IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 22, Issue 5, Ver. 10 (May. 2017) PP 22-40
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

Leadership and Management Accountability of Public Universities in South Nation and Nationalities People Regional State

Mulatu Dea Lerra,
Wolaita Sodo University
&
Jeilu Oumer (PhD),
Addis Ababa University

Abstract: This inquiry purported to examine the practices of leadership and management accountability in South Nation Nationalities Region public universities. Mixed research design instrumental. Proportional stratified random sampling, and purposive sampling techniques were used to select sample universities and respondents (n=370).Descriptive data analysis tool, mainly mean and standard deviation employed in analyzing quantitative data. Qualitative data analysis methods were applied to the data generated from transcriptions of interviews, FGD and document analysis. One way ANOVA employed to examine the variations between and within groups by considering its assumptions. Besides, Binary regression was applied to test overall model evaluation and goodness-of-fit. Principal component analysis utilized as a data reduction technique among the explanatory variables. Independent t-test also used to compare differences between separate groups and to determine a significant difference in scores between and within groups. The study reveals, the logistic regression model was statistically significant, at Wald test: $\chi^2 = 24.450$, $p<.001$. The model explained 36.0% (Nagelkerke R2) of the variation in effective governance practices and correctly classified 68.30 % of cases. Hosmer-Lemeshow test points out the goodness of fit of the model with chi-square value of 8.036 and with a P>0.05, which provides significant at the 5 % level, the model suggesting, does not conform to the data set as alternative assumption (H1).We can conclude that effective governance practices from both leadership and accountability perspective in the sampled public universities were not promising. The study also forwarded six major policy options will aid to insure that the HE to attain effective leadership management and accountability.

Key Words: *Governance, Leadership, Management, Accountability, Autonomy, Higher Education* **Institution**

I. INTRODUCTION

The paradigm of classical management practice into contemporary and self-governing structures is the cornerstone to higher education institutions. It provides academic leadership and teaching staff greater autonomy, accountability, transparency, trust and freedom to make decisions [1]. Unless the academic communities have a sensation of empowerment, such independent structures will be unrealistic. Hence, higher institutions have been trying to acclimatize this modern concept to realize their goals and advance their maneuver today's capricious environment. Higher education has undergone an intensive change in recent decades, both in Ethiopia and worldwide and became accessible to the masses. This process of massification were manifested in a sharp rise in the number of students, expansion of tertiary education systems, diversification of provision, new modes of delivery, more heterogeneous students. Furthermore, the growing internationalization of higher education, research and innovation in most countries ([1];[2]; [3];[4]; [5]) the other manifestation and affecting, among other things, the number, size, variety, leadership and management, system of accountability and structure, and quality [6] of higher education worldwide.

These changes, enhanced by the emergence of the "knowledge society" [7], demographic developments, slow economic growth, globalization [8], and the growth of global competition ([9]; [10])changed the face of higher education and necessitated a new approach to the regulation, control, and monitoring of this intricate developing system. The salience of public concern for higher education issues has made academic leadership and management a key topic in policy debates and provoked much public discourse around the relationship between institutional performance and current administration practices [11].Quality leadership and management accountability, therefore, becomes a vital element that will permit them to anticipate, design, implement, monitor and appraise effective and efficient policies, strategies, and programs.

Leadership and management often regarded as essentially practical activities. The determination of vision, the allocation of resources and the evaluation of effectiveness all involve action. Practitioners tend to be dismissive of theories and concepts for their alleged remoteness from the 'real' school situation [12]. Moreover, effective leadership and management in higher education institutions (HEIs) also implies the potency to make a

determination and decision making structures within the institutions can be created in a participatory manner and extent of centralization and decentralization [13] and enable actors more accountable and responsible to their action in institutions. Equally, accountability can be a somewhat slippery concept, defined in different ways in theory and in practice, and applied variously in a range of circumstance. Bovens [14] stated accountability as an ethical concept, which concerns proper behavior, and it deals with responsibilities of individuals and organizations for their actions towards other people and agencies. Bovens clearly underscored the relationship between and 'actors (individual or organization) and their 'stakeholders'. He also identifies accountability as methods by which the actor may render an account (i.e. Justify their actions and decisions) to the stakeholders and by which the stakeholders may hold the actor to account (i.e. Impose sanctions or grant permissions). Hence, is it at the heart of contemporary approaches to the governance of public service, including academic sector. Pandey [15] argues that autonomous or, not all organizations, including HEIs are accountable to their stakeholders, in particular and to the society, in general. Autonomy of publicly funded institutions also implies societal accountability. Greater autonomy to these institutions means greater accountability to the society. Normally, accountability means measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of what an institution serves.

The researchers under the current study is aware of the wide spectrum of possible accountability mechanisms or typologies that could achieve a balance between professional autonomy and managerial control, namely: legal, social and political accountability ([16]; [17]).

As universities have become increasingly interdependent with external powers, they become accountable to external organizational relationships, such as local and federal governments, equally in managing business and corporate relationships. Accountability will be wanting from HEIs if the society loses trust in them. If that is the case, the challenge is to regain the society's trust. Hence, HEIs strive to strike a balance between stakeholders' needs, societal demands and institutional autonomy [15].

Besides, HIEs recognized as an important means of forming skilled and educated workforce through the planning of quality education under today's world of competitions and knowledge-based economy. Consequently, HEIs are required to become responsive, innovative, quality conscious, alive, creative, dynamic, demand-driven, efficient and effective [1].

Globally, HEIs have been reacting to the challenges of globalization and the information age through improving its leadership and management system in line with governance reform. In this regard, based on a 20-year strategic direction of the nation, a goal of becoming a middle-income country by 2025, the government of Ethiopia has launched a higher education reform program throughout the country as of 2002 to enhance institutional capacity of the introductions. The reform focuses on access creation, redefining mission, governance, and responsiveness and promoting quality ([17]; [18]).

Leadership can play a great role in the proper implementation of governance reform. In bearing this, Henard [19], stated that institutional governance usually accompanied by reforms in institutional leadership and management. By developing decision-making power to HEIs, there is a demand to increase the institutional capacity and leadership of HEIs themselves to manage their increased duties. Governing boards and management council of the universities play vital roles and provides strategic vision, establish a system of risk management; determine financial autonomy and system of accountability that set the rules governing chief operating leaders of HEIs [19].

Hence, this study designed with the aim of assessing the leadership and management accountability system in public universities in South Nation Nationalities People Regional state. This study was partly motivated due to lack of adequate local studies conducted assess the leadership and management of public universities and systems of accountability.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As clearly stated by Teshome [20], despite the gain of several public universities, higher education in Ethiopia is not well developed in line with the manpower needs of the state. Due to problems associated with the quality and relevance of programs of studies and research, equity and resource use and governance, the universities' contribution to the development of the country in manpower development is non-significant.

Henceforth, adopting the 2007 civil service reform initiated and supervised by the government, HEIs, in general and public universities, in particular have gained to carry out five major reforms. Of these, governance reform, which mainly focuses on leadership and management, is one. To reinforce the implementation of the governance reform the revised higher education proclamation that allowed greater autonomy to the institutions issued in 2009.

Although the public universities enjoy some relative measures of autonomy, government involvement in their governance has become a common feature. Currently, public universities in Ethiopia are not determining their own curriculum of studies for undergraduate programs, graduate assistants recruited and placed by MoE, and the institutions have no any say on student admission. Yohannes [21] also attributes the absence of

substantial alterations in public universities to the excessive interference of the Federal Ministry of Education and lack of autonomy of the foundations.

On the other hand, Pandy [15] argues that publicly funded HEIs are accountable in their actions and outcomes to the external environment, the public at large. Nevertheless, in that respect is no security system of accountability in public universities in the nation, except some attempts of self-and external evaluations and supervisions conducted in the foundations. The centralized decision-making structure also characterizes the institutions.

In contrary, despite the HE proclamation [22] granted autonomy to board and managing council of the universities for providing strategic leadership and management, they are facing challenges in properly implementing the governance reforms [23]. Ashebir [24] identified factors such as, lack of managerial abilities to run the institutions, lack of management development, and training opportunity for Ethiopia's public university managers as well as the board members as the major causes of strategic leadership and management challenges in HIEs.

More importantly, our personal experiences as a lecturer, academic leader, researcher of the public universities in Ethiopia and the opportunity we have had to partake in the experiences of some of the public universities helped us to identify the gaps between what is stated in higher education proclamation, the national organic law, and reform documents and what is really materializing in the asylums. This has initiated the researchers to develop a keen interest to carry out scientific inquiries in university governance. This study, thus, focuses on the public universities in SNNR with a specific framework of leadership and accountability, guided by the following research questions.

Research Questions

1. What is the public universities leadership and management practices in SNNPR?
2. To what extent does public, universities in the region are guided by system of accountability (legal, social and political accountability)perspective?

3. Objectives of the Study

The primary aim of the present work is to analyze the nature of university governance as viewed by academic leaders, academic staff, and university administrators. More specifically, the study intends to address the following specific objectives:

a. To examine the practices of leadership and management in sampled public universities of the SNNPR.
b. To examine the extent to which public universities in the sampled region guided by system of accountability (professional, administrative, legal, social and political accountability)?

