

## Academic Staffs' Performance in Ugandan Public and Private Universities.

Grace Kansime<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>(Ndejje University, Uganda)

*\*Corresponding Author: Grace Kansime*

**ABSTRACT:-** The academic staff in universities world over takes on a variety of tasks in universities notably teaching, research, and administration. Despite the importance of such core activities in the universities' performance the academic staffs' in Ugandan universities display low commitment and involvement in the activities of teaching and research. This study aimed at examining academic staffs' performance in Ugandan Public and private universities. The research was informed by the performance theories, primarily quantitative and made use of a structured questionnaire as the only form of data collection. The participants were academics selected from four public and three private universities out of forty-six universities in Uganda. Participants were selected using non-probability convenience sampling methods based on their accessibility and availability. The results showed that the mean value of teaching skills was 84.81%, while the perceived teaching ability was 86.34%. Again the academic staff rated their research skills much lower on average 48.30%. The results suggest that the academic staff were more engaged in teaching than research activities.

**Keywords -** Academic Staff Performance, Private and Public Universities, Uganda.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Various scholars define performance differently. Park et al. (2016) stated that if you cannot define performance, you can neither measure nor manage it. Hafeez (2015, p. 53) refers to performance as "the achievement of specific tasks measured against predetermined or identified standards of accuracy, completeness, cost and speed." The study further argues that "employee performance can be manifested in improvement in production, easiness in using the new technology and highly motivated workers" (Hafeez, 2015). In addition, performance refers to the people who do their work, achieving results, and embracing three variables: behavior, output, and outcome (Park et al., 2016; Forrester, 2011). Performance is behavior that constitutes the observable actions of an employee which results in the attainment of the organizational set goals (Ojukuku, 2013). Hence, performance is the extent an individual employee on the job complements the identified tasks resulting in the attainment of the organizational objectives. Qureshi et al. (2010, p.1857) observed that "performance is the behavior of how the organizations' teams, and individuals get work done." Thus, performance refers to both behavior, and outcomes. Performance may be defined in terms of tasks performed, and the goals to be achieved by individuals or teams when they efficiently perform the identified tasks (Qureshi et al., 2010). Franco-Santos, Rivera and Bourne (2014) argued that performance is defined in terms of the tasks, and goals to be accomplished, and that individuals are believed to perform when they attain the set objectives by their managers. Mawoli and Babandako (2011, p. 2) argues that "performance is measured and quantified using performance measures based on job performance dimensions which include: task behaviors that an individual undertakes as part of a job, effort, commitment to job tasks, coaching colleagues, giving advice or helping maintain group goals and participation in supervisory or leadership roles." Additionally, Mawoli and Babandako (2011, p. 2) maintained that job performance is related to the extent to which an employee can accomplish the task assigned to him or her, and how the accomplished task contributes to the realization of the organizational goals. In this study, the performance of the academic staff in higher education institutions (HEIs) means the execution of tasks to accomplish the specified performance goals, targets, standards, and behavior planned by the academic staff, and their managers in teaching and research.

### Performance of the academic staff

Regarding academic staffs' performance, the academic staffs are researchers and teaching staff directly involved in the education process such as professors, lecturers and their assistants (Kasozi, 2009). Namutebi (2019, p. 93/94) maintained that the academic staffs' job performance refers to the extent to which lecturers complete their major activities of teaching, research and community service responsibilities and activities that facilitate teaching and learning of students to enhance the desired set goals. Schuz (2013) viewed part of the roles of the academic staff as providing day-to-day face-to-face contact to students; participate in the community through roles such as directors of schools and charities. Schuz (2013, p.464) argued that "the academic staff contributes to their discipline by reviewing publications, and attending conferences; besides generate income for the university through research, and consultancies." Kairuz et al. (2016, p. 881) argued that "the work of an academic staff comprises of research, teaching, community service and governance." Kairuz et al. (2016) further argued that the roles embedded in the work of the academic staff involve teacher, researcher, adviser, mentor, departmental colleagues and university citizen. Menon (2017) identified the roles of the academic staff as a facilitator of learning, evaluator, researcher, mentor, guide, friend, counselor, academic administrator and a charismatic role model.

There is an argument from various scholars about what should be termed as the core tasks in the performance of the academic staff. Several scholars world over emphasize research as the main task of the academic staff. In Nigerian public universities, scholarly publications were viewed as the most essential component of the academic staff job performance and were utilized to promote, and increase their salaries (Polycarp & Chigozie, 2015; Ojokuku, 2013). Rashheed et al. (2011) recently found that in Pakistan the academic staff at Islamia university of Bahawalpur favored teaching to be the main measures of academic staff performance. In addition, Ojokuku (2013) observed that the main responsibility of the academic staff is to teach, impart knowledge and skills among its customers, the students. Polycarp and Chigozie (2015) in his study on the performance evaluation of the academic staff in Universities and Colleges in Nigeria asserted that teaching is the primary assignment of the academic staff. On the contrary, Salesho and Naile (2014) in their study of the academic staff retention at selected universities in South Africa found that most of the academic staff preferred to concentrate on research and teaching was not the major reason for the academic staff to do work in the university much as the academic staff were involved in teaching.

Different researchers such as Gaus and Hall (2016), and Turk (2016), and Polycarp and Chigozie (2015), and Kallio and Kallio (2014) give several performance indicators for the academic staff in HEIs in teaching and research. Teaching quantitative performance indicators comprised of the number of courses, students, credit units and contact hours taught in each semester (Kallio & Kallio, 2014; Polycarp & Chigozie, 2015; Rasheed et al., 2011), and the number of students who complete their courses within a stipulated length of time (Gaus & Hall, 2016). Teaching qualitative indicators are based on competencies which included good communication skills, willingness to communicate with peers and students, course design skills and class observation, the language of instruction, knowledge of the subject matter, learner-lecturer relations, and assessment skills were paramount (Turk, 2016; Molefe, 2010). Simmons (2002) interviewed academic staff in UK universities, and revealed that teaching performance measures considered by the universities were curriculum development skills, examination results, doing administrative tasks, the number of courses taught and the students assessed. Mehmood et al. (2013, p. 301) noted that the "performance of the teachers in Pakistan universities dealt with giving solutions to students' academic challenges, the use of proper teaching methods, classroom control, teaching with confidence, and to command the respect of students and colleagues." Polycarp and Chigozie (2015) observed that in Nigerian colleges and universities, teaching performance indicators cover both what was taught, and how it was taught; it involved mastery of subject content and methodology of teaching.

