ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

Time-Management Skills and Lecturer Productivity in Federal Colleges of Education in South-Western Nigeria.

Osayomwanbor Osemwegie, Ademola Ibukunolu Atanda

Department of Educational Management, Ibadan, Oyo, Nigeria

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150500104

Received: 12 May 2026; Accepted: 16 May 2026; Published: 05 June 2026

ABSTRACT

Lecturer Productivity (LP), measured by Research Output (RO) and Teaching Effectiveness (TE), is crucial to the career progression of lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria, including Colleges of Education (CoEs). However, literature indicate that LP is low across CoEs, particularly in Federal Colleges of Education (FCEs) in south-western Nigeria. Prior studies on LP have largely focused on demographic factors, self-esteem, psychological well-being, and hard skills among university and polytechnic lecturers, with little attention paid to the relationship between Time Management Skills (TMS) and LP in FCEs in south–western Nigeria. A descriptive survey design was employed in the study. The four first-generation FCEs (FCE (Special) Oyo, FCE Abeokuta, FCE Technical Akoka and Adeyemi College of Education (ACE) Ondo) were purposively selected. One hundred and nineteen Heads of Department (HoDs) were also enumerated. Proportionate-to-size sampling was used to select 10% of the lecturers and NCE III students, yielding sample sizes of 149 and 803, respectively. The instruments used were the TMSQ (0.78) and the LPQ (0.82) scales. The quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics and Pearson product-moment correlation. The findings of this study indicated that TMS (2.65) and LP (3.02) were high against the threshold of 2.50. Time management significantly correlated with LP in FCEs in south-western Nigeria. The study therefore recommended, among other things, that lecturer productivity could be increased by organising workshops and seminars for the lecturer on planning, organising, and time management.

Keywords: Research, Teaching, Time management, Productivity

INTRODUCTION

The decline in productivity among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria, including Colleges of Education (CoEs), has a significant effect that extends beyond delayed career advancement to include reputational loss. This decline perpetuates reliance on outdated concepts, research methods, and skills, leaving students inadequately equipped with contemporary research techniques. In the same vein, Nuremi, Adigun, and Akinwole (2024:7) report that "the low ranking of the Federal College of Education (FCE), Ogun State, in the 2024 Webometrics report exemplifies this challenge, largely attributed to limited scholarly visibility and academic inactivity". Furthermore, reports consistently indicate poor academic performance among Nigerian Certificate in Education (NCE) students, compounded by educational institutions' reluctance to employ NCE graduates due to perceived deficiencies in pedagogical skills (Akpan, 2024).

It is pertinent to note that the unabated decline in lecturer productivity in CoEs in Southwestern Nigeria could have significant implications on the quality, relevance, and global competitiveness of CoEs, including FCEs. Empirical evidence shows that lecturer productivity, as measured by teaching effectiveness and research output, has fallen below established benchmarks, with some studies reporting levels well below normative standards (Raji & Oyedeji, 2021; Abiodun-Oyebanji, 2023). This decline could undermine knowledge production and diminish CoEs' roles in fostering innovation, informing policy development, and supporting socio-economic transformation. Additionally, reduced research output could also lower institutional visibility and ranking, restricting opportunities for international collaboration and external funding. At the instructional level, reduced productivity appears to compromise teaching quality, diminish mentorship, and lead to insufficient student

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

engagement, ultimately affecting graduate quality and employability. The Colleges of Education, including the FCEs, could face inadequate funding, substandard working conditions, excessive workloads, and limited research infrastructure, which further intensifies this trend by restricting lecturers' ability to fulfil their core responsibilities of teaching and research. Thus, the persistent decline in lecturer productivity will not only undermine the status of CoEs within tertiary institutions but also pose a broader challenge to national development, given CoEs' pivotal contributions to human capital formation and intellectual progress.

Previous studies have examined variables that could be responsible for the declines in lecturer productivity in tertiary institutions, particularly in FCEs. Some of these studies concentrated scholarly efforts on individual variables such as perception and willingness (Atanda, 2023), self-esteem (Gomez-Jorge & Diaz-Garrido, 2023), psychological wellbeing (Oluwole, Adeniji, & Abiodun-Oyebanji, 2022), demographic capacity (Akinwumi & Ayo-Ayinde, 2022), work-life balance (Nurfalah et al, 2022) and self-efficacy (Loughland, 2019), to mention but a few. Among these scholars, Gomez-Jorge and Diaz-Garrido (2023) posit that lecturers with high self-esteem are more productive and deal effectively with institutional expectations, but conclude that analyzing additional variables could be vital to understanding lecturers' research and teaching productivity.

