



## Staff Marital Status Perceptions on Vice Chancellors Management of Resources in Public Universities, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

Jasper Abowei Florence Ebikienmo<sup>1\*</sup>, Diepreye Okodoko<sup>2</sup>  
Niger Delta University, Bayelsa State

**Corresponding Author:** Jasper Abowei Florence Ebikienmo  
[florencejasper23@gmail.com](mailto:florencejasper23@gmail.com)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Marital status, Staff, Perception, Resources, Effective Management, Vice Chancellors

*Received :* 5 November

*Revised :* 17 December

*Accepted:* 23 January

©2025 Ebikienmo, Okodoko:  
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

This study explored the correlation between staff marital status and their perceptions of vice chancellors' resource management in public universities within Bayelsa State, Nigeria. Employing an analytical descriptive survey design, the research examined data from a sample of 1,382 employees across three universities, proportionally stratified from a total population of 4,606. The findings revealed a significant variance in resource management evaluations among different marital status groups. Notably, single staff members consistently reported mean rating scores above the 2.50 cut-off across all evaluated items, indicating a generally positive perception. Married staff also demonstrated favorable ratings, albeit with slightly lower scores on two specific items. The study concludes that marital status significantly influences staff perceptions of resource management effectiveness. Consequently, it suggests that university administrators should consider the demographic factor of marital status when formulating and implementing resource management strategies to ensure inclusivity and optimize outcomes

## INTRODUCTION

Management affects its control of the total school infrastructures operation by holding to established standards. The maintenance of conditions conducive to safety for all people who use the school resources is an important goal (Handfield, 2022). People have different perceptions on the management of resources by vice chancellors in public universities (Jasper-Abowei and Anderson, 2021).

The legally defined marital condition is known as marital status. Marital status can be classified as single, married, widowed, divorced, separated, and, in some situations, as a registered partnership. Those who have never married are those who, in accordance with the law, have never married. The several possibilities that characterize a person's relationship with a significant other are civil status and marital status. Civil statuses include married, single, divorced, and widowed (Tomaszewska, 2020). Forms, vital records, and other papers use the phrases "civil status" and "marriage status" to inquire about or specify a person's marital status. No additional differentiation is established in the most basic instances. A person who has the status of married was lawfully married in their jurisdiction. An individual's If they are in a common-law marriage or civil union, they may also be wedded to someone with a defined civil status. When someone is legally separated, their civil status is married. (Wilkinson, 2022).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Whether a cohabiting couple (such as in a domestic partnership) have a civil status of "married" depends on the circumstances and the jurisdiction. In addition to those who have never married, single status applies to people whose relationship with a significant other is not legally recognized (Serhii et al; 2020). Realities and prospects of distance learning at higher education institutions of Ukraine. *Ukrainian Journal of Educational Studies and Information Technology*, 8(1).

Questions about civil status appear on questionnaires for quantitative research, such as census forms and market research instruments. In a person's medical history, civil status is considered to have both quantitative and qualitative significance. A government records the civil status of its citizens by means of a civil registration system. Historically, inquiries into marital status have appeared on applications for employment, loans, and credit. Familial status indicates whether a person is the responsible caregiver for a child status have surfaced on credit, loan, and job applications. A person's familial status reveals if they are the child's primary caretaker (Spruch and Robert, 2022).

In the sense that married behavior is socially defined and affected rather than possessing any biological characteristics, sociologists refer to marital status as an attained attribute (Patrahau et al., 2020). "Methods to Ensure Supply." Policy Options for the European Union and the Netherlands on Protecting Vital Resources for Vital Industries. Center for Strategic Studies in the Hague, 2020. While adults are commonly categorized as single, married, separated, divorced, or widowed, while people may naturally switch categories at different points in their life, children are usually presumed to be single (never married). In almost every human community, it is assumed that the majority of individuals will get

married when they reach adulthood, and that married people's families are where social and biological reproduction typically occurs. Information from the 2000 census, 23% of females aged 15 and older reported never having been married, a modest rise from the current rate of 24%. In 2000, 16% of women were separated or divorced, 10% were widowed, and almost half (49%) were married with a partner present. Naturally, these numbers differ with age, divorce, and particularly widowhood. (Tomlin and Irina, 2022)). Legal marital status can be classified as follows:

- **Married:** Unless the pair is separated or a divorce has been achieved, this group comprises people whose spouses are of the same or opposite sex and are still alive. Civil union members are also listed.
- **Widowed (Including Living Common Law):** Those who have not remarried after losing their lawfully wed spouse to death fall under this group. This group includes those who live with a common-law spouse.
- **Separated (Including Living Common Law):** Those who are lawfully married but no longer reside with their spouse (for any reason other than illness, employment, or education) and have not filed for divorce fall into this group. This group includes those who live with a common-law spouse.
- **Divorced (Including Living Common Law):** Those who have gotten a valid divorce and have not remarried fall into this group. This group includes those who live with a common-law spouse.
- **Single (Including Living Common Law):** People who have never married fall into this category, which also includes everyone under the age of fifteen. People whose marriages have been lawfully dissolved and who were unmarried prior to the annulment and have not remarried are also included. This group includes those who live with a common-law spouse (Young, 2022). The research gives the ministry of education the baseline data and information they need to govern tertiary education in the state effectively.

## METHODOLOGY

Analytical In this study, a descriptive survey design was used. An analytical descriptive survey methodology helps an investigator evaluate various demographic facts of the population utilizing hypotheses, claim Tomlin and Irina (2022) (Ezeanvim and Ufoard, 2019). The demographic information of importance in this study is marital status, which was used to compare their perspectives on the topic being studied. The fact that this design prevents an investigator from influencing the study's independent variable is another important justification for using it. (Guth,2021).

4606 employees of three public universities in Bayelsa State during the 2021–2022 academic year comprised the study's target population (Office of the Establishment Officer of the three, 2023). The staff members from Niger Delta University (NDU), Federal University of Otuoke (FUO), and University of Africa, Toru-Orua (UAT) are 2223, 1994, and 389, respectively.

Using a proportional stratified random sampling approach, 1382 employees (about 30% of the total population) were chosen from three universities in Bayelsa State, Nigeria, during the 2021/2022 academic session. This was distributed as 667, 598 and 117 staff from Niger Delta University (NDU), Federal University of Otuoke (FUO) and University of Africa, Toru-Orua (UAT) respectively. Table 1 indicates the sample frame and distribution of sample into the three (3) Universities.

Table 1: Sample Frame and Distribution of Sample into the Three (3) Universities

S/N	Name of University	Population of Staff	Sample of Staff
1	Niger Delta University	2223	667
2	Federal University, Otuoke	1994	598
3	University of Africa, Toru-Orua	389	117
4	Total	4606	1382

Staff Perception and Resources Management by Vice-Chancellors in Universities Questionnaire (SPRMVUQ) was constructed by the investigator of this study. The SPRMVUQ instrument has two basic segments A and B. The first segment A sought information on the demographic details of the respondents, on the other hand segment B seek for information on Vice-Chancellors management of resources in universities. In addition, the segment B was not re-categorized into further sectors; rather it contained a single variable with fifteen items on it. This simply implies that items 1-15 sought information on resources management by Vice-Chancellors in Universities. All the items were measured on a 4-point rating scale of:

- Strongly Agree (SA) 4-points.
- Agree (A) 3-points
- Disagree (D) 2-points and
- Strongly Disagree (SD) 1-point

The Two experts and the investigator's supervisor implemented the validity of the instrument. The other expert comes from the Department of Educational Foundations' measurement and evaluation section at Niger Delta University on Wilberforce Island in Bayelsa State, while the first one is from educational administration and planning. Under the guidance of the instrument's face validity, the supervisor carried out the validity procedure. The educational management and planning specialist worked on the instrument's usability and clarity in relation to the content. On the other hand, the measurement and assessment expert took the instrument's validity into account from the construct viewpoint. The instrument's final draft appropriately included and implemented all of the helpful criticisms, changes, recommendations, and observations. In accordance with the outcomeresult of the validity procedure, as previously mentioned, 15 of the 18 elements that were initially developed were ultimately included in the instrument for utilization.

30 employees of Bayelsa State Medical University (BMU), Yenagoa, who were not included in the study's primary population, were given the instrument's reliability test, the Staff Perception and Management of Resources by Vice-Chancellors in Universities Questionnaire (SPMRVUQ). The staff was given the instrument once, and the results were used to determine the internal consistency of the instrument reliability coefficient value. Cronbach's Alpha analysis was then applied. The reliability coefficient value for the instrument was determined to be 0.82 in terms of internal consistency. The functioning of the instrument used for data collection in the study was significantly influenced by the obtained reliability coefficient value.

To actualize effective In order to distribute and retrieve copies of the instrument, the researcher directly used three (3) research assistants who had been instructed or trained to assist with the distribution of questionnaire copies. The primary goal of using research assistants was to guarantee a high rate of return for the different copies of the questionnaire that were sent out. Although 1410 copies of the instrument were given, 1382 (98%) of them were fully administered by the respondents, and the remaining 28 (2%) were improperly administered and were thus not included for the study's analysis. Ten days were allotted for the dissemination and retrieval of copies of the data collecting instrument ten weeks.

