Influence of Research Self-efficacy on Research Productivity of Academic Staff in Private Universities in Oyo State, Nigeria.

Tosin Abimbola AYODELE
College Library Department
Federal College of Education (Special),
Oyo, Oyo State
tosinayoola1960@gmail.com

Sophia V. ADEYEYE
Department of Information Management Lead
City University, Ibadan.
adeyeyesophia@gmail.com

Abstract

Academic staff members of university are the key to productive research outcome in many nations of the world and they determine the outcome of research direction whether productive or not. It is in the light of this that this study therefore deems it fit to investigate the role of research self-efficacy on research productivity of Academic Staff in Private Universities in Oyo State. Descriptive research design of a correctional type was adopted. The population consists of 717 academic staff in private universities in Oyo state, Nigeria. Sample size of 255 academic staff was determined using Yamane table of sampling size, while validated questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. Data collected was analyzed using descriptive and

inferential statistics. Findings revealed that research self-efficacy has significant influence on research productivity (Adj.R^2 = 0.104; p = 0.000). Jointly, Research self-efficacy was found to statistically significantly influence Research Productivity Adj.=.112, $F_{(2,,252)}$=17.010, p < 0.05,. The study concluded that Research Self-efficacy influenced Research Productivity. The study recommended that academic staff in private universities should work and improve on their research skills such as identifying research gaps, reviewing literature extensively, following the ethical principles of research and many more.

Keywords: Research Self-efficacy, Research Productivity, Academic Staff

Introduction

The purpose of research is to address societal requirements and contribute to a country's development. In this context, it is possible to assert that a country's present condition is a reflection of the quality and amount of its research productivity. In other words, no society can really develop past the level and scope of its research. Therefore, it is possible to say that research distinguishes between the developed and developing countries of the world. This explains why research productivity and the many stakeholders engaged in the process are receiving renewed and increased attention (Adekunle & Madukoma 2022). It is well acknowledged that research plays a crucial role in the development of institutions, and its significance for the academic setting cannot be overestimated.

The total amount of research that is done over a given period of time is referred to as research productivity, and it includes things like delivering seminar talks, publishing books or chapters in books, and publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals (Gabbay & Shoham 2019). Additionally, research productivity encompasses intangible products like securing research grants, editorial responsibilities, participating in public discussions and opinions on public interest topics, supervising students' class projects and dissertations, teaching, and volunteer work (Smith, Kat, Philip & Carter 2018).

However, University research can help academic staff members make decisions and get them listed on international rankings lists. Research productivity is frequently regarded as a crucial

component of success, which can result in a promotion, honors, and a good income. Academic staff at universities is very interested in how research has a real impact on scholarly advancements as well as a progressive stimulus on the world economy. This kind of influence is pretty intriguing, particularly when it can be demonstrated and supported by data (Jalal, 2020). The idea of research productivity is intricate, yet it may be quantified using concrete metrics like three themes based on individual, institutional, and academic leadership characteristics.

Thus, research self-efficacy is one of the factors that can influence research productivity of the academic staff members, an individual's self-efficacy relates to their confidence in their capacity to carry out particular actions or tasks successfully. Research self-efficacy in the context of University academic staff refers to academic staff confidence in carrying out research-related responsibilities, such as assisting faculty research, offering education in information literacy, and supporting scholarly communication initiatives (Bandura 1997). Research self-efficacy is an individual's views in their ability to engage in the research process. A person's apparent confidence in their capacity to conduct research is known as research selfefficacy. This definition places a strong emphasis on the value of self-assurance and perceived competence in research. However, research self-efficacy will affect academic staff research productivity directly or indirectly. It is based on this premise that this study seeks to examine research self-efficacy on research productivity of Academic staff in private universities in Oyo State.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are to:

i. identify the level of research productivity of academic staff in private universities, Oyo state; ii. examine the level of research self-efficacy of academic staff in private universities,

Oyo State; iii. determine the influence of research self-efficacy on research productivity of academic staff in private universities, Oyo State;

Hypothesis

The hypothesis was tested at a 0.05 level of significance.

H_01: There will be no significant influence of research self-efficacy on research productivity of academic staff in private universities, Oyo state.

