

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF SELF-EFFICACY AND RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY OF LAW LECTURERS IN SOUTH-WESTERN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES

¹O.S.Akinwumi and ²E.F. Ogbomo

¹Nigerian Law School, Abuja, ²Associate Professor, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

¹olayinkasilas2000@gmail.com & ²esoobas@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at investigating self-efficacy and research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian Universities. The specific objective of the study is to ascertain the level of law lecturers' self-efficacy about research productivity in South-western Nigerian Universities. The study was guided by two research questions, and one research hypothesis in order to arrive at reasonable conclusion of the research work. The scope of the study was limited to only the universities in South-western Nigerian universities duly accredited to offer law degree programmes. However, the research design used for the study was Correlational research design because it measures the degree of relationship among variables used in the study without the researcher manipulating any of them. The population of the study was 456 law lecturers as respondents cutting across 21 universities made up of public and private duly accredited to offer law degree programmes in South-western Nigeria. The study adopted Total Enumeration Sampling Technique. This was because the total population of the respondents was used for the study. The research instrument for the study was questionnaire in which some were adapted and some were self-developed. The questionnaire was used to collect information from law lecturers on full appointment in the 21 universities under study having earlier conducted the test and re-test of the questionnaire to 35 law lecturers in sister institution in order to ensure the reliability of the research instrument. The data obtained from the 21 universities under study were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics which included Frequencies, Means, ANOVA, Standard Deviation while Pearson's Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression were used to test the hypotheses. The results obtained from this study showed that the level of law lecturers' self-efficacy about research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities was high. The study also revealed that the level of research productivity of law lecturers in the area under study was low. In conclusion, the study recommended, among others, that for law lecturers to improve their research productivity, efforts must be in place by university management to sensitise law lectures to establish regular seminar sessions within the Faculty of Law where every faculty member should be made to present papers for internal review in order to sharpen their research and writing skills. Besides, efforts should be made to improve the facilities in the library in order to make it more responsive to the needs of faculty members towards improving research productivity.

Key words: *self-efficacy, research productivity, law lecturers, south-western universities.*

INTRODUCTION

Universities are regarded across the globe as centres of knowledge accumulation and knowledge dissemination through research and scholarship. They are also regarded as the hub of highest educational system. Okonkwo and Popoola (2012) explained that universities were institutions of higher learning participating in the evolution of knowledge and providing facilities for teaching and research. The law faculty grows concurrently along other faculties as an integral part of the academic community. Saraswati, Ratimaningsh and Utami (2020) noted that many schools formerly thought of as teaching oriented, now required publications in learned journals for staff tenure elongation and promotion. Thus, since scholarly activities and research productivity

are used to measure the success of institutions. It is clear, therefore, that research is very critical and very significant in the lives of universities, established to serve as centres of national development.

It is in this context that research productivity becomes the yardstick of academic performance and excellence of any faculty member within the university environment in terms of quality and quantity of research. Okonedo, Popoola, Emmanuel and Bamigboye (2015) stressed that the pre-occupation of any (law) lecturer was to conduct research and present scholarly publications in order to increase research output and knowledge advancement.

However, in discussing research productivity from a global perspective, Henry, MdGhati, Mashida and Baker (2020) expressed that research productivity had been the key element of rating universities and other higher education sector. The authors expressed that despite the many initiatives taken to enliven the research culture among academic staff in the universities, there were still constraints and resistance towards conducting research. Some of the constraints bordered on age, gender, rank, qualification, salary, among others. It was also opined by the authors that scholarly publications were used most often to measure the productivity of an institution which has been recognised globally as a medium to expand the social and the knowledge economy. Besides the number of publications coupled with other indicators such as the amount of research grant acquired, the status of the principal investigator, the number of Ph.D students graduated and the number of intellectual properties registered are also part of the indices to measure the productive level of an academic institution

According to Way, Allison, Lanremere and Clauset (2019), Kpolovie and Dorgu (2019) the ranking of universities globally is directly or indirectly dependent on the faculty's h-index and citation index which include: teaching, learning, research (volume, income and reputation), citations (research influence), international outlook, industry, academic reputation, employer reputation, excellence, among others. The maximum research productivity h-index of some universities in Africa is put at 76.00 with a mean score of 9.35 contrary to South African universities with a maximum h-index of 126.00 and with the mean score of 32.80 (Way, *et al.*, 2019). This simply shows that research productivity of most lecturers in Nigerian universities is relatively low and because of its importance to the academic growth of faculty staff, it is not an aspect of the academic community that should be overlooked. Therefore, the importance of research productivity in the university environment is inevitable. It is a major or most significant indicator of academic and productivity. It provides current information for growth, progress, development and an improved society. This is why academic staff promotions are based almost entirely on it (Usang, Basil, Lucy & Udey, 2007).

In addition, research productivity increases the social prestige of the academic staff status to the rank of a Professor irrespective of gender. It encourages hard-work and fills in the gaps of previous researches which creates a venue for future investigations. These are all determined by the number of published articles in refereed journals and conference proceedings of repute (Usang *et al.*, 2007). Moreover, quality research exposes academic staff to new information and sharing of socio-cultural ideas with colleagues. Academic staff also have the opportunity to travel outside their environment to seek information and collect relevant data as quality research contributes to genuine indigenous and sustainable development. The purpose of a research assessment exercise is to distribute public funds for research, competitively based on the quality of such research. This is why research productivity has been widely acknowledged not only in academic communities but also in management organisations (Way *et al.*, 2019).

In a more related development, it is generally believed that the essence of research productivity in the university is promotion of academic staff which most often encourage university administrators to influence faculty behaviour through the manipulation of the reward structure for promotion. It is also observed that some lecturers publish not for external rewards but because they enjoy the process of enquiry; while some scholars are of the opinion that most lecturers publish because of personal motivational factors that drive academic research. The personal

motivational factors include: investment factors(extrinsic rewards) in terms of salary raises, tenure elongation,promotion or elevation and consumption factors; or intrinsic rewards such as individual personal satisfaction from solving research puzzles, contributingto the discipline and achieving peer-recognition. Nonetheless, one well established research productivity theory is Life-Cycle which suggests that in general the research productivity of a researcher rises sharply in the initial stages of a career, peaks at the time of tenure review and then begins a decline (Chen, 2004). Besides, the author (Chen) explained that the following factors generally influenced research productivity in academic institutions.These include: tenure, status, allocation of working time to research activities, length of the tenure probationary period, teaching loads and financial research support.

One can say therefore, that research productivity has become essential for any university success, academic's employment and promotion prospects. This view is also true of law lecturers in any educational setting because their promotion is equally tied to publishing and research. Consequently, in order to grow academically and professionally-wise, there is need to undertake vigorous research work and publish in reputable journals, legal literature, among others. It could also be reasonably argued that the research productivity of lecturers in any university is a major citation orh-index of the lecturer's quality; and the determinant of advancement in terms of prestige, recognition for creative thinking, promotion, salary increase and acceptability in the university environment. In addition, research output provides a good justification for lecturers to become successful academics. This is because research activity develops academic knowledge as well as re-inforcing the skills for effective knowledge transfer (Okiki, 2011).

Be that as it may, one of the variables that determines the research productivity of lecturers or any academic staff in a university environment is Self-efficacy. It is important to note that the way an individual lecturer carries his or her evaluative value either proactively or otherwise, and the capacity or power to produce a desired effect on research productivity may boil down to the individual self-efficacy.Okonedo and Popoola (2012) expressed that self-efficacy was developed from a gradual attainment of skills and experience over a time and the competence and confidence an individual had exhibited in the actualisation of a specific goal.

In other words, one could admit that self-efficacy is the motivation of behaviour and belief in the capability of an individual to perform an act. Self-efficacy emphasises the possession of information skills and the confidence to use the skills effectively. Okonedo and Popoola (2012) buttressed that self-efficacy had to do with an individual confidence in his or her ability which might impact the performance of tasks stressing that it is an impression one is capable of performing in a certain manner or in attaining a certain goal. It is a belief that one has the capabilities to execute the courses of actions acquired to manage prospective situations. In this context, self-efficacy refers to a lecturer's judgment of his or her own capabilities for a specific learning outcome or a specific goal.Osisanwo *et al.*(2012) explained that self-efficacy defined the beliefs in one's capabilities to organise and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments. Therefore, one cannot but infer from the views of scholars that self- efficacy basically deals with how confident individuals believe they are, or how much control they believe they have in their ability to reach a goal or accomplish a task. In the universities, individuals believe in personal efficacy to control their educational outcomes and to become proficient in challenging subject matter is likely to have a great impact.

However, from the discussion so far, this study would make an attempt to investigate how self-efficacy may influence the research productivity of law lecturers with reference to the South-western Nigerian universities.

Statement of the Problem

Globally, research plays a very significant role in the productivity of the academic staff in all universities either public or private. However, the researcher has observed negative attributes overtime on the part of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian Universities towards improving

their research output which has had adverse effect on their academic status and progression in other academic pursuits. Besides, literature have shown that many law lecturers in universities in South-western Nigeria appeared to have been pre-occupied with the measurement of students' academic achievement (particularly the grade-point average a student may graduate with at the end of the law programme) to the total detriment of assessing the lecturer's individual academic productivity (Migosi, Muola & Maithya 2013; Kpolovie, 2016; Kpolovie & Omoshagbebe, 2017).

Regardless of the belief in the popular academic parlance, "publish or perish", observations have shown that most, often, law lecturers are pre-occupied with cases (which most times) are pursued from the court of first instance to the apex court without recourse to the adverse effect this has had on their research productivity in form of citation index and h-index for robust academic excellence as required by the respective university management (Olayinka, 2023). The low level of research productivity (aside factors such as government apathy to higher education, lack of verile policy on education, incessant strike actions) may largely be as a result of low self-efficacy which have resulted in frustration, trauma, academic stagnation, low status, lack of commitment to work and low salary being experienced by the law lecturers.

Therefore, this study hopes to solve this problem by carrying out an investigation of self-efficacy and research productivity of law lecturers in order to ascertain or establish reasons for low level of research productivity among law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study is to investigate self-efficacy and research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian Universities.

Specifically, the purpose is to:

1. investigate the extent of law lecturers' self-efficacy about research productivity in the universities;
2. determine the extent of research productivity of law lecturers in the universities.

Research Questions

The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the extent of law lecturers' self-efficacy about research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities?
2. To what extent are law lecturers productive in terms of research in South-western Nigerian universities?

Research Hypothesis

In line with the purpose of this study, the following hypotheses are formulated, tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. Self-efficacy has no significant relationship with research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities.

Significance of the Study

The study would help law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities to identify and access the type(s) of legal information resources suitable and relevant to their research work. It would also increase the law lecturers' beliefs, self-confidence and undaunting quest for knowledge advancement in order to enhance their research publications for promotion, visibility in the research world, job offer, improved academic status within and outside the university community, salary increase, satisfying individual need for creativity, attaining the height of "Chaired Professor", satisfying the need to stay current in the legal field and improving the citation index and h-index of their publications respectively.

Moreover, the study would help university administrators to see further the need to make their universities compete favourably with their counterparts in Africa and the developed world in order

to improve the ranking of their respective universities' h-index globally. The study would also enable the faculties of law in Nigerian universities particularly South-western Nigeria to improve their facilities so that they can meet best minimum international standard in continuing legal education training and scholarship.

Lastly, the study would be of immense addition to the body of literature particularly on the influence of self-efficacy on research productivity of law lecturers in universities thereby increasing the research interests of law lecturers in South-western Nigeria and the world at large.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Self-Efficacy of Lecturers on Research Productivity

The concept of self-efficacy was developed primarily in the discipline of social psychology by Bandura in 1977. Bandura (1977, as cited by Artino, 2012) described self-efficacy as the ability to perform a task in order to achieve a particular goal. Artino (2012) drawing inferences from Bandura's view, noted that self-efficacy is sine quanon to beliefs in one's capabilities to organise and execute the courses of actions required to manage prospective situations. From the foregoing, self-efficacy is a lecturer's belief or feeling in his or her ability to succeed for the purpose of academic growth in order to improve his or her academic status within the university community. Self-efficacy is important in research productivity of lecturers because it builds the self-confidence and motivation in research and publication achievement of academic staff for purposes of promotion, enhanced remuneration and excellence and academic status in the academic community. Self-efficacy is also significant in research productivity of lecturers because it encourages the use of challenging and proximal goals. It gives the lecturer to put up effort and make progress towards goal completion. It makes individual lecturer have a realistic and accurate perception of his or her ability for a given task. Besides, self-efficacy does not equate to a general confidence in one's competence, instead, it is more task and situation specific that is, developed in relation to specific goal such as the ability to use information resources for research productivity. This is also because the power of believing in one's abilities when facing challenge is when the individual says he or she thinks can do or handle something as it is the gift of assurance to cope with problematic to achieve a goal; and this is why psychologists see this phenomenon as self-efficacy (Harwant, no date; Artino, 2012; & Zinn, 2013).

Kurbanoglu (2009) also explained that self-efficacy was always influenced by four principal sources of information namely: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, physiological and emotional states. The author asserted that mastery experiences enabled individuals form his or her self-efficacy beliefs by interpreting information primarily from their previous experiences as they interpret the results of their actions and use it afterwards to develop beliefs about their capabilities in order to engage in subsequent activities. The vicarious experience explained that self-efficacy appraisals were influenced partly by vicarious experience of observing others perform tasks. Vicarious experience is particularly important when observers see similarities between themselves and the models and observing the successes of such models contributing the observers' beliefs about their capabilities. However, failures of any of the models are capable of undermining the observers' beliefs about their own capabilities to succeed. The author also noted that in terms of social persuasion, the development of self-efficacy beliefs create room for positive persuasion while negative persuasion may weaken same beliefs.

