

Original Paper

Scholarly Research Outputs and Vulnerability of Nigerian Lecturers to Predatory Journals

Ogagaoghene Uzezi IDHALAMA (CLN)¹, Kingsley Efe OSAWARU (CLN)², Magnus Osahon IGBINOVIA (CLN)³, & Prisca Iheoma NWACHUKWU⁴

¹ Department of Library and Information Science, Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma-Edo State, Nigeria

² College of Education Library, Ekiadolor, Benin-City, Edo State, Nigeria

³ University Library, Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State-Nigeria

⁴ University Main Library, NnamdiAzikiwe University, Nigeria

Received: December 6, 2022 Accepted: December 28, 2022 Online Published: January 5, 2023

doi:10.22158/wjer.v10n1p1

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/wjer.v10n1p1>

Abstract

This study investigated scholarly research outputs and vulnerability of Nigerian lecturers to predatory journals. Five objectives were formulated to guide the study. A descriptive survey research design was adopted using the online Google Form to collect data/responses from lecturers across board in Nigeria. The population of the study comprised lecturers in Nigeria. The sampling technique used for the study was the total enumeration sampling technique (107) as the whole responses were analysed using frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation for easy appreciation and comprehension, with the aid of SPSS Version 23. It was found out that: The research outputs by Nigerian lecturers appear to be a little bit low, Nigerian lecturers obviously know the reputable journals that are available, many Nigerian authors and writers do not publish in high reputable journals, some of the challenges recorded are high cost/finance, problem of delayed review process, high rejection rate by reputable journal and rigorous online submission process. Also, the idea of compulsorily publishing in high impact journals rather than focus on the quality of the research output, before promoting lecturers is misplaced and should be reviewed. Recommendations were made in line with the findings of the study.

Keywords

Research outputs, lecturers research outputs, lecturers and predatory journals, Nigerian lecturers research outputs, lecturers scholarly research

1. Introduction

Educational research entails the process of conducting scientific research in order to solve problems in a country's educational system. Theoretical development, quality improvement issues, policy draft and implications, classroom dimension, and so on are all included. It entails a never-ending quest for knowledge, progress, problem-solving methodologies, and an endeavor to comprehend the truth from an objective standpoint based on factual comprehension and systematic study (Rafeedalie, 2020). Educational research must become a priority in order to broaden the boundaries of knowledge, as education is a vital part of any civilization. Educational research is critical to the advancement of pedagogy, learning programs, and policy formulation. Educational research is a broad term that encompasses a variety of topics of study, implying that it draws on a variety of disciplines. As a result, the research findings are multi-dimensional and can be limited by the research participants' and research environment's characteristics. Educational research is a sort of systematic examination that uses empirical approaches to address educational problems. In order to collect and evaluate data for problem-solving and knowledge growth, it uses rigorous and well-defined scientific techniques. Educational research, according to Best (2020), is any effort aimed at developing a science of behavior in educational settings. The ultimate purpose of such a science is to produce knowledge that allows educators to achieve their objectives using the most efficient techniques possible. The main goal of educational research is to add to the current body of knowledge by addressing various pedagogical issues and enhancing teaching and learning practices. Researchers in education are also looking for answers to concerns like learner motivation, development, and classroom management.

According to Simisaye (2019), research output is critical in the appointment and promotion of academic personnel, also known as faculty members, as stated in the service schemes that govern their appointments and promotions. Aside from educational qualifications and relevant experience, they are expected to obtain appointments and promotions based on satisfactory research publications in renowned journals, conference proceedings, and seminar papers as a condition of their job and positions. The number of publications varies by academic rank at tertiary institutions, and a Ph.D. in a relevant field is required for lecturers, particularly university professors (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2000). The value of research output in terms of academic career progression and status is well understood, and academic staff and employers do not take it lightly. As a result, the widespread adage "publish or perish" that is used in academic circles in Nigeria is a serious worry. Academic staff workers can develop into effective academics by conducting research. This is due to the fact that research advances academic knowledge while also reinforcing the abilities required for successful knowledge acquisition. However, according to Yusuf (2012), the amount and quality of research output from institutions in Nigeria is often insufficient to have the intended impact on national development. Worse, the higher education sector has a general lack of research focus in regard to Nigeria's national research and development needs.

Whether peer, editorial, or institutional review, a renowned scholarly journal delivers some sort of

adequate and qualified evaluation. If a journal does not provide such a review, then submitting an article to it is no different than submitting a paper to your own website, a pre-print server, or a general magazine. Of course, not all works are meant for peer review, and expository articles, textbooks, monographs, and other explanatory resources have their place, but they serve a different function. A scholarly journal is one that has undergone some type of appropriate and qualified evaluation for quality assurance.

Peer review is a time-honored method that has been a component of scientific communication for more than 300 years. Musick (2020), on the other hand, believes that academic publishing has altered dramatically as a result of the proliferation of open access journals and the transition to online publishing. There are currently more journals than ever before where authors can publish their work. This benefits writers by expanding their publishing options, but it also increases their duty in avoiding the grave risk of publishing in a predatory journal. Predatory journals seek money from authors (typically through Article Processing Charges [APCs]) in exchange for publishing their articles (generally open access), but they do not follow the same editorial, peer review, or other ethical publishing processes/standards as respected journals. They usually keep information regarding fees and the publishing procedure hidden, lie about it, or mislead authors.