Literature Review

Regardless of the fields of study, all professionals engage in research; it is not just something that students and academics undertake. Re and search, the two syllables that make up the word "research," stand for "again" or "a new" and search standing for "to notice closely, to test, or to query," respectively (Aithal, & Kumar 2020). Research productivity is the entire numbers of journal articles, books, monographs, conference proceedings, technical reports, chapters in books, theses, dissertations, scientific peer reviews, co-authored textbooks, occasional papers, and patents produced by scholars within a specified timeframe (Simisaye & Popoola 2019).

Research productivity has concrete metrics like three themes based on individual, institutional, and academic leadership characteristics (Bland 20005). The characteristics of the individual researcher are one of the key elements affecting research productivity. There are a wide variety of academics' staff attributes that have been found to significantly impact their research engagement and productivity. Academic staff research productivity is influenced by their demographic, professional, psychological, and attitude characteristics. Although researchers have different methods for conducting research, their dedication to it usually determines how productive they are (Heng, Hamid & Khan 2022)**.**

A terminal degree, early publication habits, publishing-inclined coworkers, academic journal subscriptions, a high academic rank, and effective time management abilities are further qualifications. The literature also implies that people with poor research output have low levels of the here stated distinctive characteristics (Bland 2005)**.** Individual researcher traits offer only one, albeit important, aspect of research output, regardless of how eager they are to publish (Fraser, Harrison, Millar & Chutuape 2020)**.**

The faculty's leadership abilities are another element that contributes to the conditions that academic staff members find to be productive. Due to the synergy a faculty leader cultivates between the academic staff, the research culture, and the institution, leadership is essential to the productivity of its research (Bland 2005)**.** Leaders of successful research faculties are

characterized as esteemed academics who are focused on research and have an authoritative personality well as participative leadership style. The leader carries out important researchrelated tasks like managing, raising money, and setting goals. In contrast, a lack of professional autonomy and an increase in management oversight and control have an adverse effect on a researcher's productivity (Fraser, Harrison, Millar & Chutuape 2020).

However, it is critical to include the institutional environment of research accomplishments as one of the primary elements when assessing research productivity. Key institutional characteristics that have been researched in the past include the availability of financing and resources, institutional research policies, institutional culture, institutional orientation, reward and incentive systems, leadership styles, and the accessibility of top researchers. Factors at the institutional level influence research engagement and productivity. Institutional research policies, teaching loads, research funding availability, access to professional meetings, administrative staff's supportive attitude, institutional goals and missions, institutional support for research activity, research benefits and incentives, and a culture that values research are a few examples (Alemu 2023).

However, research self-efficacy is one of the characteristics that can influence academic staff members' research productivity, but, as it is well known that research is challenging and requires strong psychological and emotional conditions for sustainability and analytical skills (Adekunle & Madukoma 2022). One of the key elements determining the effective conduct of research is research self-efficacy. Self-efficacy beliefs can impact a person's functioning, his capacity for exerting effort in a difficult task, and his persistence in pursuing his goals (Jovelyn, Charity, & Manla 2021). Research the conviction that one can do research activities successfully is known as research self-efficacy. Self-efficacy can also be viewed as a generative skill that is used to effectively direct a person's cognitive, social, emotional, and behavioral sub aptitudes toward the accomplishment of particular goals. This implies that people's belief in becoming "proactive agents" to regain a sense of control in the face of failures also influences their ability to deal well with risk circumstances (Sagone & Indiana 2023).

A collection of "beliefs in one's abilities to organize and carry out the actions necessary to produce given attainments" is known as self-efficacy (Bandura 1977). Performance accomplishments (Enactive mastery experiences), vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal are the four things Bandura names as causes of self-efficacy. According to

Bandura, since it is founded on past achievements, personal accomplishment is the most significant source of self-efficacy. The ability to manage expectations can be improved by personal experience. One's perception of their skills is influenced by their experience of mastery. More self-efficacy is felt after successful experiences. Strong self-efficacy can be established by consistent behavior success. Self-efficacy can, however, be weakened or undermined if a task or challenge is not successfully completed.

The timing and complete repeat of experience have a role in the failure of self-efficacy. When academic staff members rely on indirect experience as their primary source of self-efficacy rather than past experience, this is known as vicarious experience (Bandura 1977)**.** However, they can witness this second source of self-efficacy when they watch academic staff in their universities execute an activity or deal with a circumstance; this can help them complete the same task by imitation.

