

PERCEPTION OF USE OF LEGAL INFORMATION RESOURCES AND RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY OF LAW LECTURERS IN SOUTH-WESTERN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES

¹O.S.Akinwumi, ²S.O.Uwaifo, Ph.D and ³E.F. Ogbomo, Ph.D
¹Nigerian Law School, Abuja, ^{2&3}Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

Email: olayinkasilas2000@gmail.com, esoobas@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at investigating perception and research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian Universities. The study was guided by five research questions, and one research hypothesis. However, the research design used for the study was Correlational research design because it measures the degree of relationship between variables used in the study without the researcher manipulating either 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 Technique. The research instrument for the study was questionnaire in which some were adapted and some were self-developed. The data obtained from the 21 universities under study were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics which included Frequencies, Means, Standard Deviation while Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used to test the hypothesis. The results obtained from this study showed that the level of law lecturers' perception about research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities was high. However, the study revealed that the level of research productivity of law lecturers in the zone 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 ensure that adequate, relevant and up-to-date legal information resources are available for the law lecturers in the respective university libraries in order to improve their academic growth and research development. This is to make the library more responsive to the needs of users.

--

Key words: perception, legal information resources, research productivity, law lecturers, universities

INTRODUCTION

Universities are the hub of any higher educational system. They are institutions of higher learning participating in the evolution of knowledge and providing facilities for learning, 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 have become imperative to measure the success of any academic institution, it, therefore, becomes significant for faculty members to be more productive in research. The law faculty is not oblivious of the fact that it is a support system set up to enhance teaching, learning and promoting the publication of research work and community services thereby fulfilling the mission of the university as an institution to advance, create and disseminate knowledge through research and provide service to the community.

It is in this context that research productivity becomes the yardstick of academic performance and excellence of any academic staff within the university environment in terms of quality and quantity of research work. 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 his or her research output and knowledge advancement. Little wonder, therefore, why Mcloed (2008) expressed that research productivity had to do with the

entirety of researches conducted by law lecturers (and other faculty members) in their career over a specified time frame which largely was a product of the quality and quantity of research work published as books or in chapters, articles in learned journals, conferences and workshop proceedings, among others.

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 further 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 and some of the constraints bordered on age, gender, rank, qualification, salary, among others. The authors also opined that scholarly publications were used most often to measure the productivity of an institution which has been recognised worldwide 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.

Kpolovie and Dorgu, 2019 as cited by Akinwumi (2023), research productivity in most African universities was significantly lower than the world average of 17.50 and 971 using h-index and citation index of faculty's research productivity. The h-index explains the number of publications, the total number of citations and the age average of an article whilst citation index is the number of times a published research work has been cited by other scholars. In other words, the purpose of h-index and citation index is to measure the level of research output of an academic staff. For instance, in comparing the research publication index of few of the African universities like, universities of Cape Town, Pretoria and Cairo, the citation index of their research productivity was significantly greater than those of Nigerian and other African universities. Thus, when we compare research productivity globally and then narrowing it down to the research output locally, it has shown that the research productivity locally is low. This is more noticeable if it is compared with the h-index and citation index of research productivity in the global world. Nonetheless, in some of the universities in other African countries like South Africa, the research productivity is significantly greater than some of the world average (Kpolovie, 2019).

If we rank the research productivity of universities globally, it was observed that the ranking of universities globally by different ranking bodies was primarily based on research productivity of the faculty in each institution; and results showed that African universities performed very poorly in the ranking (Kpolovie & Obilor, 2013). This was probably because little or no attention was paid to research productivity in the African universities surveyed. This could also be as a result of non-chalant attitude of the governments in the African countries to invest much in research and development (Kpolovie, 2019). Little wonder, therefore, that only one university (University of Cape Town) made the top 193 world universities in the 2020 Times Higher Education (THE) Ranking and this is the best ever outing of African universities if they are compared, for instance, with those in Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Oxford, Cambridge, Stamford, among others.

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 increases the

social prestige of the academic staff, 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. It also 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). This is also why research productivity has been widely acknowledged not only in academic communities but also in management organisations (Way *et al.*, 2019).

Be that as it may, perception of use of legal information resources is a variable that can influence research productivity. It has been observed overtime that perception of use of legal information resources for research and publishing by academic staff particularly law lecturers in most Nigerian and African universities suggests that most of them concentrate more on teaching and advocacy as main focus of their assignment as university teachers. This is most often detrimental to their research productivity. As a result, the current perception of most law lecturers towards the use of legal information resources in higher education judging from global perspective threatens the universities' abilities to sustain the conditions that support research productivity. Besides, increased demands on government and private funding, deteriorating physical structure, poor funding of the library, increased pressure on undergraduate programmes, university expansion strategies and general economic climate have raised concerns about the continued capacity of universities to maintain teaching, research and service to the community (Okonedo-Adegboye, Bamgiboye & Emmanuel, 2015). Again, perception of use of legal information resources has to do with the importance attached to the use of the information resources which will advance the knowledge of a lecturer for research productivity. Okonedo *et al.* (2015) asserted that the pre-occupation of any lecturer irrespective of his or her nature of specialisation or academic inclination, is to conduct research and present through scholarly publications with regard to effective use of information resources relevant to his or her research findings for knowledge advancement.

Ayua (2001), as cited by Uluocha and Mabawonku (2014) described the perception of use of legal information resources as legal literature a law lecturer or law related scholar regards as indispensable tools of legal education without which no meaningful research could be successfully accomplished either within or outside of the university environment. Examples of legal information resources in this regard include: books, statutes, periodicals (case laws, journals), monographs, digests, case reviews, among others. These resources enhance the research productivity of law lecturers especially where they are available and can be easily accessible in the library or other information centres. Besides, perception of use of legal information resources is considered strenuous by some academics which requires adequate preparation and commitment. Observation shows that some faculty members expect that inspiration comes in a magical form and can make their writings also magical thereby making them oblivious of the fact that writing is a gradual process guided by personal commitment and stringent discipline. Perception of the use of legal information resources, therefore, becomes the processes by which an individual becomes aware of and interprets information about the environment with inner disposition towards an object, idea or individual outcome that is either positive or negative (Oriogu, Ogbuiyi & Chuwuemeke, 2018; Amadi, 2021).

However, from the discussion so far, this study would make an attempt to investigate how perception of use of legal information resources may influence the research productivity of law lecturers with reference to the universities within the South-western Nigeria.

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. 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 perception of use of the relevant legal information resources 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 empirical research on the research productivity of law lecturers in order to ascertain or establish reasons for low level of research productivity among the faculty members in South-western Nigerian universities.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study is to investigate perception of use of legal information resources and research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian Universities.