According to Christiaan (2020), a journal publication indicated that more than a third of Nigeria's education research output was published in predatory journals between 2010 and 2018, which charge authors to publish and provide little quality control such as peer review. The report was published in the August issue of *Comparative Education Review* by three scholars from the United Kingdom. A bibliometric analysis of papers and interviews with African researchers were part of the study. In the years studied, a third of the more than 700 education research papers published by Nigerian writers appeared in journals that "lack conventional peer review, with some containing spelling and grammatical problems," according to the paper. The ratio was much greater than in any other country studied in Sub-Saharan Africa. The majority of the countries studied published at least 90% of their publications in recognized journals. Setting up screening systems at African universities, the authors believe, could "incentivize concern for quality above quantity of publications." According to the authors, South Africa was left out of the study because its academic sector is significantly more established, and hence it is not affected by the same difficulties as the rest of the continent. In order to unravel more facts about lecturers' research endeavors, this study has concentrated on scholarly research outputs and lecturers' vulnerability to predatory publications in Nigeria.

2. Statement of Problem

Over the years, research has come to form a corner stone of every economy which by extension leads to national development. The primary citadel of this kind of research is the tertiary institution where scholars and intellectuals reside; and to note that the major assignments of a University Don for instance are to teach, research and develop his/her community. In the area of research, it is important therefore to

break new grounds instead of literally reinventing the wheel, scholarly researches should be carried out in order to find remedies to disturbing issues. A very good criterion for measuring merit in research is to put standards in place that will assess and evaluate researches that have been published by authors. This may be very important as many advocates have criticized African authors by submitting that their researches are of low value and standard, hence they are published in low ranking journals. Other advocates feel that African authors seldom embark on educational researches that will lead to great discoveries. These views are not just surprising to the authors of this article but also to some other Nigerian authors who opined that Nigeria tertiary institutions have some of the best brains and researchers in the whole world. It is based on these divided opinions that the writers of this article have come up with this study in order to examine research outputs and vulnerability to predatory journals by lecturers in Nigeria.

3. Objectives

In a bid to achieve its aim of investigating the scholarly research outputs and vulnerability of lecturers to predatory journals in Nigeria, the following objectives will be x-rayed:

1. To know the number of articles to have been published by participating lecturers in Nigeria.
2. To determine if Nigerian lecturers are aware of reputable journals to publish in.
3. To ascertain the reputable journals in which these lecturers have published.
4. To establish obstacles encountered by Nigerian lecturers in publishing with reputable journals.
5. To assess the perception of Nigerian authors/lecturers in publishing with international reputable journals as a major criterion for promotion

4. Literature Review

This section of the study will review related literature with the aim of exploring previous documentation of scholars in this research area, consequently providing the basis of establishing new facts in the current study. Thus, the literature review which is divided into manageable sub-sections is presented subsequently:

4.1 Frequency at which Lecturers Publish their Researches

According to Rawat and Meena (2014), frequent publication is one of the few effective ways for scholars to display their academic ability to their colleagues. Successful research publication draws attention to academics and their institutions. This may result in additional financing for the institution as well as an individual's advancement in their area. The number of publications to an individual's credit is widely used by academic institutions and universities as a measure of research proficiency. During recruitment, administrators are increasingly adopting this as a criterion. Scholars who publish infrequently or who devote their time to pursuits that do not result in publications, such as teaching undergraduates, may find themselves out of contention for numerous teaching posts. Because of these factors, there is a great deal of pressure to publish. The term "publish or perish," first popularized by

Coolidge in 1932, is now a brutal reality. The emphasis on publication has reduced the value of the resulting study since scientists must spend more time scrambling to publish whatever they can rather than building a meaningful research plan. Professors' ability to dedicate time and effort to teaching undergraduates and post-graduates is also hampered by the pressure to publish or perish. When the benefits for outstanding teaching and exceptional research are not equal, faculty members are more likely to prioritize the latter. When hiring new academics, many universities don't consider teaching competence and instead look at the publications list (Idhalama, 2014). This singular concentration on the professor as researcher may cause academics to overlook or fail to fulfill other tasks. Due to the increased quantity of publications, unethical research techniques such as salami slicing, plagiarism, duplicate publication, ghost authorship and other fraudulent practices have increased. Fraud is described as the fabrication or falsification of research results when they are performed or reported.