4. Significance of the Study

This study is thus significant in several respects. Foremost, the study will examine the nature of establishment in public higher learning institutes in Ethiopia. As a result, findings will serve as a useful reference document for planners, administrators and practitioners dealing with higher teaching and its betterment. Secondly, the results of the survey will help to create awareness among university officials, government and its agency (MoE) about the state of university administration and associated troubles.Thirdly, the study will contribute to making possible more informed and effective decision making in government university relations.

5. Scope of the Study

Currently there are seven public universities in Ethiopia owned and regulated by the Federal Ministry of Education. Of these, the study delimited to three (42.85 %) public universities, namely Arba Minch University, Woliata Sodo University and Wachamo University. More importantly, the study emphasized on leadership management and accountability dimensions.

6. Literature Review: Theoretical Perspective of Leadership Management and Accountability practices in HEIs

Most nations have restructured its public HEIs to meet the public demand of a more transparent and accountable government. The focus is on the renovation and transformation of public HEIs to become more efficient and effective in delivering the services remains robust [25]. Moreover, the development of new technology has put the government to conceive the integrity value of HEIs with strong command in leadership management to steer the efficiency without abandoning the value of effective governance [26]; [27]. Accountability is always related to effective leadership and management that implies public organizations which conduct public matters, manage public funds and guarantee the realization of human rights in a way

fundamentally free from abuse and corruption, as well as obeying the rule of law, and maintain its professional, administrative asocial, legal and political perspectives [28]; [29]; [30].

Currently, leadership management and accountability appear to be existed between each other. Collier [31] stated that accountability entails leadership management and actor's accountability perspective is the only available option for organizations like HEIs. This notion also shared by two scholars[32] which stated that in the HEIs where accountability mechanisms have tended to focus on upward accountability to funders rather than downward to the recipients of services. Thus, the HEIs also need to be transformed into becoming a reliable and efficient one, while at the same time possesses effective leadership management ethic [26]; [27].

The leadership management practices helps to achieve the quality and positive outcomes. To endorse leadership as labeled, requires personal and managerial authority being used in an appropriate balance[33]; [34]. Those who have shown this skill has managed to develop their emotional intelligence and have a range of leadership styles to draw upon, being responsive to their actions (accountability) [35]. Effective leadership can drive improvements in teamwork, quality and safety, innovation and develops sense of accountability[32].

At this dynamic development environment, the HEIs require not only the manager but also a manager with leadership competence and accountability for their actions [36], [37]. Most of them struggle to become better at the task of leadership, which the struggle is understandable with such limited time[35]. Therefore, when the behaviours of the leader is too different from the expectations of the followers, undesirable consequences can happen, weaken individual, and work group performance [32].

Qualitative research conducted by Gonzalez & Firestone [38] revealed that despite leaders of HEIs play a key role by interpreting state and federal policies in ways that influence local interpretation, there are gap in the leadership style posed by the leader that could affect the accountability. In supporting Gonzalez and his colleague finding, Hall and his colleagues and depicted that the competence of leaders has impact on the degree of formal accountability mechanisms for their work-related decisions and actions [39]. This highlights the complex relationships that appear between leader competence, and accountability, which can facilitate leader performance and effectiveness. In order to achieve greater accountability within the HEIs, focus on developing the appropriate characteristic of leadership management must achieved.

It is undeniable that leadership is crucial factor especially when dealing issues in the HE where leaders possess ethical and higher moral values that more appreciated by their followers rather than the others who are indifferent. The leader in the HEIs is likely to have strong characteristic in leading such big organization with larger fund to manage and utilize in a wise manner. Therefore, having leadership competence and capabilities are crucial to drive the organization in achieving its ultimate goal as a protector to this nation. This could promote accountability among the employees in the HE sectors in achieving the goal of serving the nation and work for social wellbeing. One can understand form the literature so far, to assure better HEIs, understanding the way to improve leadership management and accountability in HE is very important. It will help the policy makers on encouraging leadership management and accountability environment among different government departments and agencies.

7. Research Design and Method of the Study

The study is a cross sectional survey type design in that it presented current practices in public university governance in South Nation Nationalities Regional State. Because, cross-sectional survey is effective in providing a snapshot of the current behavior, attitude and belief in among the university staff and owns an advantage of providing data relatively quickly and the information collected from the selected individual at a single period in time ([40]; [41]).The present study has employed a mixed method in that it used as a concurrent strategy for data collection and interpretation. The work was predominantly quantitative inquiry that complemented with qualitative information. The qualitative data collected to reinforce the quantitative information.

Sources of Data

Multiple sources of evidence used to triangulate the data, thereby increasing the credibility of the results of the study. Consequently, relevant information generated from both principal and secondary roots. Primary data solicited from academic leaders (Presidents, Vice presidents, Directors, College deans and department heads), academic staff, and students' council. National organizations, higher education proclamations, higher education reform documents, guidelines and our personal experiences utilized as secondary sources.

Sample Size

For the purpose of this study, the sample size was determined using the standard tables for sampling, using the confidence level of 95% and 5% confidence interval. To minimize the error, a 10% of the total population added to each sample. Based on the standard, the sample size for a population of all the three

universities is 3180 (42.8%). Of these 352 samples were selected which accounts, academic leaders, 21.6 %, which accounts for deans 10 (2.8%), department heads 40 (11.4%), directors 19 (5.4%), presidents three (. 9%), vice presidents six (1.9%) and a sum of 276 (78.4%) were lecturers according to Israel [42].

Sampling Techniques

The sample public universities selected using proportional stratified random sampling technique to ensure representation from the strata of the designated groups of institutions (1st, 2ne, 3rd generations). A multi-stage sampling method employed in the selection of academic leaders (Department Heads, Dean, Directors, Presidents and Vice President) and academic staff. After random selection of colleges/schools/faculties and departments were randomly selected from their respective college/school/faculty. The selection of instructors, however, made using a convenience sampling technique (i.e., depending on their willingness to take part in the study).Purposive sampling method used to select top management (presidents, Directors) from administration wing and the students' council.

Instruments

Relevant data generated from the study participants through self-developed survey questionnaires, interviews and focused-group discussion. Data collected from academic leaders and academic staff by means of survey questionnaires. Two sets of questionnaires comprising both open ended and closed-ended questions items were prepared. While interviewing administered to senior staff, deans, directors, department heads, and FGD conducted by students' council. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was calculated to assess the internal consistency of the instrument scales. Cronbach's coefficient alpha represents the mean reliability coefficient obtained from all possible split half correlations. Coefficient alphas were computed for each of the scales and subscales (leadership and management, social, legal and political accountability) using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 20.0 program (see Table 1). According to Churchill [43],low coefficient alphas indicate that the survey items perform poorly in capturing the construct that motivates the measure, while high coefficient alphas indicate that items in the survey instrument are highly correlated with true scores. Generally speaking,.70 is regarded as an acceptable level of reliability coefficient. Thus, all variables with r values more than the standard and accepted.

Table 1.Coefficients of Internal Consistency Using Cronbach's Alpha Methodology.

No	*Items*	*Reliability Coefficient*
1	Quality Leadership &Management (Effective Governance)	0.9135
2	Legal Accountability	0.8507
3	Social Accountability	0.750
4	Political Accountability	0.8171

Data Analysis

In the data processing phase, data editing, coding and cleaning made to determine the consistency and validity of information gathered by different instruments. In analyzing data, both quantitative and qualitative methods were instrumental. Descriptive data analysis tool, mainly mean and standard deviation employed in analyzing quantitative data. Qualitative data analysis methods were applied to the data generated from transcriptions of interviews, FGD and document analysis.

Various inferential data analysis was instrumental. Analysis One way ANOVA used to see the variations between and within groups by considering its assumptions. Moreover, the outcome variable classification was based on the threshold or mean value of the seven leadership and accountability domains which were measured based a five-point Lickert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree), accordingly, the outcome variable above the mean value is considered to be effective, represented by 1 while the outcome variable below the average value is taken as ineffective, represented by zero (i.e., a dummy variable, 1=effective and 0=ineffective). Therefore, the appropriate econometric model for the binary outcome variable is a Binary Logistic Regression model and adapted to determine the relationship between a dependent variable and a set of independent variables (Level of education, specialization, academic rank, and position held). Besides, Binary regression was employed to test overall model evaluation and goodness-of-fit of the data. Principal component analysis used as a data reduction technique among the explanatory variables. Moreover, it used to measure sample adequacy and good fitness of the model. Sample independent t-test also used. The independent samples t-test is, probably, the single most widely used tests in this study to compare differences between separate groups and to determine if there is a significant difference in scores between the groups. The quantitative analysis carried out by employing statistical analysis software SPSS Version 20.0 and Stata version 13.0 interchangeably.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Key terms that repeatedly used in the present study operationally defined as follows: *Academic Community*: refers to all those persons studying, teaching, and doing research as permanent or visiting members of an institution [44].*Academic Leaders*: refers to all persons designated in different level of leadership positions of the university. *Academic staff*: refers to all persons engaged only in the teaching – learning process of the university. *Public University*: means a higher learning institution whose budget allocated by the Federal or state government as the case may be [22]

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents on different variables

Equally it has been distinctly put forward in the methodology section of the report, the researcher has distributed 370 questionnaires and successfully collected 352 questionnaires for lecturer, department heads, deans, directors, vice presidents and presidents of the three sampled public universities to receive decent data regarding its governance practices. Below are the demographic characteristics of the respondents in terms of sex, academic qualification, academic rank, and academic position and service years. The system of leadership and management highly appreciates the participation of women in every aspect of the organizations, but, as table 2 depicts, only 25 (7.10%) from Arba Minch university, 19 (5.39%) from Woliata Sodo university and seven (1.99%) from Wachamo university, as a total of 51 (14.49 %) were females academic staff and academic leaders respondents. The remaining lion's share of proportion, that is, 138 (39.2%), 109 (30.96 %) and 54 (15.34%) as301 (85.51%) of the academic staff and academic leaders respondents were respectively males. The data make clear that females' participation in all three positions (Lecturer, middle level management and top-level management) was insignificant as compared to their male counterparts. It reveals that, all sampled public universities of south national, nationalities region were experiencing patriarchal domination.

