European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

doi: 10.5281/zenodo.268381 Volume 3 | Issue 3 | 2017

STAFFING AND THE QUALITY OF TEACHING IN UNIVERSITIES

Luija Marie Ezati Azikuru[1i], David Onen[2], Betty A. Ezati[3]
[1,2,3]Makerere University, College of Education and External Studies
Kampala, Uganda

Abstract:
This study sought to establish the influence of staffing on the quality of teaching in Uganda's public universities. It was undertaken in the face of persistent stakeholder concerns regarding the declining quality of teaching and learning in these institutions that have occasionally culminated into student strikes and different kinds of protests. Basing on a mixed-methods approach, the study employed the descriptive cross-sectional survey design where both qualitative and quantitative data were collected from 14 academic managers, 111 academic staff, and 285 undergraduate university students of Kyambogo University using survey and interview methods. The collected data from staff and students were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression techniques while content analysis technique was used to analyze qualitative data collected by interviewing purposively selected university managers. The study findings revealed that: first, staff recruitment (B=.182; p=.040), staff training (B=.340; p=.000), and development (B=.327; p=.000) have statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Meanwhile, staff deployment (B=.010; p=.914) has statistically insignificant influence on the quality of teaching. However, overall, the study revealed that staffing (R=.683; R^2=.467; p=.000) significantly influences the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. Therefore, it was concluded that effective staffing would raise the quality of teaching in universities, other factors held constant. The study thus recommends that university managers and staff should stick to the prescribed recruitment policy, invest more resources in training and developing staff, and ensure that existing staff are generally well-managed.

Keywords: staffing, recruitment, deployment, teaching quality, training, staff development

[i] Correspondent authors: email marieezati@gmail.com, donenotoo@cees.mak.ac.ug

1. Introduction

Following the massification of higher education (HE) worldwide, different stakeholders have been apprehensive about the quality of education that higher education institutions (HEIs) offer to their learners. These concerns have been underpinned by the belief that it is pedagogically challenging to teach larger than smaller classes. However, educational theorists believe that with effective staffing, the quality of teaching even in large classes could be enhanced. In Uganda, the HE sector has tremendously expanded in the past two decades especially the private HE sector. Unfortunately, according to the Uganda's National Council for Higher Education [NCHE] (2014), this increase in the number of HEIs as well as students have not been matched with a corresponding investment in the sector by both Government and the private sector; thus raising concern about the quality of teaching and learning in these institutions. This study was therefore intended to investigate the influence of staffing on the quality of teaching in Uganda's public universities. It arose as a result of the persistent complaints from stakeholders about the declining quality of teaching and learning in these institutions that have occasionally culminated into student strikes and different kinds of protests. In this section, the authors present the background to the study and the research objectives.

This study was premised on the input-process-output (IPO) model, sometimes referred to as the input-transformation-output (ITO) model. This model is widely used by scholars and researchers in explaining a variety of things that happen in work organizations including the performance of teams, staffing and many others. But, the IPO model has its roots in classic systems theory which according to Chikere and Nwoka (2015) "*focuses on the arrangement of and relations between the parts and how they work together as a whole. The way the parts are organized and how they interact with each other, determines the properties of that system*." (p.1). Similarly, according to an Anonymous author (2017), "*the IPO model has a causal structure, in that outputs are a function of various group processes, which are in turn influenced by numerous input variables*" (para 2). In short, the model looks at what takes place in an organization (or organism) in terms of the kind of inputs it receives, the transformation processes the inputs undergo which eventually would determine the resultant output of that organization. In this study, the model was opted for because the researchers viewed the staffing function of organizations including universities as an input, transformation process as well as the eventual output; that is, staffing brings in the necessary inputs to the university (in terms of staff), and the subsequent staffing functions such as deployment, training and development serve as the transformation processes as well as the outcomes of the institution (in terms of well qualified and motivated staff) that is capable of performing

well (that is, carryout effective teaching). The researchers have however used this theoretical framework while aware of the difficulties that can be faced in distinguishing the phases of the IPO model that each of the investigated staffing functions could be placed by other researchers.