The frequency at which lecturers undertake scholarly research and make the outcome of the research available to the public is determined by some factors. These factors thus predict the frequency at which lecturers publish their research. According to Adjei and Owusu-Ansah (2016), such frequency is motivated by the quest to contribute to scholarship, job promotion, marketability and sometimes prestige. Starovoytova (2017) investigated the research productivity of an engineering school based on the number of publications per faculty member, the study revealed that an average of 2.1 publications is made by faculty members per year and that the faculty sampled published a cumulative of 230 papers across their productive publishing career. In the Nigerian context, Okonedo (2015) examined the research productivity of academic librarians in public universities in South-west of Nigeria. The study revealed that the cumulate number of publications by the region's librarians in learned journals was 726, revealing that librarians publish frequently more in journal outlets

4.2 Searching for Reputable Journals to Publish in

It might be difficult for authors to discern whether a journal is credible, given the abundance of journal titles and numerous email solicitations for papers. Many resources exist to help you choose appropriate journals to submit your work to, according to University of Washington Libraries (2020). For instance, the following are expected to be considered while evaluating journals: avoid publications that have characteristics described by the World Association of Medical Editors or identified by Shamseer, et al. (2017). These characteristics include email solicitation with grammatical flaws, unprofessional and promising immediate publications; absence of genuine metrics (Index Copernicus Value, Systematic Impact Factor, or CiteFactor) in the journal's website; assertion of been indexed by Google, Google Scholar or ResearchGate; and the presence of hazy or distorted photographs on the journal's website that may have been used without permission.

Most journals that are not reputable or do not keep to standard/best practices are known by lack of or at best ineffective peer review process, questionable editorial board members (some of which are listed without their knowledge), information with regards article processing/publication fee may be hidden or deceptive and the journal's website adopts non-standard impact factors. Also well-established scholarly

literature indexes like PubMed, PsycInfo, Web of Science, Scopus, CINAHL and EbscoHost.

When contemplating a journal as a possible venue to publish, Schuler (2020) suggests asking questions that include: does the subject area of the journal correspond with the subject of your research?, does the journal type and instructions for authors including rules for article length fit the article you want to submit?, is your research aimed at the journal's target audience? and is this a standard/reputable journal?. Prospective authors need to find journals they can be affirmative about the following questions: do you know the publisher?, are you familiar with any group the journal is connected with?, does the journal have specific contact details?, are the affiliations and background of the editorial board members and that of previous authors, relevant to the publication's subject matter?, are manuscripts subjected to peer review?, are articles allocated Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs)?, is the journal's copyright policies and article publishing fees well-defined?, does the journal have index in any database you are familiar with?

4.3 Obstacles Encountered by Nigerian Lecturers in Publishing with Reputable Journals

Tarkang and Bain (2019) published a commentary on the difficulties of African scholars publishing research articles in international journals, the peer-review process, and the contentious topic of predatory publications. The following issues were cited as impediments faced by Nigerian authors in their attempts to publish in respected journals that are generally international in scope in that paper.

Manuscripts from Africa have a high rejection rate:

Foreign editors relegate Nigerian and other African authors: it has been noted that most papers submitted by Nigerian and sister African countries are flatly rejected by foreign journals. When they send something out for peer review, the decision of the reviewers isn't always favorable. This can be aggravating and upsetting, deterring Nigerian authors and potentially leading to publication in predatory journals.

Financial constraints: Journals can be closed-access or open-access, but the peer-review process is the same in both cases. The majority of open-access journals charge publishing costs, which are paid by the manuscript's author(s), while research consumers have free access to the journals. In most closed-access journals, however, accepted articles are published for free, and users must pay a price to view the articles. In today's quickly evolving scientific world, as well as the internet age in which we now find ourselves, most research consumers opt for open-access journals, which allow them to access information for free, even on their mobile electronic devices. As a result, most African scientists and researchers have little choice except to publish in open-access journals, where they must pay publishing fees. Because most African scientists cannot afford to publish in several international peer-reviewed open-access journals due to the high financial cost, most of the research done in Africa remains unnoticed by the rest of the world.

Peer-review turnaround time in high-quality journals: The peer-review process for most reputable and high-impact factor journals that are indexed in databases like Medline, PubMed, and Scopus takes a long time to complete, often as long as two years. The information in a paper can become obsolete or

redundant before it is ever published. In light of this, the majority of African academics and scientists prefer to publish their findings in low-impact journals or sometimes predatory journals.

The publish or perish syndrome: The “publish or perish” conundrum has led many African researchers to publish their work in low-quality journals, often without a rigorous peer-review process, because they are under enormous pressure to publish in order to advance their careers, particularly in academia, where publication is frequently regarded as the sole criterion for advancement.

4.4 Publishing in Reputable Journals as a Major Criterion for Promotion

According to Schimanski and Alperin (2018), there appears to be widespread agreement that scientific content and quality should take precedence over the number of articles being examined. However, it is not always apparent what defines a high-quality publication, and there is evidence that individuals who analyze Review, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) applications do not always assess each article’s scientific merits. It’s typical to use the publication venue as a proxy for quality. The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA; Cagan, 2013) and the Leiden Manifesto (Hicks, et al., 2015) have both critiqued this technique; yet, evidence for it can be found across the literature. Differentiating between peer-reviewed and un-reviewed publishing mediums, with peer-reviewed clearly preferred, is one approach of determining quality that has remained relatively uncontroversial and unchanged in recent decades. In a survey of information science department chairs conducted in the late 1990s, 43.7 percent said that all journal publications count toward tenure and promotion decisions, while 39.2 percent said that only certain types of journal publications, such as those that are refereed and/or editorially reviewed, count (Whitman et al., 1999). In several subjects, including astronomy, biology, economics, business, psychology, women’s studies, music, and some fields of political science, peer-reviewed journal papers are the primary focus of evaluations (Coonin & Younce, 2009; Harley et al., 2010; Harley et al., 2008).

