



Journal of Economics Education and Entrepreneurship

Vol. 7, No. 1, April 2026, pp. 124-136

<https://ppjp.ulm.ac.id/journals/index.php/jee/issue/view/984>

ISSN: 2746-5438 (Print) | 2745-729X (Online)



Lecturers Salary and Student Engagement in Southwestern Nigeria Universities

Olugbenga Timothy Ajadi

University of the Free State, South Africa

Article Info

Keywords:

Lecturer's salary
Student engagement
Public universities
Cognitive engagement
Affective engagement

ABSTRACT

Poverty remains a major challenge faced by many countries, particularly in developing nations where economic inequality and limited employment opportunities persist. To address this issue, governments have implemented various strategies aimed at strengthening economic capacity and fostering entrepreneurial mindsets within society. One such strategy is the development of cooperatives, which are economic institutions based on the principles of kinship, mutual cooperation, and economic democracy. The purpose of this study is to examine the role of school cooperatives in fostering the entrepreneurial spirit among students. Specifically, this study explores how involvement in school cooperative activities contributes to the development of students' entrepreneurial attitudes, skills, and values. This study employs a narrative literature review with a structured search and screening process. Relevant articles were identified through academic databases using keywords related to school cooperatives and student entrepreneurship. The selection process involved reviewing titles, abstracts, and full texts to ensure their relevance to the research objective. A total of twenty articles that met the inclusion criteria were selected and analyzed. The findings from these studies were then synthesized to identify patterns and key themes related to the contribution of school cooperatives to entrepreneurial development. The findings indicate that school cooperatives can foster students' entrepreneurial spirit through several mechanisms. These include experiential learning opportunities, the development of responsibility and leadership through cooperative management activities, and the improvement of financial literacy through basic financial management practices. In addition, participation in cooperative activities helps cultivate a strong work ethic and collaborative skills among students. The study implies that strengthening school cooperatives can be an effective strategy for integrating entrepreneurship education with practical learning experiences in schools.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA 4.0



*Corresponding Author:

Olugbenga Timothy Ajadi

University of the Free State, South Africa

Department of Education Foundations, Faculty of Education, University of the Free State, P. O. Box 339, Bloemfontein 9300, South Africa

Email: ajagbesope@yahoo.co.uk

Submitted 15 February 2025; Accepted 31 October 2025; Published 30 April 2026

How to cite: Ajadi, O. T. (2026). Lecturers Salary And Student Engagement In Southwestern Nigeria Universities. *Journal of Economics Education and Entrepreneurship*, 7(1), 124-136. <https://doi.org/10.20527/jee.v7i1.14797>.

1. INTRODUCTION

Journal homepage: <https://ppjp.ulm.ac.id/journals/index.php/jee>
<https://doi.org/10.20527/jee.v7i1.14797>

Copyright © Authors, 2026, ISSN: 2746-5438 (Print) | 2745-729X (Online)

In recent time, student engagement has become a recurring issue in universities across the globe. This may be because, students are the main reason for establishing the universities and employing lecturers. It may also be due to the geometric increase in student enrolment in the universities and the desire of the universities to meet their demands on campus. As the number of candidates desiring university education increases, Rotham et al., (2017) informed that students showed preference for world class universities where their cognitive, psychomotive and affective domains are adequately engaged. According to Salako and Nome (2018) the involvement, engagement and activities of students in the universities are key issues in attracting and retaining students in the university.

Student engagement in the universities centered round activities that would assist a student become a productive individual on graduation. Salau et al. (2020) posited that student will benefit more in the university if they are actively engaging in activities that would improve their overall performance while in the school and after graduation. Students' engagement has to do with the rate of allowing student to take active roles during teaching and learning in the class. This according to Agboola, et.al (2018) would lead to improvement in comprehension of the concept taught in particular and subject matter generally.

Student engagement in the university would be a lip story without conviction and willingness on the part of the students as well as commitment on the part of the lecturers. Obviously, if students are engaged in class, the efforts displayed at this period of engagement will be of help to that particular individual, the entire members of the class, and the lecturers. However, in a situation where students are not engaged in the class, such a situation creates issues for the cognitive, affective and psychomotive domains of the students.

In the opinion of Saks (2006) student who are not engaged in school activities struggle with the domains of learning. Such student struggle with, depression, unimpressive academic performance, self-talking, self-help and coming to school late and leaving early. However, Demetria (2018) informs that engaged students will always put in their best in their private studies ahead of the class. However, those who are not engaged will be battling with concentration on their study and interaction with peers. Those engaged are building their academic career consciously and unconsciously by sacrificing enjoyment to internalize the content covered and how to apply the learning in daily activities in the real-life situation.