The search to identify the skills required for a productive workforce in higher education has prompted numerous studies. These studies have revealed a significant skills gap in higher education. As a result, there is growing awareness of the value of soft skills, prompting discussions across various research fields. Despite this, the education system continues to prioritise the development of hard skills and pays little attention to soft skills. Meanwhile, evidence indicates that the productivity of hard skills depends on soft skills. Wibowo et al. (2020) argue that while hard skills are important, strong soft skills are more critical to determining one's productivity at work. According to the National Soft Skills Association, Harvard University found that 85% of job success is attributed to well-developed soft skills and interpersonal abilities. In contrast, only 15% of job success is attributable to hard skills (National Soft Skills Association, 2025). Additionally, researchers at Boston University's Ross School of Business found that employees who undergo soft-skills training are 12% more productive than those who do not (Vasanthakumasi, 2019). There is substantial evidence that lecturers with soft skills demonstrate mastery of student knowledge, teaching methods, materials, and learning support, as well as the quality of learning implementation (Junaidi & Kemasis, 2022). Therefore, it is evident that developing soft skills, particularly, time management skills, is essential for any lecturer to be productive in the 21st century.

Effective time management is a key factor influencing lecturer productivity in Nigerian FCEs, as it directly affects teaching quality and research output (Love Day-Osaro & Uriri,2024). Research in South-Western Nigeria demonstrates that, while lecturers are generally productive, their effectiveness is frequently limited by heavy workloads, inefficient time use, and suboptimal work environments (Udeh, Onwuka, & Oti, 2023). Therefore, lecturers are encouraged to implement proactive time-management strategies, including setting daily, weekly, and semester-based goals, prioritizing academic responsibilities, and creating structured schedules with planners, calendars, and to-do lists. These skills enable lecturers to concentrate on high-priority academic tasks and enhance overall work performance.

Additionally, lecturers should recognize and eliminate time-wasting activities, including unnecessary social engagements, unscheduled meetings, and extended telephone conversations. Efforts to reduce procrastination should involve addressing demanding tasks promptly and delegating minor clerical duties when appropriate. Furthermore, educational institutions are advised to create supportive work environments that facilitate efficient time use and mitigate work-related stress (Mustapha, Yusuf, Yusuf, and Aloba,2020). Implementing these skills is expected to improve adherence to deadlines, enhance research and teaching effectiveness, and increase overall lecturer productivity. However, despite the significance of time management skill, evidence of deficient of these skills seems to be widespread among lecturers in FCEs.

Given the growing interest among scholars in providing a solution to the issue of low productivity among lecturers in CoEs as well as establishing conceptual and empirical frameworks regarding variables that could influence lecturers' productivity in CoEs, this study, therefore, investigated the relationship between time-management and lecturer productivity using multi-dimensional evaluations: Heads of Departments, lecturers and students-based evaluations for assessing lecturer productivity in FCEs in Southwestern, Nigeria.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

Statement of Problem

Lecturer productivity, encompassing research output and teaching effectiveness, is a critical factor in individuals' career progression within higher education institutions, including Colleges of Education in Nigeria. However, findings from studies discussed in the background revealed that lecturer productivity is relatively low across colleges of education, including federal colleges of education in Nigeria. The decline in lecturer productivity has continued to manifest in various critical areas, including low research output and an overall decline in the instructional process.

Consequently, a growing number of scholarly studies have been conducted by various researchers investigating a range of different factors that may be contributing to the decline in productivity among lecturers in CoEs. Some studies focused on variables that could potentially impact lecturer productivity, such as motivation, psychosocial needs, psychological well-being, demographic factors, job-related stress, work-life balance, and self-esteem. Despite various interventions and studies aimed at improving the situation, the problem persists, suggesting that underlying issues may not have been adequately addressed. Hence, this study investigated the relationship between time management skills and lecturers' productivity in Federal Colleges of Education in Southwestern Nigeria.

Purpose of the Study : The general purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between time management and lecturer productivity in federal colleges of education in South-western Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to:

i. examine the level of lecturer productivity (research output and teaching effectiveness) in federal colleges of education in South-western Nigeria;

ii. determine the level of time-management skill of lecturers in federal colleges of education in South-western Nigeria;

iii. Investigate the relationship between time management skills and lecturer productivity in federal colleges of education in South-western Nigeria.

Research Questions

The following research questions were raised and answered

RQ1: What is the level of lecturer productivity (research output and teaching effectiveness) in federal colleges of education in Southwestern Nigeria?

RQ2: What is the level of time management skill among lecturers in federal colleges of education in Southwestern Nigeria?

Hypotheses

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

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between time management skills and lecturer productivity in federal colleges of education in South-Western Nigeria.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a descriptive survey design. The study population comprised 25,018 individuals, including 137 Heads of Departments (HoDs), 1,620 lecturers, and 23,261 students from the Federal College of Education (FCE), Ilawe, Ekiti State; Federal College of Education (FCE), Abeokuta, Ogun State; Federal College of Education (FCE) (Special), Oyo State; Federal College of Education (FCE) (Technical), Akoka, Lagos State; and Adeyemi College of Education (ACE), Ondo State. The purposive sampling technique was used to select

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

the four first-generation federal colleges of education, including FCE Abeokuta, Ogun State; FCE (Special), Oyo State; FCE (Technical), Lagos State; and ACE, Ondo State. One hundred and nineteen Heads of Department (HoDs) were also enumerated. Proportionate-to-size sampling was used to select 10% of the lecturers and NCE III students, yielding sample sizes of 149 and 803, respectively.

