

# Departmental and Faculty Committee Distributed Leadership as Predictors of Academic Staff Job Effectiveness in Federal Universities in North- East Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Fwah, Candy Michael., <sup>2</sup>Badau , Kabiru Mohammed (Ph.D)., <sup>3</sup>Kotirde, Isa Yuguda (Ph.D)

<sup>1</sup>Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education, Adamawa State University Mubi, Adamawa State, Nigeria

<sup>2,3</sup>Department of Educational Foundation, Modibbo Adama University Yola, Adamawa State, Nigeria

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400057>

Received: 08 April 2026; Accepted: 13 April 2026; Published: 29 April 2026

## ABSTRACT

The study assessed departmental and faculty committee distributed leadership as predictors of academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East Nigeria. The study was guided by three objectives, three research questions, and three null hypotheses. A predictive correlational research design was adopted for the study. The population comprised 6,575 academic staff in Federal Universities in North-East Nigeria. Using simple random sampling and proportionate stratified sampling techniques (simple random sampling of states and proportionate sampling of respondents across selected universities), a sample size of 658 academic staff was drawn for the study. Data were collected using structured questionnaires: Departmental and Faculty Committees Distributed Leadership and Academic Staff Job Effectiveness Questionnaire (DFCDLASJEQ). The instruments contained 20 items in total and were structured on a 5-point rating scale. The instruments were validated by three experts, while reliability was determined through a pilot study using the Cronbach's alpha procedure (0.852). Data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation to answer the research questions, while simple linear regression and multiple regression analyses were used for hypothesis testing at 0.05 level of significance, using SPSS version 27. Findings revealed that departmental distributed leadership ( $M=3.47$ ,  $SD=0.95$ ;  $F(1,118)=21.959$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), and faculty committee distributed leadership ( $M=3.36$ ,  $SD=0.94$ ;  $F(1,118)=21.575$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), significantly predicted academic staff job effectiveness. The study concludes that strengthening departmental and faculty committees distributed leadership practices is critical for improving academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East Nigeria. It was recommended, among others, that institutions should foster teamwork and collegiality among staff through team-building activities, collaborative projects, and recognition of cooperative efforts.

**Keywords:** Distributed Leadership, Departmental Distributed Leadership, Faculty Committee, Distributed Leadership, and Academic Staff Job Effectiveness

## INTRODUCTION

Job effectiveness among academic staff refers to their ability to perform teaching, research, administrative duties and engage in community service efficiently while maintaining professional standards. It encompasses key performance indicators such as instructional delivery, research output, student engagement, curriculum development, and participation in institutional governance (Williams, 2022). Academic staff job effectiveness refers to the capacity of lecturers to achieve high performance in teaching, research, and service. It is measured by the ability to disseminate knowledge, mentor students, contribute to research, administrative duties, peer reviews, engage in community development, teaching-assessment and self-reports (Martinez et al., 2023). Effective academic staff contribute to knowledge creation, mentorship, and academic integrity, which are vital for fostering an environment of excellence in higher education (Johnson & Ojo, 2018). Several factors enhance the effectiveness of academic staff in universities. These include access to professional development opportunities, a supportive work environment, adequate resources for research, and fair compensation (Harris,

2020). When these factors are present, academic staff are better positioned to perform their roles effectively, leading to improved student outcomes and institutional success. When leadership is shared, academic staff members are more empowered to contribute to important decisions, which may enhance staff member's motivation and engagement, and ultimately may lead to improved effectiveness in teaching, research, and service (Harris, 2019).

Distributed leadership is a conceptual framework that moves away from the traditional notion of leadership as a role held exclusively by a single individual and instead posits that leadership is a shared, dynamic process emerging from interactions among multiple members of an organization. It emphasizes collective responsibility, collaboration, and the pooling of expertise to address complex challenges (Lee & Williams, 2018). In this model, leadership is not confined to formal titles or positions but is distributed across various organizational layers, thus promoting a more flexible and adaptive approach to decision-making and problem-solving (Ng & Smith, 2019). Distributed leadership in universities involves decentralizing authority so that decisions are made collaboratively, thereby increasing responsiveness and fostering innovation (Martin, 2020). This approach enables universities to be more agile in the face of rapid technological changes, shifting student needs, and evolving research priorities. This alignment facilitates a more integrated approach to curriculum development, research initiatives, and community engagement (Carson, 2022).

