sciendo

Vol. 15, No. 25, Year 2022
ISSN: 2286-2102
E-ISSN:2286-2552

APPRAISAL OF TEACHING AND SUPERVISION LOAD OF ACADEMIC STAFF IN SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN NIGERIA

SEGILOLA YEWANDE OLADEJO
Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria

© 2022 Segilola Yewande Oladejo
This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/)
DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

Abstract

Nigerian universities have been attributed to lack of funds, inadequate infrastructure, improper teaching aids (laboratories, projectors, libraries, and computers) and irregular or lack, thereof, of salary as evidenced in some states in Nigeria. It is of little wonder then that the work performance of academic staff will spiral down particularly in terms of their teaching and supervision, research and publication and their involvement in community development services. This study, therefore, assessed teaching and supervision load of lecturers in some selected universities in Nigeria. Data were obtained using semi-structured questionnaire from nine universities. Through proportional sampling technique, 25% of the academic staff in each university were selected giving a total of 969 as the sample size. Data were analyzed using SPSS. The results showed that teaching and supervision load of the academic staff was quite heavy; hence, concluding that the performance of academic staff in terms of their teaching and supervision in the selected universities is unsatisfactory.

Keywords

Teaching, Supervision, Lecturers, Appraisal, Performance

Introduction

Most universities have been experiencing brain drain in the last decade with the academic sector witnessing a massive exit of talented, brilliant, young, experienced and efficient members of the academic to several other sectors in the Nigerian economy. The frustration of university life has forced them to flee in search of more challenging and rewarding sectors of the economy like the business world, politics while others travelled abroad for greener pastures (Oladejo & Adenuga, 2021). This turn of events has also resulted in the unavailability of mentorship by capable and high-ranking lecturers in Nigerian universities meant to be enjoyed by junior researchers, a decrease in research outputs from suitable lecturers and reduction in centers of research in Nigerian universities (Ogunyemi, Adenuga & Lawal, 2019). Reason for the above has been associated to defective and smaller classrooms particularly in public universities which makes students loiter around classes during lecture hours (Ologunde, Akindele & Akande, 2013) thereby, creating distractions for both the lecturer and the students. The classrooms and offices are not well furnished and the electric power supply is erratic. Most of these universities delay until notified of accreditation exercise by the National Universities Commission (NUC) before they equip their institutions with the appropriate facilities and improve on staff condition/welfare (Iruonagbe, Imhonopi &

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

Egharevba, 2015). Some departments go as far as "borrowing" lecturers from other departments to make up for the appropriate number of staff that is expected (Adewusi, Ogunyemi & Aluko, 2017).

For those who cared to listen, academic staff in Nigerian universities have often complained about how they have no time to pursue the research/publication and community development aspect of their work performance due to the heavy workload of the teaching and supervision. According to Amie-Ogan and Fekarurhobo (2021), universities regularly develop new courses and programs in order to stay up with the dynamism that characterizes knowledge which helps to achieve these aims. Knowledge quickly becomes obsolete, necessitating the need to refresh it on a regular basis. The institution has a monumental job in ensuring that this is accomplished. Universities' academic staff are crucial players in the knowledge theater, and they are tasked with the mammoth task of ensuring that information is updated, developed, and communicated (Oladejo, 2021).

Literature as far back as ten years ago established that lecturers are responsible for a large amount of work which included but not limited to research, which is very crucial for advancement and administrative responsibilities coupled with their primary responsibilities of teaching and supervision (Ifedili & Omiunu, 2012). With so many students to teach and final year students assigned to a lecturer for their projects, the student population continues to grow year after year. In the same vein, Archibong, Oshiomu & Bassey (2010) earlier explained that an academic staff has roughly two courses to teach per level and between 40-50 final year undergraduate project students to oversee in addition to Masters and Doctor of Philosophy students. As a result, lecturers are unable to participate in their other responsibilities as effectively as they should. It is against this backdrop that this research work became inevitable.

Issues in Nigerian Universities

Nigerian universities have a series of challenges that they battle with particularly in the 21st century. Public and private universities in Nigeria share almost the same challenges. They are considered not different from each other and these challenges are commonly categorized in character as internal and external. Adewusi, Ogunyemi & Aluko (2017) explained the internal difficulties as cultism, unionism, shortage of academic staff, as well as disruption of the academic calendar, while Bawalla (2020) described the external problems as being linked inextricably to politics and proprietorial interference. Some of them are discussed below.

Leadership/Management Style

According to Bawalla (2022), leadership can be seen as the power of a person to adapt to any alteration or modification in any organization, in an effort to get a new direction and then get the employees to align with it. The university comprises people, structure and technology that require effective and proactive leadership to thrive. Lack of effective leadership poses a serious threat in any institution, and the consequences, sometimes, include poor growth and development, lack of motivation and poor performance.

Workplace Victimization

Human resource practitioners now view workplace victimization as a grave issue for all actors, workers and management in employment relations. This form of harassment constitutes a very problematic aspect of employee relations because it is very unpleasant, and to control it requires the strict management of employees and the organization in terms of material and monetary attributes (Oladejo, 2021). Those who victimize at the workplace are mostly called 'workplace bullies' and might be the boss, co-worker or even a subordinate.