In addition, the physiological state has some measure of influences on self-efficacy in terms of individuals performing tasks to attain a goal. Individuals gauge their degree of confidence to perform a task by the emotional state they experience and strong emotional reactions such as anxiety, stress, emotional reactions such as anxiety and stress which can lower self-efficacy perceptions. For instance, in academic institutions, if a law lecturer or any faculty member expresses strong emotional reactions this may affect his/her ability to carry out research for improved output. On the importance of self-efficacy to research productivity. Kurbanoglu (2009) again stated that self-efficacy provided the foundation for human motivation, well-being and

personal accomplishment. This is to say that self-efficacy influence the totality of human behaviour. Individuals have little incentives to act or persevere if they believe that the tasks at their hands exceed their capabilities.

On the otherhand, they can undertake and perform activities if they believe that their actions can produce the outcome they desire. The author went further to explain that self-efficacy determines how long individuals persevere, how resilient they are in the face of difficulties and how much effort they put will depend on an activity or a goal. Therefore, an individual lecturer with a high self-efficacy perception expects to succeed and persevere in research activity until it is completed. A lecturer with low self- efficacy envisage failure and is less likely to persist during challenging activities; and as a result, the chances of making to the top of his or her academic career may be hindered. In otherwords, the higher the sense of efficacy, the greater the effort, endurance and persistence in improving a lecturer's research productivity level. Therefore, the lecturers' level of productivity is based more on what they believe than in what is objectively true. In my humble opinion, this is because high level of self-efficacy leads to a desire and willingness to act and risk while trying a new behaviour. This is important to the lecturer's motivational belief, self-esteem and skills necessary for research productivity in an academic institution which promotes knowledge, academic growth and scholarship. It must be noted here that self-efficacy has generated research in areas as diverse as law, medicine, business, education, psychology, technology and humanities (Abdulghani, 2018).

Self-efficacy was a "personal assignment" (Odede, 2018, p.14). The importance of self-efficacy in his study is appreciated more if it is viewed from academic stand-point. According to the author (Odede, 2018), self-efficacy explained an individual's confidence in his or her ability to impact the performance of tasks. Self-efficacy is capabilities to organise and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances which include ability to carry out research. Kurbanoglu (2009) also stressed that the importance of self-efficacy was a key factor among lecturers (irrespective of their discipline) for the purpose of attaining academic excellence. Therefore, the importance of self-efficacy on the research productivity of an individual explains how and why the individual performs differently at various tasks within a range of complete environment including academic performance domains. Kurbanoglu (2009) again expressed that self-efficacy was a conception that an individual lecturer nurtures about personal beliefs in his or her capabilities to achieve a given level of performance in his or her research pursuits. It is the confidence that people have in their ability to perform a particular task. Thus, Sharma and Nasa (2014) and Odede (2018) described self-efficacy as an individual's confidence in his or her ability to execute the actions required to attain a goal and as an attribute of self-confidence which directly affects one's performance. This is because self-efficacy is simply a self-perceived measure of one's abilities, dependent upon contextual background and setting.

Heng and Mansor (2010, as cited by Sharma and Nasa, 2014) expressed that self-efficacy was a reflection of a lecturer's confidence in the ability to perform the behaviour required to produce specific outcome and directly impact the choice to engage in a task together with the effort expended and persistence demonstrated for the purpose of enabling his or her productive level within the university system. One can deduce from this study that the effectiveness of high self-efficacy is the confidence in a lecturer's ability to carry out a task to produce a desirable outcome. Some lecturers have little incentive to persevere in the face of difficulties if they believe that their action cannot produce the outcomes they desire. It is the ability of that self-confidence that enables a lecturer to stand productive among his or her peers in accomplishing the goal of his research undertaking. Self-efficacy is not just about one's specific skill but the judgement of what a person could do with that specific skill (Odede, 2018).

It is, therefore, significant to say that to achieve a goal, there need to be discipline, determination, conviction, positive mentality, resilience, ability to cope with stress motivation, setting of new challenges and the lecturer's belief in his own capabilities and not to assess the strength of his skill rather than personal judgment on the actual application of the skill. It could,

therefore, be paraphrased as noted by Odede (2018) that self-efficacy beliefs would determine individual's resilience in the face of difficulties, and how much effort he had expended on an activity. In my view, one can say that if, for instance, a law lecturer has a high self-efficacy about himself, he expects to succeed and endure in a research activity until such activity is completed. In relevant literature, some studies have shown that self-efficacy involves cognitive processes, feelings and controllable behaviour needed for any lecturer to succeed in quest of research productivity within the academic institution (Singh, 2011).

In the same academic settings, self-efficacy is seen as a strong predicator that could enhance individual academic progression. Odede (2017) again noted that self-efficacy had become more useful when it is related to education and academic self-efficacy emphasised personal confidence in the ability to carry out a course of action as a solution to a problem. In another sense, self-efficacy theory recognised that an individual actual performance influenced his or her self-efficacy and invariably affected the individual's future performances. Sharma and Nasa (2014) again expanded this view noting that self-efficacy had proven to be highly active predictor of lecturers and students motivation in learning and research. They further argued that dimensions that influence performance include:

- i. locus of control stating whether a given outcome was caused by the individual or by external factor outside of his control.
- ii. Stability that could lead to positive or negative outcome.
- iii. Controllability- a control over a given outcome.

Based on this efficacy theory, therefore, this study presumes that self-efficacy provides the basis for law lecturers' motivation to improve on their research productive level on improve their academic status as a university teacher. The researcher agreed that most studies on self-efficacy relating to universities globally have indicated that the variable has a direct correlation to academic research growth and development (Odede, 2018). Tekbiyik and Ursavas (2010, as cited by Odede, 2018) stressed that self-efficacy had become an important factor required by academic staff generally for academic growth. There is the need therefore for lecturers to develop a wider sense of self-efficacy to maintain the concerted efforts required to excel in research outputs since the correlation linking self-efficacy and academic attainment is, no doubt, a theme for academic discourse in education and social science research.

It was also explained that the role of self-efficacy on research productivity was investigated in correlation to ability and explicit academic growth to achieve the desired goal of faculty members. The academic attainment according to the author, depended on four psychological processes which were the cognitive level of nature of optimism a lecturer or faculty member held concerning his or her ability in correlation to a given task, the motivational level in terms of willingness of lecturers or faculty members to invest more effort in their research skill even when facing difficulties after a negative academic research attainment, the affective level in terms of high strong perceived sense of proficiency in research writing which reduced anxiety and fear to avoid irrational thinking and inability to source for relevant information resources to enhance research productivity and the selection level which were likely to impact on the nature of decisions a faculty member might take in the choice of available resources suitable for his/her research in order to enhance the desired research output. From this discussion, one could deduce that self-efficacy is a concept which impacts positively on human development at difficult level of individual academic research attainment notwithstanding that confidence and skills are essential ingredients of task accomplishment in individual lecturer's level of motivation for research output (Sharma & Nasa, 2014).

Besides, Tuncer (2013) in the study on links between self-efficacy, use of legal information resources and research productivity as cited by Sharma and Nasa (2014) asserted that there was existence of a strong correlation between the variables stressing that the ability of a lecturer with a set goal of improving on his or her research output depended on positive feelings to the task no matter the hazards that might be encountered in course of engaging in research. It can be inferred

from the study conducted by Iroaganachi and Izuagbe (2018) on impact of information resources on research productivity in which self-efficacy was discussed as a judgment regarding the capability to successfully perform tasks and behaviour. It is, therefore, the belief a law lecturer has concerning his capability to organise and execute the course of action required to manage perspective situation. This is borne out of the confidence that he has to carry out that specific course of action the individual set for himself or herself for a reward in his or her academic career.

In an academic environment, it was also stated by Iroaganachi and Izuagbe (2018) that self-efficacy instruments might ask teaching staff to rate their confidence and capability in achieving a particular goal, performing a reading or writing task or engaging in certain self-regulatory strategies. However, most investigations on self-efficacy in a university environment bordered on predictive value of self-efficacy beliefs on varied performances. This was why Shrestha (2008) and Simisaye(2019) argued that the stronger the self-efficacy, the more likely an individual was able to select challenging tasks, persisting and performing them successfully. Academic achievement depends heavily on the lecturer's personal conviction of being in charge of his or her own fate rather than ascribe the fate to luck or to the vagaries of chances. The efforts of the lecturer to achieve a particular task in the course of his academic pursuit and promotion largely depend on personal decisions and efforts. Such teaching staff would know the right step to take in the course of achieving a particular task to be able to grow *pari-pasu* or simultaneously with the desired goal of the academic institution they serve.

Opesanwo and Mabawonku(2017) agreed that individuals were generally more interested in performing activities in which there was high self-efficacy. One can then infer that law lecturers with high self-efficacy will take advantage of what is around them, for instance, access to materials both printed and electronic formats to improve their self-advancement in the university community. In relating the effect of this on law lecturers' research productivity, it is observed that academic achievement is not only based on the possession of necessary skills, it requires the confidence or capacity to use the skills effectively. Besides, possessing skills depend on the competence and confidence in the use of the skills. Thus, attainment of of high sense of self-efficacy beliefs is as important as possessing the ability or skill to use the relevant information resources for attainment of a specific goal. The possession of self-efficacy beliefs provides the foundation for human motivation, well-being and personal accomplishment.

However, studies have revealed that individuals have little incentive to act, if they believe that the tasks in their hands exceeded their capabilities to undertake and perform and if same individuals believe that their actions cannot produce the desired outcomes (Shrestha, 2008). Therefore, a law lecturer with high self-efficacy perception expects to succeed in his effort having persevered in an activity until it is completed. On the contrary, where this is missing in such individuals, the self-efficacy perception becomes low and only anticipates failures that are less likely to persist during challenging activities such as the rigour of academic research and writing. In this sense, the study can also infer that individuals who develop a strong sense of self-efficacy are well required to educate themselves when they have to rely on their own initiative in the life-long teaching and for research growth.

Kurhagnoglu (2009) noted that individual lecturers who believe in their competences and confidence would always excel in academic attainment in their respective institutions as they can willingly undertake and easily solve any research problems otherwise there will always be likelihood of avoiding and hesitating to try information problems at their disposal. It was concluded by Kurbanoglu that self-efficacy was relative. Therefore, what may be self-efficacy to one lecturer may be different from how another colleague sees it. In my humble opinion, the crux of the matter here is (to ask rhetorically) whether such efficacy can lead to attainment of the desired academic growth or improves research productivity? This is because an individual may exhibit high level of self-efficacy within one domain while exhibiting low level within another domain. But with particular reference to university, high level of self-efficacy is indispensable for published research writing.

Uppal (2018) while relating the effect of self-efficacy on lecturers' research productivity remarked that self-efficacy played a significant role in academic advancement of lecturers. It made individuals feel confident and competent in research writing as it required not just necessary skills for performance but also the confidence to use the skills effectively. In the views of Achim and Kassim (2015) the effect of self-efficacy on research productivity represented an individual's idea of his or her ability to use relevant information resources for the accomplishment of the task. This study concluded that self-efficacy lead to higher use of information resources (prints or electronic) to achieve academic goal where the individual's feelings, determination, efforts were not compromised.

Oladipupo (2020) in his study averred that self-efficacy on lecturers' research productivity contributed to academic growth stressing that respondents with high self-efficacy made better use of all information resources and with better academic output. This meant that a correlation self-efficacy and research productivity in terms of skills and abilities and commitment of respondents' research productivity. Therefore, self-efficacy is a significant determinant of performance which operates partially independently of underlying skills. It is also explained that academic self-efficacy vary according to subject matter and since lecturers are generally more concerned in performing activities in which they have high level of self-efficacy, it is deduced that lecturer with high self-efficacy are more concerned with academic excellence which would make them perform far better in their quest to make academic enquiries for research growth.

In an attempt to corroborate the views of other scholars, Nsibiwe and Odede (2019) admitted that part of the effects of self-efficacy was to enable individuals make judicious use of e-information resources which goal most often result in research output. They further argued that the significance of self-efficacy grew rapidly in parallel with needs due to growing number of information resources needed for research productivity particularly in this era of technological changes in the global system. The joint authors concluded that self-efficacy was a core skill required for both academic achievement and more broadly for effective functioning in an information world. It can also be inferred that possessing self-efficacy skills with regard to use of information resources have become crucial in today's information based-world since such skills are now a fundamental determinant in coping and adapting to various information systems available to the teacher and student respectively. However, where there is lack of self-efficacy skills in an individual, the ability to access and use available and relevant information resources for research needs is much more difficult which will in turn, affect the attainment of a research goal.

Oguz (2012), Ross, Perkris and Bodey (2013) noted that self-efficacy enabled individuals' beliefs regarding their competence for obtaining, using and evaluating information. Therefore, if individuals are able to develop a positive attitude and right skills necessary to apply the information problem-solving activities successfully, they turn out to be self-leading, self-motivating and life-long researchers. However, weighing and looking more closely on the effects of self-efficacy on research productivity, it was stressed that self-efficacy was not related to background factors meaning that personality is not related to performance. It was gathered that motivational factors affect performance; and where there is low self-efficacy, it can simply be explained in terms of turn-over intentions and lack of job satisfaction which influence the thoughts, feelings and attitudes. It is observed that limited range of experience contribute to lowering some lecturers' self-efficacy probably as a result of low confidence or inexperience in conducting research.