The research performance indicators were characterized by several articles published in highly accredited international journals, defended doctoral dissertations, and the number of research grants secured (Gaus & Hall, 2016; Ter Bogt & Scapens, 2012; Turk, 2016). Kyvik (2013) also observed that research roles for the academic staff included networking and collaboration with colleagues in other universities, managing research funds and projects, supervising students' research, evaluating peers' and students' research to establish their quality. Lindsay et al. (2012) noted that in American universities, research was gauged with the quality of research and publications. Franco-Santos et al. (2014) asserted that in UK universities research was evaluated based on the number of publications in high rated journals as a yardstick to gauge the quality of teaching. Quimbo and Sulabo (2014) in the survey study of research productivity, and its policy implications in higher education found that the academic staff from the Calabazon universities believed in the quality and not the number of publications as a basis of evaluating the effectiveness of academic staff in research. Nonetheless, Kyvik, (2013) argued that the quality, and not the quantity of research was needed as a performance indicator for outstanding performance for the academic staff. The evaluation of the quality of research and publications

depended on the publication source used (Gaus & Hall, 2016; Turk & Killumets, 2014). However, the majority of the universities that emphasised research as central in gauging the academic staff outstanding performance never considered other tasks like administrative work in the department to determine excellent performance (Gaus & Hall, 2016; Kallio et al., 2016; Kallio & Kallio et al., 2014).

Nonetheless, there are various factors that determine research productivity among academic staff in HEIs. Manyikanyan and Abdulgani (2015, p.13) surveyed the factors that determined academic staffs' research productivity included individual factors such as: motivation, commitment, basic and advanced research skills, sense of achievements, scholarly pursuit, then institutional factors such as: staff support, mentoring, resources, rewards, time, culture, research emphasis, tenure, promotion, financial rewards, peer and social recognition. Hancock, Breuning and Baum (2015) highlighted high teaching load among the academic staff as a major factor that affects research productivity and suggested increasing leave time to enhance time spent on research. Thus, basing on the factors that affect research productivity of the academic staff, HEIs that intend to promote high performance of the academic staff in research activities have to be intentional to increase research productivity by minimizing the major factors that hinder the staff from engagement in research.

In Ugandan HEIs, the academic staffs are meant to participate in teaching, research and community service (Mushemeza, 2016). Kasozi (2009, p. 73) established that "the academic staff in Ugandan universities are meant to advise students, manage projects, be involved in personnel and budget formulation, head departments, serve on different committees and task forces, recruit students, participate in local, national and international debates, present papers in conferences, write books, participate in science shows, medical innovations, literature and act as role models in society." Mushemeza (2016) further noted that part of the academic staff work involves carrying out an internship, attending to students outside the lecture, taking part in faculty and departmental meetings. Kasule et al. (2016) observed that the academic staff responsibilities include course design, administrators and marketers of the university services. In this study, the academic staff should teach the allocated load per semester in terms of hours, conduct and supervise research, assess students' assignments, tests and examinations.

As already noted, Bunoti (2011) observed that lecturers in Ugandan universities displayed low levels of commitment, and involvement not only in their work but also in the core activities of the university. The academic staffs exhibited tendencies of absenteeism, sluggishness, inability to give value to time, lack of concern for students' challenges and lack of time for their guidance and counseling. This shows that they did not care about whether they performed their job well or poorly, hence treating their job as less important. Batte et al. (2010) observed that there seems to be little

effort by management to press the academic staffs to perform their duties diligently, resulting in laxity on the job. Rwothumio et al. (2021) noted that in Ugandan public universities there is ineffective teaching, research and publications. Further, Alemiga and KibukaMusoke (2019, p.5) observed that academic staffs in some Ugandan universities lacked the required skills in research and publications, the staff lacked course design skills and appropriate teaching methodologies, poor communication skills, came late for classes, and some academic staff lacked mastery of the subject content which they teach. If this situation of ineffectiveness in teaching and research is not addressed, universities will continue to produce graduates who lack the required skills by the employers both nationally and internationally and for the development of the country. Nevertheless, there has been no research carried out in Ugandan HEIs to establish the academic staffs' performance in teaching and research. Hence, based on the studies of the academic staffs' performance elsewhere in HEIs, the performance of the academic staff in Ugandan universities was analyzed and established in this study.

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was primarily quantitative and made use of an online structured questionnaire as the only form of data collection. The participants were academic staff selected from seven universities out of forty-six universities in Uganda. The universities which were sampled are the oldest public and private universities in the four regions of Uganda, namely, the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Western region. From each region, the researcher sampled one public, and one private university except for the northern region, which lacked a chartered private university, giving four public and three private universities. Public universities included Kyambogo University, Mbarara University, Gulu University and Busitema University, while private universities included Ndejje University, Bishops' Stuart University and Islamic University in Uganda. The selection of participants from the seven universities satisfied the requirements of this study.

Selection of the participants was accomplished by the researcher (GK) using non-probability convenience sampling methods based on the participants' accessibility and availability. The final sample of 405 participants was neither random nor probability-based, because it was a mixture of convenience and purposive

sampling. This procedure ensured that the population in the study represented a cross-section of academics from the selected universities. Therefore, the participants comprised full-time and part-time academic staff members who engaged in both teaching and research in Ugandan public and private universities. Majority (60.5%) of the academic staff were from public universities (245) while 39.5% (160) were from private universities since the academic staff in public universities had greater access to internet services and thus could easily access the online questionnaire in their institutions than their counterparts in the private universities.

Convenient sampling was used to select participants with the deans and heads of departments of their respective faculties, providing the telephone numbers and e-mail addresses to the researcher. Because of the Covid-19 restrictions put in place by the Ugandan government, universities were using online teaching methods only to ensure social distance to stop the spread of the virus. Therefore, communication between the researcher, the relevant university authorities, and the participants before, during, and after the data collection process was conducted via telephone and e-mail. Because of the social-distancing measures during the Covid-19 crisis, online methods of data collection were only implemented. The statistician from Nelson Mandela University assisted the researcher in creating the online link to the survey.

Participants were advised, for ethical purposes, not to disclose their names, or the names of their institutions, on the questionnaire. Confidentiality and anonymity of the participants was always secured and guaranteed. Participation in this study was completely voluntary, and there was no foreseeable risk associated with this study. However, if participants felt uncomfortable answering questions, they could withdraw from the survey at any point. It was very important to get their opinions, but if they decided not to take part, there was no negative consequence for them. If they wanted to opt-out of completing the questionnaire, they were free to do so. The online link to the survey which was confidential and anonymous was provided by the researcher to all the participants with the approval of the universities' secretaries of the public and private universities and the Director of Human Resources at Mbarara University of Science and Technology.