Specifically, the purpose is to:

1. evaluate the perception of use of legal information resources for research productivity by law lecturers in the universities;
2. examine the types of legal information resources being used by law lecturers in the universities;
3. analyse the extent of the use of legal information resources by law lecturers in the universities;
4. investigate the challenges often encountered in the use of legal information resources for research productivity by law lecturers in the universities; and
5. determine the extent of research productivity of law lecturers in the universities.

Research Questions

The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent do law lecturers perceive the use of legal information resources for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities?
2. What are the types of legal information resources used by law lecturers for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities?
3. To what extent has the use of legal information resources enhanced the research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities?
4. What are the challenges of the use of legal information resources on the research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities?
5. To what extent are law lecturers productive in terms of research in South-western Nigerian universities.

Research Hypotheses

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

1. Perception of use of legal information resources 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. The study 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 perception of use of legal information resources about research productivity of law lecturers in universities thereby spurring researchers' interests in research productivity in South-western Nigeria, Africa and the world at large.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Generally, perception is the way individuals organise and interpret their sensory input. It is basically the meaning an individual gives to his or her environment to make sense of the world. Perception is important because an individual behaviour is based on his or her level of perception. Therefore, in relating perception to use of legal information resources for research productivity in particular to law lecturers, Migosi, Muola and Maithya (2013), Agha, Adam and Ujebe (2018) asserted that academic research represented the backbone of human activities in improving the quality of life through expanding frontiers of academic knowledge and making further research possible in the world. In this way, perception of use of legal information resources entails how a law lecturer interprets his role and activities within a university environment which can drive the individual to attain new knowledge in terms of research skills for the purpose of improving his or her efficiency to himself or herself, the students and the university at large. A positive perception directs the lecturer on the need to use relevant information resources in order to improve his or her research productivity for the benefit of his academic growth and his relevance to the university community.

Okiki (2013) noted that quality research exposed academic staff to current information and sharing of research results with others. He maintained that the significance of research in the academic was to enable academics share insight, demonstrate academic scholarship and gain recognition for creative thinking. Therefore, for any faculty member to achieve this, there must be awareness of the importance of sourcing relevant information for the study he or she intends to carry out as scholar. The author (Okiki, 2013) also emphasised that the global academic syndrome of publish or perish was a popular cliché or jingle among academics in any university setting. This cliché underscored the importance attached to research and publication in universities across the globe. It should also be noted that the measures of success in academics is the result of effective perception of use of information resources for research productivity. The academic staff must be aware of and need to have access to avalanche of information resources with the knowledge of what is the current issue in his or her field of study. This is based on the level of his or her perception of what is in existence in the chosen area of study. In the earlier study conducted by Okiki (2011), it was stressed that perception of use (and availability) of information resources required the academic to have the ability to identify what resources were available for explanation, where they were available, how to access them, the merits of individual resources, types and when it was appropriate to use them. No doubt, these may have great implications for academic research activities and the ability of individuals to use the available information resources for research

productivity largely depends on the position or perception the individual shows towards research writing for personal development in the university community (Okiki,2011). Citing Ibrahim (2004) in the study carried out on use and user perception of information and electronic resources in the United Arab Emirates'University, Okiki (2013) again posited that some of the electronic resources (e-resources) such as electronic databases(e-databases), e-documents, internet, e-mail facilities, e-reports, were some of the useful tools perceived by law lecturers for research output.

Oriogu, Ogbuiyi and Chukwuemeka (2018) asserted that perception was the set of processes by which an individual became aware of and interpreted information about the environment which enabled an inner disposition towards an object or individual with an outcome that was either positive or negative. It was explained further that faculty perception of information resources available in the library or on the internet might ultimately influenced law lecturers' use or non-use of the resources. Thus, individuals' behaviour on perception of what reality is and why users of information selectively interpret what they see based on their basic knowledge, understanding, experience, use and the meaning they attach to it becomes indispensable. The level of perception of law lecturers to use of legal information resources and services determines its value and rate of use. Besides, it determines the view and opinion on how the nature of the information resources and services are sought and how necessary services and actions are provided by librarians and other information professionals to meet the demands of users. Moreover, the level of lecturers' perception as major users of these information resources would help to guide and direct how the available information resources can best be used to meet their research goal. Oriogu *et al.*,(2018) also explained that the perception of law lecturers to use of legal information resources should be based on the following factors:usefulness of service, that is, On-line Public Access (OPAC), availability of information, adequacy of information resources, currency/Update of information resources, organisation of resources, availability of electronic resources (internet, e-legal databases), competence of staff, attitude of the Librarian ,discernment/accessibility of library portal.

Eyolorunshe, Eluwole and Aregbesola (2017) in their study revealed that lecturers of Landmark University in Nigeria were very much aware of the information resources necessary for their research output; and these resources could be easily accessible in the library or in the comfort of their home via internet. Yet results had shown that the frequencyof use of such information was low compared to the level of their perception on the use of these resources. As observed, this is not different from the case of many law lecturers in some Nigerian universities.Little wonder, Sajanel (2017) indicated from his findings that perception of use of information resources was mainly by formal and informal engagement for instance, library orientation and interaction among academic colleagues. The study by Gurikar and Gurikar (2015) on research scholars in different faculties in Karamatak University showed how the use of information resources had changed from print materials to e-resources which also indicated that many of the academic scholars were eager to use electronic information resources to complement print resources. Besides, the study of Amad and Panda (2013) revealed that perception among law lecturers regarding the use of information resources (both prints and electronic format) for research productivity was found highly satisfactory in Indian Institutes in Dubai International Academic City (DIAC).

Mathabela (2018) in his study of information needs and information seeking behavior of Private Practicing Lawyers in Swaziland lent credence explaining that generally the use of legal information resources by lawyers consisted formal and informal resources, human resources, print format and electronic resources which would always have a role to play in the law lecturer's research growth. The scholar further argued that this had changed the perception of most law lecturers who seemingly preferred printed sources until mid-21st century where the perception began to change as a result of the evolution of information in electronic formats.Okiki (2012) in a survey on use of electronic information resources, perception, attitude and use by academic staff members of University of Lagos noted that 55 percent of the faculty members indicated that their level of perception of the subscribed information resources both (print and non- print) was rather low and admitted that the perception of faculty members to visit the library to access and use the information

resources available for research advancement was twice or thrice a month which was signified as low by all given standard with regard to research productivity.

