AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.17 (2), January-April, 2026; https://ajemates.org

# LEGAL BASIS FOR STAFF RECRUITMENT IN UNIVERSITY

**Ilodigwe, Nneamaka Mariah**
**Email:** nneilodigwe5@gmail.com; nm.ilodigwe@coou.edu.ng
Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam, Anambra State

## ABSTRACT

*Staff recruitment in universities is a critical administrative function that must be conducted within a clear legal framework to ensure fairness, transparency, efficiency, and compliance with national and institutional regulations. This paper examines the legal foundations guiding staff recruitment in universities, highlighting relevant laws, policies, and procedures that regulate the employment of academic and non-academic staff. The study discusses key legal principles such as equality of opportunity, merit-based selection, due process, and accountability. It also examines the roles of governing councils, regulatory bodies, and management in recruitment processes. The paper concludes that adherence to legal standards in recruitment enhances institutional integrity, prevents discrimination, and promotes effective human resource management in universities.*

**Keywords:** Legal Basis; Staff Recruitment; University

## Introduction

Universities occupy a unique and vital position in society, functioning simultaneously as custodians of knowledge, engines of innovation, critics of power, and incubators of future leadership. The efficacy with which they fulfill these complex roles is inextricably linked to the quality, diversity, and integrity of their human capital—the academic and administrative staff who constitute the institution's intellectual and operational core (Woelert & Millar, 2023). Consequently, the process by which this human capital is sourced, evaluated, and integrated—the staff recruitment function—transcends routine administrative duty. It is a strategic imperative of the highest order, a public trust exercise, and a legally prescribed activity that directly shapes an institution's reputation, its cultural ethos, and its long-term trajectory.

In contemporary higher education, characterized by mass participation, heightened public accountability, and intense global competition for scholarly excellence, the stakes of recruitment have never been higher. A flawed appointment, according to Akpunonu, (2019); Okechukwu (2025) and Ilodigwe (2026), can undermine academic standards, erode institutional morale, and trigger costly legal disputes. Conversely, a rigorous, fair, and successful recruitment secures decades of productive scholarship, inspirational teaching, and effective governance. The legal basis for staff recruitment provides the essential scaffold that elevates this function from a realm of potential subjectivity and

patronage to one of structured rationality, accountability, and fairness (Sánchez-Torné et al., 2023). It seeks to reconcile the fundamental, and often tension-filled, duality of university existence: the need for institutional autonomy to protect academic freedom and define scholarly priorities, and the demand for public accountability in the use of state resources and adherence to societal norms of justice, equality, and transparency.

This study undertakes a thorough examination of this legal foundation. It will first articulate the specialized concept of staff recruitment within the university context. It will then meticulously unpack the multi-layered legal framework that governs it, illustrating how constitutions, statutes, and internal policies interact. The core principles that animate and give moral force to this framework will be elucidated, demonstrating how they translate from abstract values into operational mandates (O'Connor & O'Hagan, 2023). A detailed walkthrough of the resulting procedural cascade will show the law in action. Crucially, the analysis will then confront the persistent challenges and tensions that arise in the practical application of this legal edifice, acknowledging that the existence of law does not guarantee its flawless execution (van den Brink & Benschop, 2022). Finally, the paper will propose forward-looking solutions aimed at strengthening both the framework and its implementation. The overarching thesis is that a robust, clearly understood, and dynamically applied legal basis is not a bureaucratic constraint but the very cornerstone of ethical, effective, and legitimate human resource management in higher education, upon which institutional excellence and public trust are built.