The Both descriptive and inferential statistical approaches were used to evaluate the data gathered for this investigation. The study's demographic data was analyzed using the descriptive statistical method of simple percentage analysis. The Z-test was the inferential statistical tool of interest that was relevant in the study for data analysis, while mean and standard deviation descriptive statistical tools were also used to address the research objectives. Every hypothesis was examined at the significance level of 0.05. Additionally, the main tool used for all of the studies was version 25 of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

## RESULT

Table 2: Simple Percentage Analysis of Respondents by Marital Status

S/N	Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
1	Single	316	23
2	Married	417	30
3	Separated	284	21
4	Divorced	244	17
5	Others	121	9
6	Total	1382	100

Of the total respondents, 316 (23%) were single, 417 (30%) were married, 284 (21%) were separated, 244 (17%) were divorced, and 121 (9%) had another marital status, according to the data in Table 2. This suggests that there were more married respondents than other research participants.

Table 3: Summary of Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Differences Among Staff with Single, Married, Separated, Divorced and Others Marital Status Mean Rating of the Resources Management by Vice-Chancellors of Public Universities

S/N	Resources management by Vice-Chancellors in public Universities	SI Mean	MA Mean	SE Mean	DI Mean	OT Mean	Total Mean	Decision
1	Financial resources are properly managed by Vice-Chancellor in my University.	2.85	2.49	2.82	2.42	1.89	2.57	Accepted
2	Internally generated revenue is adequately managed by Vice chancellors in the University.	3.15	3.07	3.16	3.16	2.92	3.11	Accepted
3	Funds reached from government are utilized by Vice-Chancellor in the University for all.	2.93	2.86	3.00	2.71	2.55	2.85	Accepted
4	The Vice-Chancellor ensures that funds provided by TETFUND are well managed in my university.	3.08	3.14	2.93	3.14	2.81	3.06	Accepted
5	Funds received from Philanthropies are adequately used by Vice-Chancellor in my University.	2.52	3.16	2.62	2.50	2.78	2.75	Accepted
6	Adequate provision of furniture is a priority by the Vice-Chancellor in my University.	2.87	2.85	2.82	2.82	2.59	2.82	Accepted
7	Inadequate classrooms affect effective	2.93	2.92	3.27	3.08	2.79	3.01	Accepted

	management of students by the Vice-Chancellor in the University.							
8	The Vice-Chancellor supports effective provision of teaching facilities in my University.	2.94	3.51	3.04	3.04	2.85	3.13	Accepted
9	Lack of well-equipped laboratories makes the management of facilities difficult for Vice-Chancellor in my University.	2.74	2.87	2.56	2.46	2.55	2.68	Accepted
10	Availability of adequate infrastructural facilities enhances Vice-Chancellor effectiveness in the University.	2.58	2.45	2.41	2.60	2.50	2.50	Accepted
11	The Vice-Chancellor relate cordially with staff in the University.	2.87	2.61	2.73	2.66	2.02	2.65	Accepted
12	Lack of transparency in resources management by the Vice-Chancellor is a problem in my university.	2.54	2.97	2.39	2.14	1.88	2.51	Accepted
13	Vice-Chancellor use of diplomatic ways of cautioning erring staff motivates growth in the University.	2.76	2.73	2.86	2.93	2.66	2.79	Accepted
14	The Vice-Chancellor use of democratic	2.78	2.58	2.46	2.36	1.81	2.49	Rejected

	style of leadership promotes management of resources in the University effectively.							
15	Vice-Chancellor use of autocratic style of leadership is detrimental to the well-being of staff in my university.	2.79	2.84	2.65	2.37	2.47	2.68	Accepted
	Grand mean	2.82	2.87	2.78	2.69	2.47	2.77	Accepted

Cut-off mean = 2.50; Single = 316; Married = 417; Separated = 284; Divorced = 244; Others = 121 and Total = 1382

According to the data in Table 3, staff members who were single had mean rating scores of 2.85, 3.15, 2.93, 3.08, 2.52, 2.87, 2.93, 2.94, 2.74, 2.58, 2.87, 2.54, 2.76, 2.78, and 2.79 for all items, which were higher than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This suggests that everything was approved. Similarly, for every item except items 1 and 10, where the mean rating scores were 2.49, 3.07, 2.86, 3.14, 3.16, 2.85, 2.92, 3.51, 2.87, 2.45, 2.61, 2.97, 2.73, 2.58, and 2.84, respectively, the mean rating scores of staff members with married marital status were greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This suggests that everything was approved, with the exception of items 1 and 10. Additionally, Table 3 shows that, With the exception of items 10, 12, and 14, where the mean rating scores were 2.82, 3.16, 3.00, 2.93, 2.62, 2.82, 3.27, 3.00, 2.56, 2.41, 2.73, 2.39, 2.86, 2.46, and 2.65, respectively, the mean rating scores of staff members with separated marital status were higher than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This suggests that everything was approved, with the exception of items 10, 12, and 14.

