ABSTRACT

The study aimed at establishing the effect of teaching experience of part-time lecturers on quality of university education in the public universities in Kenya. The study was driven by the complaints by many authors, Federation for Kenya Employers (FKE) and the Commission for University Education Kenya (CUE) which had pointed out again and again that the quality of university education has gone down. The study employed descriptive research design and correlation research design. It targeted external part-time lecturers, internal part-time lecturers and Heads of Departments from the public universities that were established in 2000 onwards and chartered in 2013. Simple random sampling was used to pick the 241 respondents. The questionnaires duly filled and returned were 202, which constituted 84% of the response rate and this was a good threshold for further subsequent analysis. ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis. Simple linear regression was also done to establish whether the independent variable explained the dependent variable. The study established a positive relationship between predictor variable and outcome variable. One of the major finding is that many part-time lecturers have many years of teaching experience.
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INTRODUCTION

Central to the study of teachers’ effect on education is the notion that the amount students learn in a year is partially a result of their teachers’ teaching experience and knowledge (Huang & Moon, 2009). Many occupations recognize employees’ years of experience as a relevant factor in human resource policies, including compensation systems, benefits packages and promotion decisions. The idea is that experience, gained over time, enhances the knowledge, skills, and productivity of workers (Rice, 2010). According to Commission for University Education in Kenya (2014), a lecturer must have 3 years working experience at university level or in research or in industry. On-the-job experience provides teachers with practical opportunities in which to build their expertise in teaching and classroom management. Further, average years of teaching experience are an indication of teachers’ maturity and their long-term commitment to education. The impact of experience is strongest during the first few years of teaching; after that, marginal returns diminish (Rice, 2010). Early-career experience has a clear payoff in teacher effectiveness and the impact is stronger than the effect of most other observable teacher-related variables including advanced degrees and class size (Clotfelter et al. 2007; Ladd 2008; Sass 2007). A key distinction between beginning teachers and experienced teachers is in the degree of sophistication with which they exhibit their application of this set of knowledge and skills (Choy et al, 2013). Zaki & Rashidi (2013) indicated that what and how teacher teach depend on the knowledge, skills, support and commitment they get. They added that lecturers are not just transporters of information but translate the curriculum to make it meaningful and beneficial to the learners hence other stakeholders.
A number of studies findings confirm that on average, brand new teachers are less effective than those with some experience under their belts (Clotfelter, Ladd & Vigdor 2007; Ladd 2008; Sass 2007). The need for experienced lecturers is that, a lecturer needs a variety of methods to identify strengths and weaknesses of individuals learners, plan differentiated instructional activities for diverse learners and assess students’ knowledge for the purpose of integrating multiple pathways of instruction namely lesson planning, instructional strategies and classroom management (Choy et al, 2013). The studies done earlier indicated that teachers with three or fewer years of experience are less effective (Rice, 2010).

A study by Olatuji (2013) revealed that, at the point of entry into university workforce, 40% of the lecturers in the sampled universities do not have any teaching experience. Olatunji indicated that one does not have any reasonable ground to guarantee that these lecturers are able to give their students the best education. At the point of entry into the university workforce, 50% of the lecturers did not have any pedagogical training but had years of teaching experience. Some lecturers had acquired professional training through trial and error over the years (Olatunji, 2013). A study by Kyule et al (2014) to 150 internal and external part-time lecturers reported that 53% of the respondents had the least experience in part-time lecturing having worked as such for a period of up to 5 years, while 33% had worked as such for 6 to 10 years. Only 11% had more than 11 years of experience. This question according to Kyule et al was important to determine the quality of staffs that are given opportunities to work on part-time basis. This indicated that majority of the part-time lecturers had relatively few years of service.

Huang & Moon (2010) agreed that total years of teaching experience are significantly associated with increased student reading achievement. Wickum & Stanley (2011) in their study noted that part-time lecturers possess a well-rounded education and a wealth of practical experience; however, lack teaching experience in the classroom. Scheutz (2002) noted that part-timers in American community colleges were weakly linked to their students and have less total teaching experience. Nationally, doctors, attorneys, bankers, engineers, psychologists and ministers comprise a large sector of the part-time lecturers (Manger, 2009). According to Leszinske et al, (2012), part-time lecturers are slightly less experienced and slightly less educated than full-time faculty. In addition, Bousquet (2002) was concerned that graduate education in America accomplishes its marvelous cheapness by allocating an ever larger section of the curriculum to flexible instructors who typically have between zero and four years of teaching experience. Wickum & Stanley (2011) study had also noted that part-time lecturers poses a well-rounded educations and a wealth of practical experience however lack of teaching experience in the class-room is a major weakness that must be address.

