



**International Journal of Economics,  
Environmental Development and Society  
(IJEEDS)**

## **INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP ROLES AS CORRELATES OF EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY IN UNIVERSITIES IN RIVERS STATE**

**Everest Onwudebe NKWOR**

Department of Educational Management  
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt  
[everestnk10@gmail.com](mailto:everestnk10@gmail.com)

---

### **ABSTRACT**

The study examined the roles played by institutional leaders as correlates of employees' productivity in the universities in Rivers State. The yearnings for effective leadership and staff productivity prompted the study. The study adopted a correlational survey design. The population of the study was 1,870 staff comprising teaching staff, registry staff, and principal officers, deans of faculties, heads of departments and directors of units. A sample size of 375 respondents was drawn from the population using stratified random sampling technique. The instruments for data collection were Institutional Leadership Roles Checklist (ILRC) and Staff Productivity Rating Scale (SPRS) of 20 items each designed based on the 4 point modified Likert scale used to test the relationship between leaders' roles and staff productivity. The reliability index of the research instruments was obtained as 0.85. Data was analyzed using the Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient to answer the research questions, z-test in testing the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The findings of the study revealed that the relationship between leaders' roles in staff recruitment process and productivity in Universities in Rivers State was not statistically significant; The relationship between the leaders' roles in supporting staff development programmes and productivity in Universities in Rivers State was statistically significant and; the relationship between leaders' supervisory roles and productivity in Universities in Rivers State were statistically significant. Based on the findings of the study, the study recommended that University leaders and proprietors should strive to adopt and maintain appropriate staff recruitment process devoid of any form of interference, initiate, support and guide regular development opportunities and; encourage the modern democratic method of supervision of University staff.

**Keywords:** Institutional, Leadership Roles, Correlates, Employees, Productivity.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Nkwor, E. O. (2024). Institutional leadership roles as correlates of employee productivity in universities in Rivers State. *International Journal of Economics, Environmental Development and Society*, 5(1), 65-78.

## INTRODUCTION

The paucity of effective leadership system at workplace has remained a major challenge of modern day organizations including educational institutions. Contextually, leadership reflects the collective responsibility of stakeholders to contribute in the effective utilization process of human and material resources of a group by way of motivating, inspiring and developing members who work willingly to achieve both individual and organizational objectives.

Undoubtedly, institutional leaders are saddled with the responsibility of staff recruitment, selection, training, supervision, rewards and incentives through effective goal setting, decision making and policy implementation processes. Strong leaders also show expertise in duties delegation, conflict resolution, team motivation, listening to feedback and flexibility to solve problems and at the same time identifying and directing the totality of the employees' skills and energies in an ever-changing work environment (Doyle, 2021). This means that strong leadership inspires employees to willingly input their individual skills, energies, talents, latent capacities, and social characteristics-beliefs, norms and values to achieve set goals.

However, productivity is the measure of employees' input into the organization they work in. It is an outcome of the employees' knowledge, capacity, motivation, workplace environment etc. The measure of employees' productivity in the workplace is concerned with the appraisal of both employees' qualitative and quantitative work with time. Therefore, it is defined as the output gained by the inputs of the employee with a goal to bring out profit to both the organization and the employee. Enhancing employee's productivity is not only about the inputs of the employee but, also the aid provided by the organization and the nature of workplace environment.

Generally, productivity of an educational institution is the reflection of its leadership effectiveness: management/administration, academic curriculum, institutional culture etc. To buttress this point, Iheonunekwu (2003) posited that each element in the input- output process of any educational institution should be of acceptable standard to enhance productivity. In the university system, leaders could ascertain employee productivity by measuring timeliness; this will help reveal the time staff report and close from work; whether a staff is able to complete accurately and effectively a specific task at a given period and this could be achieved by setting a track system in a computer, keeping staff attendance records and score cards. Measuring clients' level of satisfaction is another way to ascertain staff productivity; this could be done through survey of the clients that interact with staff on daily basis. This will help to analyze employee productivity since customer satisfaction is the ultimate target of a good organization.