On With the exception of items 1, 9, 12, 14, and 15, where the mean rating scores were 2.42, 3.16, 2.71, 3.14, 2.50, 2.82, 3.08, 2.46, 2.60, 2.66, 2.14, 2.93, 2.36, and 2.37, respectively, the mean rating scores of staff members with divorced marital status were higher than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This demonstrates that not every item was approved. However, for every item except items 1, 11, 12, 14, and 15, where the mean rating scores were 1.89, 2.92, 2.55, 2.81, 2.78, 2.59, 2.79, 2.85, 2.55, 2.50, 2.02, 1.88, 2.66, 1.81, and 2.47, respectively, the mean rating scores of staff members with other marital status were higher than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This suggests that, in addition to items 1, All other items, including 11, 12, 14, and 15, were accepted. With the exception of item 14, which had mean scores of 2.57, 3.11, 2.85, 3.06, 2.75, 2.82, 3.01, 3.13, 2.68, 2.50, 2.65, 2.51, 2.49, and 2.68, respectively, all items had overall mean scores higher than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This suggests that everything was approved, with the exception of item 14.

The grand mean rating score of staff with married marital status (2.87) was greater than that of the staff with single marital status (2.82), which in turn was also greater than that of staff with separated marital status (2.78), this also greater

than staff with divorced marital status (2.69) and it is also higher than that of staff with others marital status (2.47) with the exception of employees in other marital status categories, whose overall grand mean score of 2.77 is higher than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This only indicates that vice chancellors of public universities give married staff members a higher mean evaluation score on resource management than their peers. In order to determine if the observed difference in the mean rating scores is significant, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed. (Febus and Karen, 2022).

#### Hypothesis Four

There is no significant difference among staff with single, married, separated, divorced and others marital status mean rating of resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities in Bayelsa State, Nigeria.

Table 4. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Difference Among Staff with Single, Married, Separated, Divorced and Others Marital Status Mean Rating of Resources Management by Vice-Chancellors of Public Universities

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision at P < 0.05
Between groups	17.236	4	4.309	27.687	0.000	*
Within groups	214.303	1377	0.156			
Total	231.539	1381				

\* = Significant at 0.05 alpha Level; Critical F 4, 1377 = 2.37; N = 1382.

The With 4 and 1377 degrees of freedom, the computed F-value of 27.687 is higher than the crucial F-value of 2.37 at the 0.05 alpha level, indicating that the one-way analysis of variance is significant at the  $p < 0.05$  alpha level, according to the data shown in Table 4. Therefore, it is not possible to accept the null hypothesis. Thus, the alternative hypothesis – that vice chancellors of public universities in Bayelsa State, Nigeria, have a significantly different mean rating of resources management among staff members who are single, married, separated, divorced, and others – is maintained. To ascertain the order of effectiveness of staff marital status and direction of significance, the mean rating scores were subjected to Scheffe’s multiple comparison tests for a post hoc analysis.

Table 5: Summary of Scheffe’s Post Hoc Analysis of Staff Mean Rating of Resources Management by Vice-Chancellors in Public Universities Based on Marital Status

Marital status	Marital status	Mean difference	Sig.
Single	Married	-0.049	0.602
	Separated	0.043	0.779

	Divorced	0.129	0.006
	Others	0.350	0.000
Married	Single	0.049	0.602
	Separated	0.092	0.059
	Divorced	0.177	0.000
	Others	0.398	0.000
Separated	Single	-0.043	0.779
	Married	-0.092	0.059
	Divorced	0.086	0.156
	Others	0.307	0.000
Divorced	Single	-0.129	0.006
	Married	-0.177	0.000
	Separated	-0.086	0.186
	Others	0.221	0.000
Others	Single	-0.350	0.000
	Married	-0.398	0.000
	Separated	-0.307	0.000
	Divorced	-0.221	0.000

The data presented in Table 5. shows scheffe's post hoc test analysis of staff mean rating of resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities based on marital status. The table also reveals that the mean difference between staff that are single and married is 0.049; between single and separated is 0.043; between single and divorced is 0.129; between single and others 0.350; between married and separated is 0.092; between married and divorced is 0.177; between married and others is 0.398; between separated and divorced is 0.08; between separated and others 0.307 and between divorced and 0.221. This implies staff that are married is the most effective, followed by single, separated, divorced and the least effective group are those of others in their mean rating of resources management by Vice-Chancellors in public Universities.