An instrument titled 'Time Management Skills Questionnaire' (TMSQ) and 'Lecturer Productivity Questionnaire' (LPQ) were used for data collection. The TMQ was divided into two sections: A and B. Section A contained the demographic information, and Section B examined TMSQ items as perceived by the lecturers. The respondents rated their competencies using a four-point Likert Scale: Very High Extent (VHE) = 4, High Extent (HE) = 3, Some Extent (SE) = 2, and Low Extent (LE) = 1. The LPQ was also divided into two sections: A and B. Section A contained demographic information, while Section B assessed the LPQ items as perceived by the HoDs, Lecturers, and NCE III students. Respondents rated their contributions according to the following scale: NIL = Very Low, 1-10 = Low, 11-20 = High, and >20 = Very High.

The questionnaires administered and retrieved were 1036 in total, including HoDs, 144 lecturers and 764 NCE III students. The instruments were face- and content-validated by test experts, and the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was utilised by subjecting the data obtained to a reliability test. The instruments yielded the following coefficients: TMSQ 0.78 and LPQ 0.82, indicating reliability. The data gathered were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency counts, simple percentages, mean, and standard deviation were used to answer research questions 1 and 2. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to test Hypothesis 1 at a 0.05 significance level. The data gathered was processed using IBM® SPSS® (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), an advanced statistical tool for social science analysis**.**

RESULTS

RQ1: What is the level of lecturer productivity (research output and teaching effectiveness) in federal colleges of education in Southwestern Nigeria?

Research Question 1

What is the level of lecturer productivity (research output and teaching) in federal colleges of education in Southwestern Nigeria?

Table 1a: Level of Lecturer Productivity as Rated by NCE III Students

Supervision of Project							
S/N	Items	VH-4	H-3	L-2	VL-1	Mean	S.D
1	Students' accessibility to lecturers during project supervision in your department.	438 (57.3)	210 (27.5)	89 (11.6)	27 (3.5)	3.39	0.826
2	The level of mentorship provided by lecturers to students in your department during project writing.	178 (23.3)	460 (60.2)	110 (14.4)	16 (2.1)	3.05	0.678
3	The level of assistance from lecturers in your department in resolving difficulties students encounter during project writing.	236 (30.9)	287 (37.6)	207 (27.1)	34 (4.5)	2.95	0.870
4	The level of knowledge of scientific research of lecturers in your department.	176 (23.0)	377 (49.3)	158 (20.7)	53 (6.9)	2.88	0.838

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

5	The level of interest of lecturers in students' project supervision in your department.	231 (30.2)	265 (34.7)	210 (27.5)	58 (7.6)	2.88	0.931
6	Lecturers know the area of discipline they supervise	205 (26.8)	340 (44.5)	157 (20.5)	62 (8.1)	2.90	0.889
	N = 764; Average Mean = 3.00						
Teaching Practice Supervision							
S/N	Items	VH-4	H-3	L-2	VL-1	Mean	S.D
1	Lecturers' knowledge of the purpose of teaching practice.	256 (33.5)	285 (37.3)	181 (23.7)	42 (5.5)	2.99	0.890
2	Lecturers' level of confidentiality of student-teacher personal information.	177 (23.2)	342 (44.8)	194 (25.7)	51 (6.7)	2.84	0.854
3	The level of fairness in awarding marks for lesson note preparation and teaching.	186 (24.3)	338 (44.2)	181 (23.7)	59 (7.7)	2.85	0.877
4	Quality feedback on errors identified after the teaching practice exercise to the student–teachers.	204 (26.7)	273 (35.7)	215 (28.1)	72 (9.4)	2.80	0.941
5	Lecturers' willingness to spend appropriate time with student-teachers during teaching practice exercises.	182 (23.8)	294 (38.5)	217 (28.4)	71 (9.3)	2.77	0.917
6	The supervisory performance of lecturers during teaching practice.	204 (26.7)	259 (33.9)	224 (29.3)	77 (10.1)	2.77	0.955
N = 764; Average Mean = 2.84							
Pedagogical Content Knowledge							
	Items	VH-4	H-3	L-2	VL-1	Mean	S.D
1	Knowledge of the subject matter.	268 (35.1)	325 (42.5)	131 (17.1)	40 (5.2)	3.07	0.853
2	Knowledge of communicating the subject matter for clear understanding.	199 (26.0)	318 (41.6)	211 (27.6)	36 (4.7)	2.89	0.757
3	Knowledge of suitable teaching materials to deliver the content.	231 (30.2)	279 (36.5)	197 (25.8)	57 (7.5)	2.90	0.924
4	Knowledge of students' learning difficulties.	167 (21.9)	363 (47.5)	203 (26.6)	31 (4.1)	2.87	0.794
5	Knowledge of evaluation.	209 (27.4)	278 (36.4)	218 (28.5)	59 (7.7)	2.83	0.917
6	Improvisation of teaching strategies to suit the subject matter and context	213 (27.9)	310 (40.6)	151 (19.8)	90 (11.8)	2.85	0.964