As far as the educational qualification of respondents was concerned, despite the fact that there are age gaps in line with the establishment of three sampled universities, this data reveals that a minimum qualification gap existed between three sampled public universities which were contributed their own specific traits to build up effective governance patterns of their respective universities. Moreover, in line with their composition, it is quite better than before, and the number of professionals with high caliber increased from time to time as of 0:30:70 government initiatives GTP II. One of the key interview informants remarked that:

"Though the universities employed expatriate staff from India, Philippines, and Nigeria, to overcome the deficiencies of senior staff, they are not competent enough with either their academic caliber or experiences. Hence, the dearth of senior qualified scholars remains the salient problems of both sampled universities."(Dean1)

With regards to academic rank, to get valuable information for public university leadership and management accountability, variation in academic titles gives a hint that the bulk of academic staff, 297 (84.4%) was easily qualified, means that above second degree. The situation might have a significant effect to understand the university's governance practices.

In regards to the academic positions of the respondents, a sum of 276 (78.4%) as of 132 (37.5%), 100 (28.4%) and 44 (12.5%) from AMU, WSU and WU respectively were in lecturer positions. Moreover, a sum of 40 (11.36%) as of 18 (5.11%), 16 (4.54%) and six (1.70%) were in the department head positions in three sampled universities respectively. As far as deans and director positions concerned, a sum of 10 (2.84%) as of four (1.13%), four (1.13%) and two (0.56%) were in dean positions, and a sum of 19 (5.39%) as of six (1.70%), six (1.70) and 7 (1.98%) were in the director positions in AMU, WSU, WU respectively. Equally we can visualize from the analysis of data, a total of five (1.42%) as of two (0.56%), two (0.56%) and one (0.28%) in the vice president positions; whereas the total of two (0.56%) as of one (0.28%) from Arba Minch University and one (0.28%) from Wachamo university were in the office of president. Hence having different respondents from different academic hierarchy helps to investigate the leadership and management accountability practices and its potency in different stages of academic positions of the universities.

As far as service year concerned, more than 85% respondents served for more than six years in the sampled institutions. The availability of respondents with different years of service or stay in the universities could mean that their data is reliable and explanatory to the written report pertaining to the prevailing patterns of governance in the framework of leadership and accountability.

V. DESCRIPTIVE AND INFERENTIAL ANALYSIS BASED ON THE BASIC QUESTIONS

The first variable under leadership and management practices was the status of academic leaders in the 'articulation of clear goals and high expectations and monitoring improvement' in the sampled public

universities. As the table depicts, the highest mean and SD scores (3.92, .777), (3.74, .628) has been held in the first variable from TLM and MLM category as rated as "*Agree*". The lecturers relatively scored mean and SD (3.06, 1.020) in this variable category as rated as "*Sometimes"*. 3.22 mean values with 348 (n-3) degree of freedom gripped from the analysis. The respective F value (1.069) at P<0.001 level could also show that the difference in the mean of the three participant groups is not merely by chance since it is far less and near to 1.00.

A key interview informant from MLP appealed that:

I do not think the academic leaders in my university in both management echelons differentiate the mission, goals, and the value of the universities. As well, though the strategic plan developed by each unit of the university, there is no any system of monitoring the progress either the goals clearly achieved or not. (Dean 1)

Like to the first variable, different pool of values could found in the second variable, which is academic leader's commitment and active ownership of institutional plan in sampled public universities. The highest mean and SD scores (4.16, .710) and (3.88, .653) in this class was gained at middle and top management level respectively, and which is rated as "*Agree*". Contrary the other mean and SD values (3.03, 1.066) achieved in lecturer category and ranked as "*Disagree*". To this effect, a total mean and SD score of (3.26, 1.085) has been scored with 8.825 F value with 348 degrees of freedom at P<0.001 level reveals significant mean differences across the management and lecturer groups.

FGD from student council also claimed:

In my university, the level of commitment and sense of ownership of the institution as well as institutional plan is lesser in the middle level management but a bit better in the top-level management. (FGD 3)

The other key interview informant from Directors demanded:

"The college deans and department heads are not happy to prepare and implement their work unit plan though they are responsible to lead the faculty. Their dedication and commitment to excel in the university is not satisfactory. In this regards, top- level managers are in better position as compared to middle level managers. (Director 2)

Lecturer mainly opts for the third variable category, integration of system value in to university practice and professional pathways, to characterize the academic leaders in the current leadership and management accountability practices of sampled public universities. Consequently, (3.03, .960) where the mean and SD values of their responses of "*Disagree*" while the other two groups (TLM, MLM) also gave relatively higher social station for this practice type with (3.65, .562) and (3.60, .883) mean values for their responses of "*Agree*" respectively. Such immense values made the total figure to be 3.16 and.929 mean and SD scores with 0.002 F value at P<0.001 level of significance.

The fourth variable type, 'the development of a sustained and shared philosophy, vision, and mission that promotes a culture of excellence in the work unit', also ranked differently in the current working environment of sampled public universities. Particularly lecturer's response which is "*Sometimes***"** had a mean and SD value of (3.07, 1.035), which is much higher than the previous figures scored at different variable types. Middle-level management holders have also rated their reaction as "*Sometimes*" with mean values (3.62, .967).The highest mean and SD values of 3.85, .675 with a response of "*Agree*" has also acquired from top-level management in this variable type. When we take a look on the total figure, mean and SD values 3.28, 1.108 under 348 degrees of freedom with 0.117 F value and 0.006 significant probability level were obtained in the fourth variable item due to some reason not by chance.

In bearing this, respondent from Key interview informant pronounced:

"As we know, team spirit is real important to stimulate more honest results and to attain the intended aims of the system. However, in my university, there are no oneness and integrity, staff and academic leaders fragmented into different ethnic groups. I don't consider the possibility of developing shared philosophy, vision and mission for enhancement of the cultivation of excellence in my university". (Director 3)

The provision of attention to time allocated and protected to focus on curricula and institutional issues were the fifth variable under the table above. Accordingly, the response rate of "*Sometimes*" gained from lecturer was mean and SD values of (3.19, 1.006). The mean and SD values obtained from middle and top level management were (3.62, .987 and 3.58, .902) which is graded as "*Agree"*. The relevant F value (0.086) at

P<0.05 level of significance could also show that the difference in the mean of the three participant groups is not merely by chance.

In this regards, one of the respondents from FGD commented:

"Let me tell you one best example from engineering college. Both department heads and college deans were double employ in more than three institutions. No any system either the academic program director or academic vice president supervise and control the time allocated to cover the curricula in each department based on the academic calendar. "Students becoming overburden at the end of the semester to finish the courses. (FGD 1)

Table 2. Mean comparison and sample independent test for Equality of variance

Variables	Position	Mean	SD	DF	F	Sig
Articulation of clear goals and high expectations and monitoring improvement (P1Q3)	Lecturer	3.06	1.020	275	1.069	0.000***
	MLM	3.74	.777	49		
	TLM	3.92	.628	25		
	Total	3.22	1.011	348		
Show commitment and active ownership of institutional plan (P1Q4)	Lecturer	3.03	1.066	275	8.825	0.000***
	MLM	4.16	.710	49		
	TLM	3.88	.653	25		
	Total	3.26	1.085	348		
Integration of System value in to university practice and professional pathways (P1Q5)	Lecturer	3.03	.96	275	0.002	0.001**
	MLM	3.60	.833	49		
	TLM	3.65	.562	25		
	Total	3.16	.929	348		
The development of a sustained and shared philosophy, vision, and mission that promote a culture of excellence in work unit (P1Q6)	Lecturer	3.07	1.035	275	.117	0.006**
	MLM	3.62	.967	49		
	TLM	3.85	.675	25		
	Total	3.20	1.036	348		
Attention to time allocated and protected to focus on curricula and institutional issues (P1Q7)	Lecturer	3.19	1.006	275	.086	0.024**
	MLM	3.62	.987	49		
	TLM	3.58	.902	25		
	Total	3.28	1.008	348		
Promoting and sustaining continuous improvement by allocation resources and monitoring progress and resource use (P1Q)8	Lecturer	2.93	1.005	275	1.713	0.000***
	MLM	3.85	.926	49		
	TLM	3.77	.863	25		
	Total	3 .12	1.102	348		
Ensuring transparency and accountability at all levels (P1Q9)	Lecturer	2.66	1.095	275	0.058	0.000***
	MLM	3.42	1.052	49		
	TLM	3.38	.852	25		
	Total	2.82	1.114	348		
Note: MLM-Middle Level Manager(department Heads, Deans), TLM-Top Level Manager (Directors, Vice president and president), [* if P<0.01, ** if p<0.05, and *** if p<0.001]						

