

A comparative analysis of workload and career progression of faculty members in Uganda's private and public universities

*Eva Irene Tumusiime ^a

^a Kabale University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Career progression is a goal most employees, particularly faculty members, pursue to improve job satisfaction and advance towards self-actualisation. However, many faculty members in Uganda's private and public universities are lagging behind their desired level of career progression, but how this situation is explained by the workload allocated to them has not been comparatively analysed. The cross-sectional design was used to assess the effect of workload on academic staff career progression. Data on 207 lecturers randomly selected from two private and two public universities using the heterogeneous purposive sampling was used. Results from linear regression analysis indicate that workload assigned in terms of teaching tasks, is a significant constraint to lecturers' career progression. Much of the time lecturers would have used to improve their careers through research, publication and further training is spent on teaching. Results from independent samples T-test show that this scenario is more pronounced in public than private universities because of understaffing caused by underfunding of these universities. The paper concludes public universities' should improve staffing levels to address workload allocation in way that creates times for faculty members to pursue career.

Keywords

*Workload Allocation,
Career Progression,
Ugandan Universities*

Corresponding Author

Eva I. Tumusiime
tumusiimeeva@gmail.com

Volume 1. Issue 1.
Sept. 2021

Introduction

Career progression is defined as a process by which an employee advances through acquiring more professional knowledge and skills, and applying them to execute more meaningful tasks, receive higher rewards, and pursue fulfilment of personal psychological, social, economic and/or political goals (Sobaih & Hasanein, 2020). Career progression has for long been as one of top goals most employees pursue as a matter of optimising their job satisfaction as Herzberg's Two-factor theory posits (Sobaih & Hasanein, 2020), and seeking self-actualisation as Maslow's hierarchy of needs asserts (Johnson *et al.*, 2018; Logan & Everall, 2019). Many employees have however, tended to fall short of pursuing this goal as desired, with some retiring before reaching the pinnacle of their professional ladder (Subramaniam, 2003; Iqbal & AlSheikh, 2018; Oyedele & Chikwature, 2018; Parker *et al.*, 2018; Kuwaiti *et al.*, 2019). This is particularly evident in many African universities, especially those in Uganda (Kyaligonza *et al.*, 2015).

Most of the lecturers in Uganda's universities grapple with slow or no progress in their careers to the extent that they experience low professional empowerment (Ddungu, 2014). Most of them face low promotion prospects (Ssesanga & Garrett, 2005; Daisy, 2019; Ndyabahika, 2019) and low remuneration which contribute significantly to their job dissatisfaction (Yawe, 2010; Kyaligonza *et al.*, 2015; Rwebiita, 2019; Evans *et al.*, 2020; Kazibwe, 2020; Mukhaye, 2021).

Previous research has identified different factors to explain low or rare career progression among faculty members in Uganda's universities, but workload has not been adequately analysed. Indeed, the identified and analysed factors include not conducting research necessary to build the required publication profile and lack of funding needed to sponsor research and further training (Kyaligonza *et al.*, 2015). Other factors include lack of inspiring mentors and colleagues, low job interest, discrimination, supervisor sabotage, and not implementing due promotions because of budgetary constraints (Safari & Niazazari, 2014; Samani, 2017; O'Shea1 & McGrath, 2018). Studies that identified workload as an explanatory factor were conducted outside Uganda (Subramaniam, 2003; Adu & Okeke, 2014; Hosain, 2016; Parimita *et al.*, 2017; Garner, 2018; Ingusci *et al.*, 2019; Khetarpal, 2020). They therefore, depict a contextual gap in that they do not explain how the amount of allocated workload explains career progression of faculty members in Uganda's universities. Moreover, these studies did not delve into whether the effect of workload differs between private and public universities, nor did they look into the factors determining the amount of workload assigned to employees. The purpose of this study is therefore to fill these gaps by providing a comparative examination of the amount of allocated workload as assessed by faculty members, factors determining it, and how it affects the level of their career progression within the context of Uganda's private and public universities. This analysis is important in that it provides an empirical basis that these universities' management can use to revise their workload allocation by taking appropriate action into the factors influencing it.

Literature review

Theoretical review

Different theories have been developed to explain career progression and factors explaining it. These include the Theory of Work Adjustment (TWA), also referred to as person- environment correspondence theory, Holland's theory of vocational personalities in work environment, self-concept theory, Gottfredson's theory of circumscription and compromise, and social cognitive career theory (Jena & Nayak, 2020). This paper is however, grounded in the TWA.

TWA attempts to explain how employees attain a fit between the requirements of the work environment and satisfaction of their personal values and needs (Shtivelband, 2014). The requirements of the work environment tend to be different, but this paper focuses on workload, since it is a core requirement any work environment imposes on every employee (Ingusci *et al.*, 2019; Khetarpal, 2020). Likewise, the values or needs employees seek to satisfy tend to differ as Maslow's hierarchy of needs indicates, but this paper focuses on career progression, identified by as a self-actualisation need (Johnson *et al.*, 2018; Logan & Everall, 2019), and one that increases job satisfaction as Herzberg's Two-factor theory asserts (Sobaih & Hasanein, 2020).