Student engagement cannot be without the efforts of lecturers and university administration. This is because, In the classroom, the lecturers have a direct relationship with the students. Hence, lecturers are key in engaging student in the university for a better output. Specifically, lecturers are custodian of support and repository of what student can do and can be involved in to become a refined product in and within the system. Faloba et.al (2021) concluded that the content covered in the class when students are engaged is crucial to their life on campus. Student engagement according to Markos and Srideri (2017) could be influenced by many factors such as: lecturers and students' attitude, home background, social class, peer groups, age, location of the university and student level of intelligent. The factors contributed in no small measure to their general performance. Lecturers the world over, are responsible for imparting knowledge in the university. Hence, they are directly involved in student engagement. However, Fabayo et.al (2020) pointed out that lecturer's salary is a motivation to do more in encouraging, molding and refining undergraduate through their engagement in various activities on campus.

Demetria (2018) noted that universities in Tanzania are making concerted efforts at engaging students. However, studies by Akpa et al., (2016), Agbionu et al., (2018) and Demetria (2018) revealed that lecturers who are key in the area of student engagement are disengaging and moving from one university to another for better salary package. In addition, Adejobi and Famade (2017) argued that a considerable number of instructors have left Nigerian

universities, both in terms of their physical departure and in terms of their engagement with students.

Against this background, studies have identified cognitive, affective and psychomotive as the different areas of student engagement (Senior, et.al 2018, Sesmiyanti, 2018). It is disturbing that graduate unemployment is on the increase in Nigeria. The National Bureau of Statistics (2024) reported 5.3% graduate unemployment as at quarter 1 of 2024. The implication is that university graduates are jobless after years of study. This is frustrating for the graduates and their parents who, given the economic issues went extra mile to source for fund to see their children through university. This graduate unemployment demands urgent attention because it depletes the national workforce and lowers productivity. Hence, the Gross Domestic Product is negatively affected. This makes Nigeria to be at the mercy of foreign money lenders such as World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), Islamic Development Bank (IsDB), European Investment Bank (EIB), International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), International Development Association (IDA), and many more

To Punch Editor (2024), graduates' unemployment has dire consequences for individuals and the country as a whole. When graduates are unemployed, the secondary school students and younger ones develop a distaste for education generally and university education in particular. This might be why some of them referred to education as a scam. That is no jobs despite the investment in university education, making it to look like a deceit. This issue might be traced to their inadequate engagement in the university to build their interactive, communication and interpersonal skills in school. This is corroborated by Adebakin et. al (2015) who concluded that for student to be engaged in university's activities other than teaching and learning, concerns about their academic achievement, interpersonal skills, and communication had to be considered. In addition, the level of lecturer's commitment to aid with student engagement seems unimpressive. Some of the lecturers in public universities in southwestern Nigeria do not engage the students during teaching and learning and in activities outside the class. Some do not provide opportunity for student engagement in the class, some do not belief in engaging student in the class and some do not encourage student to participate in other university activities. Some are of the opinion that students on campus are mature enough to know what to do and not to do in the class and school. These are a few of the problems with school-related student engagement.

Various scholars have given different definitions of student engagement. To Karly (2018) It is the degree to which students pay attention, are curious, hopeful, and interested in the lessons being taught. It might also be called students' cognitive investment in their education, which includes their commitment to and involvement in their studies. To Ozurumba & Amasuomo (2015), it is the readiness of students to engage and succeed in their educational journey. In the opinion of Barkley & Major, (2020), engaging students is more than just having them consume information; they should be able to use their intellect and work through difficult concepts to understand what they are reading. To Goodall (2017), student engagement is any form of student enthusiasm and interest in the school activities, which directly or indirectly influences student academic output.

Kewhil (2014) defined student engagement as a state in which students devote their cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains to the academic program. Bridget et.al (2017) stated that the dynamics of students' positive attitudes toward the institution and its principles are known as student engagement. Expanding on these ideas, Barkley & Major (2020) suggested that active learning—what students do to develop their skills—and motivation—the factors that influence an individual's behavior—are the results of student engagement. It is critical to realize that engagement varies over time and for each individual. The degree and

context of engagement might differ; in one class, a student might be thrilled about every new development, but in another, they might be terrified of another minute.

It's also critical to recognize that different student groups may exhibit varied levels of participation. Students may find it difficult to participate fully in class discussions if they were brought up in a society that views interrupting an elder or other authority figure as disrespectful. They might still be paying close attention and considering the material, though, and they might find a small group discussion or writing exercise enjoyable. Additionally, students may decide not to take part if they fear criticism for providing the incorrect response or if they feel unsafe in any other way.