Departmental distributed leadership refers to the process of guiding, managing, and coordinating academic and administrative activities within a specific department of a university. It involves decision-making, resource allocation, faculty development, and fostering a collaborative environment to ensure the achievement of departmental and institutional goals (Hassan & Ahmed, 2020). The department serves as the foundational academic unit in universities, where leadership is exercised by department heads, program coordinators, and committees to oversee teaching, research, and service delivery. Effective departmental distributed leadership is characterized by a balance between administrative duties and academic responsibilities. Leaders at the departmental level must navigate complex organizational structures while promoting faculty development, student engagement, and research productivity (Morris et al., 2021). Unlike centralized leadership, departmental distributed leadership allows for a more context-specific and adaptable approach to governance, ensuring that academic staff can contribute meaningfully to institutional success.

Faculty committee distributed leadership are structured groups of academic staff within a university that are established to oversee, manage, and guide various aspects of institutional governance, policy development, and decision-making. These committees function as advisory or decision-making bodies that help universities manage academic, administrative, and operational affairs effectively. Faculty committees distributed leadership are essential for ensuring a participatory governance structure in higher education institutions, as they provide a platform for academic staff to contribute to institutional policies, curriculum development, research activities, and staff welfare (Anderson & Patel, 2023). Faculty committees distributed leadership play a fundamental role in promoting shared governance in universities, where decision-making is not centralized but involves academic staff from different academic units. This shared leadership approach allows for a diversity of perspectives in university management, ensuring that policies and academic programs are developed with input from those directly involved in teaching, research, and student mentorship (Williams & Carter, 2022). By facilitating collaboration between academic staff and university administrators, faculty committees enhance transparency, accountability, and inclusivity in decision-making processes.

## **Statement of the Problem**

In an ideal situation, academic staff in universities are expected to perform optimally in their core responsibilities of teaching, research, and community service. Effective academic staff are expected to contribute to the intellectual development of students, produce high-quality research, and actively engage in activities that enhance the university's role in societal development (Nwagbara, 2018). However, the reality in some universities in Nigeria, which the North East is a part, is far from this ideal. For instance, a survey by the National Universities Commission (NUC, 2020) revealed that only 30% of academic staff in Nigerian universities reported high levels of job effectiveness, citing factors such as poor leadership, inadequate resources, poor motivation, and heavy workloads as major impediments. Another study by Akpa (2018) found that distributed

leadership was significantly related to job satisfaction among academic staff in Nigerian universities. However, there is a need for more research on the impact of distributed leadership on academic staff job effectiveness in the North East region in Nigeria. Despite the widespread concern over these issues, there is a noticeable gap in empirical studies exploring how distributed leadership predicts academic staff job effectiveness in universities, particularly in North-East Nigeria. Therefore, the researcher set up this study to help provide empirical evidence on how departmental and faculty committee distributed leadership predicts academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East Nigeria.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine how departmental and faculty committee distributed leadership predicts academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities of North-East, Nigeria. Specifically, the study seeks to determine how:

1. Departmental distributed leadership predicts academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria.
2. Faculty committee distributed leadership predicts academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria.
3. Departmental and Faculty committees distributed leadership predicts academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were raised to guide the study:

1. What is the extent of departmental distributed leadership in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria?
2. What is the extent of faculty committee distributed leadership in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria?
3. What is the extent of academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria?

### **Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at a significance level of 0.05:

**H<sub>01</sub>:** Departmental distributed leadership practice does not significantly predict academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** Faculty committee distributed leadership practice does not significantly predict academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria.

**H<sub>03</sub>:** Departmental and Faculty committee distributed leadership practice does not significantly predict academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria.

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study was anchored on the Distributed Leadership Theory propounded by Peter Gronn in 2002.

