

Comparative study of Staff Development Practices and Lecturers' Job performance between Nigerian and Pakistani Universities

¹Awodiji, Omotayo Adewale (Ph.D.), ¹Ijaiya, Nike Y. S. (Ph.D.)

¹Department of Educational Management, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Abstract

Efforts, in terms of funds and support, have been invested directly and indirectly by government and private individuals on Staff Development (SD) in Nigerian and Pakistani universities. Therefore, the study compared the impact of SD practices on lecturers' job performance in Nigerian and Pakistani universities.

Expo-facto design was used for this study. A multi-stage sampling technique was adopted. A sample of 919 and 715 participants were proportionately selected from 12 Nigerian and 12 Pakistani universities. Two validated questionnaires (SDPrQ and LJPQ) with reliability of 0.70 and 0.75 respectively were used for data collection. Percentage and Rank ordering were used to answer the research question and t-test statistic was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

It was revealed that, a significant difference existed between lecturers' teaching performance of Nigerian and Pakistani universities in terms of SD practices ($t(1) = 2.60, .009, < .05$) in favour of Pakistan. The study concluded that SD practices have contributed to lecturers' teaching performance more in Pakistan than in Nigeria. The study recommended that SD practices in Nigerian universities be improved upon by ensuring that SD programmes match both individual and university's needs in line with global practice for sustainable competitive advantage.

Key words: Staff Development, Practices, Lecturers, Performance, University

Introduction

University development is significantly related to the quality of its human capital which has a direct link to the quality of training given to the worker. In other words, the productivity of a university is predicated on the total quality of its staff (World Bank, 2003; Ijaiya, Alabi & Fasasi, 2011; Ijaiya, 2012). Since all kinds of development begin with human capital development (Higher Education Commission (HEC), 2005). Therefore, universities can claim to be productive if they invest in human capital development. The acquisition of skills, knowledge, right attitude and its productive utilisation are of importance in a knowledge-driven society.

It is required in Nigeria and Pakistan that all lecturers in universities undergo staff development programmes in the teaching methods, research techniques, innovations and

educational administration (Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN), 2013; Government of Pakistan, 2009). However, to achieve this, the lecturers of these universities have been trained and still undergoing re-training programmes on new knowledge, skills and attitude that will promote the university productivity. In the perspective of Human Capital Development (HCD) theory, investment in human capital brings about greater productivity (Kern, 2009). Modern human managers seem to concur that education, training and welfare are imperative to improving human capital and ultimately increasing the university outputs (Becker, 1993). Further, Khan (2014) observed that the aim of Staff Development (SD) practice is for the universities to equip lecturers in the use of latest innovative teaching pedagogies, communication skills and research strategies that blend academic concepts with institutional goals. Staff development practice can, therefore,

be regarded as series of activities employed by any university for the improvement of its lecturers' skills, knowledge, attitude and competence. These modes are Training for Higher Qualification (THQ), continuous education, mentorship, coaching system, seminar, workshop or training, conference, university collaboration or staff exchange programme, sabbatical, among others. Other approaches to SD include induction programme, On-the-job training, work rotation, appointment, simulation, special course, professional bodies' membership, sandwich courses and part-time programmes (Oshionebo, 2003; Aigbepue & Mammud, 2012). However, SD practices in this study focused on Training for Higher Qualifications (THQ) (Fellowship, Ph.D., Master degree, PGDE), conference, workshop, seminar, sabbatical and mentoring.

It was stated that as Nigerian universities are making efforts to also improve their ranking at the global level, Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) would continue to strive towards achieving this objective through TETFund intervention. The Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) (2014), was reported to have spent N19 billion (\$60,365,470 Million) to facilitate academic programmes of selected teaching staff across the Nigerian public higher institutions 2014. TETFund (2016) stated that from 2008 - 2015, the agency has sponsored 4,823 universities' lecturers (Federal and State) on academic training and 13,601 universities' lecturers on academic conferences see Table 1 and 2.