The importance of lecturer's salary in the university needs to be recognized so that all efforts and resources will be concentrated on it to get the best required of the them to move the university. Baumruk & Gorman (2006) found that teachers are likely to engage students appropriately if their monthly emolument is enough to take care of their basic needs of life. According to Getsmay, et.al (2016) regardless of whether students are from economically or socially disadvantaged or relatively affluent backgrounds, teacher compensation has been demonstrated to be one of the most reliable indicators of student engagement in the classroom. Kaplan (2017), and Grove (2019) in their studies concluded that teacher's income is directly connected with student engagement through an analysis of teachers' compensation expectations, educational institutions may be able to improve student engagement. Employers are to ensure payment of adequate salary that will make teachers happy and deliver their statutory duties. It is frequently asserted that educators use salary-related data in determining the level of their contributions to the school (Gallup & Hopkins 2017; James 2021; Madruk, et.al, 2009). These include student's engagement in curricula and non-curricula activities as well as activities to assist students with risk factors connected with academic failure.

Rubie-Davies, et.al (2016), reported that the degree of student engagement in each area of learning determines the student's academic success. However, the study of Arrainy, et.al (2015), emphasized the need to understand how student engagement impact student outcome, because student engagement may influence extracurricular school activities outside of the classroom. In the opinion of Bland (2017), one of the student activities is engagement which is expected to be devoted to student domestic and personal needs to allow full concentration in their chosen career. A university that prioritizes student achievement is expected to give attention to student engagement among other things.

Students that are engaged in the school exhibit consistent positive contribution in class activities in a friendly manner. They choose a challenging task, and use their initiative in solving issues arising thereof. They put in their best whenever any task is assigned. When performing the specified task, these student displays positive emotions including passion, optimism, curiosity, and interest (Guvenc, 2015). Every student benefit when teachers engage them regularly because it gives them the confidence to take charge of their own learning.

The degree of lecturers' dedication to the institution's vision and mission is correlated with the degree of student engagement. According to a study conducted by Ibrahim, et.al (2017) on student engagement and university enrolment. The study found high level of student engagement by the lecturers and school administration in state universities in south west Nigeria. In order to engage students, the teacher's role cannot be underestimated. The teacher and classroom variables can account for a sizable amount of student engagement and accomplishment (Hill & Rowe, 2016). It has been demonstrated that teacher's salary impacts their affective orientation toward their pupils, resulting in more fruitful interactions between students and teachers. Students that enjoy good teacher-student interactions seems more motivated and engaged. Students who think their teacher cares about them also learn more, according to Skinner, et.al, (2008).

Highly engaged students find it easier to develop, assess, analyze, apply, understand, and retain what they have learnt (Skinner, et.al, 2017). To support this, Ran & Daler (2018), posited that the foundation of student engagement is the idea that learning increases when students are involved and declines when they are not. A longitudinal study by Nafasa & Oblinger, (2014), found that distance learners are well engaged in tutorials hence, those who demonstrated engagement traits like attending tutorials, being organized, and putting effort into tutor-marked assignments had a higher chance of succeeding academically. This was as a result of their high level of engagement in learning activities

One factor that cannot be disregarded when discussing student engagement is university lecturer's salary. It involves lecturers' take home at the end of the month (Nyamubarwa, 2013; Ahmad & Ibrahim, 2015). Previous researchers have also looked into how salary affects student involvement and have concluded that salary encourages instructors to adequately engage students in the classroom. (Al Mamun & Hasan, 2017). In the academic environment, Rotham et al. (2017) revealed poor monthly pay as a determinant of lecturers' instability while increased income is frequently cited as the primary factor influencing lecturer's ability to effectively engage students. Lecturers find their ways outside engaging students to engage in other income driven activities due to poor monthly pay of lecturers in public universities in Nigeria (Al Mamun & Hasan, 2017).

A study conducted by Chepchumba & Kimutai (2017) showed a negative association between lecturers' salary and student engagement. Lecturer's personal satisfaction has additionally been explained by Giunchi et al., (2016) as a driving force in student engagement. As puts it, "when lecturers discharge their responsibilities diligently but paid peanut can lead to departure of student engagement in the class" ...79. The Expectancy Theory confirms this, as discussed by Giunchi et al. (2016) that worker's engagement is characterized by how the workers think or view the remuneration they receive. With the rising numbers of student enrolment, uncommitted academics will find it unrewarding to engaging students actively in the class. (Rotham et al., 2017) showed that student involvement and remuneration had a negative connection. Lecturer's commitment tends to decline when work and pay satisfaction is low, which impacts the degree of student engagement (Singh & Loncar 2017).