This study used a positivist approach in data collection and analysis. The positivist paradigm is suitable since the study established whether there is a causal relationship between a performance management system and the performance of the academic staff. The positivist paradigm further utilized surveys that support the collection of quantitative data that was used to test hypotheses (Kivunja, 2017; Bogere & Gesa, 2015). In this quantitative study, a structured online questionnaire was used in data collection on the academic staffs' performance in teaching and research in Ugandan public and private universities.

Ethics approval to carry out research was sought from the Faculty of Education and the Research Ethics Committee-Humans of Nelson Mandela University in South Africa. Ethics approval to carry out research with Ugandan participants was sought from the Institutional Review Board of the Gulu University Research Ethics Committee, and Uganda National Council for Science, and Technology. Similarly, permission to collect data from the academic staff from HEIs in Uganda was sought from the Ministry of Education, Department of Higher Education in Uganda. After securing approval and permission from relevant Government authorities, permission to carry out research was sought from either the university secretary or the human resource manager of the selected universities. The researcher sought permission from the university secretaries of the Islamic University in Uganda, Ndejje, Bishop Stuart, Kyambogo, Gulu, and Busitema universities, and the Director of Human Resources of the Mbarara University of Science, and Technology. The university secretaries and the Director of human resource introduced the researcher to the faculty deans. Then the deans introduced the researcher to the heads of departments, who introduced the researcher to their academic staff.

### III. RESULTS

#### Descriptive Analyses

The study established the performance of the academic staff in teaching and research. Thus, questions were asked to analyze the academic staffs' performance in teaching and research. Results from the descriptive analysis of the academic staff skills in teaching and research are presented in the following sections.

#### Academic staff teaching skills

The questionnaire aimed to establish the performance of the academic staff in teaching in Ugandan HEIs. There were six questions asked in order to establish the academic staffs' teaching skills. The questions were formulated around the following aspects:

- Lesson attendance
- Use of teaching methods and materials



- The quality of tests and examinations
- Setting tests, assignments and examinations

Results from descriptive analysis of the academic staffs' teaching skills are presented in Table 1.

**Table1: Academic staff teaching skills**

Item	Public								Private											
	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree	
	f	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
I start my lessons on time	2	0.8%	5	2.0%	5	2.0%	117	47.8%	116	47.4%	6	3.8%	4	2.5%	8	5.0%	75	46.9%	67	41.8%
I am well versed with various teaching methods	2	0.8%	3	1.2%	4	1.6%	119	48.6%	117	47.8%	7	4.4%	4	2.5%	5	3.1%	68	42.5%	76	47.5%
I use a variety of teaching materials in my lesson	1	0.4%	11	4.5%	13	5.3%	130	53.1%	90	36.7%	5	3.1%	8	5.0%	8	5.0%	77	48.1%	62	38.8%
The test and examination items that I set are of high quality	4	1.6%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	101	41.2%	138	56.4%	5	3.1%	2	1.3%	6	3.8%	65	40.6%	82	51.2%
I set assignments	5	2.0%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	87	35.5%	151	61.5%	8	5.0%	1	0.6%	2	1.3%	52	32.5%	97	60.6%
I set tests and examinations	4	1.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	78	31.8%	162	66.2%	8	5.0%	1	0.6%	2	1.3%	44	27.5%	105	65.6%

On the question of the academic staff lesson attendance, a small margin (0.8%) of the academic staff in public universities strongly disagreed that they began their lessons on time, 2.0% disagreed. A large number of the academic staff (47.8%) agreed that they began their lessons on time, 47.4% strongly agreed, whereas 2.0% were noncommittal. And in private universities, still a small number (3.8%) of the academic staff strongly disagreed starting their lessons on time, 2.5% disagreed. A reasonable number (46.9%) agreed, 41.8% strongly agreed and 5.0% remained neutral. Although more academic staff in public universities began their lessons on time than their colleagues in private universities, results suggest that the academic staff in both institution types started their lessons on time. The results of the study are contrary to the observation of Bunoti (2011) who maintained that the academic staff in Ugandan universities was always late for their classes. Instead, the results indicated that the academic staff in the surveyed institutions started their lessons on time.

On the question of whether the academic staffs' use of various teaching methods, a very small percentage (0.8%) of the academic staff in public universities strongly disagreed that they use various teaching methods, 1.2% disagreed, the same number 1.2% were undecided, whereas most academic staff (48.6%) agreed, 47.8% strongly agreed that they used variety of teaching methods. On the contrary, a small number (4.4%) of the academic staff in private universities strongly disagreed, 2.5% disagreed. Many of the academic staff 42.5% agreed, 47.5% strongly agreed and 3.1% remained neutral. In addition, a small percentage (0.4%) of the academic staff in public universities strongly disagreed that they use a variety of teaching materials in their lessons, 4.5% disagreed. In contrast, a significant percentage (53.1%) of the academic staff agreed, 36.7% strongly agreed, while 4.5% were undecided. In private universities a small margin (3.1%) strongly disagreed, 5.0% disagreed. Most of the academic staff 48.1% agreed, whereas 38.8% strongly agreed and 5.0% were undecided. The results suggest that the academic staff in public universities used a variety of teaching methods and materials more than their counterparts in private universities. However, majority of the academic staff from both institution types greatly used a variety of teaching methods and materials. The results from the study imply that the academic staff was competent in the use of teaching methods and materials. The results are contrary to Baryamureba (2014), and Basaza et al. (2010) who observed that the academic staff in Ugandan universities has

degrees in the subjects they teach; they dictate notes to students as a method of teaching since they are not conversant with suitable methodologies of teaching. The observations made by the just mentioned scholars show that the academic staff in Ugandan universities was not well versed with suitable teaching methodologies. On the contrary, the findings in this study revealed that the academic staff uses a variety of teaching methods and materials in their teaching.