Source: Field Survey (2016)

The sixth variable is 'Promoting and supporting continuous improvement by allocating resources, monitoring progress and resource use' to characterize academic leaders in sampled universities. Equally we can understand from the finding, the highest mean and SD values (3.85, .926) and (3.77, .863) were gained from MLM and TLM which is responding as "*Agree*" respectively. Perversely, the mean and SD values (2.93, 1.1008) obtained from lecturers, which are responding as "*Disagree*". As the result depicted in the total figure, mean and SD values 3.12, 1.102 under 348 degrees of freedom with 1.713 F value at P<0.001 significant level were held under this variable item.

Ensuring transparency and accountability at all levels' ranked differently in the current sampled public universities functional setting. Predominantly, lecturer's' response had a mean and SD values of (2.66, 1.095) which is rated as "*Disagree*", which is much lower than the previous figures scored at different variable types. The other groups of respondents from MLM and TLM have also rated their transparency and accountability practices as "*Sometimes*" and "*Agree*" at their universities at highest mean and SD values (3.42, 1.052) and (3.38, .852) respectively. When we take a look on the total figure, 2.82 mean values under 348 degrees of freedom with 0.058 F value and P<0.01 at significant level were obtained in under the last variable

type. It can extrapolate that the grade of the transparency and accountability in sampled public universities not favorably rated by the bulk of respondents.

Regression Analysis leadership and management accountability in public universities

Under this inquiry, regression models used to predict the value of a dependent variable based on the value of an independent variable. At the foremost of these theoretical accounts, effective leadership and management accountability of sampled public university academic leaders analyzed in table 3 below. Thus we can visualize from the table 8, the F value of the first regression model is 97.66 ($p<0.001$). Seven variables express the degree of effective practices of academic leaders as the ratio of percentage 62.30 (R2) at $p<0.01$).

Table 3.Statistical test for individual variable Leadership and Management

P1Q3	Coef (β)	St. Err	t	P>ItI	[95 % Conf. Int]
P1Q4 (X1)	.3860318	.0469617	8.22	0.000***	.2936646 .478399
P1Q5 (X2)	.1515928	.0505924	3.00	0.003**	.0520845 .2511011
P1Q6 (X3)	.1913687	.0487277	3.93	0.000***	0955279 .2872096
P1Q7(X4)	.2523242	.0455995	5.53	0.000***	.1626362 .3420122
P1Q8 (X5)	-.0197808	.045151	-0.44	0.662	-.1085867 .0690251
P1Q9 (X6)	-.0473957	.04344676	-1.09	0.276	-.1328905 .038099
CONST	.2414901	,1330907	1.81	0.07	-.0202812 0.5032614
Note: No of Obs =352; F(6,345)=97.66; Prob>F=0.000; R-Squared=0.6294;Adj R-Squared=0.6230;Root MSE=.62075, For the abbreviation from P1Q3-P1Q9 please refer table 2 above for more understanding the variables					

Source: Field Survey (2016)

The multiple correlation coefficient of determination indicated that 62.3% % of the variance in the leadership and management practices for the sample of 352 can be explained by four explanatory variable of interest (P1Q4 (X1=0. 000), P1Q5 (X2=0. 003), P1Q6 (X3=0. 000), P1Q7 (X4=0. 000)); and while 37.7 % remain unexplained (residual, sometimes called error).Furthermore, the result reveals that good fitness of the data. This shows that, the model being instrumental statistically significantly envisage the dependent variable.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis

Table 4. Analysis of Variance between Group and Within Group (ANOVA)

Variables		SS	DF	MS	Eta Squared	F	Sig.
P1Q3	Between Group	35.363	6	5.894	.099	6.282	0.000***
	Within Group	323.352	345	.934			
	Total	358.716	351				
P1Q4	Between Group	67.923	6	11.322	.164	11.32	0.000***
	Within Group	345.057	345	1.000			
	Total	412.987	351				
P1Q5	Between Group	21.211	6	3.535	.070	4.327	0.000***
	Within Group	281.880	345	.817			
	Total	303.091	351				
P1Q6	Between Group	26.702	6	4.450	.071	4.387	0 .000***
	Within Group	349.977	345	1.014			
	Total	376.679	351				
P1Q7	Between Group	13.735	6	2.289	.039	2.303	0 .000***
	Within Group	342.981	345	.994			
	Total	356.716	351				
P1Q8	Between Group	50.387	6	8.398	.118	7.703	0.000***
	Within Group	376.113	345	1.090			
	Total	426.560	351				
P1Q9	Between Group	36.714	6	6.119	.084	5.291	0.000***
	Within Group	399.010	345	1.157			
	Total	435.724	351				
Note: SS- Sum of Squares, MS –Mean Square. Eta value=.01-small effect, .06-medium effect, .14 and above – larger							

Source: Field Survey (2016)

A one-way between and within groups analysis of division was carried on to explore the reactions of three groups on the level of quality academic leadership and management practices dimensions as described in table 4. Participants split into three groups according to their position held (Lecturer, Middle Level Manager,

and Top Level Manager). The result depicts that there was a statistically significant difference at the p <.001 levels to which in clearly articulating goals and high expectation and monitoring improvement scores for three groups F (6, 345) = 6.282, p <.001. Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in average scores between groups was rather moderate.

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, for the first variable was .099, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for between group (M = 5.894) was significantly different from within the group (M=. 934). There was no statistically significant difference in mean scores between middle and top level managers.

As we can see from the table, the scores for three groups F (6, 345) = 11.320, p <.001 at significant level of the second variable. The effect size calculated using eta squared for the second variant was.164, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test depicted that the mean score for between group was 11.322 and the mean score within the group was (M=1. 000) at (P< 0.001) value of significant level of interest.

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, for the third to ninth variables was.070, .071, .039, .118,. 084, and post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for between group 3.535, 4.450. 2.289, 8.398, 6.119 was significantly different from within group mean scores.817, 1.014, .994, 1.090, 1.157 as the value of F (6, 345) = 11.320, 4.387, 2.303, 7.703, 5.291 at p<.001 level significance of the five variables respectively

VI. INTER GENERATION MEAN COMPARISON

Table 5 shows inter mean comparison among three-generation universities on the domains of seven quality leadership and management variables. The results showed that three generations (1^{st}, 2^{nd} , 3^{rd}) respondents (Lecturers, MLM, TLM) rated the "articulation of clear goals and high expectations and monitor improvement" (P1Q3) as "*Sometimes"* with mean and SD scores of (M:3.14, SD:1.036), (M:3.35, SD:. 985), (M:3.16, SD:. 986) respectively based on their generation order. It can infer that, the practice of academic leaders in the first variable in both generations is not pleasing. In this regards, the practice was more severe in the second generation than the two as the mean value revealed.The second variable in the same table is "commitment and active ownership of institutional plan of academic leaders" (P1Q4). Accordingly, the respondents from three generations rated as "*Sometimes*" with the mean scores of (M: 3.12, SD: 1.099), (M: 3.45, SD: .896), and (M: 3.31, SD: .765). As the results reveal, the majority of respondents not appealed by the practice of the second variable in second and third generation's universities than the first generation though there is a slight deviation from the first generation**.**

Table 5: Inter-Generation Mean Comparison among Universities on Leadership and Management

University by Generation	Value	**P1Q3**	**P1Q4**	**P1Q5**	**P1Q6**	**P1Q7**	**P1Q8**	**P1Q9**
1^{st} Gene	Mean	3.14	3.12	3.01	3.09	3.33	3.12	2.68
	SD	1.036	1.099	.991	1.132	1.053	1.143	1.15
	N	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
	% of N	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%	46.3%
2^{nd} Gene	Mean	3.35	3.45	3.28	3.25	3.27	3.13	2.95
	SD	.985	1.07	.896	.947	.960	1.05	1.16
	N	128	128	128	128	128	128	128
	%of N	36.4%	36.4%	36.4%	36.4%	36.4%	36.4%	36.4%
3^{rd} Gene	Mean	3.16	3.28	3.31	3.39	3.18	3.13	2.92
	SD	.986	1.035	.765	.918	.992	1.05	.881
	N	61	61	61	61	61	61	61
	%of N	17.3%	17.3%	17.3%	17.3%	17.3%	17.3%	17.3%
Total	Mean	3.22	3.26	3.16	3.20	3.28	3.12	2.82
	SD	1.011	1.085	.929	1.030	1.008	1.102	1.114
	N	352	352	352	352	352	352	352
	%of N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Field Survey (2016)

The third, fourth variables under the table are- **"**Integration of system value in to university practice and professional pathways (P1Q5), the development of a sustained and shared philosophy, vision, and mission that promote a culture of excellence in work unit (P1Q6). Furthermore, the fifth & sixthvariables entails, 'attention to time allocated and protected to focus on curricula and institutional issues (P1Q7), promoting and sustaining continuous improvement by allocation resources and monitoring progress and resource use (P1Q8). Both variables were rated as "*Sometimes*" in both generation universities with the mean and SD scores (3.01,

.991), (3.28, .896), (3.39, .918); (3.09, 1.132), (3.25, .947), 3.39, .918); (3.33, 1.053), (3.27, .960), (3.18, .992); (3.12, 1.14), (3.13, 1.05), (3.15, 1.05) respectively. The responses of the variables from both respondents of sampled universities were similar, and the exercises of the three variables in both generation universities were not attractive. Hence, it calls for further attention to improve.