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

Workplace Stress

Workplace stress negatively influences the creativity of workers and thus their productivity. It is very detrimental to emotional stability and behavior, long-term psychological wellbeing, overall health and morale of employees (Bawalla & Adenugba, 2021). Stress at work could sometimes be excessive, resulting in reduced employees' productivity, overall effectiveness as well as accidents and increased human errors (Oladejo & Adenuga, 2021). Factors that contribute to increased stress level among academic staff in the university include, but not limited to, delay and irregular payment of salary, lack of instructional facilities, strike school interruption (Ogunyemi, Adenuga & Lawal, 2019); work-family imbalance, performance pressure and role ambiguity (Oladejo, 2021); student-related issues, academic workload and role conflicts (Akbar & Akhter, 2011); and research and publications (Uchendu, Nnaji & Nwafor, 2016).

Insufficient Funding

An issue that has equally menaced the realization of excellent quality education for higher learning in Nigeria is the issue of insufficient funding, and this challenge has been a great disruption to the improvement of education in the country. This financial limitation has made circumstances challenging for many academics and students, as the majority of higher learning institutions in Nigeria are unable to build adequate students' hostels and lecture halls, furnish workshops and laboratories, pay staff salaries, provide research allowances, grants and even medical bills (Adewusi, Ogunyemi & Aluko, 2017).

Inadequate/Weak Quality of Teaching Staff

Lack of adequate academic staff is another big challenge that affects the quality of education. The significance of good quality lecturers to accomplish good and quality education in any university cannot be overemphasized; but in Nigeria, institutions are short of lecturers to partake in effective learning and teaching activities. Due to insufficient funding, institutions are unable to engage lecturers and rigorously overload the few lecturers that are available (Asiyai, 2013). According to Bawalla and Adenugba (2021), the declining rate of quality staff in some institutions of higher learning in Nigeria is borne out of the 'problem of de-intellectualization of the academia' which makes quality education in Nigeria very problematic and challenging to attain.

Poor Implementation of Policy

Implementation of policy is another challenge that poses stress in having quality delivery in education. Delivery is of poor quality, and according to Asiyai (2013), it is liable for the appalling reduction in the attitudes of students in institutions of higher learning in Nigeria and the increasing rate of examination malpractices. The problem of policy implementation comes when the implementers are not ready to translate theory into practice even though the policies were devised by well educated, literate and articulate administrators who have the insight for the betterment of the future (Bawalla, 2022).

Brain Drain

In recent times, the academic sector has witnessed a massive exit of talented, brilliant, young, experienced and efficient members of the academic to several other sectors in the Nigerian economy. The frustration of university life has forced them to flee in search of more challenging and rewarding sectors of the economy like the business world, politics while others travelled abroad for greener pastures (Oladejo, 2021). This turn of events has also resulted in

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

the unavailability of mentorship by capable and high-ranking lecturers in Nigerian universities meant to be enjoyed by junior researchers, a decrease in research outputs from suitable lecturers and a reduction in centers of research in Nigerian universities (Oladejo & Adenuga, 2021).

Theoretical Framework

Human Relations Theory

In a study conducted by Omodan, Cias and Bekithemba (2020) titled "Analysis of human relations theory of management: A quest to re-enact people's management towards peace in university system", human relations theory was employed to analyze people's management of peace in the university system. The study found out that the theory's axioms, such as participation, inclusion, and acknowledgement, the formation of affinity in the workplace, motivation, existing informal or formal social group and communication, are the strategic plan to personnel management. Human relations theory was propounded by Elton Mayo in 1924. He participated in several studies in an effort to understand employee behavior in the organization. His study in the Textile Mills was to investigate absenteeism and lack of productivity. His second study, popularly known as the Hawthorne experiments, was conducted at the Western Electricity Company, Chicago, to understand the relationship of cause and effect. The studies also focused on the relationship between the environment, the physical work, the productivity of the worker and their well-being. The first experiment was called the illumination experiment and it was conducted from 1924 to 1927 to examine how different levels of illumination affect workers' productivity. Another experiment was conducted in 1927 called Relay Assembly Test Room Experiment to observe how various changes in working conditions affect employees' output and morale. Bank Wiring Experiment of 1931 was done for one year to observe and analyze the effect of a natural setting on the group behavior of employees.

Mayo's study concluded that employees' morale and output are determined by the mental and societal factors at the organization as opposed to the environmental conditions of the workplace. To him, the organization is a social system and every non-monetary sanction and reward influence the workers' behavior, output and morale significantly; and that employees are social animals who are not unrelated individual, isolated or inert. He believes that the most efficient approach in managing employees is not necessarily a division of labor. Employees have the propensity to create small informal groups which initiate behavioral patterns and production norms. Also, employees' satisfaction, productivity and behavior are influenced by communication, style of supervision, participation and leadership style.

Inferring from the theory, the success of every educational institution depends on how well the management and administration apply different approaches to manage their staff which constitutes a great task. Members of academic staff are considered a major asset of the university in terms of their skills, productivity and performance which is very valuable to the success of the university (Oladejo, 2021). By managing them, it is imperative to try to motivate and encourage the academic staff by providing incentives that will appeal to the social, psychological and mental well-being.