On the question of the academic staffs' teaching skills, only 1.6% in public universities strongly disagreed that the test and examination items that they set are of high quality, a very small margin (0.4%) disagreed. In contrast, a large number (41.2%) agreed, while 56.4% strongly agreed that they set the said items of high quality, and a small margin (0.4%) preferred to remain neutral. In private universities, 3.1% strongly disagreed that the test and examination items set are of high quality, and 1.3% disagreed. A reasonable percentage (40.6%) agreed that they set test and examination items of high quality, whereas 51.2% strongly agreed and 3.8% were undecided. In addition, a small margin (2.0%) of the academic staff in public universities strongly disagreed that they set assignments, 0.4% disagreed. In contrast, 35.5% agreed, while a significant number (61.5%) strongly agreed that they set assignments, and a small margin (0.4%) preferred to remain neutral. In private universities 5.0% strongly disagreed, 0.6% disagreed. A reasonable percentage (32.5%) agreed, 60.6% strongly agreed and 1.3% were neutral. Similarly, a small margin (1.6%) of the academic staff in public universities strongly disagreed that they set tests and examinations, 0.0% disagreed, 31.8% agreed, while a significant number (66.2%) strongly agreed that they set tests and examinations, whereas 0.0% being uncertain. And in private universities, 5.0% of the academic staff strongly disagreed that they set tests and examinations, 0.6% disagreed, only 27.5% agreed, 65.6% strongly agreed and 1.3% were uncertain. The results from the study suggest that more academic staff in public universities set assignments, tests and examinations of high quality than their colleagues in private universities. Nonetheless, majority of the academic staff in both institution types set assignments, tests and examinations and the set items are of high quality. The results imply that the academic staff had appropriate teaching skills since they were able to assess students through setting assignments, tests and examinations of high quality. Thus, the results of the study suggest that the academic staff in the surveyed public and private universities had high teaching skills.

#### Academic staff teaching abilities

The questionnaire aimed to establish the academic staffs' teaching abilities. There were nine questions asked in order to establish the academic staffs' teaching abilities. The questions were formulated around:

- Training in teaching skills
- Setting
- Administering and marking tests, assignments and examinations
- Adherence to deadline

Results from descriptive analysis of the academic staffs' teaching skills are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Academic staffs' perceived teaching abilities**

Item	Public				Private			
	No		Yes		No		Yes	
	F	%	f	%	F	%	f	%
<b>I have course design skills</b>	17	6.9%	228	93.1%	13	8.1%	147	91.9%
<b>I am a teacher by profession</b>	116	47.3%	129	52.7%	67	41.9%	93	58.1%
<b>I have had training in teaching skills (Pedagogy training)</b>	43	17.6%	202	82.4%	25	15.6%	135	84.4%
<b>I administer all tests and examinations personally</b>	37	15.1%	208	84.9%	33	20.6%	127	79.4%
<b>I mark all tests and assignments</b>	9	3.7%	236	96.3%	7	4.4%	153	95.6%
<b>I mark all examinations</b>	8	3.3%	237	96.7%	6	3.8%	154	96.2%
<b>I return marked scripts of tests and assignments</b>	9	3.7%	236	96.3%	6	3.8%	154	96.2%
<b>I make corrections after marking tests and assignments</b>	49	20.0%	196	80.0%	19	11.9%	141	88.1%
<b>I adhere to the deadlines of administering tests and assignments</b>	23	9.4%	222	90.6%	11	6.9%	149	93.1%

Regarding the academic staffs' course design skills, only a small margin (6.9%) of the academic staff in public universities lacked course design skills while, majority (93.1%) had course design skills. Similarly, in private universities a small percentage (8.1%) had no course design skills while, a large number (91.9%) indicated having course design skills. On the question of whether the academics' trained in teaching skills, a large number of the academic staff in public universities (47.3 %) were not trained teachers, while many of the academic staff (52.7%) were teachers by profession. In addition, 41.9% of the academic staff in private universities were not trained teachers, while most of the academic staff (58.1%) were teachers by profession. A small number (17.6%) were never trained in teaching skills. A small number (17.6%) of the academic staff in public universities were never trained in teaching skills, while majority (82.4%) had training in teaching skills such as pedagogy training. This applies to the academic staff in private universities where a small percentage (15.6%) did not get any training in teaching skills, while a significant number (84.4%) indicated having had training in teaching skills. Results from the study suggest that majority of the academic staff in both universities had training in teaching skills. The results are contrary to Karuhanga and Werner (2013) who observed that the academic staff in Ugandan universities lacked both pedagogical skills and instructional competencies, and they have never been taught the art of teaching. On contrary, most of the academic staff in the surveyed institutions in Ugandan HEIs had training in teaching skills and many were teachers by profession.

On the question of involvement in students' assessment, only 15.1% of the academic staff in public universities did not get involved in administration of tests and examinations, while majority (84.9%) strongly agreed that they administered all tests and examinations personally. Whereas, in private universities a small percentage (20.6%) showed that they did not administer tests and assignments, while a significant number (79.4%) administered all tests and assignments. In addition, majority of the academic staff (96.3%) in public universities marked all tests and assignments, while a very small margin (3.7%) did not mark tests and assignments. This is equivalent to a small percentage (4.4%) of the academic staff in private universities who had not marked all tests, while 95.6% marked all tests and assignments. A small margin (3.3%) of the academic staff in public universities does not mark all examinations, while majority (96.7%) mark all examinations. This applies to the academic staff in private universities where a small percentage (3.8%) does not mark all examinations, while the majority (96.3%) indicated marking all examinations. A small number (3.7%) of the academic staff in public universities did not return the scripts, while a significant number (96.2%) returned marked scripts of tests and assignments. In contrast, a very small percentage (3.8%) of the academic staff in private universities did not return marked scripts of tests and assignments, while a significant number (96.2%) returned marked scripts of tests and assignments. Only 20.0% of the academic staff in public universities did not make corrections after marking, while a large number (80.0%) made corrections after marking tests and assignments. Then, 11.9% in private universities did not make corrections after marking, while 88.1% made corrections after marking tests and assignments.

In addition, a small margin (9.4%) of the academic staff in public universities did not observe the deadline, while majority (90.6%) adhered to the deadlines of administering tests and assignments. The same applies to private universities where, only a small margin (6.9%) did not adhere to the deadline, while the majority of the academic staff (93.1%) indicated adhering to the deadlines of administering tests and assignments. The results showed that more academic staff in public universities administered all tests and examinations personally than their colleagues in private universities. In contrast more academic staff in private universities made corrections after marking and observed the set deadlines of administering tests and assignments. However, the results of the study suggest that majority of the academic staff in both public and private universities were involved in the students' assessment. The academic staff set, marked and made corrections of the marked tests and assignments and observed the set deadlines. The results from the study do not fit in the observation of Karuhanga and Werner (2013), and Bunoti (2011) about the academic staffs' engagement and commitment in their core activities of teaching. Bunoti observed that lecturers in Ugandan HEIs displayed low levels of commitment and involvement not only in their work and exhibited tendencies of absenteeism. On contrary the findings showed that majority of the academic staff administered, marked all tests and examinations personally, returned marked scripts for tests and assignments, made corrections after marking and observed the set deadlines for administering tests and assignments. Thus, the academic staff in the surveyed institutions give value to time in their core activities of teaching, thus the academic staff possessed high teaching abilities.

