Management Techniques and Lecturers Output in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria

Olugbenga Timothy Ajadi

University of Free State, South Africa

Corresponding Author: ajagbesope@yahooco.uk

ABSTRACT

Publication and teaching cannot be underrated when measuring lecturers output in the university. This is because, lecturers output is central to research and training, career progression and university global ranking. The study generally identified the various management strategies and their implications for lecturer's publication and teaching output. Specifically, it investigated the most prominent management strategies used, the level of lecturers' publication and teaching output and the influence of management strategy on lecturers' output in Obafemi Awolowo University, . The population of the study comprised 1,225 academic staff of the university with a sample size of 250 using multistage sampling procedure. Questionnaire titled Management Techniques and Lecturers Output Questionnaire (MTLOQ) was used to elicit information from respondents. The study found participative management strategy as the most prominent strategy in Obafemi Awolowo University, followed by delegative and authoritative strategies In addition, the level of lecturer's publication was low with 175 low google scholar appearance, 196 low high citation counts, 155 do not publish frequently, 192 with low number of publications and 172 do not published in indexed journals and teaching output was high with 203 respondents having high good students performance, 178 having high frequent student feedback, 207 recorded high graduation rates and 191 recorded high student class participation. It was recommended that the university should take over the payment of lecturer's publication in high impact journals to increase the university and lecturer's visibility. The university can also attach monetary incentive to lecturers with good number of publications in indexed journals.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of lecturer's output cannot be underestimated in lecturer's career progression in universities across the globe. It is a major factor in elevating a lecturer from one cadre to another. Lecturers output is the result of efforts put in teaching and learning by lecturers in the university. It can be measured through publications of research findings and teaching. Publications and teaching are essential in measuring lecturer's subject matter knowledge, helping the country develop, promoting academic advancement in universities, and having a big influence on lecturers' career progression. This frequently plays a major role in tenure and promotion decisions, of lecturers in the universities. The output of lecturers can be regarded as a pointer to show the direction of the university and assist in achieving the mission and vision of the university without stress.

University lecturers are specially trained with distinct standards and principles. They are not just teachers that teaches alone according to Ogosu and Agi (2024), but they teach students from the community, transform them, and then return the altered people back to the society. The distinctive aspect of the university lecturers is their ability to be feasible through publication of their research

findings in reputable local and foreign outlets. They, in addition impart the cultures and abilities that people need to make meaningful contributions to the society.

Lecturer's output is advantageous to the lecturers in getting to the peak of their profession. The peak of lecturing job in the university is 'Professor'. This can be attained through lecturer's output in publication and teaching in addition to the satisfaction of other promotion criteria as may be set by the university. Some lecturers in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria have not been promoted over the years due to issues with their output. This might not be unconnected with inadequate output, management strategies, inadequate of management support for publication in high impact, Scopus, Thomas Reuters and other indexed journals. Adomi and Mordi (2003) observed that the quality and quantity of research publication in Nigeria was declining. This reduction in lecturers' output which often results in stagnation demands urgent investigation.

The level of lecturer's success in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria is measured by the level of research and teaching output as in other universities in Nigeria and beyond. Lecturers are responsible for teaching, management of student's activities and must publish empirical, theoretical or historical articles in credible outlets if desired promotion. This suggests that lecturers are engaged in other activities that may not allow them to have time to publish articles in credible outlets. This might be why Letina and Dikovic (2021) informed that lecturers' publication and teaching output are influenced by factors such as university policies, student factors, motivation and educational inputs.

Publication output can be referred to as the numerical count of the amount of research carried out by a lecturer, documented, and published in scholarly journals. Etomes, and Molua (2019) referred to it as the quantity of scholarly work that a lecturer published, in form of articles, chapter in books, conference papers, or other recognized publications, essentially representing the total amount of research disseminated through published materials; it's often used to measure a lecturer's output and relevance within a specific field. According to Nwosu, et al (2015), publication output is defined as the number of published pieces. Thus, the quantity of research conducted, recorded, and published in academic journal of repute is what makes up lecturers' publication output. Research output to Weli (2017), is any knowledge, understanding, discovery, or any other results that originate from an approved project excluding the data itself. The definition of research output evidently showed that it is the outcome of academic investigation to find out facts or re-establish facts with the use of primary or secondary data.

The amount of research conducted and published, is very important in the career journey of lecturers, considering the common saying "publish or perish." among lecturers in the universities. This implies that a lecturer that published scholarly work in institution acceptable outlets are considered for promotion at the appropriate time while those who do not publish are not considered for promotion. Teaching output on its own can be define as the tangible results produced by a teaching process, essentially what students demonstrate as what they have learnt after completing a course, including things like test scores, completed projects, presentations, essays, or any other observable evidence of acquired knowledge and skills. Teaching output to Adekola and Emordi (2019) is the total number of students that finally acquire educational success in their school life as it is considered to be the end product of the lecturer's inputs that is realized by a thorough process of evaluation and it ensures the desired goals of output have been achieved. To Okhojie (2019), teaching output is the total number of students that successfully completed a course of study or pass after satisfying the requirements to sit for examination.