Malsch and Tessier (2015) mentioned a journal rankings list as part of their institution’s Research Incentive Policy, which is utilized to determine career promotion. In this situation, the authors’ topic of study prevented them from publishing in the top-ranked journals at their school, thus jeopardizing their careers due to journal rankings based mostly on Journal Citation Reports. This type of system is even generating studies of the value of publishing in specific journals for the purposes of promotion and tenure (e.g., Janvrin et al., 2015). Academics may be overworked when evaluating applications for promotion or tenure, which recommends the use of the impact factor to assess the quality of research articles as a strategy to reduce burden. As a result, the majority of professors (e.g., 68 percent in medical professions) consider journal impact factor to be crucial in their performance evaluation and promotion (Walker et al., 2010).

5. Methodology

A descriptive survey research was employed for the study. The study adopted this method because it used data to investigate lecturers in the context of their research outputs in Nigeria. Participants in the

study were lecturers in tertiary institutions from Nigeria that are on different social media platforms. The occurrence of the COVID-19 pandemic at the time of data collection influenced the choice of this population group, imposing social separation and making data gathering physically difficult. This population group's strength is that it includes academic staff from all areas, regardless of demographics, geographic dispersion, institutional affiliation, or career level. The structured questionnaire was utilized to collect data. The respondents' demographic information, such as gender, age range, institutional affiliation, and highest educational qualification, was included in the first section. Each section's items were developed based on a survey of related literature and the researchers' prior understanding of tertiary institutions. The responses were based on a four-point likert scale, with each concept getting points ranging from four to one. This means that the criterion mean for each notion will be ascertained was 2.5. However, the Nigerian lecturer's Awareness of reputable journals to publish, as contained in objective two, will be measured using two-point likert scale of aware and unaware, which gives a criterion mean of 1.5.

The instrument (structured questionnaire) was converted into an online survey using Google Forms. The first component of the survey comprises a letter to respondents that meets the ethical criteria of informing respondents that participation in the study is voluntary and assuring them that the data would be used purely for research purposes. The website link was posted on the various social media platforms, and platform members were requested to complete the survey. After four weeks, a reminder message was sent to guarantee maximum engagement, which lasted for one week. After the five weeks given for data collection were up, the online poll was closed to fresh responses. According to the survey answer summary, the link harnessed data from 107 academic staff. The retrieved data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentages, mean, and standard deviation using SPSS version 23 and presented in tables for clarity. The mean was derived by summing the scores for each item and dividing by the sample size (n). The standard deviation, on the other hand, is a measure of how widely scores vary throughout the set of data.

6. Demographic Distribution of the Respondents

Table 1. Gender

	Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Female	52	48.59
2.	Male	55	51.40
	Total	105	100

From the gender Table above, it is clear that of the 107 respondents, 51.40% are male while 48.59% are female, implying that male Nigerian lecturers are actively more involved in research activities than their female counterparts. Or perhaps tend to participate more in research surveys like this one.

Table 2. Age of Respondents

S/N	Age Range (in years)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Below 30	3	2.80
2.	31-40	46	42.99
3.	41-50	39	36.45
4.	51-60	17	15.89
5.	61 and above	2	1.879
Total		107	100.0

Table 2 indicates that majority of the respondents with 42.99% fall within the age range of 31-40, followed by 36.45% who fall within 41-50 and the next is 15.89% that are within the age category of 51-60, then followed closely by 2.80% who are below 30 years and finally 1.87% who are 60 years above. The implication of this finding is that, the younger an academic, the more productive he/she is in terms of scholarly research; and the older an academic, the less productive he/she becomes in scholarly research.

Table 3. Institutional of Assignment

S/N	Affiliation	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Federal (university/polytechnic/college of education)	52	48.59
2.	Private (university/polytechnic/college of education)	7	6.54
3.	State (university/polytechnic/college of education)	48	44.86
Total		107	100.0

Going by the findings in Table 3, it clear that 48.59% of respondents are from federal tertiary institutions, 44.86% are from State owned tertiary institutions, while 6.54% are from privately owned tertiary institutions. This connotes the relatively high number of academics in government owned tertiary institutions. However, the beauty of this rests on the fact that respondents cut across all the three segments.

Table 4. Educational Qualification

S/N	Qualifications	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Msc./its equivalent	44	41.12

2.	B.sc	16	14.95
3.	PhD	47	43.93
Total		107	100.0

From Table 4, most of the respondents are obviously PhD holders with 43.93%, followed by M.Sc holders with 41.12% and lastly the B.Sc respondents with 14.93%. This justifies the fact that Nigerian government has emphasized and taken deliberate steps towards ensuring that PhD is the minimum benchmark for all academics/lecturers in Nigerian tertiary institutions.