#### **Academic staff research skills**

Questions relevant to research skills were asked in order to establish the academic staffs' performance in research in Ugandan HEIs. There were thirteen questions asked in order to establish the academic staffs' research skills. These questions were formulated around the following aspects in the research activities:

- Publishing articles in an international journal
- Winning a research grant and managing a research project

- Publishing a book and chapters in an edited journal
- Presenting a paper in a conference and attending workshops
- Supervising and assessing colleagues and students' research
- Networking and collaboration

Results from descriptive analysis of the academic staff research skills are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Academic staff's research skills**

Item	Public				Private			
	No		Yes		No		Yes	
	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%
<b>I have published an article in an internal journal</b>	122	49.8%	123	50.2%	92	57.5%	68	42.5%
<b>I have won a research grant</b>	163	66.5%	82	33.5%	123	76.9%	37	23.1%
<b>I have managed a research project to its completion</b>	104	42.4%	141	57.6%	83	51.9%	77	48.1%
<b>I have published a book</b>	205	83.7%	40	16.3%	119	74.4%	41	25.6%
<b>I have published chapters in an edited book</b>	184	75.1%	61	24.9%	120	75.0%	40	25.0%
<b>I have presented a paper at an international conference</b>	119	48.6%	126	51.4%	97	60.6%	63	39.4%
<b>I have presented a paper at a national conference</b>	121	49.4%	124	50.6%	90	56.2%	70	43.8%
<b>I have participated in research workshops</b>	18	7.3%	227	92.7%	20	12.5%	140	87.5%
<b>I have reviewed articles for publication in accredited journals</b>	136	55.5%	109	44.5%	113	70.6%	47	29.4%
<b>I have participated in evaluating research work of colleagues</b>	72	29.4%	173	70.6%	40	25.0%	120	75.0%
<b>I have assessed a student's master's dissertation or doctoral thesis</b>	126	51.4%	119	48.6%	86	53.8%	74	46.2%
<b>I have experience in supervising students in their Masters and PhD research</b>	136	55.5%	109	44.5%	96	60.0%	64	40.0%
<b>I have participated in networking and collaboration in research with colleagues at other universities</b>	83	33.9%	162	66.1%	54	33.8%	106	66.2%

Regarding the academic staff involvement in research activities, a reasonable number (49.8%) of the academic staff in public universities had not published an article in an international journal, whereas a many academic staff (50.2%) had published an article in an international journal. In contrast, a significant number (57.5%) of the academic staff in private universities had not published an article in an international journal, while a reasonable number (42.5%) had published an article in an international journal. In addition, majority of the academic staff (66.5%) in public universities had not won any research grant while, a small number (33.5%) had won a research grant. On contrary in private universities a large number (76.9%) of the academic staff had not won any grant, while a small number (23.1%) had won the research grant. A reasonable percentage (42.4%) of the academic staff in public universities had not managed any research project to its completion, while many of the academic staff (57.6%) had not managed the said research project. And in private universities most of the academic staff (51.9%) never managed any research project, while a reasonable number (48.1%) won the research grant. Majority of the academic staff in public universities (83.7%) had not published a book, whereas a few of the academic staff (16.3%) had published a book. Whereas in the private universities, a significant number (77.4%) had not published any book, while a small number (25.6%) had published a book. Most of the academic staff in public universities (75.1%) had not published chapters in an edited journal, whereas only 24.9% had published the chapters. Similarly, most of the academic staff from private universities (75.0%) had not published chapters, whereas a small number (25.0%) had published chapters.

Similarly, a reasonable number (48.6%) of the academic staff in public universities had not presented a paper at an international conference, while many of the academic staff (51.4%) had presented a paper at an international conference. In contrast, a significant number (60.6%) of the academic staff in private universities had not presented a paper at an international conference, whereas a reasonable percentage (39.4%) had



presented a paper at the conference. In addition, a large number (49.4%) of the academic staff in public universities had not presented a paper at a national conference, while many of the academic staff (50.6%) had presented a paper at the said conference. In contrast, most of the academic staff (56.2%) in private universities had not presented a paper at a national conference, whereas a reasonable percentage (43.8%) had presented a paper at a national conference. On the issue of attending research workshops, a few of the academic staff in public universities (7.3%) had not attended a research workshop, whereas majority (92.7%) of the academic staff attended a research workshop. And in private universities, a large percentage (87.5%) of the academic staff had attended a research workshop, while a small percentage (12.5%) had not attended a research workshop.

Regarding the academic staff research supervision and assessment skills in public universities, a large number (44.5 %) of the academic staff had reviewed articles for publication in accredited journals, while 55.5% had not reviewed articles for publications. And in private universities a small number (29.4%) of the academic staff had reviewed articles for publication, while majority (70.6%) had not reviewed articles for publication. A significant number (70.6%) of the academic staff in public universities participated in evaluating research work of colleagues, whereas only 29.4% had not done any evaluation of a colleague's research work. And in private universities a large number (75.0%) of the academic staff had evaluated colleagues' research work, while a small percentage (25.0%) had not done any evaluation on colleagues' research work. In addition, most of the academic staff in public universities (51.4%) had not assessed any student's master's dissertation and doctoral thesis, whereas 48.6 % had assessed master's dissertation and doctoral thesis. Similarly, in private universities a few of the academic staff (46.2%) had assessed student's master's dissertation or doctoral thesis, whereas 53.8 % had assessed master's dissertation and doctoral thesis. Also, 55.5% of the academic staff in public universities had no experience in supervising students, while a large number (44.5%) of the academic staff had experience in supervising students. In addition, a significant number (40.0%) of the academic staff in private universities had no experience in supervising students, while 40.0% indicated having supervised students.