**Concept of Staff Recruitment in Universities**

Staff recruitment in the university setting, as stated by Ucheagwu-Okoye (2025) and Akpunonu and Eze (2021), is a systematic, goal-oriented process encompassing the identification, attraction, selection, and appointment of individuals to fill established academic, research, professional, and administrative positions. It is a specialized domain within public sector human resource management, distinguished by its unique objectives and the distinct nature of the roles being filled (Franco, Saito, & Vaughter, 2022). The concept extends far beyond the mere act of hiring to encompass a strategic philosophy aligned with the core mission of the university which includes

1. **Securing and Advancing Academic Excellence:** The paramount goal is the identification and attraction of individuals with demonstrable and exceptional competence. For academic roles, this is evidenced through advanced qualifications, a robust and original research portfolio (publications, grants), proven teaching effectiveness, and the intellectual rigor to contribute to the discipline's advancement. According to Iloka, (2021) and Eze and Chukwuma (2023), recruitment is the primary mechanism for renewing and elevating the intellectual capital of the institution.
2. **Fulfilling the Institutional Mission and Strategic Plan:** Recruitment must be aligned

with the university's articulated vision. This may involve targeting scholars in specific emerging research fields (e.g., artificial ethics, climate resilience), hiring for pedagogical innovation (e.g., experts in blended learning), or appointing administrators skilled in community engagement or technology transfer, directly supporting the institution's strategic goals (Woelert & Millar, 2023).

**3. Ensuring Operational Efficacy and Sustainability:** For administrative and professional staff (e.g., registrars, financial officers, lab managers, IT specialists), recruitment focuses on securing managerial competence, technical expertise, and the ability to create and maintain systems that support the academic enterprise efficiently and sustainably.

**4. Building a Collegial and Diverse Intellectual Community:** Every recruitment decision cumulatively shapes the university's social and intellectual fabric. According to Ucheagwu-Okoye (2019) and Eze (2023), it determines the diversity of thought, background, and experience within the community, impacting the culture of collaboration, the range of perspectives in teaching and research, and the overall environment for staff and students (Seierstad, Evans, & Mutambanadzo, 2022).

**5. Upholding Legitimacy and Public Trust:** As publicly accountable bodies, universities must demonstrate that appointments are made fairly, without favoritism or corruption. The recruitment process itself is therefore a performance of the institution's values, directly impacting its internal legitimacy among staff and its external reputation with stakeholders, including government, donors, and the public (Spiegler & Bednarek, 2021).

Thus, conceptualized, staff recruitment is a strategic, mission-critical function that is deeply embedded within a legal and ethical framework designed to ensure it serves these high-stakes objectives with integrity and transparency.

## The Legal Framework of Staff Recruitment in Universities

The legal basis for recruitment is not a single document but a complex, hierarchical ecosystem of norms and rules (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2023). Each layer derives authority from the one above, creating a cohesive structure that guides every step of the process.

### 1. The Foundational Layer: Constitutional and International Law

National Constitutions: Serve as the supreme law, establishing fundamental rights that directly bound recruitment practices. Key provisions typically include guarantees of equality and non-discrimination (on grounds of sex, race, ethnic origin, religion, disability, etc.), the right to fair labour practices, and often explicit protection for academic freedom. According to Ucheagwu-Okoye (2021) and Chukwuma (2025), any recruitment action or lower-level law that violates these constitutional guarantees is inherently

invalid. They provide the ultimate ethical and legal benchmark.

International Instruments: Treaties and recommendations ratified by the state become part of the national legal landscape. The UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel (1997) is particularly seminal, outlining principles for the fair appointment, tenure, and professional freedoms of academics. International Labour Organization (ILO) conventions on discrimination, freedom of association, and collective bargaining also inform national employment law, setting minimum global standards.

## 2. The Statutory Layer: National Education and Employment Legislation

This layer contains the primary statutes enacted by parliament that give direct shape to the sector (Sánchez-Torné et al., 2023).

University Acts/Education Acts: These are the enabling laws for either specific universities or the higher education system as a whole. They grant legal personality, establish the principal governance organs (Council/Board as the supreme administrative body, Senate/Academic Board as the supreme academic body), and crucially, vest the formal power of appointment. This power, as observed by Iloka, & Eze (2022) and Chukwuma, (2020) and Iloka (2022), is usually delegated, by statute, to the University Council or to specific committees constituted by the Council. These acts also mandate the creation of institutional statutes.