The study focused on two key concepts, namely: staffing and quality of teaching in public universities. Generally, staffing was earlier considered to be part of organization function of management. However in order to give staffing proper emphasis, it has now been recognized as a separate management function. Nonetheless, different scholars still define the term staffing differently depending on the context in which they use it. According to Koontz (cited in Akrani, 2011), "*staffing means filling and keeping filled, positions in the organization structure"* (para2). This implies that staffing involves recruiting, deploying, training, and developing staff while at work. In fact, Koontz and Weihrich (2005) reiterate that staffing is the process of recruiting and facilitating staff to carryout effectively their work. This view is in consonant with that of Gullick and Urwick who as early as 1937 had defined staffing as a whole personnel function of bringing in and training of staff as well as maintenance of favorable conditions of work for employees to perform their duties. Basing on these definitions, staffing in this study was looked at in terms of the process by which the academic staff of Kyambogo University are recruited, deployed, trained and developed and how these processes influence the quality of teaching in the institution.

The other concept of importance in the study was quality of teaching. The term quality of teaching has no universally agreed upon meaning; and most often, it is erroneously used interchangeably with concepts such as quality teaching, quality of education, and teaching quality. However, Ngware, Ciera, Musyoka and Oketch (2015) define quality of teaching as the status of instruction given to learners in the course of teaching and learning. In that regard, good quality teaching is said to occur when a teacher makes effective instruction that promotes excellence and student learning outcomes through best practices. But the reverse is said to be true if a teacher makes instructions that do not yield desirable learning outcomes. In this study, quality of teaching was looked in terms of the way teachers instruct students, interact with them, utilize the allocated time, and generally carryout their teaching functions.

Contextually, this study was conducted in a public university in a developing country. In the recent past, universities in Uganda have experienced different forms of unrests emanating from complaints raised by different stakeholders including students and staff. According to Businge (2008) and Teferra (2014), some of these unrests have been as a result of the deteriorating quality of services offered to students including: teaching, loss of coursework and examination marks, delays in issuing academic transcripts, etc. The researchers agreed with Lejeune (2009) who argued that if such

situations were not reversed, then the efforts by Ugandan universities to catch up with international higher education standards would remain in jeopardy; thus, the need for this investigation.

2. Study Objectives

Generally, this study was envisioned to investigate the influence of staffing on the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. Specifically, the study looked at the influence of (i) staff recruitment; (ii) deployment; (iii) training; and (iv) development on the quality of teaching at Kyambogo University, one of the nine public universities in the country.

3. Review of Literature

A few scholars have already investigated the issues of staffing and teaching quality in higher education institutions [HEIs] (Chen & Lo, 2012; Fernandes, Ross, & Meraj, 2013; Moreira, Da Luz, Da Rocha, & Kolbe Jr, 2015; Ramsden, Prosser, Trigwell & Martin, 2007; Sahney, Banwet, Karunes, 2010). In the majority of these studies, staffing was conceptualized in different ways including how the staff are recruited, deployed, trained, and developed. For instance, Chen and Lo (2012) carried out a nationwide study in China to assess the psychometric properties of the nursing student' satisfaction scale (NSSS), and they discovered that staff training and development were determinants of teaching quality. Fernandes, Ross, and Meraj (2013) also carried out an investigation in a British-based university in the United Arab Emirates. Their findings revealed that teaching quality is dependent on several factors including the quality of academic staff. They however emphasized that the quality of academic staff is associated with the way in which they are recruited, trained and developed, other factors notwithstanding.