On the other hand, a large number (66.1%) of the academic staff public universities had participated in networking and collaboration in research with colleagues at other universities, whereas only 33.9 % had not done any networking in research with colleagues at other universities. And in private universities a significant number (66.2%) of the academic staff had participated in networking and collaboration in research with colleagues at other universities, whereas 33.8% had not participated in networking and collaboration in research with colleagues at other universities

The results of the study imply that majority of the academic staff in both public and private Ugandan HEIs under study had not published an article in an international journal, a book or a chapter in an edited book, won a research grant, reviewed articles for publication in accredited journal, assessed a student's master's dissertation or doctoral thesis and supervised students in their master and PhD research. In contrast, a significant number of the academic staff both in public and private universities, had managed a research project to its completion, presented a paper at an international and national conference, had attended research workshops, evaluated research work of colleagues, participated in networking and collaboration in research with colleagues at other universities. The results of the study fit in the findings of Kasule, Wesselink and Mulder (2016) who observed that the academic staff in Ugandan universities have inadequate skills to handle the supervision of masters and doctorate students' research, and the academic staff that have masters' degrees have insufficient skills to engage in research. Additionally, the findings support the observation made by Neema-Abooki (2016) who observed that there is lack of staff development programs to boost the academic staff skills to teach in various programs, and handle the supervision of masters and PhD students in research. Thus, the study findings revealed that there was low engagement of the academic staff in the surveyed Ugandan HEIs in research activities.0752922678

## SUMMARY

In summary, this chapter presented the data analysis, description and discussion of the findings. The chapter gave the descriptive analysis on the academic staffs' performance in Ugandan public and private universities in teaching and research.

### Factor analysis of section D of the questionnaire

The factorability of the items within the sections related to the teaching and research were examined and deemed to be appropriate. Table 4 presents the results of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, all of which were above the recommended minimum value of 0.6 (Hair, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2013). Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant for all three sections as presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity for Section D**

Factor	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity		
		Approx. Chi-Square	Df	p-value
Teaching skills	0.722	607.287	36	<0.001
Perceived teaching abilities	0.853	1889.782	15	<0.001
Research skills	0.853	1480.067	78	<0.001

The results of the principal components analyses are presented in [Table 5](#), displaying the factor loadings, communalities, the reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) and the percentage of variance explained for each of the three sections. Each section resulted in a single factor solution.

**Table 5: Factor loadings and communalities based on a principal components analysis for Section D**

Teaching skills	Loading	Communality	Cronbach's alpha	Variance explained
I have course design skills	0.443	0.196	0.610	29.929
I am a teacher by profession	0.232	0.054		
I have had training in teaching skills (Pedagogy training)	0.389	0.152		
I administer all tests and examinations personally	0.522	0.273		
I mark all tests and assignments	0.741	0.549		
I mark all examinations	0.756	0.572		
I return marked scripts of tests and assignments	0.704	0.495		
I make corrections after marking tests and assignments	0.416	0.173		
I adhere to the deadlines of administering tests and assignments	0.480	0.231		
Perceived teaching abilities	Loading	Communality	Cronbach's alpha	Variance explained
I start my lessons on time	0.754	0.568	0.912	69.739
I am well versed with various teaching methods	0.847	0.718		
I use a variety of teaching materials in my lesson	0.770	0.593		
The test and examination items that I set are of high quality	0.868	0.753		
I set assignments	0.868	0.753		
I set tests and examinations	0.894	0.799		
Research skills	Loading	Communality	Cronbach's alpha	Variance explained
I have published an article in an internal journal	0.589	0.347	0.837	34.354
I have won a research grant	0.634	0.402		
I have managed a research project to its completion	0.532	0.283		
I have published a book	0.319	0.102		
I have published chapters in an edited book	0.547	0.299		
I have presented a paper at an international conference	0.726	0.528		
I have presented a paper at a national conference	0.690	0.475		
I have participated in research workshops	0.431	0.186		
I have reviewed articles for publication in	0.561	0.314		

accredited journals				
I have participated in evaluating research work of colleagues	0.484	0.235		
I have assessed a student's Masters dissertation or doctoral thesis	0.703	0.495		
I have experience in supervising students in their Masters and PhD research	0.699	0.488		
I have participated in networking and collaboration in research with colleagues at other universities	0.559	0.313		

Results in Table 5 show that internal consistency was examined using Cronbach's alpha which resulted in values of 0.610, 0.912 and 0.837, respectively. Although Hair et al. (2013) recommends a value of above 0.7 as acceptable, values between 0.5 and 0.7 can be considered acceptable for exploratory studies (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010; Kothari & Garg, 2014). Item 2 within factor D1 that states "I am a teacher by profession" was removed as it had a low communality of 0.054 and the reliability was adversely affected by this item. Composite factor scores were created for each of the three factors within this section, and thereafter transformed into percentages. A higher score represents a stronger positive perception of their teaching and research skills, respectively. Table 6 provides the breakdown of participants falling within each category.

**Table 6: Descriptive statistics for the factors within Section D**

Factor	No. of items	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Teaching skills	8	84.81	87.50	16.83	0.00	100.00
Perceived teaching abilities	6	86.34	88.89	15.79	0.00	100.00
Research skills	13	48.30	46.15	26.98	0.00	100.00

In Table 6, show the mean value of the academic staffs' performance in the surveyed Ugandan public and private universities in teaching and research. The academic staff rated their teaching skills, and perceived teaching ability high on average, 84.81% and 86.34%, respectively. However, the academic staff rated their research skills much lower on average, at 48.30%. The descriptive statistics for the factors within Section D are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7: Factor scores in academic staffs' performance in teaching and research**

Factor	Low		Medium		High	
	%	F	%	%	F	%
Teaching skills	10	2.5	11	2.7	384	94.8
Perceived teaching abilities	6	1.5	14	3.5	385	95.1
Research skills	144	35.6	143	35.3	118	29.1

Results in table 7, show the factor score in the academic staffs' performance in the surveyed Ugandan universities in teaching and research specifically on academic staffs' teaching skills (D1.1). A small number (2.5%) of the academic staff rated their teaching skills as low, 2.7% were moderate, whereas 94.8% rated their teaching skills to be high. Then, regarding the academic staffs' perceived teaching ability (D1.2), a small margin (1.5%) of the academic staff had low perceived teaching ability, and 3.5% had moderate perceived teaching ability, whereas 95.1% had high perceived teaching ability. This indicates that in the surveyed institutions, majority of the academic staff had high teaching skills and perceived ability. Additionally, the results indicated that the academic staffs were highly involved in teaching activities. Similarly, the academic staffs' research skills (D2) were established, 35.6% of the academic staff had low research skills, 35.3% moderate research skills, while 29.1% had high research skills. The results of the study suggest that the academic staffs' research skills were low implying that the academic staffs' involvement in research activities in the surveyed Ugandan universities was low.