Table 1
Academic Staff Training and Development Interventions Summary Report (2008 – 2015)

TYPE OF INSTITUTION	FOREIGN Ph.D	FOREIGN MASTERS	FOREIGN BENCH WORK	LOCAL Ph.D	LOCAL MASTERS	TOTAL
1 UNIVERSITIES	1,672	836	298	1,263	754	4,823

Table 2
Conference Attendance Interventions Summary Report (2008 – 2015)

S/N	CLASS OF INSTITUTION	LOCAL	FOREIGN	TOTAL
1	UNIVERSITIES	6,606	6,995	13,601

In Pakistan, as part of efforts and strategies put in place by HEC to improve the standard of its universities, SD programme for university lecturers is made a primary concern (Hassan, 2011). Furthermore, in order to transit from agricultural-based economy to knowledge-based economy, a lot of foreign scholarship opportunities were made available to the lecturers through the National Academy of Higher Education. Under this scheme, a total of 6,726 scholars have benefited between 2012-2013 for programmes such as Masters, Ph.D. Post-Doc and IRSIP. While a total of 5,524 scholars were awarded Ph.D. indigenous and Ph.D. scholarship (HEC Annual Report, 2014).

The university lecturers' job performance referred to the measure of the effectiveness of lecturer in relation to their roles and responsibilities at their university. It most commonly referred to whether a lecturer performs his or her job well or not in terms of teaching, research and community service.

Although comparative studies have been carried out on staff development programmes and practices, none has focused on SD practices at the university level, especially in Nigeria and Pakistan; hence, the gap, which the present study sought to fill. From the foregoing, the paper compared the impact of SD practices on lecturers' job performance in selected Nigerian

and Pakistani universities.

Purpose of the Study

The study compared the impact of staff development practices and lecturers' job performance in Nigerian and Pakistani universities. To be specific, the study compared:

- i. the mode of the staff development practices in terms of training for higher qualifications, conferences, workshop, sabbatical, mentoring, bench work/exchange programmes for lecturers in Nigerian and Pakistani universities;
- ii. the sources of funding staff development programmes in Nigerian and Pakistani universities;
- iii. impact of staff development practices on lecturers' job performance in Nigerian and Pakistani universities.

Research Questions

Some research question was raised to guide the study:

- What is the mode of staff development practices for lecturers in Nigerian and Pakistani universities?
- What are the sources of funding staff development programmes in Nigerian and Pakistani universities?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide the research:

- H₀₁:** There is no significant difference in terms of the impact of staff development practices on teaching performance between Nigerian and Pakistani university lecturers.
- H₀₂:** There is no significant difference in terms of the impact of staff development practices on research and publications between Nigerian and Pakistani university lecturers.
- H₀₃:** There is no significant difference in terms of the impact of staff development practices on community service between Nigerian and Pakistani universities lecturers.

Research Design

The study employed expo-facto design of comparative type. The population of this study comprised 22,286 faculty members/lecturers of all 40 Federal Government-owned universities in Nigeria and 6,713 faculty members/lecturers of 25 Federal Government-owned universities in Pakistan respectively (NUC, 2015; HEC, 2016). The target population for the study comprised all 17, 753 heads of departments/ chairmen of the departments, deans of faculties and lecturers/faculty members. A multi-stage sampling technique was adopted for this study. The 40 universities in Nigeria were categorised into geo-political zones/states using stratified random sampling technique while most of the 25 Pakistani Government-owned universities (public sector) are located in Islamabad, the capital city of Pakistan. Random and purposive sampling technique was used to select 12 universities from the 40 federal universities in Nigeria and 12 universities from the 25 Pakistani federal universities established between 1948 and 2007. In other words, two universities were purposively selected from each six geopolitical zone of Nigeria to give an equal representation of each zone. Stratified sampling technique was used to select the sampled lecturers/faculty members, heads of departments and deans of faculties from Nigerian and Pakistani universities with 554 and 546 (Lecturers), 100 and 56 (Deans), and 265 and 113 (HODs) respectively, using Taro Yamane sample size formula (Welsland, 2010). Hence, the total sample was 1,634.

