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Abstract
A university’s ability to remain competitive in a knowledge-driven world depends on the development of its teaching staff. Government and the private sector have invested in staff development in Nigerian and Pakistani universities. This article compares their staff development policies and practices as well as teachers’ job performance. An expo-facto comparative research design was adopted. We found significant differences between universities’ staff development policies and practices as well as lecturers’ job performance in the two countries (F (3, 657) = 41.879, p = .000). The article recommends effective implementation of staff development policies (funding, selection, performance appraisal, and promotion) to enhance staff’s skills and competencies and improve Nigerian universities’ position in global rankings.
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1. Introduction
Overhauling the university system by improving academic staff’s productivity through effective human capital development would enhance the development of this sector. A university’s development is related to the quality of its human capital which in turn depends on the quality of its staff training programmes (Khan and Sarwar, 2011). In other words, a university’s output is predicated on the quality of its academic staff (Molefe, 2010; Ijaiya et al., 2011; Ijaiya, 2012; Cadez et al., 2015; Adeyemi, 2017). Furthermore, the nature of a university’s staff development (SD) policies and practices directly impacts teachers’ skills, knowledge, attitude and competencies (Sarbeng, 2014). A university SD policy that emphasises scientific publications may undermine institutional attempts to reward commitment to quality teaching and research (Institutional Management in Higher Education, 2012). Training and retraining university teachers improves university performance and offers comparative advantage, while a lack of SD can constrain it from moving up the rankings (Asian Development Bank, 2015). Carlson, Upton, and Seaman (2006) identify five human resource management (HRM) practices that influence institutional performance, namely, setting a competitive compensation level, training and development, performance appraisal, the recruitment package, and maintaining morale.

Impact of Staff Development on Teachers’ Job Performance
The literature identifies a relationship between SD and teachers’ performance among higher education institutions, especially universities across the globe (Dawo, Simatwa and Okwatch, 2012; Abida and Mirza, 2012; Katamba and Ibrahim, 2013; Babagana, 2014). However, there is a paucity of comparative studies on the impact of SD policies and practices on lecturers’ job performance in African and Asian universities. This
study aimed to fill this gap by comparing SD policies (funding, selection, performance appraisal and promotion) and practices (training for higher qualifications, conferences and workshops) to improve university teachers’ performance in Nigeria and Pakistan.

Previous comparative studies on SD policies and practices are limited to Europe, the United States (US) and Asian countries (Yihong, 2011), the United Kingdom (UK) and Iran (Asia) (Avanaki and Sadeghi, 2017) and among African countries (Chitsamatanga et al., 2018). No empirical studies compare African and Asian countries, especially Nigeria and Pakistan. Avanaki and Sadeghi (2017) employed content analysis to compare university teacher training programmes (policy and practice) in the UK and Iran. The study found that such programmes were centralised in Iran, while they had been decentralised in the UK. Yihong (2011) examined SD practices in European universities with the aim of identifying lessons for the next phase of SD policies and programmes in China. Among other things, SD was found to be linked to strategic planning and the developing interests of staff. European universities also directly or indirectly linked promotion to SD.

H01: No significant differences exist between Nigerian and Pakistani universities in terms of the impact of SD policies and practices on teachers’ job performance.

Advances in knowledge and technology have exerted pressure on universities and other organisations across the globe to improve the capability of their human capital (Iqbal et al. 2019). Nigeria and Pakistan are developing countries in different regions that share similar aspirations to join the league of developed nations. At the time of the study, Nigeria’s population was estimated at around 180 million, while Pakistan was home to close on 200 people. Nigeria’s National Universities Commission (NUC) and Pakistan’s Higher Education Commission (HEC) have highlighted the need for SD in order for their countries’ universities to participate in the global knowledge economy and achieve global competitiveness (NUC, 2012; HEC, 2012). Staff development for the 21st century should provide faculty members with the skills, knowledge, attitude and competence required to carry out their job effectively in a knowledge-based, competitive world. Peretomode and Chukwuma (2012) established the existence of a significant relationship between SD and lecturers’ productivity in tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria, while Tahir et al. (2014) found that training and development had a significant impact on staff performance and productivity in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) province, Pakistan. Hassan (2011) found that there is a lack of SD programmes for university lecturers in Pakistan with regard to classroom teaching, modern teaching methodologies and class management in a semester system.