The last variable under the same table was "Ensuring transparency and accountability at all levels" (P1Q9**).** The majority of the respondents of both generation universities were rated as "*Disagree*" with the mean and SD scores of (2.68, 1.15), (2.95, 1.16), (2.92, .881) at the three generation universities respectively. It can infer that, the enhancement of transparency and accountability in both sampled universities not recognized and auspiciously rated by the bulk of the answerers.According to interview responses of the directors, lecturer and deans from three universities,As responded KII, lack of commitment of academic leaders, lack of trust, absence of transparency and lack of fair treatment of academic community demonstrated by failure to solve implementation related problems.Lecturers push every piece of problem, upward and seek ready-made solutions from the top academic leadership. (Dean2, T1, Director2)Seeing this, one of the participants of the Key informant interview commented:

"Academic leaders are not empowered to make academic decisions, particularly at faculty, director and department levels; they fear to decide". (DH2).

Table 6. Anti-Image Correlation Matrix for appropriateness of factor analysis

Anti-Image Correlation		**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
	P1Q3	***0.876***	-0.405	-0.159	-0.207	-0.29	0.024	0.059
	P1Q4	-0.405	***0.872***	-0.135	-0.226	-0.15	-0.181	-0.229
	P1Q5	-0.159	-0.135	***0.946***	-0.169	0.093	-0.091	-0.164
	P1Q6	-0.209	-0.226	-0.169	***0.919***	-0.25	-0.103	0.025
	P1Q7	-0.286	0.146	-0.093	-0.247	***0.892***	-0.187	-0.157
	P1Q8	0.024	-0.181	-0.091	-0.103	-0.19	***0.903***	-0.364
	P1Q9	0.059	-0.229	-0.164	0.025	0.157	-0.364	***0.888***

Principal component analysis requires that the Kaiser-Meyer - Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy be greater than 0.50 for each individual variable as well as the set of variables. On iteration 1, the MSA for all of the individual variables included in the analysis was above 0.5, supporting their retention in the analysis.

Table 7. KMO and Bartlett's Test for Appropriateness of Factor Analysis and for MSA

Kaiser-Meyer - Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA):		*0.898*
Bartlett's Test of Sphercity	*Approx. Chi-Square*	*1443.32*
	Df	*21*
	Sig.	
*0.000****		

As we can see from the table above regarding the sampling adequacy for a set of variables, the overall MSA for a set of variables included in the analysis was0.898, which exceeds the minimum requirements of 0.50 for the overall measure of sampling adequacy. Principal component analysis requires that the probability associated with Bartlett's Test of Sphercity be less than the level of significance. Thus, the probability associated Bartlett's test <0.001, which satisfies this requirement.

VII. ACCOUNTABILITY DIMENSION ANALYSIS: PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Accountability is an ethical concept and it concerns proper behavior, deals with the responsibilities of individuals and organizations for their actions towards other people and agencies. Hence, below this section, three dimensions of accountability (legal, social and political) examined.

VIII. LEGAL ACCOUNTABILITY ANALYSIS

Legal accountability is also the other variable, which helps to determine the accountability dimension in the sampled public universities. It entails four sub variables- working strongly for preventing discrimination, harassment, violence against academic community (P4Q1), having conditions for creating a code of ethics to guide an academic community of the university (P4Q2), there is transparency in the system of institutional accountability (P4Q3) and disclosure of relevant documents, procedures, and policies to different stakeholders in the university (P4Q4) used to measure the impact on effective governance practices.(See table 13 in annex)

The next part depicts, the existing legal accountability practice from the perspective of the first variable "working strongly for preventing discrimination, harassment, violence against the academic community" which

is placed by the lecturers as "*Sometimes*" with the mean and SD scores of (2.83, 1.066), whereas the other two groups MLM and TLM rated the same variable as "*Agree*" with the mean and SD scores of (3.85, .969) and (3.56, .977) respectively. Such huge values made the aggregate figure of mean and SD of (3.03 1.110) with 0.10 F value and at P<0.01 level of significance. (See table 13 in annex)

"Having conditions for creating a code of moral philosophy to lead an academic community of the university" is the second variable for legal accountability dimension. Therefore, the highest mean and SD (3.44, .951 and 3.38, .697) held in this variable as it valued as "*Agree*" from MLM and TLM categories respectively. The lecturers, group rated their reactions as "Sometimes" with the mean and SD scores of (2.82, .973). Totals 2.95, .982 mean and SD values with 348 (n-3) degree of freedom gripped from the analysis. The respective F value 0.10 at P<0.01 could also show the significant difference in the mean of the three participant groups that occur merely not by chance. (See table 13 in annex)

Disclosure of relevant documents, processes, and policies and transparency in the arrangement of institutional accountability was the third and fourth variables under the legal accountability dimension. It portrays that, the higher mean and SD scores (3.24, .981 and 3.35, .689) and (3.40, 1.01 and 3.54, .761) which is graded as "Sometimes and "*Agree*" obtained from MLM and TLM respectively. On the contrary, the lecturers rated as "*Disagree*" to both variables with the mean and SD scores of (2.57, .887) and (2.57, .960).The total mean and SD scores (2.72, .931) and (2.76, 1.018) with 348 (n-3) degree of freedom has been absorbed from the analysis. The corresponding F value 1.427, and .529 at p<0.01 could also shows the significant difference in mean of the three participant groups. Hence, these domains not auspiciously rated by the majority of the respondents. (See table 13 in annex)

The regression results depict on the table8 (see annex), the F value of the first regression model is *156.88* (p<0.01). Four variables express the status of legal accountability practices as the ratio of percentage 57.12 (R^2) at p<0.01). The coefficient of determination designated that 57.12 % of the variation in the legal accountability for the sample of 352 can be explained by the disclosure of relevant documents, procedures, and policies (A2), transparency in the system of institutional accountability and having conditions for creating a code of ethics to guide an academic community (A3) and while 43.88 % remains unexplained. This indicates that, largely, the model functional statistically significantly predicts the dependent variable. (See table 14 in annex)

IX. ANOVA FOR LEGAL ACCOUNTABILITY DIMENSION

The ANOVA method assesses the comparative size of variance among group means (between group variance) compared to the average variance within groups (within group variation).Equally we can observe from the table 9 (see annex), the observed F value 8.729 and 8.854 for the first and last variables is larger than the critical value (3.23) and (3.20) the outcome indicated that there is statistically important difference among the means of the groups at the α error level 0.01. Furthermore, there was a statistically significant difference at the p <.001 levels in second and third variable scores for three groups F (6, 345) = 4.403, and 6.623 at p <.001. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, for four variables was (. 034, .012, .46, and. 085) respectively. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for between group (9.504, 4.009, 5.238, and 8.094) was significantly different from within the group (1.089, .911, .971, and.914). There was very slight statistical difference in mean scores within groups at the table revealed. (See table 15 in annex)

X. SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY DIMENSION ANALYSIS

The "Effective communication to the public concerns to the nature of its education and societal missions (P5Q1)" is the first domain under social accountability**.** Table 16 (See annex) shows, the top mean and SD scores (3.62, .923 and 3.42, .642) has been obtained from the MLM and TLM which is valued as "*Agree*" from both groups. The other mean and SD rank, i.e. (2.69, .971) with the response of "*Disagree"* have also been driven from lecturers. In cumulative, a mean and SD of (2.87, 1.008) F value and 0.074 at P<0.01 significant level were obtained from the responses of all study participants. (See table 16 in annex)

The highest mean and SD values (3.50, .839 and 3.50, .812) were scored to the next variable "Working for addressing contemporary problems facing society (P5Q2)", by MLM and TLM to the answer of "*Agree*" and "*Sometimes*" respectively. In this respect 2.81, .942 mean and SD value figures obtained from Lecturer to the answer of "*Disagree*". A mean and SD of 2.96, .960 on 348 degrees of freedom, .271 F value and P<0.01 significant level were a total point gained to magnify social accountability for the second variable type in the respective universities. (See table 16 in annex)

