



## East African Journal of Education Studies

[eajes.eanso.org](http://eajes.eanso.org)

Volume 8, Issue 2, 2025

Print ISSN: 2707-3939 | Online ISSN: 2707-3947

Title DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37284/2707-3947>

**EANSO**  
EAST AFRICAN  
NATURE &  
SCIENCE  
ORGANIZATION

Original Article

## The Status of Performance Management for Quality Instruction in Ugandan Private Universities

John Robert Okurut<sup>1\*</sup>, Wilberforce Okongo<sup>1</sup> & Joseph Rwothumio<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kyambogo University, P. O. Box 1, Kyambogo, Kampala, Uganda.

\* Author for Correspondence Email: [okurutjr@gmail.com](mailto:okurutjr@gmail.com)

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.8.2.3222>

Date Published: **ABSTRACT**

27 June 2025

### Keywords:

Performance  
Management,  
Quality Instruction,  
Private Universities,  
Uganda.

This paper presents the current status of performance management for quality instruction in private universities in Uganda. The key objective of the study was to establish the relationship between performance management and quality instruction in Uganda's private universities. The study was grounded on the Goal Setting Theory, the pragmatist research paradigm, and convergent parallel methods. It used self-administered questionnaires, interview guides, and focus group discussions to collect data from 339 academic staff, 20 heads of department, and 12 quality assurance officers. Correlation, regression, and thematic analyses were applied to establish the relationship between the predictor and outcome variables and to glean themes for qualitative data analysis. The results showed a significant positive relationship between performance management and quality instruction ( $r=.47$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). In addition, it emerged that performance management contributed 40.8% of the change in quality instruction ( $R^2 = .408$ ). The conclusion held that performance management was a predictor of quality instruction in the selected private universities. Additionally, performance management caused a significant variation in the quality of instruction outputs in private universities. Thus, the university management should enhance its performance management efforts through tailored incentives for heads of department, improved facilities, performance appraisal, and better pay for the academic staff.

### APA CITATION

Okurut, J. R., Okongo, W. & Rwothumio, J. (2025). The Status of Performance Management for Quality Instruction in Ugandan Private Universities. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, 8(2), 906-922. <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.8.2.3222>

### CHICAGO CITATION

Okurut, John Robert, Wilberforce Okongo and Joseph Rwothumio. 2025. "The Status of Performance Management for Quality Instruction in Ugandan Private Universities". *East African Journal of Education Studies* 8 (2), 906-922. <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.8.2.3222>

### HARVARD CITATION

Okurut, J. R., Okongo, W. & Rwothumio, J. (2025) "The Status of Performance Management for Quality Instruction in Ugandan Private Universities", *East African Journal of Education Studies*, 8(2), pp. 906-922. doi: 10.37284/eajes.8.2.3222

**IEEE CITATION**

J. R. Okurut, W. Okongo & J. Rwothumio “The Status of Performance Management for Quality Instruction in Ugandan Private Universities” *EAJES*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 906-922, Jun. 2025.

**MLA CITATION**

Okurut, John Robert, Wilberforce Okongo & Joseph Rwothumio. “The Status of Performance Management for Quality Instruction in Ugandan Private Universities”. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, Vol. 8, no. 2, Jun. 2025, pp. 906-922, doi:10.37284/eajes.8.2.3222

**INTRODUCTION**

Globally, quality instruction is an issue, especially in developing countries (Suresh & Kumaravelu, 2017), as Abu reported (2008) that some private universities in Bangladesh sold certificates, provided easy-to-get degrees, with very low standards of teaching. In India, 32 institutions of higher learning were closed in 2012 for failure to maintain quality standards to attract the minimum enrollment of students (Nagaraju, 2012). Aziz (2010) observed that in Afghanistan, private universities sailed and passed students because they had paid tuition.

In Africa, private universities have been grappling with the challenges of achieving quality instruction (Afolabi & Idowu, 2019). In Malawi, for example, there is no quality framework for higher education, universities are poorly staffed, and there are no basic instructional materials for quality instruction (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2019). Similarly, Abiodun-Oyebanji and Omojola (2018) in Nigeria report that university education falls short of quality delivery because of outmoded curricula and poor methods of training.