Adewole (2014) in Ismail and Bongogoh (2017) informed that high output in any sector would mean increase in productivity. In the university, increase in lecturers' output would mean improved performance from lecturers leading to production of morally, spiritually, physically, mentally sound and

employable graduates who will not constitute nuisance. Lecturers are directly responsible for the success or failure of the university system because their output reflect the performance of the university. Anisah et al. (2020) also noted that lecturers as professional and functional staff are responsible for carrying out teaching and other related activities in the universities to showcase the universities performance.

Johnson and Birkland (2003) in Etomes and Molua (2019) also defined lecturers' output as a measure of the quantity and quality of the outcome, to their inputs in any aspect of their activities as lecturers such as test results, graduation rates, dropout rates, labour market outcome, school climate, teacher commitment and discipline. The success of students in the education and learning process will be determined by their teachers' input. Getange (2016) in Etomes and Molua (2019) explained that output on the part of the lecturers is determined by their level of participation in teaching, punctuality in the class, classroom management, proper use of instructional materials to facilitate learning and publication output. In this regard, the lecturers' output could be measured through annual report of the activities in terms of performance in teaching, and research publication.

Lecturers output according to Popoola (2008) is the combination of what students demonstrated after being taught by a particular lecturer; and report of research conducted and published in academic journal(s) or presented at academic conference(s). Okonedu (2016) defined it as the tangible results produced by a lecturer occasioned by their teaching and research activities, which include published articles, books, conference papers, presentations, research reports, and sometimes developed educational blueprint, creative or patent works. Lecturer output to Jumiran et al (2020) is referred to as the quantifiable outcome or achievement of a lecturer within teaching and publication at a specific time frame. Stinchcomb (2020) defined it as a measure of the efficiency and effectiveness of individual lecturer in transforming inputs into outputs. The value produced by a lecturer or group of lecturers is referred to as lecturer output, and it varies based on institution and employment function, Narasuci and Setiawan (2018).

Lecturers output is essential to the professional well-being and success of lecturers in the universities. It is also vital in enhancing both the quality of education and the professional satisfaction of academic staff. Lecturers must constantly improve their research skills, handle administrative duties, and hone their teaching strategies as they negotiate the challenging academic environment. This diverse job path offers chances as well as difficulties, necessitating a methodical approach to career progression. In turn, it is the duty of the university to give lecturers the tools and assistance they need to improve their output. According to Stinchcomb, (2020), lecturers output gives recognition to lecturers and to take up departmental, faculty and or university leadership responsibilities. This provides opportunity to influence institutional policies and play a crucial role in shaping the future of their departments, faculties or the university. To Kreber (2021), although these leadership positions provide substantial career progression opportunities, they also entail more administrative duties that could reduce time for lecturer's output. To Kreber, at this point, balancing academic and administrative responsibilities while also mentoring other members of the academic community is essential for successful career progression. Summarilty, lecturers' output is the successful completion of teaching and research tasks by individual lecturers in the university as stipulated in the condition of service.

A lecturer output is the substance of teaching, and provision of information to people outside the university through dissemination of research findings. McGrail et al (2006) posited that lecturer's output are statements of the knowledge, skills and abilities that individual lecturers should possess and can demonstrate in research upon completion of a teaching of a course or a topic or sequence of teaching experiences.

One component of career progression for lecturers is to create resources for lecturers output for them to become senior lecturers or professor in their universities. A lecturer's career describes their level

of status within a specific educational institution. It is crucial for all university lecturers to be aware of their opportunities for career progression while they are employed by the university. To Widodo (2015) lecturers career progression is the process of improving lecturer's own job skills in order to reach a desired career. According to Massie, et al (2015), lecturers career progression is the process by which an individual lecturer works on themselves in order to achieve their own career goals. In the opinion of Handoko (2013), the personal endeavours of a lecturer to fulfil a career plan constitute career progression.

According to Hemmings and Kay (2009), lecturers focus more on output as a result of the importance attached. In as much as output is very important to the lecturers, the institution, it is also important to the country at large. In a study carried out by Ajamu (2017) on academic staff output in selected Nigerian universities between 2011 – 2015. The study reported high lecturers' output as this is a major indicator of lecturer's promotion. In a related study conducted by Okonedu (2016) on level of lecturer's output in public universities in southwest Nigeria. The study also found high lecturers output irrespective of the condition of service. In addition, Arora et al (2017) carried out a study on lecturers output in University of Cape Coast, and University of Education, Winneba Ghana. The study found that lecturers' output was higher in the University of Cape Coast but lower in University of Education, Winneba.