Besides, in separate studies carried out by ITHAKA (2010) and Akpojotor (2016), it showed correlation of gradual decline in the perceived importance of the gateway function and the increase in the perceived importance of the buyer function. The distributing trend noted by the studies was that the perception or awareness of information resources had disintegrated the library from the research process. Namusgera (2014) and Aina (2014) remarked that lack of awareness of library materials and services was the greatest problem affecting law lecturers' use of the library or any other information centre to access legal information resources. The studies suggested that this problem of low awareness could be solved by more aggressive marketing of information resources (both legal and non-legal); and active participation of librarians in faculty meetings for ways to improve services. This would stimulate the perception and interests of faculty members in quest for more information resources (legal or non-legal) for their research advancement.

Gee-Whakho and Ling (2017) in their study on perceptions of lecturers' use of information resources for research productivity in a Malaysian University explained that there were two main necessities in the job description of tertiary institutions: teaching and conducting research. Generally, it is observed that one of the major duties of a university lecturer is to write a research paper, present it at a conference or publish it in a learned journal. This has been part of the criteria for promotion in the universities. Therefore, research is essential to lecturers' professional development. Thus, it was observed in the study that lecturers, generally perceived research being useful in teaching, learning and advancement of academic knowledge. Gee-Whakho and Ling. (2017) remarked that the perception displayed by lecturers towards the use of information resources for research development was practically based on promotion and salary increase. They also argued that lecturers were knowledgeable about what it takes to do research; and are positive about the benefits of working in the university. The perception of lecturers towards the use of information resources in this regard may be said to boil down to measuring the advantages it could be to them individually and professionally. Thus, those with high perception of the need to improve their academic status have always realised that they should attend some research and publication workshops so that they could be exposed to the techniques of writing conference or journal papers; and strategies to get it duly published. Besides, such experienced lecturers may guide the inadequacies of other colleagues (that is, lecturers with low perception to use of information resources) in writing good papers for publication.

A study by Suwamiala as cited by Gee-Whakho and Ling (2017) expressed that perception of use of legal information resources for research productivity among academic staff in Chulalongkon University showed that many of the academic members were short of the understanding, abilities, experiences and resources to do research. This accounted for low research productivity of lecturers in the university. Besides, lack of encouragement and attractive motivation methods could be said to have affected the lecturers' capabilities in conducting good research. Low perception also constrained lecturers' inabilities to think beyond research they were personally interested in conducting rather than tempting to conduct research that would be more beneficial to both their university community and national development. It was also revealed in the study that the level of lecturers' perception of use information resources on research productivity weighed on image was 3.61 or moderate which indicated that most of the lecturers had a good image in doing research that could build trustworthiness or reliability; and this was obtained in an average mean of 3.90 or high.

In our humble opinion, the level of lecturers' perception of use of information resources has enabled some faculty members to gain a greater insight or perception with what was happening in the minds of their students; and created opportunities for networking with other vibrant and diligent educators whose perception were high. Lecturers with high or positive perception towards the use of any type of the information resources did not engage in research purposely for pecuniary gain but for quest for more information resources to boost their research output even if it would increase

their pay later. In addition, the study looked at lecturers' perception of use of information resources for research output in terms of cost. The information gathered exhibited by the study rated the overall mean of lecturers' perception in terms of cost at 3.43 or moderate which indicated that their perception of use of information resources to conduct research required a certain amount of money. This simply meant that lecturers in this category had to use their own money for printing questionnaire, search for information resources (prints and non- prints) to enhance their research productivity. Although, expenses could be shared when lecturers with high perception of use of information resources were willing to break the isolation and start on collaborating with other lecturers. The study further revealed that the perception of lecturers' use of information resources for knowledge and productivity was seen in terms of time. It was explained that the overall mean of lecturers' perception of use of information resources in conducting research in terms of time was put at 2.68 mean or moderate indicating that the item was firmly evident in some occasions.

This simply meant that conducting research needed a lot of time arguing that most of the respondents disagreed with the fact that doing research was a waste of time which could be undertaken while teaching. This result moderately confirmed that the findings of Mukrim as cited by Gee-Whakho and Ling (2017) confirmed that time constraints was one of the challenges being faced when conducting research. Perception of lecturers towards the use of information resources was also confirmed from the study that heavy workload such as abundance of teaching activities; and engaging in other administrative activities might hinder lecturers to grow academically in terms of conducting research in order to improve their academic productivity. Although, they could collaborate with colleagues to do research but this would largely depend on the positive mind to space their time to carry out a robust research work.

Moreover, it was noted in the study by Gee-Whakho and Ling (2017) that lecturers' perception of use of information resources for research productivity in the academic community was in terms of individual effort with the overall average mean score of 2.90. This indicated that most of the lecturers fairly agreed that using information resources for conducting research needed some effort. The lowest level of average mean of doing research in terms of effort was also put at 2.82 or moderately level affirming that research could be done without much effort. However, Gee-Whakho and Ling (2017) highlighted seven steps in conducting research that required lecturers' individual effort. These were: initiation, preliminary investigation, formulation of hypothesis (where necessary), intervention, evaluation, dissemination and follow-up. At this juncture, it is necessary to state that we should not also be oblivious of the fact that the perception to use legal information resources by law lecturers could be seen in terms of technicality. Lecturers saw this as one of the quickest way to access timely the right resources anywhere, anytime showing that the lecturer was sufficient in possessing the method or technique of sourcing his or her information without which he or she might find difficult when accessing the available information resources to enhance his or her research knowledge output.

In lending credence to the views of Gee-Whakho and Ling (2017), Olojede (2016) in his study expressed that the perception of academic staff on the use of information resources in print and electronic format was found to be positive with grand mean score of 3.05. This implied that respondents appreciated the benefit accrued by the use of the resources. It also showed an indication that perception preceded action or behaviour in which individual lecturers were able to synthesise and integrate series of new information in the light of what they knew and made a meaning out of it. Olojede (2016) also stressed that perception modified action in terms of peoples behaviour. It is simply the same perception or awareness of knowing what to do, when to do, and how to do. Therefore, for any academic staff to use information resources for research to increase output, he or she must first be aware of the task he engages and the positive mind he has about the information resources to consult in order to enhance his research output. Where the perception is low, the ability to consult or engage and able to access relevant information resources for research productivity becomes a mirage! Again, it was observed (by me) from the study that for any lecturer within an academic system to be academically productive, he or she must first be aware of his or

her action, his or her purpose in the university environment and the goal he hopes to achieve. The lecturer must also know what should be done to attain academic excellence within such an environment. The ability to do this depends on his or awareness of the goal of the institution as well as his or her goal as academic staff. This is when individual lecturer will begin to take proactive step towards achieving such a desirable goal (Olojede, 2016).