TWA posits that the extent to which employees balance their values and needs with work requirements is determined by how they adjust to and accommodate these requirements (operationalised in this paper as workload). Adjustment describes an employee's flexibility in terms of how he or she changes to fit the work environment while accommodation describes his or her tolerance and perseverance with work-related dissatisfaction in the process of establishing a proper fit (Librizz & Dahling, 2014). This paper analyses how an employee (a faculty member) changes to fit the assigned workload and how he or she tolerates and perseveres with the dissatisfaction associated with it to pursue career progression as a need.

Career Progression

Different scholars have shown interest in understanding the concept of career progression (Schuster & Associates, 2010; Logan & Everall, 2019; Sobaih & Hasanein, 2020; Maheshwari & Krishnan, n.d; Waltz, n.d). Some of them describe it as a concept that connotes employees' upward mobility in their professions, measured in terms of a rise in job rank, increase in remuneration, greater meaningfulness of a job, more autonomy in decision making, and rising exposure to impactful opportunities (Straw, 2017; Parker *et al.*, 2018; Belyh, 2019; Maheshwari & Krishnan, n.d). This definition suggests career progression connotes an employees' ascendance in job position, responsibility, income level, and autonomy that translates into a more gratifying state as far as realising their self-fulfilment goals is concerned. Scholars who have analysed career progression within the context of faculty members have shown that it connotes a systematic ascendance from a teaching assistant through a lecturer, senior lecturer, associated professor to a full professor while also assuming more administrative and leadership responsibilities, greater power to influence the direction of their field, more gratifying rewards, and becoming exposed to more opportunities realising self-fulfilment (Airini *et al.*, 2011; Waltz, n.d). Important to note about all these scholars and writers is that while the providing the meaning of career progression as a concept, none of them examines how it is influenced by the workload assigned to employees, a gap that this paper fills within the context of faculty members in Uganda's universities.

Faculty Workload

A number of studies have been conducted about the workload of faculty members (Chiappetta-Swanson & Watt, 2011; Grant, Hackney & Edgar, 2014; Dimitrova, 2016; Hosain, 2016; Bacwayo *et al.*, 2017; Ndayambaje, 2018; Miller *et al.*, Lee, 2020; Nsereko, n.d). All these studies agree that faculty workload is often measured in terms of time-based activities allocated to lecturers in terms of teaching, research supervision, administrative assignments, and community outreach. Teaching activities include searching for content relevant to cover lecturers allocated to be delivered to students; planning for each lecture before delivery; delivering lectures; students' continuous assessment through giving and marking coursework and tests; annual student evaluation through setting, invigilating, and marking examinations; and compiling marks to submit for student grading and certification.

Research supervision involves faculty members interacting with research students allocated to them in intent to provide reliable mentorship by giving them necessary guidance and direction through listening to them to grasp their perspective of the research, and correcting their research proposals and dissertations as they develop them until they meet the ethical and research standards of the university (Chiappetta-Swanson & Watt, 2011; Bacwayo *et al.*, 2017).

It also involves monitoring research students, giving them feedback and encouraging them by checking on their research progress (Grant *et al.*, 2014; Ndayambaje, 2018). Providing these research supervisory services involves a faculty member motivating, welcoming, being affectionate, understandable, easy to access and creating collegial relationship with research students (Dimitrova, 2016).

Administrative work includes carrying out activities assigned by supervisors, including organising, chairing or attending meetings, attending faculty meetings, contributing to departmental and faculty planning, standing in for the supervisor, attending to students' non-academic queries and concerns, and ensuring students observe the expected discipline (Miller *et al.*, 2020). Participation in community outreach programmes involves faculty members representing their departments, faculties or universities in attending community meetings, engaging in community development initiatives, and providing innovative ideas and information that updates and sensitizes community members about what to do and how to do it better (Ddungu, 2017).

Generally, previous researches examined the different dimensions of the workload of faculty members, but did not delve into the analysis of its effect on career progression within the context of faculty members in Uganda's universities, a gap filled in this paper.

Faculty Workload and career progression

Previous research has established a significantly causal relationship between workload and career progression. In particular, in a cross-sectional survey of the factors influencing career progress among faculty members, Subramaniam (2003) found that workload was among these factors and that its effect was significantly negative. The survey showed that when lecturers are overloaded, they do not get enough time to pursue career progress because most of the time is spent on trying to execute and complete the workload. This study was however, conducted about faculty members in the accounting departments of Australian universities. Moreover, it established the effect without delving into whether and how it differed between public and private universities.

In support, a study by Barrett and Barrett (2011) shows that faculty members are allocated work that requires them to spend a minimum of 37-40 hours per week doing university work in terms of searching for relevant content of the allocated lectures, planning for and delivering lectures to students, assessing and evaluating students through giving coursework, tests and examinations, marking students' answer scripts, compiling marks, and research supervision. This study indicates that lecturers' workload is supposed to be allocated in a manner that maximises efficient use of a university's teaching, research, and community outreach service resources in the eight hours of a working day. The remaining time can then be used on their personal and career progression. When they are overloaded (given tasks that take more than eight hours a day), they spend much of the time they would have used to carry out the career progression activities such as research, publication and attending further training completing their job assignments (Barrett and Barrett, 2011).

The situation is exacerbated when a university uses a workload allocation model that does not put the research component into consideration. Such a model assumes that all the working time of lecturers has to be spent doing assigned teaching and administrative activities. It does not provide for faculty members' engagement in research and publication and in attending further training, yet these are the activities that enhance their career progression (Pauls, 2013).