Lecturers published for a number of reasons. To Attama (2013), there are three reasons why lecturers published. The first is to advance knowledge and understand the various facet of life, the second reason is to ensure that research training takes place in a qualitative way, while the third is for career progression. Assessing these will challenge the lecturers to publish for relevance, continuity and progression. Akuedwu et al (2017) concluded that lecturers concentrated more on teaching than publication of research findings The study revealed lecturers need to situate their teaching within the time limit set for teaching a course within a semester. Babbar et al (2019) in their own study on assessment of institutional and lecturers output in university found teaching output of lecturers was higher than publication output. The lecturers find it difficult turning students down when called for a class as stated on the university lecture time-table released for the semester lecture. A committed lecturer is expected to attend to his lectures without being called by the students. Despite the various benefits of publication output, Wadesango (2016) concluded that lecturers teaching output was more noticeable than research output because some lecturers still find it difficult to publish as a result of issues with research environment, funding and time available for research

However, Yusuf (2005) posited that lecturers' publication output was more than teaching output when they collaborated with each others to advance their prestige, recognition, and for grant. Yusuf (2005) and Muindi (2011). concluded that lecturers who have confidence in their research ability concentrated more on publication than teaching to build their profile. Yusuf and Muindi (2011), further informed that some of the lecturers feel that the quality of their articles is worthy enough for publication, hence, concentrate more on publication of research outcome than teaching

A good management technique by the university administration can increase lecturer output and satisfaction. Each university may have their own techniques of accomplishing goals. Management techniques are mechanisms put in place by administration to ensure increase in workers and institutions output. Adegbesan (2021) defined management techniques as strategies laid down by the institution to improve output from the staff and institution. Adeyemi (2016) in Ajadi (2024) informed that the prevailing institutional policies influences the choice of management technique. This is because institutional policies are premised on which management technique is laid. This will assist in achievement of aims and objectives of the institution which in most cases is increasing the output. A management technique to Bloom and Van Reenen (2023) is the technique adopted by manager to manage workers for increased output. To Bloom, et al (2020), it is a technique aimed at assisting workers to get the best from them and

increase output at minimum cost.   To Datta et al (2023), management techniques are methods used by administrators to plan, organise, coordinate, and control the activities of the institutions. To Van Reenen (2023), they are methods that assist in interacting with members of the institution, improves working relationship and achieve institutional goals on record time. Summarily, management techniques are ways adopted by institutional administration to manage human and material resources for efficiency.

Pizzolito et al (2022) identified authoritarian, participative and delegative management techniques as the foundational management techniques that can be used to direct, motivate and manage workers in educational institution. The author cautions that there is no right management technique anywhere because the technique that works for one institution may not work for another. Authoritarian management technique is a situation where the management give clear directive on what is expected of the staff. To Chiang et al. (2020) it is a technique that involves a leader having complete control over their subordinates. The technique allows the manager to use authority, as stated in the institution's books, to demand absolute obedience of their subordinates. The management decided the tasks and goals for the staff, based on management ideas and judgement without allowing any form of contribution from the staff. Schaubroeck et al. (2017) concluded that management of educational institutions that make use of this technique, tend to centralize their power and accentuate the power distance between them and the subordinate. Studies by Adeolu et al (2014), Schaubroeck et al. (2017), Rahmani et al. (2018), Okikiade (2019), Shen et al (2019), Chiang et al. (2020), Karakitapoğlu-Aygün et al. (2021) and Babatunde (2022) showed that the use of authoritarian management technique in the university reduced lecturer's output and encourages high turnover rate of lecturers. It was revealed that the limited power of lecturers in universities where this technique is in operation accounted for non-cooperation of lecturers as part of the working team. It also discourages lecturers innovation and independent ideas, hence, reduced output

The other strategy identified by Pizzolito et al is participative management strategy. It is a strategy where the management collaborate with staff in making decision. This strategy is used to build commitment and generate ideas that could be used to move the institutions forward. The involvement of lecturers in decision-making in the university with this strategy makes them feel relevant and recognized. This strategy according to Owolabi and Abdul-Hameed, (2011) satisfy lecturers self-actualization needs. According to Venter (2003) in Amos, et al (2019), employee participation in decision-making may increase levels of job satisfaction and, consequently, productivity. To Abadeenlahi and Shafiwu (2021) in a study conducted on participatory decision making and academic staff productivity, using University of Cape Coast in Ghana as a case study. The study found participative strategy as the most valuable strategy to increase lecturer's productivity in the university. The study established that this strategy strived for the collective goals of both lecturers and the university. By allowing lecturers' input in formulation and implementation of university policies and procedures, their level of commitment is impressive.   This improved communication and harmonious working relationship between the lecturers' and university and increase lecturers' morale and satisfaction.

In a related study by Ibrahim et al (2022) who investigated the impact of lecturers' participation in decision-making on productivity in federal university and two other state university in Lagos State, Nigeria. The researchers adopted a survey design. Questionnaire was administered on 137 selected respondents from the selected universities. The study tested the hypotheses formulated for the study using chi-square. The result revealed that lecturer participation has significant impact on lecturers' attitude, commitment and output. To Knudsen (2005) in Amos, et al (2019), lecturers' participation in university's decisions may not only give hope of a better involvement of the lecturers, but also leads to lecturers' higher effectiveness and efficiency.   In addition, Noah and Iyunokun (2018) in their study on lecturers' participation in decision- making within selected universities in Lagos State concluded that lecturers

output increased more when they take active part in decision-making and implementation in the university. Abadeenlahi and Shafiwu (2021), informed that this strategy leads to improved teaching and research skills due to their contributions to decision on university output policy before the implementation of the policy, and above all, it increases lecturers' overall productivity