#### IV. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

##### Recommendations

The academic staffs in the surveyed public institutions were more committed to the task of teaching; they started their lessons on time more than their colleagues in private institutions. In addition, the academic staff in public universities used a variety of teaching methods and materials more than their counterparts in private universities, implying that they were more competent in the use of variety of teaching methods and materials. Additionally, more academic staff in public universities set assignments, tests and examinations of high quality than the colleagues in private universities. Thus, the study recommended that supervisors in the survey institutions most especially in private institutions should be keen on the punctuality of the academics in their work activities. The managers should advise means of encouraging their academics to begin their lessons on time to avoid time wastage that may hinder effective teaching in the subjects. Then, the managers in the surveyed institutions should emphasize setting performance goals, monitoring and supervising the academic staff on their tasks, reviewing and assessing performance to enhance the staffs' performance most especially in teaching and research.

Nonetheless, more emphasize in training the academic staff in teaching skills should be done more especially in private universities since the staff displayed less competences in teaching skills and abilities. Therefore, the study recommended that the academic staff in both institutional type needed instructional pedagogical training, ICT skills to enhance blended teaching in order to perform effectively in their teaching activities. Moreover a large number of the academic staffs in both public and private universities were not trained as teachers whereas a small number in both public and private universities respectively did not get training in teaching skills. In addition, the academic staff requires training in diagnostic, formative and summative assessment to be equipped with the assessment skills of learning.

Equally, rewards significantly impacted academic staffs' perceived teaching abilities in private universities. Correlation results for rewards and perceived teaching abilities for private universities was statistically significant ( $p < 0.011$ ). Therefore, the more the academic staffs were rewarded, the more they participated in setting, administering examinations and marking tests, assignments and examinations, and adhering to set deadlines for administering tests and assignments. Therefore, the study recommended enhancement in rewards to increase the academic staffs' participation in teaching activities. The surveyed institutions should put in place a performance management system that provides incentive framework that compensates performance in which extra pay is given for extra work done in teaching activities.

Besides, the academic staff in both public and private universities engaged less in research activities. The academic staff had not: published an article in an international journal, won any research grant, managed a research project, published a book, published chapters in an edited journal, reviewed articles for publication, and supervised students' research. Therefore, the study recommends training of the academic staff in research skills. Academic staff could be trained in workshops and seminars, pedagogy, short and special courses in teaching and research (Nabunya, Mukwenda and Kayeligionza, 2020; Kasule et al, 2015). Training that improves the academic staffs' skills in teaching and research should be continuous throughout the semesters for the staff to acquire the required skills. The training could be done in workshops, seminars, short courses, mentoring and coaching. In addition, senior academic staff should mentor the junior academic staff in teaching and research skills. The staff may carry out team or collaborative teaching in which two teachers work with a single class of students at the same time. One teacher teaches and another observes and assists. In research the junior staff may co-supervise a student with the senior staff to acquire the required skills in research.

Similarly, the surveyed institutions should provide a favorable work environment that inspires the academic staff to engage in research activities. The academic staff needed to be motivated to engage in more research activities with both financial and non-financial rewards such as recognition, promotion, research grants, bonuses and increased pay which should be based on research productivity. In addition, the study findings showed that an increase in the research workload contributed to an increase in the academic staffs' perception of their research knowledge and skills. Thus, the study recommended that the academic staff should be engaged by their managers more in various research activities such as writing research grants, supervising research for students, assessing research for colleagues and students, carrying out research and publishing articles in accredited journals.

Additionally, managers of the surveyed institutions should orient their academic staff in research skills through workshops and conferences and other training, set up forums for research study done, encourage best practices that encourage the academic staff to write research proposals, carry out research and publish, develop a high impact university journal with open access to publish, all aiming at encouraging the academic staffs to engage in research activities. The surveyed institutions should enhance collaborations which build communities of practice in research in which faculty staff exchange staff for mobility to enhance teaching and research capacity and the quality of staff that teach in the surveyed institutions. Similarly, to enhance research, the



surveyed institutions should allocate appropriate funds to promote research activities among the academic staff and support the staff to carry out research, publications and attend conferences and other research training.

## V. CONCLUSION

The study showed that the academic staffs in the surveyed public institutions were committed to their tasks of teaching than their colleagues in private institutions. The academic staff begun their lessons on time, used a variety of teaching methodologies and materials. Therefore, the study concluded that the academic staffs in public universities were more trained in pedagogical skills than their counterparts in private universities; it could be the reason why their teaching abilities most especially in setting assignments, tests and examinations were of more high quality. In addition, the academic staff in public universities set performance goals, emphasize monitoring of performance more often than their counterparts in private universities. Thus, the study concluded that the academic staffs in public universities were more focused on attaining the set performance goals and targets than their counterparts in private universities. Additionally, the study concludes that the academic staff in both institution types did more work in teaching than research. This could be the reason why the academic staff in the surveyed institutions had more competences in teaching than research. Also, the study concluded that the university managers rewarded teaching more than research, thus research activities were not efficiently rewarded to entice the academic staff to engage in such activities.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Alemiga, J., & Kibukamusoke, M. (2019). Determinants of the quality of academic staff in the process of teaching and learning in private universities in Uganda. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review* 7(1): 1-9.
- [2]. Asiiimwe, S., & Steyn, G. M. (2013). Obstacles hindering the effective governance of universities in Uganda. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 34(1), 17-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.11893114>.
- [3]. Baryamureba, V. (2016). Problems of Makerere University. Kampala: Staff Writer.
- [4]. Basaza, G. N., Milman, N. B., & Wright, C. R. (2010). The challenges of implementing distance education in Uganda: A case study. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 11(2), 85-91. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v11i2.833>.
- [5]. Batte, R., Wanzala, S., Ochola, W., Judith, F., & Adipala, E. (2010). Key challenges and issues facing African Universities: A case study of selected African Universities. In *2nd RUFORUM Biennial Meeting* (781-787).
- [6]. Bogere, M., & Anthony, G. (2015). *Understanding research and statistical methods: A guide for East African students and researchers*. Kampala: Smart Stationers Limited.
- [7]. Bunoti, S. (2011). The quality of higher education in developing countries needs professional support. *22nd international conference on higher education*.
- [8]. Forrester, G. (2011). Performance management in education: Milestone or millstone? *Management in Education*, 25(1), 5-9.0708503579.
- [9]. Franco-Santos, M., Rivera, P., & Bourne, M. (2014). *Performance management in UK Higher Education institutions*. The need for a hybrid approach. London: LFHE.
- [10]. Gaus, N., & Hall, D. (2016). Performance indicators in Indonesian university. The perception of academics. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 70(2), 122-144.
- [11]. Hafeez, U. (2015). Impact of training on employees' performance. Evidence from pharmaceutical companies in Karachi, Pakistan. *Business Management and Strategy*, 6(1), 2157-6068. <https://doi.org/10.5296/bms.v6i1.7804>.
- [12]. Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2013). Partial least squares structural equation modeling: Rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance. *Long Range Planning*, 46(1-2), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2013.01.001>.
- [13]. Hancock, K. J., Baum, M., & Breuning, M. (2015). *What Explains High Research Productivity? Evidence from a Survey of International Studies Scholars*.
- [14]. Kagaari, J., Munene, J. C., & Ntayi, J.M. (2010). Performance management practices, employee attitudes and managed performance. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(6), 507-530. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541011067683>.
- [15]. Kairuz, T., Andriés, L., Nickloes, T., & Truter, I. (2016). Consequences of KPIs and performance management in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(6), 881-893. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2015-0067>.
- [16]. Kallio, K. M., & Kallio, T. J. (2014). Management-by-results and performance measurement in universities—implications for work motivation. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(4), 574-589. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.709497>.
- [17]. Kallio, K. M., Kallio, T. J., Tienari, J., & Hyvönen, T. (2016). Ethos at stake: Performance