In another study by Chalmers (2008), she discovered that effective teaching is based on several factors including the knowledge and skills acquired during training and staff development programmes. Harris and Sass (2011) also agreed with this observation but reiterated that effective training does not only improve the quality of teaching but also overall raises the productivity of teachers in whatever they do at school. But while several scholars have pointed out the linkage between staffing and the quality of teaching, many of these studies were carried out in the context of developed nations unlike the current study. Furthermore, there are limitations in some of the studies including the sample sizes used (Douglas, Douglas & Barnes, 2006). The

researchers identified these as gaps requiring further investigation; hence the need for this investigation.

4. Methodology

This study was majorly a quantitative study although both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. In terms of design, the researchers opted to employ the descriptive cross-sectional survey research design due to the kind of problem that the study was intended to resolve. Specifically, data were collected from Kyambogo University, one of the largest but not so old universities in Uganda. The researchers believed that Kyambogo University ably represented all the other eight public universities in the country since it apparently has all the characteristics of the older universities like Makerere as well as the younger ones such as Busitema University or Gulu University. Data were collected from a sample population of 14 academic managers, 111 academic staff, and 285 undergraduate university students totaling to 410 respondents using semi-structured questionnaires and interview guide. These tools were preferred because of the large number of respondents that were targeted in this study. Analysis of data was undertaken using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical techniques as well as content analysis method. In the next section of the paper, the results of the study are presented.

5. Results

5.1. Background Information on Respondents

Of the 410 respondents, their different background characteristics were captured and are presented here in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of staff and student respondents by background characteristics

Background Characteristic	Staff Attributes	Frequency	%	Students Attributes	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	62	55.9	Male	168	58.9
	Female	49	44.1	Female	117	41.9
	Total	111	100	Total	285	100
Age	< 30 years	5	4.5	<20 years	5	1.8
	30 – 39 years	30	27.0	20 – 24 years	142	49.9

	40 – 49 years	41	36.9	25 – 29 years	67	23.5
	>50 years	35	31.5	30+ years	71	24.9
	Total	111	100	Total	285	100
Faculty	Education	24	21.6	Education	52	18.3
	Science	23	20.7	Science	79	27.7
	Arts & Social Sciences	20	18.0	Arts & Social Sciences	44	15.4
	Engineering	11	9.9	Engineering	26	9.1
	Special Needs	14	12.6	Special Needs	45	15.8
	Management & Entrepreneurship	12	10.8	Management & Entrepreneurship	25	8.8
	Vocational Studies	7	6.3	Vocational Studies	14	4.9
	Total	111	100	Total	285	100
Length of Service in years (Staff) & Year of Study (Students)	< 5 years	12	10.8	Year 1	83	29.0
	5– 9 years	20	18.0	Year 2	111	39.0
	10– 14 years	27	24.3	Year 3	84	29.1
	>15 years	39	35.1	Year 4	7	2.5
	Total		100	Total	285	100

Results in Table 1 reveal that more male staff (62 or 55.9%) and students (168 or 58.9%) participated in this study than their female counterparts. This was in agreement with the records of the Departments of Academic Registrar (DAR) of Kyambogo University that indicate that the University has male staff and students than females (DAR, 2016). Second, the results also show that the bulk of the staff (76 or 68.4%) that were involved in this study were 40 years and above old - implying that the majority of them were mature enough to appreciate the importance of the issues under investigation. In the case of students, the majority of them (142 or 49.9%) who participated in the study were within 20 to 24 years of age. This is the age-group when most Ugandans are actually enrolled in higher education institutions. Third, the results also show that most staff respondents were drawn from the faculties of Education (24 or 21.6%), Science (23 or 20.7%), and Arts and Social Sciences (20 or 18.0%) respectively. While for the students, more respondents were drawn from the faculties of Science (79 or 27.7%), Education (52 or 18.3%), and Special Needs (45 or 15.8%) respectively. These distributions were more

or less in proportion to the sizes of student enrolment in the different faculties of the University. Lastly, the results in Table 1 indicate that the majority of the staff respondents (66 or 59.4%) have worked at Kyambogo University for at least 10 years. This implies that most of the respondents were knowledgeable about the issues that were under investigation. For the case of students, the results indicate that the majority of the respondents (111 or 39.0%) were second-years. This is actually the year when students are often very active in different university activities - including in participating in studies of this kind.