According to reports, the concept of quality instruction is believed to have originated in Africa's two of the world's oldest private universities (Lulat, 2005). These private universities are Al-Quarawiyyin University, founded in 859 A.D. and Al-Azhar University, established in 970 A.D, in Morocco and Egypt, respectively. According to Woldegiorgis and Doeverspeck (2013), the two private universities demonstrated quality instruction by providing knowledge/skills that enabled graduates to function socially, economically, and politically.

In East Africa, a study by the Inter-University Council in East Africa (2014) found that 49% of university graduates were not adequately taught to work in their respective disciplines (McCowan, 2018). Coupled with pedagogical aspects, there was a lack of physical facilities and teaching materials that were essential for quality instruction (Mwebi & Simatwa, 2013). In Tanzania, the problem was not with physical resources that affected quality instruction, as it was with corruption exhibited by the academic staff (Ngalomba, 2014).

Here in Uganda, low-quality instruction arises because private universities fail to operate according to the quality framework (NCHE, 2014). Fairland University, for example, was closed in 2009 for breach of several provisions regarding quality instruction. Busoga University was closed in 2016 because of awarding fake degrees to thousands of Sudanese and Nigerian nationals. Kayiwa International University was deregistered in 2020 for failure to recruit qualified staff and to place the required infrastructure (Nangonzi, 2020). NCHE canceled 66 Ph.D. degrees that had been awarded by Kampala International University in 2013 over matters of quality instruction (Alemiga & Kibuukamusoke, 2019).

Owing to the significance of quality instruction, some studies have been undertaken. For instance, Atwebembeire et al. (2018a) investigated the causal relationship between performance monitoring and quality instruction in private universities. Furthermore, Kibaliwandu and Mwesigye (2021) studied financial strategies and quality assurance implementation in universities. Yet, Atwebembeire (2018b) researched staff participation and quality teaching and research in private universities in

Uganda. Nevertheless, these studies reveal a conceptual gap.

Hence, the study was based on the need to establish the relationship between performance management and quality instruction in private universities in Uganda. Based on the objective of establishing the relationship between performance management and quality instruction in private universities in Uganda, the emerging hypothesis was stated as follows: *H01: There is no statistically significant relationship between performance management and quality instruction in private universities in Uganda.*

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Theoretical Review

This study was informed by the Goal Setting Theory by Locke (1968). Goal Setting Theory (GST) is one of the most documented theories for improving excellence (Lisa et al., 2009). Therefore, Goal Setting Theory (GST) was used to inform the two variables in this study, namely, Performance Management and Quality Instruction, respectively. Regarding performance management, Akinlabi et al. (2021) posit that goal setting influences human behaviours and is thus an avenue for managing employee performance. A study by Otaka et al. (2023) indicated that goal-setting was instrumental in performance management in terms of setting targets for performance appraisal. Cherulyot et al. (2023) noted that goal setting was one of the avenues the performance of lecturers could be managed and measured, especially in terms of the use of effective teaching methods, assessment of learning, and support services to the students. Similarly, Ogbeiwi (2018) also noted that goal setting could be used not only to improve the institution but quality of instruction of the lecturers as a whole. Therefore, in the context of this study, managers use goal-setting theory during performance planning, performance monitoring, performance appraisal, and performance rewarding, as well as when setting instructional methods, assessment procedures, and support for the students.

### Performance Management and Quality Instruction

Performance management is a strategy for tracking and developing people's skills so that they can contribute more effectively to the organisation (Udoye & Chinwe, 2023). Brown et al. (2017) argue that performance management exists in all organisations, whether formally through an official organisational process or informally through daily dialogue. Various scholars, (Azikuru et al., 2016; Atwebembeire et al., 2018a; Padhaya et al., 2021; Anyango et al., 2022; Rwothumio et al., 2021; Mohd & Ismail, 2021; Rwothumio et al., 2020; Hashim et al., 2017; Ahamed et al., 2021), have researched performance management and its constructs of performance planning, performance monitoring, performance appraisal, performance rewards, and their effects on quality instruction in universities.

However, contextual, methodological, knowledge, and empirical gaps emanate from the studies. For example, Azikuru et al. (2016) explored quality teaching and its influence on performance planning in Uganda's public universities, and the results revealed that goal setting and monitoring had a statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Atwebembeire et al. (2018a) investigated performance monitoring and its linkage to quality teaching and research in non-governmental universities in Uganda. Results showed that performance monitoring contributed to quality teaching and research in private universities in Uganda.