In his study, Kusilima (2020) maintained that research output largely depended on high self-efficacy since self-efficacy in itself grows overtime which could enable individual lecturer learn how to achieve a particular goal. He further explained that people's actions and motivations were based on the perspective of anticipative, purposive and self-evaluation. In a similar study carried out by Fridah (2020) as to whether self-efficacy and research productivity among lecturers in the University of Makerere were related, findings showed that self-efficacy and research productivity or performance were related. The study further showed that self-efficacy was an important factor in

the research efficacy of human decency. In addition, the findings of the author revealed that lecturers with low or very low research productivity tended to have the lowest level of research self-efficacy. Ebrahimi-Kosohbani (2011, as cited by Kusilima, 2020) stressed that though individuals might encounter problems but the way they coped with the problems depended on their personal characteristics. Self-efficacy, in this regard, helped university lecturers conduct extra-ordinary tasks using their problem-solving skills. According to the author, self-efficacy was related to these beliefs on their capabilities for controlling their performances.

Thus, it could be reasonably argued from literature that a law lecturer who possesses high self-efficacy would always look forward to better himself or herself than other colleagues. Kusilima (2020) again observed that self-efficacy beliefs were most central and pervasive influences on the choices lecturers made and goal they set for themselves which of course, strongly affect their approach to a task motivation to engage in a task and the level of effort they exert, degree of persistence while facing a considerable extent correlation on task and their performance of a task. This is viewed in the light of improving on their research capacity for self- development within the university community. This is also consistent with the view of Bandura (1986, as cited by Fridah, 2020) who was quoted excessively by many researchers that perceived self-efficacy affects research productivity of academic staff. Fridah (2020) also observed that the influence of self-efficacy on research productivity of lecturers had particularly increased strong self-confidence concerning their career achievement which could help overcome the obstacles leading to improvement of their research productivity. This evidence shows again that the higher the self-efficacy, the more capable an individual lecturer can achieve research goal.

Garnasih, Primiana and Effendi (2017) affirmed that self-efficacy in relation to research productivity of lecturers had received increased attention in educational research. They revealed in their study that self- efficacy was the performance of a research task whereby someone had confidence in successfully running tasks that could increase research prowess. It was further explained that self-efficacy dealt with an individual's assessment of his or her own confidence associated with his or her ability to conduct research activities from planning the research to publishing it. However, in modern realities, when a lecturer does not display a high level of conviction in his research in order to gain a sense of self – efficacy, such a lecturer may unlikely use a skill successfully or observe someone else's doing a task successfully or acquire positive feed-back about completing a task or rely on physiological cues. It is, therefore, important for the self-efficacy of a lecturer in conducting a research to be known and understood by his university community so that he or she can develop good strategies to produce quality research based not just on the lecturer's intellectual ability but also the standard requirements of the university. Garnasih *et al.* (2017) again noted that the self-efficacy of a lecturer explained the variation in proportion to the productivity of the study. The author revealed that research productivity was the research results generated by academics, the innovation of thoughts and ideas that lead to the publication of articles in form of journals or patents. Therefore, assessing research productivity or quality of lecturers globally is very germane to any university or academic community. It was enunciated by the authors that apart from personal development of lecturers, self-efficacy could increase learning and teaching comprehension and quality research which consists of epistemic dimension, technological dimension, capacity building value for people and economic dimension. Therefore, research productivity is the result of a lecturer's research with regard to the aspects of quantity and quality. A strong research culture is a product of high self-efficacy and high research productivity. The authors expressed further that high self-efficacy would itself also result in high research productivity.

Hemmings and Kay (2009); Holosco, Domenech, Rosello and Artiga (2016) observed that lecturers with high self-efficacy with regard to research productivity often usually viewed obstacles as challenges and were more likely to tackle the challenges than avoid them. They further argued that research productivity of lecturers depended on attitude, emotion, value, skills and knowledge they possess. In the studies carried out on two big universities in Australia, the two authors

revealed in their separate studies that there was a clear relationship between self-efficacy and research productivity explaining that the more confidence a lecturer had in his or her research, the greater the chances in published works in highly accredited international and reputable journals. Callaghan (2015) also conducted a study on big universities in South Africa and findings confirmed that self-efficacy had a significant influence on research results (or productivity) of lecturers as most of the respondents expressed high sense of self-efficacy having contributed to their research growth.

Mendez and Cruz (2014, as cited by Callaghan, 2015) posited that lecturers who decided to spend significant time on administrative tasks, family responsibilities and social commitments were observed to be more likely unsuccessful in their research tasks. This was as a result of a lack of self-efficacy, coupled with no motivation, inadequate incentives for producing quality research, a lack of quality research journals and a lack of adequate equipment and infrastructure for conducting research. Bay and Clerigo (2013) again in their studies on factors associated with research productivity affirmed that private law lecturers in the Riau Province had a high research productivity as a result of very high positive self-efficacy though observed that there were still some aspects that required improvement and concluded that self-efficacy was a tool for research productivity whether as full (or part-time) lecturers. The authors further explained that enhancing the quality of research productivity required related institutional support by providing adequate time for research, implementing effective research policies, providing adequate financial support and differentiated support for differing needs of various faculty members.

Hemmings and Kay (2009) in their study on lecturers' self-efficacy among Australian academics noted that the work of lecturers (irrespective of disciplines) in all universities was within three broad areas: research, teaching and service. According to the authors, lecturers were often faced with perplexing choices in balancing their workload between research, teaching and service activities. This choice was as a result of mixed signal on how best to expend energy across the three workload areas, workload strain and a lack of time to complete the multitude of tasks set for themselves coupled with pressure from competing groups - students, colleagues, outside agencies and university administrators. This was because research tended to be valued over teaching and services in many higher education settings. The joint authors concluded that the effect of rank on research self-efficacy beliefs that senior academics compared to junior academics were more self-efficacious with respect to research than self-efficacy for teaching. The authors also revealed using mean comparisons of the two constructs that self-efficacy was clearly related to research productivity.

Kusilima (2020) again observed that despite some intrinsic and extrinsic reward that lecturers might gain from teaching and services activities, the greatest reward (including tenure, promotion and professional standing) flow to the faculty members who published scholarly work. The ability to achieve this boiled down to self-efficacy which has to do with beliefs, capability a lecturer or faculty member had towards research bearing in mind the slogan of either publish or perish or publish or prosper. Self-efficacy is, therefore, the ability to organise and implement action to reach a certain level of performance. It is, however, observed that self-efficacy within a higher education context encapsulate the way law lecturers or other faculty members see themselves as teachers, researchers and academic citizens as well as their belief as to whether they can successfully complete tasks in each of the areas they function in their respective universities for research and academic productivity.

Cheng (2020) drew attention on the self-efficacy construct in an attempt to investigate the work of faculty members with regard to self-efficacy and research productivity. Findings showed that the academics surveyed, reported higher levels of self-efficacy for teaching compared with other work tasks. This simply meant that teaching was performed more frequently and more opportunities were afforded to successfully master this activity. The two authors, Kusilima (2020) & Cheng (2020) clarified in their respective studies that there were no significant differences between male and female academics (whether in law, social sciences or other disciplines) in

relation to self-efficacy and research productivity. Although, it was reported by the author that male academics reported stronger research self-efficacy beliefs than their female counterparts. However, which angle the pendulum swings, the basic fact to know here is that faculty members should realise that self-efficacy is an important tool in research productivity in respective universities and other higher education system. The moment the beliefs, attitudes and capabilities which are believed to be all products of self-efficacy are absent, such affected lecturers may tend to dig their academic doom, remain undeveloped and unproductive in the institutions they serve.

Lampert (2007) described self-efficacy as a “construct that describes how confident people believe they are or how much they believe they have in their ability to reach a goal or accomplish a task”(p.ii). Citing Bandura (1977), Kusilima again stated that self-efficacy was the belief about one's capacity truly indicated of performance or behaviour. In paraphrasing the opinion of Lampert (2007) as opined Kusilima, self-efficacy beliefs influence motivation and self-regulations in relation to the choices people make and the action they undertake. Individuals with strong self-efficacy beliefs can enhance their abilities to accomplish great undertakings as well as personal being. It could be said from this view that self-efficacy is the belief of individual expectations of certain outcomes. In relation to law lecturers whose belief, confidence and capability in academic advancement within and outside the university community would most likely expect to perform better in terms of research skills and writing for research productivity than those possibly lack self-efficacy and low confidence.

Kusilima (2020) concluded that the following factors generally influenced self-efficacy beliefs of lecturers' research productivity in academic settings: university's academic policy, environmental factors, motivational factors, individual attitude and personal desire. If these factors are viewed in positive manner, the individual is likely to be more apt to take initiative and make positive choice thereby engaging more in a cycle of hard-work and success. It was also concluded by the author that self-efficacy accounted for 27 percent of the variance in university adjustment for academic staff in most universities using the complete model that were tested as follows: stress, self-efficacy (optimism) social support, acculturation . Nonetheless, Kurbanoglu (2009) in his conclusion on the relationship between self-efficacy and research productivity confirmed that low self-efficacy belief was most likely a significantly limiting factor for individuals to use their information literacy skills to develop their research skills for productivity in the university community. However, assessment of self-efficacy belief for research productivity of lecturers does not only entail individual capability and confidence but also knowledge and skills on legal information literacy; and the method to assess the level and strength of the self-efficacy belief regarding these knowledge and skills.

Fridah (2020) believed that self-efficacy on research productivity of law lecturers had to do with structural equation which showed that higher consciousness and extraversion and lower neuroticism contributed to higher self-efficacy. This boiled down to personality traits though may be operating on a different level in which it may be regarded as describing the inherent character of a person while self-efficacy describes how the person regulates his or her behaviour when interacting with the environment particularly if it concerns achieving a goal. Thus, self-efficacy beliefs may allow inherent personality trait to be expressed as behaviour suggesting a mediating function for self-efficacy. It was summarised by the scholar that the effect of self-efficacy on research productivity of law lecturers has to do with the overall self-discipline of an individual. The author (Fridah, 2020) also argued that emotional arousal had always occupied a significant place in self-efficacy theory as it “acts like a filter through which people view efficacy information” (p.6).

It was further revealed by the author that self-efficacy affected the way people think, feel and motivate. Emotion determines the individual law lecturer's resilience to diversity and his or her vulnerability to stress and depression for improved academic output. Efficacy tells whether individuals should engage in the task and the effort in performing it would show in accomplishing it since the most important part of self-efficacy is performance accomplishment and the experience of success in performing the task (that is, research productivity) would increase self-

efficacy connected to this task of improving the research output. The high levels of the feeling of success, self-reliance and the skills of motivating increase the success of research but the low levels decrease such success. The author also explained that value was an engagement in academic activities and consisted four components namely: attainment value, intrinsic value, utility value and cost. Thus (law) lecturers who believed they could perform a certain task were more likely going to find research more interesting, important and useful by creating a positive relationship between self-efficacy and value.

It was concluded that, self-efficacy of a law lecturer in pursuit of research productivity could be influenced by skills. Nonetheless, where such skill is influenced by doubt, a lecturer who believes he is unable to achieve result in his or her research undertaking makes less use of the abilities to reason but sense of self-efficacy enables the use of skills in dealing with the position of great things and the belief that the task will be accomplished. Besides, self-efficacy enhances the knowledge of a lecturer's intention to be more willing to participate in sharing knowledge through his or her academic output if the individual believes that his or her contribution would be valuable to others. In terms of its effect on research productivity, knowledge predicts future performance and individuals' belief about their abilities is an important factor in production in relation to performance, conscientiousness which are considered to be the strongest and most consistent predictor of personality traits (Fridah, 2020).

However, when we look at self-efficacy in relation to individual ability, Migroho and Tiarto (2020) avowed that self-efficacy and motivation are good examples and they both related to the effectiveness of the performance of lecturers in STPI particularly in India with regard to application of higher education for research productivity. Garnasih *et al.* (2017) again opined that self-efficacy also directly influenced research productivity of lecturers in university communities. These two variables, according to the authors, might not easily be divorced from each other in terms of enhancing the productive level of lecturers in academic institutions. The findings of Garnasih *et al.* (2017) concluded that the effect of self-efficacy of lecturers on research productivity span through the belief in individual efforts, high esteem, attainment of social goals, ability to cope with stress, adrenalin for motivation, execution of skill, determinant of social goals and setting new challenges with the expectation of a reward to achieve the research goal.

Extent of Use of Legal Information Resources for Research Productivity

Owushi and Emesulu (2016) remarked that legal information resources might be available in the library and even in identified bibliography and might be relevant to individual's area of interest or knowledge provided there was no difficulty in accessing or retrieving them for efficient use of the resources in order to improve research and teaching activities of the researcher.

In their studies, Eyiolorunshe, Eluwole and Aregbesola (2017) while agreeing with Uluocha and Mabawonku (2014) stressed that the extent of use of (legal) information resources on research productivity in most universities in Nigeria was measured with a scale of items in order to determine their level of importance, availability and accessibility. The result of their studies showed that legal information resources relating to print materials, law reports, government publications, statutes, legal digests were the most available and regularly used by law lecturers because they could be easily acquired, stored, organised for dissemination by the library. Tukur (2020) asserted that the commonly legal information resources used by law lecturers for research comprised government publications, state laws, case laws and general reference sources.

In the views of Anyaogu (2014) and Olorunfemi (2015) it was stressed that the legal materials often used by legal researchers for research productivity were textbooks and case laws because others were either unavailable or outdated in the library. In separate studies carried out by Nkamoebe, Udem and Nkamoebe (2014); Umar and Sokari (2020) the extent of use of legal information resources by law lecturers was to allow access to a wide variety of information essential for scholarly activities particularly in the lives of researchers for academic progression, improvements in academic status, research output, teaching, learning, advocacy, writing of

technical reports and paper presentations at conference proceedings. The types of legal sources always consulted in this regard were case laws, books, journals, case reviews and statutes. It was concluded by the study that the extent of use of legal information sources was dependent on the choice of their use by the user in terms of currency of information, relevance, ease of use, availability and affordability of the information resources.