Unarguably, employees of educational institutions are the largest group of workers in the public service especially in the developing countries (Madumere in Babalola, 2009). It is rather regrettable that, to provide, develop and sustain strong leadership in educational institution is usually relegated or even neglected in that, leadership principles, theories, processes, skills and styles adopted to coordinate employees' actions are often down played on and; this has raised concern about low work morale and motivation among staff especially in the university system. Ogbodo (2011) had argued that educational institutions at all levels risk poor performance and perhaps total collapse if the workforce are haphazardly employed, poorly trained, not properly supervised, neither motivated nor rewarded for incidental achievements and contributions and; above all, not exposed to continuous self-development programmes. It is obvious that the leader has vital roles to play in this regard if employees are to perform above expectation.

## **BACKGROUND**

Of course, low priority and inappropriate leadership approaches, strategies and skills have reflected concerns about stress, low morale and motivation among staff especially in the universities in Rivers State. In these universities, one expects to see co-operation among staff, sense of punctuality, emotional maturity, due respect for one another, dedicated and highly productive workers with high personal integrity and sense of responsibility under good conditions of service and friendly work environment.

Observably, the non-teaching staff who are meant to be in the office by eight o'clock in the morning hardly open their offices by nine. Not minding their lateness, when they report and sign in, some low cadre staff among them would disappear to their private businesses. Some middle level ones move from one office to another chatting; some top officers who are expected to be supervising the junior ones report at times by eleven O'clock under the excuse that they closed late the previous evening or were held in traffic. Files pile up unattended to, for a longtime. The academic staff are not left out in these unholy behaviours. They go late to lectures and leave the classroom early enough. Some purposely absent themselves from lectures while; some still do not put in their best but decide to hustle and bustle for part time teaching in other learning institutions such as Nigeria Teachers Institute (NTI) among others. This affects the quality of their teaching. The lecturers hardly have time for their students. Many lecturers hardly publish. Despite that it is one of the requirements for their promotion (Publish or perish' policy), many lecturers hardly publish. Some remain at one level for as long as six to seven years without producing a paper perhaps due to the fact that issues relating to staff development are considered less important by university leaders who are supposed to be in charge of staff motivation, welfare and development.

Irrespective of the fact that technological advancement has made academic work a bit easier, poor attitude to work still persists. It is a notable maxim in Nigerian workforce that government work is nobody's work and therefore does not deserve commitment. The apathy to work among Nigerian workforce including university staff in Rivers staff can be traced to the colonial era when indigenous civil servants had very limited growth potentials. As observed by Nwosu in Ogbodo (2011) that Nigeria workers during the colonial era worked to meet the requirements of the colonial masters. They never obtained the reward which was commensurate with the work done. Today, despite the fact that the policies and objectives are now being formulated by Nigerians for Nigerian need, that colonial attitude persists. Moreso, the irregularities in method and process of staff appointment in public universities in Nigeria is causing a lot of concern to those who have education at heart.

Ogbodo (2011) reiterated that there was suppression of excellence and diligence and promotion of mediocrity in appointment and promotion of staff in Nigerian universities. These universities including the ones in Rivers State seem not to employ based on merit but based on who backs the candidates. It will be more of understatement to say that approximately fifty percent of staff in the Nigerian universities gets employed based on personal relationship or political affiliation or tribe. Many of these staff often flout the rules and cannot be disciplined because they are protected by those who brought them into the system. Appointment into leadership positions such as heads of departments, deans of faculties, directors and heads of units in these universities are never based on merit but on the grounds that they would be loyal and faithful to the university leadership (principal officers). Several studies on leadership roles and responsibilities have neglected to consider if leadership as provided in the universities in Rivers

State has any relationship with staff productivity. It is on this background that the study strives to examine the relationship between the leadership roles and employee productivity in the universities in Rivers State

### **Statement of the Problem**

Indisputably, the employees of educational system at all levels are the fundamental assets and determinants of its growth and success. Nevertheless, the leadership principles, styles, theories and skills adopted by educational leaders in inspiring employees to put in their best to ensure that organizational objectives are achieved remain a difficult challenge. Notably, a lot of anomalies and inadequacies abound in our tertiary education institutions especially, in the areas of leadership inaptitude, poor service delivery, students' poor performance and character related issues in recent times.