Public Service/Employment Acts: As most universities are public institutions or receive significant public funding, general laws governing public employment apply. They regulate the creation of posts ("establishment"), general conditions of service, pension schemes, disciplinary procedures, and often prescribe baseline requirements for open competition and fair hiring practices across the public sector.

Specialized Equity and Anti-Discrimination Legislation: Laws such as Gender Equality Acts, Disability Rights Acts, or comprehensive Equality Acts impose specific positive duties on public bodies like universities. They may require the development and implementation of employment equity plans, reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, and regular reporting on workforce composition, thereby actively shaping recruitment goals and processes (Seierstad et al., 2022).

## 3. The Operational Layer: Institutional Autonomy in Practice

Here, the university exercises the autonomy granted by statute to tailor the general rules to its specific context.

University Statutes, Charters, and Regulations: Made under the authority of the parent University Act, these documents detail the internal governance architecture. They precisely specify the composition, authority, and jurisdiction of various appointment committees (e.g., a Central Appointments Board for Vice-Chancellors and Registrars,

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.17 (2), January-April, 2026; https://ajemates.org

Faculty Appointments Committees for professors and lecturers). They are legally binding internal laws.

Staff Recruitment and Promotion Policies and Procedures: These are the detailed, user-facing documents that translate higher-order legal requirements into actionable steps (Mampaey & Huisman, 2022). They define academic qualifications for different ranks (e.g., what constitutes a "substantial publication record" for a professorship), outline the mandatory composition of selection panels (including requirements for external and international members), prescribe advertisement channels and durations, establish scoring rubrics for applications and interviews, and formalize grievance and appeal mechanisms. This is the direct procedural bible for any recruitment exercise.

Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs): Negotiated between university management and recognized staff unions, CBAs are legally binding contracts that cover terms and conditions of employment. They can directly influence recruitment by stipulating processes for internal advertisement, redeployment of existing staff in cases of redundancy, or even setting criteria for the conversion of fixed-term contracts to permanent posts.

### 4. The Interpretive Layer: Jurisprudence

The application of the above framework is refined and defined through adjudication.
Case Law from Courts and Tribunals: Disputes arising from recruitment—allegations of bias, procedural irregularity, failure to shortlist, or discriminatory treatment—are resolved by courts, labour tribunals, or ombudsman institutions. Their rulings interpret the meaning of statutes and policies, establish crucial principles (such as the scope of "procedural fairness" in an academic interview), and set binding precedents that all universities must subsequently follow. This layer breathes dynamic life into the written rules.

### Principles Guiding Legal Recruitment in Universities

The legal framework is animated and given coherent purpose by a set of interdependent principles. These are not merely aspirational; they are legally embedded and serve as interpretive guides for any ambiguity in the rules (O'Connor & O'Hagan, 2023).

**1. Meritocracy and Competence:** This is the non-negotiable cornerstone. Appointment must be based on the objective, evidence-based assessment of a candidate's ability, qualifications, experience, scholarly output, and potential to excel in the specific role. The principle is a bulwark against nepotism, cronyism, and patronage, ensuring that intellectual and professional caliber is the primary determinant of success.

**2. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity:** The law mandates moving beyond passive non-discrimination towards active promotion of a representative workforce (Seierstad et al., 2022). This involves substantive equality—recognizing that historical disadvantages require proactive measures (e.g., targeted scholarships, gender-balanced shortlists where underrepresentation exists). It encompasses policies for the inclusion of

racial/ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, and other marginalized groups, fostering a university community that reflects societal plurality.

**3. Transparency and Accountability:** The process must be conducted in an open manner, subject to scrutiny (Sánchez-Torné et al., 2023). Key manifestations include the public advertisement of vacancies, clear publication of selection criteria, the recording of selection panel deliberations and scores, the declaration of conflicts of interest, and the provision of constructive feedback to candidates. Transparency demystifies the process, deters malfeasance, and enables accountability to both internal stakeholders and the public.