Thamskodi (2012) in his study on the evaluation of the use of electronic resources and services by law lecturers revealed that use of internet resources were frequent to access case laws when compared to other sources of legal information. The study further showed that half of the respondents preferred to use the Boolean Operators ("and", "or") followed by those who preferred to improve their skills in the use of open access legal resources on their own irrespective of the difficulties in their use because of minimal computer literacy level. It was also gathered that acts of parliament (government publications) were also found to be used by lecturers with 68 percent opting for it, while 64 percent used textbooks; whilst 52 percent and 48 percent depended on judgements and statutes (Tahuwire & Okello-Obara, 2010).

It was again revealed from the study of Thamskodi (2012) that in the universities, law lecturers generally made use of legal literature for research activities which carried 87 percent of total respondents; and for teaching 61 percent. The most used information source and channel is the university law library with 97 percent, personal collections 45 percent, legal websites 35 percent, other libraries 26 percent and exchange with colleagues accounted for 25 percent. Studies have also shown that journal articles and books were frequently used with Online Public Access (OPAC) searching which amounted to 60 percent of total respondents, e-mail 59 percent and searching the web using legal databases 58 percent. However, a lack of currency of information was rated as the most critical issue in accessing legal information resources (Peruginelli, 2004. Ramasany, Padma & Elan, 2018). It was further revealed in the study conducted on University of Malaysia law faculty members that the respondents preferred printed formats over electronic formats which suggested that they first consulted their personal collection before resorting to other information resources (Ramasany *et al.*, 2018). Another study on Namibian faculty members showed that libraries failed to cater for the information needs of legal practitioners. Although, lawyers are usually conservatives and prefer information written by people who have reputations and can be tracked if the need warrants as opposed to information obtained through the internet or other resources. They collaborate most times with one another as sources of information. In the study, they complained that the internet was not user friendly; and took a longer time to access some information instead by asking colleagues or consulting their personal collection (Ramasany, *et al.*, 2018).

However, Migroho and Tiarto (2020) in their study used an empirical approach with quantitative methods; and using descriptive statistical analysis of the results of the variables self-efficacy (x_1) and motivation (x_2) obtained from questionnaires for 30 respondents using the percentage of answers to 35 indicators, stated that lecturer performance at STPI is already good or high which means that the correlation between two positive variables is solemnly strong. The result of the study showed that self-efficacy and motivation are closely and strongly related for the effectiveness of the performance of Sekolah Tinggi Penerbangan Indonesia (STPI).

Extent of Research Productivity in Universities

The objective of research productivity in any higher educational system is very significant. Uluocha and Mabawonku (2014), Kpolovie and Dorgu (2019) in separate studies explained that research productivity had always been a product of research publications in learned journals, conferences or workshop proceedings, authored book(s), chapter(s) in books, gathering and analysing original evidence, working with post-graduate students in dissertations or theses, or class projects, obtaining research grants, carrying out editorial duties, obtaining pretexts and licenses, writing monographs, developing experimental designs, producing works of an artistic or creative nature and engaging in public debates and commentaries. Kusure, Primiana, Mawere and

Dhliwayo (2006) described research productivity as the extent at which individuals in teachers' colleges, universities or any higher educational system engaged in research and published research articles in order to increase level of academic output. Giovanni and Ciriaco (2014) noted that research activity was a production process in which the inputs consisted of human, tangible (scientific instruments or materials), intangible (accumulated knowledge, social networks), character of both tangible nature (publications, patents, conference presentations, databases) and intangible nature (tacit knowledge, consulting activity, and so on) in which the new knowledge production function has a multi-input and multi-output dimensions which were ascribed as part of research activities.

Haliso, Iwu, Soyemi and Madulima (2020) observed that any university that desired to have active productive workforce should be interested in identifying factors that could enhance research endeavours; and show commitment to its researchers by providing adequate support factors which included: equipping and granting support to research productivity by increasing and sustaining research that would increase level of job satisfaction and anticipation to engage in research in order to reinforce loyalty to the university core value. Basiru (2020) as cited by Haliso, *et al.* (2020) explained that the extent of research productivity in the universities was a representation of the totality of research carried out by academic members within a given period of time. Therefore, the quality of teaching, research and community service of staff coupled with their publications in the university system depends on the quality of research materials and facilities. Uwizye, Karimi, Khisa and Wao (2021) in peer-review studies carried out expressed that the level of research productivity in higher educational institutions in Africa was low. They explained that if the situation continued, it was likely going to compromise the development agenda of the continent if not addressed. However, 838 papers related to research productivity were identified in higher education institutions in Africa from databases and results showed that the low level was as a result of both institutional and individual factors. Institutional factors included: non-availability of research funding, low level of institutional networking and low degree of research collaborations; while individual factors majorly bothered on personal motivation, academic qualifications and research efficacy. The authors suggested that there was need for research funding to enable researchers and faculty members contribute to the development agenda of the continent. Besides, it was opined that there should be provision of research enabling environments, policies and incentives and strengthening research capabilities through relevant training courses mentorship.

Ogbomo (2010), Okonedo and Popoola (2012) also observed that research was a major index of any measure of the academic communities and/or the determinant of advancement in terms of prestige, recognition for creative thinking, promotion, salary increase and acceptability in the academic setting. It was also inferred from their studies that research output would provide a good instillation for academic staff to become successful in their career. This view, in my opinion, was not wrong. This is because research activity develops academic knowledge and enforces the skills for effective knowledge transfer. Thus, the quality of research output among lecturers and other academics in general depend on the quality and quantity of their research work. It was concluded from the studies that research productivity is measured in terms of quantity and quality of books or chapters in books, written journal articles, published conference/workshop proceedings, monographs, case/book reviews, number of journals managed by other higher education institutions, citation index (that is, number of citations of published research articles) and work-related publications which include: abstracts, bibliographies and published indexes which served as most significant parts of index for research productivity of individual academic promotion and universities' academic rankings.

In determinants of the research productivity of the university faculty members, Kpolovie and Dorgu (2019) also explained that research productivity was of greater interest to the faculty members in order to improve and preserve their academic status and as signal to the university management to provide a smooth and progressive climate for research output. In the academic

environment, the productivity of academic personnel is measured based on the research productiveness of such personnel. Kpolovie and Dorgu (2019) further observed that in measuring the level of research productivity of faculty members, the yardstick usually used should be “h-index” (p.63) which was introduced by Jorge Hirsh in 2005. The h-index is the best numerical representation of the impact and productivity of a researcher’s scientist or those involved in empirical research, which is strictly based on the researcher’s publications and patents, rather than the impact factor of the journal in which the papers were published. The h-index is to provide an option to other bibliometric indicators including the number of publications, the total number of citations and the age average of an article. It characterises the output of a researcher. For instance, if a researcher A has published articles and each has been cited as follows: A1(15), A2(17), A3(5), A4(4), A5(3), A6(2), A7(1), A8(1), A9(1), A10 (1), the h-index is the position at which the number of citations is greater or equal to that rank, and the rest citations are each less than the rank. Therefore, in the case of researcher A, the h-index is 5 times (15, 7 and 5) while his fourth most cited article has been cited 4 times. Hence, since four of researcher A’s published articles have each been cited at least four times, his h-index is 4 (Kpolovie & Dorgu, 2019).

However, Isabelle, Wolfgang and Kamrani (2021) expressed further that the h-index was a quantitative metric based on analysis of publication data using publications and citations to provide an estimate of the importance, significance and broad impact of a scientist’s cumulative research contributions. As an example, if we look at the publications of a researcher and the h-index of his/her number of published papers have at least h-citations each and the other (Np-h) papers have *sh* citations each, the h-index will decide the metric for evaluating the cumulative impact of the researcher’s scholarly output and performance, measure quantity with quality by comparing publications to citations. Therefore, the h-index of 10 publications means that among all publications by one author or faculty member, 10 of these publications have received at least 10 citations each. Isabelle *et al.* (2021) further argued that the h-index was more preferable to other single-number criteria such as the total number of papers, the total numbers of citations and citations per paper which indicated that:

- a. a single number can never give more than a rough approximation to an individual’s multifaceted profile.
- b. Other factors would have to be considered as combination in evaluating an individual.
- c. there would be differences in typical h values in different fields, determined in part by the average number of references to papers in the field, the number of papers produced by each researcher in the field and the size (number of researchers) of the field; and
- d. for an author with a relatively low ‘h’ that has a few seminar papers with extraordinarily high citation counts, the h-index will not fully effect that researchers accomplishments.

This measure of academic impact often generates widespread interest as well as proposals of other indices based on analyses of publication data such as the g-index, h-index, m-quotient, r-index and so on using databases such as Elsevier’s Scopus, Google Scholar, Carivate Analytics Web of Science provides h-index values for authors. For instance, Google Scholar provides the h-index for authors who have created a profile; Elsevier’s Scopus provides a citation tracker feature that allows generation of a Citation Overviewed Chart to generate h-index for publications and citations from 1970 to date. It also allow removal of self-citations from the overall citation counts. Web of Science allows generation of the h-index for publications and citations from 1970 to date using the Create Citation Report feature (Isabelle *et al.*, 2021).

One of the criticisms of the h-index by scholars according to Isabelle *et al.* (2021) is that it is not considered as a universal metric because it is difficult to compare authors of different seniority or disciplines to arrive at their h-index. Young researchers or faculty members are at a disadvantage because academic disciplines vary in the average number of publications, references and citations, whereas some authors can do self-citations or gratuitous citations among colleagues which can skew the h-index. Nonethelss, the h-index corrects the disproportionate weight of highly cited publications or publications that are yet to be cited and that explains its importance to

measure research productivity of lecturers in the university community. Therefore, in discussing the ranges of h-index, it can be summarised as follows:

- a. that the h-index of 20 publications after 20years of research activities, characterises a successful or good researcher.
- b. that the h-index of 40 publications after 20years of research activities, characterises an outstanding or great reseaher.
- c. that the h-index of 60 after 30years or h-index of 90 after 30years of research activities characterises truly a remarkable or unique individuals(Isabelle *et al.*, 2021).

On the ranking of universities' based on research productivity globally, the h-index is based on the level of research productivity of faculty members in each university and unfortunately, African universities, particularly Nigerian universities, perform very poorly in world universities'rankings yearly(Kpolovie, 2019). The World Universities' Ranking of 2020 considered 5 indicators which were directly or indirectly dependent on the faculty lecturers' h-index and citation index. These indicators were (i) teaching in which the learning environment was accorded 30 percent. (ii) research in which income and reputation attracted 30%. (iii) citations which were based strictly on the university's role in the generation and spreading of new knowledge and ideas as reflected by the faculty's h- index and citation index (iv) academic reputation which was primarily based on lecturers' research quality and (v) teaching quality (Kpolovie, 2019).

In his opinion, Albach (2015), Jakarta (2019) stressed that publications in high status refereed journals were major criteria of academic successes especially in the competitive environment of global higher education. It was suggested that research, for most of any academic system, should be the measurement or level of effective teaching and a careful understanding of what students learn. The two separate studies also revealed that the extensor level of research productivity of lecturers in universities was neither straightforward nor easy since the key function of teaching and research quality was seldomly measured adequately. Therefore, the inference to be drawn from the studies is that so many indices are usually put to determine the level of research productivity of a lecturer. For instance, for a law lecturer, these indices could be in form of the quantity and quality of articles in refereed journals, (authored books), chapters in books, case reviews, book reviews, monographs, peer-reviewed articles, published conference/workshop proceedings, among others. What is important here is the number of times the published works are cited which indicates the contributions of the works to knowledge and scholarship but in some universities particularly in Nigeria, in as much as books are important tools for imparting knowledge and reporting research, it is difficult to easily calculate the impact factors or intellectual influence of the books and so they are typically not counted at all (Albach, 2015).

Usang, Akuegwu and Udida (2007 as cited by Albach (2015) stated that research productivity of lecturers was one of the pivotal points on which universities education rested. Research consists of a study and investigation to discover facts, insights and other elements central to the matter at issue. It constitutes a key criterion for the promotion of faculty members which is highly regarded, sought after and requires high level participation and quality work (Albach, 2015). For a lecturer to be research productive, it requires a lot of efforts and demands a great deal of money particularly if it is scientific based. With the emphasis on the extent of research productivity in universities, the number of publications by lecturers is frequently used as an indicator of quality research. The obvious reason is that the research published is taken as an indication of quality which could be further categorised and weighted by identifying the type of publication either book or research article; and if it is an article, there is need to know the type of journal (refereed or not refereed) and the institutions of employment of the authors.

Onifade (2011) concluded that there was, though, an unacceptability low level of research productivity of lecturers in both private and public universities as a result of failure to understand the purpose of publications, its limitations or how it might be effectively used, spending more time in daily routine jobs than in publishing, ignorance about learned journals to publish, lack of

interest, poor management policy, lack of funds to publish (which in my view is considered as poor mind set), poor research skills and writing which hinder the acquisition and identification of research problem, insufficient knowledge skills, and inexperience as well failure to realise the significance of research; and poor attitude to produce a desired effect in the academic community. Yang (2017) in reviewing his research articles published in 1960s, 70s, 80s, 90s and early part of 20s in the United States about factors influencing Taiwanese professors' research output, explained that the factors were both individuals and experimental. Individual factors included: IQ (Intelligence Quotient), motivation, perception of stress, age and gender. Experimental factors included: university reputation, resource allocation, academic colleagues and research field though further studies applied diversified method to explore the effect of individuals and research field differences on university lecturers' research performances. Aitha (2016) avowed that lack of graduate students' abilities and confidence in conducting research as well as research assistant's ability significantly influenced extent of university lecturers' research article production. It was also revealed in the study of Aitha (2016) that psychological perception and background variables such as stress, motivation, gender and age influenced the extent of university lecturers' research production. Moreover, environmental factors such as research support culture, good research space and facilities, collaboration with colleagues were important variables for predicting extent of university lecturers' research productivity.