On the other hand, the verbal persuasion addressed can be summed up as individual being convinced that a proposal will enable them to effectively complete an activity or behavior**.** Verbal persuasion is not rooted in prior failures; rather, it is a weak inducer of self-efficacy that can be put out by ignoring them. Nevertheless, emotional arousal is the final source of selfefficacy that can be sparked by demanding and difficult circumstances that might have a positive value for self-ability; consequently, this affects the perceived self-efficacy in dealing with frightening situations. This indicates that the emotion felt following a stressful event may have an impact on how academic staff members feel about their individual abilities. If someone is confident, it will result in excitement without worry and eventually cultivate a strong sense of self-efficacy, however if someone is nervous, it may generate a lower sense of self-efficacy Bandura 1977. The way that people perceive and evaluate emotional arousal is crucial in helping them form their own self-efficacy beliefs. Thus, one's self-efficacy views are positively impacted by being able to control one's emotions.

Methodology

The study utilized a cross-sectional descriptive survey research approach. The population of the study consists of all academic staff in private universities. The sample size of this study is Two hundred and fifty-five (255). Specifically, the sample size was drawn from the total number of lecturers in two private universities that were purposively selected in Oyo State i.e., Lead City

University, Ibadan and Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo. Taro Yamane (1967) published table was used to select the sample size for the study. The table at confidence level 95% with margin error of +5.0 was used to select sample size of 255 out of the total population of 717 academic staff identified for this study.

Findings and Discussion

The findings of this study in table 1 shows the demographic composition of the respondents. Gender wise, there are more females than male respondents. There are 152 female respondents which constituted 59.6% of the total respondents while there are 103 male respondents which means they constituted 40.4%. In term of institutional affiliation, majority of the respondents 161(%) were from Lead city, while the rest, 94(%) are from Ajayi Crowther University, the finding show that Lead City University has more academic staff than Ajayi Crowther University.

Table 1 also, shows the distribution of the respondents according to their faculties. Majority of the respondents 33(13%) were from College of Medicine & Health Sciences followed by those in Natural & Applied Sciences 28(11%), 23(9%), Social & Management Sciences 28 (11%), 5(2%). In addition, here were 18(7%), 5(2%) respondents from Arts & Education, Communication & Infor. Science 15(6%), 5(2%), Humanities 15(6%), also, Engineering & Technology 13(5%), 8(3%), Environment Design & Mgt (Built Env.) 13(5%), 5(2%), while Law 8(3%), 8(3%), Agricultural Science 8(3%) while Management 7(3%) and were 5(2%) of the respondents from Medical Sciences and Pharmacy respectively.

In term of academic attainment, there are 101 (39.6%) Ph.D. holders, followed by 154(60.4) MPhil/ Masters and others 0(0%). This data shows a diverse blend of qualification and educational backgrounds. This diversity was also shown in the positions held by the respondents. Those in the Assistant Lecturer status which is 61 which means they constituted about (23.9%). Majority of the respondents 76 are Lecturer II which is (29.8%) of the total respondents, while those in the Lecturer I status 58 constitutes (22.7%) of the total respondents. There are 60 Senior Lecturers which represents (23.5%) and 0 respondents for professor status. The demographic distribution is very important because some of the factors that determine selfefficacy include gender, role played and experience (Lase & Hartijasti 2018).

Experience also has a role to play in the pressure or motivation of academic staff to conduct research. Among the study respondents, it can be seen that 77(30.2%) has between <1-5 years' experience; 88(34.5%) of them has between 6-10 years while 43(16.9%) have been lecturing for 11-15 years. Also, 35(13.7%) of the respondents has experience between 16-20 years while few who has experience between 21-25 years 5(2.0%), 26-30 years 0(0%) and 31and above years has 7(2.7%). The combination of academic attainment, work experience and gender are important in investigating the research self-efficacy of academic staff. In addition, the rank of academic staff may determine whether they would conduct more or less research (Emami, Rezaei, Sangani & Goh 2019)**.**

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to Demographics characteristics

Items		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	103	40.4
	Female	152	59.6
	Total	**255**	**100.0**
Institutions	Lead City University	161	
	Ajayi Crowther University	94	
	Total	**255**	

Faculties	Frequency	Percent
Lead City University		
College of Medicine & Health Sciences	33	13
Natural & Applied Sciences	28	11
Law	8	3
Social & Management Sciences	28	11
Environment Design & Mgt (Built Env.)	13	5
Arts & Education	18	7
Engineering & Technology	13	5
Communication & Infor. Science	15	6
Pharmacy	5	2
Ajayi Crowther University		
Natural & Applied Sciences	23	9
Law	8	3
Social & Management Sciences	5	2
Environment Design & Mgt (Built Env.)	5	2