Items on the instruments used for this study were randomly adapted from previous empirical and conceptual literature. The instruments were modified to suit the current study and mostly adapted from Asian and African past studies of like manner. Adapted questionnaire tagged "Staff Development Practices Questionnaire" (SDPrQ) adapted from Hassan (2011); Nabunya, (2012); Muhoi, (2013); Dawo, Smatwa, and Okwatch, (2013) was used to gather information on Staff development practices from the respondents (Lecturers). While "Lecturers' Job Performance Questionnaire" (LJPQ) was adapted from Ekpoh, Edet, and Nkama (2013);

Dawo, Smatwa and Okwatch, (2013); Moreno-Murcia, Torregrosa, and Pedreno, (2015) was used to gather information on lecturers' job performance from the respondents (HODs and Deans).

Experts from the Department of Educational Management and Measurement and Evaluation in the University of Ilorin, Nigeria, and Department of Management Science of the COMSATS University, Islamabad, Pakistan validated the questionnaires. The instruments were pilot-tested using 20 lecturers from one university from Nigeria and 20 lecturers from one university Pakistan. The scales for all variables demonstrated an acceptable reliability at 0.70 and 0.75 for SDPrQ & LJPQ because Cronbach's Alpha values were above 0.70.

Descriptive statistics of percentage and rank ordering were adopted to answer the research questions raised while, inferential statistic of t-test was adopted to test the hypotheses formulated at 0.5 alpha level of significance.

Results

Research Question 1: What is the mode of staff development practices for lecturers in Nigerian and Pakistani universities?

In order to answer the research question one, responses of the sampled universities' lecturers were gathered and analysed as indicated in Table 3. The percentage scores obtained were ranked while the decision was taken based on the higher ranked SD mode and compared between the two groups.

Table 3

Mode of Staff Development Practices for Lecturers in Nigerian and Pakistani Universities

SD Practices	Responses	NIGERIAN			PAKISTANI		
		N	%	Rank	N	%	Rank
Training for Higher Qualifications	Yes	205	73.2	3	279	73.2	3
	No	75	26.8		102	26.8	
Conference	Total	280	100	1	381	100	1
	Yes	237	84.6		332	87.1	
Workshop/Seminar	No	43	15.4	2	49	12.9	2
	Total	280	100		381	100	
Sabbatical Leave	Yes	228	81.4	4	308	80.8	6
	No	52	18.6		73	19.2	
Bench Work	Total	280	100	6	381	100	5
	Yes	117	41.8		60	15.7	
Mentoring	No	163	58.2	5	321	84.3	4
	Total	280	100		381	100	
	Yes	59	21.1		71	18.6	
	No	221	78.9		310	81.4	
	Total	280	100		381	100	
	Yes	71	25.4		135	35.4	
	No	209	74.6		246	64.6	
	Total	280	100		381	100	

The results shown in Table 3 revealed that out of the six modes of SD practices listed in this study, three, namely; conference, workshop and

training for higher qualifications were similarly ranked first (1st) (81.4%; 80.8%), second (2nd) (84.6%; 87.1%), and third (3rd) (73.2%; 73.2%)

both in Nigerian and Pakistani universities. However, differences in the ranking of the practice of sabbatical, benchwork and mentoring between Nigerian and Pakistani universities could be observed.

Research Question 2: What are the sources of funding staff development programmes in

Nigerian and Pakistani universities?