Khan and Bhatti (2012) while reporting the results of a study on information needs of law faculty members at university of Peshawar and its 17 affiliated colleges, observed that the preferences of the law faculty members for various information resources were library use patterns and convenient study spaces but majority were not satisfied with the provision of library resources, facilities and services. Shakeel and Rabina (2011) explained that perception towards the use of information resources by law lecturers was for general knowledge, for guiding and supporting research work for purpose of workshop and seminar presentations, to carry out administrative work and leisure reading only. Ossai(2011) submitted that majority of law lecturers sought information for the purpose of current development, update their knowledge and current awareness. However, the electronic resources were found to be inadequate in terms of use and user satisfaction.

Uluocha and Mabawonku(2014)and Uluocha (2015) stressed that law books, legal periodicals, reference materials, law reports or case laws, legislation/statutes, loose leaf, indexes and abstracts were adequately available to law lecturers in some Nigerian universities. Using multistage sampling technique to select 517 out of 905 law lecturers from 16 faculties of law in 29 universities across the six geo-political zones of Nigeria, Uluocha and Mabawonku stressed that law books, law reports, indexes and abstracts, law journals, legislation/statutes, legal digests and e-resources (internet) were used daily by some law lecturers in universities in Nigeria. They concluded that there was need for universities to invest more on access to legal information resources and provision of well-equipped and up-to-date law libraries with current legal information which are regarded as indices for enhanced use of legal information resources. They also suggested that constant awareness programmes in law libraries by law librarians and continuous training of law lecturers on the use of legal information resources were indispensable. Padma and Ramasani(2017)revealed in their study that 62.5 percent of law lecturers made use of internet resources, 63 percent used e-mails, 29 percent used open and subscribed online legal databases showing that the perception of law lecturers towards the use of legal information resources varied according to needs, environment, time and usefulness of the information resources to research productivity.

Types of Legal Information Resources in Law Libraries for Research Productivity

Legal Information Resources are essential ingredients for effective legal research. Uluocha and Mabawonku (2014) asserted that legal information resources could be described as legal literature that are indispensable tools of legal education which entail the provision and supply of information at the right quantity and quality time. They further explained that the use of legal information resources, to a large extent, depended on the efforts put in place by the information professionals in organising information resources appropriately for timely use by law lecturers and other related scholars. They concluded that legal information resources were basic tools for legal productivity. In a separate study by Uluocha (2015), legal information literature were described as resources that enhance legal research and knowledge - examples of which are legal prints including books, case laws or law reports, government publications, case reviews, monographs, (legal) theses and dissertations, legal periodicals (law journals and magazines), reference materials (newspapers) and non-legal resources.

Umar and Sokari (2020) buttressed that the types of legal information resources used by law lecturers included: books, case laws, journals, legal encyclopaedias, legal dictionaries (for instance, Black's Law), legal digests, indexes and abstracts, treaties and international laws, bye-laws, acts, gazettes, proclamations, bills, newspapers, legal databases, research reports, theses and dissertations, case reviews, law reviews and monographs noting that these could be in both printed and electronic formats. These legal information materials are the materials that (law)

libraries should make available to their patrons or users including academics, research scholars, and students for generation of new knowledge. They are tools used by law lecturers in carrying out research work for research output (Umar & Sokari, 2020).

Mathabela (2018) explained that the types of legal information resources used by law lecturers were mostly in prints and less of electronic formats probably because most law libraries were not fully Information Communication Technology (ICT) compliant. The author outlined the print resources to include: law books, law journals, law reports or case laws, codes and statutes, government publications (gazettes, statutes, codes), law reviews, case reviews, monographs, conference proceedings, general legal reference materials- (newspapers, legal dictionaries) among others. All of these are significant to law lecturers' research growths. Okiki (2013) also observed that other types of legal information resources used by law lecturers for research productivity that should be available in the university law libraries include: electronic legal resources vis- a-vis electronic legal conference proceedings, electronic legal project reports, electronic legal theses and dissertations, legal databases, electronic laws of the federation and open access legal information in addition to print formats. This view was corroborated by Padma, Ramasany and Ramathany (2018) which explained that legal information resources in the 21st century cut across legal databases such as west law, lexis nexis (academic), jstor, ebscohost, heinonline, soultron law pavilion prime. Other legal information resources in this category include: electronic books(e-books), e-journals, e-case summaries, e-judgments and other legal websites (Padma, Ramasany & Selvan, 2015).

Oriogu, Ogbuiyi and Chuckwuemeka (2018) avowed that legal information resources were available in institutional information system with the sole purpose of supporting research activities of faculty members. As part of my contributions to the views expressed by Oriogu, *et al.*, (2018), I humbly feel that the authors seemed to have omitted in their study that the purpose of legal information resources in an academic institution particularly in the university which supersedes research activities. Rather, the study should have also observed that the information resources could, in addition, be used for teaching and learning purposes for the overall growth of the institution's academic excellence and scholarship; and not just to satisfy the research needs of the lecturer. This is because the development and growth of a university encompasses three major components- teaching, learning and research. However, Emesulu (2012) and Uluocha (2015) disclosed that use of legal information resources varied among individuals and professionals depending on their information needs and academic statuses but the most important fact to express here is that irrespective of users' needs and statuses, the type(s) of legal information resources that lecturers use are all geared towards achieving a specific purpose; and it is to improve scholarly publishing for research productivity.

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 studies 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).

Challenges of Use of Legal Information Resources for Research Productivity in Universities

Mathabela (2018) summarised the frequency of challenges of use of legal information resources in some libraries (in addition to the earlier ones mentioned) as inadequate internet, complete lack of non-legal databases, inadequate reference materials, inadequate indexes and abstracts, lack of newspapers, legal journals, conference papers, case laws, inadequate relevant law books, statutes and government publications. The author argued further that some of the reasons for these challenges were that most of the libraries, particularly law libraries were ill-equipped by university management as there was no specific policy to cater for acquisition of legal information resources.

Moreover, most of the library staff offered no professional skills to lecturers seeking information in the libraries; and the library had no subscriptions or facilities for legal databases.