Arts & Education		5	2
Engineering & Technology		8	3
Communication & Infor. Science		5	2
Humanities		15	6
Agricultural Science		8	3
Basic Medical Sciences		5	2
Management		7	3
Total		**255**	**100**

Status	Professors	0	0
	Senior Lecturer	60	23.5 22.7
	Lecturer I	58	29.8
	Lecturer II	76	23.9
	Ass. Lecturer	61	0
	Others	0	
	Total	**255**	**100**

Academic Qualification	Ph.D	101	39.6
	M.Phil/Masters	154	60.4
	Total	**255**	**100**

Work Experience	<1-5	77	30.2
	6-10	88	34.5
	11-15	43	16.9 13.7
	16-20	35	2.0
	21-25	5	0
	26-30	0	2.7
	31&above	7	
	Total	**255**	**100**

Source: Field survey 2023

Table 2 below shows how the research productivity is measured under various dimensions such as individual characteristics, institutional characteristics and leadership characteristics. The analysis shows that the dimension with highest means score of individual characteristics in academic staff research productivity is that the respondents find research activities stimulating (Mean = 3.30). This means that the academic staff find research activities stimulating is high.

This dimension is followed by the respondents always ready to participate in research groups (Mean = 3.20) which means that most of the academic staff always ready to participate in research groups**.** However, the analysis also shows that while the editors/reviewers' comments does not discourage the academic staff (Mean = 3.03), and academic staff rarely miss deadline for paper submission (Mean = 3.02). The average mean score (3.14) shows that the respondents individual characteristics is high which it has really contribute to their research productivity.

However, the analysis also shows that, the highest mean score of institutional characteristics is there are research groups in my institution the respondents can join (Mean = 3.11) followed by their institution promotes a culture of research and innovation (Mean = 3.10). Additionally, the respondents' institutions ensure they have a enough time for research (Mean = 2.99) and also, their institution facilitates access to grant for research activities (Mean = 2.58). Thus, the average means score 2.95 shows that the institutional characteristics of the respondents is also high under decision rule and this has helped their research productivity. Furthermore, the highest (Mean = 3.12) of leadership characteristics is there are many proficient researchers around me. This revealed that the respondents have many proficient researchers around them which as really improve their research productivity. In addition, the respondents supervisor/HOD encourages them to conduct research (Mean = 2.98) and also, they have access to mentoring that encourages research (Mean = 2.96). The supervisor/HOD encourages the respondents to see problems and challenges as opportunities to perform better (Mean = 2.85). However, the average mean score 2.97 which is also high under decision rule, reveal that the leadership characteristics have impact in research productivity of academic staff.

Individual characteristics have the highest average mean score 3.14 follows by leadership characteristics 2.97 while institutional characteristics is 2.95. These three measures fall under high under division of rule which is acceptable, this means that these three measures have great impact on academic staff research productivity.

Table 2: Distributions of the respondent according to research productivity of academic staff in private universities in Oyo State.

Statement	SA	A	DA	SDA	Mean	Std. Deviation
Research Productivity **Individual** **Characteristics**						

I find research activities stimulating	78 (30.6%)	177 (69.4%)	- -	- -	3.30	.461
I am always ready to participate in research groups	53 (20.8%)	202 (79.2%)	- -	- -	3.20	.406
Editors/ Reviewers comments does not discourage me	46 (18.0%)	172 (67.5%)	37 (14.5%)	- -	3.03	.570
I rarely miss deadline for paper submission	38 (14.9%)	185 (72.5%)	32 (12.5%)	- -	3.02	.524
Average Mean Score					**3.14**	

Institutional Characteristics

My institution facilitates access to grant for research activities	3 (1.2%)	145 (56.9%)	105 (41.2%)	2 (.8%)	2.58	.532
My institution ensures I have a enough time for research	3 (1.2%)	250 (98.0)	- -	2 (.8%)	2.99	.208
My institution promotes a culture of research and innovation	32 (12.5%)	221 (86.7%)	- -	2 (.8%)	3.10	.381
There are research groups in my institution I can join	38 (14.9%)	211 (82.7%)	4 (1.6%)	2 (.8%)	3.11	.427
Average Mean Score					**2.95**	