A lecturer should be able to plan and provide a set of learning opportunities that offer access to crucial concepts and skills for all students. The first thing a lecturer must do is to design an effective classroom so as to create conducive learning environment that supports students’ engaged learning and meaningful instructions. These elements of lesson planning serve as a guide for beginning lecturer to be good in the classroom. Lesson planning makes teaching more conscious and purposeful; one is able to articulate what they plan to do, what they do and why they do it (Marzano, 2007). The aim of lesson planning is also to avoid students being overwhelmed with information.

Another study by Meixner, Kruck & Madden (2010), indicated that some part-time lecturers have years of experience, while others are hired at the 11th hour. The study revealed that approximately 22% of surveyed part-time lecturers’ had between zero and one year of
experience. In America, Scheuz (2002) reported that part-time lecturers have less total teaching experience; teach less hours per week, have fewer interactions with students and have less preparation for teaching. Additionally, the surveyed part-time lecturers showed that approximately 12.4% taught at a second institution in a part-time capacity as well (Meixner et al, 2010). To Scottsdale (2014) some lecturers want to work part-time so that they can pursue other interests. Others are too inexperienced to secure full-time university employment.

Part-time lecturers account for nearly 67% of the community college level (Christensen, 2008) but lacks the necessary curriculum development, instructional and assessment skills to adequately address the needs of the students in general (Morthland, 2010). Makochekanwa & Kwaramba (2011) indicated that lecturers should have the capability to interpret the national curriculum. Failure to do so results in poor lecture delivery for if the lecturer does not understand the syllabus; it is an obvious case that lecture delivery will be a nightmare. In essence, lecturers should be individuals of high caliber who are able to deliver content and make learning come for students. Without well qualified and committed lecturers, learning becomes difficult because students of diverse ability need different levels of attention. The lecturers should therefore be well developed on syllabus interpretation, so that they may have confidence before the students when delivering lectures (Muzenda & Ntombozuko, 2014). However, Wickum & Stanley (2011) noted that part-time lecturers are not supported. Instead, they are frequently hired late for them to become acquainted with the curriculum, campus, students’ culture and teaching requirements before the start of the semester (Leszinke et al, 2012).

A study by Mwiria & Carey (2007) indicated that part-time lecturers devote insufficient time to their involvement or lack adequate information about the courses they teach, and this disrupts the teaching programme and leads to lack of continuity. Kyule et al (2014) also pointed out that these employees on temporary contracts are more likely to be unable to apply the full range of their skills and work in positions that do not fully utilize their qualifications and experience. To avoid such, a lecturer must understand what the expected curriculum goals and outcomes are for students and what resources are needed in order to accomplish the goals. They need to understand how the curriculum they teach fits into the larger department or school curriculum and ultimately the national standards. They should then connect their content knowledge with their knowledge of how students learn in order to instruct in a manner that is responsive to students’ thinking.

Classroom management is a key factor to quality education reason being, it creates a classroom environment that leads to higher order thinking and learning (Choy et al, 2013). According to Barbetta, Narona & Bicard (2006), a chaotic classroom that lacks boundaries can prevent students from being engaged in the learning activity and process. Organized classroom increases engagement and reduces distractions leading to quality learning.

In United State and many other universities in the world, one is required to be a holder of PhD, with teaching experience and publications an increasing prerequisite (Moon, 2010). A survey by Guardian (2014) in UK indicated that teaching experience or ability in terms of either hiring or promotion is not considered while engaging part-time lecturers. In fact, this teaching experience is without value if it’s not accompanied by those all-important publications – the one and only measure for employment in higher education today, most notably among ‘old’ universities (Guardian Survey, 2014).
Statement of the Problem

Quality of university education is a big issue in universities in Kenya and this has been associated with massification and proliferation of universities. Due to this, massive shortage of lecturers has been noticed (Mengo, 2010; Yego, 2013). To curb the shortage, hiring of part-time lecturers have become the norm (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). A long line inquiry by Umbach & Wawryzinski (2005) indicated that lecturers play a central role in undergraduate education. This therefore triggered the need to establish whether teaching experience of part-time lecturers affect the quality of university education offered in public universities in Kenya.