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

	N = 764; Average Mean = 2.91						
Classroom Management							
S/N	Items	VH-4	H-3	L-2	VL-1	Mean	S.D
1	Lecturers encourage mutual respect among all students.	293 (38.4)	300 (39.3)	132 (17.3)	39 (5.1)	3.11	0.866
2	Lecturers organise a comfortable environment for all students.	181 (23.7)	380 (49.7)	168 (22.0)	35 (4.6)	2.93	0.797
3	Lecturers allow student contributions to the lesson	209 (27.4)	272 (35.6)	232 (30.4)	51 (6.7)	2.84	0.905
4	Lecturers keep to the lesson plan.	212 (27.7)	295 (38.6)	211 (27.6)	46 (6.0)	2.88	0.884
5	Lecturers maximise instructional time.	192 (25.1)	280 (36.6)	228 (29.8)	64 (8.4)	2.79	0.916
6	Lecturers arrange the classroom to minimise crowding and distraction.	207 (27.1)	271 (35.5)	174 (22.8)	112 (14.7)	2.75	0.731
	N = 764; Average Mean = 2.88						
	Grand Average Mean = 2.91						

Note: 0.00 – 1.49 = Very Low; 1.50 – 2.49 = Low; 2.50 – 3.49 = High; 350 – 4.00 = Very High.

Answer to research question one on the level of lecturer productivity in federal colleges of education in Southwestern Nigeria was tested on NCE III students, heads of departments and lecturers as well. Table 4.2.1a presents the response of students on the level of lecturer productivity based on supervision of project, teaching practice supervision, pedagogical content knowledge and classroom management. The following emerged as the responses of the students on supervision of project: Student's accessibility to lecturers during project supervision in your department (mean = 3.39); The level of mentorship provided by lecturers to students in your department during project writing (mean = 3.05); The level of assistance from lecturers in your department in resolving difficulties students encounter during project writing (mean = 2.95); The level of knowledge of scientific research of lecturers in your department. (mean = 2.88); The level of interest of lecturers in students' project supervision in your department (mean = 2.88); Lecturers know the area of discipline they supervise (mean = 2.90). The average mean of project supervision as an indicator of lecturer productivity as rated by students is given as 3.00, which indicates the lecturer productivity in terms of supervision of project is high.

The following emerged as responses of students on teaching practice as an indicator of lecturer productivity: Lecturers' knowledge of the purpose of teaching practice (mean = 2.99); Lecturers' level of confidentiality of student-teacher personal information. (mean = 2.84); The level of fairness in awarding marks for lesson note preparation and teaching. (mean = 2.85); Quality feedback on errors identified after the teaching practice exercise to the student–teachers (mean = 2.80); Lecturers' willingness to spend appropriate time with student-teachers during teaching practice exercises (mean = 2.77); The supervisory performance of lecturers during teaching practice (mean = 2.77). The average mean of teaching practice supervision as an indicator of lecturer productivity as rated by students is given as 2.84, which indicates the lecturer productivity in terms of teaching practice supervision is high.

On pedagogical content knowledge, the following emerged: knowledge of the subject matter (mean = 3.07); knowledge of communicating the subject matter for clear understanding (mean = 2.89); knowledge of suitable teaching materials to deliver the content (mean = 2.90); knowledge of students' learning difficulties (mean = 2.87); knowledge of evaluation (mean = 2.83); and improvisation of teaching strategies to suit the subject matter

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

and context (mean = 2.85). The average mean of pedagogical content knowledge, as an indicator of lecturer productivity as rated by students, is given as 2.91, indicating that lecturer productivity in terms of pedagogical content knowledge is high.

Measurement of lecturer productivity based on classroom management as measured by students is as follows: Lecturers encourage mutual respect among all students (mean = 3.11); Lecturers organise a comfortable environment for all students (mean = 2.93); Lecturers allow student contributions to the lesson (mean = 2.84); Lecturers keep to lesson plan (mean = 2.88); Lecturer maximiSe instructional time (mean = 2.79); Lecturers arrange the classroom to minimise crowding and distraction (mean = 2.75). The average mean of classroom management as an indicator of lecturer productivity as rated by students is given as 2.88, which indicates that lecturer productivity in terms of classroom management is high.

The grand average mean of the table is 2.91, which implies that students rated the level of lecturer productivity in terms of project supervision, teaching practice supervision, pedagogical content knowledge, and classroom management in federal colleges of education in Southwestern Nigeria as high.