Ossai (2011, as cited by Umar and Sokari, 2020) asserted that the scenario in many developing countries was under-utilisation of information sources and services partly due to lack of knowledge, poor marketing and user education efforts. This was as a result of lack of knowledge and awareness of the relevant legal information resources of some of the library staff. In a similar study, Abdullahi (2013) remarked that part of the challenges of legal information resources was problem of up-to-date books, journals, case laws, acts, codes and other government publications. Consequently, the inability to access current information resources in the library by lecturers for teaching and particularly for research purposes was one of the major challenges to research productivity. The author further noted that where the few current resources were available, improper organisation, theft and mutilation of the library materials posed another serious challenge to their use. Musert and Olorunfemi (2013) remarked that part of the problems was theft, mutilation and lack of up-to-date legal materials as a result of shortage of funds to purchase materials. As a result, the ability to access current materials by law lecturers for teaching and research was a difficult task. It was also expatiated by Musert and Olorunfemi that the problems that often limited the use of legal information resources for productive level of law lecturers and other faculty members were summarised as follows: constant interrupted power supply, lack of research skill of some of the researcher, insufficient number of books, non-availability of current legal information resources, inadequate reading facilities, inconducive reading environment, poor funding of libraries, laziness and non-chalant attitude on the part of the researchers(lecturers). It was concluded by the authors that the effect of these challenges hindered lecturers from obtaining relevant information (both in prints and electronic) for research productivity. Little wonder, therefore, why the law libraries account for a total of 70 percent as part of the requirementst for accreditation of law programmes in Nigerian universities (public and private) by Council of Legal Education (CLE) as measures to make the law libraries adequately funded for meeting improving teaching, learning and research purposes of the universities (Prospectus containing Guidelines for accreditation of law degree programmes in Nigerian universities).

However, Owushi and Emasulu (2016); Ramasany, Padma and Helan (2018) summarised in their studies that unless some proactive measures were put in place, the following would remain as challenges to the use of effective legal information resources by lecturers in universities: lack of training and re-training of library staff in legal information dissemination, inadequate provision of adequate facilities in the law library - internet, air conditioners, equipment, absence or poor acquisition of up-to-date legal materials - textbooks, periodicals, digest, statutes, case laws, among others, gross absence or inadequate subscription to e-legal resources or databases, for instance, lexis nexis (academic), law pavilion prime, legalpedia, compulaw and heinonline, poor management of legal information resources. lack of adequate fund to acquire relevant and up-to-date legal materials in the library, inadequate information dissemination skill of library staff, attitude of librarians and lack of Nigerian Resource On-line.

It could, therefore, be concluded from the foregoing studies that law lecturers generally made frequent use (perhaps where they are available) of law books, statutes, case laws, legal databases, internet, government publications and Online Public Access (OPAC) for research productivity. The law libraries as custodians of legal information resources and knowledge were usually found to be affected by lack of information skills, non-chalant attitude of some library staff, difficulties in getting relevant resources for effective information dissemination, research inadequacies and laziness of some lecturers in areas of evaluation of resources, copyrights and citation skills.

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. Uwizeye, 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. Nonetheless, 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 researcher.
- 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 individual(Isabelle *et al.*, 2021).

Be that as it may, if it comes to universities' ranking on the basis of 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 extent or 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 unacceptably 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 individual 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 individual 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 expertise 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. Vijayakarsan (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 Onoshagbebe (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: improve citation index and h-index; improve teaching effectiveness; encourage quality assurance; achieving peer-recognition; improve research skill; high academic progression (being full professor); improvement in individual academic status; encourage presentation of ideas; improve individual self-confidence; encourage persistence/resilience and self-confidence in achieving a desired goal or task; getting better salary increase;

satisfying individual need for creativity/curiosity; tenure elongation (for instance, the retirement age for Professor is now 70 years); satisfying the need to stay current in the field; Satisfying the need to contribute to the field (of law); satisfying collaborations with others; getting respect from students; getting reduced teaching load; getting a "Chaired Professorship"; finding a better job at another university and 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). Nonetheless, Ariadurai and Rajendra (2020) in their studies on Learners' Perception on Learning Resources revealed that about 14% of 71 respondents perceived that the resources available to enhance learning and research were useful whilst 31% of respondents found the audio-visual materials provided in the MOOCS to be very effective.

Besides, Migosi, Muola and Maithya (2013) summarised the perception of lecturers towards use of information resources for research productivity as follows:

- a. use of information is for teaching alone and it is important without research with 31.8 percent of respondents strongly agreed.
- b. use of information resources is for publishing which is important for any lecturer aspiring to grow professionally and 4.7 percent strongly agreed to this perception whilst 2.94 percent only agreed.
- c. use of information resources is for teaching which is more important than publishing with 35.0 percent strongly agreed and 37.5 percent only agreed.

Migosi, *et al.* (2013) posited that the following explained the ranking of some of the different perception of law lecturers to the use of legal information resources for research and publication in Kenyan universities:

- a. some lecturers perceived that for them to be academically productive, the university should spend money meant for research on improving salary for lecturers which put the average at 27.8 percent. This category of lecturers believed that the sole purpose of getting employed as academic staff within a university was basically to improve their living standard as a result of increment in salaries than to engage in research as gateway for salary increase.
- b. The study also revealed that the perception of some other lecturers towards use of information resources for research productivity was that promotion should be based on publishing alone considering the cost spent on research, time management and image building of the researcher. This represented about 44% of the total respondents in this category.

Notwithstanding, the effect of perception of use of legal information resources on lecturers' research productivity according to the study was that lecturers who wished to progress academically should spend financial resources on research and publishing; and 17.7 percent believed that lecturers should spend personal resources on research and publishing whilst according to the study, 54.9 percent of lecturers strongly agreed to this view. Some lecturers, however, perceived that appointment to senior university management should be based only on academic writing which represented 14.8 percent of total respondents. The study also showed that some lecturers preferred to spend their time as part-time lecturers than on writing articles with 39.4 percent only agreed and 39.0 percent of total respondents strongly agreed to the opinion. The two results again confirmed that most lecturers took up teaching appointment solely to better their standard of living, feeding their families and not necessarily to make any impact in research and scholarship to increase their knowledge, academic status and for the growth of the university they represented. The study concluded that both male and female lecturers tended to have equal perception mean score towards research productivity, thus there was no significance in their perception of use of information resources for productivity. With all profound respect, judging from the literature reviewed so far, one may not hesitate to conclude that lecturers in Kenyan universities had low perception of use of information resources, the types of information resources sourced in addition to some other challenges they might have encountered in an attempt to source for right information resources in course of their research work. Osisanwo, Jude and Adeyeoye (2021) revealed that the problem of use of library resources are power outage (94%), insufficient internet access points (86%), obsolete books (85%), lack of easy access to journals (85%), non-chalant attitude of library staff & librarian (84%), poor retrieval skills of library staff (83.5%); these pose as major challenges to use of legal resources for research productivity by users. In analysing time factor as one of the challenges often

encountered in the use of legal information resources by law lecturers, Mathabela (2018) reported as follows: 74% accounted for majority of law lecturers lacked the time to search for law materials especially relevant and up- to- date law books for their research work., 73% lacked the time to search for case laws, 70% for statutes, 67% for government publications, 65% lacked the time for law journals, 59% for newspapers, 56% also lacked the time to search for reference materials while 38% of total respondents lacked the time for law databases.