In Asia, Padhaya et al. (2021) studied performance appraisal and its effectiveness in universities in India. The study found that performance appraisal was not effective in enhancing lecturers' pedagogical skills, but was a formality for promoting and rewarding employees. Anyango et al. (2022) explored the relationship between performance management and the quality of services offered by lecturers at Makerere University and found that there was a highly positive

significant impact between goal setting and the quality of lecturers' services. Relatedly, Rwothumio et al. (2021) investigated the association between performance appraisal and teaching and research outputs of academic staff in four public universities.

Results indicated that a moderate positive relationship existed between performance appraisal and academic staff teaching output in public universities. Furthermore, Mohd and Ismail (2021) conducted a study to determine the influence of performance appraisal on employee performance at University Hospital X. The research revealed that there is no significant relationship between the performance management construct of performance appraisal and quality performance among employees in university hospitals.

Still, Rwothumio et al. (2020) explored monetary rewards and their effectiveness in determining the performance of academic staff in state-owned universities in Uganda and found that a weak positive relationship existed between financial reward and academic staff teaching output in public universities. Hashim's (2017) study showed that the performance management practices of compensation and performance evaluation had a significant relationship with the performance of academic staff. Moreover, Ahamed et al. (2021) established the effects of performance appraisal on the job performance of academic staff in Thi-Qar Sumer universities, by revealing that there was a positive and significant relationship between the variables. The investigators acknowledge the quality instruction gaps that have been highlighted by the literature review, hence the need for a study to establish the relationship between performance management and quality instruction in private universities in Uganda.

## METHODOLOGY

The study used a convergent parallel mixed-method research design as a lens. As noted by Saraswati et al. (2021), a convergent parallel mixed-methods research design is a synthesis of quantitative and qualitative approaches aimed at understanding the problem more deeply. In the same vein, the study adopted a pragmatist research paradigm because it gives liberty for a researcher to use a variety of methods and approaches that enhance the validity and reliability of research findings (Gillespie et al., 2024). Using a survey questionnaire, structured interviews, and Focus Group Discussions, the study collected data from four of Uganda's private universities.

The study population comprised the academic staff, Heads of Department, and the Quality Assurance Officers who were recruited using probabilistic and non-probabilistic sampling techniques (Kyu-Seong 2022). The overall sample consisted of 400 lecturers, 20 Heads of Department, and 12 Quality Assurance Officers. The survey method was used to collect data from the participants using questionnaires, while documentary review was used to collect data on performance management and the various academic programmes in private universities. The validity and reliability of the research instruments were tested and presented. As shown in Table 1, the CVI for the sub-scales ranged from 0.77 to 0.86, hence, were above the recommended threshold of 0.70 (Polit et al., 2007). Similarly, the Alpha coefficient of the questionnaire was above 0.70, therefore, it was deemed reliable for data collection (Bisel & Adame, 2017). Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations), inferential statistics (correlations and multi-regressions), as well as thematic analysis, were used to analyse the data.

**Table 1: Content Validity Index (CVI) and Alpha Coefficients of the Questionnaire Instrument**

| Constructs                          | CVI | Alpha |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-------|
| <b>Quality Instruction</b>          |     |       |
| 1. Effective Teaching Methods       | .78 | .73   |
| 2. Effective Assessment of Learning | .77 | .90   |
| 3. Students' Support Services       | .80 | .79   |
| <b>Performance Management</b>       |     |       |
| 1. Performance Planning             | .85 | .91   |
| 2. Performance Monitoring           | .80 | .83   |
| 3. Performance Appraisal            | .83 | .84   |
| 4. Performance Rewarding            | .86 | .87   |

As for the interview guide, a pilot on the Heads of Department from one of the local private universities was conducted (Cobern & Adams, 2020). Piloting the qualitative instruments was an avenue for clarity, rephrasing, and ordering (Aung et al., 2021). Furthermore, triangulating the study

instruments was the basis for reliability (Gray, 2018).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This preliminary section presents the demographic characteristics of the 339 lecturers who participated in the study.