A number of human capital development theories can be applied to examine SD in universities. This study drew on the Resource Based View (RBV) that suggests that, ‘the method in which human resources are used within an organisation can create a competitive advantage’ (Barney, 1991). The RBV is based on two assumptions, namely, resource diversity and resource immobility (Barney, 1991). It can be employed to determine whether innovative strategies enable a university to gain a real advantage in the marketplace. Eric (2007) argued that most institutions do not place sufficient emphasis on human capital management as a component of competitive advantage and institutional growth. For universities to succeed and be globally competitive, they must create value for their workforce and sustain the competitive advantage it brings. This calls for the development and maintenance of an engaged, knowledgeable and creative workforce (Afouni, 2007; Eric, 2007). Scott (2014) noted that the RBV indicates that resources and capabilities (academic staff) that are rare, valuable, inimitable and non-substitutable could be used to gain competitive advantage. Universities possess sustainable comparative advantage in the areas of knowledge generation and dissemination, reputation, innovation and ranking (Richard and Paul, 2004). Thus, the RBV can be applied to promote the strategic development of universities for global competitiveness and reputation through effective SD policy and practices. We built on this theory to explore SD programmes in Nigerian and Pakistani universities for competitive advantage.

2. Literature Review

Staff development is essential for a university to achieve its goals and enhance its performance (Parry, 2011; Nicoleta and Elena, 2014; Kawaljit and Dhiraj, 2016). Developing teaching staff will help a university to cope with a changing society and enhance their skills and knowledge in teaching, research and community service (Aidelomon, 2010; Onyeizugbe et al., 2016). People and knowledge are the key drivers of today’s knowledge-based world and universities need to build a sound human capital
foundation if they are to gain competitive advantage (Aliyu and Kabiru, 2014). The academic vitality of any university is thus directly related to the professional development of its faculty members (Abid, 2013). Anunya (2014) noted that lecturers are assets and a university’s success and competitiveness largely depend on their policy and practice towards quality performance. Apart from achieving the university’s educational goals, effective management of faculty members would attract efficient, quality staff. Investing in SD programmes has both short- and long-term benefits (Maimuna and Rashad, 2013).

Teachers’ Job Performance

Job performance is a commonly used yet poorly conceptualised concept in managerial psychology (Campbell, 1990). It is a branch of psychology that deals with the workplace (Awotunde, 2012). Taiwo (2014) noted that lecturers’ job performance refers to the work-related activities expected of a lecturer and how well these are executed. Job performance is a measure of a university teacher’s effectiveness in relation to his/her roles and responsibilities in a given period of time (Igboekwe et al., 2015). It is thus a measurement tool to determine a university’s operational effectiveness. Indicators are used to measure academics’ teaching, research, publications and community service in pursuit of the university’s goals and objectives (Yunus et al., 2013). Shno and Premalatha (2019) found significant differences in faculty performance in public and private universities in Malaysia. Molefe (2010) investigated faculty members’ performance measurement dimensions in selected universities in South Africa, the US, UK, Australia and Nigeria.

$H_0$: No significant difference exists between teachers’ job performance (teaching, research and publications and community service) in Nigerian and Pakistani universities.

Staff Development Policies

Practices flow from policies and universities’ policies, and financial and other resources influence SD and job performance. An SD policy sets out guidelines on professional development programmes (Sarbeng, 2013) to improve staff’s knowledge, skills, attitude and competencies to enable them to perform effectively and productively (Owolabi and Amisu, 2016). It is a framework that guides administrators on strategies to improve staff’s efficiency (Armstrong, 2006). The policy thus covers funding, selection procedures, the performance appraisal system, and promotion.