Delegative strategy is another management strategy that can be used in educational institutions as pointed out by Pizzolito et al (2022). It is a strategy where lecturers are given authority to make decisions, take the glory or praise for a well-thought and taken decisions and take blame for a poorly conceived and taken decision. The lecturers are given high degree of freedom with this strategy. The management only provide guidance and support where necessary. Muhammad et al (2023) defined it as a management strategy in which the manager delegates a large part of the decision-making and responsibility to the workers. The concept is defined by Jaewon, et al (2010) as strategy where leaders of educational institutions delegates duties and responsibilities and backed it up with authority to take responsibility for outcome of the decisions. Jacobson et al (2018) in their study on the effects of University management delegative voice on lecturers' performance using 106 respondents. Both regression and correlation analysis were used to measure the variables. Management delegative voice was examined in terms of delegative influence on key lecturers work-related issues. It was found that delegative voice significantly contributed to improved lecturers' performance

Owolabi and Abdul-Hameed (2011) in Amos et al (2019) conducted a study on the relationship between delegative strategy and productivity in the manufacturing sector in Nigeria. The researcher adopted a cross sectional survey design, using a simple random sampling technique to select respondents, 740 copies of structured questionnaire were distributed to the staff of selected manufacturing companies in Lagos State. Of the distributed questionnaire, 90.54% (670) were duly filled and found useful for analysis. The descriptive statistics was used to answer the questions while, Pearson product moment correlation, regression analysis and Z-test of the inferential statistics were used to test the hypotheses. The study found statistically significant relationship between delegative strategy and productivity. In addition, the study found significant difference between the performance of workers who are allowed to take responsibilities for their decisions and those who are handed over instructions. The performance of workers who are given free hand to decide on what to do in line with the institutional goals were highly commendable than those who are handed over instruction.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Universities are ivory towers that are run by highly skilled, knowledgeable, and professional staff to enhance lecturers' output and career progression. Despite the expectations placed on the university worldwide, lecturers continue to struggle with their output, which has an indirect influence on their career progression within universities. Given the importance of a university education as the cornerstone of any country's development, the government and university authorities have not adopted management strategies to influence lecturers' output by offering opportunities for personal growth and career progression, which has varied in how much lecturers are promoted.

Management techniques employed by university is very germane to the lecturer's publication and teaching output. This is because publication and teaching output are germane to lecturer's career progression in universities across the globe. For any lecturer to stand out and get to the peak of the lecturing profession on record time in the university, there must be evidence of teaching and publication output. The management technique deployed by the university administration must be the one that will encourage lecturer's to be highly committed to the teaching and publication output. However, some lecturers in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria are not promoted over the years. This might not

be unconnected with the issue of their output as a requirement for promotion. This has deprived the lecturers of the opportunity to take up leadership position and influence the policies at the departmental, faculty or the university levels. Hence, this study investigated management techniques and lecturers output in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

METHODS

The study adopted descriptive research design of the *ex post facto. The study describeg the pattern of relationships between each variable based on empirical information collected with the help of the instruments created.* The population comprised all 1,225 academic staff from the 11 Faculties (Administration, Agricultural Science, Arts, Education, Environmental Design and Management, Law, Science, Social Sciences, Pharmacy, Computing and Technology) and two Colleges (Health Science and Postgraduate Colleges) in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. The multi-stage sampling procedure was adopted to select respondents for this study. The first stage was the use of purposive sampling technique to select five Humanities related Faculties (Administration, Arts, Science, Social Science, and Education) with four-year programmes duration. The purpose was to ensure that Science, Technology realted, Law and other courses with more than four year duration are excluded from the sampling The second stage was the use of simple random technique to select 50 participants each from the five selected faculties from Assistant Lecturers to Readers from the selected Faculties. Those on these cadres, are not yet professor and still need promotion in the university. A structured questionnaire titled 'Management Techniques and Lecturers Output Questionnaire (MTLOQ)' was used to collect information relating to Lecturer's demographic data, influence of management techniques on lecturers' output. The instrument was validated and trial tested. To ensure that the instruments was reliable, test-retest of the instrument was carried out on two occasions at two weeks interval on 20 academic staff from the University of Ibadan, which was not the university where the study was carried out. The trial tested instruments was analysed with Cronbach's alpha to measure the internal consistency, and reliability, of the instrument. The reliability value orindex of the instrumjent was 0.84. This was considered adequate for the instrument to be administered for the study. The researcher employ two research assistants to assist in administration and retrieval of the instrument. The researcher directed the research assistants to note respondents who could not fill and return the instrument immediately to facilitate follow-up and retrieval of the instrument as the respondents may request. Out of the 250 copies of questionnaire administered, only 239 copies were adequately filled and returned which brings the response rates to 95.6%. The research questions one and two were answered with percentage and mean of the descriptive and correlation of the inferential statistics to test the only hypothesis for the study. The researcher sorted out the respondents responses on identification of management startegies using frequency counts. In addition, the researcher employed Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) using correlation to test for the significant influence of management strategies on lecturers' output in Obafemi Awolowo University

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1: Identify the most prominent management strategies used in Obafemi Awolowo University?

Result presented in Table 1 showed that the most prominent strategies used in Obafemi Awolowo University is participative management strategy. This is followed by delegative and the least prominent as revealed in the Table is authoritative strategies. The most prominent strategy in the Obafemi Awolowo University is the type that allows lecturers to participate in and contribute to making decision. This implies that lecturers are part of the decision arrived at in the Obafemi Awolowo University.