- management and academic work in universities. *Human Relations*, 69(3), 685-709. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715596802>.
- [18]. Karuhanga, B. N. (2015). Evaluating implementation of strategic performance management practices in universities in Uganda. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 19(2), 42-56.
- [19]. Karuhanga, B. N., & Werner, A. (2013). Challenges impacting performance management implementation in public universities: A case of Uganda. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 4(2), 223-243.
- [20]. Kasozi, A. B. K. (2009). *Financing Uganda's public universities: An obstacle to serving the public good*. Kampala. Fountain Publishers.
- [21]. Kasule, G.W., Wesselink, R., Noroozi, O., & Mulder, M. (2015). The current status of teaching staff innovation competence in Ugandan universities: Perceptions of managers, teachers, and students. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(3), 330-343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2015.1034425>.
- [22]. Kivunja, C. (2017). "Understanding and applying research paradigms in educational contexts." *International Journal of Higher Education* 6 (5): 26-41. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n5p26>.
- [23]. Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2014). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. 3rd edition, New Delhi: New Age International Limited Publishers.
- [24]. Kyvik, S. (2013). The academic researcher role: Enhancing expectations and improved performance. *Higher Education*, 65(4), 525-538.
- [25]. Lindsay, D. H., Campbell, A., & Tan, K. B. (2012). The impact of merit pay on teaching and research outcomes of accounting programs. *American Journal of Business Education*, 5(3), 331.
- [26]. Mantikanyan, J. M., & Abdulhani, M. A. (2018). Factors affecting research productivity: Conclusions from a critical review of the literature. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary research*, 31(1).
- [27]. Mawoli, M. A., & Babandako, A. Y. (2011). An evaluation of staffs motivation, dissatisfaction and job performance in an academic setting. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 1.
- [28]. McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-Based Inquiry, MyEducationLab Series*. Pearson
- [29]. Mehmood, T., Qasim, S., & Azam, R. (2013). Impact of emotional intelligence on the performance of university teachers. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(18), 300-307.
- [30]. Menon, G. (2017). Critiquing teacher performance management in higher education institutions. Reviving the observation cube in India. *International Journal of Engineering Technology Science and Research*, 4(8), 132-145.
- [31]. Molefe, G. N. (2010). Performance measurement dimensions for lecturers at selected universities: An international perspective. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8(1), 1- 13. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC95904>.
- [32]. Mushemeza, E. D. (2016). Opportunities and challenges of academic staffs in higher education in Africa. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 5(3), 236-246.
- [33]. Musiige, G., & Maassen, P. (2015). Faculty perceptions of the factors that influence research productivity at Makerere University. *Knowledge Production and Contradictory Functions in African Higher Education*, 1(6), 109-127.
- [34]. Nabunya, K. (2021). Professional development practices and teaching service delivery of academic staff at Kampala International University. Uganda. *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies*, 5(9), 107-117.
- [35]. Nabunya, K., Mukwenda, H. T., & Kyaligonza, R. (2020). Professional development practices and teaching service delivery of academic staff at Kyambogo University, Uganda. *Journal of Popular Education in Africa*, 4(3): 111 – 124.
- [36]. Namutebi, E. (2019). Instructional leadership and lecturers' job performance in public universities in Uganda. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 10(2), 93-118.
- [37]. Neema-Abooki, P. (2016). Academic staff competence development as a gap in quality assurance in universities in Uganda. East African School of higher education studies and development. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 8(2) 139-151.
- [38]. Ojokuku, R. M. (2013). Effect of performance appraisal system on motivation and performance of academics in Nigerian public universities. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 3(3), 20-28.
- [39]. Park, S. M., Min, K. R., & Chen, C. A. (2016). Do monetary rewards bring happiness? Comparing the impacts of pay-for-performance in the public and private sectors. *International Review of Public Administration*, 21(3), 199-215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2016.1237092>.
- [40]. Polycarp, A.I., & Chigozie, P.U. (2015). Performance evaluation of academic staff in Universities and

- Colleges in Nigeria: The missing criteria. *International Journal of Education and Research*, (3), 3.
- [41]. Quimbo, M. A. T., & Sulabo, E. C. (2014). Research productivity and its policy implications in higher education institutions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(10), 1955–1971. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.818639>.
- [42]. Qureshi, J. A., Zia-ur-Rehman, A. S., & Afsar, B. (2010). Performance management systems. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(9), 1856-1862. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM10.391>.
- [43]. Rasheed, M. I., Aslam, H. D., & Sawar, S. (2010). Motivational issues for teachers' in higher education: A critical case of Islamia university of Bahawalpur. *Journal of Management Research*, 2(2), 1-23.
- [44]. Rwothumio, J., Okaka, W., Kambaza, S., & Kyomukama, E. (2021). Influence of performance appraisal in determining academic staff performance in public universities in Uganda. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 3(1), 20-32.
- [45]. Salesho, J. M., & Naile. I. (2014). Academic staffs' retention as a human resource factor: University perspective. *International Business and Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, 13(2), 295-304. <https://doi.org/10.19030/iber.v13i2.8444>.
- [46]. Simmons, J. (2002). An “expert witness” perspective on performance appraisal in universities and colleges. Employee relations. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3), 541-563.
- [47]. Ter Bogt, H. J., & Scapens, R. W. (2012). Performance management in universities: Effects of the transition to more quantitative measurement systems. *European Accounting Review*, 21(3), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2012.668323>.

**\*Corresponding author: Grace Kansüme**  
**<sup>1</sup>(Faculty of Education, Ndejje University Kampala Uganda)**