

Research Paper

HUMAN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY A STUDY OF NON TECHING STAFF OF UNIVERSITY OF AFRICA TORU ORUA

YIDOUGHHA ESIDO (Ph.D)¹, POAZI, FRANCIS DEINMODEI W. (Ph.D)²

^{1,2}Niger Delta University Wilberforce Island Bayelsa State

Received: 10 May 2025

Accepted: 02 July 2026

Published: 15 July 2026

Abstract

This study examined human capital development and productivity among non-teaching staff at the University of Africa, Toru-Orua. Specifically, the study identified the human capital development practices available to non-teaching staff, assessed their level of productivity, and identified the challenges hindering effective human capital development within the institution. The study adopted a survey research design. The population comprised 306 non-teaching staff, while a sample size of 169 respondents was determined using the Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table. A structured questionnaire was used for data collection, and 149 valid copies were retrieved and analyzed, representing a response rate of 88.17%. Data were analyzed using univariate statistics comprising frequencies, percentages, mean scores, and standard deviations. The findings revealed that the university organized some training programmes for non-teaching staff; however, there was inadequate institutional support for professional development programmes and no clearly established training policy. The results further showed that the productivity level of non-teaching staff was generally low, as respondents disagreed that assignments were completed within the required time, that prompt services were rendered, and that staff contributed effectively to the administration of the institution. The study also found that management's limited interest in non-teaching staff training programmes was the major challenge hindering effective human capital development. The study concluded that inadequate human capital development contributed to the low productivity of non-teaching staff. The study recommended the establishment of a formal staff development policy, increased support for professional development programmes, and a transparent staff training selection process.

Keywords: Human Capital Development, Productivity, Non-Teaching Staff, Staff Training, Professional Development

Introduction

Human Capital Development (HCD) is a fundamental economic concept that plays a significant role in promoting organizational growth and development. It enhances employee productivity and contributes to improved organizational performance and profitability. According to Kenton (2019),

organizations that consistently invest in the training and retraining of their workforce are more likely to achieve higher levels of effectiveness and efficiency. Human capital development involves deliberate efforts aimed at improving employees' knowledge, skills, competencies, and capabilities, thereby enabling them to perform their duties more effectively. Ekiran and Olasehinde (2025) noted that the acquisition of relevant knowledge, experience, and professional skills is essential for enhancing employee performance and strengthening organizational resources. Human capital encompasses the knowledge, skills, competencies, and attributes possessed by individuals that contribute to personal, social, and economic advancement (OECD). Within the university system, academic staff are primarily responsible for teaching, research, and community service, while non-teaching staff provide the administrative and support services necessary for the smooth functioning of the institution. These personnel manage critical areas such as finance, registry operations, library services, information and communication technology (ICT), security, estate management, and student support services. The effectiveness of these functions significantly affects the overall quality of educational service delivery in universities (Eze & Ude, 2019).

In Nigeria, state-owned universities are increasingly expected to improve their operational efficiency and service delivery despite facing financial and infrastructural constraints. The University of Africa, Toru-Orua (UAT), established by the Bayelsa State Government in 2016, was created to expand access to quality tertiary education within the Niger Delta region and Nigeria at large. Achieving this mandate requires a competent and productive workforce capable of adapting to the evolving demands of higher education administration. Human capital development initiatives such as staff training, capacity-building programmes, professional development, and career advancement opportunities are crucial for equipping non-teaching personnel with the competencies needed to function effectively in a modern university environment. Continuous development enables staff to acquire updated knowledge in areas such as ICT, records management, customer service, and administrative procedures. Conversely, inadequate training and limited professional development opportunities can negatively affect employee productivity and organizational effectiveness. Despite the important contributions of non-teaching staff to university administration, they are often overlooked in staff development programmes within many Nigerian universities. Institutional management and government agencies frequently concentrate training resources on academic staff, while non-teaching employees receive fewer opportunities for professional growth and capacity enhancement. As a result, the skills and competencies required for efficient administrative service delivery may not be adequately developed among this category of staff (Olorunsola & Olayemi, 2011).

Objectives of the Study

To examine the relationship between human capital development and the productivity of non-teaching staff at the University of Africa, Toru-Orua.