Critics such as Shafritz, Ott and Jang (2005), Daft (2007), Markle (2011) and Larrick and Feiler (2013) claimed that this theory lacked a scientific base and that the experiments are not based on actual employee behavior, because they were predisposed to feeling important, receiving publicity and attention because of the research setting. Critics believe that when employees know they are being observed, they tend to react positively and often give their best. The theory also focused on interpersonal relations; thus, neglecting the nature of work. It ignored the fact that employee behavior and attitudes are greatly influenced by environmental factors.

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

Methodology

The study adopted an explanatory survey, predicated on a mixed method and was conducted in Southwestern Nigeria. For the purpose of this study, three states were chosen through balloting, and these included Ogun, Ondo and Osun States. Proportionally, the universities sampled included Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta (FUNAAB), Tai Solarin University of Education (TASUED), Crescent University, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State University of Science and Technology (OSUST), Ondo State, Wesley University of Science and Technology (WUSTO), Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Ile Ife, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology (LAUTECH) and Oduduwa University, Ipetumodu (OUI). The population of the study included all academic staff of the selected universities. Through proportional sampling, twenty-five per cent of the academic staff in each university was selected giving a total of nine hundred and sixty-nine (969) as the sample size. Data were collected using questionnaire and were later analyzed through SPSS

Results and discussion of findings

Results

Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

Data from table 1 show the socio-demographic characteristics of all the respondents in the selected universities as at the period of data collection. On the respondents' ages, 20.2% of the study population were between 21 and 40 years, 60% were between 41 and 60 years while 19.8% were above 61 years of age. This showed that, generally, the majority of the respondents was above 40 years of age in all the universities. However, there is exception to the case of OUI which has majority of the respondents (57.7%) below 40 years of age. This can be attributed to its year of establishment. On respondents' gender distribution, 77.7% of the respondents were males while the females were 22.3%. This showed the prevalence of males in the study and reduction in involvement of female academics in the study.

Data from the table also showed that 17.2% of the respondents were single, 79% were married, 1.9% were divorced and 1.6% were either a widow or widower while 0.2% were separated. This implies that ~~as~~ at the time of this study, the majority of the respondents were married. When cross tabulated, data showed that out of the 17 divorcees, only four were males, the rest were females. Also, amongst the 150 singles (and unmarried) when cross tabulated, 29 were females. When further analyzed, out of the 29 single (and unmarried) females, 21 of them were above 30 years of age (with the least being 33 years old). And out of the 21 females above 30 years of age, 12 had been an academic staff over three years.

The table also showed information on the number of children respondents had in the time the study was conducted. 17% of the respondents had no children, 48.6% had between one and three (1 – 3) children, 32.2% had between four and six (4 – 6) children and 2.3% had above six children as at the time of the survey. This indicates that the majority of the respondents (83.1%) had children. When cross tabulated, only the respondents above 60 years of age had above 6 children irrespective of their gender, rank or religion. This partly reflect that there could be no consideration for birth control or family planning though this was not probed because it is not embedded in the scope of the study.

Concerning respondents' rank in their universities of employment, that 62.3% of the study population were senior academic staff (Professors 24.4%, Readers 14% and Senior Lecturers 23.9%) while 37.7% were junior academic staff (Lecturer I 16.3%, Lecturer II 20.6% and Assistant Lecturers 0.8%). However, findings showed that the federal universities sample had more senior academic staff (50.1%) than the state (10.5%) and private universities (1.3%)

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

combined. Also, in the result, state universities had most junior academic staff (20.2%) than federal (9.3%) and private universities (8.6%). Data further indicated that the majority of the respondents in the private and state universities with the exception of TASUED were junior lecturers. As a result, the majority of the respondents in the federal universities were senior lecturers with Professors having the highest representation (24.4%) at the time of the study. Only FUNAAB had fewer representations of Professors in the study.

Data on the respondents' highest educational qualification showed that 14.5% of the respondents had a Master's Degree and 85.5% had their doctorate degree. When rated on ownership basis, only WUSTO (a private university) had a higher number of respondents with PhD like the majority of their counterparts in the state and federal universities. This showed that most of the respondents' highest educational qualification at the time this study was conducted was PhD. This may be attributed to the fact that PhD is fast becoming the minimum requirement for appointments into the university system.

Lastly, the study found out that, on respondents' religion, 75.8% of the respondents were Christians, 24.1% practiced Islam, while 0.1% practiced traditional faith. This indicated that most of the respondents were Christians. Meanwhile, data showed that most of the respondents from religious based institutions practiced the faith of the founders (WUSTO 100% and Crescent University 100%). This signifies that religious ownership has a major influence on employment in these particular study areas.