In order to answer the research question, responses of the sampled universities' lecturers were gathered on how SD programmes participated in were funded and analysed, as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4
Sources of Funding Staff Development Programmes in Nigerian and Pakistani Universities

Sources of funding	Responses	Nigeria			Pakistan		
		N	%	Rank	N	%	Rank
By self	Yes	182	65	1	150	39.4	2
	No	98	35		231	60.6	
	Total	280	100		381	100	
By institution	Yes	133	47.5	2	239	62.7	1
	No	147	52.5		142	37.3	
	Total	280	100		381	100	
By Government (Agency)	Yes	22	8	4	111	29.1	3
	No	258	92		270	70.9	
	Total	280	100		381	100	
Foreign grants/ Scholarship	Yes	47	17	3	58	15.2	4
	No	233	83		323	84.8	
	Total	280	100		381	100	

From Table 4, lecturers whose SD programmes attended were self-sponsored was ranked 1st in Nigeria (65%) but ranked 2nd in Pakistan (39.4%). Also, institution-sponsored SD programmes was ranked 2nd in Nigeria (52.5%) but ranked 1st in Pakistan (62.7%). Government-sponsored SD programmes was ranked 4th in Nigeria (8%) but 3rd in Pakistan (29.1%) respectively while foreign grants/scholarship was ranked 3rd (17%) in Nigeria but 4th (15.2%) in Pakistan. By implication, sponsorship in Nigerian and Pakistani universities seem to be in opposite direction. In the first order of ranking, participants of SD programmes sponsored themselves in Nigeria compared to their colleagues from Pakistan whose SD programmes attended were mostly sponsored/funded by their universities (institutions). In the second order ranking, participants of SD programmes were being sponsored by their institutions to attend SD

programmes while their colleagues in Pakistani universities attending SD programmes engage in self-sponsorship. Foreign grants followed by government agencies sponsorship were the sources of funding for SD programme's participants in Nigeria while it was in the reverse order (Government agencies followed by foreign grants) in Pakistani universities.

Ho₁: There is no significant difference in terms of impact of staff development practice on teaching performance between Nigerian and Pakistani university lecturers.

Testing for the difference in the impact of SD practices on lectures' teaching performance between Nigerian and Pakistani universities, data collected from deans, heads of departments and lecturers of the sampled universities were collated and analysed using t-test as shown in Table 5. The decision was taken at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 5
Impact of SD Practices on Lecturers' Teaching Performance of Nigerian and Pakistani Universities

Country	N	Mean	SD	SEM	t	df	P	Decision
Nigeria	280	18.21	2.49	.148				Ho
					2.60	657	.009	Rejected
Pakistan	381	18.42	3.20	.164				

Significant @ < .05

Table 5 showed the difference between Nigerian and Pakistani universities on the impact of staff development practices on lecturers' teaching performance. It can be deduced from Table 5 that there is a significant difference between Nigerian and Pakistani universities lecturers in terms of teaching performance ($\bar{x}_P = 18.21$; 18.42); $t(657) = 2.60$, $.009$, $< .05$. Since the p-value was less than .05 thresholds, the stated null hypothesis was therefore rejected. This shows that the mean score on the job performance of universities' lecturers in Pakistan after SD mode was slightly higher than lecturers in Nigerian universities. This implies that the SD practices aided lecturers in Pakistani universities to have a

better teaching performance than their colleagues in Nigerian universities.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in terms of the impact of staff development practices on research and publications between Nigerian and Pakistani university lecturers.

Testing for the difference in the impact of SD practices on lectures' research and publications between Nigerian and Pakistani universities, data gathered from deans, heads of departments and lecturers of the sampled universities were collated and analysed using independent t-test as shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Impact of SD Practices on Lecturers' research and publications of Nigerian and Pakistani Universities

Country	N	Mean	SD	SEM	t	df	P	Decision
Nigeria	280	18.90	3.18	.190				Ho
					4.78	659	.000	Rejected
Pakistan	381	17.75	2.97	.152				

Significant @ < .05

It can be deduced from Table 6 that there was a statistically significant difference between lecturers' research and publications in Nigerian and Pakistani universities $\bar{x}_P = 1.15$; $t(4.780) = .000$, $< .05$. Since the p-value is less than .05 thresholds, the stated null hypothesis was therefore rejected. The mean score shows that Nigerian universities faculty members have a slightly higher score in their research and publications after SD modes more than their counterparts in Pakistani universities.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in terms of the impact of the staff development practices on community service between Nigerian and Pakistani university lecturers.