Any university's student engagement is defined by three primary areas: cognitive, behavioural and affective engagement (Okpe et al., 2013; Sulaiman et.al, 2018; Mutabuzi, 2019). Universities have a longstanding tradition of cognitive, behavioural and affective engagement. Students' success and progress at any university are mostly dependent on the number and caliber of these important metrics, which also impact a university's performance and ranking (Mushemeza, 2016).

Cognitive engagement to Tracy et al. (2021) is the extent to which is the degree to which students are paying attention to and exerting mental energy on the assigned learning assignments. This is the level of student curiosity, wanting to understand something. It has to do with student investment in intellectual or psychological learning and use of various strategies towards deep learning. Cognitive engagement according to Richardson & Newby, (2006) is "the incorporation and application of students' learning strategies and motivations" ...28 Teachers can better understand how students learn and whether their past experiences aid in new learning when they are cognitively engaged. To Shukor et.al (2014) The degree to which students are prepared and able to tackle the current learning task is known as cognitive engagement. This involves how long students persevere and how much effort they are willing to put into the assignment.

Interactions with the academic environment that are proactive, goal-oriented, adaptable, constructive, and persistent are referred to as behavioral engagement (Wu, et al, 2011; Martin, 2008; Skinner & Pitzer, 2012). These writers claim that planning, effort, on-task attention,

focus, hard work, perseverance, time spent, attendance, voluntary participation, task involvement, and adherence to classroom rules and norms are some markers of behavioral engagement in academic settings. Emotions like zeal, curiosity, pleasure, contentment, pride, and vigor frequently accompanied this practice. To Fredricks et al., (2024) It is the degree to which students are actively responding to the assigned learning activities. Posing or responding to inquiries, attending lectures promptly and regularly and paying attention in the class. It is the attention given to learning to achieve the best.

The degree to which students are emotionally invested in and respond to the learning activities is known as affective engagement. It is the passion, zeal, and excitement they have for their studies and classes. They are inherently driven and challenged by novel concepts in the classroom and school environment and are willing to participate actively in the teaching and learning process. To Fredricks et al., (2024), affective engagement, commonly referred to as emotional engagement, is defined as the emotional reaction of students to learning. It's a component of learner engagement, which also includes cognitive and behavioral engagement. To Richardson & Newby, (2006) it is referred to as student's feelings, attitudes, and perceptions about school, teachers, and classmates. It's a measure of how much a student enjoys learning, how much they value it, and how connected they feel to the school. It's also a measure of how far a student is motivated to learn, and how well they regulate their emotions.

One of the students' primary performance metrics is their level of engagement. Numerous studies' conclusions have shown this to be a measure of students' performance. (Kasule et al., 2016; Ozurumba & Amasuomo, 2016; Atwebembeire & Malunda, 2019). The degree of class involvement, the quality of that participation, the preparation of the students, the number of courses completed, the help given to classmates, and the overall success of the students are all used to measure student engagement. (Collinson, 2000; Kasule et al., 2016; Mushemeza, 2016). (Kasule et al., 2016). Likewise, numerous research has demonstrated a favorable correlation between lecturers' pay and students' engagement. (Ozurumba & Amasuomo, 2015; Walters & Openjuru, 2016). The engagement function includes the regular and prompt class attendance, active class participation, writing of test and examination, and writing of the final year project on record time

Other aspects of student engagement include developing and promoting innovative teaching methods, consulting lecturers when necessary, and helping other students when needed. (Agbionu et al., 2018). Despite the importance of student engagement to all stakeholders of the universities. Walters & Openjuru (2016) showed that the majority of lecturers are unable to keep students interested. They frequently engage in interaction are not consistent in class or only spend half of the anticipated contact hours with students.

1.1. The Problem

Engagement of university students actively in the classroom and school activities is expected to contribute positively to the students, lecturers and university output. However, it seems lecturers in public universities in southwestern Nigeria did not engage the students actively in the teaching and learning and other university activities. This might be the reason why students come to lectures at will, with no remorse for coming late to the lecture and perform unimpressive in the university. This might also be one of the reasons why the zone has the highest number university graduate unemployment in Nigeria. Therefore, this study looked on the salaries of lecturers and student engagement in public universities in southwest Nigeria.

1.2. Research Question

What is the level of student engagement in public universities in southwestern Nigeria?

1.3. Hypothesis

Ho: Lecturer's salary has no significant influence on student engagement in public universities in southwestern Nigeria.

2. METHOD

The study employed descriptive and correlational research design. The selection of questionnaires to collect data and the requirement to determine the nature of the link between lecturer salary and student engagement informed the choice of descriptive survey and correlation for this study in the selected tertiary universities. The population for the study comprised lecturers across cadres in the seven federal government owned universities in southwestern Nigeria (University of Lagos, Federal University of Technology, Abeokuta, University of Ibadan, Obafemi Awolowo University, Federal University of Health Sciences, Ila-Orangun, Federal University of Technology, Akure and Federal University, Oye-Ekiti).