Be that as it may, with regard to some of the challenges in using the legal information resources, Mathabela (2018) also revealed that 66% agreed that there were insufficient textbooks in the law libraries, 65% agreed that there were insufficient case reports, 64% accounted for insufficient statutes, 63% for government publications, 60% for law journals and 56% for conference proceedings. The study also stressed that outdated legal resources formed part of the challenges of use of legal information resources by law lecturers in Swaziland putting 45% for law textbooks, 39% for case laws and 34% for statutes, among others.

Okonedo-Adegboye and Popoola (2012) in their empirical study revealed that the highest percentage rate of publication of the respondents were articles in learned journals 107 (79.9%) followed by conference proceedings 42 (31.3%), chapters in books 41(30.6%), co-authored textbooks 27(20.1%), textbooks 19(14.2%), occasional papers 18(13.4%), bulleting 12 (9.0%), monographs 10(7.5%). This showed that research productivity of faculty members is relatively high. 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

Research Design

The research design used for this study was Correlational research. Correlational research design was used because usually it investigates and measures the degree of relationships between two or more variables without the researcher controlling or manipulating any of them (Creswell, 2018). However, 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.

Table 1 shows the population distribution of universities offering law degree programmes by states.

Table 1: Population Distribution of Universities Offering Law Degree Programmes By States

S/ N	State	No. of Universities Offering Law (As Approved)	Universities (Public)	Universities (Private)
1	Ekiti	3	Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti (EKSU). Federal University, Oye-Ekiti (FUOYE).	Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti (ABUA).
2	Lagos	2	University of Lagos, Akoka (UNILAG). Lagos State University. Ojoo (LASU).	-
3	Ogun	3	Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye (OOUA).	Crescent University, Abeokuta (CUAB). Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo (BU).
4	Ondo	3	Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko (AAUA).	Achievers' University, Owo (AUO). Elizade University, Ilara-Mokin (EUI).
5	Osun	6	Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife (OAU). Osun State University, Osogbo (OSU).	Joseph Ayo Babalola University, Ikeji-Arakeji (JABU). Adeleke University, Ede (AU). Bowen University, Iwo (BUI). Redeemer's University, Ede (RUN)
6	Oyo	4	University of Ibadan, Ibadan (UI)	Lead City University, Ibadan (LCU). Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo (ACU). Kola Daisi University, Ibadan (KDU).
	Total	21		

Source: Council of Legal Education Guidelines for Law Faculties, 2021**Sample and Sampling Technique**

There was no sampling for the study, the population was used. As a result, the entire 456 population of the study across the 21 universities offering law programme in the South-western Nigerian universities were investigated. This was why 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.

Research Instrument

The research instrument used for the study was the questionnaire. It was captioned: "Perception of Use of Legal Information Resources and Research Productivity Questionnaire"

(PULIRRPQ). The questionnaire was prepared for law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities as respondents and were used to collect data for this study. The questionnaire consisted six sections (A-F) as follows: Section A was designed to elicit background information from the respondents; Section B was to know the perception of use of legal information resources by law lecturers for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities. Section C was to address types of legal information resources used by law lecturers for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities. Section D was to obtain information on the extent of use of legal information resources by law lecturers for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities. Section E elicits information on the challenges being encountered by law lecturers in the use of legal information resources for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities and Section F asked questions on extent of research productivity of the law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities.

However, some of the questions were designed on a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agreed with a scale of 4 points—strongly agreed= 4; agreed= 3; disagreed=2 and strongly disagreed=1 point. Some questions were also designed on the two options of agreed and disagreed as a result of the nature of questions. Part of the questionnaire also required respondents to state the extent they have agreed on some questions and these ranged from very high extent (VHE) also with a scale of 4 points; high extent (HE) =3; low extent (LE)=2 and very low extent (VLE) =1 respectively. However, many of the questions were adapted from Ibegbulem (2015), Oriogu, Ogbuiyi and Chukwuemeka (2018) while few were self-developed.

However, the method of Data Collection was that the researchers 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; and the data collected 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}) and Standard Deviation were adequately employed to answer all research questions. The Criterion Mean was placed at 2.50. For the hypothesis, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation because it sought to know the relationship of one independent variable on the dependent variable and all statistical analyses were carried out using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Section 1

Table 2: 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 2: Analysis of the Respondents' Background Information

Table 3: 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 3 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: Sex of the Respondents

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

From Table 4, 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 5: 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 5, 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 6: 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 6, 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.

Section 2: Answering of the Research Questions

Research Question 1: To what extent do law lecturers perceive the use of legal information resources for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities?

Data in Table 7 provide answer to this question.

Table 7: Extent of Law Lecturers' Perception of the Use of Legal Information Resources for Research Productivity

S/N	Self-Concept	VHE	HE	LE	VLE	Mean
1.	My perception of use of legal information resources is that, there is no immediate pecuniary reward for publishing in refereed journals for research growth.	237	128	7	4	3.59
2.	I use legal information resources because of usefulness of service (e- mail, telephone, internet, cybercafé, and so on).	162	207	4	3	3.40
3.	I use legal information resources because, there are availability of relevant materials in the library to aid my research output.	32	145	184	15	2.52
4.	I feel that using legal information resources is for teaching alone, not for research growth.	5	32	265	74	1.91
5.	I do not spend family resources for the purpose of sourcing legal information resources for productive research.	211	109	34	22	3.35
6.	I use legal information resources because of currency of materials to update my knowledge.	243	116	12	5	3.59
7.	My perception is that, there is no access to the library Portal.	37	176	109	54	2.52
8.	I use legal information resources because of the conducive learning environment of the library which enables my research goal to be actualised in the University.	26	100	202	48	2.28
9.	Attainment of academic status of law lecturers should be ranked purely on the use of legal resources for research productivity based on research h-index.	123	132	100	21	2.95
10.	I use legal information resources because they only enhance my research productivity.	64	193	108	11	2.82
11.	If I have my way, I will rather prefer to spend my time as part- time Law Lecturer to writing articles in order to avoid the stress of searching for information resources for academic growth because it is tedious.	26	146	166	38	2.43
12.	My perception towards the use of legal information resources enhances the gate-way to appointment to senior university management position as a result of my research skills, in terms of quantity and quality of research output.	173	184	12	10	3.37
13.	My perception of the use of legal information resources is that, they are not easily accessible for my research activities.	43	172	139	22	2.63
14.	Incompetence of staff to disseminate legal information affects my use of legal information resources in the library.	11	59	176	130	1.87
15.	The attitude of some Librarians to users often discourages me from using the legal information resources for research in the library.	14	80	150	132	1.94