Hardly, a day passes without the news on the radio, social media, newspaper or television about tertiary education institution employees in Nigeria embarking on strike resulting from poor conditions of service or hostile work environment all bordering on leadership lapses. In the same vein, many of our university graduates have been tagged "educated illiterates or "half baked" invariably due to leadership negligence of staff welfare. The much talked about fallen standard of education in our educational institutions has been blamed by the general public on staff unproductive and unwholesome attitudes without considering the quality of leadership provided. This scenario, undoubtedly calls for a scientific investigation. Following the observed state of affairs in the leadership of the universities in Rivers State, the researcher is perturbed to unravel whether there is any relationship between the roles played by school leaders and employees' productivity.

### **Purpose of Study**

The study aims at investigating the relationship between leadership roles and employees' productivity in the universities in Rivers State. Specifically, the study examined:

- The relationship between leaders' role in the recruitment process and employees' productivity in universities in Rivers State.
- The relationship between leaders' role in providing development opportunities and employees' productivity in universities in Rivers State.
- The relationship between leaders' supervisory role and employees' productivity in universities in Rivers State.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were raised to guide the study:

- What is the relationship between leaders' role in recruitment process and employees' productivity in universities in Rivers State?
- What is the relationship between leaders' role in providing training/development opportunities and employees' productivity in universities in Rivers State?

- What is the relationship between leaders' supervisory role and employees' productivity in universities in Rivers State?

## **Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses further guided the study:

- Leaders' role in recruitment process does not relate with employees' productivity in universities in Rivers State.
- Leadership role of providing training/development opportunities does not relate with employees' productivity in universities in Rivers State.
- Leaders' supervisory role does not relate with employees' productivity in universities in Rivers State.

## **Empirical Review on the Relationship between University Leadership Roles and Employees' Productivity**

Leadership roles today have become very complex because of the intricate nature of social or political organizations, globalization and technological advancement especially in Information and Communication Technology (ICT). Ololube (2019) noted that several researches on effective schools points to the crucial roles leaders play in establishing and monitoring quality schools for all students. Leadership however, is the moral and intellectual ability to visualize and work for what is better for the organization and its employees. Madumere (1999) viewed leadership as the ability to guide, conduct, direct or influence the followership for the purpose of achieving common goals or task. The leader in this circumstance is one who has the ability to influence others to achieve results. Leadership role in this context however, is all about the execution of organizational policies and decisions which help to direct the activities of an organization towards its specific goals. Leadership is a status of dominance and prestige acquired by ability to control, initiate or set the pattern of behaviour for others. The university leaders are ideally for the control of the activities of the staff and students of the university.

Leadership roles are the expectations, nominative right and duties prescribed through job titles and descriptions in work manuals; and the way people actually behave in these positions depend partly on the way they think (Ololube, 2019). The leadership role of university management team is demonstrated in all the general duties of the university leadership. Ordinarily, leadership roles deal with the initiation, organization, motivation and direction of the actions of members of a group in a specific situation towards the achievement of group goals.

## **Training/Development Role of the Leader and Staff Performance**

Ogundele (2001) defined personnel development as the process which includes all developmental functions of the leader directed at the maintenance, updating and enhancement of professional competence. It includes the sum total of formal learning experiences throughout an employee's career from employment to retirement. Personnel development/training as a basic requirement of human resource development involves re-investment in training employees by employers; investment in time and money by individuals for their self-development and; the creation of an enabling environment by employers for the acquisition of necessary skills by

employees either through formal education or through on-the-job training (Nwadiani; 1992; Ajayi, 2001).