Table 5. Years of Experience

S/N	Years of Experience	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Below 5	16	14.95
2.	6-10	32	29.91
3.	11-15	35	32.71
4.	16-20	8	7.48
5.	21-25	8	7.48
6.	26 and above	8	7.48
Total		107	100.0

On years of experience, Table 5 shows that most lecturers that responded have spent between 11-15 years with 32.71% followed by 29.91% of lecturers who have spent 6;10 years on the job. Also followed by those below 5 years with a record of 14.95%. This implies clearly that younger lecturers appear to be more involved in research writing in order to boost their CV in their early career stage.

Section B: Answers to Research Questions

Table 6. Number of Articles Published to Your Credit?

S/N	Number of Articles published	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	1-10	43	40.19
2.	11-20	28	26.17
3.	21-30	15	14.01
4.	31-40	11	10.28
5.	41-50	4	3.74
6.	51-60	2	1.87
7.	61-70	0	0
8.	71-80	1	0.93
9.	81-90	0	0

10.	91-100	0	0
11.	100 and above	3	2.80
	Total	107	100

From Table 6, most of our respondents (40.19%) indicated that they have published between 1-10 articles. This was followed closely by 26.17 of the respondents who said they have published between 11-20 article, and 14.01% who noted that they have published between 21-30 articles, also 10.28% stated that they have published 31-40 articles and the next is 3.78% who indicated that they published 41-50 articles. Only 2.80% noted that they have published 100 and above articles. This implies that research output in Nigeria appears to be a little bit low.

Table 7. Nigerian Lecturer's Awareness of Reputable Journals to Publish in

S/N	Items	Aware		Not Aware		Mean	Std. Dev.
1.	Web of science journal list	68	66.67%	34	33.33%	1.7	1.92
2.	Scopus journal list	89	87.25%	18	18.63%	1.8	2.36
3.	JSTOR journal list	70	68.63%	32	31.37%	1.7	1.98
4.	Other critically peer reviewed journals	87	85.29%	15	14.71%	1.8	2.42
5.	Scimago journal list	60	58.82%	42	41.18%	1.6	1.72
6.	Elsevier journal finder	51	50%	51	50%	1.5	1.5
7.	Sage journal selection	81	89.41%	21	20.59%	1.8	2.26
8.	Wiley journal finder	64	62.75%	38	37.25%	1.6	1.8
9.	Springer nature finder	60	58.82%	42	41.18%	1.6	1.72
10.	Taylor and Francis journals suggester	71	69.61%	31	30.39%	1.7	2.00
Grand Mean = 1.68							

Std. Dev. = Standard deviation.

Table 7 has shown responses as per the various reputable journals outlets that lecturers are aware of. 87.25% percent are aware of Scopus list of journals, 85.29% of the lecturers know other critically peer reviewed journals, 69.91% are aware of Taylor and Francis journals suggester, followed by 68.63% of respondents who know JSTOR journal list. This simply confirms the fact that Nigerian lecturers obviously know the reputable journals that are available.

Table 8. Reputable Journals and Journal Ranking Bodies Nigerian Lecturers Have Published

with

S/N	Items	Have Published		Not yet published		Mean	Std. Dev.
1.	Web of science journal list	25	24.51%	77	75.49%	1.2	0.87
2.	Scopus journal list	47	46.08%	55	53.92%	1.5	1.40
3.	JSTOR journal list	10	9.80%	92	90.19%	1.1	0.48
4.	Other critically peer reviewed journals	33	32.35%	69	67.65%	1.3	1.06
5.	Scimago journal list	22	21.57%	80	78.43%	1.2	0.79
6.	Elsevier journal finder	29	28.43%	73	71.56%	1.3	0.97
7.	Sage journal selection	23	22.55%	79	77.45%	1.2	0.82
8.	Wiley journal finder	12	11.76%	90	88.24%	1.1	0.54
9.	Springer nature finder	11	10.78%	91	89.22%	1.1	0.51
10.	Taylor and Francis journals suggester	22	21.57%	80	78.43%	1.2	0.79
Grand Mean = 1.22							

Std. Dev. = Standard deviation.

From Table 8 above, only 46.08% of the respondents indicated that they have published in Scopus journals. 32.35% agreed that they have published in other critically peer reviewed journals, 28.43% stated that they have published in Elsevier journals, 22.55% have published with sage journals and only 9.80% have published with JSTOR journal list. The implication of the finding is that many Nigerian authors and writers do not publish in high reputable journals looking at the number of respondents studied.

Table 9. Challenges Encounter in a Bid to Publishing in Reputable/Scholarly Journals

S/N	Challenges	SA		A		D		SD		Mea n	Std. Dev
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1.	High rejection rate	46	45.09	32	31.37	21	20.59	3	2.94	3.2	0.86
2.	Editors' biased mindset against African authors	34	33.33	29	28.43	33	32.35	6	5.88	2.9	0.94
3.	Financial	58	56.86	23	22.55	16	15.69	5	4.90	3.3	0.91

	constraints										
4.	Rigorous online submission process	44	43.14	33	32.35	22	21.57	3	2.94	3.2	0.86
5.	Delayed review process	52	50.98	35	34.31	13	12.75	2	1.96	3.3	0.77
6.	Back and forth corrections by reviewers	41	40.19	42	41.18	16	15.69	3	2.94	3.2	0.80
7.	I do not have the capacity to write for reputable/scholarly journals	11	10.78	21	20.59	40	39.22	30	29.41	2.1	0.96

Grand Mean = 3.03

SA=strongly agree, A=agree, D=disagree, SD=strongly disagree, Std. Dev=standard deviation.