**4. Procedural Fairness (Natural Justice/Administrative Justice):** This principle ensures the fair treatment of every candidate. It entails two core rules: nemo iudex in causa sua (no one shall be a judge in their own cause), requiring an impartial selection panel; and audi alteram partem (hear the other side), meaning candidates must have a genuine opportunity to present their case (through their application and interview) and be assessed on its merits. It also implies a right to a reasoned decision and often, an avenue for appeal.

**5. Institutional Autonomy and Academic Freedom:** Universities are granted self-governance to protect the integrity of teaching and research from undue external interference (Woelert & Millar, 2023). This autonomy extends to the right to define their own academic standards and, within the legal framework, to select staff whose research directions, teaching philosophies, and professional values align with the institution's unique character and mission. This principle is perpetually balanced against the need for public accountability.

**6. Efficiency and Timeliness:** While thoroughness is paramount, the legal process must facilitate a recruitment cycle that is sufficiently agile to compete in the global academic marketplace. Protracted delays can result in the loss of top candidates to more efficient institutions, undermining the very goal of securing merit.

**Procedures for Staff Recruitment in Universities**

The legal and principled framework crystallizes into a formal, sequential procedural cascade (Mampaey & Huisman, 2022). The following outlines a comprehensive process for a senior academic appointment:

**1. Strategic Initiation and Authorization:**

An academic department or administrative unit identifies a vacancy based on strategic planning, retirement, or new program development. A formal request, with a robust business case, is submitted to university leadership and the governing Council (or its Finance & General Purposes Committee) for authorization. This confirms the post is budgeted for within the approved establishment and releases the financial authority to recruit.

**2. Job Design and Profiling:**

A detailed Job Description is crafted, outlining specific duties, responsibilities,

reporting lines, and key performance areas. A Person Specification is developed, listing essential and desirable criteria. These include formal qualifications (e.g., "PhD in a relevant field"), specific experience (e.g., "5 years of undergraduate teaching"), technical skills, and behavioral competencies. This document becomes the objective benchmark for the entire selection process.

3. **Public Advertisement and Dissemination:**

The vacancy is advertised publicly for a minimum period (often 3-4 weeks) as stipulated by policy. Advertisements must appear in widely circulated national newspapers, international academic journals relevant to the field, on the university's website, and on global academic job portals. The advertisement must accurately reflect the Person Specification and include a clear statement of the university's commitment to equity and diversity, encouraging applications from all qualified individuals (Seierstad et al., 2022).

4. **Constitution of the Selection Panel:**

The appropriate authority (e.g., Vice-Chancellor upon Senate recommendation) formally constitutes the panel as per university statutes. A typical panel for a professorial appointment might include: The Vice-Chancellor or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Chair), the Dean of Faculty, the Head of Department, two distinguished external professors in the discipline (at least one preferably from an international institution), and an equity/diversity representative. All members sign formal declarations of confidentiality and absence of conflict of interest.

5. **Application Management and Shortlisting:**

Applications are received by a specified deadline, often coordinated by the Human Resources department. The panel convenes to shortlist. According to Akpunonu, (2025) and Iloka, (2023) and Eze (2022), each application is systematically evaluated only against the published essential criteria. Panelists score applications independently, followed by a moderated discussion to produce an agreed shortlist of candidates for interview. Detailed minutes and score sheets from this meeting are maintained as a legal record.

6. **Comprehensive Assessment:**

Shortlisted candidates undergo a multi-modal assessment: In-depth Interview: A formal, structured interview with the full panel, often using competency-based questions. Academic Presentation (or "Job Talk"):

A lecture or research seminar delivered to faculty and students, demonstrating teaching ability, communication skills, and the significance of their research.

Rigorous Reference Checks: Confidential references are sought from world-renowned experts in the candidate's field, providing external validation of their standing and achievements.

Portfolio Review: Meticulous scrutiny of the candidate's CV, published works, teaching evaluations, grant awards, and evidence of leadership or service (Franco et al., 2022).

