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A B S T R A C T

The main objective of this survey is to present data on the perception of the influence of faculty support initiatives on efficacy of job responsibilities using six private university in Nigeria as case study. The population of the study included all faculty members of selected private universities with a total of 1912 faculty members. A sample size of 500 were selected to participate in the survey based on the outcome of the sample size determination formula suggested by Falola et al. (2016) [5]. The validity and reliability of the research instrument were carried out. Regression analysis and structural equation modeling were used as statistical tool of analysis. It is believed that when the data is analysed, it will give insight into how faculty support initiatives of various universities can help in enhancing the effectiveness of job responsibilities.
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Specification Table

| Subject area               | Management       |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| More specific subject area | Human Resource Management |
| Type of data               | Table            |

https://www.elsevier.com/locate/dib
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How data was acquired

Copies of questionnaire were administered to faculty members of some selected private universities in Nigeria.

Data format

Raw, analyzed and statistical data

Experimental factors

Stratified and Simple random sampling of faculty members of some selected universities.

Experimental features

The perception of faculty members on the influence of faculty support initiatives on the efficacy of job responsibilities.

Data source location

South west Nigeria

Data accessibility

All the data are included in this article.

Value of the data

- University management can have insight into which of the faculty support initiatives mostly predicts efficacy of faculty responsibilities.
- If the data is properly analysed, it can provide a platform upon which universities take decisions that will completely restore the dignity of Nigerian Universities. See [3,5] for similar data.
- The data provided here can be used for decision making purposes.
- This can be used as a platform upon which management of the universities and other stakeholders in the education sector formulate policies.
- The questionnaire can be adopted or adapted for a similar studies.

1. Data

The data presented in this study is quantitative in nature. It comprises raw statistical data on the influence of faculty support initiatives on the efficacy of job responsibilities. The study is descriptive in nature. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for the coding of the data collected. The population, sample size and response rate of questionnaire administered as well as demographic characteristics of the respondents are depicted in Tables 1 and 2. Meanwhile, Tables 3 and 4 show the descriptive outputs of the measures of independent and dependent variables while Table 5 shows the standardized regression weights of the structural equation modelling outputs as generated by AMOS 22. It is also important to note that 5-point Likert scale of questionnaire was used for the collection of data from the respondents as suggested by [1–3]. However, the relationship and resultant effect of faculty support initiatives and efficacy of job responsibilities is depicted in Fig. 3. The data can provide a deep insight that will help the management of the universities and other stakeholders in the education sector to formulate policies and decision that will help in repositioning the university education in Nigeria.

Table 1 shows the population, sample size and number of returned questionnaire of each university. Meanwhile, it is also important to state here that universities B, D and F are faith based while universities A, C and E are owned by group of individuals.

| S/N | University | Population | Sample | No. of returned questionnaire |
|-----|------------|------------|--------|-----------------------------|
| 1.  | University A | 362        | 95     | 88                          |
| 2   | University B | 377        | 99     | 91                          |
| 3   | University C | 200        | 52     | 46                          |
| 4   | University D | 476        | 124    | 101                         |
| 5   | University E | 296        | 77     | 70                          |
| 6   | University F | 201        | 53     | 47                          |
| Total |             | 1912       | 500    | 443                         |
### Table 2
Demographic characteristics of academic staff.