From Table 10, majority of respondents affirmed that there are challenges lecturers encountered in a bid to publish in reputable journals. 56.86% strongly agreed while 22.55% agreed that finance is a major challenge. On the other hand, 50.98% strongly agreed while 34.31% agreed that there is the problem of delayed review process. There is also 45.09% of responses strongly agreeing that there is high rejection rate by reputable journals. 43.14% noted that there is rigorous online submission process and few others. Obviously, different challenges abound.

Table 10. Perception on Publishing in Reputable Scholarly Journals before Promotion

S/ N	Perceptions	SA		A		D		SD		Mea n	Std. Dev
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1.	Individual articles should be assessed rather than quality of journals	47	46.08	36	35.29	15	14.71	4	3.92	3.2	0.84
2.	Lecturers should be scored for any article released without considering the	22	21.57	27	26.47	37	36.27	16	15.69	2.5	0.99

	publishing journal									
3.	Writing of articles is not the true test of lecturers' scholarship	23	22.55	37	36.27	33	32.35	9	8.82	0.91
										2.7
4.	All Nigerian lecturers should be made to publish in only high impact journals	15	14.71	31	30.39	42	41.18	14	13.73	0.90
										2.5
5.	Publishing in international journals should be more acceptable than publishing in local journals	17	16.67	13	12.75	50	49.02	22	21.57	0.97
										2.3
6.	Only peer reviewed journals should be accepted in academia	34	33.33	49	48.04	12	11.76	7	6.86	0.85
										3.1
7.	All Nigerian tertiary institutions should abolish the policy of publishing in only high impact journals	24	23.53	38	37.25	29	28.43	11	10.78	0.94
										2.7
8.	Altmetrics should be considered in assessment instead of the reputation of a particular journals (online articles)	27	26.47	54	52.94	19	18.63	2	1.96	0.73
										3.0
9.	Societal impact of one's scholarly works should be used for assessment instead of reputable journals.	34	33.33	52	50.98	14	13.73	2	1.96	0.72
										3.2
Grand Mean = 2.80										

From Table 11, there have been suggestions by respondents on the issue of academic promotion as per publications. Some of their views are: societal impact of one's scholarly works should be used for

assessment instead of reputable journals, altmetrics should be considered in assessment instead of the reputation of a particular journals (online articles), all Nigerian tertiary institutions should abolish the policy of publishing in only high impact journals, individual articles should be assessed rather than quality of journals and a few others. The implication of this finding is that the idea of compulsorily publishing in high impact journals before promoting lecturers is misplaced and should be reviewed.

7. Discussion of Findings

Finding to objective one which is to know the number of articles to have been published by lecturers has therefore indicated that research outputs by Nigerian lecturers appear to be a little bit low. This finding tallies with Okafor (2011) when he conducted a comparative analysis of research output of six federal universities in southern Nigeria (University of Benin, University of Ibadan, University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, and University of Uyo) from 1997 to 2006. Based on both local and foreign publications, the University of Benin had the highest research output (12.17 publications per head) and the University of Uyo had the lowest (8.13 publications per head) over the ten-year period. It's worth noting that even the best-case scenario of 12.17 equates to only roughly 1 publication per academic staff every year. This is a ridiculously low publication rate.

The outcome of the research confirms the fact that Nigerian lecturers obviously know the reputable journals that are available. This contradicts the finding of Kurt (2018) when he reported that several researchers ($n = 68$, or 70.8 percent) were unaware that they were publishing in these "predatory" journals, according to the survey results. When they received an e-mail request to publish their work, they frequently expressed their gratitude. Researchers were also enticed to publish in these journals by aggressive advertising efforts. Perhaps, over time, the awareness of reputable journals by academics has greatly increased.

The third objective was to ascertain the reputable journals in which lecturers have published, and finding shows that many Nigerian authors and writers do not publish in high reputable journals looking at the number of respondents studied. This may be due to the publish-or-perish syndrome where all academic staff may want to meet up with the required number of articles. Obviously, predatory journals are fast in publications as Okafor (2011) reminded us that predatory journals lack the scholarly publishing community's standards and best practices for evaluating research and improving the quality of published work.