#### **Peter (2002) Distributed Leadership Theory**

The Distributed Leadership Theory (DLT) was introduced by Peter Gronn in 2002 as an alternative to traditional hierarchical leadership models in educational and organizational settings. The theory states that leadership should not be viewed as a role confined to a single individual but rather as a collective and interactive process

shared among multiple actors within an institution. This theory emphasizes interdependence, collective decision-making, and shared responsibilities among team members. According to Gronn, leadership is an emergent property of group interactions rather than a function limited to appointed leaders. He identifies spontaneous collaboration, intuitive working relations, and institutionalized practices as key components of distributed leadership, which collectively contribute to enhanced organizational effectiveness. In the context of universities, particularly in North East Nigeria, distributed leadership is highly relevant given the complex and dynamic nature of academic institutions. The study of departmental and faculty committee distributed leadership as a predictor of academic staff job effectiveness aligns with Gronn's theory, as it emphasizes the importance of collective leadership in enhancing job effectiveness. At the departmental level, distributed leadership plays a crucial role in fostering academic staff effectiveness. Similarly, the Distributed leadership theory suggests that when leadership is shared at the faculty level, it reduces bureaucratic bottlenecks, enhances academic freedom, and fosters innovation in teaching and research.

## METHODOLOGY

A predictive correlational research design was adopted for this study, predictive correlational studies are used to determine the extent to which one or more predictor variables can explain or forecast the outcome of a dependent variable without manipulation of the variables (Jenkins, 2015). The population of this study is 6,575 academic staff in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria, as collated by the researcher (Field Survey, 2025). This population encompasses of academic staff in universities of North East Nigeria that are fully engaged in teaching, research, and various administrative roles. The sample size for this study was 658 respondents. The sample represents 10% of the population of all academic staff in Federal Universities in North East, Nigeria as recommended by Cohen et al., 2011. Hence, a probability sampling technique which employed; simple random sampling and proportionate stratified random sampling techniques. First, the universities were categorized based on state using stratified sampling techniques ensuring that each state is represented and then subjected to a simple random sampling technique, where the names of every State in North East Nigeria was written on a piece of paper and put in a hat, whereas a colleague were asked to select three states through balloting without replacement. The selected states included Gombe, Taraba and Adamawa States. Secondly, each selected state (under the first stage) and their universities were subjected to a proportionate stratified sampling technique to select lecturers from each of the Federal Universities selected. Hence, the proportion of the sample for each university selected were Federal University, Kashere, 195; Federal University, Wukari, 241 respondents; Federal University of Agriculture, Mubi, 24 respondents; and Modibbo Adama University, Yola, 198 respondents. The instruments used for data collection was a structured questionnaire titled Departmental and Faculty Committee Distributed Leadership and Academic Staff Job Effectiveness Questionnaire (DFCDLASJEQ) and was adapted with modifications from Bolden (2020). The questionnaire consisted of closed-ended items to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the respondents' views. The questionnaire contained 20 items constructed on five points rating scale with the following response options: Very High Extent (VHE) = 5 points, High Extent (HE) = 4 points, Moderate Extent (ME) = 3 points, Low Extent (LE) = 2 points, and Very Low Extent (VLE) = 1 point. The validity of the research instrument was established through both face and content validity procedures. The questionnaires were subjected to three expert review to determine whether they adequately measured the intended constructs and sufficiently covered all relevant aspects of the study.. The reliability of the research instruments was established through a pilot study conducted prior to the main data collection. The pilot testing involved forty (40) academic staff drawn from universities outside the study sample but with characteristics similar to those of the main study participants. The Departmental and Faculty Committee Distributed Leadership and Academic Staff Job Effectiveness Questionnaire (DFCDLASJEQ) demonstrated good reliability. The overall Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the 20- items scale was 0.852, indicating very high internal consistency. The direct delivery approach was adopted in administering the questionnaire copies. The collected data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. For the research questions, the Mean and Standard Deviation were used in answering the research questions. Accordingly, mean scores ranging from 4.50 to 5.00 were interpreted as Very High Extent; 3.50 to 4.49 as High Extent (HE); 2.50 to 3.49 as Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50 to 2.49 as Low Extent (LE); and 1.00 to 1.49 as Very Low Extent. To test the hypotheses, simple linear regression analysis was employed. Thus, any p-value less than or equal to 0.05 was considered statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis, while p-values greater than 0.05 resulted in the non-rejection of the null hypothesis. The decision rule for the relationship co-efficient ( $R^2$ )

was that if,  $R^2 \geq 0.7$ : High explanatory power,  $0.5 \leq R^2 < 0.7$ : Moderate explanatory power,  $0.3 \leq R^2 < 0.5$ : Low explanatory power,  $R^2 < 0.3$ : Very low explanatory power. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27 was used for all data analyses.