Table 1b: Level of Lecturer Productivity as Rated by Heads of Departments

Setting of Examination Questions							
S/N	Items	VH-4	H-3	L-2	VL-1	Mean	S.D
1	Lecturers focus on the recall of only the material covered during lessons.	30 (30.6)	58 (59.2)	7 (7.1)	3 (3.1)	3.17	0.689
2	Lecturers use easily understandable language to set the question.	26 (26.5)	63 (64.3)	8 (8.2)	1 (1.0)	3.16	0.604
3	Lecturers guide the students toward understanding the concepts in the questions.	28 (28.7)	61 (62.2)	7 (7.1)	2 (2.0)	3.17	0.643
4	The time allotted to the questions is considerable	29 (29.6)	54 (55.1)	13 (13.3)	2 (2.0)	3.12	0.707
5	The mark allocated to each question is appropriate	33 (33.7)	52 (53.1)	11 (11.2)	2 (2.0)	3.18	0.709
6	Questions set by lecturers are clear, unambiguous and error-free.	23 (23.5)	62 (63.2)	9 (9.2)	4 (4.1)	3.06	0.701
7	Lecturers ensure that syllabus contents are covered in question papers.	29 (29.6)	54 (55.1)	15 (15.3)	– (0.0)	3.14	0.658
8	Lecturers' knowledge of setting examination	27 (27.6)	57 (58.2)	12 (12.2)	2 (2.0)	3.11	0.687
	N = 98; Average Mean = 3.14						
Marking of Examination Scripts							
S/N	Items	VH-4	H-3	L-2	VL-1	Mean	S.D
1	Assessment criteria of the lecturer	26 (26.5)	54 (55.1)	15 (15.3)	3 (3.1)	3.05	0.737
2	Fairness in assessment.	24 (24.5)	60 (61.2)	11 (11.2)	3 (3.1)	3.07	0.6.92

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

3	The outcome of the marking demonstrates the learning experience of the students.	20 (20.4)	58 (59.2)	15 (15.3)	5 (5.1)	2.95	0.751
4	Marking is consistent with the college policy.	20 (20.4)	65 (66.3)	11 (11.2)	2 (2.0)	3.05	0.632
5	Sensitive to the student's difficulties.	19 (19.4)	60 (61.2)	16 (16.3)	3 (3.1)	2.97	0.695
6	Scripts are moderated before recording	30 (30.6)	53 (54.1)	12 (12.2)	3 (3.1)	3.12	0.736
7	All answer Scripts are labelled and stored in a safe place	30 (30.6)	57 (58.2)	7 (7.1)	4 (4.1)	3.15	0.723
8	Lecturers understanding of examination's scripts marking	28 (28.5)	52 (53.1)	15 (15.3)	3 (3.1)	3.07	0.750
	N = 144; Average Mean = 3.05						
	Grand Average Mean = 3.10						

Note: 0.00 – 1.49 = Very Low; 1.50 – 2.49 = Low; 2.50 – 3.49 = High; 350 – 4.00 = Very High.

Table 1b presents the level of lecturer productivity as rated by heads of departments, the rating was in terms of prompt setting of examination questions and prompt marking of examination scripts. The following emerged: Lecturers focus on recall of only the material

covered during lessons (mean = 3.17); Lecturers use easily understandable language to set the question (mean = 3.16); Lecturers guide the students toward understanding the concepts in the questions (mean = 3.17); The time allotted to the questions is considerable (mean = 3.12); The mark allocated to each question is appropriate (mean = 3.18); Questions set by lecturers are clear, unambiguous and error-free (mean = 3.06); Lecturers ensure that syllabus contents are covered in question papers (mean = 3.14); Lecturers' knowledge of setting examination (mean = 3.11). The average mean of setting of examination questions as an indicator of lecturer productivity as rated by heads of department is given as 3.14, which implies that the lecturer productivity in terms of setting of examination questions is high.

Responses of lecturer productivity in term of marking of examination scripts by heads of departments are as follows: Assessment criteria of the lecturer (mean = 3.05); Fairness in assessment (mean = 3.07); The outcome of the marking demonstrates the learning experience of the students (mean = 2.95); Marking is consistent with the college policy (mean = 3.05); Sensitive to the student's difficulties (mean = 2.97); Scripts are moderated before recording (mean = 3.12); All answer Scripts are labelled and stored in a safe place (mean = 3.15); Lecturers understanding of examination's scripts marking (mean = 3.07). The average mean of marking of examination scripts as an indicator of lecturer productivity as rated by heads of department is given as 3.05, which implies that the lecturer productivity in terms of marking of examination scripts is high.

The grand average mean of the table is given as 3.10, which implies that heads of departments assessed the level of lecturer productivity in terms of prompt setting of examination questions and prompt marking of examination scripts in federal colleges of education in Southwestern Nigeria high.

Hence, the grand average mean of teaching as rated by NCE III students (2.91) and HoDs (3.10) in the sampled FCEs was 3.01, which implies that the students and HoDs rated teaching high.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