Specific Objectives

1. To identify the human capital development programmes available to non-teaching staff at the University of Africa, Toru-Orua.
2. To evaluate the level of productivity of non-teaching staff at the University of Africa, Toru-Orua.

3. To determine the challenges affecting the effective implementation of human capital development programmes for non-teaching staff at the University of Africa, Toru-Orua.

Review of Related Literature

Human capital is widely recognized as one of the most valuable assets of any organization. According to Bontis (2001), human capital comprises inherited abilities, educational attainment, accumulated experience, and personal attitudes that influence individual and organizational performance. Similarly, Hines (2000) described human capital as the collective knowledge, competencies, creativity, and capabilities possessed by employees that enable them to accomplish organizational objectives. It also encompasses intangible elements such as organizational culture, values, and philosophy. Consequently, organizations that invest in employee education and development enhance their stock of human capital, thereby improving their capacity to achieve strategic goals. Edvinsson (2007) argued that organizations cannot own human capital in the same manner as physical assets; rather, they can only benefit from employees' expertise while they remain within the organization. In support of this view, Sveiby (2008) emphasized that people are the primary drivers of organizational success, as both tangible and intangible organizational assets are products of human effort and depend on individuals for their creation and sustainability.

Ahangar (2011) identified human capital as the most significant asset within an organization because it provides the knowledge, experience, skills, talents, and innovative abilities required to deliver goods and services effectively. Human capital also reflects an organization's capacity for creativity and innovation. Despite increasing investments in workforce development, measuring the precise contribution of human capital to organizational performance remains challenging. Ahangar further explained that structural capital serves as the support system for human capital and includes organizational processes, databases, technologies, patents, and operational procedures. Unlike human capital, structural capital remains within the organization even when employees leave and can be transferred, shared, and replicated. Relational capital, another component of intellectual capital, refers to the relationships an organization maintains with customers, suppliers, strategic partners, investors, and other stakeholders. The combined effect of human, structural, and relational capital forms what the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA, 2001) described as intellectual capital. Intellectual capital consists of knowledge, expertise, professional skills, technological capabilities, and valuable relationships that provide organizations with a sustainable competitive advantage.

Stewart (1997) viewed human capital as the collection of individual and collective skills, abilities, and competencies that contribute to organizational effectiveness. Similarly, Boujelbene and Affes (2013) defined human capital as the value-creating potential embedded in employees' knowledge, experience, talents, and capabilities. Human capital therefore represents a strategic resource that organizations can leverage to improve performance and maintain competitiveness. Rastogi (2000), cited in Stiles and Kivisaechana (2008), argued that the concept of human capital is founded on the understanding that knowledge, learning, innovation, competencies, and creativity are irreplaceable organizational resources. These resources must be continuously developed and aligned with the organization's competitive environment. Likewise, Nielsen, Bukh, Johansen, and Gormsen (2006) asserted that human resource capital forms the core of intellectual capital and consists of skilled

personnel, organizational knowledge, and managerial philosophy that collectively influence organizational productivity.

According to Wikipedia, human capital refers to the skills, abilities, and knowledge possessed by individuals that contribute to economic productivity and organizational success. Schmidt (2004) described human capital as an intangible asset capable of generating future economic benefits through employees' competencies and the organization's collective capabilities. Mustapha (2005) defined human capital as the combination of knowledge, skills, expertise, and personality traits that enable individuals to perform tasks effectively and produce goods and services with economic value. He emphasized that organizations must prioritize employee training and development to adapt to changing business environments and improve productivity. Rapid technological advancements and evolving market conditions have increased the need for organizations to develop and effectively utilize the intellectual and creative potential of their workforce.

John (2000) viewed human capital as the accumulation of knowledge, abilities, and skills acquired through natural talents, education, and professional training. In a similar vein, Udu (2014) described human capital development as the enhancement of individuals' educational attainment, skill levels, and problem-solving abilities, enabling them to become more productive contributors to the economy. Stone (2002) noted that human capital development is essential for improving employee performance because it provides the knowledge and competencies necessary for operational efficiency. Consequently, an organization's ability to allocate, mobilize, and utilize resources effectively depends largely on the quality of its human capital development initiatives.