The study was however, conducted about female faculty members and took a general theoretical approach focusing on models by which workloads are allocated in universities. Yet that of Pauls (2013) was about developing and testing a questionnaire for measuring faculty perception of how workload allocation affects them.

Adu and Okeke (2014) reached the same conclusion in the study they conducted to establish the factors that influenced lecturers' participation in career progression through continuing professional development. This study showed that overloading lecturers with teaching, research supervision and administrative tasks can keep them busy, prevent them from moonlighting and help them gain more work experience and maturity in their job. However, it constrains their vertical progress by limiting their time to improve their research publication profile and to engage in further training. This study was however conducted about faculty members in Botswana university. Validation of its findings is therefore necessary in the context of other universities such as those in university.

Similarly, Parimita et al. (2017) found that workload had a negative effect on the career development of employees. In support, Garner (2018) found that overloading employees with work increases job-related stress and burnout that drain much of the energy they would have spent on improving their careers. Likewise, Khetarpal (2020) found that work overload stressed close to 60% of women employees that they were sceptical about taking promotion that could result into more increase in their workload. These two studies were however, conducted in non-academic organisations in Indonesia (Parimita *et al.*, 2017), United Kingdom (Garner, 2018) and globally (Khetarpal, 2020). Therefore, they left a question of whether the same effect could apply in educational organisations, particularly the universities in Uganda.

Factors explaining workload allocation

Prior research has identified different factors that determine the amount of workload allocated to faculty members. Barrett and Barrett (2011) identify a model used to allocate workload as one of the factors, noting that some universities use a granularity work allocation model that emphasises teaching more than the research and administrative responsibilities. This model emphasises teaching when allocating workload, thereby paying little attention to research and administrative work (Hull, 2006). Universities that use this model allocate workload in terms of number of one- or two-hour lectures taught per day, number of students taught and number of research students to supervise. They do not pay attention to even the time faculty members need to search for the content of allocated lectures and to plan for them. All they mind about is the number of lectures to be taught per week, how they should be assessed and examined, and when the marks should be submitted for grading and certification (Pauls, 2013). Universities using this model tend to slow down career progression for their faculty members (Vardi, 2009)

Hull (2006) observed further that other universities use the continuing research model whose work allocation approach attempts to balance teaching with research and training which faculty members are expected to undertake to improve their universities' contribution to innovation and development, and improve their careers. This model ensures that faculty members use their working time not only to teach but also to engage in administrative activities (such as attending department, faculty or senate planning meetings), writing research funding proposals, and conducting research and publishing its findings (Vardi, 2009).

Evidently, this model provides ensures that lecturers remain active in career progression activities such as research, publication and attending further training. A question however, is whether universities in Uganda use this model when most of their faculty members are associated with low engagement in research, whose publication rates are very low and whose participation in further training and community outreach service is wanting (Kagaari & Munene, 2010; Kasule & Neema, 2014; Kyaligonza *et al.*, 2015; Ddungu, 2017; Nabunya *et al.*, 2019).

In addition, research has shown that allocation of work is determined by the staffing levels of organisations (World Health Organization, 2016), particularly universities where these levels are compared with the number of offered academic disciplines and enrolment size (Watanabe *et al.*, 2013; Kenny & Fluck, 2014; Botha & Swanepoel, 2015). This research indicates that adequately staffed universities tend to allocate workloads that resonate with each faculty member's ideal number of hours and amount of work expected from him or her. In contrast, understaffed universities allocate more than the number of lectures, teaching hours, and number of students to teach and supervise than they can efficiently cover (Botha & Swanepoel, 2015). These universities allocate work in this fashion to ensure that they provide the educational services expected of them by enrolled students and their subsequent employers, but hardly realise this goal from the consumers' perspective (Kenny & Fluck, 2014). These studies were however, conducted in universities outside Uganda and therefore, do not discussed the identified factors within the context of Ugandan universities.

Overall, the cited literature indicates that there is an inverse relationship between workload and career progression, which suggests that workload has a negative effect on career progression. This effect was however, not established within the context of Uganda's universities; hence the need for this paper to provide this context by establishing this effect, comparing it between private and public universities and identifying the factors explaining it following the research methods explained in the next section.

Data and Methods

This study was designed as a cross-sectional comparative survey involving a quantitative approach. This design was adopted to facilitate collection of cross-sectional questionnaire data that was needed to provide a comparative analysis of the similarities and differences between Uganda's private and public universities using relevant statistics (Clasen, 2004; Cairney, 2016). The analysis was provided based on the sample size (Mills *et al.*, 2009; York, 2017), and in respect of how these university types went about workload allocation, what determined the allocated amount, and how it affected their faculty members' career progression. The data was collected from faculty members randomly selected from four Ugandan universities selected using heterogeneous purposive sampling. Heterogeneous purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling technique that facilitates selection of a sample from different categories based on a judgement that each category can provide data needed to understand the phenomenon being investigated (Etikan *et al.*, 2016). The categories in this study included private and public universities. This sampling technique facilitated their selection of two public and two private universities from those located in central Uganda. This region was considered because it had the largest and easily accessible public and private universities. Faculty members were drawn randomly to give each a chance to participate in the study as they all had a workload and were expected to pursue career progression as a matter of pursuing their personal goals. The sample size was determined using Sloven's formula stated as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{[1 + N(e)^2]}$$

