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**Abstract**

*This quantitative survey study investigated the perceptions and measures to improve teaching quality in the Department of Educational Management and Policy at a university in urban Nigeria. The study comprised a sample size of 103 respondents including 52 lecturers and 51 final-year students in the 2021/2022 academic year. The researcher-developed instrument entitled Teaching Quality Questionnaire (TQQ) was used for data collection. The instrument was validated by three experts in the field of educational research. The reliability index of the instrument was determined using the Cronbach alpha technique, and a reliability coefficient of 0.86 was obtained. Data collected were analyzed using mean ratings. Findings indicated high perceptions of the teaching quality of lecturers. However, major discrepancies between the perceptions of lecturers and students were discovered. In addition, the findings also identified measures to improve teaching quality in the institution, such as knowledge of subject content, effective feedback mechanisms, high student assessment, and a safe learning environment, among others. Based on the findings, recommendations include encouraging lecturers to engage in one-to-one interactions with students, providing staff development opportunities on effective classroom management, and organizing student engagement activities under the supervision of the department head.*
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Introduction

Teaching can generally be defined as the art of conveying knowledge, skills, and information to students. Quality teaching is described by Sahat (2014) as teaching that produces desired outcomes such as students’ acquisition of skills, knowledge, and understanding. To be described as quality, teaching must have an impact on learners. Some educational researchers have identified indicators of quality teaching, which include teacher qualification, teacher characteristics,

teacher practices, and teacher effectiveness (Toropova et al., 2019). Teachers’ qualifications include credentials, knowledge, and experience; teachers' characteristics cover attitude and class behavior, while teachers’ practices include teaching strategies and methodologies employed by the teacher (Goe & Stickler, 2008). The overall aim of these indicators is to achieve high student learning outcomes. Teachers have numerous roles, which include helping students understand the course content, providing extra help to students when needed, listening to their ideas, and answering their questions during and after instruction (Klusmann et al., 2016). There are many factors that contribute to the quality of teacher teaching for achieving high student learning outcomes, such as teacher qualification, characteristics, practices, and effectiveness.

In Nigeria, the Ministry of Education comprises 40 universities, while state governments maintain 44 universities; additionally, there are 69 private universities (Agbu, 2017). One of the goals of higher education in Nigeria is to contribute to national development through high-level manpower training which promotes valuable skills, aptitude, attitudes, knowledge, morals, values, and creative abilities (FGN, 2013). Moreover, the aim of all universities in Nigeria is to provide quality learning opportunities to students (FGN, 2013). Universities actively pursue this goal by employing qualified personnel, admitting hardworking students, encouraging research, and providing quality teaching and learning (Agbu, 2017). The Department of Educational Management and Policy (EMP) at the university under study in Nigeria offers 28 courses to students from the first year to the final year. The university will be referred to as “AP University” (pseudonym). Students also have the option to select additional education-related subjects as electives from 13 other departments. The reason behind this is to prepare students to develop expertise in specific teaching subjects for teaching practice purposes. In addition, it is important to expand the knowledge base of the department. The departmental courses aim to develop students' administrative knowledge and skills, preparing them to become effective and efficient educational leaders and managers.