## RESULTS

RQ1. What is the extent of departmental distributed leadership in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria?

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviations of Extent of Departmental Distributed Leadership in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria

S/N	Item	n=658	Mean	S. D	Remark
1	Involvement of academic staff in tracking Key Performance Indicators		3.74	0.95	HE
2	Facilitates collaboration between members of the department		3.53	0.84	HE
3	Communicates departmental goals clearly to academic staff		3.40	1.00	ME
4	Develops long-term plans that support the department's vision		3.18	1.03	ME
5	Provision of clear guidance to academic staff in their duties		3.26	0.96	ME
6	Promote professional development opportunities for academic staff to maintain high standards		3.69	0.91	HE
	<b>Grand Mean</b>		<b>3.47</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>ME</b>

The results in Table 1 show that departmental distributed leadership in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria is exercised to a moderate extent, with a grand mean of 3.47. This indicates that, on average, academic staff perceive departmental distributed leadership practices as fairly adequate but not optimal. The standard deviations, which range from 0.84 to 1.03, indicate moderate variability in respondents' opinions. Overall, the variability reflects uneven implementation of leadership practices within department.

RQ2. What is the extent of faculty committee distributed leadership in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria?

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviations of Extent of Faculty Committee Distributed Leadership in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria

S/N	Item	n=658	Mean	S. D	Remark
7	Adherence to established policy procedures		3.42	0.93	ME
8	Adoption of best practices in committee governance		3.21	0.92	ME
9	Tracking improvement in students' outcomes related to committee recommendations		3.23	0.93	ME
10	Ensuring that curricula align with current academic standards based on global practices		3.56	0.94	HE
11	Advocate for improved working conditions for academic staff through adequate resource allocation		3.49	0.95	ME

12	Measuring the impact of committee-led initiatives on faculty research output/scholar activity	3.26	0.96	ME
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>ME</b>

Table 2 reveals that faculty committee distributed leadership is practiced to a moderate extent, as reflected by a grand mean of 3.36. The standard deviations for faculty committee distributed leadership range from 0.92 to 0.96, showing moderate dispersion of responses. This implies that respondents hold differing views on how effectively faculty committees perform their distributed leadership roles. The consistency of the standard deviation values across items suggests that perceptions of faculty committee distributed leadership are relatively uniform, though not strongly positive, indicating a need for enhanced committee effectiveness and clearer impact.

RQ3. What is the extent of academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria?

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation of Extent of Academic Staff Job Effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria

S/N	Item	n=658	Mean	S. D	Remark
13	Delivering engaging lectures		3.67	0.92	HE
14	Using a variety of teaching methods to cater to diverse student needs		3.07	1.28	ME
15	Timely feedback on student assignments/exams		3.38	0.94	ME
16	Integrate real-life examples during lectures		3.37	0.83	ME
17	Use technology effectively to enhance student learning		2.78	1.23	ME
18	Active engagement of students in class discussions		3.32	0.96	ME
19	Assess student performance fairly		3.45	0.85	ME
20	Set clear learning objectives for their courses		3.24	1.08	ME
	<b>Grand Mean</b>		<b>3.29</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>ME</b>

Source: Field Survey (2025)

Table 3 reveals that academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria is demonstrated to a moderate to high extent, as reflected by a grand mean of 3.33. The standard deviations, which range from 0.76 to 1.28, indicate moderate to high variability in respondents' perceptions. Overall, the results suggest that while academic staff are generally effective in their roles, targeted capacity building and resource support could enhance consistency and overall job effectiveness.

### Hypotheses

**H<sub>01</sub>:** Departmental distributed leadership practice does not significantly predict academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria.