Funding

Funding is essential to promote teaching and research (Nwakudu, 2014; Mansoor, 2010). “It is only when this is available for faculty members that they can engage in serious research and staff development programmes. And any serious research requires serious funding” (Akinboye, 2015, p. 3). Nigeria’s Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) allocated N19 billion ($60,365,470 million) to facilitate academic programmes for selected lecturers from all public tertiary institutions in 2014. In Pakistan, the HEC has sponsored faculty and top students to obtain their doctorates and complete post-doctoral fellowships at prestigious foreign universities, while local scholarships are offered for studies up to PhD level (HEC Annual Report, 2014). The International Research Support Initiative Programme (IRSIP) also sponsors six-month research fellowships abroad for full-time PhD students registered at Pakistani universities. The aim of these initiatives is to enhance research skills through studying in technologically advanced countries. A total of 6,726 scholars benefited from the international programmes and 5,524 received local PhD scholarships (HEC Annual Report, 2014).

Selection

Selection involves choosing individual academics to undergo SD (Sheikh, 2006). It calls for identification and screening of candidates for specific training (Muhoi, 2013). An effective selection policy trains the right staff in the right skills at the right time. Meir (2016) observes that selecting the wrong people not only undermines the success of the training programme, but will not benefit the individual or the university, and is a waste of time, money and material. It is therefore imperative for universities to identify who to train and the purpose of the training.

Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal serves as a channel for university administrators and individual staff to examine the extent to which performance expectations have been met (Biswajeet, 2006; Sarbeng, 2013). It is an opportunity to discuss available professional development and to identify
options to acquire additional skills and knowledge so as to enhance staff performance and career growth (Makawiti, 2011; Akpan, 2016).

Promotion
Promotion occurs when a lecturer satisfies the required conditions (qualifications, skills, and competence, among others), and results in increased status, remuneration, allowances, and prestige, as well as increased responsibilities within the university system (Emechebe, 2009; Adeyemi, 2009; Frances, 2010).

**H₀₁**: Staff development policy is not significantly different between Nigerian and Pakistani universities.

Staff Development Practices
Staff development practices are the learning activities, specifically training and the educational mode organised and provided by the university for lecturers during certain periods of time in order to improve their performance and personal growth (Alabi, 2005; Mansoor et al., 2007). These ongoing activities enable staff to acquire new skills and knowledge that will improve their job performance (Mgijima, 2014). Biswajeet (2006) defines SD practices as planned programmes that aim to improve teachers’ performance and to achieve significant change in their knowledge, skills, competencies, attitude and social behaviour in carrying out teaching, research and community service in the university.

Academic staff’s growth and development thus results in change (Cole, 2002). Cole notes that SD is a learning activity that is directed towards future rather than current needs and is more concerned with career growth than the immediate performance of the lecturer. Therefore, SD practice can be regarded as the systematic development and acquisition of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required by lecturers to perform adequately in teaching and research, publications and community service (Aroge, 2012; Okemakinde et al., 2013). It also aims to equip lecturers to use the latest innovative teaching pedagogies, communication skills and research strategies that blend academic concepts with institutional goals for higher achievement and quality service delivery (Dawo et al., 2013; Khan, 2014).

For the purposes of this study, SD practices were considered as training for higher qualifications (THQ) (fellowship, PhD, Master’s degree, PGDE) and conferences, workshops, and seminars. Universities in Nigeria and Pakistan (and elsewhere) can employ these SD practices to increase their teachers’ skills and knowledge so as to enhance their job performance and enable the institution to gain a competitive advantage. Wade (2012) noted that making a PhD a prerequisite for university teaching would enhance the standard of education. Furthermore, THQ enables academic staff to confront new challenges and changes in the world of education; hence, it is imperative to enhance their professionalism (Omar, 2014).