5.2 Descriptive Statistics on the Independent Variable – Staffing

The researchers presented several questions on the independent variable – staffing, that was conceptualized as staff recruitment, deployment, training and development whereby the respondents were to indicate their opinions on a scale with responses ranging from 1= not at all true, through 2 = slightly true, 3 = true about half the time, 4 = mostly true to 5 = completely true. However, the results were finally collated into three categories coded as 1= not true (NT), 2 = true about half the time (TAHT), and 3 = true and presented here in Table 2 for both staff and student respondents.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics on respondents' views over staffing

	Staff				**Students**			
Questionnaire Item	NT F (%)	TAHT F (%)	T F (%)	X	NT F (%)	TAHT F (%)	T F (%)	X
Recruitment effectively done	54 (48.6)	10 (9.0)	47 (42.4)	1.94	75 (26.3)	54 (18.9)	156 (54.8)	2.28
Deployment effectively carried out	8 (7.2)	15 (13.5)	88 (79.3)	2.72	77 (27.0)	51 (17.9)	157 (55.1)	2.28
Training is effectively carried out	19 (17.1)	19 (17.1)	73 (65.8)	2.49	107 (37.5)	72 (25.3)	106 (37.2)	1.20
Development is effectively carried out	14 (12.6)	16 (14.4)	81 (73.0)	2.60	69 (24.2)	57 (20.0)	159 (55.8)	2.32

The results in Table 2 indicate that more staff (54 or 48.6%; mean= 1.94) than student (75 or 26.3%; mean=2.28) respondents disagreed with the statement that "*recruitment at institutional and departmental levels at Kyambogo University*" were being effectively carried out. But a whole 42.4 percent of staff and 54.8 percent of student respondents agreed that recruitment at the University was effectively done. These findings suggest that both the staff and students are satisfied with the process of recruitment at the institution, and this could mean that the staff is competent in the conduct of their teaching job. With regard to whether the staff were being effectively deployed, the

results in Table 2 reveal that the majority of both staff (88 or 79.3%; mean=2.72) and student (157 or 55.1%; mean=2.28) respondents agreed that deployment at the University is often systematically done. These findings imply that the stakeholders are satisfied with the manner in which the staff of the University are being deployed. Results in Table 2 also indicate that more staff (73 or 65.8%: mean =2.49) than student (106 or 37.2%: mean =1.20) respondents agreed that further training of staff at the University is being effectively carried out. These findings suggest that the staff and student fraternity are satisfied with the way in which the training function at the institution is being handled. Finally, the results also reveal that more staff (81 or 73.0%: mean=2.60) than student (159 or 55.8%: mean =2.32) respondents agreed that staff development at the University is being effectively catered for. This could have happened because the staff were defending the quality of their teaching performance; yet, the students indicated that they still expect better quality teaching than the status quo. Overall, the results showed that the performance of the staffing function at Kyambogo University is moderate with mean responses ranging from 1.20 to 2.32. This implies that there is still room for improving the university' staffing function.

During the interviews held with some academic and non-academic staff involved in managing and conducting actual teaching, several interviewees expressed different opinions regarding staffing in the University. While a large number of interviewees expressed satisfaction with the manner in which the staffing function was being performed, many were equally dissatisfied with the way in which it was conducted. In fact, one head of department observed that "*while we know that the human resource policy of the university stipulates for the hiring of staff on merit, the reality on ground is far different. Most often, we fail to achieve quality because some of the recruitment of staff is not done on merit but on the basis of nepotism*". Another interviewee meanwhile said "*it is our bosses who often let us down because they do not provide the staff training and development opportunities equitably to all academic staff. This affects the way we teach*". All in all, while the majority of the interviewees agreed that there are efforts being made to recruit, deploy and develop academic staff at Kyambogo University, there is also consensus that a large number of university teaching staff may not be very effective due to several factors.