Where n was the sample size, N was the size of the target population, which, from Annual Management Reports of the four selected universities was equal to 85,800 faculty members; e was the standard error at which the sample was selected. It was selected at the 95% confidence level, implying that $e = 5\%$ or 0.05.

$$\text{Therefore, } n = 85,800 \div [1 + 85,800 (0.05)^2] \approx 398$$

The expected sample size was proportionately divided into 210 faculty members from public universities and 188 from private universities. However, due to the closure of all educational institutions resulting from lockdown caused by COVID-19, the expected sample size was not realised. The actual sample consisted of 109 respondents from public universities and 98 from private universities. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire emailed to the respondents using their email contacts obtained from the personnel/human resource officials of the selected universities. This questionnaire consisted of items measuring the amount of allocated workload and factors determining it as perceived by these respondents using a 5-point Likert scale of responses running from Strongly Disagree (1) through Disagree (2), Not Sure (3) and Agree (4) to Strongly Agree (5). The scale that measured the level of career progression ran from Very Unsatisfactory (1) through Unsatisfactory (2), Average (3) and Satisfactory (4) to Very Satisfactory (5).

The questionnaire was first tested for validity using Content Validity Method and for reliability using the Alpha method of internal consistency aided by SPSS (Version 25). The computed validity and reliability indices were .875 and .899, respectively, suggesting that the questionnaire items were largely valid and reliable. Data was analysed using the mean comparison method based on the independent samples T-test, data transformation and a comparison of effects generated using linear regression of the data obtained from each sample (private versus public universities).

Results

The aim of this study was to compare the amount of allocated workload as assessed by faculty members in Uganda's public and private universities, the factors determining its allocation, these lecturers' level of career progression, and how it was affected by the assessed workload.

Self-assessed amount of workload: When the selected faculty members were asked to assess the amount of workload allocated to them, results obtained from the mean comparison method based on the independent samples T-test were as summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparison of amount of allocated workload as assessed by faculty members

Indicators of the amount of allocated workload	No. of Faculty members by University type	Min	Max	Mean	t	Sig.
Lectures assigned to me make me spend a lot of time searching for content needed to plan for them	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	3 4	5 5	4.05 4.75	-11.580	.000
Planning for the lectures assigned to me takes much of the time I would use for personal growth.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	3 4	5 5	4.06 4.69	-10.463	.000
Number of lectures allocated to me to deliver are way too many that I have to put in extra time	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	4 4	5 5	3.89 4.67	-9.112	.000
I get too busy during examination time because of the number of exams allocated to me to invigilate.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	4 4	5 5	3.93 4.68	-8.667	.000
Coursework scripts I have to mark are too many for me to finish within the allocated time.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	2 4	5 5	3.77 4.63	-9.292	.000
Number of exam scripts I have mark is so large that I finish them way beyond the allocated time.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	4 4	5 5	4.07 4.71	-11.081	.000
Number of students I have to supervise is way beyond those I should supervise.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	4 4	5 5	3.99 4.72	-8.110	.000
Number of students whose theses I have to assess is far beyond those that should be allocated to me.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	3 4	5 5	3.80 4.65	-7.781	.000
Time it takes me to compile the students' marks to submit for grading usually goes beyond schedule.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	4 4	5 5	3.79 4.65	-6.984	.000
The administrative work assigned to me takes the time I would have used to do personal work	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	4 4	5 5	4.14 4.73	-8.909	.000
I am allocated community outreach tasks that add to the already stressing work I have to do	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	3 4	5 5	3.88 4.70	-6.711	.000
Overall assessment.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	3 3	5 5	3.96 4.69	-8.667	.000

The minimum and maximum values in Table 1 ranged from '2' to '5', suggesting that there were faculty members who disagreed (Min = 2), were not sure (3), agreed (4) and strongly agreed (Max = 5) to some indicators of the amount of their allocated workload. Given the way the indicators are phrased, faculty members who disagreed to them indicated that the amount of the assigned workload matched their expectations. Those who were not sure showed that they had no definite view on the amount of their assigned workload. Faculty members who agreed showed that the assigned workload was heavy; yet those who strongly agreed showed that the allocated workload was very heavy.

The mean values indicate however, that on average faculty members in private universities agreed (all the means were close to '4'), but those from public universities strongly agreed to all the indicators (all means were close to '5'). These results suggest that while faculty members in Uganda's private universities assessed the amount of workload assigned to them as heavy, those in public universities judged theirs as very heavy. Therefore, the amount of workload assigned to these faculty members differed as a result of the type of university for which they worked. The difference was significant, since all the t-values in Table 1 were significant at the .01 level of significance (Sig. = .000 < .01), with the overall assessment indicating faculty members in public universities as having significantly heavier workloads assigned to them compared to their counterparts in private universities (Mean = 3.96 for private universities reveals heavy workload compared to 4.69, which reveals a very heavy workload, $t = -8.667$, Sig. = .000 < .01).

Factors determining allocated workload: Regarding the factors that determined the amount of allocated workload, results obtained from the independent samples T-test are in Table 2.