Research Objective

The study sought to establish the teaching experience of part-time lecturers and its effect on quality of university education in the public universities in Kenya

Research Hypotheses

This study sought to test the following hypothesis:-

$H_0$ Teaching experience of part-time lecturers does not significantly affect the quality of university education in the public universities in Kenya

Methodology

Descriptive and correlation research design were employed. The target population for the study was the public universities that were established from 2000 to 2013 and chartered in 2013. The reason for choosing these newly established and chartered public universities in Kenya was because of the Commission for University Education (CUE) survey which had indicated that the longstanding public universities were not as adversely affected by part-time teaching as was the constituent colleges (Yego, 2013). When the Commission for University Education complained about this, all these universities were then the constituent colleges. The target population for the study was therefore nine public universities in Kenya as shown in Table 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newly Established and Chartered Public Universities in Kenya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chuka University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaramogi Oginga Ondinga University of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatina University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maasai Mara university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meru University of Science and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-media University of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pwani University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern Kenya University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kabianga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> 9 universities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CUE 2013; Universities HoDs
The sample size was 241 respondents. The data collected was quantitative and was collected using questionnaires.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Response Rate

Two hundred and forty one questionnaires were administered to the 9 newly established and chartered public universities in Kenya. Two hundred and two (202) questionnaires were returned as shown in Table 2.0. This was 84.14% which is way above 50% that is considered adequate for subsequent analysis in research study according to Babbie (2002).

Table 2.0: Response rate
Source: Research Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newly Established public universities</th>
<th>Total Number of questionnaires returned</th>
<th>% of Total Number of questionnaires returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chuka University</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaramogi Oginga Ondinga</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatina University</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maasai Mara university</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meru University of Science and technology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-media University of Kenya</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pwani University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern University of Kenya</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kabianga</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 9 universities</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>84.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO and Bartlett’s test were performed. The KMO value of 0.5 and above was considered adequate as recommended by Kaiser (1974). Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity tests the null hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. To find out if there was a relationship, a threshold value was chosen, called the significant level at $p < 0.05$.

Table 3.0 KMO and Bartlett's Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin of sampling adequacy</th>
<th>Barlett’s test of Sphericity approx Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>1670.137</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the Table 3.0, the test on Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity tests were deemed appropriate and viable for the variable. This is because KMO measures of sampling had reached the value of above 0.5 and the Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was significant at $p < 0.05$. This test therefore concludes that Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) and Bartlett's measure were adequate for factor analysis of the variable to be performed.

Factor Analysis on Working Experience

The independent variable had fifteen (15) items from the original questionnaire, these items were subjected to factor analysis and all the items meet the recommended threshold of 0.4
and above and were considered for further subsequent analysis. The results of this variable are illustrated on Table 4.0

**Table 4.0: Rotated Factor Analysis for Working Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to apply theories into practices while teaching</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to connect my content knowledge with my knowledge of how students learn</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fully understand what the expected curriculum goals and outcomes are for my students and what resources are for my students and what resources are needed in order to accomplish these goals</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to build learners' knowledge, creativity, innovation, critical thinking and problem solving skills through projects</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to foster debate and develop the ability of students to engage in critical dialogue and rational thinking</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide a set of learning opportunities that offer access to crucial concepts and skills for all students</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how this curriculum I teach fits into the larger national standards</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more I teach in the university, the more I gain experience</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My area of specialization is always considered when am allocated classes</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have mastery of content of the subjects that I teach</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students are disciplined</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am given time to actualize the curriculum that I will use to teach</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My lesson take into consideration the different abilities of students</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The total number of years I have in teaching determines the quality of education I give</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make lesson plan which I follow while teaching</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data

**Descriptive Statistics on Teaching Experience**

The respondents were given one closed-ended question and 15, 5 level likert questions. After doing exploratory factor analysis, all the items were retained.