The multi-stage sampling procedure was adopted for this study. The first stage was the use of purposive sampling technique to select five universities in the zone that have been in existence for a minimum of 10 years (University of Lagos, Federal University of Technology, Abeokuta, University of Ibadan, Obafemi Awolowo University and Federal University of Technology, Akure). The second stage was the use of simple random sampling technique to select 250 participants from each of the selected university making a total of 1,250 participants altogether. A self-designed questionnaire titled 'Lecturer's Salary and Student Engagement Questionnaire (LSSEQ)' was used to collect information relating to respondent's demographic data, lecturer's salary and student engagement. The instrument was validated and trial tested. The draft of the instrument was handed over to colleagues in the faculty who are experts in items generation for their observations. The final instrument was improved using the suggestions and corrections from experts to elicit responses from the respondents. To ensure that the instruments was reliable, test-retest of the instrument was carried out on 30 lecturers of the Federal University of Health Sciences, Ila-Orangun which was part of the population but not part of the sample for this study. The reliability index of 0.91 was obtained for the instrument which was considered adequate for the instrument. Research questions one was answered with descriptive statistics while the hypothesis was answered with inferential statistics.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To answer the research question, the items in the questionnaire designed for this study that focused on the level of student engagement in public universities in southwestern Nigeria were used using descriptive statistics. The items used to measure students' level of engagement are: class participation, prompt in the class, regular in the class, assist other students when need arises, creating new learning techniques, and consulting lecturers for assistance when there is th need. To test for the hypothesis, items on lecturer's salary and on student engagement in public universities in southwestern Nigeria were tested using inferential statistics

3.1. Result

What is the level of students' involvement in public secondary school in southwest states of Nigeria?

The findings presented in Table 1 showed that, out of the 1,250 participants, 915 of them did not participate in the class while only 315 participated in the class, 875 of the respondents are not arrive in the class promptly while 375 arrived promptly. In addition, 805 of the respondent are not regular in the class while 445 are regular in the class. The results revealed that 1,002 of the respondents do not assist other students while 248 rendered assistance to other students when the need arises. Furthermore, 895 of the respondents do not create new learning techniques while only 355 of them created new learning techniques. Finally, 988 of the respondents agreed that they do not consult lecturers for assistance while only 262 agreed that they consult lecturers for assistance when the need arises. Lecturer's salary has no significant influence on student engagement in public universities in southwestern Nigeria

Table 1. Level of Student Engagement in Public Universities

Aspects Measured	Yes	No	$\bar{x}$	Std. Dev
Class Participation	335 (26.8)	915 (73.2)	2.32	0.95
Prompt in the Class	375 (30)	875 (70)	2.64	0.87
Regular in the Class	445 (35.6)	805 (64.4)	2.27	0.89
Assist other Students when needed	248 (19.84)	1.002 (80.16)	2.39	0.65
Create new Learning Techniques	355 (28.4)	895 (71.6)	2.49	0.88
Consult Lecturers for Assistance when Needed	262 (20.96)	988 (79.04)	2.45	0.96
Weighted Average = 0.86				

Source: *Researcher's Field Work 2024*

Table 2 showed the influence of lecturer's salary on student engagement in public universities in southwestern Nigeria. The Table showed that the calculated value $0.64 > 0.197$ at $p < 0.05$. The hypothesis raised is hereby rejected because there is significant influence of salary on student engagement as presented on Table 2.

Table 2. Influence of Lecturer's Salary on student engagement

Variables	X	SD	N	Df	Cal. r	Critical r
Lecturer's Salary	34.77	18.31	1250	106	0.64	0.197
Student Engagement	46.38	24.12				

Significant, $P < .05$.

3.2. Discussion

From Table 1, the overall weighted average for level of students' engagement in public universities in southwestern Nigeria is 0.86. This means that the level of students' engagements across public universities in southwest, Nigeria was low. This might be due to meagre salary of Nigerian lecturers and non-availability of modern teaching facilities. In addition, it may also be as a result of inadequate recognition given to university lecturers in Nigeria. The lecturers in public universities in southwestern Nigeria need to look elsewhere to get additional income to meet their domestic and other needs. Hence, they resulted to giving lecture or sending notes to students. Most of the time to be used in engaging the students are used deliver part-time lectures in other educational institutions for additional income. This is because, lecturers need to work on family survival and since they are poorly paid by the government, active working time are used elsewhere for extra income. It might also be because the university administration does not in any way give any form of incentive or training to the lecturers on when, where and how to engage the students. Student engagement is a task that requires more efforts and resources from the lecturers. The result might also be due to non-replacement of the disengaged lecturers. Those on ground has so many other activities in addition to student engagement. It

might also be due to epileptic supply of electricity which have turn on lecturers' preparation of activities to engage the students in the class. It might also be due to non-readiness and willingness on the part of the students. Most of the students in the university of today are not committed to their study. Some of them see education as a fraud and are just attending schools without convictions. They are more into online trading activities. All they are looking for is to be certificated even if they know next to nothing.