Ogbodo (2011) argued that people invest on training because they know that the returns would be much. In essence, staff development does not only cover expenditure on their education and training but also the development of attitudes towards productive activities (Babalola, 2009). Since the expenditure is to enhance human capabilities, it also increases the productivity or performance of human efforts (labour), they will yield some positive rate of returns. Arikewuyo and Adegbesan (2009) in order to buttress this point stated that staff training and development may be used directly to increase the job skills of an individual or a group of individuals by teaching them to perform their tasks more efficiently and effectively. To them, staff need continuous training and retraining on the job if their potentials are to be utilized effectively. Therefore, the orientation or induction, workshops, conferences and seminars among others organized by university leaders should provide members of staff with an understanding of how job performance contributes to the development of the institutions and how the services rendered by staff contribute to the development of the society.

In staff training, no matter how automated an enterprise may be, high performance depends upon the effectiveness of the workforce. It is essential therefore, that staff should have good initial training for their respective roles. The objective of the enterprise among others should be to give every employee the opportunity for improvement and self- development to meet the ever changing challenges and requirements of new techniques, and new equipment of production and management.

### **Hiring/Selection Role of the Leader and Staff Performance**

In reality, it is the duty of an ideal educational leader to identify the staff needs of the school and indicate the specific type of personnel needed to meet the needs. Uche (2009) reiterated that staff recruitment is purely a personnel [leadership] function which starts with identifying the personnel needs after which people are recruited. She further stated that, it is the quality of staff that sets the tone of standard of any educational institution. Nwafor (2004) asserted that the extent to which a school system succeeds in its programmes depends largely upon the quality of staff engaged in the educational process and upon the effectiveness with which they discharge their individual and group responsibilities. To him, staffing the school with truly able and inspiring staff transcends all other areas of educational leadership. The aim of hiring (recruitment) is to attract qualified job candidates for the organization. So, it is the starting point for the appointment of staff.

However, since the major objective of recruitment is to fill job positions available with qualified candidates, the extent to which an organization is able to achieve this objective will in no doubt help the organization in attaining high productivity as well as employees' satisfaction. Therefore, a good recruitment programme should be one that is properly planned and well operated.

### **Supervisory Role of the Leader and Staff job performance**

Staff supervision has been an age long control technique used by educational leaders to ensure that appropriate teaching methods and materials are utilized in the school. The dictionary of education defined supervision as all efforts of designated school official(s) directed toward

providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction; the stimulation of professional growth and development of teachers, the selection and revision of educational objectives, materials of instruction and methods of teaching and the evaluation of instruction.

Adeyemi (2008) viewed personnel supervision in school as an act of seeing to the efficient and effective utilization of facilities and instructional materials in schools as well as the control of staff and students to achieve the objectives of effective teaching and learning. The need for staff supervision in the school system is brought about by the natural condition of human groups that some people must be watched and encouraged if subordinates are to work efficiently and produce more. Nwogu (2006) buttressed this point when he opined that the purpose of supervision was to ensure that quality and standard were maintained in education.

Supervision in the Nigeria's education system began in the missionary schools and was made a government concern in 1882 when the first education ordinance for the whole British West African was promulgated. Later on, the colonial masters in 1887 got interested in education and started visiting the missionary schools with grants and aids. They began to enact education laws or ordinances to enable them introduce, control and supervise education. The inspectors were rather interested in making judgment about teachers than on teaching (McLeans & Mills, 1965 in Nte, 2005). Modern day school supervision adopts democratic in place of the traditional autocratic method by bringing in the idea of involving the teacher in active participation in identifying and helping to solve some of his instructional supervision problems with the aids of the supervisor.

Adeyemi (2008) argued that effective supervision is a viable tool for the attainment and maintenance of high level outcome in the sense that it benefits both the individuals supervised and the organization. Supervision in this sense is geared towards helping staff members to gain competency makes them feel supported and valued and makes the organization more competent and effective. It requires that the supervisor should be adequately trained for the job. He must devise a scheme well known to staff for work inspection and quality control. He should know when to cajole and when to reprimand. Effective supervision is essentially a matter of good leadership. The supervisor in order to be effective must display at all times the leadership qualities of sound judgment and fair play. He must be courageous to transmit to management any just and reasonable reactions of his staff and should be encouraged and given an opportunity to do so whenever necessary.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study adopted a correlational survey design. This type of design is appropriate because it established the relationship between the two major variables of the study (leadership roles and employees' job performance). The study sought the opinions of teaching and administrative staff (lecturers and registry staff), Principal Officers, Deans of Faculties, Heads of Departments, and Directors of Units in the three Universities situated in Rivers State. The study strived to establish whether there is significant relationship existing between how staff are managed and their productivity. The population for this study was 1,870 comprising teaching staff (lecturers), administrative staff (Registry), Principal Officers, Deans of Faculties and Directors of Units in the three (3) Universities in Rivers State namely: University of Port Harcourt, Choba; Rivers state University of Science and Technology, Nkoplun-Oroworukwo and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni (Source: 2022 staff list of Universities under study).