Hill (2001) further maintained that human capital has become a critical factor in enhancing employee productivity and sustaining competitive advantage in today's dynamic business environment. Organizations that invest in the continuous development of their workforce are better positioned to respond to environmental changes and achieve long-term success. Productivity, on the other hand, refers to the efficiency with which resources are utilized to produce goods and services. The Oxford Dictionary defines productivity as the rate at which goods and services are produced relative to the amount of time, effort, and resources used in the production process. Productivity is influenced primarily by technological advancement and effective utilization of human resources. Since technological improvements often require substantial financial investment, organizations frequently focus on optimizing workforce performance as a means of enhancing productivity. Effective human relations play a crucial role in improving productivity. A positive work environment fosters employee motivation, cooperation, and commitment, which ultimately contribute to higher levels of organizational performance. When productivity gains are recognized and rewarded fairly, employee morale and organizational effectiveness are further strengthened. In the contemporary business environment characterized by rapid expansion and intense competition, organizations require highly skilled and productive employees to remain competitive and achieve sustainable growth.

Onah (2010) defined productivity as the relationship between the output of goods and services and the resources utilized in producing them. In simple terms, productivity is expressed as the ratio of output to input, with higher ratios indicating greater efficiency. Similarly, Mali (1978) described productivity as the extent to which organizational resources are effectively combined and utilized to achieve desired outcomes while minimizing resource expenditure.

Productivity can be measured at different levels, including individual employees, departments, and entire organizations. It reflects how efficiently resources such as labour, capital, technology, time, and finances are transformed into valuable outputs. Ikeanyibe (2009) explained that productive employee's complete tasks efficiently within a specified period, thereby reducing operational costs and increasing organizational profitability. Conversely, low productivity results in delays, increased costs, and reduced organizational performance. The significance of employee productivity in public enterprises cannot be overstated. Nwachukwu (1988) identified several benefits of improved productivity, including increased income and profitability, higher employee earnings, greater availability of goods and services at lower costs, improved working conditions, and enhanced economic welfare for workers. Productivity therefore serves as a foundation for organizational growth and economic development. The survival and success of any organization largely depend on its ability to maintain high productivity levels. Consequently, many organizations continually restructure and reposition their operations in pursuit of improved performance. Simon (1957) observed that productivity considerations often drive organizational reforms and strategic adjustments. As a result, productivity remains one of the most important issues in both public and private sector organizations.

Robert and Tybout (1997) defined productivity as the relationship between the quantity and quality of outputs produced and the resources required to produce them, including labour, capital, and technology. In a similar perspective, Mali (1978) emphasized that productivity involves the effective integration and utilization of both human and material resources to achieve maximum output with minimum resource consumption. Thus, productivity reflects an organization's ability to efficiently coordinate its available resources to attain desired objectives.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a survey research design to investigate the relationship between human capital development and productivity among non-teaching staff of the University of Africa, Toru-Orua. The survey approach was considered suitable because it allowed the researcher to gather firsthand information from respondents concerning their views, experiences, and perceptions regarding human capital development practices and their impact on productivity. Furthermore, the design enabled the collection of data from a relatively large group of participants within a short period, thereby ensuring efficiency and enhancing the credibility of the findings.

The target population consisted of all non-teaching employees of the University of Africa, Toru-Orua, numbering 306 staff members. To ensure adequate representation of the population, a sample size of 169 respondents was determined using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size determination table. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire specifically designed for the study. A total of 169 questionnaires were administered to the selected respondents. Out of this number, 149 questionnaires were properly completed and returned, resulting in a response rate of 88.17 percent. These valid responses formed the basis for the analysis and interpretation of the study. The questionnaire contained items aimed at obtaining information on the human capital development programmes available to non-teaching staff, their productivity levels, and the challenges limiting the effective implementation of human capital development initiatives within the institution.

The data obtained from the 149 usable questionnaires were analyzed using univariate statistical techniques, including frequency distributions, percentages, mean scores, and standard deviations.