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Institutions/Variables		PRIVATE						FEDERAL						STATE							
		WUSTO		CRESCENT		OUI		FUNAAB		FUTA		OAU		LAUTECH		OSUST		TASUED		TOTAL	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
AGE	21 - 30 years	2	6.3	-	-	3	11.5	7	5.9	4	4.1	13	4.3	3	2.3	-	-	-	-	**32**	**3.7**
	31 - 40 years	4	12.5	5	17.9	12	46.2	11	9.3	12	12.4	45	14.8	21	16.4	17	33.3	17	19.1	**144**	**16.5**
	41 - 50 years	9	28.1	11	39.3	6	23.1	51	43.2	37	38.1	78	25.7	64	50	30	58.8	26	29.2	**312**	**35.7**
	51 - 60 years	8	25	5	17.9	4	15.4	17	14.4	23	23.7	79	26	31	24.2	4	7.8	41	46.1	**212**	**24.3**
	above 60 years	9	28.1	7	25	1	3.8	32	27.1	21	21.6	89	29.3	9	7	-	-	5	5.6	**173**	**19.8**
	Total	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**304**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**873**	**100**
SEX	Male	20	62.5	21	75	17	65.4	96	81.4	71	73.2	242	79.6	100	78.1	46	90.2	60	67.4	**678**	**77.7**
	Female	12	37.5	7	25	9	34.6	22	18.6	26	26.8	62	20.4	28	21.9	5	9.8	29	32.6	**195**	**22.3**
	Total	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**304**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**873**	**100**
MARITAL STATUS	Single	8	25	5	17.9	2	7.7	17	14.4	20	20.6	59	19.4	14	10.9	17	33.3	8	9	**150**	**17.2**
	Married	23	71.9	22	78.6	23	88.5	101	85.6	74	76.3	230	75.7	104	81.3	34	66.7	79	88.8	**690**	**79**
	Divorced	1	3.1	1	3.6	-	-	-	-	1	1	10	3.3	3	2.3	-	-	1	1.1	**17**	**1.9**
	Widowed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.1	5	1.6	7	5.5	-	-	-	-	**14**	**1.6**
	Separated	-	-	-	-	1	3.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			1	1.1	**2**	**.2**
	Total	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**304**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**873**	**100**
NO. OF CHILDREN	No Child	9	28.1	8	28.6	10	38.5	17	14.4	19	19.6	53	17.4	6	4.7	14	27.5	12	13.5	**148**	**17**
	1 – 3	11	34.4	14	50	13	50	45	38.1	44	45.4	123	40.5	79	61.7	34	66.7	61	68.5	**424**	**48.6**
	4 – 6	11	34.4	5	17.9	2	7.7	53	44.9	33	34	116	38.2	43	33.6	3	5.9	15	16.9	**281**	**32.2**
	7 and above	1	3.1	1	3.6	1	3.8	3	2.5	1	1	12	3.9	-	-	-	-	1	1.1	**20**	**2.3**
	Total	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**304**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**873**	**100**
RANK	A L	-	-	19	67.9	2	7.7	1	.8	-	-	2	.7	-	-	-	-	2	2.2	**7**	**.8**
	L II	16	50	3	10.7	10	38.5	7	5.9	6	6.2	15	4.9	48	37.5	43	84.3	16	18	**180**	**20.6**
	L I	10	31.3	4	14.3	11	42.3	10	8.5	18	18.6	23	7.6	42	32.8	3	5.9	22	24.7	**142**	**16.3**
	S L	5	15.6	1	3.6	3	11.5	75	63.6	15	15.5	49	16.1	17	13.3	3	5.9	38	42.7	**209**	**23.9**
	Reader	1	3.1	1	3.6	-	-	14	11.9	20	20.6	66	21.7	11	8.6	2	3.9	7	7.9	**122**	**14**
	Prof	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	9.3	38	39.2	149	49	10	7.8	-	-	4	4.5	**213**	**24.4**
	Total	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**304**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**873**	**100**
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION	Masters	7	21.9	20	71.4	14	53.8	18	15.3	-	-	5	42.4	41	32	19	37.3	3	3.4	**127**	**14.5**
	PhD	25	78.1	8	28.6	12	46.2	100	84.7	97	100	299	57.6	87	68	32	62.7	86	96.6	**746**	**85.5**
	Total	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**304**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**873**	**100**
UNIVERSITY OWNERSHIP	Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	118	100	97	100	304	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	**519**	**59.5**
	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	128	100	51	100	89	100	**268**	**30.7**

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

Institutions/Variables		PRIVATE						FEDERAL						STATE							
		WUSTO		CRESCENT		OUI		FUNAAB		FUTA		OAU		LAUTECH		OSUST		TASUED		TOTAL	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
	Private	32	100	28	100	26	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**86**	**9.9**
	Total	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**304**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**873**	**100**
RESIDENCE	On-campus		-	-	-	-	-	18	15.3	-	-	50	16.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	**68**	**7.8**
	University town	32	100	28	100	22	84.6	20	16.9	46	47.4	254	83.6	112	87.5	16	31.4	18	20.2	**548**	**62.8**
	Neighboring town	-	-	-	-	4	15.4	80	67.8	51	52.6	-	-	16	12.5	35	68.6	60	67.4	**246**	**28.2**
	Neighboring state	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	12.4	**11**	**1.3**
	Total	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**304**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**873**	**100**
RELIGION	Christian	32	100	0	0	18	69.2	94	79.7	75	77.3	256	84.2	87	68	40	78.4	60	67.4	**662**	**75.8**
	Islam	0	0	28	100	8	30.8	24	20.3	22	22.7	48	15.8	41	32	11	21.6	28	31.5	**210**	**24.1**
	Traditional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	**1**	**0.1**
	Total	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**304**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**873**	**100**

Source: Fieldwork (2022)

Teaching and Supervision load in the selected Universities

Table 2 shows the reports of teaching and supervision schedule of academic staff for both undergraduate and postgraduate programs in all the selected universities.