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.17 (2), January-April, 2026; https://ajemates.org

7. **Deliberation, Ranking, And Recommendation:**

The panel reconvenes to deliberate on the full assessment data. Using a pre-agreed scoring matrix, candidates are ranked. The panel prepares a comprehensive report detailing the process, the assessment of each candidate, the final ranking, and a clear recommendation for the appointment of the top-ranked candidate. This report is submitted to the ultimate appointing authority (the University Council).

8. **Formal Appointment and Onboarding:**

The Council reviews the panel's report. Assuming satisfaction with the process, the Council passes a resolution formally appointing the candidate. According to Eze, and Iloka (2022) and Chukwuma (2025), a formal offer letter, detailing the terms and conditions of employment, salary, and benefits, is issued by the Human Resources directorate. A structured Induction and Onboarding Program is initiated, integrating the new staff member into the academic, social, and administrative life of the university. This final phase is increasingly recognized as a critical component of successful recruitment, ensuring long-term retention and productivity.

**Challenges in the Legal Recruitment of University Staff**

Despite the elaborate legal and procedural framework, its implementation is fraught with significant, persistent challenges that can undermine its effectiveness (van den Brink & Benschop, 2022).

**1. Bureaucratic Inertia and Procedural Delay:** The very robustness of the process can lead to excessive rigidity and slowness. Multiple layers of authorization, mandatory advertisement periods, and the difficulty of coordinating busy senior academics for panel meetings can extend recruitment cycles to six months or more. In a global market where, top candidates receive multiple offers, such delays are fatal to competitiveness (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2023).

**2. Political and External Interference:** Universities, as significant public institutions, can be vulnerable to pressure from political actors, influential alumni, or governing body members seeking to influence appointments for parochial, ethnic, or political reasons (Liu & Liu, 2022). This subverts meritocracy, damages institutional integrity, and can lead to the appointment of underqualified individuals.

**3. Tensions Between Core Principles:** The simultaneous pursuit of meritocracy and equity can create perceived or real conflict (O'Connor & O'Hagan, 2023). Efforts to accelerate demographic representation (e.g., through preferential shortlisting) may be criticized as compromising on quality, leading to resentment and undermining the legitimacy of both principles if not managed with extreme sensitivity and clear communication.

**4. Ethical Erosion and Cognitive Bias:** The human element within the legal process is its Achilles' heel. Unconscious bias based on gender, accent, pedigree of alma mater, or research sub-field can skew evaluations (van den Brink & Benschop, 2022). "Academic

inbreeding" (a preference for candidates from one's own scholarly lineage or institution) and panel "groupthink" can disadvantage excellent but non-traditional candidates. Mere procedural compliance does not eradicate deep-seated bias.

**5. The Global-Local Dilemma:** The drive to internationalize and climb global rankings incentivizes recruiting "star" scholars from abroad. This can clash with national policies promoting the employment of citizens, mandates to address historical local inequities, or practical concerns about the integration and long-term commitment of international staff.

**6. Resource and Remuneration Constraints:** Public universities often operate within government-mandated salary scales that are uncompetitive compared to private industry, elite foreign universities, or even other public sectors. The inability to offer competitive financial packages severely limits the pool of talent that can be attracted, particularly in high-demand fields like data science, medicine, or engineering.

**7. Variable Competence of Selection Panels:** The effectiveness of the entire process hinges on the skill of the panel. However, panel members are typically selected for their academic seniority, not their expertise in recruitment law, interview techniques, or bias mitigation. This can lead to inconsistent, legally vulnerable, and subjective decision-making.

**Way Forward**

To fortify the legal framework against these challenges, a combination of systemic, technological, and cultural interventions is required.