Although there is a focus on improving quality in Nigerian universities, problems persist that can hinder quality teaching and outcomes. A major problem in Nigerian universities is the lack of quality educators. There are also concerns about the quality of doctoral dissertations and the research training that students receive (Agu & Odimegwu, 2014). According to a Nigerian Federal Ministry of Education (2018) report, there is a need to focus more on fairness and dealing with other social problems that impact higher education. The report also highlights other issues inhibiting the development of Nigerian universities including governance, infrastructure, curricula, disruptions to learning that are primarily caused by strikes, access and equity, and funding problems (Nigerian Federal Ministry of Education, 2018). Despite efforts to improve quality in Nigerian universities, persistent problems, including a lack of quality educators, continue to impede development. Addressing these challenges, such as governance, infrastructure, curricula, disruptions to learning, access and equity, and funding, are vital for sustainable development and improving learning outcomes in Nigerian higher education.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of teaching quality among lecturers and students in the Department of Educational Management and Policy and to identify measures for enhancing their teaching effectiveness. There is a dearth of research that explores teaching quality from both the lecturer and student perspective in the higher education context in Nigeria. Hence, there is a need to contribute to the limited existing literature on teaching quality in Nigerian higher education. This study can be significant because it came at a time when the World University Ranking 2023 edition placed the “AP University” (pseudonym) among the top 1,501 universities in the world. This was seen as a significant improvement from its former rank of 2,988. It became necessary that the university focus on continuous improvement through effective teaching, learning, and research. Additionally, this study is aligned with the national goals of higher education in Nigeria, and thus it is critical to further examine lecturer and student perceptions of instruction in the Nigerian university context. It is against this backdrop that this study was carried out to investigate the perceptions of students and lecturers on teaching quality and to identify possible measures of improvement. Finally, the study's research questions focus on the perceptions of teaching quality and measures for improvement, shedding light on the views of both lecturers and students. By understanding these perceptions and identifying effective measures, the study aims to contribute to the ongoing improvement of instructional practices, leading to better learning outcomes and overall educational experiences. Specifically, the study explores the perceptions of teaching quality among lecturers and students during instructional delivery in the Department of Educational Management and Policy. The study also aims to identify measures for improving the teaching quality of lecturers in the Department of Educational Management and Policy. The following research questions guided the study:

**Research Questions**

1. What are the perceptions of the teaching quality of lecturers in the Department of Educational Management and Policy?

2 .What are the measures for improving the teaching quality of lecturers in the Department of Educational Management and Policy?

Literature Review

Teaching quality has been discussed in various studies as a factor influencing student achievement (La Velle & Flores, 2018; Osakwe, 2014; Ruiz-Alfonso et al., 2020; Scherer et al., 2016; Skourdoumbis, 2017). Researchers have also characterized it as both the problem and solution to student performance (Baroutsis, 2016; Sahat, 2014). Teaching quality is defined by Henard and Leprince-Ringuet (2008) as teachers’ attention to the class level they are teaching and their academic progress, the certainty of what the class requires for productive learning, understandable explanations, respect for students’ opinions, and encouragement of students’ independent thought during instructional delivery. Xhaferi (2017) posited that the knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and disposition a teacher brings into their profession could predict students’ achievement. Teaching quality includes a wide range of dimensions and factors that contribute to positive educational outcomes and transform students from passive to active learners (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). Teaching quality is also connected to teachers’ performance, knowledge, and creativity (Blanton et al., 2006). However, it is important to note that there is no universal or standard definition of teaching quality (Barnes & Cross, 2018) due to the complexity of teaching quality and the influence of multiple variables (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005). Despite the difficulty in precisely defining teaching quality, it has emerged as a global concern in education, necessitating further research and understanding of the outcomes of quality teaching (Lingard & Lewis, 2017).

A study conducted in the United States by Haskins and Loeb (2007) examined how to improve the quality of teaching and highlighted that good teachers can enhance student achievement. Furthermore, students who receive quality teaching over consecutive years demonstrate cumulative gains in achievement. Haskins and Loeb (2007) also proposed a five-part plan for improving teaching quality, which includes rethinking entry requirements, implementing strategies to identify effective teachers, promoting effective teachers, providing bonuses to teachers working with disadvantaged students, and linking professional development to teachers' work.

Additionally, research by Lee (2018) addressed an important issue related to teaching quality, namely its correlation with student performance and achievement. Lee (2018) argued that it is incorrect to solely attribute student performance to teaching quality, as there are other factors that may influence it. These factors play a significant role in how students acquire and apply what they have been taught. The researcher identified common features associated with teaching quality including classroom management, cognitive activation, student engagement, and student support. In conclusion, Lee's research underscores the complex nature of student performance and its connection to teaching quality, emphasizing that factors beyond instruction alone impact student success. The proceeding sections focus on classroom management and student engagement.