Stratified random sampling technique was used in drawing a sample of 375 staff comprising teaching staff 202, registry staff 126 and principal officers, Deans of faculties and Directors of units 47 representing 20% of the total population. The main instruments used in data collection for this study were two sets of questionnaire namely: Institutional Leadership Roles Checklist (ILRC) and Staff Productivity Rating Scale (SPRS). Institutional Leadership Roles Checklist (ILRC) is a four four-point likert type scale of Strongly Agree SA, Agree A, Disagree D, and Strongly Disagree SD. It is made up of twenty (20) items administered to Teaching and Registry staff. The essence of (ILRC) was to draw valuable responses from Teaching and Registry staff on the roles their bosses play while performing certain leadership functions i.e. staff recruitment, development programmes, reward, incentives, monitoring and supervision.

In the same vein, staff Job Performance Rating Scale (SJPRS) is a four-point Likert type scale of Strongly Agree SA, Agree A, Disagree D, and Strongly Disagree SD with twenty (20) items. It was administered to Principal Officers, Deans of Faculties, Heads of Departments and Directors of Units since they make up among others, the key arms of the University Leadership. Its essence was to elicit information from the leaders on their staff job performance considering punctuality, regularity, record keeping and ability to meet work deadline, student's performance, honesty, integrity and willingness to accept responsibilities. The responses of lecturers and Registry staff in (SJPRS) were correlated with the responses of the principal officers, Deans, Heads of Departments and Directors of units in (SJPRS).

The instruments were presented to a research expert in the department of Mathematics and Statistics, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt for critical appraisal. He carefully checked the quality and relevance of the items including the appropriateness, clarity and sufficiency of the instruments for collecting the required information for the study. His inputs in the form of correction or comments were adequately utilized, to ensure that the instruments measure exactly the variables in the study. The reliability of the instruments was established through test-retest method. To do this, eight (8) copies of ILRC was administered to Lecturers and Registry Staff while eight (8) copies of SJPRS was administered to Principal Officers, Deans, Heads of Departments and Directors of Units all in Rivers State College of Arts and Science, Rumuola, Port Harcourt. This was to ensure that the groups meant for the study were not tested in the process of establishing the reliability of the instruments. After an interval of two weeks, the instruments were re-administered to the same set of staff. Their responses to the items of the instruments at the two instances were correlated using Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient method to determine the reliability index of 0.87. The researcher engaged the services of Two (2) research assistants who assisted in administering to the respondents the 375 copies of the questionnaire in University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State University of Science and Technology and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education and retrieving 358 copies used for the study. Data collected were grouped into categories of respondents and responses converted into numerical data. Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used in answering the research questions while z-test was used in testing the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The presentation and analyses of data was based on the research questions and hypotheses earlier stated in the study and the 358 respondents who correctly filled and returned the instruments administered to them. The retrieval rate is therefore 96%.



Table 1: Distribution and retrieval of instruments

Instrument	Teaching Staff		Registry Staff		Principal Officers, Deans, HOD's and Directors		Total No.
	No. Distributed	No. Retrieved	No. Distributed	No. Retrieved	No. Distributed	No. Retrieved	Instrument Retrieved
Uni-Port	81	79	44	42	20	19	<b>140</b>
RSUST	72	70	42	40	15	13	<b>123</b>
IAUOE, PH	49	47	40	38	12	10	<b>95</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>358</b>

**Research Question 1:** What is the relationship between leaders’ role in recruitment process and employees’ productivity in universities in Rivers State?