**Years Taught in a University**

The study sought to determine how many years the respondents have taught in a university; those who have taught for less than a year were 30 (14.9%), 2-3 years 50 (24.9%), 4-5 years 39 (19.3%), 6-10 years 58 (28.7%) and above 11 years 25 (12.4%). From the findings, majority of the lecturers 119 (59.1%) had teaching experience of up to 5 years and 41.1% had teaching experience of above 5 years as shown in Figure 1.0

![Fig 1.0 Years Taught in a University](image-url)
This study was in conformity with Kyule et al (2014) findings which indicated that 53% of the part-time lecturers had the least experience in part-time lecturing having worked as such for a period of up to 5 years, while 33% had worked as such for 6 to 10 years. Only 11% had more than 11 years of experience. Wickum & Stanley (2011) study had also noted that part-time lecturers pose a well-rounded educations and a wealth of practical experience however they lack teaching experience in the class-room. Kyule et al (2014) emphasized that majority of the part-time lecturers had relatively few years of service. Clotfelter, Ladd & Vigdor (2007); Harris & Sass (2007); Kane, Rockoff & Staiger (2006); Ladd (2008) added that on average, brand new teachers are less effective than those with some experience under their belts. According to Bousquet (2002) universities jeopardize quality of education by allocating an ever larger section of the curriculum to flexible instructors who typically have between zero and four years of teaching experience. Guardian (2014) noted that teaching experience or ability in terms of either hiring or promotion is not considered while engaging part-time lecturers.

Commission for university Education in Kenya (2014) commends a lecturer to have 3 years working experience at university level or in research or in industry. Basing on that, above 50% of the lecturers had above 3 years teaching experience at the university level and 39.7% had teaching experience below 3 years. According to Rice (2010) teachers with three or fewer years of experience are less effective in class. Average years of teaching experience are an indication of teachers' maturity and their long-term commitment to education. Universities should put more emphasize on the teaching experience of part-time lecturers to enhance quality.

**Years goes with Experience**

The respondent were required to indicate whether the more they teach in the university the more they gain experience; 5 (2.5%) strongly disagreed, 1 (0.5%) disagree, 4 (2.0%) neutral, 53 (26.2%) agreed and 139 (68.8%) strongly agreed. Majority 192 (94.0%) were in agreement that years come with experience as shown in Table 5.0.

These findings were in conformity with Huang & Moon (2010) who indicated that the total number of years of teaching experience is significantly associated with increased student reading achievement. Emphasizing on the same is (Clotfelter, Ladd & Vigdor 2007; Harris & Sass 2007; Kane, Rockoff & Staiger 2006; Ladd 2008; Sass 2007) noting that on average, brand new teachers are less effective than those with some experience under their belts. Rice (2010) added that experience gained over time enhances the knowledge, skills, and productivity of workers.

The study findings show that part-time lecturers agree that the more one teaches the more one gain experience. The reason is because experienced lecturers needs a variety of methods to identify strengths and weaknesses of individuals learners, plan differentiated instructional activities for diverse learners and assess students’ knowledge for the purpose of integrating multiple pathways of instruction namely lesson planning, instructional strategies and classroom management (Choy et al, 2013). Part-time lecturers pose a well-rounded educations and a wealth of practical experience however they lack teaching experience in the class-room which may affect the quality of their teaching.
Specialization Area is considered

The study sought to establish whether the respondents area of specialization is always considered when allocation is being done. 4 (2.0%) strongly disagreed, 6 (3.0%) disagreed, 23 (11.4%) neutral, 51 (25.2%) agreed and 118 (58.4%) strongly agreed. Majority 169 (83.6%) of the respondents were affirmative that specialization is always considered when allocation is being done as shown in Table 5.0.

A study by Mwiria & Carey (2007) indicated that part-time lecturers devote insufficient time to their involvement or lack adequate information about the courses they teach and this disrupts the teaching programme and leads to lack of continuity. Emphasizing on the same is Kyule et al (2014) who pointed out that these employees on temporary contracts are more likely to be unable to apply the full range of their skills and work in positions that do not fully utilize their qualifications and experience. The study findings show that majority 83.6% of the respondents overwhelmingly agreed that specialization is always considered when allocation of classes is being done. When lecturers teach in their area of specialization, they are guaranteeing quality since they will have mastery of content and will also know which teaching methodology fits the situation.