Leertputarak (2018) described the level of research productivity of lecturers as an outcome measurement of scholarly effort which had two germane components: knowledge creation (research), knowledge distribution (productivity); and the "product of academic research is scholarly publication" (p.19). The significance of research productivity here is that it enables members to share insight, creative thinking and to develop a reputation for expenses in an area or specialisation. Bassey, Akwuegu, Idia and Udey (2007) in study of academic staff research productivity in South-south zone of Nigeria remarked that the National Universities' Commission (NUC), the Nigeria's higher education funding and regulatory body of the country's universities' indexes revealed that only 20 out of over 70 universities (public and private) in the country were found to have performed better with regard to their research output. In which case, majority of the universities were found to have low index comparing this with their counterparts in the developed world. According to the 2020 research ranking of universities, by Center for World Universities' Rankings (CWUR), University of Ibadan which was ranked the best in Nigeria in year 2020 was ranked 1,219 position among world class universities; whilst Obafemi Awolowo University which was ranked nationally as 4th and University of Lagos 5th best came a distant 1,614 and 1,894 positions respectively. Besides, in the report of the Center for World Universities' Rankings (CWUR) on the survey carried out by Times Higher Education (**THE**) in year 2022, it was revealed that University of Ibadan (UI), Ibadan (which was ranked as best in Nigeria same year came a distant 1172nd position globally with 69.3 points; followed by University of Nigeria, Nsukka (UNN) which came second nationally within the same year scored 66.6 points globally and 1775th position in world ranking; whilst University of Lagos (UNILAG), Akoka-Yaba ranking 3rd nationally also came a distant 1924th position in the world ranking with 66.0 points; and Ahmadu Bello University (ABU), Zaria ranked 4th position nationally also in the same year 2022 came a distant 1941st position in year 2022 World Universities' Ranking.

The best universities in Nigeria came far behind the likes of Oxford University, California Institute of Technology, Harvard University, Stanford University, University of Pretoria, Makerere University, and other universities in Africa. However, part of the yardsticks used in determining the ranking of universities across the globe is the h-index and citation index of the universities in which the level of research productivity of lecturers that make or teach in the respective universities as faculty members is grossly a factor to be considered. The low level ranking of universities particularly in Nigeria shows the extent of research productivity in the country particularly by lecturers in South-western Nigeria. Vijayakarsarn (2013) as cited by Leertputarak (2018) investigated research productivity of academics in high performance and low performing

institutes in India and findings showed that there was critical need for revisiting the system of career advancement for principal staff as the t-test failed to produce significant value of productivity of academic staff. The result further explained that academic staff affirmed their motivation and interests which showed the need for publishing in order to increase their intellectual growths, knowledge and social improvements.

Simisaye (2019) investigated the contribution and impact of research output on PEC University of Technology as reflected in the university publications covered in Scopus International Multidisciplinary Database concluded that over 77 research papers were published by the department. Sar (2019) reported the extent of research productivity of lecturers on the basis of articles in the rest of the world which was fast increasing but the situation in most African countries was that knowledge was decreasing gradually. The author stressed that sub-saharan Africans contributed around 0.7 percent of world scientific output and this figure decreased over the last 15-20 years. However, except for South Africa, lack of incentives to publish research remained low in Africa. It was also lamented that most of the research conducted in most African universities and research institutions were backward, forcing many researchers to seek publication in foreign journals. From these analogies, it is clear that the low level of research productivity in Nigerian universities if it is considered in number of research works in article journals, books, international conference proceedings, monographs, chapters in books, collaborated works, occasional papers, peer-review, patent and certified invention (Okiki, 2013).

Brew, Boud, Namgung, Lucas and Crawford (2015); Kpolovie and Onoshagbegbe (2017); Dellelo, (2018), Suardi, Fuad and Rosyidi (2018) in summary submitted that the extent of research productivity of lecturers in universities was dependent on influencing factors such as funding policies, research collaboration, research rules and ethics, demographic variables (gender, age, rank), academic capabilities and confidence (individual factors), self-efficacy, social factors (workload, time), intellectual property (relating to research support that occurs outside university environment) and use of social media. Opesanwo and Mabawonku (2017) noted that individuals who used social media at work for research purposes were about 9 percent more productive than those who did not and explained that in a report carried out by IPSOS public affairs in 2015 on behalf of Microsoft of 9,908 employees across 32 countries, showed that nearly half (46 percent) of information workers, using social tools had increased level of research productivity while less than one in ten (9 percent) agreed that the tools had reduced their efficiency as researchers. The study also showed that 56 percent of respondents from Latin America indicated that the use of social (internet) tools had increased their research productivity and 62 percent of the same respondents predicted these tools with collaboration with other colleagues. The tools were said to be quick access to academic materials, ease of communication, access to relevant and up-to-date information. It was also explained that by the use of social media such as citation sharing, loop, research Gate, linkedin academia, ResearchID and Graduate Junction, results had shown they enhanced not only research productivity but also research collaboration among academic staff across the globe by bringing their wealth of research advancement to public glare (Opesanwo & Mabawonku, 2017).

Handayani, Kusmaningtyas and Riyadi (2019) while observing the extent of research productivity of lecturers in relation to quality of writing as well as functioning well in teaching, adding that the distinction between a lecturer who read, wrote a lot and conducted much research was different from those who only read to teach. Thus, from the analysis of Handayani, it could be argued that the extent of research productivity of lecturers in conducting academic research should be noted by the rarity of research outputs published within a given year compared to the number of lecturers available in same institution. In another study, Kpolovie and Onoshagbebe (2017) attested that the extent of research productivity in sub-saharan Africa using Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife (OAU) and University of Ibadan (UI) as a case study indicated that academic rank, attendance of conferences and collaborations with professional bodies were the predictors of research productivity in the two universities. It was also explained that the research

productivity of the two universities improved compared to north-east geo-political zone which declined. Nonetheless, the pertinent question I wish to ask at this point is that: Does the outcome of research productivity of these two universities suffice as yardstick to determine the extent or level of research productivity of lecturers in South-Western Nigeria? Aitha (2016), Aitha and Suresh-Kumar (2016) identified the following strategies as measures to increase lecturers' research productivity using Srinivas Institute of Management Studies (SIMS) model:

- (a) commitment and hard-work of indigenous and stakeholders in universities and higher education institutes is indispensable in order to enhance research contributions of faculty members.
- (b) set a target for the number of scholarly publications a faculty member should have per year to his or her credit for promotion. As way of doing this, the faculty can organise one national conference in the faculty every year and setting the target to institutional faculty members to submit and present papers in the identified themes of the conference to enable them publish their papers in international or open access journals to increase the citation of the published papers.
- (c) individual lecturer should be made or encouraged to set up his or her desired objectives, policies, strategies and targets and universities should focus on developing team-based research productivity so that every faculty member could be the Star Researcher.

Castelle (2017), Rankumar(2018), Sondari(2018) also asserted in separate studies that research productivity was a major concern in any institutional or organisational climate. It interacts with other aspect of employee performance, innovation, financial control and competitive effectiveness. According to Castelle (2017), the concept of performance was incorrectly associated with productivity either in an academic community or management organisation stressing that quality and development were more align with the notion of performance. The three scholars concluded that productivity either on the basis of research development in academic community or organisational climate dealt with the individual deriving from the perception that an environment conducive to the effective or efficient use of institutional resources and processes was present and sought to develop an instrument that would produce a general measure. It can be inferred that while research productivity is important in the life of a faculty member for academic progression, it is possible that an increase in research productivity would also mean a decrease in performance.

Muslinge and Maassen (2015) stressed that scholarly journals were the main conveyors of knowledge or research productivity. This often undergoes rigorous evaluation leading to staff ranking nationally and internationally. Pasupathy and Siwatu (2014), Saraswati, Ratimaningsh and Utami (2020) broadly summarised the importance of publications on cumulative effects of research productivity of faculty members, bearing in mind all other variables as follows:

- a. improve citation index and h-index;
- b. improve teaching effectiveness;
- c. encourage quality assurance;
- d. achieving peer-recognition;
- e. improve research skill;
- f. high academic progression (being full professor);
- g. improvement in individual academic status;
- h. encourage presentation of ideas;
- i. improve individual self-confidence;
- j. encourage persistence/resilience and self-confidence in achieving a desired goal or task;
- k. getting better salary increase;
- l. satisfying individual need for creativity/curiosity;
- m. tenure elongation (for instance, the retirement age for Professor is now 70 years);
- n. satisfying the need to stay current in the field;
- o. Satisfying the need to contribute to the field (of law);
- p. having satisfying collaborations with others;

- q. getting respect from students;
- r. getting reduced teaching load;
- s. getting a "Chaired Professorship";
- t. finding a better job at another university;
- u. getting an administrative assignment.

The extent of research productivity of lecturers rests largely upon the quality (and often more than not) the quantity of research publications cited which determine the citation and h-index of a lecturer in the university. This is important because "publication is motivated by eagerness or enthusiasm to publish, presence of enabling environment and mostly self-perception of individual lecturers with regard to their role, the will power to succeed and the determination not to perish in the academic high sense" (Okonedo & Popoola, 2012, p.5; Rankumar, 2018).

However, Basiru (2023) avowed that there was low level of publication output among the academic staff in 21 private universities in South-west Nigeria. In his empirical study, he noted that the weighted average of 2.02 showed a clear indication that the academic staff has a moderately low level of research productivity in private universities in South-west Nigeria. Henry, Caroline and MdGani (2020) in their studies on factors contributing towards research productivity in Higher Education revealed that the probability of the classification of academic staff as being productive is 0.922 which indicated that the likelihood of being productive is high out of the 456 respondents that were selected from Science & Technology- based faculties while another 456 were selected from Social Science based faculties.

In his study, Okafor (2011) analysed the extent of research output in selected faculties of federal government owned universities in Nigeria; and it was revealed that 30.6 percent of the academic published between 0-4 journal articles, 2.7 percent of them published 30 or more articles during the period and 42.1 percent did not have any article in overseas journals.

However, Basiru (2023) avowed that there was low level of publication output among the academic staff in 21 private universities in South-west Nigeria. In his empirical study, he noted that the weighted average of 2.02 showed a clear indication that the academic staff has a moderately low level of research productivity in private universities in South-west Nigeria. Henry, Caroline and MdGani (2020) in their studies on factors contributing towards research productivity in Higher Education revealed that the probability of the classification of academic staff as being productive is 0.922 which indicated that the likelihood of being productive is high out of the 456 respondents that were selected from Science & Technology- based faculties while another 456 were selected from Social Science based faculties.

In his study, Okafor (2011) analysed the extent of research output in selected faculties of federal government owned universities in Nigeria; and it was revealed that 30.6 percent of the academic published between 0-4 journal articles, 2.7 percent of them published 30 or more articles during the period and 42.1 percent did not have any article in overseas journals.

RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The research design used for this study was Correlational research. Correlational research design as it measures the degree of relationships between two or more variables without the researcher controlling any of them (Creswell, 2018). The population of the study was 456 law lecturers comprising 285 from nine Federal and State universities; and 171 from 12 private universities in South-Western Nigeria who are on full-time appointment in their respective universities. Those on part-time, sabbatical leave, adjunct and contract appointment were excluded from this study. This is because much are not expected from them in terms of research productivity and internal operations of the universities.

However, there was no sampling for the study, the population was used. Therefore, the study adopted Total Enumeration Method. This was in compliance with the views of Egbule (2003) that, if a population of a study is small, the researcher does not need to draw any sample size and this

is what Total Enumeration Method is all about. The research instrument used for the study was the questionnaire. The questionnaire was prepared for law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities as respondents and were used to collect data for this study. Some of the questions were designed on a four point likert-type scale ranging from Very High Extent (VHE), High Extent (HE), Low Extent (LE) and Very Low Extent (VLE)

The research instrument was done with the assistance of the researcher's supervisors and lecturers from other universities outside the area of study for the validation of the instrument. This was to build the face and content validity of the research.

However, the research was administered to 35 law lecturers from sister universities in order to estimate the reliability co-efficient of the instrument. The data obtained was analysed with the use of Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient for internal consistency. The test re-test method of establishing reliability index was done at an interval of two weeks; and was used in collecting data from the 35 respondents from other institutions.

The researcher administered the questionnaire with the help of 10 research assistants to all the full-time law lecturers in the universities under study on a one-on-one basis and first ensured that adequate instructions were given to the 10 assistants on the guidelines to follow in the administration and collection of the questionnaire. The data obtained from respondents were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. This was because the instrument was designed to collect data on nominal and ordinal scales. Frequencies, Means ($\bar{X}$), ANOVA and Standard Deviation were adequately employed to answer all research questions. The Criterion Mean was placed at 2.50. For the hypotheses, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation and Moment Correlation were used to test the hypotheses because it sought to know the relationship of one independent variable; and to know the extent of the relationship of more than one independent variable on the dependent variable. (that is, research productivity). All statistical analyses were carried out using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Section 4.1: Questionnaire Response Rate

Table 4.1: Questionnaire Response Rate

Number of Questionnaire Administered	Number of Questionnaire Returned	Percentage of Questionnaire Returned
456	376	82%

A total of 456 copies of the questionnaire were distributed and 376 (82%) copies of them were completely filled and useful for conducting the study. The response rate of 82% is considered adequate for the study because the standard and acceptable response rate for most studies including humanities, social and management sciences, health sciences and particularly education is 60% and above (Fincham, 2008; Choi, 2016; Kubai, 2019).