On the fourth objective which aimed at establishing the obstacles encountered by Nigerian lecturers in publishing with reputable journals; high cost/finance, problem of delayed review process, high rejection rate by reputable journals and rigorous online submission process were some of the challenges recorded. In connection with this, Tarkang and Bain (2019) published a commentary on the difficulties of African scholars publishing research articles in international journals, the peer-review process, and the contentious topic of predatory publications. Some of the challenges cited by the authors are high cost/finance, problem of delayed review process, high rejection rate by reputable journals, rigorous

online submission process and others

On objective five which is to assess the perception of Nigerian authors/lecturers in publishing with international reputable journals as a major criterion for promotion. The finding indicated that the idea of compulsorily publishing in high impact journals before promoting lecturers is misplaced and should be reviewed. This appears to slightly corresponds with the standpoint of Grodniewicz, et al (2019) when they submit that efforts to combat predatory publishing must be continuous and flexible. The threat is unlikely to go away as long as institutions utilize a scholar's number of publications as a factor for graduation or progress. Predatory publications thrive in an environment characterized by a publish-or-perish mentality, a lack of understanding about predatory publishing, and difficulty distinguishing legitimate from illegitimate publications.

8. Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of this research:

- 1) Universities, polytechnics and colleges of education should list different reputable journals to publish, and lecturers should be encouraged (and not forced) to publish in those journals.
- 2) Management of tertiary institutions should encourage lecturers to carry out quality scholarly researches irrespective of where these researches are published.
- 3) Tertiary academic institutions should provided facilitating conditions that stimulate innovative research among academics as well as reward impactful scholarly research outputs.
- 4) Periodically, lecturers should assess themselves if their research works are impactful and not necessarily waiting for university assessors for instance.
- 5) Nigerian lecturers should not be carried away by the enticing mails from predatory journals, rather deliberately avoid them to ensure quality in their scholarly research outputs.

9. Conclusion

Effective teaching, learning and research is said to be a very important aspect of tertiary institutions without which their core objectives' realization may be hindered or end up in fiasco. To this very end, scholarly research should be encouraged in our tertiary institutions as this goes a long way in solving disturbing problems and attracting national development. But flowing from the findings of the research therefore, there is need to critically reevaluate the standing rule in some institutions where lecturers are made to compulsorily publish their research works in international reputable journals like those indexed in Scopus, before promotion letters can be issued to them. The focus should be more on the quality of research output than the journal outlet in which it is published. But this is not to say that lecturers should publish their research works in predatory journals without any form of peer review.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Abbott, A., Cyranoski, D., Jones, N., Maher, B., Schiermeier, Q. & Noorden, R. V. (2010). Metrics: Do metrics matter? *Nature*, 465, 860-862. Retrieved from <https://www.nature.com/articles/465860a>
- Adjei, K. O. K., & Owusu-Ansah, C. M. (2016). Publishing preferences among academic researchers: Implications for academic quality and innovation. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 1349. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1349>
- Adler, R., Ewing, J., & Taylor, P. (2009). Citation statistics. *Stat Sci*, 24(1), 1-10. Retrieved from <https://projecteuclid.org/journals/statistical-science/volume-24/issue-1/Citation-Statistics/10.1214/09-STS285.full>
- Cabrera, D., ..., et al. (2017). More than likes and tweets: Creating social media portfolios for academic promotion and tenure. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 9(4), 421-425. Retrieved from <https://dx.doi.org/10.4300%2FJGME-D-17-00171.1>
- Cagan, R. (2013). The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. *Disease Models and Mechanisms*, 6(4), 869-870. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3701204/>
- Christiaan, V. D. M. (2020). Predatory journals take a bite out of Nigerian education research. Retrieved from <https://researchprofessionalnews.com/rr-news-africa-pan-african-2020-8-predatory-journals-take-a-bite-out-of-nigerian-education-research/>
- Cocchio, C., & Awad, N. (2014). The scholarly merit of social media use among clinical faculty. *Journal of Pharmacy Technology*, 30(2), 61-68. Retrieved from <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177%2F8755122513518497>
- Coonin, B., & Younce, L. (2009). Publishing in open access journals in the social sciences and humanities: Who's doing it and why. *ACRL Fourteenth National Conference 12-15*. Retrieved from <https://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/conferences/confsandpreconfs/national/seattle/papers/85.pdf>
- Dagenais, B. J. (2014). Citation searching for tenure and promotion: An overview of issues and tools. *Reference Services Review*, 42(1), 70-89. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/RSR-05-2013-0023>
- Darling, E. S., Shiffman, D., Côté I. M., & Drew, J. (2013). The role of Twitter in the life cycle of a scientific publication. *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv*, 1305.0435. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4033/iee.2013.6.6.f>
- Fox, J. W. (2012). Can blogging change how ecologists share ideas? In economics, it already has. *Ideas in Ecology and Evolution*, 5(2), 74-77. Retrieved from <https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/IEE/article/view/4457>