Mastery of Content

The study sought to establish whether the respondent has mastery of content on the subjects that they, 3 (1.5%) strongly disagreed, 3 (1.5%) disagreed, 1 (0.5%) neutral, 59 (29.2%) agreed and 136 (67.3%) strongly agreed. Majority 195 (96.5%) were in agreement that they have mastery of content of the subjects that they teach as shown in Table 5.0. These findings contradict Mwiria & Carey (2007) whose study indicated that part-time lecturers lack adequate information about the courses. To teach all students according to today’s standards, lecturers indeed need to understand subject matter deeply and flexibly so that they can help students map their own ideas, relate one idea to another and re-direct their thinking to create powerful learning (Solis, 2009).

The study findings show that majority 96.5% of the respondents overwhelmingly agreed that they have mastery of content. They know how ideas connect across fields and to everyday life. They have abilities to transform knowledge into actions needed for effective teaching such as abilities to evaluate students thinking and performance in order to plan appropriate learning opportunities. The abilities to critique, modify, combine and use instructional materials to accomplish teaching and learning goals; the abilities to understand and use multiple learning and teaching strategies; the abilities to explain concepts clearly and appropriately given the developmental needs and social experiences of students and the abilities to provide useful feedback to students in constructive and instructionally helpful ways (Choy et al, 2013).

Able to apply Theories

The study sought to determine on whether the respondents are able to apply theories into practices while teaching, 3 (1.5%) strongly disagreed, 3 (1.5%) disagreed, 1 (0.5%) neutral, 59 (29.2%) agreed and 136 (67.3%) strongly agreed. Majority 195 (96.5%) were in agreement that they are able to apply theories while teaching the courses that they are given to teach as shown in Table 5.0.
Koehler (2011) indicated that a teacher with deep pedagogical knowledge understands how students construct knowledge and acquires skills, develop habits of mind and positive dispositions towards learning. As such, pedagogical knowledge requires an understanding of cognitive, social and developmental theories of learning and how they apply to students in their classroom (Olsson et al., 2010).

The findings indicated that 96.7% of part-time lecturers overwhelmingly agreed that they understand and are able to apply theories into practice in teaching. This implies that part-time lecturers give applicable teaching to students. This will therefore guarantee students quality education since they will be able to apply what they learn.

**Able to connect content knowledge to students’ knowledge**

The study sought to establish whether the respondent is able to connect content knowledge with the knowledge of how students’ learn, 5 (2.5%) strongly disagreed, 3 (1.5%) disagreed, 11 (5.4%) neutral, 82 (40.6%) agreed and 101 (50.0%) strongly agreed. Majority 183 (90.6%) of the respondents agreed that they are able to connect content knowledge with the knowledge of how students’ learn as shown in Table 5.0

These findings contradict with Kyule et al (2014) whose study pointed out that these part-time lecturers on temporary contracts are more likely to be unable to apply the full range of their skills and work in positions that do not fully utilize their qualifications and experience. They devote insufficient time to their involvement or lack adequate information about the courses they teach, and this disrupts the teaching programme and leads to lack of continuity (Mwiria & Carey, 2007).

The result findings noted that an overwhelming number 90.6% of the respondents affirmed that they are able to connect content knowledge with the knowledge of how students’ learn. The knowledge of how student learn guarantee that there is learning taking place in classroom.

**Build Learners knowledge**

The study sought to establish whether the respondent is able to build learners’ knowledge, creativity, innovation, critical thinking and problem-solving skills through projects, 6 (3.0%) strongly disagreed, 9 (4.5%) disagreed, 19 (9.4%) neutral, 86 (42.6%) agreed and 82 (40.6%) strongly agreed. Majority 168 (83.2%) of the respondents agreed that they are able to build learners’ knowledge, creativity, innovation, critical thinking and problem-solving skills through projects as shown in Table 5.0

According to OECD (2013), characteristics of an expert teacher includes extensive pedagogical content knowledge, better problem solving strategies, better adaptation for diverse learners, better decision making, better perception of classroom events, greater sensitivity to context and greater respect for students. Baldwin & Wawrzynski (2011) contradicted this and indicated that part-time lecturers have fears of experimenting with innovative strategies which will negatively affect teaching evaluations from their students to lack of professional development limiting instructors’ exposure to high impact practices and pedagogies.
The findings noted that majority 83.2% of the respondents indicated that they are able to build learners’ knowledge, creativity, innovation, critical thinking and problem-solving skills through projects. There is active learning when students learn using projects. This is because project learning promotes life-long learning. This therefore implies that there is teaching and learning that foster quality in part-time lecturers’ classes.