This result is in contrary with the finding of Ibrahim et.al (2017) who found high level of student engagement in state universities in southwest Nigeria. However, it is also in line with the finding of Gallup & Hopkins (2017), who found that students in the remote areas are less engaged in teaching and learning activities. This might be one of the reasons why students do not seem to benefit more as revealed by graduate unemployment in southwester Nigeria and as stated by Sala et.al (2020) that student will benefit more if they are actively engaged in activities that will improve their performance in the school and after graduation.

Table 2 showed that salary has significant influence on students' engagement in public universities in southwestern Nigeria. The hypothesis raised is hereby rejected because there is significant influence of salary on student engagement as presented on Table 2. This might be as a result of crucial roles of salary to lecturers in the university. They depend on salary for their own survival. As a result, salary is one of the motivations for lecturers in the universities to be productive or not. The findings supported that of Gandor et.al (2015) who found teacher's remuneration as the most robust predictor of student engagement. It also supported the finding of Hopkin (2017) and Grave (2019) who found teacher's income having direct connection with student engagement. It also supported the findings of Ozurumba and Amasuomo (2015), Walters & Openjuru (2016) who concluded that salary has positive relationship with student engagement.

However, the result negated the finding of Hill & Rowe (2016) who found teacher and classroom variables accounted for student engagement. In addition, Rotham et.al (2016) and Chepchumba (2017) also found negative association between salary and student engagement. The finding did not also support the finding of Glunchi et.al (2016) who found lecturer's personal satisfaction as a driving force in student engagement as against lecturer's salary.

4. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that, management and lecturers in public universities in Nigeria should nurture students well and engage them in class activities and other activities that could boast their cognitive, behavioural and affective engagement in the class and in the school. Lecturers in public universities in southwestern Nigeria should improve in the area of student engagement due to the important role of student engagement in teaching and learning. This will reduce the number of dropouts from the university. This will also assist in building students' self-confidence and improve their academic performance. University administration and lecturers should involve students in other university activities to increase student's behavioral and affective engagement. The students need more than the cognitive engagement to survive in life hence they must also be actively engaged in those two areas. Government should increase lecturers' salary and ensure it is at par with what is operating in African countries. A well-paid lecturer will likely devote more time to student engagement. If a lecturer salary can take care of his or her needs, all attention will be given to lecturing and research. There will be no need looking for means of survival that takes much of the time to be used in engaging students in the place of primary assignment

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My special thanks to my colleagues at the Department of Educational Management Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria for their efforts in validating the instruments used to collect data from the respondents. I also need to put on record my appreciation to the lecturers at the Federal University of Health Sciences, Ila-Orangun for their time and cooperation when responding to the instrument during the trial testing stage. I also need to specially thank the respondents from University of Lagos, Federal University of Technology, Abeokuta, University of Ibadan, Obafemi Awolowo University and Federal University of Technology, Akure who are the sample for this study. Finally, I thank the University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa for appointing me as a Senior Research Fellow of the University

REFERENCES

- Adejobi, R., & Famade, E. (2017). Staff turnover in public universities in Nigeria. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 59-72. <https://www.sciedupress.com/journal/index.php/ijhe/about/contact>
- Agboola, U.C., Anyadimu, M., & Kwali, A.C. (2018). Lecturers job satisfaction and student engagement in Nigerian University. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Education*, 5(2), 69-87.
- Agbionu, U.C., Anyalor, M., & Nwali, A.C. (2018). Employee engagement and performance of lecturers in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Journal of Education and Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), 69-87. <https://doi.org/10.26762/jee.2018.40000015>
- Akpa, V.O., Soetan, T.A., Nwankwere, I.A., & Magaji, N. (2016). An investigation of influence of job satisfaction on employee's intention to leave: An empirical study of selected private universities in South West Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering and Management Research*, 1(5), 592-613. <https://ijaemr.com/link/45>
- Al Mamun, C.A., & Hasan, M.N. (2017). Factors affecting student's turnover and sound engagement strategies: A conceptual view. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 15(1), 63-71. DOI:10.21511/ppm.15(1).2017.06
- Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How learning works*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2015-38684-000>
- Arrainy, J. N., Autina, K. A., & Zhang, D. (2015). Teacher's take home and student engagement in academics at-risk minority and majority first grade students. *Journal of School Psychology*, 53(4), 303-320. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/journal-of-school-psychology>
- Atwebembeire, J., & Malunda, P. N. (2019). Staff development and quality education in Uganda: analysis of quality teaching and engagement in private chartered universities. *Ugandan Journal of Management and Public Policy Studies*, 15(1), 104 -117. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330385648_Staff_Development_and_Quality_Education_in_Uganda_Analysis_of_Quality_Teaching_and_Research_in_Private_Chartered_Universities
- Barkley, E. F., & Major, C. H. (2020). *Student engagement techniques: A handbook for college faculty* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. [https://www.google.com/search?q=Barkley%2C+E.+F.%2C+and+Major%2C+C.+H.+\(2020\).+&client=firefox-b-](https://www.google.com/search?q=Barkley%2C+E.+F.%2C+and+Major%2C+C.+H.+(2020).+&client=firefox-b-)
- Baumruk, R. & Gorman, B. (2006). Why managements are crucial to increasing engagement? *Strategic HR Review*, 5(2), 24-27. DOI: 10.1108/14754390680000863