Section 4.2: Analysis of the Respondents' Background Information

Table 4.2: Name of University

Name of University	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Achievers' University, Owo (AUO), Ondo State.	8	2.1
Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko (AAUA), Ondo State	26	6.9
Adeleke University, Ede (AU), Osun State.	13	3.5
Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti (ABUA), Ekiti State.	15	4.0
Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo (ACU), Oyo State.	10	2.7
Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo (BU), Ogun State.	24	6.4

Bowen University, Iwo (BUI), Osun State.	14	3.7
Crescent University, Abeokuta (CUAB), Ogun State.	9	2.4
Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti (EKSU), Ekiti State.	16	4.3
Elizade University, Ilara-Mokin(EUI), Ondo State.	15	3.9
Federal University, Oye-Ekiti (FUOYE), Ekiti State.	20	5.3
Joseph Ayo Babalola University, Ikeji-Arakeji (JABU), Osun State.	7	1.9
Kola Daisi University, Ibadan (KDU), Oyo State.	4	1.1
Lagos State University, Ojoo(LASU), Lagos State.	32	8.5
Lead City University Ibadan(LCU), Oyo State.	11	2.9
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife (OAU), Osun State.	37	9.8
Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye (OOUA), Ogun State.	15	3.9
Osun State University, Osogbo (OSU), Osun State.	24	6.4
Redeemers' University, Ede (RUN), Osun State.	8	2.1
University of Ibadan, Ibadan (UI), Oyo State.	37	9.8
University of Lagos, Akoka-Yaba(UNILAG), Lagos State.	31	8.2
Total	376	100.0

Table 4.2 shows the number of law lecturers from the various universities who participated in the study. There were more lecturers that participated from Obafemi Awolowo University, (OAU) Ile-Ife, Osun State with 37 (9.8%) and University of Ibadan (UI) Ibadan, Oyo State recording same response rate of 37(9.8%) respectively. This is closely followed by 32(8.5%) of them from Lagos State University, Ojoo(LASU), Lagos State. Besides, 31(8.2%) from University of Lagos, Akoka-Yaba(UNILAG), Lagos State, 26(6.9%) from Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko(AAUA)Ondo State, 24(6.4%) from Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo (BU), Ogun State, 24(6.4%) from Osun State University, Osogbo (OS Osun State, 20(5.3%) from Federal University, Oye-Ekiti(FUOYE),Ekiti State. Others include: 16(4.3%) from Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti (EKSU), Ekiti State, 15 (4.0%) from Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye (OOUA) Ogun State, 15(4.0%) from Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti (ABUA), Ekiti State, 15(4.0%) from Elizade University(EU) Ilara-Mokin, Ondo State, 14(3.7%) from Bowen University, Iwo (BU), Osun State, 13 (3.5%) Adeleke University, Ede(AU), Osun State, 11(2.9%) from Lead City, University, Ibadan(LCU), Oyo State, 10(2.7%)from Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo(ACU), Oyo State, 9(2.4%) from Crescent University, Abeokuta (CUAB), Ogun State, 8(2.1%) from Achievers' University,(AU), Owo, Ondo State, 7(1.9%) from Joseph Ayo Babalola University, Ikeji-Arakeji (JABU), Osun State and 4(1.1%) from Kola Daisi University, Ibadan(KDU), Oyo State.

Table 4.3: Sex of the Respondents

Sex	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	322	85.6
Female	54	14.4
Total	376	100.0

From Table 4.3, it can be seen that there are 322(85.6%) male and 54(14.4%) female. This implies that majority of the law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities are male.

Table 4.4: Rank of the Respondents

Rank	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Professor	12	3.2
Associate Prof./Reader	25	6.6
Senior Lecturer	78	20.7
Lecturer I	140	37.2
Lecturer II	98	26.1
Assistant Lecturer	23	6.1
Total	376	100.0

From Table 4.4, it can be seen that there are 140(37.2%) lecturer I, 98(26.1%) Lecturer II, 78(20.7%) Senior lecturer, 25(6.6%) Associate Prof. /Readers, 23(6.1%) Assistant lecturer and 12(3.2%) Professor. This implies that majority of the law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities are within the rank of Lecturer I.

Table 4.5: Years of Teaching of the Respondents

Years	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1-3 years	54	14.4
4-6 years	84	22.3
7-10 years	122	32.4
11-13 years	64	17.0
14-16 years	33	8.8
17 years and above	19	5.1
Total	376	100.0

From Table 4.5, it can be seen that there are 122(32.4%) lecturers who have taught for 7-10 years, 84(22.3%) have taught for 4-6 years, 64(17%) have taught for 11-13 years, 54(14.4%) have taught for 1-3 years, 33(8.8%) have taught for 14-16 years and 19(5.1%) have taught for 17 years and above. It can be concluded that majority of the law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities have been teaching within 7-10 years.

Table 4.6: Level of Law Lecturers' Self -Efficacy about Research Productivity

S/N	Self-Efficacy	VHE	HE	LE	VLE	Mean
1.	Self-efficacy increases my ability to conduct research for academic productivity.	223	151	0	2	3.58
2.	I am encouraged to improve my skill of professional writing such as technical reports, authored book, case reviews, writing articles, chapters in books.	214	154	4	4	3.54
3.	I am able to have a broad view of a research area as a result of self-efficacy.	256	114	3	3	3.66
4.	My ability to have confidence to deliver tutorials, organise public lectures , paper presentation at seminars/conferences/workshop proceedings in order to increase my research output is not necessarily a product of self-efficacy.	13	12	174	177	1.63
5.	There is no need for self-efficacy to carry out my professional and academic engagements.	4	10	142	220	1.46
6.	Reporting and supervising research through self – efficacy is not a necessary ingredient or factor for	2	27	148	199	1.55

	my research productivity in the university.					
7.	Self-efficacy is an indication for recognition as a lecturer who is academically productive.	113	250	6	7	3.25
8.	As for me, self-efficacy is sine qua non to my research productivity as a University Lecturer.	159	213	1	3	3.40
9.	My ability to consult colleagues and associates professionally is a result of self-efficacy.	169	199	4	4	3.42
10.	I spend at least 2 hours per week on personal research.	10	43	92	231	1.55
11.	As a result of self-efficacy, professional recognition motivates me to carry out research work.	149	215	9	3	3.36
12.	Opportunities for collaborative research which contributes to my research productivity as law lecturer is through self-efficacy.	185	181	6	4	3.45
13.	My flair for writing in terms of published articles, authored books, book reviews, chapters in books, case reviews to increase my research output for promotion., annual salary increment, job offer, among other benefits are products of self-efficacy.	165	200	9	2	3.40
14.	I do not possess enough self-efficacy which limits my research skill in order to increase my productivity as a University Lecturer.	43	154	103	76	2.44
Aggregate Mean						2.84

Criterion Mean

2.50

Table 4.6 shows that with an aggregate mean of 2.84 which is greater than the criterion mean of 2.50, it can be concluded that the extent of law lecturers' self-efficacy about research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities is high.

Research Question 2: To what extent are law lecturers productive in terms of research in South-western Nigerian universities?

Data in Table 4.7 were used to answer this question.

Table 4.7: Extent of Law Lecturers' Research Productivity

S/N	Publication Level	None	1-3	4-6	7-10	10 and above	Mean
1.	Authored books	357	16	0	0	3	1.07
2.	Chapters in books	285	67	16	4	4	1.34
3.	Published Technical Reports	364	11	1	0	0	1.03
4.	Monographs	365	8	3	0	0	1.04
5.	Occasional papers	364	10	1	1	0	1.04
6.	Articles in learned journals	58	97	90	77	54	2.93
7.	Published Conferences/workshops/ seminar proceedings	331	34	4	4	3	1.18
8.	International/local peer reviewed journals	345	19	5	6	1	1.14
9.	Theses/ dissertations	346	24	3	1	2	1.11
10.	Edited books, conference papers, journals, workshops, and so on.	353	13	6	3	1	1.10
11.	Case or Book Reviews	341	31	3	0	1	1.11
12.	Unpublished Technical Reports.	348	23	2	1	2	1.10
Aggregate Mean							1.27

Criterion Mean

2.50

Table 4.12 shows that with an aggregate mean of 1.27 which is less than the criterion mean of 2.50, it can be concluded that the extent to which law lecturers are productive in terms of research in South-western Nigerian universities is low. However, they are productive with articles in learned journals.

Testing of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1:

Self-Efficacy has no significant relationship with research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities.

Data in Table 4.8 provide answer to this hypothesis.

Table 4.8: Correlation between Self-Efficacy and Research Productivity of Law Lecturers

		Self-efficacy	Research Productivity
Self-efficacy	Pearson Correlation	1	.138
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.007
	N	376	376
Research Productivity	Pearson Correlation	.138	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	
	N	376	376

From Table 4.8, Pearson correlation coefficient r (0.138). Since the significant value (Sig.2-tailed) is 0.007 (which is greater than 0.05), it can be concluded that self-efficacy has no significant relationship with research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities. The null hypothesis is, therefore, accepted implying that an increase/decrease in the self-efficacy of the law lecturers, may not lead to a corresponding increase/decrease in their productivity. This means that self-efficacy do not influence the law lecturers' research productivity.

Discussion of the Findings

The finding of the study showed that law lecturers' self-efficacy about research productivity in South- western Nigerian universities was high. The findings corroborated the views of Simisaye (2019) who maintained that the extent of the of faculty members was high stressing that the stronger the self-efficacy of respondents, the more likely they were able to select challenging tasks, persisting and performing them successfully. Kurbanoglu (2019) also explained that the self-efficacy among faculty members was high which served as a key factor for the purpose of attaining their academic goal. It leaves no one in doubt, therefore, why the findings showed that the self-efficacy level of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities about research productivity is high for the purpose of academic progression.

The study also revealed that the extent of law lecturers' research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities was low though, notwithstanding the attempts made to publish a number of articles in learned journals. This finding was consistent with those of Uluocha and Mabawonku (2014) and Kpolovie and Dorgu (2019) which could be inferred from their studies that the research productivity among the respondent faculty members was low. This was because most of them believed that as academics, writing only articles in journals was an end to research productivity probably oblivious of the fact that research encompasses all means of publications including published conferences or workshop proceedings, authored books, chapters in books, gathering and analysing original evidence, working with postgraduate students in dissertations and theses, writing monographs, book reviews and technical reports, among others. Therefore, writing articles only for publication in learned journals do not suffice for research productivity.

Besides, in the study carried out by Onifade (2011), it was concluded that the extent of research productivity of lecturers was low. This was as a result of failure to understand the

purpose of publications, its limitations or how it might be effectively used, lack of interest, lack of funds to publish, poor research skills and writing, among others.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The study investigated Self-efficacy and Research Productivity of Law Lecturers in South-western Nigerian Universities.

The population of the study was 456 law lecturers which cut across nine public and 12 private universities duly accredited by National Universities' Commission (NUC) and Council of Legal Education (CLE) to offer law degree programmes in South-western Nigeria. Some of the universities include : University of Ibadan, Ibadan; University of Lagos, Akoka-Yaba; Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife; Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko; Achievers' University, Owo; Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye and Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti.

In the study, two research questions were raised and answered while two research hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance. However, a number of literature was reviewed in line with the research questions and organised under sub-headings. Using Total Enumeration method, all the 456 copies of the questionnaire were administered to the respondents; and 376 of the questionnaire were retrieved representing 82.4% of response rate which was considered adequate. The data collected were analysed and descriptive statistics such as frequency, mean, standard deviation and ANOVA were used to arrive at finding of the study. The criterion mean was placed at 2.50 for data analysis. For the hypotheses, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used to test the hypothesis in order to know the effect of one independent variable on the dependent variable; and hypotheses 4 was tested using Multiple correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

Main Finding

The finding from the study showed that:

- i. The level of law lecturers' self-efficacy about research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities was high.
- ii. The extent of law lecturers' research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities was low.
- iii. Self-efficacy had no significant relationship with research productivity: that is, self efficacy did not influence the law lecturers' research productivity. This implied that, an increase or decrease in self-efficacy of law lecturers might not lead to a corresponding increase or decrease in productivity.

CONCLUSION

The study investigated self-efficacy and research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities.

The study is significant because it would improve the research productivity of law lecturers in quest of academic growth within and outside the university community. However, the study showed the degree of self-efficacy by law lecturers for research productivity was high yet it did not underscore the fact that there was low level of research productivity among faculty members in the universities in the zone.

The study also showed that self-efficacy did not influence the law lecturers which might not also lead to a corresponding increase or decrease in their research productivity. However, the study showed that an increase or decrease in perception of law lecturers' use of legal information resources might lead to a corresponding increase or decrease in their research productivity.