Leadership Characteristics

I have access to mentoring that encourages research	17 (6.7%)	225 (88.2%)	- -	13 (5.1%)	2.96	.520
My supervisor/ HOD encourages me to conduct research	27 (10.6%)	197 (77.3%)	31 (12.2%)	- -	2.98	.477
There are many proficient researchers around me	39 (15.3%)	209 (82.0%)	7 (2.7%)	- -	3.12	.406

My supervisor/ HOD encourages me to see problems and challenges as opportunities to perform better	22 (8.6%)	175 (68.6%)	56 (22.0%)	2 (.8%)	2.85	.562
Average Mean Score					**2.97**	
Grand Mean					**2.81**	

Decision rule: 1.00 -1.49 = very low, 1.50 -2.49 =Low, 2.50 – 3.49 = High, 3.50 – 4.00 = Very high

Source: Field Survey Result (2023)

Table 3. Presents data on the research self-efficacy of the respondents, the research selfefficacy was measured by performance accomplishment, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion and emotional arousal. The data presented shows that the most prominent research self-efficacy of performance accomplishment by the respondents is identifying research gaps (mean = 3.16). This is followed by following the ethical principle of research (mean = 3.10). Other performance accomplishment include; working independently in a research work (mean = 2.89) and reviewing literature extensively (mean= 2.77). Over all, the respondents demonstrate the ability to identify to performance accomplishment as the average means 2.98 is high under decision rule. The table also shows the preferred vicarious experience among the respondents. The most preferred vicarious experience according to the mean score of the responses include; witnesses scholars' academic presentations (mean=3.49); learn from academic mentors in research (mean= 3.28); gain much experience in seminar (mean = 3.26) and gain much experience in workshop (mean = 3.09). The average mean of 3.28 shows that the respondents have vicarious experience is high which it has really helped them in their research.

The data presented show that the respondents mostly in verbal persuasion discuss research with colleagues and hope for the best (mean = 3.44) followed by consult senior researchers for research ideas (mean = 3.35) and participate in generating collaborative research ideas (mean = 3.09). The lowest among is belong to a group of researchers on social medial where I gain more experience (mean = 2.67). As a result, the average mean of verbal persuasion is 3.13 which is also high, this shows that verbal persuasion assists the respondents in their research activities.

The data shows that majority of the respondents usually remain calm when facing difficulties in research activities (mean =3 .03). The respondents also ensure that they handle whatever

comes their way in research (means = 2.99) and always manage to solve difficult problems in research if they try hard enough (mean= 2.96). In addition to these, the result of the respondents shows that they can rely on their coping abilities while embarking on research (mean = 2.79) which is the lowest among. The average mean score for emotional arousal is 2.94 which is also high according to decision rule, this shows that emotional arousal in research self-efficacy help the respondents in their research activities.

However, vicarious experience has the highest average mean score 3.28 followed by verbal persuasion 3.14, performance accomplishment 2.98 and emotional arousal 2.94. They are all high and acceptable by the decision rule. This shows that theses measure improve the research self-efficacy of academic staff in private universities.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to research self-efficacy of academic staff in Private Universities, Oyo state

Statement	TVHE	THE	TLE	TVLE	Mean	Std. Deviation
Performance Accomplishment						

Statement				Mean	SD
I work independently in a research work	25 (9.8%)	179 (70.2%)	51 (20.0%)	2.89	.537
I follow the ethical principles of research.	28 (11.0%)	227 (89.0%)	-	3.10	.313
I can identify research gaps	43 (16.9%)	212 (83.1%)	-	3.16	.375
I can review literature extensively	33 (12.9%)	131 (51.4%)	91 (35.7%)	2.77	.660
Average Mean				**2.98**	
Vicarious Experience					
I gain much experience in Seminar	68 (26.7%)	187 (73.3%)	-	3.26	.443
I gain much experience in workshop	49 (19.2%)	182 (71.4%)	24 (9.4%)	3.09	.527
I learn from academic mentors in research	73 (28.6%)	182 (71.4%)	-	3.28	.452
I have witnessed scholars academic presentations	135 (52.9%)	112 (43.9%)	8 (3.1%)	3.49	.560
Average Mean				**3.28**	