Table 4a: Summary of ANOVA from Regression Analysis of Departmental Distributed Leadership Practice as predictors of Academic Staff Job Effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.049	1	8.049	21.959	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	43.250	118	.367		
	Total	51.299	119			
a. Dependent Variable: Academic Staff Job Effectiveness						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Departmental Distributed Leadership						

The ANOVA results in Table 4a show that the regression model is statistically significant ( $F = 21.959, p = .000$ ). This indicates that departmental distributed leadership practice significantly predicts academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East Nigeria. The p-value being less than 0.05 confirms that the observed relationship is not due to chance.

Table 4b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.396 <sup>a</sup>	.157	.150	.60541
a. Predictors: (Constant), Departmental Distributed Leadership				

As shown in Table 4b, the correlation coefficient (R) is 0.396 and the  $R^2$  is 0.157. This indicates that departmental distributed leadership accounts for 15.7% of the variance and has small explanatory power in academic staff job effectiveness. The adjusted  $R^2$  of 0.150 suggests that the model's predictive capacity remains consistent when adjusting for the sample size, and the standard error of estimate (0.60541) reflects moderate precision in prediction.

Table 4c: Coefficients of Beta

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.216	.253		8.768	.000
	Departmental leadership	.333	.071	.396	4.686	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Academic Staff Job Effectiveness						

Table 4c presents the regression coefficients, showing a positive and significant effect of departmental leadership on academic staff job effectiveness ( $B = 0.333, \text{Beta} = 0.396, t = 4.686, p = .000$ ). This means that an increase in departmental distributed leadership practice is associated with an increase in academic staff job effectiveness. The standardized beta indicates a moderate strength of this predictive relationship.

**H0<sub>2</sub>:** Faculty committee distributed leadership practice does not significantly predict academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria.

Table 5a: Summary of ANOVA from Regression Analysis of Faculty Committee Distributed Leadership Practice as Predictor of Academic Staff Job Effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.930	1	7.930	21.575	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	43.369	118	.368		
	Total	51.299	119			
a. Dependent Variable: Academic Staff Job Effectiveness						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Faculty Committee Distributed Leadership						

The ANOVA results in Table 5a show that the regression model is statistically significant ( $F = 21.575, p = .000$ ). This indicates that faculty committee distributed leadership practice significantly predicts academic staff job effectiveness. The p-value being less than 0.05 confirms that this predictive relationship is not due to chance.

Table 5b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.393 <sup>a</sup>	.155	.147	.60625
a. Predictors: (Constant), Faculty Committee Distributed Leadership				

As presented in Table 5b, the correlation coefficient (R) is 0.393 and the  $R^2$  is 0.155. This suggests that faculty committee distributed leadership explains 15.5% of the variance in academic staff job effectiveness and has small or limited explanatory power. The adjusted  $R^2$  of 0.147 indicates that the predictive power of the model remains reasonably consistent when accounting for the sample size. The standard error of estimate (0.60625) reflects moderate precision in predicting job effectiveness.

Table 5c: Coefficients of Beta

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.148	.269		7.983	.000
	Faculty committees	.364	.078	.393	4.645	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Academic Staff Job Effectiveness						

Table 5c shows that the regression coefficient for faculty committee distributed leadership is positive and significant ( $B = 0.364, \text{Beta} = 0.393, t = 4.645, p = .000$ ). This means that for every one-unit increase in faculty committee distributed leadership practice, academic staff job effectiveness increases by 0.364 units. The standardized beta indicates a moderate effect size, demonstrating that stronger committee distributed leadership is meaningfully associated with higher staff effectiveness.

**H03:** Departmental and Faculty committee distributed leadership practice do not significantly predict academic staff job effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria.

Table 6a: Summary of ANOVA from Regression Analysis of Departmental and Faculty Committee Distributed Leadership Practices as Predictor of Academic Staff Job Effectiveness in Federal Universities in North-East, Nigeria

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.732	2	2.946	9.186	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	36.567	117	.321		
	Total	51.299	119			
a. Dependent Variable: Academic Staff Job Effectiveness						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Faculty Committees and Departmental Leadership						

The results in Table 6a show that distributed leadership practices significantly predict academic staff job effectiveness. The ANOVA outcome,  $F(5,114) = 9.186, p < 0.05$  demonstrates that the group of predictors departmental and faculty distributed leadership, collectively contributes significantly to predicting job effectiveness. Hence, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected.