The other variables detested and trigged to knock down in the aspired working environment. As shown, the total mean and SD obtained from readers in the third item "Working with industries closely to meet the human resource requirement of different sectors (P5Q3)" is 2.69 to the response of "*Disagree*" whereas, response mean in the same culture type is only about 8.88. Similar response patter "*Sometimes*" could also be scored in a third variable with mean and SD of the values (3.38, .901 and 3.27, .778) from MLM and TLM. A

total of mean and SD scores (2.96, .960) with the F value of 1.221 at P<0.01 significant level were obtained to expand the social accountability under third variable type. (See table 16 in annex)

XI. REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR THE SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Social accountability entails three variables to evaluate its practices at the sampled public universities. Therefore, the F value of the fourth regression model is 92.93 at (p<0.01).Three variables express the proportion of social accountability as the ratio of percentage 62.83 (R2) at p<0.01).The coefficient of determination indicated that 62.83 % of the magnetic declination in the social accountability of the sample of 352 can be explained by V1 (Working for addressing contemporary problems facing society), V2, (Working with industries closely to meet the human resource requirement of different sectors), whereas 37.17 % remains unexplained. From this what we conclude that, overall, the model applied can statistically significantly envisage the dependent variable. (See table 17 in annex)

XII. ANOVA FOR THE SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

To examine the status of social accountability scores a one-way between and within groups, analysis of variance conducted among three participant groups. The results disclosed that there was a statistically significant difference at the p < .01 level in social accountability variables scores for three groups with the F value (2, 349) = 24.757, 15.690, 12.373 at p < .001 level of significance respectively for three variables. (See table 18 in annex)A constituent of the accomplishment of statistical significance, the actual difference in average scores between groups was large. As we can see from the table, the effect size calculated by using eta squared, was .0353, .0288, and .0258 respectively. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for between group (22.124, 13.204, and 12.428) was significantly different from within the group (. 894, .842, and 1.004). There was statistically important difference in average scores between group among the first variable and second and third variable, only very slim difference between second and third variables. (See table 18 in annex)In addition, there was slight significance difference within the group among three variables. It entails that the means do not differ more than would be expected by chance alone and differences between the means are not great enough within a group to allow the researcher to say that they are dissimilar.

XIII. POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY ANALYSIS

The political accountability is the last dimension of accountability framework. It consists of two variables used to assess the position of its practice at sampled public universities. The two variables under this analysis is "There is participation of organization units representing the academic community in developing quality assurance system and decision making process (P6Q1)" "There is accountability of clear, accurate, and timely information across all levels of institutional engagement of all stakeholders (P6Q2**"**. (See table 19 in annex)Consequently, the highest mean and SD scores obtained from lecturers which is rated as "*Disagree*" in both items is almost equivalent, that is (2.66, .898 and 2.66, .874) respectively. Regarding the management class (MLM and TLM), a mean and SD score in the same variables which is rated as "*Sometimes*" and "*Agree*" were found to be (3.46, .973 and 3.38, .752) and (3.38, 1.028, and 3.23, .710) respectively. The cumulative effect of these individuals gave the highest mean and SD ranks 2.83, .951 and 2.80, .928with the F value of 1.780, and 3.185 with (349) degree of freedom at P<0.01 level of significance for the two variables of political accountability. (See table 19 in annex)

XIV. REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY

In this study, R^2 = 0.4669. Adjusted R2 = 0.4054, which means that the independent variable, "Current academic status", explains 40.54 % of the unevenness of the dependent variable, which is (P6Q1 and P6Q2) in the population. Adjusted R2 is also an idea of the effect size, which at 0.4054 (40.54%), is suggestive of a medium effect size, according to Cohen's (1988) classification. However, normally it is R^2 not the adjusted R^2 that is reported in the results. The results also depict that, the regression model is statistically significant, F (1, 350) = 306.51, p =.01. This shows that, overall, the model applied statistically significantly predicts the dependent variable. (See table 20 in annex)

XV. ANOVA FOR THE POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY

In order to testify political accountability variables scores a one-way between groups analysis of variance conducted. In that respect are three groups of respondents (Lecturer, MLM, and TLM). The table portrays that there was a statistically significant difference at the p <.001 levels in two variables. The variables are "participation of organization units representing the academic community in developing quality assurance system and decision making process (P6Q1)" and "accountability of clear, accurate and timely information across all levels of institutional engagement of all stakeholders (P6Q2**)"** scores for three groups F (2, 348) = 20.869 and 16.532, p <.001. (See table 21 in annex)The actual difference in average scores between groups was

moderate and very small within the group. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was.047, and 0.063. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for between group (16.763 and 12.895) was significantly different from within the group (. 803, and. 780). There was statistically significant difference in mean scores between groups. (See table 21 in annex)

XVI. BINARY LOGISTIC REGRESSION RESULT

As important to Park [45], a logistics model for overall evaluation and goodness-of-fit should admitted in the logistic regression results. As recommended by Park [45] relating to the results of logistic regression, this written report also attempts to represent the outcomes in table, 22 and 23.

1. Overall Model Evaluation

Table 22.Present the inferential information for overall model evaluation, which includes likelihood ratio and Wald tests.

Test	Categories	X^2	df	P-Value
Overall Model Evaluation	Likelihood ratio test	498.95	1	.000***
	Wald Test	24.450	1	.000***

As shown above, statistics for the likelihood ratio and Wald test were 498.95 and 24.450 respectively. These tests yield similar conclusions from the given data ($P < 0.01$).

1. Goodness of fit Statistics:

Hosmer-Lemeshow test indicates the extent to which the model offers a better fit than a null model with no predictors, or, in a different interpretation, how well the model fits the data, as in log-linear modeling. If the chi - square for goodness of fit is not significant, then the model has sufficient faith. The outcome presented below.

Table 23.Hosmer - Lemeshow Test

Test	Chi square	df	P-Value
Goodness of –fit test	8.036	4	**.090**
Assumption: Ho= the modal is fit to the data set at P<0.05; H_1 = The model is not fit the data set at P>0.05 (alternative hypothesis)			

Hosmer-Lemeshow test points out the goodness of fit of the model with chi-square value of 8.036 and with a probability value of >0.05, which provides significant at the 5 % point. The overall model is statistically significant, suggesting it does not conform to the data based on the second alternative assumption (H1) designed to hold the first assumption (H0).To summarize, a logistic regression done to determine the effects of Independent variables (academic leadership positions, employment experience, academic rank, Educational qualification) on the likelihood that participants have effective governance practices. The logistic regression model was statistically significant, at Wald test: $\chi^2 = 24.450$, $p<.001$. The model explained 36.0% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in effective governance practices and correctly classified 68.3% of cases. It also depicts only the association between academic leadership position and work experience with leadership and management accountability practices at P<0.001 level of significance.

XVII. CONCLUSIONS

The way higher education perceived and approached, bringing up new unforeseen challenges for the government and universities to deal with highly influenced by the globalization. Thus, the concept of vision and strategic leadership along with effective management seem to have finally dominated the academic universe. In the very competitive nations, it is very vital for higher education institutions being highly independent and detached from the strings of governmental centralization; the academic leaders well equipped with requisite competencies and skills efficiently and effectively lead the universities. Taking into account the findings and reality, the practices of leadership and management to promote a culture of excellence in the work unit at sampled public universities not rated as satisfactory as possible. Hence, the leadership and management practices in the sampled public universities were on infant stage. As we experience, accountability arrangements are of outstanding interest and implication for the office holders, their masters, and the broader public because they dispense with professional autonomy and external control and generally organized professional, administrative, legal, social and political. Despite the facts that there was a great deal of initiatives of

government to maintain accountability in the public universities, the higher officials of the sampled universities are neither accountable nor transparent to their university communities in all dimensions of accountability.

For instance, legal accountability is one of the dimensions of accountability, which is very vital in increasing due to formalization of social relations and shifts of trust from top-level management to operational level of management. Hence, the legal accountability of academic leaders of sampled public universities to all stakeholders and the public at large dominantly rated as '*moderate*'. The sampled public universities were perceived to demonstrate moderate legal accountability in the domains of preventing a form of discrimination, harassment and violence against academic community; creating a code of ethics to guide an academic community of the university; and disclosure of relevant documents, procedures, policies to stakeholders. Likewise, the universities legal accountability measured to be not attractive in the area of transparency and system of accountability.

The fundamental approach of social accountability is building accountability that relies on civic engagement; participate directly or indirectly in exacting accountability. It bases the competing requirements of individuals and collective benefits. In this regards, the patterns of social accountability dominantly rated as 'medium' in demonstrating the domains of effective communication to the public concerns, directing the contemporary problems facing society, better industry linkage to fulfil the human resource demands. We can infer that, the pattern of this accountability dimension is not pleasing and needs further attention.