1. **Leveraging Technology for Efficiency and Transparency:** Implement integrated e-recruitment platforms that manage the entire workflow—from application submission and automated acknowledgement to secure document sharing for panels, digital scoring, and audit trails (Spiegler & Bednarek, 2021). This reduces administrative delays, ensures consistency, and creates a transparent digital record of the process.
2. **Fortifying Independent Oversight Mechanisms:** Strengthen the mandate and resourcing of internal audit departments and establish dedicated Recruitment Ombudsman offices. These bodies should have the power to conduct random audits of recruitment files, provide confidential advice to candidates and panel members, and investigate complaints independently from line management, reporting directly to the University Council.
3. **Policy Harmonization and Holistic Assessment Rubrics:** Conduct regular reviews of recruitment policies to clarify areas of tension. Develop sophisticated assessment frameworks that holistically evaluate merit, where "excellence" is explicitly defined to include contributions to diversity, community engagement, interdisciplinary work, and teaching innovation alongside

traditional publication metrics (Franco et al., 2022). This helps reconcile the merit-equity divide (O'Connor & O'Hagan, 2023).

4. **Proactive Transparency and Communication:** Beyond reactive disclosure, universities should publish annual recruitment transparency reports. These would aggregate data on applicant pools (demographics), selection rates, time-to-hire, and outcomes, alongside case studies of good practice (Sánchez-Torné et al., 2023). This builds public trust and allows for data-driven policy adjustment.
5. **Structured Internationalization of Panels:** For all senior academic appointments, institutionalize the requirement for at least one internationally-based subject expert on the selection panel. This not only enhances objectivity and global benchmarking but also signals the university's commitment to international standards, making it more attractive to top global candidates.
6. **Strategic Remuneration Flexibility:** Advocate for legal amendments that allow universities, within strict governance frameworks, limited discretionary flexibility to offer enhanced or performance-linked packages for posts in critically scarce skill areas. This must be based on a transparent market analysis and approved by the Council to prevent abuse, but it is essential for competing in key fields.
7. **Mandatory Professionalization of Selection Panels:** Institute a requirement that no individual can serve on a selection panel without first completing a certified training program (van den Brink & Benschop, 2022). This training must cover: university recruitment law and policy; principles of unconscious bias and strategies to mitigate it; structured interview techniques; scoring and calibration methods; and ethics of conflict of interest. Certification should be valid for a defined period (e.g., three years).

## Conclusion

The legal basis for staff recruitment in universities is far more than a collection of restrictive rules; it is the essential architecture for building and sustaining an institution's most valuable asset: its people (Mampaey & Huisman, 2022). This paper has demonstrated that this basis is a sophisticated, multi-layered ecosystem, descending from constitutional imperatives through statutory mandates to the fine-grained detail of institutional policy, all interpreted through the lens of jurisprudence. It is animated by a powerful set of principles—merit, equity, transparency, fairness, and autonomy—that translate noble aspirations into enforceable standards (O'Connor & O'Hagan, 2023).

However, as the examination of challenges reveals, this legal edifice is not self-executing. Its strength is tested daily by

bureaucratic inertia, political pressure, human bias, and the relentless forces of the global academic market (van den Brink & Benschop, 2022; European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2023). As noted by Akpunonu, and Eze, (2022) and Eze, and Iloka (2022), the enduring gap between legal theory and practice underscores that compliance is a necessary but insufficient condition for success. The ultimate goal must be ethical internalization—where the spirit of the law guides action beyond its mere letter. Therefore, the future of effective university recruitment lies in the intelligent evolution of this legal foundation. It requires embracing technology as an enabler of both efficiency and integrity (Spiegler & Bednarek, 2021), investing in the professional competence of those who administer the process, and courageously advocating for the policy flexibility needed to compete while safeguarding core principles of fairness. By doing so, universities can ensure their recruitment processes are not just legally defensible, but are powerful, strategic tools for shaping a vibrant, excellent, and inclusive academic community (Anushiem, Anushiem, Nwakoby and Ilodigwe (2025). In this endeavour, a robust, dynamic, and conscientiously applied legal basis remains the indispensable foundation for earning public trust, fulfilling the university's social contract, and securing its legacy of excellence for generations to come.

## REFERENCES

Akpunonu, A. C. (2019). The Nigerian Constitution and Federal Character Principles: A Critical Appraisal. *AJLHR*, *3*, 38.

Akpunonu, A. C. (2019). Youth Development and Empowerment in Nigeria: The Panacea for National Integration. *AJLHR*, *3*, 169.