Table 1c: Level of Lecturer Productivity based on Research Output

African-Centric Research Indexing Databases Publication Checklist							
S/N	Items	Nil	1-10	11-20	Above 21	Mean	S.D
1	Scopus	7 (4.9)	9 (6.3)	75 (52.1)	53 (36.7)	3.21	0.765
2	Google Scholar	8 (5.6)	18 (12.5)	79 (54.8)	39 (27.1)	3.03	0.788
3	Web of Science	8 (5.6)	8 (5.6)	53 (36.7)	75 (52.1)	3.35	0.823
4	Cross Ref.	10 (6.9)	7 (4.9)	38 (26.4)	89 (61.8)	3.43	0.874
	N = 144; Average Mean = 3.26						
African-Centric Research Indexing Databases (Citation Checklist)							
S/N	Items	Nil	1-10	11-20	Above 21	Mean	S.D
1	Scopus	7 (4.9)	16 (11.1)	58 (40.3)	63 (43.7)	3.23	0.834
2	Google Scholar	7 (4.9)	16 (11.1)	64 (44.4)	57 (39.6)	3.19	0.819
3	Web of Science	8 (5.6)	17 (11.8)	16 (11.1)	103 (71.5)	3.49	0.908
4	CrossRef.	7 (4.9)	23 (16.0)	41 (28.5)	73 (50.6)	3.25	0.897
	N = 144; Average Mean = 3.29						
Paper-Based Journal (Publication Checklist)							
S/N	Items	Nil	1-10	11-20	Above 21	Mean	S.D
1	Colleges of Education-based Journal	37 (25.7)	53 (36.8)	49 (34.0)	5 (3.5)	2.15	0.847
2	University-based Journal in Nigeria	11 (7.6)	35 (24.3)	90 (62.5)	8 (5.6)	2.66	0.701
3	Association-based journal in Nigeria	7 (4.9)	28 (19.4)	90 (62.5)	19 (13.2)	2.84	0.706
4	Polytechnic-based journal in Nigeria	10 (6.9)	14 (9.7)	76 (52.8)	44 (30.6)	3.07	0.825
5	Monotechnic-based journal in Nigeria	6 (4.2)	9 (6.3)	55 (38.2)	74 (51.3)	3.37	0.782
6	International-based journal.	14	28	73	29	2.81	0.869

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

		(9.7)	(19.4)	(50.7)	(20.2)		
	N = 144; Average Mean = 2.82						
Scholarly Contributions							
	Items	Nil	1-10	11-20	Above 21	Mean	S.D
1	Number of NCE 3 projects overseen as main supervisor	87 (60.4)	16 (11.1)	36 (25.0)	5 (3.5)	1.72	0.958
2	Number of conference papers delivered	18 (12.5)	38 (26.4)	78 (54.2)	10 (6.9)	2.56	0.800
3	Research work that has an impact on the government	9 (6.3)	14 (9.7)	77 (53.4)	44 (30.6)	3.08	0.806
4	Number of research awards received	7 (4.9)	6 (4.2)	75 (52.1)	56 (38.8)	3.25	0.753
5	Research grants obtained	6 (4.2)	7 (4.8)	95 (66.0)	36 (25.0)	3.12	0.674
6	Participation in the editorial board of scientific journal (s)	7 (4.9)	14 (9.7)	89 (61.8)	34 (23.6)	3.04	0.728
7	Number of book chapters edited in monographs	11 (7.6)	19 (13.2)	89 (61.8)	25 (17.4)	2.89	0.777
8	Technical Reports	7 (4.9)	10 (6.9)	101 (70.1)	26 (18.1)	3.01	0.669
	N = 144; Average Mean = 2.83						

Note:0.00 – 1.49 = Very Low; 1.50 – 2.49 = Low; 2.50 – 3.49 = High; 350 – 4.00 = Very High.

The level of lecturer productivity, as rated by lecturers based on research output, is presented in Table 1c. The following are the responses from lecturers: the African-Centric Research Indexing Databases Publication Checklist has an average mean value of 3.26; the African-Centric Research Indexing Databases (Citation Checklist) has an average mean value of 3.29; the Paper-Based Journal (Publication Checklist) has an average mean value of 2.82; while the Scholarly Contributions have an average mean score of 2.83. The grand average mean of the table is given as 3.05, which implies that the level of lecturer productivity in terms of research output in federal colleges of education in Southwestern Nigeria is high.

Table 1 d.: Summary of the level of productivity as rated respondents

Lecturer Productivity		Grand Average Mean
Teaching	Level of lecturer productivity as rated by HoDs	2.91
	Level of lecturer productivity as rated by NCE III students	3.10
Research Output	Level of lecturer productivity as rated by lecturers	3.05
Lecturer Productivity (3.02 > 2.50) was high		

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

The results in table1d shows mixed perceptions among the groups of respondents on lecturer productivity in FCEs. Students rated lecturers' teaching productivity at a mean score of 2.91, while HoDs rated lecturers for teaching performance at 3.10. In addition, lecturers rated their productivity in terms of research output at a mean value of 3.05. When these indices were aggregated, the overall grand mean score was 3.02 for lecturer productivity.

Since the benchmark beyond which the level of productivity is considered positive is 2.50, the obtained grand mean of 3.02, being way above the cutoff, indicates that lecturer productivity across the sampled FCEs in southwestern Nigeria is generally high. This means that lecturers are perceived to perform well in both their teaching and research responsibilities. Additionally, with three respondent groups displaying rather similar means, this shared perception that lecturers meet expected standards of productivity is consistent across these respondents.

RQ2: What is the level of time management skills among lecturers in federal colleges of education in Southwestern Nigeria?