Undergraduate Programs

Data showed that respondents that taught part time, distant learning and diploma programs constituted 45.3% of the entire study, although when cross tabulated the population comprised more of junior academic staff. Also, the study showed that not all the schools examined run pre-degree programs and some of the institutions did not involve regular academic staff in pre-degree and diploma programs (OAU).

On the duration spent on teaching undergraduates per day, the study found out that the majority of the respondents (80.9%) taught between one to four hours per day. When cross-tabulated, data further showed that junior lecturers in state and private universities taught more than four hours per day. This is often because they were paired with senior academic staff on course allocation and the latter because of commitment to administrative and other university community responsibilities compelled the junior academic staff to take classes on behalf of the senior academic staff. Hence, increasing the hours spent in class for undergraduate lectures.

The study found out that six tertiary institutions academic staff taught undergraduate classes more than four times in a week, although data showed that this population accounted for 22.8% of the entire study and it is more prevalent among junior academic staff in all private and two federal universities when cross-tabulated.

On the average number of courses taught per semester, the study found out that 73.3% of the respondents taught more than two courses per semester. A larger percentage of this occurred in the selected state and private universities.

Most of the respondents (77.7%) taught more than 60 students per class, although in the results presented in Table 5.6.1a, public universities fall in the category of the institutions where academic staff taught above the population of 60 undergraduate students per class. The study also further showed that private universities had their fair share of inclusion in the league of institutions with larger undergraduate students attending lectures.

The study found out that the majority of the respondents (64.4%) marked examinations scripts after three weeks of conducting the exams. This population is mostly comprised of senior academic staff across the selected institutions. The others that marked their scripts within two

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

weeks were led by private universities, followed by public universities. Data showed that the majority of the respondents (76.6%) submit examination results after three weeks. When cross-tabulated, this population consisted of senior academic staff (mostly Readers and Professors) of the selected public universities. Meanwhile, private universities apart from OUI submit examination results within three weeks.

On supervision, the study found out that 15.4% of the study population supervised more than 10 undergraduates per session. When cross-tabulated, data showed that supervising above 10 students is peculiar to public institutions as indicated in Table 5.6.1a and this further showed that they were junior academic staff who either supervised diploma and part time students and those who inherited rejected students from the senior academic staff.

Findings from the study showed that a larger percentage of the study population supervised students for a duration of four to five months with the exception of FUTA where the duration lasts above 5 months.

Postgraduate programs

As presented in the table, 46.7% of the respondents taught postgraduate programs. The findings encompassed the public universities apart from OSUST which just obtained approval to commence postgraduate programs few months prior to the study. When cross-tabulated, data showed that respondents from OUI who taught postgraduate programs with the rank of Assistant Lecturers were assigned to only teach candidates that enrolled for postgraduate diploma.

On the average number of courses taught per semester, the study found out that 46.7% of the study population taught postgraduate courses. Also, 18.2% of the entire population indicated teaching more than one postgraduate course while 28.5% indicated teaching just one postgraduate course. When cross-tabulated, data showed that most of the academic staff from private university (OUI) who taught postgraduate courses taught Postgraduate diploma.

Data showed that respondents from the federal universities (13.8%) indicated that they taught postgraduate classes more than three times in a week. When cross-tabulated, this consisted of senior academic staff and mostly dominated by Senior lecturers and Readers apart from OAU where Professors take postgraduate courses more than other federal institutions. Findings showed that teaching postgraduate courses was more prevalent in federal universities.

Data on the number of postgraduate student's academic staff taught per class showed that out of the 46.7% of the respondents that taught postgraduate classes, 18.2% of the academic staff taught more than 10 postgraduate students per class. This only included the public institutions.

On supervision, data showed that in some institutions, respondents supervised projects between seven to eight months. These were mostly PGDE in the case of TASUED and PGD for other universities. On the duration of supervision, majority of the respondents (31.5%) indicated that the average duration for postgraduate project supervision was above eight months. These include the postgraduate diploma, masters (academic and professional) and PhD.

Table 2: Teaching and Supervision Load of Academic Staff in the selected Universities

S/N	STATEMENTS		FEDERAL						STATE						PRIVATE						TOTAL	
			OAU		FUNAAB		FUTA		LAUTECH		OSUST		TASUED		WUSTO		CRESCENT		OUI			
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Which other undergraduate programmes do you teach?	None	304	100	17	14.4	56	57.7	16	12.5	51	100	-	-	10	31.3	24	85.7	-	-	**478**	**54.8**
		Part-time	-	-	101	85.6	41	42.3	112	87.5	-	-	76	85.4	22	68.8	4	14.3	-	-	**356**	**40.8**
		Diploma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	14.6	-	-	-	-	26	100	**39**	**4.5**
		Pre-degree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
2		Yes	112	36.8	61	51.7	70	72.2	55	43	-	-	89	100	-	-	-	-	21	81.8	**408**	**46.7**