**Lesson plan**

The study sought to establish whether the respondents make lesson plans which they follow while teaching, 21 (10.4%) strongly disagreed, 19 (9.4%) disagreed, 26 (12.9%) neutral, 72 (35.6%) agreed and 64 (31.7%) strongly agreed. Majority 136 (67.3%) were in agreement that they make lesson plans which they follow while teaching as shown in Table 2.0

A lecturer should be able to plan and provide a set of learning opportunities that offer access to crucial concepts and skills for all students. One way to plan is having a lesson plan. Lesson planning makes teaching more conscious and purposeful; one is able to articulate what they plan to do, what they do and why they do it (Marzano, 2007). These elements of lesson planning serve as a guide for beginning lecturer to be good in the classroom. The aim of lesson planning is also to avoid students being overwhelmed with information, avoid frustrations and unpleasant surprises, stay on track and achieve their objectives.

The research finding observed that majority 67.3% of the respondents make lesson plans. Lesson planning allows the teacher to visualize every step of the teaching process in advance and this visualization eventually increases teachers’ success in class. The students will not be bombarded or overwhelmed with a lot of unplanned information. Instead they will be delivered in bit and this will enhance quality.

**Consider Different Learning Abilities**

The research sought to establish whether the respondent lessons take into consideration the different abilities of students, 8 (4.0%) strongly disagreed, 19 (9.4%) disagreed, 26 (12.9%) neutral, 72 (35.6%) agreed and 64 (31.7%) strongly disagreed. Majority 136 (67.3%) were in agreement that their lessons take into consideration the different abilities of students.

According to Felder & Brent (2005) students have different levels of motivation, different attitudes about teaching and learning and different responses to specific classroom environments and instructional practices. The more thoroughly instructors understand the differences, the better chance they have of meeting the diverse learning needs of all of their students.

Lecturers teach students of various learning ability level and they make decisions upon their knowledge and experiences with the students. Considering the findings majority 67.3% of the respondents take into consideration the students different learning abilities an indication that all students are put into consideration by the course lecturer while teaching in class. This is likely to warrant quality.

**Time to actualize the curriculum**

The study sought to establish whether the respondent is given enough time to actualize the curriculum that they uses to teach, 8 (4.0%) strongly disagreed, 27 (13.4%) disagreed, 32
neutral, 78 (38.6%) agreed and 57 (28.2%) strongly agreed. Majority 135 (66.8%) of the respondents were in agreement that they are given enough time to actualize the curriculum that they will use to teach as shown in Table 5.0

Leszinke et al (2012) indicated that part-time lecturers are not given time to actualize the curriculum since they are frequently hired in “August”, assumedly late for the faculty member to become acquainted with the curriculum, campus, students’ culture and teaching requirements before the start of the semester.

Based on the findings majority 66.8% of the respondents affirmed that they are given enough time to actualize the curriculum. This implies that part-time lecturers are not informed of their engagement late and that the heads of departments plays their role of giving the curriculum to all the lecturers in time.

Understand Curriculum Goals

The study sought to establish whether the respondents fully understands what the expected curriculum goals and outcomes are for the students and what resources are needed in order to accomplish these goals, 2 (1.0%) strongly disagreed, 7 (3.5%) disagreed, 14 (7.0%) neutral, 96 (47.8%) disagreed and 82 (40.8%) strongly agreed. Majority 178 (88.6%) of the respondents were in agreement that they fully understands what the expected curriculum goals and outcomes are for the students and what resources are needed in order to accomplish these goals.

Kyule et al (2014) indicated that a lecturer must understand what the expected curriculum goals and outcomes are for students and what resources are needed in order to accomplish the goals. They need to understand how the curriculum they teach fits into the larger department or school curriculum and ultimately the national standards. They should then connect their content knowledge with their knowledge of how students learn in order to instruct in a manner that is responsive to students’ thinking. Emphasizing on the same is Zaki & Rashidi (2013) who indicated that lecturers are not just transporters of information but translate the curriculum to make it meaningful and beneficial to the learners hence other stakeholders.

The findings noted that majority 88.6% of the part-time lecturers affirmed that they understands what the expected curriculum goals and outcomes are for the students and what resources are needed in order to accomplish these goals. This is an implication that part-time lecturers adheres to the stipulated items in the curriculum and connect it to the general understanding of the student.