Classroom Management

Classroom management is an important issue in teaching and learning and a crucial part of teachers’ success in creating a safe and effective learning environment for students’ quality education (Nwankwo et al., 2019). It refers to the tactics adopted by teachers to ensure decorum in the classroom thus creating a conducive atmosphere for learning to take place during instruction (Asiyai, 2011). Additionally, classroom management helps to create an enabling environment for teaching and learning to run smoothly without disruption from students. Proper classroom management helps maintain students’ focus during instructional delivery. It involves techniques such as a positive attitude, happy facial expressions, encouraging statements, respectful and fair treatment of students, a well-lit classroom, understanding students’ behavior; fostering productive teacher-student relationships; time consciousness, setting classroom expectations, proper class organization, preventing disruptive behavior in class, and many more (Crisis Prevention Institute, 2021). Effective classroom management starts with student compliance and orderliness since learning cannot happen when students disrupt other students and are inattentive (Glossary of Education Reform, 2014). It is one of the important criteria for assessing teaching effectiveness, and quality teaching is dependent on teachers’ ability to manage and control classroom instruction (Asiyai, 2011). The ability to effectively manage the classroom is a major factor in evaluating teaching effectiveness and highlights the importance of instructional skills in fostering a learning environment that facilitates successful instructional delivery and student learning.

Student Engagement

Student engagement refers to the level of attention, curiosity, and interest students show during instructional delivery (Glossary of Education Reform, 2016). Learning improves when students are inquisitive, interested, or inspired. On the other hand, learning suffers when students are bored, dispassionate, or disengaged (Glossary of Education Reform, 2016). Student engagement is malleable, and teachers can design contexts and tasks that either encourage or discourage it (Parsons et al., 2014). It is also defined as the activities students participate in to achieve desired school outcomes (Stephens, 2020). In summary, student engagement plays a critical role in the learning process as it reflects the level of attention, curiosity, and interest demonstrated by students during lessons. When students are actively engaged in classes, their learning experiences are enriched, leading to improved outcomes.

There is a consensus among scholars that student engagement consists of affective engagement, behavior engagement, and cognitive engagement (Parsons et al., 2014). These three aspects of engagement have been observed by the researcher as a necessary component of effective teaching. Cognitive engagement involves students being mentally stimulated in the learning process. It is centered on their perseverance to know more and understand difficult concepts (Parsons et al., 2014). Teachers engage students cognitively by giving them complex tasks that will stimulate them to engage in a deeper mental investigation of the subject matter (Lipowsky et al., 2009). This enables them to reflect more and find solutions to problems. Thus, student engagement encompasses affective, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions, with cognitive engagement playing a vital role in effective teaching. By stimulating students' mental processes and encouraging their understanding of complex concepts, educators can foster a deeper level of learning.

Affective engagement deals with students’ feelings toward the school; it also involves students’ interest and curiosity around specific learning topics and tasks (Fredricks & McColskey, 2012). Finally, behavioral engagement includes students’ active participation in tasks in school; attendance in classes, attention during instruction, and adherence to rules and regulations (Fredricks & McColskey, 2012). Active participation in class activities inspires students to be more engaged (Merho, 2022). Furthermore, student engagement can be fostered through the following practices:

* linking student’s prior knowledge to content (Loughran, 2018)
* conceptual understanding of the content of instruction by teachers will make it easier for them to respond to students’ difficulties in understanding concepts (Loughran, 2018)
* Nurturing student–student relations (Bailey & Lee, 2021) and teacher-student relationships (Lee, 2018; Lee & Bailey, 2016; McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015).

Close and supportive relationships between students and teachers are necessary for quality teaching to take place in schools. Students are more likely to feel closer to teachers who express an interest in their well-being and provide support for them when needed (McGrath & Van Bergen, 2015). A positive teacher-student relationship promotes a positive attitude in students, increases one–on–one time with students, and helps teachers treat students fairly (Pino-James, 2015). In the student/teacher relationship, students learn from teachers while teachers observe how students respond to didactic methods, and together both successfully achieve academic goals (Merho, 2022).