5.3 Descriptive Statistics on the Dependent Variable – Quality of Teaching

The researchers put forward questionnaire items on quality of teaching that the respondents could indicate their opinions by selecting an appropriate response from a range of responses on a scale with responses ranging from 1= not at all true, through 2 = slightly true, 3 = true about half the time, 4 = mostly true to 5 = completely true. However, the results were finally collated into three categories coded as 1= not true

(NT), 2 = true about half the time (TAHT), and 3 = true and presented here in Tables 3(a) and (b) below.

Table 3(a): Descriptive statistics on staff respondents' views over quality for teaching

Statements on Quality of Teaching	**Response Category**			
	Not True F (%)	**True About Half the Time F (%)**	**True F (%)**	**Mean**
1. Qualified staff is recruited	5 (4.5%)	15 (13.5%)	91 82.0%)	2.77
2. Varied pedagogies	8 (7.2%)	22 (19.8%)	81 (73.0%)	2.66
3 Teaching hours effectively used	7 (6.3%)	18 (16.2%)	86 (77.5%)	2.71
4. Course content is covered in time	7 6.3%)	20 (18.0%)	84 (75.7%)	2.69
5. Students satisfied with the teaching	6 (5.4%)	22 19.8%)	83 (74.8%)	2.69
6. Staff satisfied in this university	13 (11.7%)	30 (27.0%)	68 61.3%)	2.50
7.Undergraduate semester grades are high	10 (9.0%)	22 (19.8%)	79 (71.2%)	2.62
8. Undergraduate graduation rates are high	6 5.4%)	17 (15.3%)	88 (79.3%)	2.74

The results in Table 3(a) reveal that the staff perception of the quality of teaching was excellent for the most part. Out of the eight constructs to measure quality of teaching, seven were given a score of "true", while one, staff satisfaction with the university, scored "true about half the time". These statistical results indicated that the staff perception of the quality of teaching in their University was very good on seven dimensions, and fair on one dimension. It was reasonable to state that the quality of teaching was very good.

During interviews held with staff, many expressed different opinions on the quality of teaching at Kyambogo University. For instance, one staff said that "*the quality of teaching at Kyambogo University is good*"; while another observed that "*it is fair*". The statements requesting staff to indicate measures to be taken to improve quality of teaching yielded answers as follows: "*improve library resources*"; "*increase the provision of ICT and internet connectivity*"; "*University should emphasize staff development, staff motivation and the mentoring of students*"; and "*everyone - including students and staff should emphasize time management".* Overall, the staff respondents reported that the quality of teaching in the University was "*good*". This result was in consonance with the

managers' overall rating of the quality of teaching which also revealed that the quality of teaching "*is very good*".

Meanwhile, the student respondents were also asked to rate their opinions about the quality of teaching at Kyambogo University. The results are presented in Table 3(b) below.

Table 3(b): Descriptive statistics on student respondents' views over quality for teaching

	Response Category			
	Not True F (%)	**True About Half the Time F (%)**	**True F (%)**	**Mean**
1. My lecturers care about me	86(30.2%)	48(16.8%)	151(53.0%)	2.56
2. My lecturers are approachable	41(14.4%)	44(15.4%)	200(70.2%)	2.56
3. My courses have relevant content	19(6.7%)	30(10.5%)	236(82.8%)	2.76
4. My lecturers concerned about my success	32(11.2%)	42(14.7%)	211(74.1%)	2.63
5. The instruction given to me is excellent	38(5.4%)	22(19.8%)	188(66.0%)	2.53
6. My lecturers are fair to all students	42(14.7%)	59(20.7%)	184(64.6%)	2.50
7. My lecturers are knowledgeable	32(11.2%)	47(16.5%)	206(82.3%)	2.61
8. My lecturers are committed to their teaching job	33(11.6%)	46(16.1%)	206(82.3%)	2.61
9. My lecturers conduct reasonable course assessment	34(11.9%)	57(20.0%)	194(68.1%)	2.56
10. Intellect. growth obvious	63(22.1%)	62(21.8%)	160(55.2%)	2.34
11. Lecturers provide acad. Feedback	38(13.3%)	53(18.6%)	194(68.1%)	2.55
12. Course requirements clear	38(13.3%)	53(18.6%)	194(68.1%)	2.55
13. I get required info. on campus	52(18.2%)	60(21.1%)	173(60.7%)	2.42
14. I am aware of campus affairs	73(25.6%)	58(20.4%)	154(54.0%)	2.28
15. My lecturers are available	72(25.37%)	57(20.0%)	156(74.7%)	2.29
16. Lecturers are specialists	26(9.1%)	35(12.2%)	224(78.7%)	2.69
17. Channels for students' academic complaints	72(25.3%)	46(16.1%)	167(58.6%)	2.33