Political accountability exercised by designated and appointed academic and political leadership, mainly achieving democratic control and dynamic participation of citizen in decision-making and clear and clear accountability. It is the cornerstone of the notions of responsible government. In this regards, the domains of political accountability which is a participation of the academic community in developing quality assurance systems and decision making process; and accountability of clear, open and timely information across all levels of stakeholders were not rated sympathetically by the majority of respondents. Hence, the exercise of such accountability dimensions is low.

From this, we can conclude that, the required leadership and management qualities to lead and manage HEIs in the sampled public universities yet in place. Furthermore, with the absence of such leadership and management qualities, it is impossible to find the effective system of accountability in HEIs. Thus, it needs more attentions of government to get the intended results from HEIs.

XVIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

This part forwards major key policy recommendations for fostering governance reform in public universities in Ethiopia in particular of Southern region. This shapes on both the experience in the region and fashionable experience of internationally competent public and private higher education institutions. Moreover, conceiving and executing on forwarded policy options will help to ensure that the HE sector in the sampled region attains autonomy, accountability, flexibility, and responsiveness to the society and market demand. Some of the measures are as follows:

Modalities of leadership nomination based on specialization and merit. Selecting and nominating leaders in academic institution is quite different from other institutions. Thus, the government should clearly consider the specialization, particularly those with leadership and management competence to lead the public universities. Besides, further management development program to the leaders should emphasized because of the changing and dynamic nature of HEIs.

Creating an enabling environment for the implementation of HEIs leadership and management in the region. This is the way of providing an effective autonomy to the HE sector and ensuring institutional ownership of HE governance reform process and political viability of undertaking the governance reform itself in HEIs of the sampled region.

Provoking tenancy of the leadership and accountability reform process in the HEIs. Much more emphasis needs to be placed on undertaking dialogue with government and all stakeholders, particularly HEIs themselves, to ensure that they use the merits of how a decentralized system can potentially benefit them.

Structure up sound institutional autonomy to HEIs: Sound autonomy for the HEIs necessitates two issues which are not set up well before; identifying the governments' operational management role from the policy role and revamp both substantive and procedural autonomy and accountability.

Strengthening Governing Boards and Management Council of the HEIs: It has paramount importance of building up leadership and autonomy of governing boards and university council to increase institutional autonomy and accountability. The current study reveals that, one of the major challenges of the current governing boards and council of in sampled public universities in the region is continuing to look for direction from the government other than having the confidence to give strategic directions themselves. Hence, the designation of a wide variety of external members with the high academic caliber on these boards and council of universities helps to represent the diversity of interests within society as well as government priorities, and serve as a source of information to the market and society demands.

Firming up Accountability in HEIs: Having the right balance between self-reliance and accountability in HEIs is very critical to maintain effective leadership and management practices. In order to operationalize this right, extricates steered systems from those heavily regulated in the HEIs. Besides, to ensure accountability in HEIs, the government should clearly define roles, responsibilities, relationship between actors and their stakeholders. This help the government to build in the particular characteristics of accountability that best reflect its own priorities, method of working and to make the actors accountable to their actions in the HEIs. Moreover, the universities should be independent from external influences. As universities have become increasingly interdependent with external powers, they become accountable to external organizational relationships, such as local and federal governments, equally in managing institutional business and corporate relationships.

REFERENCES

[1] Brown, R. (2012). *The corporatization of university governance.* London: University of West London.

[2] Finnie, R., & Usher, A. (2007). *Room at the top: Strategies for increasing the number of graduate students in Canada*. PLACE: C.D. Howe Institute.

[3] Henard, F. (2009). *Good Governance and the Transformation of Higher Education Institutions. A review of Higher Education Governance Literature, Governance Guidelines and Quality Assurance Guidelines*, Paris: OECD.

[4] Lindberg, M. (2007). At the frontier of graduate surveys: Assessing participation and employability of graduates with master's degree in nine European countries. Higher Education: *The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 53,623-644. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/10734-005-1672-4

[5] [5] Toutkoushian, R., & Shafiq, M. (2010). A conceptual analysis of state support for higher education: Appropriations versus need-based financial aid. *Research in Higher Education, 51*(1), 40 64.http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9148-5

[6] Vaira, M. (2004). Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis. *Higher Education, 48*(4). 483-510

[7] Kirsch, U. (2014). *The higher education system in Israel – Issues, characteristics, and unique aspects*, Jerusalem: Shmuel Ne, aman, Institute

[8] Enders, J. (2004). Higher Education, Internationalization, and the Nation-State: Recent Developments and Challenges to Governance Theory, in *Higher Education*, Vol. 47, No.3, Springer, Netherlands, pp. 361-382.

[9] Dobbins, M., &Knill, C. (2014). *Higher education governance and policy change in Western Europe: International challenges to historical institutions*. Palgrave Macmillan.http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9781137399854

[10] Dobbins, M., Knill, C., &Vögtle, E. M. (2011). An analytical framework for the cross-country comparison of higher education governance. *Higher Education, 62*(5), 665-683.http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-011-9412-4

[11] Solanke, O. A. (2011). Models of institutional culture and governance: A literature review. Hummingbird, 2 (69).

[12] Bush, T. & Glover, D. (2002). *School Leadership: Concepts and Evidence*, Nottingham: NCSL.

[13] Bovens (2005). Public accountability. *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[14] Pandey, I.M. (2004). Governance of higher education institutions. VIKALPA, V.29, No.2.

[15] Ferlie, E., Lynn, L.E & C. Pollitt (2005). The Oxford Handbook of Public management, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[16] May, P.M. (2007). Regulatory Regimes and Accountability". *Regulation and Governance*, Vol.1. No. 1, pp 8-26).

[17] FDRE (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia). (2002). *Capacity Building Strategy and Programs.*February 2002, Addis Ababa, 295 pp.

[18] Behailu A. (2011). The path of governance transformation in Ethiopia Higher Education: Institutional Perspective (MA Thesis) Oslo University.

[19] Henard, F. (2009). *Good Governance and the Transformation of Higher Education Institutions. A review of Higher Education Governance Literature, Governance Guidelines and Quality Assurance Guidelines*, Paris: OECD.

[20] Teshome Y. (2003). Transformation is higher education: Experiences with reform and expansion in Ethiopian higher education system.

[21] Yohannes H. (2010). Governance in Ethiopian HEIs: State University relationship. Tampered University.

[22] FDRE (2009). Higher Education proclamation, No. 650/2009 Federal NegaritGazeta: 15th Year No. 64.

[23] Kenenisa D. (2015). Reforms in Ethiopian Higher Education Systems in a Global Context*:* Continuities, Changes and Challenges. PhD dissertation, Addis Ababa University.

[24] Ashebir B. (2016). Power distance and its Impact on academic staff performance in Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions. PhD dissertation, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia
[25] Andrews, M. (2010). Good Government Means Different Things in Different Countries. Governance: An *International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 23, 7–35.
[26] Christensen, M. &Skaerbaek, P. (2007). Framing and overflowing of public sector accountability innovations: A comparative study of reporting practices. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal,* 20(1), 101–132.
[27] Haat, M. H. C., Rahman, R. A. &Mahenthiran, S. (2008). Corporate governance, transparency and performance of Malaysian companies. *Managerial Auditing Journal*. 23(8), 744-778.
[28] Salminen, A. &Ikola-Norrbacka, R. (2010). Trust, good governance and unethical actions in Finnish public administration. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23(7), 647–668.
[29] Bhuiyan, S. H.&Amagoh, F. (2011). Public sector reform in Kazakhstan: issues and perspectives. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 24(3), 227–249.
[30] Morrell, K. (2009). Governance and the public good. *Public Administration*, 87, 538–556.
[31] United Nation Human Rights. (2012). Good Governance. Retrieved from http://www.ohchr.org/en/Issues/Development/GoodGovernance/Pages/GoodGovernanceInde .aspx
[32] Collier, P. M. (2008). Stakeholder accountability: A field study of the implementation of a governance improvement plan. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 21 (7), 933–954.
[33] O'Dwyer, B.,&Unerman, J. (2007). From functional to social accountability: Transforming the accountability relationship between funders and nongovernmental development organizations. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 20, 446–471.
[34] Greenfield, D. (2007. The enactment of dynamic leadership. *Leadership in Health Services*, 20(3), 159–168.
[35] Subramaniam, A., Othman, R.&Sambasivan, M. (2010). Implicit leadership theory among Malaysian managers: Impact of the leadership expectation gap on leader-member exchange quality. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 31(4), 351–371.
[36] Thomas, R. J. (2009). The leadership lessons of crucible experiences. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 30(1), 21–26.
[37] Hoffman, B. J.&Frost, B. C. 2006. Multiple intelligences of transformational leaders: an empirical examination. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1), 37–51.
[38] Simpson, P. (2007). Organizing in the mist: a case study in leadership and complexity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 28(5), 465–482.
[39] Gonzalez, R. & Firestone, W. (2013). Educational tug-of-war: internal and external accountability of principals in varied contexts. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(3), 383–406.
[40] Hall, A. T., Blass, F. R., Ferris, G. R.,&Massengale, R. (2004). Leader reputation and accountability in organizations: Implications for dysfunctional leader behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*.
[41] Creswell, J.W., (2012). Educational Research Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research. 4th Edition. University of Nebraska–Lincoln.
[42] Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., Airasian, p., (2009). *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Applications* 9th Ed. Upper saddle river, New Jersey Columbus, Ohio.
[43] Churchill, G. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research, 16*(1),64-73.
[44] Israel, G. (2013). Determining sample size. Program evaluation and organizational development, IFAS, University of Florida. PEOD-6.
[45] Nkurikiyumukiza, P. (2010). Educational leadership and the management of change in higher education. Implementation of Module based Teaching at National University of Rwanda.
[46] Park, H. (2013). An introduction to logistic regression: from basic concepts to interpretation with particular attention to nursing domain. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing, 43*(2), 154–164. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23703593.