16.	Absence of or gross insufficiency of legal databases in the university library to improve on my research productivity affects my perception towards the use of legal information resources.	181	171	14	11	3.39
17.	Use of legal information resources to increase my research growth often consumes time, hazardous and more expensive to engage or undertake.	205	145	17	9	3.45
18.	Inadequacy of legal materials affects my perception of use of legal resources for my research productivity.	193	157	20	6	3.43
19.	I use legal information resources for knowledge-building only.	21	121	205	29	2.36
20.	My perception of use of legal information resources is for publishing alone for my teaching career in the University.	9	70	227	70	2.05
Aggregate Mean						2.79

Criterion Mean

2.50

Table 7 shows that with an aggregate mean of 2.79 which is greater than the criterion mean of 2.50, it can be concluded that the extent to which law lecturers perceive the use of legal information resources for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities is high.

Research Question 2: What are the types of legal information resources used by law lecturers for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities?

Data in Table 8 were used to answer this question.

Table 8: Types of Legal Information Resources Used by Law Lecturers

S/N	Types of Legal Information Resources	Agree		Disagree		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Textbooks	371	98.7	5	1.3	376	100.0
2.	Published Conference papers/Workshop proceedings.	367	97.6	9	2.4	376	100.0
3.	Law Journals	371	98.7	5	1.3	376	100.0
4.	Government Publications (for instance, law reviews, gazettes/statutes, acts, codes, rules, bills).	370	98.4	6	1.6	376	100.0
5.	Law Reports or Case Laws	370	98.4	6	1.6	376	100.0
6.	Reference Materials (for instance, legal dictionaries, encyclopedias).	368	97.9	8	2.1	376	100.0
7.	Legal Databases (for instance, law pavilion prime, lexis-nexis (academic), heinonline, and so on) for e-judgements, e-books, e-journals.	368	97.9	8	2.1	376	100.0
8.	Case or Book Reviews	365	97.1	11	2.9	376	100.0
9.	Annotations	349	92.8	27	7.2	376	100.0
10.	Bye-laws	359	95.5	17	4.5	376	100.0
11.	Legal Digests	361	96.0	15	4.0	376	100.0
12.	Newspapers	325	86.4	51	13.6	376	100.0
13.	Monographs	358	95.2	18	4.8	376	100.0
14.	Research Reports (Theses and Dissertations)	353	93.9	23	6.1	376	100.0
15.	Legal Indexes and Abstracts	366	97.3	10	2.7	376	100.0
16.	Technical Reports	360	95.7	16	4.3	376	100.0
17.	Non-Legal Materials	97	25.8	279	74.2	376	100.0

From Table 8, it can be concluded that all types of legal information resources are used with the exception of non-legal materials.

Research Question 3: To what extent has the use of legal information resources enhanced the research productivity of law lectures in South-western Nigerian universities?

Data in Table 9 were used to answer this question.

Table 9: Extent of use of Legal Information Resources for Enhanced Research Productivity

S/N	Resources	VHE	HE	LE	VLE	Mean
1.	Law Textbooks	251	118	1	6	3.63
2.	Newspapers/Magazines	11	48	100	217	1.61
3.	Bulletins/Newsletters	10	69	151	146	1.85
4.	Law Journals	224	135	7	10	3.52
5.	Electronic sources(e-books, e-journals, e-judgements).	275	85	6	10	3.66
6.	Case Reviews	203	159	5	9	3.48
7.	Legal Databases-(heinonline, lexis-nexis academic, legalpedia, law pavilion prime, jstor).	299	58	9	10	3.72
8.	Law Reports or Case laws	326	35	6	9	3.80
9.	Monographs	77	209	71	19	2.91
10.	Theses and Dissertations	40	46	154	136	1.97
11.	Legal Indexes and Abstracts	57	216	81	22	2.82
12.	Published papers at conference/workshop/seminar proceedings.	224	128	15	9	3.51
13.	Govt. Publications (statutes, gazettes, codes, state laws and so on).	332	31	3	10	3.82
Aggregate Mean						3.10

Criterion Mean

2.50

Table 9 shows that with an aggregate mean of 3.10 which is greater than the criterion mean of 2.50, it can be concluded that the extent to which law lecturers use legal information resources to enhance the research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities is high with the exception of newspapers/magazines, bulletins/newsletters, monographs, theses/dissertations, legal indexes and abstracts.

Research Question 4: What are the challenges of the use of legal information resources on the research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities?

Data in Table 10 were used to answer this question.

Table 10: Challenges to the Use of Legal Information for Research Productivity by Law Lecturers

S/N	Challenges	Agree		Disagree	
		No.	%	No.	%
1.	Inadequacy of legal materials in relation to user needs.	355	94.4	21	5.6
2.	Lack of knowledge, awareness of existing legal materials.	76	20.2	300	79.8
3.	Poor organisation and management of legal resources	185	49.2	191	50.8
4.	Poor access to legal materials.	196	52.1	180	47.9
5.	Insufficient number of current books, journals, law reports, and so on.	349	92.8	27	7.2
6.	Poor funding of law library (that is, budget- cut).	350	93.1	26	6.9
7.	Theft and mutilation of legal information resources.	112	29.8	264	70.2
8.	Lack of internet services.	252	67.0	124	33.0

9.	Low internet bandwidth.	224	59.6	152	40.4
10.	Lack of qualified professional library staff in the dissemination of legal information and services to users.	148	39.4	228	60.6

From Table 10, 355(94.4%) of the law lecturers agreed that they had challenges of inadequacy of legal materials in relation to user needs, 350(93.1%) on poor funding of law library (that is, budget-cut), 349(92.8%) agreed on insufficient number of current books, journals, law reports, and so on, 252(67%) on lack of internet, 224(59.6%) on low internet bandwidth and 196(52.1%) of them noted poor access to legal materials. It can be concluded that the challenges encountered on the use of legal information resources for the research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities include: inadequacy of legal materials in relation to user needs, poor funding of law library (that is, budget-cut), insufficient number of current books, journals, law reports, and so on, lack of internet, low internet bandwidth and poor access to legal materials.

Research Question 5: To what extent are law lecturers productive in terms of research in South-western Nigerian universities?

Data in Table 11 were used to answer this question.

Table 11: 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 11 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.