Table 6b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.536 <sup>a</sup>	.287	.256	.56636
a. Predictors: (Constant) Faculty Committees and Departmental Leadership,				

According to Table 6b, the model achieved  $R = 0.536$  and  $R^2 = 0.287$ , meaning that approximately 28.7% of the variance in job effectiveness is explained by both departmental distributed leadership and faculty committee distributed leadership practices substantially higher than in previous models. This result shows moderate explanatory power, indicating that distributed leadership practices of department and faculty committee when combined across different organizational levels will have more meaningful implication for academic staff effectiveness. Table 6c: Coefficients of Beta

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.807	.332		5.437	.000
	Departmental Leadership	.323	.085	.383	3.790	.000
	Faculty Committees	.224	.093	.242	2.407	.018
a. Dependent Variable: Academic Staff Job Effectiveness						

From Table 6c, four variables: departmental distributed leadership ( $\beta = 0.383, p < 0.05$ ), faculty committees distributed leadership ( $\beta = 0.242, p < 0.05, p < 0.05$ ) significantly predict academic staff effectiveness. Departmental and faculty committee distributed leadership practices contribute positively, indicating that collaborative and empowering distributed leadership structures enhance staff effectiveness.

---

## DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The finding of the study reveals that Departmental distributed leadership practice was moderate and significantly predicted academic staff job effectiveness. This suggests that the way departmental heads manage their units, including decision-making, supervision, and motivation of staff plays a critical role in determining how effectively academic staff perform their duties. A moderate level of leadership practice implies that while departmental heads demonstrate distributed leadership behaviours that positively impact staff effectiveness, there remains room for enhancing the quality and consistency of these practices to achieve even greater effectiveness. The finding of the present study agrees with that of Ajayi and Omisakin (2024), who reported that departmental leaders with transformational qualities cultivate academic excellence, though lapses such as power abuse, nepotism, and favouritism can undermine trust and standards. Similarly, the finding is in agreement with Nnaji et al., (2024), who found that leadership styles of departmental heads significantly influence academic staff performance in lesson presentation, academic advising, classroom management, and student evaluation. Overall, the present study reinforces the view that departmental distributed leadership is an essential determinant of academic staff effectiveness.

The study also reveals that Faculty committee distributed leadership practice was moderate and significantly predicted academic staff job effectiveness. This implies that leadership exercised through faculty committees, through mechanisms such as participatory decision-making, accountability, supervision, and facilitation of professional development positively affects academic staff performance. The moderate level of practice suggests that while faculty committees contribute meaningfully to job effectiveness, there are potential limitations related to workload, delayed decision-making, or insufficient engagement that could be addressed to optimize their impact. The finding of the present study is in tandem with Agyemang (2024), who reported that committee systems promote participatory decision-making, supervision, accountability, and skills development, all of which are positively related to effective school management, while Diakpomrere and Uhumwuangho (2018), affirmed the committee system's role in promoting sustainable development and organizational growth.

The finding of the study reveals that overall departmental and faculty committee distributed leadership practices were moderate and jointly predicted academic staff job effectiveness. This suggests that when leadership responsibilities are shared across multiple levels departmental heads and faculty committees, they collectively influence staff effectiveness. Distributed leadership allows for participatory decision-making, accountability, and collaborative goal-setting, which can enhance teaching, research, and administrative outcomes. Universities would benefit from focusing on the combined distributed leadership practices of both departmental and faculty committee level implementation as this would lead to noticeable improvements in job effectiveness. The finding of the present study agrees with Ogbogu and Moses (2018) emphasized that departmental heads employ democratic, transformational, transactional, and charismatic leadership styles, which are shaped by institutional goals, resources, culture, and subordinate attitudes. The finding also corroborates the notion of Arthur and Ewusi-Armah (2021), that committee leadership enhances collective responsibility and engagement among academic staff, thereby improving overall job effectiveness.