Table 13: Mean and Interdependent sample test for Legal Accountability Domains between Lecturer, MLM& TLM

Variables	*Position*	*Mean*	*SD*	*DF*	*F*	*Sig*
Working strongly for preventing discrimination, harassment, violence against academic community (P4Q1)	*Lecturer*	*2.83*	*1.066*	*275*	*0.10*	*0.000****
	MLM	*3.80*	*.969*	*49*		
	TLM	*3.65*	*.977*	*25*		
	Total	*3.03*	*1.110*	*348*		
Having conditions for creating a code of ethics to guide an academic community of the university (P4Q2)	*Lecturer*	*2.82*	*.973*	*275*	*.136*	*0.001***
	MLM	*3.44*	*.951*	*49*		
	TLM	*3.38*	*.697*	*25*		

	Total	*2.95*	*.982*	*348*		
There is transparency in the system of institutional accountability (P4Q3).	*Lecturer*	*2.57*	*.886*	*275*	*1.427*	*0.006***
	MLM	*3.24*	*.981*	*49*		
	TLM	*3.35*	*.689*	*25*		
	Total	*2.72*	*.931*	*348*		
Disclosure of relevant documents, procedures, and policies to different stakeholders in the university (P4Q4)	*Lecturer*	*2.57*	*.960*	*275*	*.529*	*0.000****
	MLM	*3.40*	*1.010*	*49*		
	TLM	*3.54*	*.761*	*25*		
	Total	*2.76*	*1.018*	*348*		
*Note: [** if p<0.05, and *** if p<0.001]*						

Table 14: Statistical test for individual variable of Legal Accountability Dimension

P4Q1	Coef. (β)	St. Err	t	P>ItI	[95 % Conf. Interval]
P4Q2 (A1)	*.5739118*	*.0486298*	*11.80*	*0.000****	*.4782664 .6695571*
P4Q3 (A2)	*.1441837*	*.0563111*	*2.56*	*0.011***	*.0334308. . 2549365*
P4Q4(A3)	*.272072*	*.0567608*	*4.79*	*0.000****	*.1604346 .383719*
CONST	*.1931235*	*.1414783*	*1.37*	*0.173*	*-.0851365 .4713836*
Note: No. of Observations =352; F(3,348)=156.88; Prob>F=0.000; R-Squared=0.5749;Adj R-Squared=0.5712;Root MSE=.72698					

Table 15: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Variable of Legal Accountability

Variable		SS	DF	MS	F	Eta V	Sig.
P4Q1	*Between Group*	*57.025*	*6*	*9.504*	*8.729*	*.034*	*0.000****
	Within Group	*375.632*	*345*	*1.089*			
	Total	*432.656*	*351*				
P4Q2	*Between Group*	*24.052*	*6*	*4.009*	*4.403*	*.012*	*0.000****
	Within Group	*314.127*	*345*	*.911*			
	Total	*338.179*	*351*				
P4Q3	*Between Group*	*31.428*	*6*	*5.238*	*6.623*	*.046*	*0.000****
	Within Group	*272.842*	*345*	*.791*			
	Total	*304.270*	*351*				
P4Q4	*Between Group*	*48.564*	*6*	*8.094*	*8.854*	*.085*	*0.000****
	Within Group	*315.391*	*345*	*.914*			
	Total	*363.955*	*351*				
Note: SS- Sum of Squares, MS – Mean Square, Eta value=.01-small effect, .06-medium effect, .14 and above –larger							

Table 16. Mean and Interdependent sample test for Social Accountability Dimension between participants

Variables	*Position*	*Mean*	*SD*	*DF*	*F*	*Sig*
Effective communication to the public concerns to the nature of its education and societal missions P5Q1	*Lecturer*	*2.69*	*.971*	*275*	*0.074*	*0.000****
	MLM	*3.62*	*.923*	*49*		
	TLM	*3.42*	*.643*	*25*		
	Total	*2.87*	*1.008*	*48*		
Working for addressing contemporary problems facing society. (P5Q2)	*Lecturer*	*2.81*	*.942*	*275*	*.271*	*0.000****
	MLM	*3.50*	*.838*	*49*		
	TLM	*3.50*	*.812*	*25*		
	Total	*2.96*	*.960*	*349*		
Working with industries closely to fulfill the human resource requirement of different sectors. (P5Q3)	*Lecturer*	*2.69*	*1.036*	*275*	*1.221*	*0.000****
	MLM	*3.38*	*.901*	*49*		
	TLM	*3.27*	*.778*	*25*		
	Total	*2.96*	*.960*	*349*		
*Note: [** if p<0.05, and *** if p<0.001]*						

Source: Field Survey (2016)

Table 17: Statistical; test for individual variable of Social Accountability

P5Q1	Coef. (β)	St. Err	t	P>ItI	[95 % Conf. Interval]
P5Q2 (V1)	*.1018086*	*.0647773*	*1.57*	*0.117*	*-.0255944 .2292117*
P5Q3 (V2)	*.4029797*	*.0600979*	*6.71*	*0.000****	*.28478 .52117940*
CONST	*1.433374*	*.1597568*	*.8.97*	*0.000****	*1.119167 1.747581*
Note: No. of Observations - 352; F(2,349) = 92.93; Prob>F=0.000; R – Squared = 0.6327; Adj R-Squared = 0.6283;Root MSE = .8853					

Table 18: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Variable of Social Accountability

Variable		SS	DF	MS	F	Eta V.	Sig.
P5Q1	*Between Group*	*44.248*	*2*	*22.124*	*24.757*	*.0353*	*0.000****
	Within Group	*310.983*	*349*	*.894*			
	Total	*355.234*	*351*				
P5Q2	*Between Group*	*26.408*	*2*	*13.204*	*15.690*	*.0288*	*0.000****
	Within Group	*292.263*	*349*	*.842*			

	Total	*319.271*	*351*				
P5Q3	*Between Group*	*24.856*	*2*	*12.428*	*12.373*	*.0258*	*0.000****
	Within Group	*349.543*	*349*	*1.004*			
	Total	*374.399*	*351*				
Note: SS- Sum of Squares, MS - Eta value=.01-small effect, .06-medium effect, .14 and above –larger							

Table 19. Mean and Interdependent sample test for Political Accountability Dimension between L, MLM, and TLM

Variables	*Position*	*Mean*	*SD*	*DF*	*F*	*Sig*
There is participation of organizations units representing the academic community in developing quality assurance system and decision making process (P6Q1)	*Lecturer*	*2.66*	*.898*	*275*	*1.780*	*0.000****
	MLM	*3.46*	*.973*	*49*		
	TLM	*3.38*	*.752*	*25*		
	Total	*2.83*	*.951*	*48*		
There is accountability of clear , accurate and timely information across all levels of institutional engagement of all stakeholders (P6Q2)	*Lecturer*	*2.66*	*.874*	*275*	*3.185*	*0.000****
	MLM	*3.38*	*.1.028*	*49*		
	TLM	*3.23*	*.710*	*25*		
	Total	*2.80*	*.928*	*349*		
*Note: [** if p<0.05, and *** if p<0.001]*						

Table 20: Statistical test for individual predictor of Political Accountability

P6Q1	Coef. (β)	St. Err	t	P>|t|	[95 % Conf. Interval]
P6Q2	*.6686096*	*.0381901*	*17.51*	*0.000****	*.5934987 .7437206*
CONST	*.8325704*	*..1139902*	*7.30*	*0.000****	*.6083786 1.056762*
Note: No. of Observations - 352; F (1, 350)= 306.51; Prob> F=0.000; R-Squared = 0.4669; Adj R-Squared = 0.4054; Root MSE = .68078					

Table 21: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Variable of Political Accountability

Variable		SS	DF	MS	F	Eta V.	Sig.
P6Q1	*Between Group*	*33.526*	*2*	*16.763*	*20.869*	*.047*	*0.000****
	Within Group	*279.523*	*348*	*.803*			
	Total	*313.048*	*350*				
P6Q2	*Between Group*	*25.790*	*2*	*12.895*	*16.532*	*.063*	*0.000****
	Within Group	*274.440*	*348*	*.780*			
	Total	*297.231*	*350*				
Note: SS- Sum of Squares, MS-Mean Square - Eta value=.01-small effect, .06-medium effect, .14 and above –larger							

Source: Field Survey (2016)