Table 2: Factors determining amount of workload allocated to faculty members

Indicators of the factors	No. of Faculty members by University type	Min	Max	Mean	t	Sig.
University assigns work by emphasising teaching more than research and community service	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	4 4	5 5	4.70 4.91	-1.276	.206
University balances between teaching, research and community service when allocating work.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	4 4	2.28 1.99	--1.745	.082
University allocates us much more work than we should do because it is understaffed	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	3 4	5 5	4.89 3.59	-10.887	.000
Our university allocates more work to us because it is too underfunded to have enough lecturers.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	2 4	5 5	4.92 4.53	-1.260	.209
Overall assessment	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	3.60 3.93	-1.335	.119

The minimum (min) and maximum (max) values in Table 2 indicate that there were faculty members who strongly disagreed, disagreed (2), were not sure (3), agreed or strongly agreed (5) to the various factors determining allocation of their workload. Those who disagreed and strongly disagreed indicated that all the factors did not determine the amount of workload assigned to them. Those who were not sure showed that they could not tell whether the factors determined or did not determine the allocation of their workload. The faculty members who agreed and strongly agreed indicated that the factors determined the allocation of their workload.

The mean values corresponding to the overall assessment suggest however, that on average faculty members in both universities agreed without a significant difference that the factors in Table 2 determined the amount of allocated workload (Mean = 3.60 for public and 3.93 for private universities, $t = -1.335$, Sig. = .119 > .01). The exception to this overall assessment was the factor that related to balancing workload allocation in terms of balance between teaching, research and community service when allocating work to which faculty members in both university types disagreed (Mean = 2.28 for public and 1.99 for private university faculty members). This suggests that the universities did not pay attention to balancing their faculty members' workload in terms of their three core functions.

Further scrutiny of the mean values reveals that while there was plain consensus in both universities about other factors, strong agreement was expressed without a significant difference (Mean = 4.70 for public and 4.91 for private faculty members, $t = -1.276$, Sig. = .206 > .01) that the two types of universities emphasised teaching more than on research and community service when allocating workloads. Therefore, regardless of their type, the selected universities prioritised teaching more than their other core functions when allocating workload to faculty members. The results indicate further that allocation of heavy workloads was more strongly determined by understaffing in public compared to private universities (Mean = 4.89 for public and 3.59 for private university faculty members, $t = -10.887$, Sig. = .000 < .01).

Level of career progression: Faculty members were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with the various indicators of their career progression level. Results obtained of the independent samples T-test of their assessment revealed this level as shown in Table 3.

Indicators of level of career progression	No. of Faculty members by University type	Min	Max	Mean	t	Sig.
Lectures assigned to me make me spend a lot of time searching for content needed to plan for them	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	2.44 2.32	.960	.357
Planning for the lectures assigned to me takes much of the time I would use for personal growth.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	4 4	2.17 2.36	.924	.443
Number of lectures allocated to me to deliver are way too many that I have to put in extra time	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	2.22 2.25	-.511	.613
I get too busy during examination time because of the number of exams allocated to me to invigilate.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	2.24 1.87	-.278	.781
Coursework scripts I have to mark are too many for me to finish within the allocated time.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	2.44 2.32	.960	.357
Number of exam scripts I have mark is so large that I finish them way beyond the allocated time.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	2.43 2.34	.769	.455
Number of students I have to supervise is way beyond those I should supervise.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	2.21 2.27	.749	.610
The administrative work assigned to me takes the time I would have used to do personal work	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	2.22 2.25	-.511	.613
I am allocated community outreach tasks that add to the already stressing work I have to do	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	2.24 1.87	-.278	.781
Overall assessment.	Public (n = 109) Private (n = 98)	1 1	5 5	2.29 2.24	-.273	.785

The minimum and maximum values in Table 3 indicate that there were faculty members who were very unsatisfied (Min = 1) and those who were very satisfied (Max = 5) with the various indicators of their career progression level. These results suggest that there were faculty members who did not post any level of career progression (Min = 1) and those who registered a very high level of career progression (Max = 5). All the mean values in Table 3 were however close to '2' and none of the t-values was statistically significant (Sig. > .01). This suggests that on average, all the selected faculty members were on average dissatisfied with the level of their career progression.

Effect of workload on career progression: Faculty members' self-assessed amount of workload and level of career progression were each computed as global variables from the responses obtained from each type of universities using the arithmetic technique of the data transformation method of SPSS. Thereafter, linear regression was carried to establish how workload predicted career progression level in each type of the selected universities. Results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Linear regression statistics between workload and career progression

Predictor	Statistics predicted on the dependent variable: Career progression											
	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		t	Sig	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	Sig	Error of estimate
	B	Std. Error	Beta									
(Constant)	5.272	1.224			12.585	.000	.460	.213	.211	41.102	.000	1.683
Workload (Private)	.309	.047	-.460		-6.333	.000						
(Constant)	.241	.090			2.684	.008	.760	.577	.556	338.66	.000	.776
Workload (Public)	1.011	.055	-.760		-18.403	.000						

Table 4 indicates that while the amount of faculty members' self-assessed workload predicted their self-assessed level of career progression by significant a 21.1% (Adjusted R² = .211, F = 41.102, Sig. = .000 < 0.01) in private universities, the prediction was a significant 55.6% (Adjusted R² = .556, F = 338.66, Sig. = .000 < 0.01) in public universities. These predictions imply that the amount of workload allocated to faculty members affected their career progression in statistically significant manner in both types of universities, but the effect was greater in public universities. The beta coefficients, corresponding t-values and levels of significance (Beta = -.460, t = -6.333, Sig. = .000 < .01 for private and -.760, t = -18.403, Sig. = .000 < .01 for public universities) indicate that the effect was significantly negative, suggesting that increasing the amount of workload caused a significant reduction in the faculty members' career progression.