- Bland, D. (2017). Placing a value on education. <http://agrad.wmki.org/blogs/wfyi-blog/2017/03/08/solutions-for-high-school-dropouts/>
- Bridget, F., Jaena, A., Pambansha, W., & Claudine, A. J. (2017). Addressing psychosocial factors with library mentoring. https://digitalcommons.du.edu/libraries_facpub/92/
- Chepchumba, T. R., & Kimutai, B. D. (2017). The relationship between lecturers' compensation and student engagement in public universities in Uganda. *International Journal of Management*, 5(2), 190-201. <https://doi.org/10.35912/amor.v5i2.2017>
- Collinson, V. (2000). Student engagement by any other name: Changing words or changing practices? *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6 (2), 319-327. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2014.02.006>
- Demetria, G. (2018). Student retention in private universities in southern high zone Tanzania, a strategy of attaining sustainable development. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 8(5) 148-158.
- Fabayo, K. A., Ogunyemiwo, B. O., & Ojetola, T. K. (2020). Workplace remuneration and Pharmacy student talent engagement in the Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Advanced Research in Pharmacy*, 37(2), 18 – 42. <https://aprh.journals.ekb.eg/>
- Faloba, A. O., Adeyemi, N. P., Adeyefa, J.O., Agbalajobi, E. K., & Atobatele, F. L. (2021). Measuring institutional support strategies and student engagement. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112, 204-216. <https://hipatiapress.com/hpjournals/index.php/ijep/>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, *State of the Evidence Review of Educational Research* 74(1):59-109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Gallup, M. K & Hopkins, H. I (2017). Teacher remuneration and student's involvement in college activities. *International Journal of Research*, 32(2), 62 – 76
- Getsmay, M., Emaundu, F., Cambel, M. O., & Ghislieri, A.O. (2016). Evaluating student engagement models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Education, Theory and Practice*, 28(1), 29-40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62177/jetp>
- Giunchi, M., Emanuel, F., Chambel, M.J., & Ghislieri, C. (2016). Lecturers' workload, job exhaustion and student engagement. *Journal of Education*, 18(3), 77 - 94. DOI: 10.1108/CDI-07-2015-0103
- Goodall, A. (2017). Narrowing the achievement gap: Parental engagement with children's learning creating a learning-centred schooling system. London: Routledge. *Journal of Higher Education Policy And Management*, 38(4), 214 – 23. <https://www.scrip.org>
- Grove, A. (2019). The teacher's role in student engagement. Gardner-Webb, School of Education.
- Guvenc, H. (2015). The Relationship between teachers' motivational support and engagement versus disaffection. *Theory and Practice*, 15(3), 647 – 657. <https://www.psycnet.apa.org>
- Hill, M. K & Rowe, O. A. (2016). Student engagement and satisfaction in the class. *International Journal of Psychology and Education*, 3(3), 124-140
- Ibrahim, A. O., Babatunji, K. J., & Oyetunji, P. F. (2017). Student engagement as a determinant of student enrolment in state universities in south west Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Management Research*, 5(2), 176 - 194
- Igbadumhe A. F., Adeniji A. A., Osibanjo A. O., Falola H. O., Salau O. P., & Ohunakin F., (2020). Remuneration as a predictor of job-hopping intention: implication for teaching engagement of academics among selected universities in Nigeria. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 19(5), 1 – 20. <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amj.2004.14438580>