Teachers can also create meaningful learning activities by connecting with students’ previous knowledge and experiences, providing learning activities that are slightly beyond students’ current level of competence, and helping students engage more by welcoming their ideas and opinions into the flow of the activity (Pino-James, 2015). Teachers could also introduce students to collaborative learning which is a powerful tool to activate students’ cognitive faculties and problem-solving skills (Suruchi & Sunil, 2017). Effective teaching involves creating meaningful learning activities that connect with students' prior knowledge and experiences. By designing tasks that slightly challenge students' current level of competence and by actively welcoming their ideas and opinions, teachers can enhance student engagement and promote deeper learning.

Ofeimu and Kolawole (2017) conducted a study in Nigeria to find out the extent teacher qualification determines student academic performance. The result of the study indicated that the level of teacher qualification did not significantly influence the academic performance of secondary school students. This suggests that a teacher’s effectiveness in the class does not depend on his or her qualifications; the findings also discourage the common belief by many school managers that the higher the degree the more productive the teacher will be. It also proves that there could be other factors responsible for student academic performance in the school apart from teacher quality.

The importance of student achievement has led scholars to develop practical ways of improving quality teaching and learning in institutions of learning. Some of these practices include:

* Teachers should have high expectations for their students.
* Teachers should explicitly explain knowledge and concepts to students.
* Teachers should have effective feedback mechanisms that will provide students with information about their performance and the areas they need to improve during instruction.
* Teachers should use data to identify students’ learning needs.
* High student assessment should be paramount in the learning process.
* Effective classroom management will address disengagement and disruptive behaviors.
* Promoting a safe and supportive learning environment.
* Collaboration among teachers will lead to best practices (Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation, 2020).

Methodology

The quantitative survey study aimed to explore the perceptions of students and lecturers on the teaching quality of lecturers during instructional delivery and to identify measures for improving teaching in the Department of Educational Management and Policy at the university under study. The population of the study consists of 174 respondents, which include 78 lecturers and 96 final-year students in the department based on available data in the Department of Educational Management and Policy. The reason for using final-year students for the study was because they have experienced first-hand the teaching skills and methodology of most lecturers in the department. It was believed that they would be in the best position to give information on their lecturers’ teaching qualities.

A purposive sampling technique was used to select 51 students and 52 lecturers based on their availability at the time of the study. One questionnaire was used in this study, titled “Teaching Quality Questionnaire” (TQQ), to elicit responses from lecturers and students. The questionnaire has sections “A and B,” which contain 26 items that obtained participant responses in the areas of classroom management practices, student engagement practices, and the possible ways of improving the teaching quality of lecturers in the department.

The test instrument was subjected to content and face validity by three experts in the faculty of Education, one from a department of education in the United States and two from the department under study. Questions were constructed based on similar teaching quality scales but were developed specifically for the Nigerian higher education context. To find the degree of internal consistency of the test items, Cronbach’s alpha was used and a reliability coefficient of 0.86 was obtained. One hundred and three copies of questionnaires were administered by the researcher and two research assistants and were retrieved and used for analysis. Responses (see Table 1) were based on a Likert-like scale of Strongly Agreed (SA), Agreed (A), Disagreed (D), and Strongly Disagreed (SD). Data were analyzed using mean ratings and standard deviation. A criterion mean of 2.5 and above was used to accept an item, while below 2.5 was rejected. The left column includes the lecturers’ responses, while the right column includes the students’ responses.

Results

This section presents the results of the study. Table 1 provides the mean ratings and standard deviation scores on perceptions of the teaching quality of lecturers.

Research Question 1: What are the perceptions of the teaching quality of lecturers in the Department of Educational Management and Policy?