Table 1. Most Prominent Management Strategies *in Obafemi Awolowo University*
N = 239

Strategies	Mostly Used (%)	Used (%)	Rarely Used (%)	Not Used (%)	Total (%)
Authoritative	18 (45)	12 (30)	4 (10)	6 (15)	40 (100)
Participative	90 (66.67)	20 (14.81)	15 (11.11)	10 (7.41)	135 (100)
Delegative	37 (57.81)	12 (18.75)	8 (12.5)	7 (10.94)	64 (100)
Total	145	44	27	23	239 (100)

This strategy is used to build commitment and generate ideas that could be used to move the university forward. The findings align with the findings of Venter (2003) in Amos, et al (2019), who found that employee participation in decision-making may increase their levels of job satisfaction and, consequently, productivity. It is also in agreement with the finding of Abadeenlahi and Shafiwu (2021) who found participative strategy as the most valuable strategy to increase lecturer's productivity in the university.

Research Question 2: What is the level of lecturers' publication and teaching output in Obafemi Awolowo University?

Table 2 showed respondents responses to the items to measure lecturer's level of publication output at OAU. The Table showed that the lecturer's level of publication at OAU was low. The respondent's responses to the items measured showed that 64 of the respondents google scholar appearance level was high while 175 of respondents google scholar appearance was low. In addition, 43 of the respondents high citation count was high while 196 of the respondents' high citation count was low. The Table also revealed that 84 of the respondents frequency of publication was high while 155 of the respondents frequency of publication was low. In addition, the Table showed that 47 of the respondents has high number of publications while 192 has low number of publications. Finally, only 67 of the respondents published in indexed journals while 172 of them do not. Summarily, from the Table, the lecturer's publication output was low.

Table 2. Lecturer's Level of Publication in OAU
N =239

Aspects Measured	High	Low
Google Scholar Appearance	64 (26.78%)	175 (73.22%)
High Citation Count	43 (28.00%)	196 (82.00%)
Frequency of Publications	84 (35.15%)	155 (64.85%)
High Number of Publications	47 (19.67%)	192 (80.33%)
Publication in Indexed Journals/Books	67 (28.03%)	172 (71.97%)

The result presented in Table 2 might not be unconnected to the fact that lecturers are not financially supported and encouraged to publish in high impact journals which could assist their google scholar appearance and citation count. It might also be as a result of more teaching load due to inadequate staff. The university has not employed academic staff in the last five years. This results in

increasing the teaching workload of those on ground. The lecturers may also be having issues with their research facilities such as laboratory, library, internet and electricity on campus. It may be because lecturers in OAU are not challenged by the reasons for lecturer's to published as identified by Attama (2013), who informed that there are three reasons why lecturers published: knowledge advancement, research and training and promotion. The result is in line with the findings of Yusuf (2005) who concluded that lecturers' publication output was more than teaching output. However, it is against the finding of Wadesango (2016) who conducted study on publish or perish: impediments to research output and publication and concluded that lecturers teaching output was more noticeable than research output.

Table 3. Lecturer's Level of Teaching Output in OAU

N =239

Aspects Measured	High	Low
Good Students Performance	203 (84.94%)	36 (15.06%)
Frequent Students Feedback	168 (70.29%)	71 (29.71%)
Assignment Quality	165 (69.04%)	74(30.96%)
Students Graduation Rates	207(86.61%)	32 (13.39%)
Student Participation in Class Activities	191 (79.92%)	48 (20.08%)

Table 3 showed respondents responses to the items to measure lecturer's level of teaching output at OAU. The Table showed that the lecturer's teaching output at OAU was high. The respondent's responses to the items measured showed that 203 of the respondents have high good students' performance while only 36 have low good students' performance. In addition, 168 of the respondents has high frequent students' feedback while 71 of them has low frequent students' feedback. The Table also revealed that 165 of the respondents has high quality assignment for the students while 74 has low quality assignment for them. Table 3 also showed 207 of the respondents has high students' graduation rates while 32 has low students' graduation rates. The Table finally revealed 191 has high student participation in class activities while 48 of the respondents has low students' participation in class activities. From the Table, it could be concluded that lecturers level of teaching output in OAU was high.

The result in Table 3 might be due to the presence of students to teach in the class during the semester. Hence, the lecturer will arrange for them. If not, it may lead to uncontrollable situation on the part of the students. Teaching is time bound. It is within the semester hence, what is meant for first semester, must be taught in the first semester. This result is in line with the position of Akuedwu et al (2017) who conducted a study on attitude towards quality teaching among lecturers in Universities in Southeast Nigeria. The study found that lecturers concentrated more on teaching than publication of their research findings. It also agreed with the finding of Babbar et al (2019) who conducted an empirical assessment of institutional and lecturers teaching output in university management. The researchers foundnd teaching output of lecturers was higher than publication output.

Hypothesis: Management strategies have no significant influence on lecturers' output in Obafemi Awolowo University?