Results in Table 3(b) indicate that the students' perceptions of the quality of teaching were largely positive. Of the 17 constructs used to measure quality of teaching including approachability of lecturers, reasonable course requirements, experience of intellectual growth, lecturers being knowledgeable, commitment to academic excellence in the University, and relevance of course content were all given a Likert score of "*true*", confirmed by the mean response ranging from 2.34 to 2.76. These statistical results implied that the students perceived quality of teaching to be favorable on 10 out of 17 constructs, fair on three constructs and poor only on one construct. On the basis of these results, the researchers could reasonably state that the quality of teaching in Kyambogo University is '*very good*'. This finding, however, contradicted with the data collected

through interviews where some students revealed that some lecturers do not teach well and others were unavailable for consultation.

5.4 Verification of Research Hypotheses

This study was based on four research hypotheses, namely: H_1: Staff recruitment statistically has a significant influence on the quality of teaching; H_2: Staff deployment statistically has a significant influence on the quality of teaching; H_3: Staff training statistically has a significant influence on the quality of teaching; and H_4: Staff development statistically has a significant influence on the quality of teaching. To verify these hypotheses, first, the hypotheses were converted into null hypotheses. Thus, the tested null hypotheses were stated as follows: $H0_1$: Staff recruitment statistically has no significant influence on the quality of teaching; $H0_2$: Staff deployment statistically has no significant influence on the quality of teaching; $H0_3$: Staff training statistically has no significant influence on the quality of teaching; and $H0_4$: Staff development statistically has no significant influence on the quality of teaching. Second, the researchers generated indices to measure each of the variables, namely: staff recruitment (Staffrec), staff deployment (Staffdep), staff training (Stafftra), and staff development (staffdev) as well as quality of teaching (Teachquali) using data generated out of the questionnaires administered to the staff and student respondents. Thereafter, the hypotheses were tested with the use of the multiple regression technique. The results of the tests of the null hypotheses are presented in Tables 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c) below.

Table 4(a): Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.683[a]	.467	.447	.46380	.467	23.202	4	106	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Staffrec, Staffdep, Stafftra, and staffdev

b. Dependent Variable: Teachquali

The results in Table 4(a) show that the correlation coefficient between staffing and the quality of teaching is positive with an R value of 0.683 and R^2 of 0.467. These results suggest that a unit change in staffing brings about 0.467 (46.7%) increase in the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.000, lower than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that staffing has a statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching.

In other words, the more effective the staffing of university, the better the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. However, to determine whether the overall

regression model is a good fit for the data, the researchers proceeded to perform the F-ratio test which results are presented in Table 4(b).

Table 4(b): ANOVA Table

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	19.964	4	4.991	23.202	.000[a]
	Residual	22.801	106	.215		
	Total	42.765	110			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Staffrec, Staffdep, Stafftra, and staffdev

b. Dependent Variable: Teachquali

The results in Table 4(b) (F (4. 991) = 23.202, p < .05) show that the independent variables (staff recruitment, staff deployment, staff training, and staff development) significantly predict the dependent variable (quality of teaching); that is, the regression model is a good fit of the data.