To establish this, responses from Deans, Heads of Departments and lecturers of the sampled universities were gathered and analysed using independent t-test, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7**Impact of SD Practices on Lecturers' community service of Nigerian and Pakistani Universities**

Country	N	Mean	SD	SEM	t	df	p	Decision
Nigeria	280	17.46	3.30	.197				
					.231	659	.817	Ho
Pakistan	381	17.40	3.31	.169				Accepted

Not-Significant @ > .05

Table 7 shows that there is no significant difference between lecturers' community service of Nigerian and Pakistani universities based on the SD practices ($\bar{x} = 17.46; 17.40$); $t(.231) = .817$, $p > 0.05$. Since the p-value was greater than .05 thresholds, the null hypothesis is not-rejected. It is evident that the community service of university lecturers in Nigeria, after SD practices, was not different from that of their colleagues in Pakistani universities.

Discussion of the Findings

The SD practices in Nigerian and Pakistani universities from Table 3 showed that conference, workshop and training for higher qualifications were ranked first (1st), second (2nd) and third (3rd), among the others, both in Nigerian and Pakistani universities. There are differences in the practice of Sabbatical, Bench work and Mentoring between Nigerian and Pakistani universities as a mode of SD practices. Sabbatical is more practiced at (41.8%) in Nigeria than in Pakistan at (15.7%) because low funds availability does not encourage the practice of sabbatical. Bench work/exchange programme (21.1%; 18.6%) and mentoring were more practiced at (35.4%) in Pakistan than in Nigeria (25.4%). The present findings were supported by Abida and Mirza (2012) that the universities need a sustained long term lecturer development practice to enable them work effectively and accomplish the institutional goals, necessary for survival in the rapidly-changing environment of higher education. The aspiration of the Pakistani Government is to ensure that the few faculty members/lecturers are judiciously utilised and that there should be transfer of knowledge. Thus, SD practices were more instrumental in improving lecturers' skills,

competencies and attitudes in universities (World Bank, 2003; Hassan, 2011; Abida & Mirza, 2012; Ijaiya, 2012).

The results of the research question analysed showed that SD programmes were more self-sponsored in Nigeria at 65% compared to Pakistan where SD programmes attendees were mostly sponsored/funded by the universities (institutions) and the government at 62.7% and 29.1% respectively. The reason for this could be connected to low availability of funds where there is little financial provision for numerous numbers of academic staff who desire professional development. Therefore, the lecturers that want to attend SD programmes may have to be self-sponsored. The present findings was in agreement with Onyeizugbe, Obiageli and Igbodo (2016) who found out that despite the interventions of TETFund in the area of staff development, many universities in Nigeria are unable to meet the conditions for accessing funds allocated to them, thereby making many lecturers to miss the opportunities to access funds for SD. Besides, the available fund is limited compared with the number of the lecturers qualified for SD.

The result of hypothesis one tested showed a statistically significant difference between lecturers' teaching performance in Nigerian and Pakistani universities. Although the level of difference was not pronounced, considering the mean and standard deviation of the two sampled nations, Pakistani lecturers seem to be better in their teaching performance after SD programmes compared to their Nigerian counterparts. The SD practices are imperative not only to the lecturers' teaching improvement

but also as an instrument for the university to have comparative advantages. This showed that the mean score on the teaching performance of university lecturers in Pakistan after SD practices was slightly higher than that of lecturers in Nigerian universities. The implication is that the SD practices aided lecturers in Pakistani universities to have a better teaching performance than their colleagues in Nigerian universities. The present findings agreed with Sarbeng (2013) and Ullah, Ullah Khan, Murtaza, & Ud Din, (2011) that the skills, knowledge and competence possessed by lecturers are the product of training received to increase their instructional delivery, intellectual planning, class attendance and assessment, among others.