Discussion

The results indicate that the amount of the workload allocated to faculty members in Uganda affects their level of career progression in a negatively significant manner regardless of whether they are employed by a private or public university (Table 4). Therefore, the results confirm the conclusion reached by Subramaniam (2003), Barrett and Barrett (2011), Adu and Okeke (2014), Parimita et al. (2017) and Garner (2018) that workload has a negative effect on employees' career progression. In addition to this consistency, the results indicate that the magnitude of the effect differed between the selected private and public universities. It was much greater in public compared to private universities. Indeed, while an increase in the assigned workload decreased career progression of faculty members in private universities by slightly 21%, the decline it caused in public universities was up to 56%. Therefore, career progression suffered more as a result of the amount of workload assigned to faculty members in Uganda's public compared to private universities. These results reveal that while workload constrains career progression as previous research suggests, the extent to which it does so is not the same in all organisations. Table 1 indicates that career progression suffered more in public universities because the workload allocated to faculty members in these institutions was heavier than that which was allocated to their counterparts in private universities – even when the latter were also assigned heavy workloads.

Accordingly, results point to a need for both types of Uganda's universities to take a downward revision of the amount of workload allocated to their faculty members. This revision is needed because faculty members in both universities showed that the level of their career progression was unsatisfactory (Table 3). It is however, much more required in public universities as the constraining effect of workload was more felt in these institutions compared to their private counterparts (Table 4).

The revision needs to focus on ensuring that workload is allocated in a way that allows faculty members to improve their careers as they perform their jobs. Results in Table 2 reveal that workload allocation emphasised teaching tasks much more than research and community service. This suggests that faculty members were loaded with more teaching than research and community service responsibilities. Consequently, teaching activities took up most of the time which faculty members would have spent improving their career through conducting research and offering community outreach services.

Such workload allocation was unfair. Not only did it deny faculty members time to develop their careers, it also meant that the universities neglected their research and community outreach roles. Therefore, it points to a need for Uganda's universities to shift from a workload allocation model that emphasises teaching, referred to by Hull (2006) as the granularity work allocation, to the continuing research model, which balances allocation of teaching tasks with research, administrative and community outreach activities. The need to adopt this latter model cannot be overemphasised in the light of the results in Table 2 that showed that none of the selected universities used it when allocating workloads to their faculty members.

Results indicate further that the amount of workload that the universities allocated to their faculty members was much more than it should have been because the universities were understaffed because of underfunding (Table 2). This state of affairs was more pronounced in public than private universities (Tables 2). These results suggest that the reduction in the workload assigned to faculty members can be realised to create time for them to improve their careers by addressing the problems of understaffing and underfunding facing these universities.

Limitations

The actual sample size was lower than the statistically expected size. In addition, Uganda had over 10 public and over 40 private universities, but the study was based on two public and two private universities. These two factors limit the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, the study relied on quantitative data only. This limited it in terms of in-depth understanding of the nature of assigned workload, factors explaining its allocation and career progression as explained by each individual faculty member using unlimited qualitative data.

Conclusion

The study indicates that the amount of allocated workload significantly constrains the level of career progression attained by faculty members of Uganda's universities, regardless of their types. Due to overreliance on the use of the granularity work allocation model and understaffing caused by underfunding, faculty members in either type of universities are overloaded with mostly teaching tasks, which eat up much of the time they would have spent pursuing career progression through research, doing administrative work, participating in community outreach projects, and attending further training programmes. The constraining effect of workload on career progression is more felt by faculty members in public than private universities of Uganda.

Recommendations

The top management of Uganda's private and public universities, and especially of the latter institutions, should revise the workload allocation policy from relying on the granularity work allocation model to the use of the continuing research model. This will ensure that workload is allocated to faculty members in a manner that balances allocation of teaching tasks with research, participation in further training, community outreach projects, and administrative work, thereby allowing faculty members to perform their jobs as they also improve their level of career progression.

The government of Uganda should increase funding to public universities to enable them to overcome underfunding and be able to fill their academic staff structures. This will enable them to balance workload allocation. The same should be done by investors in Uganda's private universities for the same reason.

A replicate of this study should be conducted using a mixed methods research design that provide a generalisable in-depth understanding of the variables it has investigated.