Akpunonu, A. C. (2025). True Federalism in The Democratic Governance of Nigeria the Panacea for National Integration and Development. *Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Law Journal*, *9*(1).

Akpunonu, A. C. and Eze, J.A. (2022). Towards Effective Policing in Nigeria. *African Journal of Law and Human Rights (AJLHR)* 6(1); 82.

Akpunonu, A. C., & Eze, J. A. (2021). Practice of Democracy in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects. *IJOCLLEP*, *3*, 164.

Anushiem, M. I., Anushiem, U. M., Nwakoby, I. P., & Ilodigwe, N. M. (2025). Corporate Social Responsibility in Curbing Increased Environmental Pollution in Nigeria: Imperative for Adequate Tax Incentives. *Awka Capital Bar Journal*, *4*(1).

Chukwuma, W. A. (2020). The Court of Appeal's Pronouncement in CNOOC & Anor V NNPC & Anor:

A Jurisdictional Landmine? Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Journal of Private and Public Law (2) 1.

Chukwuma, W. A. (2025). Enthroning a New Legal Framework for Stamp Duties Act in Nigeria. *Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Law Journal (*8) 1.

Chukwuma, W. A. (2025). Legal Appraisal of Pay as You Earn Tax System as A Stimulus for Economic Growth in Nigeria. *Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Law Journal*, *10*(1).

Chukwuma, W. A. (2025). Mobilising self-assessment tax regime to facilitate taxpayers' voluntariness in Nigeria. *Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Journal of Private and Public Law (COOUJPPL)*, *7*(1).

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice. (2023). Academic career progression in Europe: Variability, transparency, and competitiveness. Eurydice Report. Publications Office of the European Union.

Eze, J. A. (2022). Are Shareholders Really the 'Owners' of a Company to Justify the Primacy of Their Interests over Every Other Interest in the Management of Public Companies? *IJOCLLEP*, *4*, 60.

Eze, J. A. (2022). The Possibility of Imposing Enforceable Legal Duty on the Board with Respect to the Interests of Non-Shareholding Stakeholder Groups. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence*, *13*(2), 40-48.

Eze, J. A. (2023). Shareholder/stakeholder dichotomy and the directors' duties. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence*, *14*(1), 148-159.

Eze, J. A. and Akpunonu, A. C. (2021). "Modern" Corporations and their Directors Becoming too Powerful, Contributing Little to their Non-Shareholding Stakeholders? *LASJURE (*2); 138

Eze, J. A. and Chukwuma, W. A. (2023). Short-Termism As a Militating Factor Against Corporate Pluralist Approach. *Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Journal of Commercial and Property Law*, *(*4) 1

Eze, J. A. and Iloka, A.C. (2022). Merits of Corporate Pluralist or Stakeholder Approach in Nigeria. *LASJURE (*3); 81

Eze, J.A. and Iloka, P. C. (2022). Possible measures Nigeria may take towards improving good Corporate Stakeholding and Social Responsibility Practices in the Country. *LASJURE; (*3), 19

Franco, I., Saito, O., & Vaughter, P. (2022). A global review of university tenure and promotion policies: Implications for sustainability science. Sustainability Science, 17(3), 1029-1044.

Ilodigwe, N. M. (2026). Legal and Policy Framework for Child Rights Protection in Schools. *Unizik*

*Journal of Educational Laws and Leadership Studies (UNILAWS), 4 (1);* 310-316.

Ilodigwe, N. M. (2026). Modalities For the Establishment of Schools: Review of The Legal Basis. *Unizik Journal of Educational Research, Science and Vocational Studies (UJERSVOCS),* 4 (1); 262-267.

Ilodigwe, N. M. (2026). Industrial Strike Actions in Nigerian University Education System: The Legal Framework, Causes and Possible Solutions. *Unizik Journal of Educational Laws and Leadership Studies (UNILAWS), 4 (1);* 300-309.

Iloka C.P. (2022). Contemporary issues on reproductive and sexual health vis-à-vis the rights of women in Nigeria. *Nnamdi Azikiwe Univ J Int Law Jurisprudence; 13*(2):77-86.