**Table 1**

*Mean Ratings and Standard Deviation Scores on Perceptions of Teaching Quality of Lecturers*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | ITEMS | Lecturers (*n* = 52) | | | Students (*n* =51) | | |
| Mean | SD | Decision | Mean | SD | Decision |
| 1 | My class is usually well-organized | 3.18 | 0.78 | Agree | 3.16 | 0.83 | Agree |
| 2 | Lecturers are punctual to class | 3.38 | 0.63 | Agree | 2.92 | 0.84 | Agree |
| 3 | Lecturers use teaching time effectively | 3.46 | 0.64 | Agree | 2.73 | 2.92 | Agree |
| 4 | Lecturers control disruptive behavior effectively | 3.15 | 0.54 | Agree | 3.33 | 0.77 | Agree |
| 5 | Lecturers prohibit the use of cell phones during instructional delivery | 3.38 | 0.63 | Agree | 3.45 | 0.78 | Agree |
| 6 | Lecturers shun chorus answers | 3.38 | 0.49 | Agree | 3.12 | 0.86 | Agree |
| 7 | Lecturers ask for students’ opinions during class discussions | 3.23 | 0.43 | Agree | 3.02 | 0.62 | Agree |
| 8 | Lectures are usually interesting | 3.46 | 0.50 | Agree | 3.00 | 0.75 | Agree |
| 9 | Students pay close attention during instructional delivery | 3.15 | 0.36 | Agree | 3.39 | 0.60 | Agree |
| 10 | Lecturers ask lots of questions during class instruction | 2.85 | 0.54 | Agree | 3.10 | 0.61 | Agree |
| 11 | Students are involved during class activities | 3.46 | 0.50 | Agree | 3.27 | 0.80 | Agree |
| 12 | Lecturers connect to students’ previous knowledge during instructional delivery | 3.23 | 0.43 | Agree | 2.92 | 0.84 | Agree |
| 13 | Lecturers encourage students’ collaboration during class activities | 3.23 | 0.58 | Agree | 3.14 | 0.85 | Agree |
| 14 | Lecturers motivate students to explain concepts in their own words | 3.08 | 0.27 | Agree | 3.00 | 0.72 | Agree |
| 15 | Lecturers assess students’ understanding during instruction | 3.00 | 0.56 | Agree | 2.88 | 0.79 | Agree |
| 16 | Students stay after class to seek information on what has been taught | 2.31 | 0.61 | Disagree | 2.10 | 0.78 | Disagree |
| 17 | Students seek lecturers’ counsel on their learning challenges | 2.92 | 0.62 | Agree | 2.39 | 0.92 | Disagree |
| 18 | Students interact with lecturers easily | 2.46 | 0.50 | Agree | 2.31 | 0.84 | Disagree |
|  | **Cluster Mean** | **3.13** | **0.53** | **Agree** | **2.90** | **0.90** | **Agree** |

As shown in Table 1, items 1–15 have mean scores above the cut-off mean of 2.50 for both lecturers and students and this indicates their agreement with the items as their perceptions of the teaching quality of lecturers. On the other hand, the mean ratings of both lecturers and students for item 16 fell below the acceptable mean score of 2.50, indicating their disagreement with the item as part of the teaching quality of lecturers. The results further reveal that lecturers agreed with items 17 and 18 as part of their teaching quality, while students disagreed with the items.

The cluster standard deviation scores of 0.53 and 0.90 for lecturers and students, respectively, indicated that their responses in each item were close to the mean, implying that their responses were homogenous. The cluster mean of 3.13 and 2.90 for lecturers and students, respectively, are above the cut-off mean of 2.50, and this shows high perceptions of the teaching quality of lecturers in the Department of Educational Management and Policy.

Table 2 provides mean ratings and standard deviation scores on measures for improving the teaching quality of lectures.

Research Question 2: What are the measures for improving the teaching quality of lecturers in the Department of Educational Management and Policy?