References

- Adu, E., & Okeke, C. (2014). Factors affecting lecturers' participation in continuing professional development. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 5(3), 271-281.
- Airini, S.C., Lindsey, C., Kathryn, M., Brenda, M., & Cheryl, W. (2011). Learning to be leaders in Higher Education: What helps or hinders women's advancement as leaders in universities. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 39, 44-62.
- Bacwayo, K.E., Nampala, P., & Oteyo, I.N. (2017). Challenges and opportunities associated with supervising graduate students enrolled in African universities. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(3), 29-39
- Barrett, L., & Barrett, P. (2011). Women and academic workloads: career slow lane or Cul-de-Sac? *Higher Education*, 61(2), 141-155.
- Belyh, A. (2019). *The ultimate career progression guide*. Retrieved 14 February 2021 from <https://www.cleverism.com/ultimate-career-progression-guide/>
- Botha, P.A., & Swanepoel, S. (2015). Allocation of academic workloads in the faculty of human and social sciences at a South African University. *Africa Education Review*, 12(3), 398-414.
- Cairney, P. (2016). *Research design: Case studies and comparative research*. Retrieved 16 February 2021 from <https://paulcairney.wordpress.com/2016/02/01/research-design-case-studies-and-comparative-research/>
- Chiappetta-Swanson, C., & Watt, S. (2011). *Good practice in the supervision & mentoring of postgraduate students: It takes an academy to raise a scholar*. Masters Dissertation, McMaster University.
- Clasen, J. (2004). *Defining comparative social policy: A handbook of comparative social policy*. London: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Daisy, A. (2019). *Motivational practices and performance of lecturers in tertiary institutions in Arua District*. Masters Dissertation, Kyambogo University.
- Ddungu, L. (2014). University lecturers' professional empowerment and turnover in Uganda. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 6(1), 35-54.
- Ddungu, L. (2017). Performance appraisal as a predictor of Ugandan university lecturers' participation in community service. *Kampala International University Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 4(2), 87-96.
- Dimitrova, R. (2016). Ingredients of Good PhD supervision— Evidence from a student survey at Stockholm University. *Utbildning & Lärande*, 10(1), 40-52
- Etikan, I., Musa, S.A., & Alkassim, R.S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.

- Evans, D.K., Yuan, F., & Filmer, D. (2020). *Are teachers in Africa poorly paid? Evidence from 15 countries*. Policy Research Working Paper 9358. Washington: World Bank
- Garner, M. (2018). *Workload stress and lack of job progression highlighted in employee survey*. Retrieved 14 February 2021 from <https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:jslWm7qNSKIJ:https://www.workingmums.co.uk/workload-stress-lack-job-progression-highlighted-employee-survey/+&cd=17&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ug&client=opera>
- Grant, K., Hackney, R., & Edgar, D. (2014). Postgraduate research supervision: An 'agreed' conceptual view of good practice through derived metaphors. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 9, 43-60
- Hosain, S. (2016). Teaching workload and performance: An empirical analysis on some selected private universities of Bangladesh. *International Journal of English and Education*, 5(3), 1-12.
- Hull, R. (2006). Workload allocation models and 'collegiality' in academic departments. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 19(1), 38-53
- Ingusci, E., Spagnoli, P., Zito, M., Colombo, L., & Cortese, C.G. (2019). Seeking challenges, individual adaptability and career growth in the relationship between workload and contextual performance: A two-wave study. *Sustainability*, 11, 422-439
- Iqbal, M.Z., & AlSheikh, H.M. (2018). Factors affecting the transfer of training to the workplace after a faculty development programme: What do trainers think? *Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences*, 13(6), 552-556.
- Jena, L., & Nayak, U. (2020). Theories of career development: An analysis. *Indian Journal of Natural Sciences*, 10(60), 23515- 23523.
- Johnson, J., Irizarry, M., Nguyen, N., & Maloney, P. (2018). *Part 1: Foundational theories of human motivation*. Motivation 101 - A guide for public servants. 1. Retrieved 14 February 2021 from <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/motivationforpublicservants/1>
- Kagaari, J.R.K., Munene, J.C. (2010). Agency relations and managed performance in public universities. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39(1).
- Kasule, G.W., & Neema, A.P. (2015). Challenges and strategies of improving academic staff development in higher education institutions in Uganda: The case of Kyambogo University. *International Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Comparative Studies*, 1, 36-48.
- Kazibwe, K. (2020). *Lecturers in government universities announce strike over pay*. Retrieved 15 February 2021 from <https://nilepost.co.ug/2020/05/28/lecturers-in-government-universities-announce-strike-over-pay/>
- Kenny, J.D.J., & Fluck, A.E. (2014). The effectiveness of academic workload models in an institution: a staff perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 36(6), 585-602.
- Khetarpal, S. (2020). *Stress, burnout, job insecurity: Tough for women in COVID-19 world*. Retrieved 14 February 2021 from <https://www.businesstoday.in/current/economy-politics/stress-burnout-job-insecurity-tough-for-women-in-covid-19-world/story/420260.html>
- Kuwaiti, A.A., Bicak, H.A., & Wahass, S. (2019). Factors predicting job satisfaction among faculty members of a Saudi higher education institution. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 12(2), 296-310.
- Kyaligonza, R., Kimoga, J., & Nabayego, C. (2015). Funding of academic staff's research in public universities in Uganda: Challenges and opportunities. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 147-162.
- Librizz, U.A., & Dahling, J.J. (2014). Integrating the theory of work adjustment and attachment theory to predict job turnover intentions. *Journal of Career Development*, 42(3).
- Logan, J., & Everall, K. (2019). First things first: Exploring Maslow's hierarchy as a service prioritization framework. *Journal of Library User Experience*, 2(2), 61-75.
- Maheshwari, S., & Krishnan, T.N. (n.d). *Career effectiveness and its determinants*. Retrieved 15 February 2021 from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6443726.pdf>
- Miller, M.T., Mamiseishvili, K., & Lee, D. (2020). Administrative hierarchy and faculty work: Examining faculty satisfaction with academic leadership. *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education*, 1, 1-6.
- Mills, M., van de Bunt, G.G., & de Bruijn, J. (2009). Comparative research: Persistent problems and promising solutions. *International Sociology*, 21(5), 619-631
- Mukhaye, D. (2021). *Lecturers at govt universities go on strike*. Retrieved 17 February 2021 from <https://www.monitor.co.ug/uganda/news/national/lecturers-at-govt-universities-go-on-strike-3285874>
- Nabunya, K., Mukwenda, H.T., & Kyaligonza, R. (2019). Professional development practices and service delivery of academic staff at Kampala International University and Kyambogo University. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 10(2), 133-143