**Hypothesis 1:** Leadership role in recruitment process does not relate with employees’ productivity in the universities in Rivers State.

Table 2: Relationship between leaders’ role in recruitment process and employees’ productivity in universities in Rivers State

Variables	N	$\sum x^2$	$\sum y^2$	$\sum xy$	r-value	z-cal	z-crit	Result
Recruitment Procedures (x)	358	231,591	49,252	58,912	0.21	1.011	1.96	<b>Not Significant</b>
Staff Productivity (y)								

Table 2 shows a correlation coefficient (r-value) of 0.21 between leaders’ role in recruitment process and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State. The result is that there is very low but positive relationship between leaders’ role in recruitment process and staff productivity in Universities in the state. Furthermore, it shows a calculated z-value of 1.011 while critical z-value is 1.960 at 0.05 level of significance for a two – tailed test. Since the calculated z-value (1.01) is less than the critical z-value (1.960) at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis that “there is no significant relationship between leaders’ role in recruitment process and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State” is accepted. This means that the alternate hypothesis is rejected. The result is that the relationship between leaders’ role in recruitment process and staff productivity (0.21) in Universities in Rivers State is not statistically significant

**Research Question 2:** What is the relationship between leaders’ role in providing training/development opportunities and employees’ productivity in universities in Rivers State?

**Hypothesis 2:** Leadership role in providing training/development opportunities does not relate with employees’ productivity in the universities in Rivers State.

Table 3: Relationship between leadership role in providing training/development opportunities and employees’ productivity in Universities in Rivers State

<b>Variables</b>	<b>N</b>	<b><math>\sum x^2</math></b>	<b><math>\sum y^2</math></b>	<b><math>\sum xy</math></b>	<b>r-value</b>	<b>z-cal</b>	<b>z-crit</b>	<b>Result</b>
<b>Staff Development Programmes (x)</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>241,985</b>	<b>53,284</b>	<b>60,728</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>2.105</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>Significant</b>
<b>Staff Productivity (y)</b>								

Table 3 shows a correlation coefficient (r-value) of 0.63 between leaders’ role in providing staff development opportunities (x) and staff productivity (y) in Universities in Rivers State. The result is that there is moderate but positive relationship between leaders’ role in providing staff development opportunities (x) and staff productivity (y) in Universities in Rivers State. Furthermore, it shows a calculated z-value of 2.105 while the critical z-value is 1.960 at 0.05 level of significance for a two-tailed test. Since the calculated z-value (2.105) is greater than the critical z-value (1.960) at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis that “there is no significant relationship between leaders’ role in providing staff development opportunities (x) and staff productivity (y) in Universities in Rivers State” is rejected. This means that the alternate hypothesis is accepted. The result is that the relationship between leaders’ role in providing staff development and staff productivity (0.63) in Universities in Rivers State is statistically significant. Thus, there is significant relationship between leaders’ role in providing staff development opportunities and staff productivity in Universities in the State.

**Research Question 3:** What is the relationship between leaders’ supervisory role and employees’ productivity in universities in Rivers State?

**Hypothesis 3:** Leaders’ supervisory role does not relate with employees’ productivity in the universities in Rivers State.

Table 4: Relationship between leaders’ supervisory role and employees’ productivity in Universities in Rivers State

<b>Variables</b>	<b>N</b>	<b><math>\sum x^2</math></b>	<b><math>\sum y^2</math></b>	<b><math>\sum xy</math></b>	<b>r-value</b>	<b>z-cal</b>	<b>z-crit</b>	<b>Result</b>
<b>Methods of Staff Supervision (x)</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>245,261</b>	<b>53,184</b>	<b>610,588</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>2.219</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>Significant</b>
<b>Staff Productivity (y)</b>								

Table 4 shows a correlation coefficient (r-value) of 0.66 between leaders' supervisory role (x) and staff productivity (y) in Universities in Rivers State. The result is that there is moderate but positive relationship between leaders' supervisory role (x) and staff productivity (y) in Universities in Rivers State. Furthermore, it shows that a calculated z-value of 2.219 while the critical z-value of 1.960 was obtained at 0.05 level of significance for a two-tailed test. Since the calculated z-value (2.219) is greater than the critical z-value (1.960) at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis that "there is no significant relationship between leaders' supervisory role and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State" is rejected. This means that the alternate hypothesis is accepted. The result is that the relationship between leaders' supervisory role and staff productivity (0.66) in Universities in Rivers State is statistically significant. Thus, there is significant relationship between leaders' supervisory role and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State.