The choice of univariate analysis was informed by the descriptive nature of the study objectives, which focused on examining existing human capital development practices, evaluating staff productivity, and identifying factors constraining effective human capital development among non-teaching personnel. These statistical tools facilitated the systematic organization, summarization, and interpretation of the data, thereby enabling meaningful conclusions to be drawn from the responses provided by the participants.

RESULT, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Demographical Result

Gender of Respondents

sex		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	male	56	37.6	37.6	37.6
	female	93	62.4	62.4	100
	Total	149	100	100	

The demographic results on the gender distribution of the respondents revealed that out of the 149 non-teaching staff who participated in the study, 56 respondents, representing 37.6%, were male, while 93 respondents, representing 62.4%, were female. This indicates that female staff constituted the majority of the respondents involved in the study. The result suggests that the views and responses obtained were largely influenced by female non-teaching staff, reflecting their greater representation within the sampled population.

Age Range of Respondents

Age Range

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	30-35	47	31.5	31.5	31.5
	36-44	102	68.5	68.5	100.0
	Total	149	100.0	100.0	

The results on the age distribution of the respondents showed that out of the 149 non-teaching staff who participated in the study, 47 respondents, representing 31.5%, were within the age range of 30–35 years, while 102 respondents, representing 68.5%, were within the age range of 36–44 years. This indicates that the majority of the respondents were between 36 and 44 years of age. The finding suggests that most of the non-teaching staff were in their middle working years, a stage typically associated with increased job experience, skill acquisition, and organizational commitment.

Educational Qualification of Respondents

Educational Qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Olevel/ND	52	34.9	34.9	34.9
	B.Sc/HND	89	59.7	59.7	94.6
	M.Sc	4	2.7	2.7	97.3
	Ph.D	4	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	149	100.0	100.0	

The results on the educational qualifications of the respondents revealed that out of the 149 non-teaching staff who participated in the study, 52 respondents, representing 34.9%, possessed O'Level/ND qualifications, while 89 respondents, representing 59.7%, held B.Sc./HND qualifications. Furthermore, 4 respondents (2.7%) possessed M.Sc. degrees, and another 4 respondents (2.7%) held Ph.D. degrees. The findings indicate that the majority of the respondents were holders of B.Sc./HND qualifications, suggesting a relatively educated workforce among the non-teaching staff of the University of Africa, Toru-Orua. The presence of respondents with postgraduate qualifications further demonstrates that the institution has staff with advanced educational backgrounds.

Length of Service of Respondents

Length of Service		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-3	59	39.6	42.4	42.4
	4-7	76	51.0	54.7	97.1
	8-10	4	2.7	2.9	100.0
	Total	139	93.3	100.0	
Missing	System	10	6.7		
Total		149	100.0		

The results on the length of service of the respondents showed that, out of the 139 respondents who provided valid responses to this question, 59 respondents, representing 42.4%, had worked at the University of Africa, Toru-Orua for between 1 and 3 years, while 76 respondents, representing 54.7%, had served for between 4 and 7 years. In addition, 4 respondents, representing 2.9%, had been in service for between 8 and 10 years. The results further revealed that 10 respondents (6.7% of the total sample) did not provide information regarding their length of service. The findings indicate that the majority of the respondents had worked in the institution for between 4 and 7 years, suggesting that most participants possessed adequate experience and familiarity with the university's human capital development practices and work environment.

Univariate Analysis Result

To Identify the Human Capital Development Practices Available to Non-Teaching Staff at UAT

Descriptive Statistics	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
university of Africa organizes regular training for non-teaching staff	149	1.00	5.00	3.2282	1.39556
There is a policy for training of non-teaching staff in the institution	149	1.00	5.00	2.6779	.96750
The institution supports staff to attend professional programs	149	1.00	5.00	1.8926	.86322
Valid N (listwise)	149				

The univariate analysis results on the human capital development practices available to non-teaching staff at the University of Africa, Toru-Orua revealed that the institution organizes regular training for non-teaching staff, as indicated by a mean score of 3.23 and a standard deviation of 1.40. This mean value, being above the benchmark of 3.00, suggests that respondents generally agreed that regular training programmes are organized for staff development. However, the relatively high standard deviation indicates some variation in the opinions of respondents regarding the regularity and accessibility of such training opportunities.