3.28

Statement				Mean	SD
Verbal Persuasion					
I discuss research with Colleagues	113 (44.3%)	142 (55.7%)	- -	3.44	.497
I consult senior researchers for research ideas	93 (36.5%)	160 (62.7%)	2 (.8%) -	3.35	.496
I participate in generating collaborative research ideas	35 (13.5%)	209 (82.0%)	11 (4.3%) -	3.09	.414
I belong to a group of researchers on social medial where I gain more experience	179 (70.2%)	69 (27.1%)	-	7 (2.7%)	2.67 .524
Average Mean				**3.14**	

Emotional Arousal

I can usually handle whatever in research	9 (3.5%)	236 (92.5%)	10 (3.9%)	- -	2.99	.273 comes my way
I can remain calm when facing (3.5%)	9	246 (96.5%)	- -	- -	3.03	.184 Difficulties
I can rely on my coping abilities on research	10 (3.9%)	182 (71.4%)	63 (24%)	- -	2.79	.494 while embarking
I can always manage to solve problems in research	16 (6.3%)	214 (83.9%)	25 (9.8%)	- - if I try hard enough	2.96	.400 difficult

Average Mean	**2.94**
Grand Mean	**3.09**

Decision rule: 1.00 -1.49 = very low, 1.50 -2.49 =Low, 2.50 – 3.49 = High, 3.50 – 4.00 = Very high

Source: Field Survey (2023).

Regression Analysis on influence of research self-efficacy on research productivity of academic staff in Private Universities, Oyo state.

Table 4 presents the results of the linear regression analysis on the influence of research selfefficacy on research productivity of academic staff in private university, Oyo state. From the data presented in the table, it can be seen that level of research self-efficacy of academic staff has a significant value which indicates that it has a positive influence on research productivity among respondents. In addition to this, the research model also shows an R^2 value 0.108 and adjusted R^2 value of 0.104. This means that the level of research self-efficacy of academic staff can lead to a 10.4% variation in the research productivity among the academic staff in the selected university.

Table presents the results of ANOVA (overall model significance) of the regression test which revealed that the level of research self-efficacy of academic staff has a significant influence on research productivity of academic staff in private university in Oyo state, Nigeria. This can be explained by the F-value (30.550) and low p-value (0.000) which is statistically significant at 95% confidence interval. Hence the result posited that the level of research self-efficacy of

academic staff has a significant influence on research productivity of academic staff in private university in Oyo state, Nigeria.

In addition, the results of regression coefficient in table 4, revealed that the level of research self-efficacy of academic staff has a significant influence on research productivity of academic staff in private universities in Oyo state, Nigeria. Specifically, the analysis showed that at 95% confidence level, a unit change in the level of research self-efficacy of academic staff will lead to 0.349 increase in research productivity of academic staff in private universities in Oyo state, Nigeria.

The null, hypothesis which states that there is no significant influence of level of research selfefficacy of academic staff on research productivity of academic staff in private universities, Oyo state, is therefore rejected.

Table 4: Summary of results of regression analysis showing significant influence of research self-efficacy on research productivity of academic staff in Private Universities, Oyo state

Model Summary

Model	R	R_2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.328[a]	.108	.104	2.88383

Predictors: (Constant), Level of research self-efficacy of academic staff

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	254.068	1	254.068	30.550	.000[a]
	Residual	2104.073	253	8.316		
	Total	2358.141	254			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Level of research self-efficacy of academic staff						
Dependent Variable: Level of research productivity of academic staff						

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	19.035	3.130			6.082	.000
	Level of research self-efficacy of academic staff	.349	.063	.328		5.527	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Level of research productivity of academic staff							

Source: Fieldwork 2023.

Conclusion

The result of the study validated that Research Self-efficacy is an important skill required of academic staff to achieve a robust research productivity. Based on this study, it was identified that academic staff witnessed scholars' academic presentations mostly. It was found that research self-efficacy influenced research productivity of the academic staff members. Research self-efficacy such as performance accomplishment, verbal persuasions and emotional arousal could predictors of research productivity of academic staff. Therefore, it is very important for academic staff members in private universities to acquire and incorporate research self-efficacy skill to enhance their research productivity.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Academic staff should work and improve on their research skills such as identifying research gaps, review literature extensively, follow the ethical principles of research and many more.

2. Private Universities need to improve in sponsoring their academic staff to workshops and seminars where they can hone their research skills and learn about the global best practices in research.

References

Adekunle, A.P. & Madukoma, E. (2022). Research Self-Efficacy and Research Productivity of Doctoral Students in Universities in Ogun State. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal*), 7097.