**H₀₄**: No significant difference exists in SD practices between Nigerian and Pakistani universities.

3. Methodology
An expo-facto comparative design was employed for this study. This was considered suitable because it permitted adequate investigation of the independent variables, since the events had already taken place and involved a comparison between Nigeria and Pakistan. Our inability to manipulate SD policies and practices was observed as a weakness of the design. Consequently, the independent variables (countries) were compared using the dependent variables (SD policies, practices, and teachers’ job performance). The differences in the effect variable (teachers’ job performance) across the representative samples were analysed and attributed to the caused variable(s) (SD policies and practices).

The population comprised 22,286 faculty members across the 40 Federal Government-owned universities in Nigeria (NUC, 2015) and 6,713 faculty members at 25 Federal Government-owned universities in Pakistan (HEC, 2016). The target participants were Heads of Departments (HODs), Deans of Faculties and lecturers in Nigeria and Chairs of Departments, Deans of Faculties and faculty members in Pakistan.

A multi-stage sampling technique was adopted. The 40 Nigerian universities are located across the six geo-political zones comprising 36 states and Abuja or the capital city, while most of the 25 Pakistani Government-owned universities are located in Islamabad, the capital city. Random and purposive sampling was used to select 12 universities from the 40 Federal universities in Nigeria. Two universities were purposively selected from each of the six geopolitical zones to obtain equal representation. Twelve of the 25 Pakistani Federal universities established between 1948 and 2007 (Cresswell, 2003; Nabunya, 2012) were selected.
in order to obtain adequate information which might not be available from the other Federal universities.

Stratified sampling using the Taro Yamane sample size formula was used to select the teachers, HODs and Deans of faculties with 554 and 546 (lecturers), 100 and 56 (Deans), and 265 and 113 (HODs), respectively (Welsland, 2010). Half of the sample size was added to the sample due to the low rate of responses. Hence, the total sample was 1,634. This was decided because the participants were not located in the same geographical area. The participants were selected because they were the targeted beneficiaries of the SD policies and practices in the universities that supplied the required information.

The items on the instruments used for the study were adapted from the empirical and conceptual literature. According to Borsa et al. (2012), adaptation of an instrument improves the researcher’s ability to generalise and also promotes investigation of differences within a diverse population. The instruments were modified to suit the study and were mainly adapted from previous similar studies in Africa and Asia. Korb (2012) states that an instrument can be adapted based on relevant localised, cultural conditions and can emanate from a different discipline or organisation which helps to build on existing knowledge. This enabled a comparison of data from samples with different backgrounds, promoting fair evaluation.

The Staff Development Policies Questionnaire (SDPQ) adapted from Radhakrishna (2001), Khan (2005), Sarbeng (2013), Siboniso (2013), Babagana (2014), and Stephen (2016) was used to gather information on SD policies. Section A solicited the respondents’ demographic details, namely, the name of the institution, gender, and rank. Section B focused on the sub-variables (dimensions) of SD policies such as selection, funding, performance appraisal and promotion policy, with 20 items. The Staff Development Practices Questionnaire (SDPrQ) adapted from Hassan (2011); Nabunya, (2012); Muhoi, (2013); and Dawo, Smatwa, and Okwatch (2013) was used to gather information on SD practices. Section A sought demographic data on the respondents and had six items. Section B contained 15 items to elicit responses on training for higher qualifications, conferences and workshops/seminars. The Teachers’ Job Performance Questionnaire (TJPQ) adapted from Ekpoh, Edet, and Nkama (2013); Dawo, Smatwa and Okwatch (2013); and Moreno-Murcia, Torregrosa, and Pedreno (2015) was used to gather information on teachers’ job performance (HODs and Deans). Section A gathered data on the faculty, department, rank, and work experience, while Section B contained 15 items on teaching, research and publications, and community service as indicators of lecturers’ job performance.