Finally, to test for the influence of each independent variable on the quality of teaching, the multiple regression analysis was carried out. The results are presented in Table 4(c).

Table 4(c): Multiple regression results for influence of staffing on quality of teaching

Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1(Constant)	2.260	.215		10.530	.000	1.834	2.685
Staffrec	.110	.053	.182	2.076	.040	.005	.216
Staffdep	.006	.060	.010	.108	.914	-.112	.124
Stafftra	.165	.043	.340	3.826	.000	.080	.250
Staffdev	.175	.046	.327	3.810	.000	.084	.266

a. Dependent Variable: Teachquali

The results in Table 4(c) show that the coefficient relating staff recruitment, the first independent variable, with quality of teaching is positive with a beta value of 0.182. This result suggests that a unit change in staff recruitment brings about 0.182 (18.2%) increase in the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.040, lower than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that staff recruitment has a statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Therefore, the null

hypothesis that "*staff recruitment has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching*" was rejected and the research hypothesis upheld.

Second, the results in Table 4(c) show that the coefficient relating staff deployment, the second independent variable, with quality of teaching is positive with a beta value of 0.010. This result suggests that a unit change in staff deployment brings about 0.010 (1.0%) increases in the quality of teaching other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.914, greater than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that staff deployment has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Therefore, the null hypothesis that "*staff deployment has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching*" was upheld and the research hypothesis rejected.

Third, the results in Table 4(c) also show that the coefficient relating staff training, the third independent variable, with quality of teaching is positive with a beta value of 0.340. This result suggests that a unit change in staff training brings about 0.340 (34.0%) increase in the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.000, lower than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that staff training has a statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Therefore, the null hypothesis that "*staff training has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching*" was rejected and the research hypothesis upheld

Lastly, the results in Table 4(c) show that the coefficient relating staff development, the last independent variable, with quality of teaching is positive with a beta value of 0.327. This result suggests that a unit change in staff development brings about 0.327 (32.7%) increase in the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.000, lower than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that staff development has a statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Therefore, the null hypothesis that "*staff development has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching*" was rejected and the research hypothesis upheld.

6. Discussion

This study aimed at establishing the influence of staffing on the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. The study came out with two key findings: first, that recruitment, training and development of staff have significant influence on the quality of teaching; while staff deployment does not. Second, it was also established that staffing in public universities in Uganda was fairly well done; and overall, it significantly influences the quality of teaching. The finding that staff recruitment, training and development positively influence the quality of teaching is in consonance with the results of many other earlier studies. For instance, Sahney et al. (2010) also established that training and development of staff among other cross-functional

administrative activities result into better quality of teaching. This was also in agreement with the work of Chen and Lo (2011) where it was established that the quality of teaching is not only dependent on the staffing function, but the overall teaching environment of an institution.

According to Fernandes et al. (2013), recruitment and development of faculty members act as antecedents of quality teaching. This implies that the more effective the staff recruitment and development functions in an institution, the higher would be the quality of teaching. This argument is supported by Chalmers (2008) who contends that effective staff recruitment and development make the teachers more knowledgeable and professional; thus, enabling them to perform their teaching function satisfactorily. Jimmieson et al. (2010) also concur with this finding, where they strongly argue that professional development is a quality determinant not only in industry but also in other aspects of human endeavors.

Overall, the finding that staffing has a significant influence on the quality of teaching is in tandem with the theoretical and conceptual perspectives of this study. The IPO model used to underpin this study stipulates that good quality inputs and transformation process would yield quality outputs (or outcomes). With regard to this study, the results show that effective recruitment, training and development of staff positively influence the quality of teaching in public universities, other factors notwithstanding. This implies that managers of HEIs should pay attention to the manner in which academic staff are recruited, trained, and developed.

7. Conclusion

In line with the findings of the study and the ensuing discussion, the researchers concluded that effective staffing would raise the quality of teaching in universities, other factors held constant.