Adekunle, P.A. & Madukoma, E. (2022). Information Literacy, Critical Thinking and Research Productivity of Doctoral Students in Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria.
Library *Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 7050.
https://digitalcommonus.inl.edu/libphilprac/7050
Aithal, P.S. & Kumar, P. M. Global ranking and its implications in higher education. SCHOLEDGE, **International Journal of Business Policy & Governance**, 7(3), 2020,25-47.
Alemu, K. Factors determining research productivity in Ethiopian Universities. The case of MaddaWalabu University. **Social Science & Humanities** 8
,2023;100562.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100562

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control. W.H. Freeman and Company.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.8k.2.191

Bland, C. J., Weber-Main, A., Lund, Marie, S. & Finstad, D.A. (2005). *The Research – Productive Department: Strategies from Departments That Exce*l. Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Emami, M., Rezaei, S., Sangani, B. & Goh*, S.K. Ethical Considerations in Quantitative Tourism and Hospitality Researches. In Quantitative Tourism Research in Asia*, Springer, Singapore. 2019, 311-322.

Fijeh, B. A. Ogbomo, M.O. & Ifijeh, G. (2018). Utilization of Academic Library Resources for Research Productivity among Lecturers in Private Universities in South South Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice, (e-journal)*,
2071http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2071.
Fraser, C., Harrison, L., Millar, J., & Chutuape, D. Incentivizing and rewarding research outputs   Final   Report   2020
https://www.toiohomai.ac.nz/sites/default/files/inlinefiles/20.%20Fraser%20et%20al.p

 Gabbay, K. L. & Shoham, S. (2019). The Role of Academic Libraries in Research and Teaching. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 51(3), 721- 736.

Heng, K., Hamid, M.O. & Khan, A.. Research Engagement of Academics in the Global South: The Case of Cambodian Academics. **Globalisation, Societies and Education** 21(3)2022, 322-337 tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/

Jalal, A. (2020). Research Productivity in Higher Education Environment. *Journal of Higher   Education   Service   Science   and
 Management*. 3(1), https://www.joherd.co/journals/index.php
Jovelyn, G.D., Charity, R.A.P. & Manla, E.C. (2021). Research Self-Efficacy, Interest in Research and Research Knowledge of Graduate Students. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science* (IJRISS) 5(10).

Lase, E.P.S. & Hartijasti, Y. "The Effect of Individual and Leadership Characteristics Toward Research Productivity with Institutional Characteristics as a Mediator Variable: Analysis Toward Academic Lecturers in the Faculty of Economics and Faculty of Linguistic and Arts at University," *The South East Asian Journal of Management*, 12(1)2018, Article 2. DOI: 10.21002/seam.v12i1.9071

Sagone, E. & Indiana, M.L. The Roles of Academic Self-Efficacy and Intolerance of Uncertainty on Decisional Procrastination in University Students during the COVID-19 Pandemic. **Educ. Sci.** 13, 2023; 476. https://doi.org/10.3390/ educsci13050476

Simisaye, O.A. & Popoola, S.O. (2019). Relationship Between Information Literacy Skills and Research Productivity of Researchers in Nigeria, and the Mediating Role of Socio-Economic Factors. *Libres*, 29(1), 51-76.

Smith, T. E., Kat, S .J., Philip, J .O. & Carter, T.E. (2018). Comparing the Research Productivity of Social Work Doctoral Programs Using the h-Index. *Scientometrics*, 116(3), 1513-1530.

Information & Communication Technology Skills and Service Quality of Librarians in Agricultural Research Institutes, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

Theresa Folasade ODUSANYA
Department of Library and Documentation,
Federal College of Forestry, Ibadan
otheresafolasade@gmail.com

Sophia .V. ADEYEYE

Department of Information Management,

Lead City University, Ibadan

adeyeyesophia@gmail.com

Abstract

Like every other library, research libraries in Agriculture institutes are service rendering organizations with the sole aim of satisfying the researchers' information need through quality services. User's satisfaction is key to the usage of library and it resources. Like every other service rendering organizations, regular evaluation from user's perspective is inevitable especially in the face of obstructive nature of the technological innovation which has kept librarian on their toes thereby leaving them with no option but to be equipped with necessary Information and Communication Technology (ICT) skills for optimum and overall quality service. This study aimed at finding out influence of ICT skills of librarians on the quality of service rendered in Agriculture research institute, Ibadan, Oyo State. It's a descriptive study,