Understand how Curriculum fits larger National Standards

The study sought to establish whether the respondent understand how the curriculum they teach fits into the larger national standards, 3 (1.5%) strongly disagreed, 9 (4.5%) disagreed, 16 (7.9%) neutral, 85 (42.1%) agreed and 89 (44.1%) strongly agreed. The majority 174 (86.2%) of the respondents understand how the curriculum they teach fits into the larger national standards as shown in Table 5.0

Makochehanwa & Kwaramba (2011) indicated that lecturers should have the capability to interpret the national curriculum. Failure to do so results in poor lecture delivery for if the lecturer does not understand the syllabus; it is an obvious case that lecture delivery will be a
nightmare. The lecturers should therefore be well developed on syllabus interpretation, so that they may have confidence before the students when delivering lectures (Muzenda & Ntombozuko, 2014). Emphasizing on the same is Zaki & Rashidi (2013) who indicated that lecturers are not just transporters of information but translate the curriculum to make it meaningful and beneficial to the learners hence other stakeholders.

Based on the findings part-time lecturers understand how the curriculum they teach fits into the larger national standards. This implies that part-time lecturers are individuals of high caliber who are able to deliver content and make learning come for students.

Effectively Manage Students

The research wanted to establish whether the respondent is able to effectively manage their students in class, 5 (2.5%) strongly disagreed, 7 (3.5%) disagreed, 28 (13.9%) neutral, 79 (39.1%) agreed and 83 (41.1%) strongly agreed. The majority 162 (80.2%) were in agreement that they are able to effectively manage their students in class.

Classroom management is a key factor to quality education reason being, it creates a classroom environment that leads to higher order thinking and learning (Choy et al, 2013). According to Barbetta, Narona & Bicard (2006), a chaotic classroom that lacks boundaries can prevent students from being engaged in the learning activity and process. Organized classroom increases engagement and reduces distractions leading to quality learning. The first thing a lecturer must do is to design an effective classroom so as to create conducive learning environment that supports students’ engaged learning and meaningful instruction (Marzano, 2007). The findings noted that 80.2% of the respondents are able to effectively manage their students in class. In a disciplined class students’ stay focused since it creates conducive learning environment that guarantee quality education.

Table 5.0: Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The more I teach in the university, the more I gain experience</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My area of specialization is always considered when am allocated classes</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have mastery of content of the subjects that I teach</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to apply theories into practices while teaching</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to connect my content knowledge with my knowledge of how students learn</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to build learners' knowledge, creativity, innovation, critical thinking and problem solving</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide a set of learning opportunities that offer access to crucial concepts and skills for all</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make lesson plan which I follow</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My lesson take into consideration the different abilities of students 4.0% 9.4% 16.3% 39.1% 31.2% 4 4 1
I am given time to actualize the curriculum that I will use to teach 4.0% 13.4% 15.8% 38.6% 28.2% 4 4 1
I fully understand what the expected curriculum goals and outcomes are 1.0% 4.0% 6.9% 47.5% 40.6% 4 4 1
I understand how this fits into the larger national standards 1.5% 4.5% 7.9% 42.1% 44.1% 4 4 1
I am able to effectively manage my class 2.5% 3.5% 13.9% 39.1% 41.1% 4 4 1

Source: Research Data

Correlation Analysis for Teaching Experience

The correlation analysis for teaching experience was performed. Scatter plot was generated first for the purpose of checking for violation of the assumptions of linearity and also the nature of the relationship as shown in Figure 2.0

As shown in Figure 2.0, the scatter plot shows a positive association or relationship between teaching experience and quality of university education since the distribution is spread from the left to the right. This shows that the assumption of linearity was not violated.

A Pearson correlation coefficient for teaching experience and quality of university education was performed and $r = 0.450$ as shown in Table 6.0.
Table 6.0 Correlation Analysis of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality of Education</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of university education</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation 1</td>
<td>.450***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience of part-time lecturers</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .450**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In this finding, there was a strong positive correlation between teaching experience and quality of university education. This therefore implies that an increase in the teaching experience of part-time lecturers will lead to an increase in the quality of university education.