Result presented in Table 4 showed a significant influence of management strategies on lecturers' output (0.882). This might be due to the fact that lecturers see their job as humanitarian work to assist students in realizing their potentials. In addition, lecturers' output Is one of the criteria for their

promotion and measure university standard. Hence, the need to adopt a management strategy to assist lecturers' output since lecturers' output is also one of the indicators of university global ranking. If lecturers' output is unimpressive, the image and recognition of the university are at stake. The university may lose both local and international patronage if the management strategy adopted does not influence output positively.

Table 4. Influence of Management Strategies on Lecturers Output
N=239

Variables	Manageme Strategi	Lecturers Outp
Management Strategies	1	
Lecturers' Output	0.882	1

** Significant at≤ 0.05

The result supported the finding of Babatunde (2022) who conducted a study on management efficiency and lecturers research output in southwestrn Nigerian Universities. The study concluded that the use of authoritarian management technique in the university reduced lecturer's output and encourages high turnover rate of lecturers. This implies that management strategy influences what happens to lecturer's output. It can also be concluded that it is in line with the findings of Noah and Iyunokun (2018) in their study on lecturers' participation in decision- making within selected universities in Lagos State. In their study it was concluded that lecturers output increased more when they take active part in decision-making and implementation in the university. This equally showed that management strategy influences lecturers output in the university. The finding also supported the position of Owolabi and Abdul-Hameed (2011) in Amos et al (2019) who found significant difference between the performance of workers who are allowed to take responsibilities for their decisions and those who are handed over instructions.

CONCLUSION

The study established the use authoritarian, participative and delegative management techniques in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria, leading to significant implications for lecturer's publication and teaching output. The findings showed that the most prominent strategies used Obafemi Awolowo University is participative management strategy, followed by delegative and authoritative strategies. The study specifically found the level of lecturer's publication output to be low while the lecturer's teaching output was high in Obafemi Awolowo University.

The study brought out the importance of appropriate management technique in improving lecturers output in the university. It is evidently clear that to improve lecturers' publication and teaching output, participative management strategy is the way out. This will boast lecturers google scholar appearance, increase their citation, encourage to publish regularly and in high impact outlets as well as improve students' performance, encourage student feedback, giving quality assignment, reduced dropout rates in the university. It will also improve the university image and global ranking.

Based on the conclusion from the study, the study recommended as follows:
(i) Obafemi Awolowo University administration should consolidate on the use of participatory management strategy by involving lecturers at various committees in the university. This will build lecturers confidence in the system and go a long way in improving lecturers output

(ii) Obafemi Awolowo University administration should give lecturers the chance to grow in their professions. This will give them additional information, abilities, and experience to deal with students' challenges and increase their publication and teaching output in the university.

(iii) The university should adopt measures to encourage change of lecturers' attitude to publication. The university can take over the payment of lecturer's publication in high impact journals to increase the university and lecturer's visibility. The university can also attach monetary incentive to lecturers with good number of publication in university selected accredited journals in line with the best practice.

(iv) To reduce lecturers teaching workload of lecturers, the university administration should employ lectures on sabbatical leave and pay from the internally generated revenue of the university to fill the gap. Since there are unresolved issues at the Federal Ministry of Education and National Universities Commission regarding employment of staff at the public universities in the country since the introduction of recently abolished centralized salary payment system (IPPIS) in the university. This will allow lecturers more time to concentrate on the publication output

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The researcher was confronted with uncooperative attitude of some respondents during administration of the instruments. The respondents are too busy with lectures and other university activities that did not allow them to give necessary attention to theee research assistants.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Further studies on the variables of this work could be conducted in other federal government own universities in southwesten region and other regions in the country. This study primarily focused on federal university, similar studies could be conducted in state-owned and private owned universities across the six geo-political zones in Nigeria.

By addressing these areas in further studies, studies can revealed the understanding of how appropriate management strategies can improve: lecturers output, career progression and university global ranking

REFERENCES

Abadeenlahi, I. A., & Shafiwu, A. G. (2021). Participatory decision making and academic staff productivity: A case study of University of Cape Coast, Ghana. *Business Economic Journal*, *5*(99), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.4172/2151-6219.100099

Adebanbi, J. R., Omoluabi, B. A. I., Emmanuel, J. A., & Adaranile, A. P. (2019). Participative management and lecturer's productivity in Nigerian universities. *Entrepreneurial Journal of Management Sciences*, *6*(1), 1-12.

Adegbesan, P. H. (2021). Management strategies and lecturer's output. *Journal of Education Science*, *21*(2), 178-186.

Adekola, J. O., & Emordi, P. Y. (2019). Publication in renowned journals and elevation of academic staff in Nigeria public universities. *Journal of Education Science*, *28*(1), 67-82.

Adiele, E. E., Leigha, M. B., & Abraham, L. N. (2010). *Introduction to teaching profession*. Harey Publications.

Adomi, E. E., & Mordi, C. (2003). Publication in foreign journals and promotion of academics in Nigeria. *Learned Publishing*, *16*(4), 229-235. https://www.libra.msra.cn/Publication/36274747/publication-in-foreign-journals-and-promotion-of-academics-in-nigeria

Adeolu, O. E., Obara, P., & Kachukwu, B. (2014). Leadership and productivity of academic staff in selected Nigerian universities. *International Scientific Research Journal*, *12*(2), 58-76.