- Goldstein, A. O., & Bearman, R. S. (2011). Community engagement in US and Canadian medical schools. *Adv Med Educ Pract*, 2, 43-49. Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23745075/>
- Grudniewicz, A, Moher, D., & Lalu, M. M. (2019). Predatory journals: no definition, no defence. *Nature*, 576, 210-212. Retrieved from <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-03759-y>
- Gruzd, A., Staves, K., & Wilk, A. (2011). Tenure and promotion in the age of online social media. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 48(1), 1-9. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/meet.2011.14504801154>
- Harley, D., ..., et al. (2010). Assessing the future landscape of scholarly communication: An exploration of faculty values and needs in seven disciplines. *Center for Studies in Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/15x7385g>
- Harley, D, ..., et al. (2008). Assessing the future landscape of scholarly communication: An In-depth Study of Faculty Needs and Ways of Meeting Them. *Center for Studies in Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://cshe.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/sc_draft_interim_report_060808.doc.pdf
- Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L. de Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, 520, 42-431. Retrieved from <https://www.nature.com/articles/520429a>
- Howard, J. (2013). Rise of “altmetrics” revives questions about how to measure impact of research. *Chron. High Educ.*, 59(38), A6-A7.
- Idhalama, O. U. (2014). Adoption and use of ICT by lecturers in Delta State University. *Communicate. Journal of Library and Information Science*, 16(1), 2-18.
- Janvrin, D. J., Lim, J. H., & Peters, G. F. (2015). The perceived impact of journal of information systems on promotion and tenure. *Journal of Information Systems*, 29(1), 73-93.
- King, C. J., Harley, D., Earl-Novell. S., et al. (2006). Scholarly communication: Academic values and sustainable models. *Center for Studies in Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/scholarly-communication-academic-values-and-sustainable-models>
- Kurt, S. (2018). Why do authors publish in predatory journals? *Learn Publ*, 31(2), 141-147. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/leap.1150>
- Malsch, B., & Tessier, S. (2015). Journal ranking effects on junior academics: Identity fragmentation and politicization. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 26, 84-98. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2014.02.006>
- Musick, C. (2020). *8 questions and answers about predatory journals: Protecting your research, reputation, and funding from theft and fraud*. Retrieved from <https://thinkscience.co.jp/en/articles/predatory-journals>

- Okafor, V. N. (2011). Comparative analysis of research output of federal universities in Southern Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/498/>
- Okonedo, S. (2015). Research and publication productivity of librarians in public universities in South-West, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1297>
- Piwowar, H. (2013). Altmetrics: Value all research products. *Nature*, 493, 159. Retrieved from <https://www.nature.com/articles/493159a>
- Rafeedalie, R. (2020). *Educational Research, Meaning, Scope, Purpose and Characteristics*. Retrieved from <https://tophat.com/marketplace/social-science/education/course-notes/oer-educational-research-meaning-scope-purpose-and-characteristics-dr-rafeedalie/1191/>
- Rawat, S., & Meena, S. (2014). Publish or perish: Where are we heading?. *Journal of research in medical sciences: The official journal of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences*, 19(2), 87-89.
- Reinstein, A., Hasselback, J. R., Riley, M. E., & Sinason, D. H. (2011). Pitfalls of using citation indices for making academic accounting promotion, tenure, teaching load, and merit pay decisions. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 26(1), 99-131. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2308/iace.2011.26.1.99>
- Sanberg, P. R., Gharib, M., Harker, P. T., et al. (2014). Changing the academic culture: valuing patents and commercialization toward tenure and career advancement. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.*, 111(18), 6542-6547.
- Schimanski, L. A., & Alperin, J. P. (2018). *The evaluation of scholarship in academic promotion and tenure processes: Past, present, and future*. Retrieved from <https://f1000research.com/articles/7-1605>
- Schuler, A. (2020). *Identify and evaluate journals*. Retrieved from <https://researchguides.library.tufts.edu/c.php?g=685277&p=4842466>
- Shamseer, L., Moher, D., Maduekwe, O. et al. (2017). Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical journals: can you tell the difference? A cross-sectional comparison. *BMC Med*, 15(28). Retrieved from <https://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12916-017-0785-9>
- Simisaye, A. O. (2019). A study of research productivity of the academic staff in research institutes in south-west Nigeria. *Samaru Journal of Information Studies*, 19(2), 75-99. Retrieved from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/sjis/article/view/195467>
- Starovoytova, D. (2017). Research-Productivity at Engineering-School: Number of Publications per Faculty-Member. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(28), 14-38.
- Tarkang, E. E., & Bain, L. E. (2019). The bane of publishing a research article in international journals by African researchers, the peer-review process and the contentious issue of predatory journals:

- A commentary. *The Pan African medical journal*, 32, 119.
<https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2019.32.119.18351>
- University of Washington Libraries. (2020). *Identifying Reputable Journals: Identifying Reputable Journals*. Retrieved from <https://guides.lib.uw.edu/research/reputable>
- Walker, R. L., Sykes, L., Hemmelgarn, B. R., & Quan, H. (2010) Authors' opinions on publication in relation to annual performance assessment. *BMC Med Educ*, 10(21).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-10-21>
- Whitman, M. E., Hendrickson, A. R., & Townsend, A. M. (1999). Research commentary. Academic rewards for teaching, research, and service: Data and discourse. *Information Systems Research*, 10(2), 99-109. Retrieved from <https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/isre.10.2.99>
- Wolff, C., Rod, A., & Schonfeld, R. (2016). *Copyright, Fair, Use, Scholarly Communication, etc. Ithaka S+R US Faculty Survey, University of Nebraska*. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/scholcom/17/>
- Yusuf, A. K. (2012). The Research Scene in Nigeria's Non-University Higher Institution *Journal of Research in National Development*, 10(2). Retrieved from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/jorind/article/view/92656>