## **DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

The result shows that there is very low positive relationship between the roles played by leaders in staff recruitment process and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State. This is because the correlation coefficient which is a measurement of the relationship between the two variables is 0.21 (Table 2). Furthermore, on the application of z-test a calculated z-value of 1.011 and the critical z-value of 1.960 at 0.05 level of significance were obtained. This implies that the relationship between leaders' role in recruitment process and staff productivity in the Universities is not statistically significant. The result means that as scores on leaders' role in recruitment process increases there was no corresponding increase in the scores on staff productivity and vice versa. More so, it reveals that leaders' roles during recruitment exercise do not apparently reflect correspondingly on staff productivity.

The degree of association between the two variables in this study was found to be 0.21, while the degree of lack of association ( $\sqrt{1 - r^2}$ ) between the variables was found to be 0.97. The percentage of association ( $r^2 \times 100$ ) was found to be 4.41% which represents the magnitude of the relationship between staff recruitment procedures and their staff productivity. The value (4.41%) however, shows a very low relationship.

The finding of this research question and hypothesis is that there is a very low significant relationship between leaders' role in recruitment process and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State. This is because although Universities have their laid down procedures for the recruitment of their staff, such recruitment procedures are not followed strictly by the University leaders. This indicates that there are other interferences in the recruitment exercises in the Universities. Sometimes recruitment is left for landowners, political considerations, etc. This finding is in agreement with Ifedili (2011) who explained that in the Universities, those charged with the responsibility of staff recruitment do not have adequate recruitment principles. There is no proper advertisement schedule and conduct of interview and where there is, is to "fulfill all righteousness".

The result also shows that there is a positive relationship between leaders' role in providing training/development opportunities and staff productivity in Universities. The calculated correlation coefficient is 0.63 (Table 4.3). The application of z-test, r-value of 0.63, was found to be statistically significant. This means that there is significant relationship between leaders' role in providing training/ development opportunities and staff productivity in the Universities in Rivers State. The result means that as scores on staff training/development

opportunities increase; there is a corresponding increase in the scores on staff productivity among the Universities in Rivers State. This reveals that when staff are better trained to discharge their duties, it is going to reflect on their productivity and the ease they carry out assigned task.

The degree of association between the two variables was found to be 0.63 while the degree of lack of association ( $\sqrt{1 - r^2}$ ) between the variables was found to 0.77. The percentage of association ( $r^2 \times 100$ ) was found to be 39.69% which represents the magnitude of the relationship between leaders' roles in providing training/development opportunities and staff productivity. This shows a moderate relationship between the two variables. The finding is that there is a significant relationship between the role of leaders in providing training/development opportunities and staff productivity. Universities usually have various staff development programmes. This includes workshop, talk shop, conferences, on the job training, study leave with or without pay. Such staff development programmes are very important in enhancing or boosting staff productivity. This finding is in agreement with Arikewuyo and Adegbesan (2009) that staff training and development may be used directly to increase the job skills of an individual or a group of individuals by teaching them to perform their tasks more efficiently and effectively.

The result shows that there is a positive relationship between leaders' supervisory role and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State. The measure of relationship is 0.66 (Table 4.5). On the application of z-test, a calculated z-value of 2.219 and the critical z-value of 1.960 at 0.05 level of significance were obtained. This implies that the relationship between leaders' supervisory role and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State is statistically significant. This means that as scores on leaders' supervisory role increases, there is a corresponding increase in the scores on staff productivity.