**Table 2**

*Mean Ratings and Standard Deviation Scores on Measures for Improving Teaching Quality of Lectures*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | ITEMS | Lecturers (*n* = 52) | | | Students (*n* =51) | | |
| Mean | SD | Decision | Mean | SD | Decision |
| 19 | Lecturers should have high expectations from their students | 2.77 | 0.43 | Agree | 2.96 | 0.82 | Agree |
| 20 | Lecturers should have good subject content knowledge | 3.62 | 0.49 | Agree | 3.59 | 0.50 | Agree |
| 21 | Lecturers should develop effective feedback mechanisms | 3.38 | 0.49 | Agree | 3.31 | 0.62 | Agree |
| 22 | Lecturers should use data to note where students’ learning needs are more | 3.00 | 0.79 | Agree | 3.12 | 0.79 | Agree |
| 23 | High student assessment should be paramount | 3.31 | 0.47 | Agree | 3.35 | 0.74 | Agree |
| 24 | Effective classroom management should be emphasized | 3.54 | 0.50 | Agree | 3.16 | 0.81 | Agree |
| 25 | A safe learning environment should be promoted | 3.46 | 0.50 | Agree | 3.57 | 0.54 | Agree |
| 26 | Collaboration among lecturers will produce best practices | 3.38 | 0,49 | Agree | 3.10 | 1.01 | Agree |
|  | **Cluster Mean** | **3.31** | **0.52** | **Agree** | **3.27** | **0.73** | **Agree** |

Table 2 revealed that the mean scores of lecturers and students for all items are higher than the criterion mean value of 2.50 and this indicates agreement with these items as the measures for improving the teaching quality of lecturers. The overall standard deviation scores of 0.52 and 0.73 for lecturers and students, respectively, indicated that there is homogeneity amongst their responses. The cluster mean of 3.31 and 3.27 for lecturers and students, respectively, which are above the cut-off mean of 2.50, indicated agreement in the need to implement measures to improve the teaching quality of lecturers in the department.

Discussion

Table 1 revealed the perceptions of lecturers and students on teaching quality in their departments, with mean scores of 3.13 and 2.90, respectively. This finding aligns with Asiyai (2011) who observed that effective classroom management ensures decorum in the classroom and creates a conducive atmosphere for learning to take place during instructional delivery. Further observation shows that students and lecturers rejected item 16 “Students stay back after classes to search out more information on what had been taught” These findings conflict with Lipowsky et al., (2009) who noted that teachers engage students cognitively by giving them complex tasks that will stimulate them to engage in a deeper mental investigation after school to evaluate what they have learned and develop an independent solution. The effect of the 8-month strike in Nigerian universities could have induced negative perceptions from the students. It is possible that lecturers in the department were rushing to cover the scheme of work for the section and failed to give students complex tasks or assignments that demanded them to stay back after school to tackle them. Also, item 17, which is “students seek lecturers counsel on their learning challenges,” was rejected by students but accepted by lecturers. This disagreement could be a result of the poor relationship existing between the students and the lecturers in the department, and the rejection of item 18, “students interact with lecturers easily,” by students, again confirms the fact that students don’t seek counsel from whom they hardly interact with. Constant interaction builds trust in relationships and gives the opportunity for effective communication and open-mindedness. The reason for the acceptance and high ratings for items 17 and 18 by lecturers alone could suggest that they were biased and decided to overrate themselves. The discrepancies observed between the perceptions of lecturers and students highlight areas for improvement in instructional approaches, communication channels, and the overall learning environment, ultimately emphasizing the need for continuous evaluation and enhancement of teaching practices.

Table 2 indicates that both lecturers and students agreed that all the items were measures for the improvement of teaching quality in the school with a cluster mean of 3.31 for lecturers and 3.27 for students. The findings are in tandem with Merho (2022) and the Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation (2020) which identified possible ways of improving lecturers teaching quality as high student expectations, explicit explanation during instruction, feedback mechanism, use of data, assessment, effective classroom management, safe learning environment, and teachers’ collaboration. The ultimate purpose of all these indices is to increase learning and academic achievement in the department.

The findings shed light on the perceptions of lecturers and students regarding teaching quality in the department. While there were some areas of discrepancy such as the rejection of certain items by students, the consensus on measures for development highlights the need to address major factors such as classroom management, student engagement, teacher-student relationships, and collaborative efforts. These findings also underscore the need for continuous efforts to enhance teaching quality, considering its impact on creating a learning environment that centers on academic achievement.