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

S/N	STATEMENTS		FEDERAL						STATE						PRIVATE						TOTAL	
			OAU		FUNAAB		FUTA		LAUTECH		OSUST		TASUED		WUSTO		CRESCENT		OUI			
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
	I take postgraduate programmes	No	192	63.2	57	48.3	27	27.8	73	57	51	100	-	-	32	100	28	100	5	19.2	**465**	**53.3**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
3	Number of hours you teach per day (undergraduate)	1 hr	24	7.9					19	14.8	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	**43**	**4.9**
		2 hrs	44	14.5	19	16.1	56	57.7	49	38.3	-	-	74	83.1	24	75	-	-	-	-	**266**	**30.5**
		3 hrs	44	14.5	35	29.7	14	14.4	19	14.8	33	64.7			8	25	-	-	-	-	**153**	**17.5**
		4 hrs	65	21.4	64	54.2	13	13.4	41	32	18	35.3	15	16.9	-	-	28	100	-	-	**244**	**27.9**
		Above 4 hrs	127	41.8	-	-	14	14.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	100	**167**	**19.1**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
4	Number of times you teach per week (undergraduate)	1 time	19	6.3	-	-	28	28.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**47**	**5.4**
		2 times	25	8.2	38	32.2	-	-	57	44.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	71.4	-	-	**140**	**16**
		3 times	119	39.1			27	27.8	55	43	51	100	85	95.5	-	-	4	14.3	-	-	**341**	**39.1**
		4 times	47	15.5	18	15.3	42	43.3	16	12.5	-	-	2	2.2	21	65.6	-	-	-	-	**146**	**16.7**
		Above 4 times	94	30.9	62	52.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.2	11	34.4	4	14.3	26	100	**199**	**22.8**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
5	Number of times you teach per week (postgraduate)	Nil	192	63.2	57	48.3	27	27.8	73	57	51	100	-	-	32	100	28	100	5	19.2	**465**	**53.3**
		1 time	45	14.8	18	15.3	-	-	39	30.5	-	-	88	98.9	-	-	-	-	12	46.2	**202**	**23.1**
		2 times	-	-	18	15.3	42	43.3	16	12.5	-	-	1	1.1	-	-	-	-	9	34.6	**86**	**9.9**
		3 times	24	7.9			28	28.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**52**	**6**
		Above 3 times	43	14.1	25	21.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**68**	**7.8**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
6	Number of undergraduate courses you teach on the average per semester	1	19	6.3	-	-	14	14.4	35	27.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**68**	**7.8**
		2	84	27.6	-	-	28	28.9	17	13.3	-	-	3	3.4	28	87.5	5	17.9	-	-	**165**	**18.9**
		3	83	27.3	75	63.6	41	42.3	76	59.4	51	100	84	94.4	4	12.5	5	17.9	-	-	**419**	**48**
		4	93	30.6	18	15.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	64.3	2	7.7	**131**	**15**
		5	25	8.2	25	21.2	14	14.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	26.9	**71**	**8.1**
		Above 5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.2	-	-	-	-	17	65.4	**19**	**2.2**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
7	Number of undergraduate students you teach per class	1-30	25	8.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	100	-	-	-	-	**57**	**6.5**
		31-60	54	17.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	42	82.4	-	-	-	-	24	85.7	18	69.2	**138**	**15.8**
		61-90	44	14.5	45	38.1	28	28.9	-	-	-	-	12	13.5	-	-	4	14.3	8	30.8	**141**	**16.2**
		91 and above	181	59.5	73	61.9	69	71.1	128	100	9	17.6	77	86.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	**537**	**61.5**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
8	Number of postgraduate courses you teach on the average per semester	Nil	192	63.2	57	48.3	27	27.8	73	57	51	100	-	-	32	100	28	100	5	19.2	**465**	**53.3**
		1	69	22.7	35	29.7	41	42.3	39	30.5	-	-	65	73	-	-	-	-	-	-	**249**	**28.5**
		2	43	14.1	18	15.3	28	28.9	-	-	-	-	24	27	-	-	-	-	21	80.8	**134**	**15.3**
		3	-	-			1	1	16	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**17**	**1.9**
		Above 3	-	-	8	6.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**8**	**.9**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
9	Number of postgraduate students you teach per class	N/A	192	63.2	57	48.3	27	27.8	73	57	51	100	-	-	32	100	28	100	5	19.2	**465**	**53.3**
		1-5 students	93	30.6			14	14.4	19	14.8	-	-	58	65.2	-	-	-	-	21	80.8	**205**	**23.5**
		6-10 students	19	6.3	32	27.1	42	43.3	20	15.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**113**	**12.9**
		11-15 students	-	-	25	21.2	14	14.4	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	**25**	**2.9**
		16-20 students	-	-	2	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	11.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	**26**	**3**
		21 and above	-	-	2	1.7	-	-	16	12.5	-	-	21	23.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	**39**	**4.5**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
10	How soon do you mark your scripts after examination?	Within 1-2 weeks	108	35.5	38	32.2	28	28.9	38	29.7	22	43.1	13	14.6	32	100	28	100	4	15.4	**311**	**35.6**
		3 weeks	161	53	80	67.8	55	56.7	74	57.8	29	56.9	72	80.9	-	-	-	-	22	84.6	**493**	**56.5**
		One month	35	11.5	-	-	14	14.4	16	12.5	-	-	4	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	**69**	**7.9**
		Above 1 month	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
11	How soon do you submit your results after examination	Within 1-2 weeks	108	35.5	20	16.9	-	-	33	25.8	-	-	28	31.5	11	34.4	4	14.3	-	-	**204**	**23.4**
		3 weeks	44	14.5	56	47.5	69	71.1	60	46.9	6	11.8	61	68.5	21	65.6	24	85.7	4	15.4	**284**	**32.5**
		One month	152	50	42	35.6	28	28.9	35	27.3	45	88.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	57.7	**378**	**43.3**
		Above 1 month	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	26.9	**7**	**.8**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