The degree of association between the two variables in this study was found to be 0.66, while the degree of lack of association ( $\sqrt{1 - r^2}$ ) between the two variables was found to be 0.75. The percentage of association ( $r^2 \times 100$ ) was found to be 56.44% which represents the magnitude of the relationship between leaders' supervisory role and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State.

The finding is that there is a significant relationship between leaders' supervisory role and staff productivity in Universities in Rivers State. This is due to the application of modern techniques of supervision which involves demonstration lessons, observational visits, and use of constructive feedback which help to bring out the best in the staff as well as enhancing their productivity. This finding is in agreement with Adeyemi (2008) that effective methods of staff supervision help to boost their productivity in any organization.

## **CONCLUSION**

The role of institutional leaders especially in staff recruitment process, training and supervision has been considered hitherto, as a major factor for organizational goals achievement. However, leadership roles have often been undertaken with utmost naivety, negligence or outright relegation as revealed in the study hence, establishing the assertion that relationship exist between roles leaders play at workplace and employees' productivity in the universities in Rivers State. The study therefore, concluded that appreciable employee productivity is achievable if leaders will remain diligent in discharging their duties without being bias.

## Recommendations

In the light of the findings and conclusion of the study, the following recommendations are offered:

- University leadership should endeavour to adopt and maintain appropriate staff recruitment procedures against all odds to ensure hiring the best quality of staff as it may influence productivity.
- The government, the university leadership, and private organizations should always synergize to provide more professional development opportunities for university staff in order to continuously get the best from them.
- The government and the university leadership should continuously encourage the use of modern methods of staff supervision rather than monitoring.

## REFERENCES

- Adeyemi, T. O. (2008). *Educational administration: an introduction*. Atlantic Associated Publishers.
- Ajayi, A. E. (2001). Human Resource Management in the Civil Service; Paper presented at the senior staff seminar, Ministry of Education, Ado Ekiti, March 1-9.
- Arikewuyo, O. M., & Adegbesan, S. O. (2009). Practicum on Administration of Personnel in Education: In J. B. Babalola & A. O. Ayemi (Eds.), *Educational management theories and tasks*. Macmillian.
- Babalola, J. B. (2009). Strategic planning: development, implementation and role of university administrators. In J. B. Babalola & A. O. Ayemi (Eds.), *Educational management theories and tasks*. Macmillian Nigeria Publishers.
- Doyle, A. (2021). Top Skills Employers Value. <https://www.coursehero.com>.
- Iheonunekwu, S. (2003). *Strategic for permanent installation and management of change: entrepreneurship theory and practice*. Crown Publishers.
- Nte, A. R. (2005). *Foundation of Educational Management*, Port Harcourt. Mission Publishers Limited
- Nwadiani, M. (1992). Relationship Between Human Resources and Planning and Availability of Places in Higher Education in Nigeria. *Higher Education in Europe*, xvii(3).
- Nwafor, S. O. (2004). Principles of Management. In Nnabuo, P. O. M., Okorie, N. C., Agabi, O. G. & Igwe, L. E. B. (Eds.), *Fundamentals of educational management*. Versatile Publishers.
- Nwogu, U. J. (2006). Achieving Qualitative Universal Basic Education through the Application of Quality Circle Management Technique. In S. N. Maduagwu (Ed), *Administration of Universal Basic Education: The Basic Facts*. Springfield Publishers.
- Madumere, S. C. (1999). *Organizational theory and management*. Bilesanmi Nigeria Press.
- Ogbodo, C. M. (2011). Human Resource Development. In S. U. Basse & U. U. Basse (Eds.). *Management of Higher Education in Africa* (pp. 131-160). Abaam Publishers.
- Ogundele, A. (2001). Staff Development for Improved School Management. In N. A. Nwagwu, M. A. Oguru & E. T. Ehiemetalor. *Association of Educational Administration and Planning Publishers*.

- Ololube, N. P. (2019). *Practical guide to human resources management and organizational theory*. Pearl Publishers.
- Uche, C. M. (2009). Human resource management in higher education. In S. U. Bassey & U. U. Bassey (Eds.), *Management of higher education in Africa*. Abaam Publishing.