The result of the study also revealed a statistically significant difference between lecturers' research and publications of Nigerian and Pakistani universities in terms of the impact of SD practices. It could be observed that the performance of lecturers from Nigerian universities better in terms of research and publications after their participation in SD programmes compared with that of their colleagues from Pakistan universities. The reason for this could be the strong emphasis on publication and participation in academic conferences as major requirements for promotion in Nigeria. These help lecturers in Nigeria to have a high number of publications. In Pakistan, however, the demand is for faculty members to have their research output published in an impact factor journal, not in terms of volume but in quality. Thus, for Nigerian and Pakistani universities to grow and have comparative advantages over their colleagues in knowledge-based economy world, school management, as a matter of importance, must be committed to the development of their academic staff in the area of research and publications. This is in agreement with Quayson (2017) who found out that SD programmes correlate with the lecturers' research and publication. This aligned with the view of Agboola and Oduwale (2005) that SD programmes have a positive impact on lecturers' publications output.

The result of the hypothesis three tested showed

no significant difference between lecturers' community service in terms of SD practices in Nigerian and Pakistani universities. The present findings agreed with Oladimeji (2017) and Quayson (2017) who found out that SD has a positive impact on higher institution teachers' community service. It could be explained that community service is part of the three responsibilities of university lecturers both within and outside their immediate university environment in terms of organising capacity programmes for the host community, keynote delivery, administrative appointments, among others. These will be achieved based on the skills, knowledge and competence acquired during the SD programmes attended.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, the conclusion could be reached that Pakistani lecturers have a better teaching performance than their colleagues in Nigerian universities after SD practices while Nigerian lecturers' have better performance in research and publications than their counterparts in Pakistani universities after SD practices.

Recommendations

- i. University-industry collaboration via donation and sponsorship could be explored to increase the rate of lecturers' participation in SD programmes.
- ii. Adequate funds could be made available to universities through industry and international grants/scholarship initiatives in terms of capacity building of Nigerian lecturers. Since knowledge is now a factor of production, governments, as well as institutions, can engage in bilateral agreement with foreign nations and institutions on SD of university lecturers.
- iii. A follow-up should be carried out on the faculty members who have benefitted from SD programmes award both in Nigeria and in Pakistan so as to establish their level of improvement after training.
- iv. Teaching performance should be given more attention in the assessment of Nigerian lecturers. It was discovered that the focus of Nigerian lecturers is more on

research and publication rather than on teaching students. In Pakistan, however, teaching is given the same attention as research.

Reference

- Abida, N. & Mirza, M. S.(2012). Faculty training and development in the public sector universities of Punjab.*International Journal of Business and Social Science* 3(3),229-240.
- Agboola, A. T. & Oduwole, A. A. (2005). Staff seminars and publications productivity: A study of academic librarians in Ogun State. *Library Management Journal*, 26(8/9), 478-480.
- Aigbepue, S.&Mammud, V. E. (2012). Training, development aormance..*JORIND* 10 (3), Retrieved on January 17, 2017, from www.transcampus.org./journals, www.ajol.info/journals/jorind
- Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bogoro, S. (2015, November 25). Nigerian universities will do well in rankings. Retrieved from www.punchng.com on November 25, 2015.
- Dawo, J. I. A, Smatwa, E. M. W.&Okwatch, T.O. (2013). Academic staff development practices' influence on job performance in selected public Universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 2 (2), 236-248.
- Ekpoh, U.I., Edet, A.O.&Nkama, V. I. (2013).Staff development programme and secondary school teachers' education in Uyo Metropolis, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice* 4(2), 217-223. Retrieved from www.iiste.org on October 20, 2014.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, (2004).*National policy on education (4thed.)*. Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, (2013).*National policy on education (6thed.)*. Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Government of Pakistan, (2009).*National education policy (Revised)*.Islamabad: Ministry of Education, 55-60.
- Government of Pakistan (2012).*The Gazette of Pakistan Extraordinary*. Karachi: Printing Corporation of Pakistan Press, p. 55.
- Government of Pakistan, (2015).Annual budget statement 2015-2016.Government of Pakistan Finance Division.
- Hassan, D. A. (2011).Analyzing professional development practices for teachers in public universities of Pakistan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(4), 97-106.
- Hassan, D.A. (2013). Analysis of performance evaluation system for teachers in colleges of Pakistan: A case study of colleges operating in Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Learning & Development*. Pdf retrieved on February 6, 2016.
- Higher Education Commission, (2005). *Higher Education Medium Term Development Framework 2005 – 10*. Pdf retrieved from [https:// www.hec.gov.pk](https://www.hec.gov.pk) on March 9, 2016.
- Higher Education Commission, (2014). Annual Report 2012-2013. Pp 2-38
- Ijaiya, N. Y. S. (2012). *Management that matters: Key to sustainable education*. University of Ilorin, The one hundred and thirteenth (113th) inaugural lecture. Ilorin: Unilorin Press.
- Ijaiya, N. Y. S., Alabi, A. T. & Fasasi, Y. A. (2011). Teacher education in African and