Implications and Conclusion

The teaching quality of a school determines its standards and contributions to society. It comprises teacher effectiveness in classroom management and student engagement during instructional delivery. The study found that lecturers in the department exhibited teaching quality during instructional delivery. The implication of this finding is that students will only be part of the learning process when adequate measures are taken by lecturers to ensure that they stay engaged during teaching and learning. It is therefore needful that lecturers in the department take the art of teaching seriously and improve their teaching quality to increase the academic performance of students.

The findings highlight the importance of quality improvement initiatives in Nigerian higher education. Effective classroom management, such as organization and punctuality are important in the classroom. Additionally, lecturers and students indicated the importance of the value of student engagement practices as well as strengthening teacher-student relationships. The results also indicate the importance of incorporating feedback mechanisms more effectively in the classroom. In addition, collaboration among lecturers is important in fostering best practices in the classroom. Although this study focused on the Nigerian context, many issues pertaining to teaching quality in this study impact education systems around the world. The results can provide valuable insight into teaching quality in the higher education classroom; however, it is important to be cognizant of cultural differences when interpreting the results.

On a positive note, both lecturers and students agreed on several measures for improving teaching quality. These measures include setting high expectations for students, providing clear explanations, offering feedback, utilizing data effectively, managing the classroom well, fostering a safe learning environment, and promoting collaboration among teachers. These findings align with existing research and suggest practical strategies that can be implemented to enhance teaching practices within the department. Considering these findings, it is necessary for the department to address the areas of disagreement and focus on implementing the identified improvement measures. By fostering positive teacher-student relationships, improving classroom management, and incorporating the suggested strategies, the department can create a conducive learning environment that promotes student engagement, learning, and overall academic success. These findings may also be beneficial to the national educational ministry, which is striving to improve educational outcomes. The results of this study may provide valuable insight to other higher education institutions in Nigeria and abroad.

The results of this study have provided valuable insight into quality teaching in this context under study. Although this study was only conducted in one department and at one university, the results can be beneficial in other educational settings. Department heads can consider the implications of the study and work on improving instructional delivery through professional development sessions, effective teaching evaluations, or mentoring. lecturers can also work on fostering better teacher-student relations and help them seek more guidance as needed. Furthermore, it may be beneficial to promote effective communication between lecturers and students and foster a more collaborative learning environment.

Although this study provided much-needed research on teaching quality in the higher education context in Nigeria, it is not without limitations. It is important to consider the impact of a relatively small sample size, a single departmental focus, and self-reporting bias. Participants, especially the lecturers, may have inflated their sense of teaching quality; alternatively, lecturers may have rated their teaching quality as low due to modesty or lack of confidence in teaching abilities. Additionally, participants may have varying views of what constitutes effective teaching.

Future research could include qualitative data or a mixed method approach. Utilizing interviews, focus groups, or open-ended survey data can provide much-needed insight into closed-ended responses. This approach allows for more nuanced insights and can complement the quantitative data obtained through closed-ended responses. It would also be valuable to obtain a larger sample and look at other departments or institutions of higher education in Nigeria. A longitudinal study of lecturer teaching quality could be beneficial to explore adaptations that may lead to positive teaching and learning outcomes. Finally, observer-based assessments may be valuable. Including observations of third parties who are not affiliated with the department can be beneficial. These observers can evaluate teaching practices, classroom dynamics, and student engagement using standardized assessment frameworks. This method adds an objective dimension to the evaluation process and can provide valuable feedback to lecturers.

In conclusion, the findings of this study reveal some interesting insights into the perceptions of teaching quality among lecturers and students. It seems that both groups have slightly different views, but overall, they agree that there is room for improvement. It is worth noting that while lecturers generally rated teaching quality higher than students, there were certain areas where they both had reservations. For instance, students didn't feel inclined to stay back after classes for further exploration, and they also seemed reluctant to seek counsel from their lecturers. This could be due to a lack of trust or a strained relationship between students and lecturers. It's important to recognize the significance of building positive connections with students, as studies have shown that a strong teacher-student relationship can have a positive impact on learning outcomes.
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