The results further showed that the existence of a formal policy for the training of non-teaching staff recorded a mean score of 2.68 with a standard deviation of 0.97. The mean score falling below the acceptance threshold of 3.00 suggests that respondents generally disagreed that there is a clearly established or effectively implemented policy guiding the training and development of non-teaching staff in the institution. This finding implies that although training activities may be organized from time to time, they may not be anchored on a well-defined and widely recognized institutional policy.

In addition, the statement that the institution supports staff to attend professional programmes recorded the lowest mean score of 1.89 and a standard deviation of 0.86. This indicates strong disagreement among respondents regarding the availability of institutional support for participation in professional development programmes. The finding suggests that financial, administrative, or logistical support for professional advancement may be inadequate.

To Assess the Level of Productivity among Non-Teaching Staff at UAT

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Staff complete assignment given to them within required time	149	1.00	5.00	2.0604	1.06052
Staff and students receive prompt attention from servicing unit in the institution	149	1.00	5.00	2.3020	1.00475
Staff contribute effectively to the smooth administration of the institution.	149	1.00	5.00	1.6510	.93669
Valid N (listwise)	149				

The univariate analysis results on the level of productivity among non-teaching staff at the University of Africa, Toru-Orua revealed that the statement "Staff complete assignments given to them within the required time" recorded a mean score of 2.06 with a standard deviation of 1.06. Since the mean score falls below the benchmark value of 3.00, the respondents generally disagreed that assignments are completed within the stipulated time. This finding suggests that timeliness in task execution among non-teaching staff may be below the expected standard, thereby indicating a relatively low level of productivity in terms of meeting deadlines and work schedules.

The analysis further showed that the statement "Staff and students receive prompt attention from servicing units in the institution" recorded a mean score of 2.30 and a standard deviation of 1.00. The mean score, which is also below the acceptance threshold of 3.00, indicates that respondents

generally disagreed that prompt services are rendered to staff and students. This implies that service delivery within the institution may not be sufficiently efficient, resulting in delays in responding to the needs and requests of stakeholders. Such delays could negatively affect operational effectiveness and overall institutional performance. Similarly, the statement "Staff contribute effectively to the smooth administration of the institution" recorded the lowest mean score of 1.65 with a standard deviation of 0.94. This result indicates strong disagreement among respondents regarding the effectiveness of staff contributions to the administration of the institution. The low mean score suggests that respondents perceived the overall productivity of non-teaching staff to be inadequate.

To Identify Challenges Hindering Effective Human Capital Development at UAT

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
inadequate funding of the institution affect human capital development of UAT	149	1.00	5.00	1.9396	1.16380
Favouritism in selection of staff for training and workshop affect productivity in UAT	149	1.00	5.00	2.7584	1.39328
Management of UAT are not interested in non-teaching staff training programs	149	1.00	5.00	3.0940	1.17025
Valid N (listwise)	149				

The descriptive statistics in the table were used to identify the challenges hindering effective human capital development at UAT. The responses were obtained from 149 respondents using a five-point Likert scale. The results show that the statement "Management of UAT are not interested in non-teaching staff training programs" recorded the highest mean score of 3.0940 with a standard deviation of 1.17025. This indicates that respondents generally agreed that inadequate management attention to non-teaching staff training constitutes a major challenge to human capital development in the institution. The relatively low standard deviation suggests a moderate level of agreement among respondents regarding this issue.

The statement "Favouritism in selection of staff for training and workshop affect productivity in UAT" had a mean score of 2.7584 and a standard deviation of 1.39328. The mean value, which is slightly below the benchmark of 3.00, suggests that respondents were somewhat divided in their opinions, although a considerable number perceived favouritism in staff selection for training as a challenge affecting productivity and human capital development. The higher standard deviation indicates greater variation in respondents' views on this issue.