Face and construct validity of the instruments were carried out. The reliability of the instruments was measured through Cronbach’s Alpha (α) to ensure internal consistency and the quality of the scale. There is no absolute standard on the acceptable level of Cronbach’s Alpha. However, the scales for all variables demonstrated an acceptable reliability at 0.71, 0.70 and 0.75 for SDPQ, SDPrQ and TJPQ, respectively because the Cronbach’s Alpha values were above 0.70. Therefore, it can be said that the scales have good internal consistency (Gerbing et al., 1988; Pavot et al., 1991; Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994; DeVellis, 2003; Pallant, 2011).

The participants’ consent was sought after they were informed of the purpose of the study and shown letters of introduction from the appropriate authorities. They were assured of the confidentiality of any information provided and that it would be used solely for research purposes. Participation was voluntarily as no one was compelled to take part. Given the nature of the study, the respondents were not exposed to any form of risk or harm and their identities remained confidential.

The data gathered from the respondents on SD policies, practices, and lecturers’ job performance were compiled and screened. The differences were statistically analysed using inferential statistics, One-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to test all the hypotheses formulated at 0.5 alpha level of significance. One-way MANOVA was found appropriate in testing the hypotheses. According to Pallant (2011), when the dependent variable (SD policies, practices, and teachers’ job performance) is more than one and the independent variable is categorical (Nigeria and Pakistan), MANOVA is an appropriate statistic for testing whether there is a significant difference or otherwise. Decisions were taken statistically using the calculated level against the critical significant level of 0.05.

4. Results

In order to investigate if a significant difference exists between teachers’ job performance in Nigerian and Pakistani universities in terms of the impact of SD policies and practices, the responses from the HODs,
Deans/Directors, and lecturers on the performance of faculty members following SD programmes were collated and analysed and the results are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Staff Development Policies, Practices and Teachers’ Job Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>23322.601</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>23322.601</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>23322.601</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling’s Trace</td>
<td>106.496</td>
<td>23322.601</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Largest Root</td>
<td>106.496</td>
<td>23322.601</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>41.879</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>41.879</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>41.879</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling’s Trace</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>41.879</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Largest Root</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>41.879</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>657.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results presented in Table 1 reveal a statistically significant difference between the job performance of teachers in Nigerian and Pakistani universities in terms of the impact of SD policies and practices. F (3, 657) = 41.879, p = .000; Pillai’s Trace =.161; partial eta squared = .161 at 0.05 level of significance. Although Wilks’ Lambda value is one of the most reported statistics (Pallant, 2011), Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest that Pillai’s Trace value is more robust if there is an unequal sample size. Univariate analysis was conducted to determine if the observable difference was peculiar to a certain aspect or across all dimensions of the dependent variables. The results are presented in Table 2.
Table 2 shows the results for the dependent variables (SD policies, practices and teachers’ job performance) considered separately. In order to reduce the chances of committing a Type 1 error, especially when a number of separate analyses are performed, Bonferroni adjustment was adopted. This was done by dividing the original alpha level of .05 by 3 (number of dependent variables) which gives a new alpha level of 0.017 (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007; Pallant, 2011). After Bonferroni adjustment alpha of 0.017, SD policies, F (1, 659) = 22.17, $\rho = .000$; partial eta squared = .003; SD practices, F (1, 659) = 16.26, $\rho = .000$; partial eta squared = .08; and teachers’ job performance, F (1, 659) = 23.56, $\rho = .003$; partial eta squared = .01, were found to be statistically different between Nigerian and Pakistani universities because none of the variables exceeded the new alpha level of 0.017. Hence, there was a statistically significant difference between Nigerian and Pakistani universities in terms of SD policies, SD practices, and lecturers’ job performance.

Table 3: Comparison of SD Policies, Practices and Teachers’ Job Performance between Nigeria and Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig. a</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development Policies</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>61.36</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>-5.130*</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>66.43</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.130*</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development Practices</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>62.53</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>5.622*</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.622*</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59.39</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Job Performance</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>55.21</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.745*</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>53.42</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.745*</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54.18</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results presented in Table 3 show higher mean scores for SD policy implementation in Pakistani universities than for Nigerian universities (Mean Difference = 5.13$, p = 0.00<0.017$). This implies that Pakistani universities reported higher levels of SD policies (66.43) than Nigerian universities (61.36). However, SD practice scored higher in Nigeria (62.53) than in Pakistan (57.08) (Mean Difference = 5.62*, $p = 0.00<0.017$). Lastly, there was a higher level of teachers’ job performance in Nigerian universities (55.21) than in Pakistani (53.52) universities (Mean Difference = 1.75*, $p = 0.00<0.017$) following SD programmes.