Section 3: Testing of the Hypothesis

Hypothesis:

Perception of use of legal information resources has no significant relationship with research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities. Data in Table 12 provides answer to this hypothesis.

Table 12: Correlation between Perception of Use of Legal Information Resources and Research Productivity of Law Lecturers

		Perception the use of legal information resources	Research Productivity
Perception the use of legal information resources	Pearson Correlation	1	.146
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005
	N	376	376
Research Productivity	Pearson Correlation	.146	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	
	N	376	376

From Table 12, Pearson correlation coefficient r (0.146). Since the significant value (Sig.2-tailed) is 0.005 (which is equal to 0.05), it can be concluded that the perception of the use of legal information resources has no significant relationship with research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities. The null hypothesis is, therefore, rejected implying that an increase/decrease in the perception of the use of legal information resources by the law lecturers, may lead to a corresponding increase/decrease in their research productivity. This means that perception of the use of legal information resources influences the law lecturers' research productivity

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Extent of Law Lecturers' Perception of Use of Legal Information Resources for Research Productivity

The study showed that the extent of law lectures' perception of use legal information resources for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities was high.

It was also revealed that all types of legal information resources including textbooks, case laws, government publications(statutes, codes), case reviews, law journals, book reviews, bye-laws, monographs, legal digest, legal databases, dissertations/theses, monographs, legal indexes and abstracts and technical reports were being used by law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities for research productivity. This was in tandem with the finding of Umar and Sokari (2020) where same list of types of legal information resources used by law lecturers were given. They maintained that these could be in printed and electronic formats.

Besides, it showed that the extent to which law lecturers use legal information resources to enhance research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities ws high. For instance, textbooks, case laws, legal databases, government publications were most highly used. However, the challenges encountered in the use of legal information resources for research productivity of law lecturers in South- western Nigerian universities were: inadequacy of legal materials in relation to user needs, poor funding of law libraries (budget-cut), insufficient number of current books, journals, case laws, lack of internet, low internet bandwidth and poor access to legal information.

It was 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.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter focused on the summary of the study, conclusion, recommendations and contributions to knowledge.

Summary of the Study

The study investigated and gave an empirical view of perception of use of legal information resources and research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities.

The population of the study was 456 law lecturers and in the study five research questions were raised and answered while one research hypothesis was formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance. 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 were used to arrive at finding of the study. The criterion mean was placed at 2.50 for data analysis.

Main Finding

The finding from the study showed that:

- i.* The extent of law lecturer's perception of the use of legal information resources for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities was high.
- ii.* All types of legal information resources were being used by law lecturers for research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities including textbooks, statutes or case laws, law journals, book reviews, legal digests.
- iii.* The extent of use of legal information resources by law lecturers in enhancing research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities was high.
- iv.* The major challenges often encountered in the use of legal information resources by law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities were: inadequate legal materials in relation to user needs, poor funding of law library (budget-cut); insufficient number of up-to-date books, case laws, legal journals, lack of Internet, low Internet bandwidth and poor access to legal materials.
- v.* The extent of law lecturers' research productivity in South-western Nigerian universities was low.
- vi.* Perception of use of legal information resources had no significant relationship with research productivity of law lecturers in South-western Nigerian universities. This meant that, perception of use legal information resources influence law lecturers' research productivity.

CONCLUSION

The study showed that the degree of perception of use of legal information resources 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 and identified some challenges that were often being encountered by law lecturers in relation to user need in the course of using legal information resources for research productivity; and such other factors which might not have been contemplated. The immediate challenges were dearth of legal textbooks, inadequacy of current or up-to-date case laws, poor internet connectivity, low bandwidth and dearth of legal databases. However, four hypotheses were tested and the study showed that there was no relationship between self-concept and research productivity; and as such, did not influence faculty members which might not have led to a corresponding increase or decrease in their research productivity.

Finally, the study showed that an increase or decrease in perception of law lecturers' use of legal information.

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.

- 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, refridgerators, book-shelf, good tables and chairs, good toilet system, smart television, among others.
- v. 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."
- vi. The respective university administrators should formulate a policy for the library to mitigate the challenges being encountered in the use of legal information resources by law lecturers by increasing the funding of the library for provision of more current books, statutes, case laws, functional Internet, high Internet bandwidth, adequate provision of textbooks, awareness of existing legal materials, well organisation and management of legal materials including journals, case laws legal databases in relation to user needs and recruitment of qualified professional law librarians in the dissemination of legal information and service to users. This will make the library more responsive to users' needs in order to enhance the research productivity of law lecturers.
- vii. The law librarian should, as part of library Collection Development, acquire more monographs, legal indexes and abstracts of works, bulletins/newsletters in various aspects of law, create special collection for theses/dissertations and increase the number of newspapers/magazines in the library. This will create more awareness on the relevance and level of their usage by law lecturers for 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.
2. There should be a comparative study of perception of use of legal information resources on research productivity of male and female law lecturers in Nigerian universities.

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.
- 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.interestjournals.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>.
- 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://mpa.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 in the Department of Library Science, Delta State University, Abraka.
- 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/libphilrac/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>.
- Anyaoogu, 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>
- 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.

- 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/S/10734-015-9130- 6211.
- Castelle, K.M. (2017). *An investigation into perceived productivity and its influence on the relationship between organization climate and affective commitment*".
https://digitlcommons.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
- 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>.
- 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.
- Eyolorunshe, 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.
- Fridah, K. (2020). *Relationships between self – efficacy, background factors and performance among lecturers in Makerere University, Kampala*. www.dissertations.mak.ac.ug

- Gee-Whakho, M., & Ling, Y. (2017). A study of peripheral and capability to influence action in research among literatures of a polytechnic 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 influence 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*, ii(xi), 439-440.
- 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.
- 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://digitalcommons.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 importance? <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>.
- Kpolovie, P.J. (2016). *Research productivity: H-index and 110-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
- Kusure, L.P., Primiana, I., Mawere, D., & Dhliwayo, 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.oc.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>.
- 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., & Ejiro, 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://www.researchgate.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>
- 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.
- 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>.
- 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.
- 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>.
- 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/khanbhatti.pdf.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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
- Umar, H., & Sokari, V. (2020). Challenges associated with utilization of legal information resources by post graduate law students in federal universities of Northern Nigeria. *Information Impact: Journal of information and Knowledge Management*. 11 (1). 2141 – 2147. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ijikm.VIIIi.4>.
- 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., & Clauzet, A. (2019). *Productivity prominence and the effects of academic environment*. [http://doi.org/10,073/pras,1817431116](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>