Furthermore, the statement "Inadequate funding of the institution affect human capital development of UAT" recorded the lowest mean score of 1.9396 with a standard deviation of 1.16380. This implies that respondents generally disagreed that inadequate funding is a major factor hindering human capital development in the institution. The result suggests that funding may not be perceived as the primary obstacle compared to management's lack of interest in non-teaching staff development and concerns about favouritism in training opportunities.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that human capital development initiatives for non-teaching staff at the University of Africa, Toru-Orua are inadequate to significantly improve employee productivity. Although certain training programmes are organized by the institution, there is limited evidence of a comprehensive and structured staff development policy. In addition, opportunities and support for professional growth and capacity building remain insufficient.

The study further revealed that the productivity of non-teaching staff is relatively low. Many employees experience difficulties in completing assigned tasks within stipulated deadlines, service delivery is often delayed, and their contributions to the effective administration of the university are perceived as less than satisfactory. The findings also indicated that inadequate management commitment to staff training and development constitutes a major obstacle to effective human capital development. Moreover, the existence of favoritism in the selection of employees for training opportunities further undermines the effectiveness of staff development programmes.

Therefore, the study concludes that the limited investment in the training and development of non-teaching staff has negatively affected their productivity and overall job performance. Consequently, there is a need for the university management to place greater emphasis on human capital development as a strategic tool for enhancing employee effectiveness and institutional performance.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn from the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. The management of the University of Africa, Toru-Orua should formulate and implement a comprehensive human capital development policy that clearly specifies staff training objectives, development strategies, and continuous learning opportunities for all categories of non-teaching personnel.
2. The university should strengthen its commitment to professional development by providing adequate funding, sponsorship, study leave opportunities, and other forms of support that will enable non-teaching staff to participate in workshops, seminars, conferences, and professional certification programmes aimed at improving their competencies and job performance.
3. University management should adopt a transparent, merit-based, and equitable system for selecting staff for training and development programmes. Greater attention should also be given to the training needs of non-teaching employees, as this will enhance productivity, improve service delivery, and contribute positively to the overall effectiveness and growth of the institution.

References

- Affes, H. (2013). The impact of intellectual capital disclosure on cost of equity capital: A case of French firms; *Journal of Economics, finance and administrative science*. 18(34)45-53.
- Ahangar, R. G. (2011). The relationship between intellectual capitals and financial productivity: An empirical investigation in an Iranian company. *African Journal of Business Management*. 5(1), 88-95, 4
- Danjuma, K. J. & Akinpelu M. A. (2016). Human Capital Efficiency and corporate Productivity: The Nigerian Perspective. *The international journal of Business & management*. 1 (4), 1-9
- Ekiran J.O and Olasehinde 1.0 2025 Human capital Development, Productivity and output Growth in the Nigeria Economy.
- Eze, S. C., & Ude, D. C. (2019). Human resources development and administrative efficiency in Nigerian universities. *_International Journal of Management Studies_*, 26(1), 45-62.
- John, O.M (2020) the problematic of service Delivery in the Nigerian Federal Civil Service, *annals of social sciences and management studies*
- Kenton, W. (2019). Human capital. Retrieved www.investopedia.com
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities.
- Maran M. (2009), “Human capital development and its impact on firm productivity: Evidence from development economics” *The Journal of International Social Research*, 2 / (8).
- Nwachukwu, D.O. (2004). *Technology Development in Nigeria*: Aba, Riddon Publishing House.
- Nzuve, S. & Bundi, E. G. (2012). “Human Capital Practices and Firms Productivity: A Survey of Commercial Banks in Kenya” *Journal of Social Science Research Network*, Nairobi, Kenya
- Olayemi, S. O. O.(2012). Human capital investment and industrial productivity in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2 (16) 298 -105
- Onah, F.O. (2008). *Human Resource Management*: John Jacob Classic Publication Ltd.
- Osborne, D., 1993. *Reinventing Government*. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 16(4):
- Udu, A.A (2014), *In-System Human Capital Development in Nigerian Universities: The Case of National Universities Commission on Doctoral Degree*. *EBSU Journal of Contemporary Management*, 2, (1) 67-73
- Yaya, J. A. (2016). The Effect of Human Capital Development on Job Satisfaction of Librarians in Public Universities in Nigeria. *American Journal of Business and Society*. 1, (3), 98-117