S/N	STATEMENTS		FEDERAL						STATE						PRIVATE						TOTAL	
			OAU		FUNAAB		FUTA		LAUTECH		OSUST		TASUED		WUSTO		CRESCENT		OUI			
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
12	Number of undergraduate students you supervise on the average per session	1-5	216	71.1	21	17.8	41	42.3	92	71.9	51	100	-	-	32	100	3	10.7	-	-	**456**	**52.2**
		6-10	53	17.4	97	82.2	42	43.3	20	15.6	-	-	25	28.1	-	-	19	67.9	26	100	**282**	**32.3**
		11-15	-	-	-	-	14	14.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	21.4	-	-	**20**	**2.3**
		16-20	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**16**	**1.8**
		21 and above	35	11.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64	71.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	**99**	**11.3**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
13	Duration of supervision for undergraduates	2 months	30	9.9			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	19.2	**35**	**4**
		3 months	40	13.2	18	15.3	-	-	19	14.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**77**	**8.8**
		4 months	87	28.6	65	55.1	-	-	89	69.5	4	7.8	23	25.8	13	40.6	9	32.1	21	80.8	**311**	**35.6**
		5 months	69	22.7	35	29.7	14	14.4	20	15.6	47	92.2	64	71.9	19	59.4	19	67.9	-	-	**287**	**32.9**
		Above 5 months	78	25.7	-	-	83	85.6	-	-	-	-	2	2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	**163**	**18.7**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
14	Number of postgraduate students you supervise on the average per session	Nil	217	71.4	75	63.6	27	27.8	73	57	51	100	-	-	32	100	28	100	5	19.2	**508**	**58.2**
		1-5	43	14.1	25	21.2	70	72.2	52	40.6	-	-	77	86.5	-	-	-	-	21	80.8	**288**	**33**
		6-10	25	8.2	18	15.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	13.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	**55**	**6.3**
		11-15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		16 and above	19	6.3	-	-	-	-	3	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**22**	**2.5**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**
15	Duration of supervision for postgraduates	N/A	217	71.4	75	63.6	27	27.8	73	57	51	100	-	-	32	100	28	100	5	19.2	**508**	**58.2**
		5 months	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		6 months	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		7 months	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	14.8	-	-	3	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	**22**	**2.5**
		8 months	-	-	18	15.3	-	-	16	12.5	-	-	30	33.7	-	-	-	-	4	15.4	**68**	**7.8**
		Above 8 months	87	28.6	25	21.2	70	72.2	20	15.6	-	-	56	62.9	-	-	-	-	17	65.4	**275**	**31.5**
		Total	**304**	**100**	**118**	**100**	**97**	**100**	**128**	**100**	**51**	**100**	**89**	**100**	**32**	**100**	**28**	**100**	**26**	**100**	**873**	**100**

Source: Fieldwork (2022)

Discussion of findings

The main objective of this article was to appraise the teaching and supervision load of academic staff. The study found out that most of the academic staff taught full time students (undergraduates and postgraduates), while some academic staff were engaged with other programs like part-time and diploma; only a minority of them teach postgraduate studies alongside. When assessed based on staff to students' ratio, one to thirty respectively as recommended in the revised National Universities Commission (NUC) Benchmark Minimum Academic Standards (BMAS) in 2017, the workload on academic staff in public institutions were quite much and this can hinder the quality of education and performance of academic staff and students.

Also, the majority of academic staff taught between two to four hours per day and three times and above in a week, while a larger percentage of them teach three courses and above with ninety-one and above students in class. This shows that the pressure placed on teaching and processing of results is quite high, which may explain why it takes them between three to four weeks to mark scripts after examination and submit such scripts after a month. This supports the findings of Oladejo (2021) and Adisa & Oladejo (2022) that Nigerian universities place emphasis on teaching, which is why several products of Nigerian universities thrive everywhere in the world with proven remarkable records. Meanwhile, Agba & Ocheni (2017) had earlier stated that the increasing population of university entrants increases workload for academic employees and this definitely has impact on other job performance such as research, laboratory works and community service. Another implication of the heavy workload on academic staff job performance is that the available infrastructure to facilitate teaching has not been increased and improved to accommodate the ever-increasing number of university entrants

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

over the years. Although this study found out that heavy teaching workload is the most pronounced heavy task on academics, Bello, Ogundipe & Eze (2017) revealed that there is increasing demand for specific medium of publication for global index and high impact factor relevance among Nigerian universities. On final year project supervision for undergraduates, most of the academic staff supervised an average of ten students usually within five months' duration.