- critical thinking skills: Need and strategies. *Research Journal of Business Management* 5 (1), 26-34. Retrieved from <http://scialert.net/abstract/?doi=rjbm.2011.26.34> on October 4, 2015.
- Kern, A. F. (2009). *Human capital development theory: Implications for education comparison of influential twenty-first century economists Samuel Bowles and Gary S. Becker*. Retrieved from <https://blogs.psu.edu/mt4/mt-tb.cgi/116204> on 20/05/2016
- Moreno-Murcia, J. A, Torregrosa, Y. S & Pedreno, N. B. (2015). Questionnaire evaluating teaching competencies in the University environment. Evaluation of teaching competencies in the university. *New Approaches in Educational Research*, 4(1), 54-61.
- Muhoi, B. W. (2013). *Use of performance appraisal in staff training and development at the teachers' service commission*. (Unpublished Master dissertation), University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Nabunya, K. (2012). *Factors affecting service delivery of academic staff in the college of education and external studies Makerere University, Kampala Uganda*. (Unpublished Master Dissertation) Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
- National Universities Commission, (2012). *Manual of accreditation procedures for academic programmes in Nigerian universities*. Revised: Abuja.
- Oladimeji, R. M. (2017). *Vice-chancellors' management strategies, staff development programmes and academic staff job performance in private universities Nigeria*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis), University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
- Onyeizugbe, C. U., Obiageli, L. O., & Igbodo, R. O. (2016). TETFund international programmes and academic staff development of selected Universities in South East, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Public Finance*, 2(1), 171-193. Retrieved from www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/jepf. on April 1, 2017.
- Oshionebo, B. O. (2003). *Dimensions of management and organizational management*. Ibadan: Spetrum Books.
- Quayson, K. P. (2017). *Resources management, motivation and goal achievement in colleges of Education in Southern Nigeria and Ghana*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis), University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
- Sarheng, I. B. (2013). Staff training and development interventions and teaching performance: Application of structural equation modeling. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 3(4), 159-176.
- Ullah, M. H., Ullah Khan, M. N., Murtaza, A. & Ud Din, M, N. (2011). Staff development needs in Pakistan higher education. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning* 12(4). Pdf retrieved on 3/2/2016.
- Tetfund, (2015). *Guidelines for accessing tetfund intervention funds*. Pp.28-31
- Tetfund, (2016). *Academic staff training & development interventions report (2008-till date)*.
- Westland, J. C. (2010). Lower bounds on sample size in structural equation modeling. *Electron Comm. Res. Appl.* 9 (6), 476-487.
- World Bank, (2003). *Lifelong learning in the global knowledge economics: Challenges for developing countries*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS), (for the advancement of science in the developing countries) Trieste, Italy and COMSATS University Islamabad (CUI), Pakistan, for provision of fellowship/scholarship.