| Gender | University A | University B | University C | University D | University E | University F |
|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Gender | Male         | 73           | 84           | 37           | 82           | 48           | 40           | 364 |
|        | Female       | 15           | 7            | 9            | 19           | 22           | 7            | 79  |
| Total  | 88           | 91           | 46           | 101          | 70           | 47           | 443          |     |
| Age    |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |     |
| Age    | 18–30        | 6            | 7            | 2            | 14           | 5            | 3            | 37  |
|        | 31–40        | 41           | 24           | 5            | 23           | 21           | 11           | 125 |
|        | 41–50        | 22           | 29           | 16           | 25           | 29           | 32           | 153 |
|        | 51–Above     | 19           | 31           | 23           | 39           | 15           | 1            | 128 |
| Total  | 88           | 91           | 46           | 101          | 70           | 47           | 443          |     |
| Marital status |               |              |              |              |              |              |              |     |
| Marital Status | Single      | 22           | 7            | 2            | 13           | 5            | 3            | 52  |
|        | Married      | 66           | 81           | 44           | 87           | 61           | 44           | 383 |
|        | Others       | 0            | 3            | 0            | 1            | 4            | 0            | 8   |
| Total  | 88           | 91           | 46           | 101          | 70           | 47           | 443          |     |
| Current rank |               |              |              |              |              |              |              |     |
| Rank   | Prof         | 15           | 17           | 12           | 20           | 5            | 5            | 74  |
|        | Ass Prof.    | 4            | 14           | 10           | 13           | 9            | 6            | 56  |
|        | Srn. Lecturer | 18          | 23           | 10           | 27           | 17           | 14           | 109 |
|        | Lecturer I   | 28           | 14           | 5            | 18           | 29           | 13           | 107 |
|        | Others       | 23           | 23           | 9            | 23           | 10           | 9            | 97  |
| Total  | 88           | 91           | 46           | 101          | 70           | 47           | 443          |     |

### Table 3
Descriptive statistics of items measuring faculty support initiatives.

| Descriptive statistics       | N  | Mean  | Std. Dev | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------|----------|----------|
| Conference Support (CS)      | 443| 4.1151| .02631   | .55383   | .793     |
| Research Grant (RG)          | 443| 3.3634| .04058   | .85417   | .406     |
| Research Leave with Pay (RL) | 443| 4.1941| .02242   | .47187   | .480     |
| Publication Support (PS)     | 443| 3.7675| .02622   | .55185   | .192     |
| Valid N (listwise)           | 443|       |          |          |          |

### Table 4
Descriptive statistics of items measuring efficacy of faculty job responsibilities.

| Descriptive statistics       | N  | Mean  | Std. Dev | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------|----------|----------|
| Research Outputs (RO)        | 443| 4.2009| .02932   | .52826   | .149     |
| Administrative Role (AR)     | 443| 3.8450| .02932   | .61737   | .142     |
| Knowledge Sharing (KS)       | 443| 4.1512| .02199   | .46274   | .466     |
| Valid N (listwise)           | 443|       |          |          |          |
Table 2 shows the cross-tabulations of the demographic characteristics of the faculty members of the selected universities. If this is interpreted, it will give clear understanding of the composition of the respondents and this can be used for decision making purposes and can as well be leveraged on for further investigation.

Table 3 and Fig. 1 above shows the descriptive statistics of specific items such as conference support, research grant, research leave with pay, publication support that were used to measure university support initiatives for effective job performance in the core areas of faculty responsibilities.
Meanwhile, x-axis score of Fig. 1 shows the level to which respondents of each university agreed with the specific construct used for the measurement of faculty support initiatives. The data if analyse and properly interpreted will help to determine which of the support is more effective in driving job performance.

Table 4 and Figs. 2 and 3 show the description statistics of the specific construct used to measure the efficacy of faculty job responsibility such as research outputs, administrative role and knowledge sharing. Meanwhile, x-axis score of Fig. 2 shows the level to which respondents of each university agreed with the specific construct used for the measurement of job responsibilities. If the data presented for both independent and dependent variables are linked together, it will help to determine the level of prediction of each of the constructs.

2. Experimental design, materials and methods

Six best private universities as ranked by National Universities Commission, and webometric ranking were selected from Southwest Nigeria. What informs the choice of the best six private
universities in southwest Nigeria was because of their outstanding performance when it comes to research and innovation. The researchers wanted to find out the institutional supports given to the Academic Staff that might be responsible for their performance. Data were collected from the sample of four hundred and forty three faculty members across all the colleges with the aid of structured questionnaire designed by the researcher based on the similar studies of [4–7]. Stratified and simple random sampling techniques were used in order to ensure that every faculty has equal chance of being selected. The data presented information on questions related university support initiatives and efficacy of job performance. Meanwhile, the researchers also sought for the permission of the management of the selected universities before the questionnaire were administered to the faculty members of their institutions. In addition, every faculty member was adequately informed about the objective of the study and they were equally given opportunity to stay anonymous and their responses were treated with upmost confidentiality.
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