Agi, U. K. (2023). *Priming internal mechanisms for the improvement of Nigeria's secondary education system in the 21st century*. Pearl Publishers.

Ajadi, O. T. (2024). Management strategies and workers job commitment in southwestern Nigeria Universities. *International Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *5*(5), 957-965. http://www.ijess.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/IJESSP24510243.pdf

Ajamu, S. A. (2017). Assessment of academic staff output in selected Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Applied Information Science*, *10*(3), 127-140.

Akuedwu, A. O., Ukachi, M. P., & Udesey, M. L. (2017). Attitude towards quality teaching among lecturers in universities in Southeast Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, *14*(3), 40-57.

Amos, J. R., Omolabi, I., & Suleiman, A. A. (2019). Participative management and employee job performance in a Nigerian manufacturing industry. *Entrepreneurial Journal of Management Sciences*, *6*(1), 1-11.

Anisah, A. O., Gistituati, N., & Rusdinal, G. A. (2020). Analysis of factors affecting teachers' productivity. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *504*(2), 137-151.

Arora, J., Trivedi, K. J., & Kembbavi, A. (2017). Impact of access to e-resources through the UGC–INFONET Digital Library Consortium on research output of member universities. *Current Science*, *107*(2), 307-315. https://www.currentscience.ac.in/Volumes107/02/0307

Attama, O. R. (2013). *Library resources utilization and publication output of academic staff of polytechnics in south-east and south-south Nigeria* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nigeria]. https://www.unn.edu.ng/publications/files/Dr.%20Attama%20pdf

Aviles, N. (2012). *Building strong school systems that hold on to all students*. Intercultural Research Development Association (IDRA). https://www.idra.org

Babatunde, M. O. (2022). Management efficiency and lecturers research output in southwestern Nigerian Universities. *International Journal of Operation Management*, *40*(2), 92-110.

Babbar, O. A., Hamilton, B. R., & Lyloid, J. A. (2019). An empirical assessment of institutional and lecturers teaching output in university management. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *37*(2), 395-413.

Blakley, L. (2006). *Rites of passage: The role of induction in the enculturation of beginning teachers* [Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans]. ScholarWorks@UNO. https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/379

Bloom, N., Lemos, R., Sadun, R., Scur, D., & Van Reenen, J. (2020). International data on measuring management practices. *American Economics Review*, *106*(5), 152-156.

Bloom, N., & Van Reenen, J. (2023). Why do management practices differ across firms and countries? *Journal of Economics Perspectives*, *24*(1), 203-224.

Chiang, J. T. J., Chen, X. P., Liu, H., Akutsu, S., & Wang, Z. (2020). We have emotions but can't show them! Authoritarian leadership, emotion suppression climate, and team performance. *Human Relations*, *74*, 1082-1111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720908649

Datta, D. K., Guthrie, J. P., & Wright, P. M. (2023). Human resource management and labour productivity: Does industry matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(1), 135-145.

Dutton, P., & McLaughlin, J. (2023). *Organizational subculture: Types, importance and examples*. https://study.com/academy/lesson/organizational-subculture-definition-examples.html

Etomes, S. E., & Molua, E. L. (2019). Strategies for enhancing the productivity of university lecturers in South West Region of Cameroon. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *8*(1), 14-31.

Glavaa, C., & Glavab, A. (2016). Beliefs of pre-service teachers master students on school as an enculturation factor. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*. https://www.europeanproceedings.com

Glossary of Education Reforms. (2023). School culture. https://www.edglossary.org

Handoko, T. H. (2013). *Personnel and human resources management* (2nd ed.). BPFE.

He, T., & Wang, W. (2006). Library and information science research in China: An international perspective. *International Information Library Review*, *38*(4), 185-191. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2006.10762721

Hemmings, B., & Kay, R. (2009, November). *Lecturer self-efficacy, research skills, and publication output* [Conference presentation]. Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) Conference, Brisbane, Australia. https://www.lier.org.au/iier19/hemmings3.pdf

Herrity, J. (2024). *8 types of management styles for effective leadership*. https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/management-styles

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. McGraw-Hill.

Ibrahim, N. P., Mohammed, I. G., & Idrisu, I. O. (2021). Lecturers participation in decision making and its impact on output: An appraisal of federal government university and two other state universities in North-Central, Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Sciences*, *9*(2), 64-79.

Igere, M. A. (2022). Publication output of lecturers in library schools, Nigeria. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, *3*(3), 260-276.

Ismail, A., & Bongogoh, S. (2017). The supervisor's role in training programmes: An empirical study in one city based local authority in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Unitare Journal*, *3*(2), 191-208.

Jacobson, A. O., Johnson, Y. B., & Fritson, B. J. (2018). University management delegative voice and lecturers' performance. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *54*(3), 79-92.

Jaewon, K., John, P. M., & Frits, K. P. (2010). Employee voice and organisational performance: Team versus representative influence. *SAGE Journals*, *63*(3), 120-135. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709348936

Jumiran, N. D., Nugroho, Y. A., Sutardi, D., Sasono, I., & Asbari, M. (2020). The influence of transformational leadership dimensions on job satisfaction and lecturer's commitment: Case study of private university lecturers. *Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, *2*(1), 600-621. https://ummaspul.e-journal.id/Edupsycouns/article/view/555

Kanya, N., & Fathoni, A. B. (2021). Factors affecting teacher performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *10*(4). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356664542

Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z., Gumusluoglu, L., Erturk, A., & Scandura, T. A. (2021). Two to tango? A cross-cultural investigation of the leader-follower agreement on authoritarian leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, *128*, 473-485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.02

Knudsen, C. (2005). Performance-related pay: Objectives and application of human resource. *Management Journal*, *32*(3), 16-33.