8. Recommendations

This study thus recommends that university managers and staff should stick to the prescribed recruitment policy, invest more resources in training and developing staff and ensure that existing staff are well managed.

References

1. Akiba, M., LeTendre, G. K., & Scribner, J. P. (2015). Teacher quality, opportunity gap, and national achievement in 46 Countries. *Education & Educational Research, 9* (224). Doi: 10.3102/0013189X07308739.
2. Akinsolu, A.O. (2010). Teachers and students' academic performance in Nigerian secondary schools: implications for planning. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 3*(2), EJ903008.
3. Akrani, G. (2011). *What is Staffing? Meaning Definition Factors Affecting*, downloaded on 20/01/2017 from http://kalyan-city.blogspot.ug/2011/07/what-is-staffing-meaning-factors.html.
4. Anonymous. (2017). Input-Process-Output Model http://psychology.iresearchnet.com/industrial-organizational-psychology/group-dynamics/input-process-output-model/.
5. Businge, C. (2008, March, 3). Kyambogo University Lecturers still on strike. The New Vision, p.4. Retrieved from: www.savethemothers.org/file.../23/STM.
6. Chalmers, D. (2008). Teaching and learning quality indicators in Australian Universities. Programme on institutional management in higher education (IMHE). Outcomes of higher education: quality, relevance, and impact. 8th Sept. 2008 Paris, France OECD.
7. Chen, H, & Lo, H. (2012). Development and psychometric testing of the nursing student satisfaction scale for the associate nursing programs. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice 2*(3). DOI: 10.5430/jnep.
8. Chikere, C. C. & Nwoka, J. (2015). The Systems Theory of Management in Modern Day Organizations - A Study of Aldgate Congress Resort Limited Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications,* 5(9), pp. 1-7.
9. Douglas, J., Douglas, A. & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK University, *Quality Assurance in Education, 14*(3), 251 – 267, http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684880610678568.
10. Fernandes, C., Ross, K., & Meraj, M. (2013). "Understanding student satisfaction and loyalty in the UAE HE sector", *International Journal of Educational Management*, (6), 613 – 630, DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2012-0082.
11. Gulick L. & Urwick L. (Eds.). (1937). Papers on the science of administration. New York, NY: Institute of Public Administration.
12. Harris, D.N. & Sass, T.R. (2011). Teacher training, teacher quality and student achievement. *Journal of Public Economics, 95*(7–8), 798–812, doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.11.009.

13. 14. Jimmieson, N.L., Hannam, R.L., & Yeo, G.B. (2010).Teacher organizational citizenship behaviours and job efficacy: Implications for student quality of school life. *British Journal of Psychology 101* (3), 453–479, DOI: 10.1348/000712609X470572.
14. Koontz, H. & Weihrich, H. (2008). Essentials of Management. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.
15. 16. Lejeune, M. (2009). Quality assurance framework and credit accumulation and transfer system *(CATS*): East Africa Project. *The Uganda Higher Education Review: Journal of the National Council for Higher Education 6*(1), *Kampala: NCHE Press.*
16. Moreira, H., Da Luz, S.V., Da Rocha, R.D. & Kolbe Jr, F.Z. (2015). Pedagogical Practice in Engineering Courses: Students' Contribution. *International Journal of Education 7*(2), http://:dx.doi.org/10.5296/ije.v7:2.7503.
17. 18. Ngware, M. W., Ciera, J., Musyoka, P.K & Oketch, M. (2015). Quality of teaching mathematics and learning achievement gains: evidence from primary schools in Kenya. *Educ Stud Math*, DOI 10.1007/s10649-015-9594-2
18. Sahney, S., Banwet, D.K. S. Karunes, S. (2010). "Quality framework in education through application of interpretive structural modeling: An administrative staff perspective in the Indian context", *The TQM Journal*, *22* (1), 56 – 71, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17542731011009621.
19. Teferra, D. (2014). Charting African higher education: perspectives at a glance. *International Journal of African Higher Education 1*(1).