It could be argued therefore, that law lecturers are generally aware of the importance of productive research as members of their respective universities but the fact remains that the level

of their research is still low which has undermined promotion, elevation, salary increase, prestige, honour and as "Chaired Professor," among others.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study have led to the following recommendations:

- i. There is more need to sensitise law lecturers by management in the respective universities on the need to appreciate research and publishing as significant part of their academic growth. For instance, this could be done during faculty board meetings so that they could see the need why they must continue to be relevant in the university community.
- ii. Individual universities are to be engaged in ambitious plans to create a research and publishing culture in their institutions. This involves advocacy and publicity to popularise and encourage appreciation of research and publishing.
- iii. Establishment of regular seminar sessions within the faculty of law where every faculty member will be made to present papers for internal review. This will sharpen law lecturers' research and writing skills.
- iv. The work environment of law lecturers, both internal and external, should be improved upon in order to further boost their morale and self-efficacy. Such improvement include: equipping the offices of faculty members in terms of functional air-conditioners, refrigerators, book-shelf, good tables and chairs, good toilet system, smart television, among others.
- v. Law lecturers should be further encouraged to engage in research and publication through the provision of research grants. This may be achieved by creating institutional research fund to support any activity related to research and publication. This will also increase the h-index of both the lecturer and the university.
- vi. University administrators should endeavour, every year, to honour any faculty member who contributes considerably to new knowledge creation through research publications. This could be tagged "Star Researcher."
- vii. Organising national/international conferences periodically in each department of law faculty of the university; and setting the target to institutional faculty members to submit and present papers in the identified themes of the conferences.
- viii. Opportunities should be given to law lecturers to increase institutional collaborations both at national and international levels where better opportunity for exchanging ideas and work together for inter-institutional collaborative publications will abound. This will increase the lecturers as well as institutional research productivity.

Suggestions for Further Studies

The following suggestions are made for further studies:

1. The study should be replicated in other geographical zones of Nigeria to see if the results will be same or different.

REFERENCES

- Abdulgani, M. A. (2018). *Factors affecting faculty productivity: Conclusions from a critical influence as the literature* <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325313131>.
- Abdullahi, K. A. (2013). *Utilization of information resources in law in libraries by the law students in federal universities of northern states of Nigeria*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Bayero University, Kano, 18-23.
- Achim, A.N. & Kassim, K.K. (2015). Computer usage: The impact of computer anxiety and computer self-efficiency. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 172, 701-708.

- Adeleye, R.O. (2009). Relationship among self-concept, job satisfaction and work productivity of individual workers in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of Personnel Management*, 8 (2), 153 – 154.
- Adetomiwa, B., & Okwilagwe, A.O. (2018). Awareness and use of electronic databases as determinants of research productivity of academic staff in Nigerian private university. *International Journal of Current Research. Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal*, 5-13. www.journalera.com.
- Afod, A.A., & Lamptey, R.B. (2012). Information needs and the information seeking behaviour of law lecturers in Kwame Nkrumah. University of science and technology, Kumasi, Ghana. *International Research Journal of Arts and Social sciences*, 1 (4), 75–80. <https://www.interesjournals.org/IRJASS>.
- Agha, N. C., Adam, A. U., & Ujebe, N. (2018). *Assessing the relevance of academic research productivity in teaching practices in Nigerian universities*. www.ajol.info
- Amadi, R.N. (2021). Perception of zee world movie channel of the residence of Rivers state. *Journal of Advance Research and Development*, 24. <https://www.ajol.info>.
- Aina, R. F. (2014). Awareness, accessibility and use of electronic database among academic staff of Babcock University business school. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3 (3), 11-15.
- Aitha, P.S. (2016). *How to increase research productivity in higher educational institutions SIMS model*. <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/71750>.
- Aitha, P.S., & Suresh-Kumar, P.M. (2016). *ABC model of research productivity and higher education institution ranking*. Proceedings of National Conference on Curriculum Design and Development for Student Centric Learning, 11-22.
- Akinwumi, O.S. (2023). Self-concept, self-efficacy, perception of use of legal information resources and research productivity of law lecturers in south-western Nigerian universities being a ph.d thesis submitted to the Department of Library Science, Delta State University 4-20..
- Akpojotor, L.O. (2016). Awareness and usage of electronic information resources among postgraduate students of library and information science in southern Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 5-23. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1408>.
- Albach, P.G. (2015). What counts for academic productivity in research universities? *International Higher Education*, 79, Winter, 1-2.
- Anhwere, B.K., Paulina, A.A., & Manu, A.E. (2018). Utilization of library resources by lecturers in university of Cape Coast. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 10 (1), 11-14. <https://www.researchgate.net>.
- Anyaogu, U. (2014). Postgraduate law students' information needs and seeking behaviour: Implications for improved provision of resources and services in Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies Library in Lagos State. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-Journal)*, 14-15. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1128>

- Ariadurai, S.A. & Rajendra, J.C.N. (2020). *Learners' perception on learning resources*. <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Artino, A. R. (2012). "Academic self-efficacy: From educational theory to instructional practice: Perspective to medical education". <https://wwwlink.springer.com>
- Atanda, A. I., & Olasupo, I. O. (2018). A survey of academic staff research output in the University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. *East African Journal of Educational Research and Policy*, 13 (1), 80-84.
- Babalola, G.A. (2014). Influence of job movement demographic and environmental factors in the productivity of librarians in college of education in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Relevance and Concern*, 2 (2), 23-28.
- Bamigboye, O.B., Adegboye, & Emmanuel, S. (2015). Correlational analysis of Demographic factors, self-concept and research productivity of librarians in public universities in South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Library Science*, 4(3), 43-46.
- Barni, D. (2019). *Teachers self-efficacy: The role of personal values and motivation for teaching*. <https://doi.org/103389/fpsyg2019.01645>.
- Bashorun, M.T., Adisa, M., & Isah, A. (2011). *User perception of electronic resources in the University of Ilorin, Nigeria (Unilorin)*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265811766>.
- Basiru, A. (2023): Level of research productivity of academic staff in private universities in south-west Nigeria. *International Journal of Current Research Peer-Review OpenAccess Journal*. <https://www.journalora.com>
- Bassey, U., Akuegwu, B., Idia, L., & Udey, F.U. (2007). Academic staff research productivity: A study of universities in South-South zone of Nigeria. *Educational Research and Review*, 2(5), 103-108. <http://www.academicjournals.org/ERR>
- Bay, B.E.; & Clerigo, M.E.C. (2013). *Factors associated with research productivity among oral healthcare educators in an Asian university*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org>
- Brew, A., Boud, D., Namgung, S.U., Lucas, L., & Crawford, K. (2015). Research productivity and academic conceptions of research. *Higher Education*, doi: 10.107/S10734-015-9130- 6211.
- Callaghan, S. (2018). Academic self-efficacy, subjective well-being and academic achievement of students who "believe" they are gifted. *The International Journal of Learning: Annual Review*, 27(1), 16-19. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1447.9494/CGP/v27i01/17-35>
- Castelle, K.M. (2017). *An investigation into perceived productivity and its influence on the relationship between organization climate and affective commitment*. https://digitcommons.odu.edu/emse_etds/12.
- Center for World Universities' Ranking (2020). <https://cwur.org/2020-21-university>.
- Chen, Y. (2004). *Faculty perceptions of research rewards*. www.researchgate.com

- Cheng,Y. (2020).Academic self-efficacy and assessment.*International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology*, 40(4). 2-4.<https://doi.org/101080/01443410.2020.1755501>
- Choi, J. (2016). *What is an acceptable response rate of questionnaire in social studies?* www.researchgate.net
- Council of Legal Education Guidelines for Faculties of Law (2021).
- Creswell,J.W.(2018).*Research design (5th ed.)*.<https://www.kspjournals>
- Delello, J. (2018). *Understanding the productivity of faculty members in higher education*.<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322186626>.
- Egbule, J. F.(2003).*Statistics for researchers in the behavioural sciences and education*. Owerri:Whyte and Whyte.
- Emesulu, H.U. (2012). "Information needs, accessibility and utilization of library information resources as determinants of psychological well – being of person inmates in Nigeria".Ph.D Thesis Department of Library and information Studies University of Ibadan, 7-15.
- Eyiorunsho, T. A., Eluwole, O.A., & Aregbesola, A.(2017). Awareness, accessibility and use of library resources by faculty members of Landmark University, Nigeria. *Journal of information and Knowledge Management*, 8 (2), 118 – 128. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijikm.v8i2.10>
- Ezemenari, M.O. (2010).Academic performance in African-American undergraduates: Effects of cultural mistrust, educational value and achievement motivation.*Journal of Career Development*, 36, 348-369.
- Faculty of Law Registers of South-Western Nigerian Universities.
- Fincham,J.E.(2008). *Response rates and responsiveness for surveys, standards and the journal*.*American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 72 (2), 43.<https://doi.org/10.5688/aj720243>
- Fridah, K. (2020). *Relationships between self – efficacy, background factors and performance among lecturers in Makerere University, Kampala*. www.dissertations.mak.ac.ug
- Garnasih, L.R., Primiana, I., & Effendi, N. (2017). Strengthening research self – efficacy and research productivity through research culture implementation. *Journal of Management and Marketing Review*, 2(4), 19- 26.<https://www.ideas.repec.org>
- Gee-Whakho, M., & Ling, Y. (2017).A study of perephic and capability to influence action in research among literatures of a polyeecture in Sarawak.*Teaching Education and Curriculum Studies* 2(4), 17-26.
- Giovani, A., & Ciriaco,A. (2014).*How do you define and measure research productivity?*<https://www.researchgate.net>

- Gurikar, R., & Gurikar, R. (2015). Use of library resources and service of university research scholars: A case study of *DESIDOC*. *Journal of Library & information Technology*, 35 (5), 361-367. doi:10.14429/djlit.35.5.8275
- Haliso, Y. L., Iwu, J. J., Soyemi, O. D., Madulima, E. (2020). *Producing research productivity of librarians: The intervention of institutional support*. <https://www.scholar.google.com>
- Handayani, A., Kusmaningtyas, A., & Riyadi, S. (2019). Factors that influences the achievement motivation and research productivity of lecturers in the higher institution services. Institution region vi central java. *International Journal of Research in Social Science*, iii(xi), 439-440.
- Harwant, K. (no date!). *Self-efficacy: The power of believing in oneself to succeed*. <https://www.tero.com>
- Hemmings, B.M., & Kay, R. (2009). Lecturer self-efficiency: Its related dimension and the influence of gender and qualification. *Laws and Educational Research*, 19(3), 243-248.
- Henry, C., MdGhati, M., Marshida, U., & Baker, N. (2020). Factors contributing towards research productivity in higher education. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 9(1), 203-206.
- Holosco, Domenech, B., Rosello, L., & Artiga, A.G. (2016). *Self-fficacy, satisfaction and academic achievement: Th mediator role of students' expectancy-value beliefs*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.201701193>
- Ibegbulem, C. (2015). *Appropriate research designs, valid instruments, appropriate use of statistical tools*. <https://www.iosjournals.org>.
- Iroaganachi, M.A., & Izuagbe, R. (2018). A comparative analysis of the impact of electronic information resources use towards research productivity of academic staff in Nigerian universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). <http://digitalcommon.Uni.edu/libphilprac/1702>.
- Isabelle, D., Wolfgang, G., & Kamrani, P. (2021). Do researchers know what the h-index is? And how do they estimate its impoertance? <https://link.springer.com>
- ITHAKA (2010). S+Report. *Centre for Asian Research*. <https://www.car.clas.assu.edu>
- Jakarta, U. N. (2019). *Strategy improving research productivity of the lecturers*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332419135>.
- Khan, G., & Bhatti, R. (2012). Information needs and seeking behaviour of law faculty members: A survey of the University of Peshawar and its affiliated law colleges. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, Paper 786. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/786>.
- Khosravi, M., & Azami, S. (2011). The relationship between academic self- concept and achievement motivation with academic achievement among secondary school girls. *International Congress Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 1-3. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304942216>.

- Kpolovie, P.J. (2016). *Research productivity: H-index and I10-index of academics in Nigerian universities*. <https://researchgate.net>
- Kpolovie, P. J., & Onoshagbebe, E. S. (2017). Research productivity: H-index and citation index of academics in Nigerian universities. *International journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*, 5(2), 62-123.
- Kpolovie, P.J., & Dorgu, I.E. (2019). Comparison of faculty's research productivity (H – index and citation index) in Africa. *European Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology*, 7 (6), 60– 67.
- Kpolovie, P.J., & Obilor, (20113). *Research productivity: H-index and I10-index of academics in Nigerian universities*. <https://www.academia.edu>
- Kubai, E. (2019). *Reliability and validity of research instruments*. www.researchgate.net
- Kurbanoglu, S. (2009). Self-efficacy: "An alternative approach to the evaluation of information literacy: Qualitative and quantitative methods in libraries". International Conference, Turkey, 1- 4
- Kusilima, F. (2020). Self-efficacy, background factors and performance among lecturers in Makerere University. A Dissertation submitted to Makerere University, Kenya, www.researchgate.com
- Kusure, L.P., Primiana, I., Mawere, D., & Dhlwayo, L. (2006). Factors influencing research productivity among lecturers in teacher's college in Zimbabwe. *South African J. of Education, Science and Technology*, 1(2), 118-120.
- Marcus, G. W. K., Ling, Y. L. (2017). *A study of perception and capability to undertake action research among lecturers at a polytechnic in Sarawak*. www.researchgate.net
- Mathabela, N.N. (2018). "Information needs and information seeking behaviour of private practicing lawyers in Swaziland: A case of the law society of Swaziland". A thesis submitted to the Department of Information Studies, university of Kwazulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South-Africa <http://ukzn-dispace.ukzn.ac.za>
- Migosi, J., Muola, J., & Maithya, R. (2013). Perception of academic staff on research and publishing in Kenyan Universities. *International Journal of Education Administration and Policy Studies*. 4 (4). 115 – 126. <https://www.academicjournals.org/IJEAPS>.
- Migroho B., & Tiarto, R. (2020). The effect of self-efficacy and motivation on the effectiveness of the lecturer's performance. *Journal Manajemen*, 24,(1) DOI:1024912 Ijm.v24ii.619
- Mulauzi, F. (2018). *Information needs and information seeking behaviour of judges and lawyers: A study of the judiciary superior courts in Lusaka, Zambia*. <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Musert, J. B., & Olurunfemi, D. Y. (2013). Serving Nigerian law students: E- reading and utilization of university e-information facilities. *International Journal of Technology and Inclusive Education. Infonomics Society*, 2(2), 200-207.