Kreber, C. (2021). Authenticity in teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *111*, 25-35.

Letina, A., & Dikovic, M. (2021). Lecturers output management and their beliefs on effective teaching behaviour. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, *72*(138).

Massie, R., Tewal, B., & Sendow, G. (2015). The influence of career planning, training and career development on employee performance at the North Sulawesi Provincial State Museum. *Efficiency Scientific Periodical Journal*, *15*(5), 11-17.

McGrail, M. R., Rickard, C. M., & Jones, R. (2006). Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *25*(1), 19-35. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360500453053

Muhammad, N. K., Yunus, H., & Tin, A. K. (2023). The influence of delegative leadership style, work motivation and organizational commitment on teacher performance at MTs Tanwiriyyah Cianjur. *International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management*, *5*(8), 168-177.

Muindi, F. K. (2011). *The relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction among academic staff in the school of business, University of Nairobi* [Master's thesis]. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366921693_Career_Development_and_University_Teacher%27s_Performance

Narasuci, W., & Setiawan, M. (2018). Effect of work environment on lecturer performance mediated by work motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Management Applications*, *16*(4), 645-653.

Naylor, S. L. V. D. (1990). *Teachers' perceptions of their enculturation process*. UNT Digital Library. https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark

Noah, B. K., & Iyunokun, A. C. (2018). A study of lecturers' participation in management decision making within selected universities in Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science*, *27*(2), 41-53.

Nwosu, O. C., Obiamalu, A. R., & Udem, O. K. (2015). Relationship between information literacy skills and research output of academic staff in Nnamadi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Information Science and Technology*, *8*(1), 89-108.

Ogosu, D. A., & Agi, U. K. (2024). Improving teachers productivity through enculturation in secondary schools. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, *17*(1), 49-59. https://www.ijsre.com.ng/assets/vol.%2C-17(1)-deborah-abraham-ogosu---agi-.pdf

Okhojie, A. M. (2019). Lecturer's productivity in selected universities in Nigeria. *Higher Education Research*, *34*(2), 87-106.

Okikiade, M. B. (2019). Leadership style, course load and ratings of lecturers. *Journal of Applied Science*, *33*(3), 104-133.

Okonedo, S. (2016). Research and publication output of lecturers in public universities in south-west, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, *191*(4), 37-51.

Ololube, N. P. (2017). *Educational management, planning and supervision: Model for effective implementation* (2nd ed.). Pearl Publishers.

Owolabi, L. K., & Abdul-Hameed, A. S. (2011). Employee involvement in decision making and firms performance in the manufacturing sector in Nigeria. *Serbian Journal of Management*, *6*(1), 1-15.

Pizzolito, E., Verna, I., & Venditti, M. (2022). Authoritarian leadership styles and performance: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Management Review Quarterly*, *73*, 841-871. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-022-00263-y

Popoola, S. O. (2008). The use of information sources and services and its effect on the research output of social scientist in Nigerian Universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, *183*(4), 1-10. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/183

Rahmani, M., Roels, G., & Karmarkar, U. S. (2018). Team leadership and performance: Combining the roles of direction and contribution. *Management Science*, *64*, 5234-5249. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2017.2911

Schaubroeck, P. L., Lebo, M. P., Odigbo, B. E., & Iheanacho, M. U. (2021). Management strategies and university teachers' performance in Nigeria. *Solid State Technology*, *64*(2), 1-11.

Shen, Y., Chou, W. J., & Schaubroeck, J. M. (2019). The roles of relational identification and workgroup cultural values in linking authoritarian leadership to employee performance. *European Journal of Work Organisation and Psychology*, *28*, 498-509. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2019.1615453

Stinchcomb, J. B. (2020). Developing a comprehensive academic leadership program. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *42*(4), 471-483.

Van Reenen, J. (2023). Does competition raise productivity through improving management technique? *International Journal of Industrial Organisation*, *42*(3), 306-316.

Venter, E. (2003). *Leadership of organisational members*. South-Western Publishing.

Wadesango, N. (2016). Publish or perish: Impediments to research output and publication. *International Journal of Education Science*, *8*(1), 57-63. https://doi.org/10.1080/09751122.2014.11890118

Weli, S. E. (2017). *Contemporary educational administration*. Harey Publications.

Wey-Amaewhule, B., & Udofia, A. E. A. (2022). Influence of teachers' orientation on instructional delivery in public senior secondary schools in Rivers State. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, *3*(12). http://www.ijrpr.com

Widodo, S. (2015). *Human resource management: Theory, strategic planning, key issues and globalization*. Manggu Media.

Yusuf, M. O. (2005). An investigation into teachers' self-efficacy in implementing computer education in Nigerian secondary schools. *Meridian: A Middle School Computer Technologies Journal*, *8*(2), 4-18.