Regression Analysis for Teaching Experience

Teaching experience affects quality of university education, regression analysis was done using the regression equation below:

\[ y = \alpha_2 + \beta_2 x_2 + \epsilon \]

Whereby \( y \) is quality of university education, \( \beta_2 \) is the coefficient correlation, \( x_2 \) is teaching experience. The Figure 3.0 shows the linear relationship between teaching experience and quality of university education.

**Fig 3.0: Regression line for teaching experience**

The Figure 3.0 indicates a positive linear relationship between teaching experience and quality of university education as indicated by the positively sloped regression line.

Goodness of Fit

As shown in Table 7.0, the R squared indicates the coefficient determination; that is, it explains how much quality of education can be explained by teaching experience. In this case,
20.2% of the total variation can be explained by linear relationship between teaching experience and quality of education. Since the use of adjusted R square is recommended then 19.8% explains the relationship between teaching experience on quality of university education.

Table 7.0 Goodness of fit for Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.450(^a)</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>10.04318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7.0, teaching experience can be explained by quality of education by 19.8%. This therefore implies that only 19.8% can be explained by teaching experience while the remaining 80.2% can be explained by the other variables in the study.

ANOVA

To test whether teaching experience had a significant influence on quality of university education an ANOVA test was done as shown in Table 8.0

Table 8.0 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5114.519</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5114.519</td>
<td>50.706</td>
<td>.000(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>20173.104</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25287.624</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Education
b. Predictors: (Constant), Teaching Experience

The table 8.0 indicates the test of significance of the model in predicting the outcome variables. The null hypothesis tested was, teaching experience in regression model is not statistically fit to predict the outcome, quality of university education. Considering the findings, the F-test is statistically significant at \(p < 0.05\). This therefore indicate that teaching experience predict the outcome (quality of education) hence we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that teaching experience affects quality of education at \(p < 0.05\) level of significant with a 95% level of confidence.

A t-test was performed to predict quality of university education from teaching experience as shown in Table 9.0.

Table 9.0 Determining the Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.451</td>
<td>4.660</td>
<td>4.818</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>7.121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Education

Table 9.0 provides information needed to predict quality of education from teaching experience. The teaching experience and constant are both statistically significant at \(p < 0.05\). The regression equation takes the following form: predicted variable (quality of university education)
education) = intercept + slope * teaching experience. The intercept is where the regression line strike Y axis. The regression model was represented by a regression equation below:

\[ y = \alpha + \beta x + \epsilon \]

Whereby \( \alpha \) is 22.451 and \( \beta \) is 0.524

Quality of education = 22.451 + 0.524 teaching experience.

\[ Y = 22.451 + 0.524x \]

This means that for every unit increase in teaching experience, there is a 0.524 increase in quality of university education. To test whether the regression coefficient for teaching experience was significantly different from zero, a t-test was determined at 5% level of significance. The null hypothesis tested was; teaching experience of part-time lecturers does not significantly affect the quality of university education. That is,

\( H_0: \beta = 0; \) regression coefficient of teaching experience is equal to zero

\( H_1: \beta \neq 0; \) regression coefficient of teaching experience was not equal to zero

\( \beta \) is the regression coefficient of teaching experience

The coefficient in Table 9.0 above indicate that the calculated t-value for teaching experience = 7.121 and is statistically significant at p value 0.000. This therefore implies that the null hypothesis should be rejected and the conclusion to be teaching experience of part-time lecturers had significant positive influence on quality of university education.

This finding agrees with Rice (2010) who indicated that experience, gained over time, enhances the knowledge, skills, and productivity of workers. Emphasizing on the same was Clotfelter, Ladd & Vigdor (2007); Harris & Sass (2007); Kane, Rockoff & Staiger (2006); Ladd (2008) and Sass (2007) who pointed out that brand new teacher is less effective than those with some experience under their belts. A teacher with experience has mastery of content and is able to apply theories into practice while teaching enhancing quality.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The findings revealed that majority of part-time lecturers have taught for up to five years in a university and agreed that years come with experience. The respondents indicated that specialization area is widely considered while they are being allocated classes. The respondents who pointed that they have mastery of content also pointed out that they are able to connect their content knowledge with the knowledge of how students learn. They agreed that they make lesson plans and understand how their curriculum fits into the larger national standards. This can lead to a conclusion that part-time lecturers have the teaching experience that is required to give quality education.

The study recommends that the university administration should ensure that all their part-time lecturers have the teaching experience that is necessary for giving quality education.
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