Iloka, C, P. (2023). Appraisal of the Legal Framework of the Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights of Women in Nigeria. *Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University Journal of Private and Public Law*;4(1).

Iloka, C. P. (2021). Hurdles to Women Political Participation and Advancement in Nigeria: *The Legal Leeway. LASJURE, 2*, 17.

Iloka, C. P. (2022). Understanding the Concept, History and Dimensions of Domestic Violence against Women. *African Customary and Religious Law Review, 3.*

Iloka, C. P. (2023). Student-centredness in teaching and learning process for effective performance. *Nigerian Journals Online, 1(1)*, 67–78.

Iloka, C. P., & Eze, J. A. (2022). Breaking the culture of silence on rape: A cry for justice. *Journal of Commercial and Property Law*, *9*(4), 41-57.

Iloka, C.P. (2023). Migration, Internal Displacement, Public Disorder and the Role of Crisis Management Framework: A Focus on Women and the Minority Rights in Nigeria. *International Review of Law and Jurisprudence (IRLJ)* 5 (1), pp. 45-55.

Iloka, P. C. (2025). Teaching Integrity: Strategies for Fostering Ethical Behavior in Students. *UNIZIK Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, *19*(1).

Liu, S., & Liu, H. (2022). The influence of Guanxi on faculty recruitment in Chinese universities: Navigating between institutional policy and cultural practice. International Journal of Educational Development, 94, 102656.

Mampaey, J., & Huisman, J. (2022). The homogenization of academic hiring criteria: A comparative study of university job advertisements. Higher Education Quarterly, 76(3), 610-626.

O'Connor, P., & O'Hagan, C. (2023). The myth of meritocracy? Reconciling equity and excellence in university hiring. Studies in Higher Education, 48(1), 112-129.

Okechukwu, E. (2025). Teachers Rights and Responsibilities and Societal Expectations. *Unizik Journal of Educational Laws and Leadership Studies (UNILAWS)*, 1 (1).

Okechukwu, E. (2025). Legal Protections of Teachers for Sustainable Workforce. *Unizik Journal of Educational Laws and Leadership Studies (UNILAWS)*, 1 (1).

Onyinye Ucheagwu-Okoye (2019). The Concept of Cross Carpeting and Legislative Behaviour. *Madonna University Nigeria, Faculty of Law Journal Vol. 5(1)*; 74-90.

Onyinye Ucheagwu-Okoye (2021). The Need for Arbitration as an Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanism in Tax Disputes Resolution in Nigeria. *Journal of Legal Issues*; Vol 2, pages 76-81.

Sánchez-Torné, I., Moriano, J. A., & Molero, F. (2023). Transparency and merit in academic recruitment: A comparative analysis of legal frameworks in the European Higher Education Area. Higher Education Policy, 36(2), 345-367.

Seierstad, C., Evans, C., & Mutambanadzo, T. (2022). Beyond tick-boxes: Implementing holistic diversity mandates in South African higher education appointments. Journal of Higher Education in Africa, 20(1), 89-110.

Spiegler, S., & Bednarek, P. (2021). The legal limits of algorithm-driven hiring in the public university: A case study of the UK. Education and Law Review, 30(4), 455-478.

Ucheagwu-Okoye, O. M. (2025). Community and stakeholder engagement in educational leadership in secondary schools in Nigeria: Legal implications. *UNIZIK Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, *19*(3).

Ucheagwu-Okoye, O. M. (2025). Role Of School Leaders in Promoting Mental Health Awareness Among Secondary School Students in Anambra State for Sustainable Development. *African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies*, *14*(1).

Van den Brink, M., & Benschop, Y. (2022). Gender practices in the construction of academic excellence: Sheep with five legs. Organization, 29(2), 323-341.

Woelert, P., & Millar, V. (2023). The 'paradox of interdisciplinarity' in Australian research governance: The erosion of disciplinary autonomy and the proliferation of evaluation. Higher Education, 85(2), 347-363.