- Ndayambaje, I. (2018). Effect of supervision on timely completion of PhD Programme. *Rwandan Journal of Education*, 4(2), 57-70.
- Ndyabahika, D. (2019). *Mak lecturer challenges failure to promote him to full professor*. Retrieved 15 February 2021 from <https://ugandaradionetwork.net/story/mak-lecturer-challenges-failure-to-promote-him-to-full-professor>
- Nsereko A.K.N. (n.d). *Doctoral supervision a challenge in universities: The context of the sub-Saharan African universities*. Retrieved 15 February 2021 from https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:hD6Qp_0G6XsJ:https://www.iuiu.ac.ug/journaladmin/iuj/ArticleFiles/87891.pdf+&cd=3&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ug&client=opera
- O'Shea1, J., & McGrath, S. (2018). Contemporary factors shaping the professional identity of occupational therapy lecturers. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 82(3), 186-194
- Oyedele, V., & Chikwature, W. (2018). Factors that affect professional development in education on teacher efficacy in Chipinge district high schools. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 4(4), 56-71.
- Parimita, W., Pambudi, W.S., & Aminah, H. (2017). The impact of career development and workload toward employee job satisfaction at PT Askrido Jakarta. *Journal Riset Manajemen Sains Indonesia*, 8(1), 39-57.
- Parker, P., Hewitt, B., Witheriff, J., & Cooper, A. (2018). Frank and fearless: Supporting academic career progression for women in an Australian program. *Administrative Sciences*, 8(5), 1-18.
- Pauls, T.N. (2013). *Building an instrument for measuring academic administrator and faculty member perceptions of the workload allocation process as it applies to higher education*. Doctoral Dissertation, West Virginia University
- Rwebiita, M.K. (2019). *Pay for lecturers a serious policy issue*. Retrieved 15 February 2021 from <https://www.monitor.co.ug/uganda/news/education/pay-for-lecturers-a-serious-policy-issue-1857240>
- Safari, M., & Niazazari, K. (2014). Analysis of factors affecting the professional maturity of faculty members, Azad University in Azadshahr. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 5(3), 1-6.
- Samani, R.E. (2017). Factors Affecting the professional development of faculty members: A case study of Iran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran. *International Journal of Agricultural Management and Development*, 7(4), 509-515.
- Schuster, J.H., & Associates, D.W. (2010). *Enhancing faculty careers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shtivelband, A. (2014). *Applying the theory of work adjustment to recent and non-recent Latino immigrant workers*. Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State University
- Shtivelband, A. (2014). *Applying the theory of work adjustment to recent and non-recent Latino immigrant workers*. Doctoral Thesis, Colorado State University
- Sobaih, A.E.E., & Hasanein, A.M. (2020). Herzberg's theory of motivation and job satisfaction: Does it work for hotel industry in developing countries? *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 19(3), 319-343.
- Ssesanga, K., & Garrett, R. (2005). Job satisfaction of university academics: Perspectives from Uganda. *Higher Education*, 50(1), 33-56.
- Straw, S. (2017). *Career progression in the further education and training sector*. Retrieved 14 February 2021 from <https://www.et-foundation.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Career-progression-in-the-further-education-and-training-sector-FINAL.pdf>
- Subramaniam, N. (2003). Factors affecting the career progress of academic accountants in Australia: Cross-institutional and gender perspectives. *Higher Education*, 46, 507-542.
- Vardi, I. (2009). The impacts of different types of workload allocation models on academic satisfaction and working life. *Higher Education*, 57(4), 499-508.
- Waltz, M. (n.d). *The essential guide to moving up the academic career ladder: An ebook with tips and tested techniques for making yourself promotion-ready*. Retrieved 14 February 2021 from <https://www.jobs.ac.uk/media/pdf/careers/resources/the-essential-guide-to-moving-up-the-academic-career-ladder.pdf>
- Watanabe, S.P., Murasawa, M., & Abe, Y. (2013). Internal staff allocation and the changing workload of Japanese Professoriate: A multilevel statistical analysis with simulations. *Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.1.13*. University of California, Berkeley: Centre for Studies in Higher Education.
- World Health Organization. (2016). Workload indicators of staffing need (WISN): Selected country implementation experiences. *Human Resources for Health Observer Series No. 15*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Yawe, G. (2010). *Motivation and academic staff performance in public universities in Uganda: the case of Makerere University* (Masters Dissertation). Makerere University.
- York, K.B. (2017). *A causal comparative study on the effect of proficiency-based education on school climate* (Doctoral Dissertation). Liberty University