- James, M. O. (2021). The role of remuneration in inspiring teaching and learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching*, 58(3), 249 – 262
- Kaplan T. R. (2017). “*Combining Research, Teaching and Engagement*”, London. University of Exeter press.
- Kasule, G.W., Wesselink, R., & Mulder, M. (2016). Professional development status of teaching staff in a Ugandan public university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 38(4), 434-447.
- Karly, W.A. (2018). Psychological conditions of student engagement and disengagement at school. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2), 492-512
- Madruk, C., Kurt, S. R., & Difree, L. J. (2009). Investing in teaching and teachers. *Urban Education*, 44(3), 292-337.
- Markos, S. & Srideri, S. (2017). Student engagement: The key to improving performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 5(12) 131-145
- Martin. A. J., (2008). Enhancing student motivation and engagement: The effects of a multidimensional intervention. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(2), 239–269
- Mushemeza, E.D. (2016). Opportunities and challenges of student engagement in Higher Education in Africa. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 5(3), 236-246.
- Mutabuzi, H. (2019). Factors affecting student retention at the college of business education in Tanzania. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mzumbe University.
- Nafasa, J. D., & Oblinger, D. A. (2014). Academic success among distance learners at risk for school failure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 111-126.
- National Bureau of Statistics (2024). Nigeria labour force statistics report. www.nigerianstar.gov.ng on the 30th January, 2025
- Nyamubarwa, W. (2013). I am considering leaving soon engagement intentions of college students in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Business Management and Education*, 4(1), 74 - 89
- Okpe, I. J., Simisaye, A. O., & Otuza, C. E. (2013). Research output and pattern of student engagement in Nigerian private universities: Babcock University Experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 62 - 77.
- Ozurumba, C.N., & Amasuomo, J.O. (2015). Academic staff development and student engagement in state Universities in southsouth Nigeria. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 49-59.
- Ran, E. Y & Daler, O. N (2018). Involvement and dissatisfaction in the classroom. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 16(2), 136 -151
- Richardson, J., & Newby, T. (2006). The role of students’ cognitive engagement in online learning. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 20(1), 23–37.
- Rotham, T. O., Ottoh, N. S., & Koihi, T.K. (2017). Lecturer-student engagement in public and private universities in Malaysia. *European Journal of Education Studies* 9(2):124-142
- Rubie-Davies, C., Hattie, J., & Hamilton, R. (2016). Expecting the best for students: Teacher expectations and academic outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(3), 429-444
- Saks, M. A. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement”. *Journal of Managerial*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Salako, J. M., & Nome, I. (2018). Academic staff retention as a human resource factor: University perspective. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 13(2), 295-304.
- Salau, O., Worlu, R., Osibanjo, A., Adeniji, A., Falola, H., Olokundun, M., Ibidunni, S., Atolagbe, T., Dirisu, J., & Ogueyungbo, O. (2020). The impact of workplace

- environments on student engagement of public Universities in Southern Nigeria. *Sage Open*, 10(2), 46 - 63
- Senior, R. M., Bartholomew, P., Soor, A., Shepperd, D., Bartholomew, N., & Senior, C. (2018). "The rules of engagement": Student engagement and motivation to improve the quality of undergraduate learning. *Frontiers in Education*, 3, Article 32. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00032>
- Sesmiyanti, S. (2018). Student's cognitive engagement in learning process. *Polingua*, 5(2), 48–51. <http://doi.org/10.30630/polingua.v5i2.34>
- Shukor, N. A., Tasir, Z., Meijden, H. V. D., & Harun, J. (2014). A predictive model to evaluate students' cognitive engagement in online learning. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 4844–4853
- Singh, A. O., & Loncar, F. T. (2017). Salary satisfaction, job satisfaction and student retention. *International Journal of Human Relations*, 46(2), 148 – 171
- Skinner, A. O., Kuderman, P.K & Singe, I. N. (2017). *Engaging students: The next level of working on the work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Wiley Imprint.
- Skinner E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). *Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience*. Department of Psychology, Portland State University, Portland.
- Sulaiman, A. A., Salihu, A. N., & Peter, A. A. (2018). Work-life balance and academic staff performance in Nigerian universities. *Ilorin Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2(1), 102-113.
- The Punch Editor (2024). Rising graduate unemployment. *Punch Newspaper*, 4th October, 2024. <https://punchng.com/tags/research/>
- Tracy, M. L., Marcella, A. O. & Addy, G. M. (2021) *What inclusive instructors do: Principles and practices for excellence in student engagement*. Sterling VA: Stylus
- Walters, S., & Openjuru, G. (2014). *Knowledge, engagement and higher education in Africa*. Global Universities Network for Innovation (GUNI).
- Wu, W., West, S. G., & Hughes, J. N. (2011). Effect of grade retention in first grade on psychosocial outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102, 135-152.