Table 2: Summary of the level of time management skills rated by the Lecturers

Time Management Skills							
S/N	Items	VHE-4	HE-3	SE-2	LE-1	Mean	S.D
1	Lecturers meet the deadline for setting examinations.	17 (11.8)	75 (52.1)	42 (29.2)	10 (6.9)	2.69	0.771
2	Lecturers meet the deadline for submitting marked scripts	13 (9.0)	77 (53.5)	43 (29.9)	11 (7.6)	2.64	0.754
3	Lecturers are proficient in scientific study software	14 (9.7)	79 (54.9)	41 (28.5)	10 (6.9)	2.67	0.746
4	Lecturers allocate sufficient time for teaching	15 (10.4)	78 (54.2)	40 (27.8)	11 (7.6)	2.67	0.765
5	Lecturers engage in multiple academic activities within a short time	10 (6.9)	89 (61.8)	32 (22.2)	13 (9.1)	2.67	0.739
6	Lecturers' time management in the college	9 (6.3)	74 (51.3)	45 (31.3)	16 (11.1)	2.53	0.775
	N = 144; Average Mean = 2.65						

Note: 0.00 – 1.49 = Very Low; 1.50 – 2.49 = Low; 2.50 – 3.49 = High; 350 – 4.00 = Very High.

The result in table 2 shows that time management skills has the following as the responses of lecturers: Lecturers meet the deadline for setting examinations; (mean = 2.69); Lecturers meet the deadline for submitting marked scripts (mean = 2.64); Lecturers are proficient in scientific study software (mean = 2.67); Lecturers allocate sufficient time for teaching (mean = 2.67); Lecturers engage in multiple academic activities within a short time (mean = 2.67); lecturers' time management in the college (mean = 2.53). The mean was 2.65, implying that time management, as an index of lecturers' soft skills in federal colleges of education in southwestern Nigeria, is high.

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between time management skills and lecturer productivity in federal colleges of education in South-Western Nigeria.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

Table 3: Relationship between time management skills and lecturer productivity

Variables	Lecturer Productivity (LP)	Time Management Skills (TMS)	Mean	Std. Dev.
Lecturer Productivity (LP)	1.00		45.10	5.89
Time Management (TMS)	0.147*	1.00	16.15	3.47
Sig. value	0.014			

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 3 presents the analysis of the relationship between time management skills and lecturer productivity, revealing a correlation coefficient r = 0.147 with a p-value of 0.014, based on the null hypothesis H_{01}: p = 0. The results indicate that p is less than 0.05, demonstrating a significant association between the two variables. It can therefore be interpreted that time management skills are associated with lecturers' productivity at FCE in southwestern Nigeria. The strength of this relationship is minimal, as indicated by a correlation coefficient of 0.147, suggesting a weak link between lecturer performance and time management. Time management, in this context, is related to increased productivity among well-timed lecturers. Nevertheless, their productivity cannot be relied on to reflect their time-management skills. Intangible skills or institutional support must be in place. Lecturer productivity had a mean of 45.10 and a standard deviation of 5.89, with time management having a mean of 16.15 and a standard deviation of 3.47. This suggests that lecturers generally demonstrated measurable productivity and time-management skills, while there were obvious variations in other areas. From all this, it seems that time management skills are not the only variable that can positively impact lecturer productivity, suggesting they are just one aspect.

DISCUSSION

The findings of research question one revealed that the level of lecturer productivity in terms of research output, such as publications and citations in African-Centric Research indexing databases and Paper-Based Journals, as well as scholarly contributions and effective teaching, including supervision of projects, teaching practice supervision, pedagogical content knowledge, classroom management, setting of examination questions and marking of scripts was high.

This study aligns with Raji and Oyedeji (2021), who reported that research output among academic staff at the University of Ibadan was high. This study also aligns with Asubiano and Onaolapo (2023), which assessed the representation of African journals in Web of Science, Scopus, and CrossRef. The researcher's findings indicated that Nigeria accounts for 44.5% of all journals from Africa. Additionally, a related study by Loveday-Osaso and Uriri (2024) on effective teaching found that lecturers' instructional delivery in Nigeria is notably high.

Conversely, the findings of this study contradict several empirical studies. For example, Abiodun Oyebanji (2023) analysed the research output of lecturers in Colleges of Education across Oyo, Ogun, and Lagos States, revealing low research productivity. Furthermore, Idhalama, Osawaru, Igbinouia, and Nwachukwu (2023) found that the overall research output of Nigerian lecturers was relatively modest. Observations from the researchers' study suggest that Nigerian lecturers face significant challenges in publishing in reputable journals, including high costs, prolonged review processes, high rejection rates, and complex online submission procedures.

The findings of the study likewise support the submission of Love Day-Osaro and Uriri (2024), who found that time management was high in tertiary institutions in Rivers State. However, observations from this study contradict the findings of Udeh, Onwuka and Oti (2023), who found that the majority of university lecturers do not utilise time-management skills. The findings of this study also confirm those of Adiele (2017), who revealed a significant positive relationship between time-management practice and job effectiveness. This study also corroborates the findings of Mustapha, Yusuf, Yusuf, and Aloba (2020). The researchers used a descriptive research design and reported a significant relationship between time-management strategies and lecturers' job performance in Colleges of Education in Kwara State.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

CONCLUSION

It was concluded that lecturer productivity is high across the four sampled federal colleges of education in South-Western Nigeria. The differences between this study and those of other researchers may be attributed to the fact that most respondents in this study were from the first generation colleges of education. The study also established that time management skills had a positive relationship with lecturer productivity in federal colleges of education in South-western Nigeria.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made:

1. Lecturer productivity could be increased by offering more help to faculty in planning, organizing, and time use, with no improvement if nothing else were done differently, through professional or institutional strategies.

