12.	My vice-chancellor motivates students to give their opinions during the decision-making meeting.				
13.	It takes the students conscious extra effort to contribute promptly to solving the university's problem.				
14.	My vice-chancellor finds it difficult to involve students in decision-making.				
15.	My vice-chancellor involves the students in the making of school rules and regulations.				
16.	In my university, students have very little freedom to decide in management meetings.				
17.	Students have a lot to say about what happens in their university, but are afraid to say it.				
18.	The vice-chancellor really values students and also involves them fully in the university decision-making process.				
19.	My vice-chancellor's job is hectic so he does not have time for meetings.				

20. What type of leadership style is being operated in your university?

Democratic leadership style []

Autocratic (authoritarian) leadership style []

Laissez-faire leadership style []

Appendix III: Administrative structure of Nigerian universities