## CONCLUSION

The study concludes that departmental and faculty committee distributed leadership practices within the university significantly predicted academic staff job effectiveness, suggesting that external engagement activities may not directly impact staff effectiveness. The study emphasizes that there is cumulative impact of collaborative leadership on institutional effectiveness.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made based on the findings of the study.

1. Departmental heads should enhance their distributed leadership skills through training in transformational and participatory leadership to further improve academic staff effectiveness.

2. Faculty committees should implement structured decision-making and accountability frameworks to strengthen distributed leadership practices and promote staff productivity.
3. Universities should promote shared leadership by clearly delegating responsibilities, encouraging participatory decision-making, and developing leadership capacity across all levels.

## REFERENCES

1. Ajayi, I. A., & Adeniji, A. O. (2017). Leadership styles and staff performance in Nigerian universities: The mediating role of work motivation. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(15), 10-18.
2. Ajayi, A., & Omisakin, T. (2024). Distributed leadership and academic staff performance in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 36(1), 55–70.
3. Akpa, V. O. (2018). Distributed leadership and job satisfaction among academic staff in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 25(2), 1-13.
4. Anderson, L., & Patel, S. (2023). *The role of faculty committees in academic decision-making*. Routledge.
5. Bolden, R. (2020). Distributed leadership in organizations: An exploration of leadership practices. *Leadership Quarterly*, 31(5), 763-772
6. Carson, R. (2022). Administrative distributed leadership: Challenges and opportunities in tertiary education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy*, 45(1), 123–145.
7. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
8. Diakpomrere, V. O. & Uhumwuangho, S. O. (2018). Comparative analysis of the effective functions of committee systems in the management of universities in Nigeria for sustainable development. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 20(4), 25-36.
9. Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423–451.
10. Harris, A. (2019). Distributed leadership: Opportunities and constraints. *School Leadership & Management*, 39(1), 5–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1578734>
11. Harris, A. (2020). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Theory and practice. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(1), 5-19
12. Hassan, A., & Ahmed, K. (2020). Departmental leadership and academic productivity: A study of Nigerian universities. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(4), 321–338.
13. Johnson, T., & Ojo, L. (2018). Enhancing academic staff job effectiveness through professional development: The role of universities in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Development*, 13(4), 56-71.
14. Lee, H., & Williams, T. (2018). Distributed leadership and organizational change in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(3), 438–457.
15. Martin, E. (2020). Collaborative leadership in modern universities: Pathways to innovation. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 23(2), 202–220.
16. Martinez, P., Green, H., & Richardson, K. (2023). *Academic governance: Challenges and best practices in universities*. Palgrave Macmillan
17. Morris, C., Lee, T., & Scott, B. (2021). Distributed leadership and departmental effectiveness: Case studies from public universities. *Leadership in Higher Education*, 8(3), 78–95.
18. Ng, K., & Smith, L. (2019). Distributed leadership in higher education: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(4), 378–392.
19. Nnaji, E. S., Ekpo, E. E. & Onabe, D. B. (2024). Leadership styles of Departmental Heads and Job Performance of Academic Staff in Universities in Enugu and Anambra States, Nigeria. *Prestige Journal of Education*, 7(1), 13-24.
20. National Universities Commission (NUC). (2020). *Nigerian universities: A survey report on academic staff job effectiveness*.
21. Nwagbara, U. (2018). Leadership and employee performance in Nigerian universities: The role of organizational support and job satisfaction. *African Journal of Business and Economic Development*, 12(1), 49-63.
22. Ogbogu, C. O. & Moses, K. A. (2018). Leadership Styles of Heads of Departments: Evidences from Nigerian Federal Universities. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8(24), 73-80.



23. Oladipo, S. E., & Adeniran, O. J. (2020). Interpersonal relationships and work engagement among university staff in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 10(5), 75-85.
24. Williams, K., & Carter, W. (2022). *Research funding and interdisciplinary collaboration in universities*. Taylor & Francis
25. Williams, T. (2022). The impact of leadership on interpersonal relationships in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Administration Review*, 10(3), 155–170
26. Yusuf, M. A. (2019). Distributed leadership and academic staff job effectiveness in tertiary institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 15(3), 112-123.