#### **Summary of Finding**

There is a significant difference among staff with single, married, separated, divorced and others marital status mean rating of resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. The result also reveals a significant difference among staff with single, married, separated, divorced and others marital status mean rating of resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities.

#### **DISCUSSION**

The result indicates that, the mean score of staff with married status (2.87) was greater than that of staff with single (2.82) which was in turn greater than staff with separated (2.78), which further greater staff with divorced status (2.69) and also greater than staff with other marital status (2.47) on their mean rating of resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities. Statistical analysis shows that, there is a significant difference among staff with single,

married, separated, divorced and others marital status mean rating of resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities.

The result implies that, marital status motivates staff mean rating of resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities. The result also indicates that staff with married marital status rated higher the resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities than that of their other colleagues in the research. Given their knowledge of management challenges in the university system, the ranking of staff members who are married is expected and not surprising. This study's results are consistent with those of Janani and Sankar (2021), who found that vice chancellors of public universities' mean ratings of resource management varied significantly across staff members who are single, married, separated, divorced, and in other marital statuses. On the other hand, this study's results do not support those of Leteroff (2022); there is no discernible difference between the two. among staff with single, married, separated, divorced and others marital status mean rating of resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff mean rating is significantly impacted by marital status resources management by Vice-Chancellors of public Universities.

University employees should endeavour to rely on their marital status, because it has the potential to enhance on their ability to properly rate resources management of Vice-Chancellors in universities.

## **FUTURE STUDY**

The study provides baseline information/data for further studies and the ministry of education for the effective management of tertiary education in the state.

## **REFERENCES**

- Ezeanyim, E. E and Ufoaroh, E. T. & A. (2019). The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance in Selected Public Enterprise in Awka, Anambra State. *Journal of Management and Business Research: An Administration and Management*.
- Febus, S, and Karen P (2022). "Checklist for materials management supply contracts." *Healthcare Financial Management*, pp. 10-27,
- Guth, M. E. (2021) "Craft Organizations and Operations." *Craft Culture in Early Modern Japan: Materials, Makers, and Mastery*, 1st ed., University of California Press, pp. 109-38,
- Handfield, R. B (2022). "The role of materials management in developing time-based competition." *International Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management*, 19 (1): 39-56.

- Janani, R. and. Sanka,r A (2021). "Material management and effective utilization of materials". *Materials Today: Proceedings*. 37: 3118–3124. ISSN 2214-7853.
- Jasper-Abowei E.F and Anderson P. Sele (2021). Teachers' perception on the effective management of funds and material resources by principals in public secondary schools in Port Harcourt Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. *Niger Delta Journal of Education*. Vol.13, No 2. Pp 46-60
- Lefteroff, L (2022). "Efficient materials management: design and operations advice for productive supply activity." *Health Facilities Management* 30, no. 3. Pp. 264
- Patrahau, I, Ankita S, Michel R, Hugo V, René K, and Lucia V (2020). "Strategies to Secure Supply." *Securing Critical Materials for Critical Sectors: Policy Options for the Netherlands and the European Union*. Hague Centre for Strategic Studies, 2020.
- Serhii V, Vladyslav K, Viacheslav O and Kateryna O (2020). Realities and prospects of distance learning at higher education institutions of Ukraine. *Ukrainian Journal of Educational Studies and Information Technology*, 8(1).
- Spruch, A, and Robert B (2022). "Investing in materials management: how the right materials and campus design approaches can promote sustainability" *18.51:47-67*.
- Tomaszewska J. P (2020). Transition towards Circular Economy: Materials Management and Implications for the Construction Sector. *Materials (Basel)*. 13(22):5228.
- Tomlin, N and Irina K (2022). "Ready or not? An assessment of shelf-ready materials management practices in US academic libraries." *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 13(22):5228.
- Wilkinson, E. S (2022). "An overview of certification programs in the purchasing and materials management field." *International Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management*,6 (1): 33–49.
- Young, S. T (2022). "Materials Management - Evolving the Process for an Evolving Marketplace." *Chemical Engineering*, 2, (3) pp 124-132