5. Discussion

The results of the analysis show significant differences between Nigerian and Pakistani universities in terms of teachers’ job performance following SD. While SD policies and practices impact teachers’ job performance in both Nigerian and Pakistani universities, the level of job performance following SD among lecturers in Nigerian universities improved more than it did in Pakistani universities. This could be due to socio-economic factors, government policies, and institutional policies, among others. The researchers’ personal interaction with university teachers in both nations, suggests that SD activities are more pronounced in Pakistan in terms of policy, and that the government, universities and their staff believe that SD will not only improve staff performance but will also enhance the performance of the institution and the nation at large. As noted previously, through the HEC, the government of Pakistan adopted a set of measures, including short-term initiatives (faculty hiring programmes, faculty exchange programmes, visiting scholar programmes, and faculty professional and pedagogical skills development programmes), as well as long-term measures (overseas scholarships, scholarships, PhD fellowships, public sector universities and postdoctoral fellowships), and incentives (upward revision of faculty’s pay scales, tenure-track system, placement of new PhDs holders at top universities) to enhance lecturers’ capacity (Anam et al., 2012).

In Nigeria, this could be a result of promotion criteria, accreditation requirements, and the NUC policy on a PhD as a requirement for teachers in Nigerian universities. Thus, SD is regarded as playing two roles, namely, to improve the job performance of lecturers and prepare them for promotion. This is in line with Khan, Yusoff, and Khan (2014), and Peretomode and Chukwuma (2012), who observed that SD programmes improve lecturers’ productivity, irrespective of their location and the type of institution. Anam et al. (2013) found that SD activities had a significant impact on the job performance of Pakistani university teachers while Peretomode and Chukwuma (2012) established a positive significant relationship between SD and lecturers’ productivity in Nigerian
Moreover, a statistically significant variation was observed between Nigerian lecturers’ job performance and their Pakistani counterparts in terms of the impact of SD policies, with a more positive impact on the former. This implies that SD policies are instrumental in the attainment of university goals and improvement of lecturers’ job performance. The fact that the difference was in favour of Nigeria could be the result of a number of factors, including the ‘publish or perish’ syndrome, accreditation procedures, and the management strategies adopted by the HEC, NUC and university management, among others. This is in agreement with Shno and Premalatha’s (2019) study that established a significant difference in faculty performance between public and private universities in Malaysia.

6. Conclusion and Implications for Policy and Practice
The study found that Nigerian teachers demonstrated higher levels of job performance following the adoption of SD policy and practices than their counterparts in Pakistan, whereas Pakistan’s SD policies were significantly superior. The margin of differences could be attributed to factors such as policy implementation and funding, among others.

Based on the study’s findings and conclusions, it is recommended that the implementation of SD policies (funding, selection, performance appraisal, and promotion) should be improved in Nigeria to enhance university teachers’ skills and competencies and improve universities’ global ranking.

Staff development in the area of pedagogy should be compulsory for all university teachers in Nigeria to enable them to meet the demands of the knowledge-based economy, to keep abreast of developments and new methods in their disciplines, and to gain competitive advantage.

Furthermore, teaching performance should be given more attention in the assessment of Nigerian lecturers. It was found that Nigerian lecturers tend to focus more on research and publications rather than on teaching, while in Pakistan, teaching receives the same attention as research.

Lastly, SD policies and practices in Nigerian and Pakistani universities should be improved by ensuring that SD programmes match both individual and university needs in line with global practice for sustainable competitive advantage and knowledge diversity.
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