On postgraduate studies, most of the respondents involved taught classes once in a week, two courses on the average per semester with an average of ten students per class, supervised an average of five students within the duration of eight months and above. This is in tandem with the argument of Oladejo and Adenuga (2021) on the increasing teaching and supervision workload of academic staff in Nigerian universities.

Conclusion and recommendation

From the study, it can be concluded that the teaching and supervision load of the academic staff was quite heavy, thereby maintaining the performance of academic staff in terms of their teaching and supervision in the selected universities is unsatisfactory. A recommendation was further made that a moderate or lesser teaching and supervision load can be achieved if more academic staff are employed.

REFERENCES

Adewusi, O. A., Ogunyemi, S. Y. and Aluko, Y. A. (2017). Motivation and ethics: critical factors for sustainable public service delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities, Social Sciences and Creative Arts, 12,* 38-60.

Adisa, A. L., and Oladejo, S. Y. (2022). Content analysing work performance of lecturers in Southwestern Nigeria. *Journal of Education, Society and Multiculturalism, 3*(2), 37-45

Agba, M. S. and Ocheni, S. I. (2017). An empirical study of the effects of work environment (electric power supply) on job performance of academic staff in Nigerian public and private universities. *Higher Education of Social Science, 12,* 11-21.

Akbar, A., and Akhter, W. (2011). Faculty stress at higher education: A study on the business schools of Pakistan. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, 1082,* 345-362.

Amie-Ogan, O. T., & Fekarurhobo, B. E. (2021). Perceived influence of work overload on academic staff job performance in universities in Rivers State. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences & Humanities Research 9*(2), 56-67.

Archibong, I. A., Bassey, A. O., & Effiom, D. O. (2010). Occupational Stress sources among university academic staff. *European Journal of Educational Studies, 2*(3), 217-225.

Asiyai, R. I. (2013). Challenges of Quality in Higher Education in Nigeria in the 21st Century. *International Journal of Educational Planning & Administration, 3*(2), 159-172.

Bawalla O G. (2022), Sustainability and free education policy: an examination of public secondary schools in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Iranian Journal of Educational Sociology, 4*(4), 1-9.

Bawalla, O. (2020). Coping strategies of today's public secondary school teachers, Ogun State, Nigeria. Dhaulagiri *Journal of Sociology and Anthropology, 14,* 116-123. https://doi.org/10.3126/dsaj.v14i0.27066.

Bawalla., O. G & Adenugba, A. A. (2021). Financial rewards and job commitment among public secondary school teachers in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology, 15,* 72-81. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/dsaj.v15i01.41928.

Bello, A. O., Ogundipe, O. M. and Eze, S. C. (2017). Employee job satisfaction in Nigerian tertiary institution: A Comparative study of academic staff in public and private universities. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management, 5,* 33-46.

Daft, R. (2007). *Understanding the Theory and Design of Organizations*. Mason, OH: Thomson South Western

Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., and Jang, Y. S. (2005). *Classics of Organization Theory* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ifedili, C. J., & Omiunu, S. (2012). Supervision of undergraduate final year's project requirement in Nigerian universities-The way out of the wood. *Asian Culture and History, 4(*2), 153-165.

Iruonagbe, Imhonopi & Egharevba, 2015 Iruonagbe, C. T., Imhonopi, D., & Egharevba, M. E. (2015). Higher education in Nigeria and the emergence of private universities. *International Journal of Education and*

DOI: 10.2478/eras-2022-0006

Research, 3(2), 49-64.

Larrick, G. and Feiler, R. (2013). Theory X and Theory Y: HR Strategy. In D. J. Teece & M. Augier (Eds.), *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Strategic Management.* New York: Palgrave McMillan

Markle, A. B. (2011). Dysfunctional learning in decision processes: the case of employee reciprocity. *Strategic Management Journal, 32,* 1411–1425.

National Universities Commission (2017). *Benchmark Minimum Academic Standards (BMAS) For Undergraduate Programmes in Nigerian Universities*. https://www.mciu.edu.ng › nuc-bmas-download. Assessed On 3/10/2019

Ogunyemi, S. Y., Adenuga, A. O. and Lawal, O. (2019). Sociological assessment of job-related experiences of female academics in selected universities in Ogun state. *Ilorin Journal of Sociology, 11* (1&2), 14-26.

Oladejo, S. Y. (2021). Work-Life Balance: Coping strategies of female academics in selected universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Management of Organizations: Systematic Research, 86,* 65-74.

Oladejo, S. Y. and Adenuga, A. O. (2021). Challenges of recruitment in a Nigerian tertiary institution: A case study of Ondo State University of Science and Technology (OSUSTECH), *KIU Journal of Social Sciences, 7* (2), 99-103.

Ologunde, A. O., Akindele, R. I. and Akande, W. O. (2013). Moonlighting among university lecturers and their performance in the South-Western Nigeria. *Journal of Management and Sustainability, 3,* 92-104

Omodan, B. I., Cias T. T, and Bekithemba, D. (2020). Analysis of human relations theory of management: A quest to re-enact people's management towards peace in university system. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management 18*, 10.

Uchendu C. C., Nnaji, E. S. and Nwafor, I. A. (2016). Physical work environment and academic staff productivity in universities in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, 1,* 14-25.