- Muslinge, G., & Maassen, P.(2015).*Faculty perceptions of the factors that influence research productivity of Makerere University*. <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Namusgera, L. (2014). Users' awareness, perceptions and usage of Makerere Library Services in the main and selected branch libraries.*Qualitative and quantitative method. Libraries Journal, 3*, 743-746.
- Ngozi, O., Uche, E.U., & Ejoro, A.K. (2015).*Information seeking behaviour of faculty members in a Nigerian University*. www.researchgate.net
- Nkamoebe, E.C., Udem, O.K., & Nkamoebe, C.B. (2014). Evaluation of the use of university resources and service by the students of Paul University, Akwa, Anambra State, Nigeria.*Philosophy and Practice*, 13-21.
- Nsibiwe, Z., & Odede, I. (2019). A comparative analysis of information literacy self – efficacy skills of postgraduate students in library schools in South – South, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal), 3.Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.uni.edu/libphilprac/1917>.
- Nwantimwa, K.,& Elias, E. (2017). Utilisation of e-resources to support teaching and research in higher learning institutions, Tanzania.*University of Dar es Salaam Library Journal, 12* (2), 98-123. <https://wwwresearchgate.net>.
- Odede, I. (2017). Usage and perception of on – line information resources among students of Delta State University Abraka, Nigeria: A case study of library and information science department. *Journal of Research in Education and Society, 8* (2), 2 – 3.
- Odede, I.O. (2018). *Information literacy self-efficacy in the use of electronic information resources by library and information science post graduate students in South Nigeria*. File://D:/151/project/self-eficacy odede_Israel_Ogbenerukevwe_2018pdf-
- Ogba, C.O. (2013). Information seeking behavior of final year law students in south western Nigeria universities.*Information and Knowledge Management, 3* (5), 5-9.
- Ogbomo, E.F. (2010). Publication output of librarians in tertiary institutions: A case study of Delta State University, Abraka, *Nigerian Library Philosophy and Practice (e – journal)*, 1 – 9. <https://digitalcommons.uni.edu/libphilprac/322>.
- Ogbuiyi, D.C., Ogbuiyi, S.U., & Oriogu, C.D. (2014). Influence of computer literacy skill and online searching on undergraduates' use of academic materials in Babcock university library. *JOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 19* (7).www.josrjournals.org.
- Ogunniyi, A.S. (2008). Self – concept, personal factors and jobs productivity of workers in federal colleges of education in Nigeria. *Education Research, 8* (3), 139 – 141.
- Oguz, A. (2012). Teacher proficiency credentials of classroom teacher candidates. *AJESI, 2* (2), 15 – 16.
- Okafor, V. N. (2011). Comparative analysis of research output of federal universities in southern Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal).<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/498>.

- Okiki, O.C. (2011). "Information literacy skills as factors influencing research productivity of academic staff in Nigerian Federal Universities". A PGD Seminar Presented of the Department of Library Archival and Information Studies, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Okiki, O. C. (2012). Use of electronic information resources awareness, perception, attitude and use by academic members of the University of Lagos, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, 9-13.
- Okiki, O.C. (2013). Availability of information for research output: Perception of academic staff members in Nigerian federal universities. *International Journal of Computer Science and Telecommunications*, 4 (8), 3-14.
- Okiki, O.C.(2013). Research productivity of teaching faculty members in Nigerian federal universities: An investigative study. *International Electronic Journal*, 36, URL <https://www.icic.as/cliij/ci.36okiki.pdf>
- Okojie, S.E., Aderotimi, B., & Ogunmola, J.O. (1998). *Management Principles 2*. Akure: Stecum.
- Okonedo-Adegboye, S.I., Bamigboye, O.B., & Emmanuel, S. (2015). Correlation analysis of demographic factors, self – concept and research productivity of librarians in public universities in South Western Nigeria. *International Journal of Library Science*, 4 (3), 43 – 44, 46.
- Okonedo-Adegboye, S.I., & Popoola, S.O. (2012). Effect of self – concept, knowledge sharing and utilization on research productivity among librarians in Universities in South-West, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journals)*, 2-10. <http://digitalcommons.uni.edu/libphilprac/865>.
- Oladipupo, A. J. (2020). *Assessment of the contributions of time information resources*. www.trendfrontline.com.
- Olasore, R.E., & Adekunmisi, S.R. (2015). Use of library electronic information resources by academic staff in Olabisi Onabanjo University. *Global Advance Research Journals of Education Resources and Review*, 4 (4), 8-10 <https://gerj.org/garjerr/index.htm>.
- Olojede, J.C. (2016). Perception and attitudinal behavior of lecturer's in the use of information and communication technology tools in teaching/learning in Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike. *Science Papers Series Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development*, 16(3), 207-208.
- Olorunfemi, D. Y., & Monstert, J. (n.d.). *Information seeking behavior of law students in a developing country: A literature review*. www.lis.uzulu-ac-za.
- Olorunfemi, D.F. (2015). "The use of law information sources in legal research by Nigerian Universities law students" (Ph.D Research Project). Zululand, University, South Africa, 20-22. <http://uzspace.uzulu.ac.za>
- Olusegun, O., & Mabawonku, I. (2016). Influence of use of social media on research productivity of lecturers in two selected universities in south-west Nigeria. *Journal of applied Information Science and Technology*. 9 (2), 8-12.

- Onifade, F.N. (2011). "Relationship among knowledge sharing, organizational effectiveness in Nigerian Federal University Libraries". Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Library, Archival and Information Studies, University of Ibadan, 68 – 69.
- Onohwakpor, J.E., & Titemo, D.A. (2006). The pains and gains of publication: A Survey of Librarians in Delta State University, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 8 (2), 6-13. <https://digitalcommons.uni.edu/libphilprac/322>.
- Onuoha, U. D., Ikonne, C. N., & Madukoma, E. (2013). Perceived impact of library use on the research productivity of postgraduate students at Babcock University, Nigeria. *Journal of Research Method in Education*, 1 (1), 10-13. www.iosrjournals.org.
- Opesanwo, O., & Mabawonku, I. (2017). Influence of use of social media in research production of lecturers in two selected Universities in South-West Nigeria. <http://www.researchgate.net>
- Oriogu, C.D. (2015). Availability of information resource as determinants of undergraduates' use of internet search engines in two universities in Oyo State, Nigeria. *International Research Journal of Interdisciplinary & Multidisciplinary Studies (IRJIMS)*, 1(1), 97-102. <http://www.irjims.com/files/Chuks-Daniel-Oriogu.pdf>
- Oriogu, C.D., Ogbuiyi, D.C., & Chukwuemeka, A. (2018). Faculty awareness, perception and use of information resources and services in a private university in Nigeria. *Journal of Library & Information Science*, 1 (2), 32-39. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330400301>.
- Osisanwo, T.A., Jude, C.J., & Adeyeoye, O.I. (2021). Academic self – concept as it correlates to use of library resources by undergraduates in Tai Solarin University of Education. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal), 1-10. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprace/4812>.
- Ossai, N. B. (2011). How law students utilize the information resources: A case study of the University of Benin, Benin City. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 3(1), 1-14. <http://www.academicjournals.org/ijlis>.
- Owushi, E., & Emasulu, H. (2016). An evaluation of legal information resources and service in academic law libraries of selected universities in Edo State, Nigeria. *Library Progress (International)*. 36 (1), 1- 10.
- Oyewumi, O. O., Oladapo, Y.O., & Adegun, A. I. (2014). Users perception and library patronage among postgraduate students: A case study of Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State. *International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature*, 2(10), 56-59.
- Padma, P., & Ramasamy, K., & Ramathany, H. (2017). Lawyers as information seekers: A study of information seeking behaviour of lawyers, Madurai District Court, Tamilnadu. *Journal of Library and Information Management*, 4(2), 83-92.
- Padma, P., Ramasamy, K., & Selvam, K.P. (2015). Digital information seeking behaviour of lawyers of Madurai. In K. Karunai Raghavan, ed. *Library and Information Services: Advancing with Technology*, 227-230. SALIS, Chennai.
- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival guide: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows*. Australia: Allen and Unwin.

- Pasupathy, R., & Siwatu, K. O. (2014). An investigation of research self-efficacy beliefs and research productivity among faculty members at an emerging research university in the USA. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 33 (4). <https://www.tandfonline.com>
- Peruginelli, G. (2004). Understanding information-seeking behavior and the needs of Italian legal users in accessing legal literature. *Informational E Diritto*, 8 (1-2), 283-289.
- Pickard, A.J. (2013). *Research method in information*. In Pickard, A.J.(ed). *Research Method in Information Science*, London: Facet, 111 – 112.
- Prospectus of Guidelines for Accreditation of Law Programmes in Nigerian Universities.
- Ramansamy, K., Padma, P., & Helan, R.C. (2018). Use of legal information sources and service by the undergraduate students of government law college, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu State, India: A study. *Library Philosophy and Practice(e- journal)*, 1-11. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1808>.
- Rankumar, S. (2018). *Faculty Research Productivity*. <http://amity>.
- Ross, M., Perkris, H., & Bodey, K. (2013). Information literacy self – efficacy the effect of juggling work and study. *Library and Information Science Research*, 35 (1), 279 – 282.
- Sar, M. K. (2019). *Research Productivity and Research Trends in the Library*. <https://digitalcommons.wn.edu/lis>.
- Saraswati, N., Ratimaningsh, N.M., & Utami, I.P.G.A.(2020). Students' teachers' perceptions of rewards research. *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation*, 4(3), 1-6. <https://www.ejournal.undiksha.ac.id>
- Sajanel, L. (2017). "Access to and use of electronic information resources in the academic libraries of the Lesotho library consortium". A Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of philosophy in the information studies programme, School of Social Sciences, College of Humanities, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu>
- Shakeel, A.H., & Rabina, B. (2011). Information seeking behavior of law practitioners: A survey of Bahawalpur city. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/khan-bhatti.pdf.
- Sharma, H.L., & Nasa, G.(2014). *Academic self-efficacy: A reliable predictor of educational performances*. www.eajournals.org
- Shrestha, N. (2008). "A study on students use of library resources and self – efficacy, University of Kirhpur, Nepal". A Thesis submitted to Department of Library and Information Science, 34-36.
- Simisaye, A.O. (2019). A study of the research productivity of the academic staff in research institute in South Western Nigeria. *Samaru Journal of Information Studies*, 19 (2), 3-11. <https://www.ajol.info>.

- Singh, D.(2011).The role of the academic library in facilitating research: Perceptions of postgraduate students. In Abrizah Abdullah *et al.* (Eds.). *ICOLIS*, 467-470.
- Siwatu, K. (2014). *Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs*.<https://wwwscholargoggle.com>
- Sondari, M. (2018). Using moa frameworks research productivity of faculty members with mediation role of knowledge creation process. *International Journal Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(5), 2-8. <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Suhardi, M., Fuad, N., & Rosyidi, U. (2018). Strategy in improving research productivity of the lecturers.1st International Conference on Educational Sciences and Teacher Profession. *Advance Social Science and Humanities Research*, 29 (5), 23-25.
- Tang, Y., & Tseng, H.W. (2013). Distance learners' self – efficacy and information literacy skills. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 29 (6), 517 – 521.
- Tella., A., Ayeni., C.O., & Omoba, R.O. (2007). *Self –efficacy and uses of electronics informations as predictors of academic performances*. *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship (E-JAS)L*, 10, 2-5. www.researchgate.net.
- Thamskodi, S. (2012). E-resources and their usage patterns among the lawyers of the supreme court of India: A case study. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 49(1), 4-6.
- Tahuowire, I., & Okello-Obara, C. (2010).Sources and means of access to legal information by lawyers in Uganda. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 5(3),6-7.
- Tukur, L. M., & Karinan, S. (2020). *An appraisal of availability and utilization of information resources and library services by undergraduate students in agriculture*.www.researchgate.net
- Uluocha, A.,& Mabawonku, I. (2014). Legal information resources availability and utiilization as determinants of law lecturers research productivity in Nigerian universities. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 4 (9), 2-10.
- Uluocha, A. (2015). Influences of legal information resources use on research productivity of law lecturers in Nigerian universities.*Journal of Applied Information Science and Technology*, 8(2), 27-34. Uluanyaogu@yahoo.com
- Uppal, G.K. (2018). Self –efficacy to use of electronic information's resources. A study on the users of researchr institution of Punjad. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*,7(1). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334234524>.
- Uwizeye, D., Karimi,F., Khisa, A.M.,& Wao, H. (2021). *Factors associated with research productivity in higher education institutions in Africa (peer review)*.<https://www.aasopenresearch.org>
- Way, S.F., Allison, C.M., Larremere, D.B., & Clauset, A. (2019). *Productivity prominenceand the effects of academic environment*.<http://doi.org/10.073/pras,1817431116>

World University Ranking (2022).Times Higher Education (THE).
<https://www.timeshighereducation.com>

Yang, J. C. C. (2017). A study of factors affecting university professors' research output: perspectives of Taiwanese professors. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 14(1), 11-13.

Zarel, A.,&Usefli, Z.(2019). *Types of assessment affecting Iranian EFL learners' general and academic self-efficacy*.<http://semanticsscholar.org>

Zinn, S.E. (2013). The information literacy self-efficacy of disadvantaged teachers in South Africa. *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 397 CCIS, 212 – 213.