2. This study has substantiated that the cultivation of time management skills significantly enhances lecturer productivity. Consequently, the assessment of time management skills should be incorporated into the evaluation criteria during employment interviews for prospective candidates, alongside traditional measures of academic intelligence

REFERENCES

1. Abiodun-Oyebanji, O. J. (2023). Teamwork and lecturer research output in Colleges of Education in Southwestern Nigeria. American International Journal of Business Management 6.9:21-29
2. Adiele, E. E. (2017). Time management practices and job effectiveness among university lecturers in Rivers State, Nigeria. International Journal of Education and Evaluation, 3(2), 34–42.
3. Akinwumi, F. S., & Ayo-Ayinde, A. I. (2022). Resource allocation policy and the needs of higher education institutions for the implementation of proactive teacher training during national emergencies. Nigerian Journal of Education Administration and Planning, 22(3), 199–220.
4. Akpan, S. (2024). Low enrollment in colleges of education. Retrieved on April 2, 2024, from https://www.thecable.ng.
5. Asubiaro, T. U., & Onaolapo, S. (2023). A comparative study of the coverage of African journals in Web of Science, Scopus and Cross Ref. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology 2.4:23-34.
6. Atanda, A.I. (2023). Academic staff's perception and willingness to participate in collaborative research: implications for the development in Sub-Saharan Africa, Book of Conference Proceedings in NAEAP, 381-413.
7. Gómez-Jorge, F. & Díaz-Garrido, A. (2023). The relationship between self-esteem and productivity: An analysis in Higher education institutions. Journal of Frontiers in Psychology 10.22:24-37
8. Idhalama, O.U., Osawaru, K.E., Igbinovia, M.O., & Nwachukwu, P.I. (2023). Scholarly research outputs and vulnerability of Nigerian lecturers to predatory journals—World Journal of Educational Research 10.1.
9. Junaidi, J. & Kemasis, I. R. (2022). Determining the quality of educators and teacher work productivity: Competency and soft skill analysis. Dinasti International Journal of Education Management and Social Science, 3(6), 867–880.
10. Loughland, T. (2019). The relationship between teacher adaptability, self-efficacy, and autonomy and their adaptive practices. In: Teacher Adaptive Practices. Retrieved April 2, 2024, from http://www.reserchgate.net
11. Loveday-Osaro, P., & Uriri, C. (2024). Managing Time Resources for Lecturers' Instructional Delivery in Rivers State Universities. African Journal of Information, Economics and Management Research 2.1
12. Mustapha, A.I., Yusuf, S., Yusuf, L.I., & Aloba, F.M. (2020).Time Management Strategies as Determinants of Lecturers' Job Performance in Colleges of Education in Kwara State, Nigeria. International Journal of Educational Management 6.2: 45-52

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

13. National Soft Skills Association. (2025). The real skills gap. National Soft Skills Association. Retrieved on 12th August, 2025 on hpps;//hbr.org/2025/08/Soft Skills Matter Now More Than Ever, According to New Research
14. Nureni, Y., Adigun, O., & Akinwole, A. (2023). Empirical analysis of webometric ranking in the Nigerian polytechnics education sector. Information and Control Systems 6.10:39-43
15. Oluwole, A. D., Adeniji, E. O., & Abiodun-Oyebanji, O. J. (2022). Presumptive behavioural indices and psychological well-being of academic staff in tertiary institutions in Ogun State, Nigeria. Journal of Humanities Therapy, 13(2), 147–178.
16. Nurfalah, D., Supendi, M., Waruwu, N., Hia, A. K., & Sartono, L. N. (2022). Effectiveness of work-life balance on lecturers' productivity in higher education during COVID-19. Psychology and Education, 59(1), 168–175.
17. Raji, I. A. & Oyedeji, A.A. (2021). Institutional support and research output in the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. Achiever Journal of Scientific Research 3.2:124-136
18. Udeh, P. C, Onwuka, J. O., & Oti, E. O. (2023). Time management and job performance of lecturers in state universities across southeast Nigeria: A stress management approach. International Journal of Development Strategies in Humanities, Management and Social Sciences 13.2: 274-285
19. Vasanthakumari, S. (2019). Soft skills and their application in the workplace. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 3.2: 066–072.
20. Wibowo, T.S., Badi'áti, A.Q., Annisa, A.A., Wahab, M., Jamaludin, M.R., Rozikan, M., Mufid, A., Fahmi, K., Purwanto, A., & Muhaini, A. (2020). Effect of hard skills, Soft skills, Organizational Learning and Innovation Capacity on Islamic University Lecturers' Performance—a Multifaceted Journal of Pharmacy, University of Bath 11.7:556-569.