**Table 2: Background Characteristics of Lecturers**

| Gender                 | N   | %    |
|------------------------|-----|------|
| Female                 | 203 | 59.9 |
| Male                   | 136 | 40.1 |
| <b>Age groups</b>      |     |      |
| 30 years and below     | 56  | 16.5 |
| 31 to 40 years         | 156 | 46.0 |
| 41 years and above     | 127 | 37.5 |
| <b>Education</b>       |     |      |
| Bachelor's Degree      | 21  | 6.2  |
| Master's Degree        | 255 | 75.2 |
| Ph. D                  | 63  | 18.6 |
| <b>Academic Rank</b>   |     |      |
| Graduate Fellow        | 4   | 1.2  |
| Assistant lecturer     | 98  | 28.9 |
| Lecturer               | 169 | 49.9 |
| Senior Lecturer        | 51  | 15.0 |
| Associate Professor    | 10  | 2.9  |
| Professor              | 7   | 2.1  |
| <b>Tenure</b>          |     |      |
| Less than a year       | 20  | 5.9  |
| between 1 and 5 years  | 103 | 34.5 |
| between 6 and 10 years | 122 | 36.0 |
| Over 11 years          | 94  | 27.7 |

**Source:** Primary Data

Results in Table 2 showed that there were 59.9% (203) female lecturers compared to 40.1% (136) male lecturers, implying that the study was not

biased in terms of gender. Furthermore, results revealed that 16.5% (56) of the lecturers were 30 years and below; 46.0% (156) were in the 31 to 40



years age group, and 37.5% (127) were aged 41 years and above, indicating that the majority of lecturers were aged 30 years and above, and so having sufficient life and work experience could have enabled them to provide a reliable evaluation of their work environment. In connection to gender, female lecturers were the majority, 203 (59.9%), while male was 136 (40.1%). This shows that the majority of the lecturers are female, so the information in the study represented the views of both genders.

Further, in line with education background, Table 2 showed that 6.2% (21) of the lecturers hold a Bachelor's Degree, 75.2% (255) hold a Master's Degree, which is the highest proportion of lecturers, and 18.6% (63) hold a Ph.D. Given that the majority of respondents do not have the minimum requirements needed for university lecturers, a PhD, they could have been facing performance evaluation and job satisfaction challenges, and were able to provide revealing information on the issues that were being investigated. It was further revealed that 1.2% (4) were Graduate Fellows; 28.9% (98) were

Assistant Lecturers; 49.9% (169) were lecturers; 15.0% (51) were Senior Lecturers; 2.9% (10) were Associate Professors; and 2.1% (7) were Professors. Hence, a larger proportion of respondents were at lower ranks of university teaching, prospecting better terms of employment so were able to provide credible information on issues that were being investigated. In the case of tenure at the University, 5.9% (20) had worked for less than a year; 34.5% (103) had been at the university for 1 to 5 years; 36.0% (122) had worked for 6 to 10 years, which is the largest group, and 27.7% (94) had worked for over 11 years. This indicates that most respondents had stayed long enough in their work environment, and so could provide a reliable evaluation of its working conditions.

### Quality Instruction

Quality Instruction was the dependent variable, and it was assessed as effective teaching methods, assessment of learning, and student support services. The status of these aspects is presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics on Teaching Methods**

| Aspect  | Mean        | SD         | Rating       |
|---|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Quality Instruction Items   |             |            |              |
| <i>Effective Teaching Methods (Aggregate mean= 3.93; SD 0.85)</i>                     | =           |            |              |
| When teaching, my students have a chance to present their findings                    | 4.35        | .70        | Agree        |
| My students have a chance to do things practically during the lessons                 | 4.20        | .83        | Agree        |
| My students ask several questions during my lessons                                   | 4.23        | .78        | Agree        |
| My students can use the knowledge acquired in class to solve day-to-day challenges    | 4.05        | .76        | Agree        |
| My students can use the knowledge acquired in class under different circumstances     | 4.07        | .76        | Agree        |
| My students are put into small groups whenever I teach Them                           | 3.64        | .96        | Agree        |
| My students are assigned different roles whenever they are in group work              | 3.95        | .82        | Agree        |
| My students are ever attentive during my lectures                                     | 3.85        | .90        | Agree        |
| My students do not engage in other activities other than those related to my lectures | 3.12        | 1.06       | Not sure     |
| The teaching methods at our university are effective.                                 | 3.86        | .91        | Agree        |
| <b>Score</b>  | <b>3.93</b> | <b>.85</b> | <b>Agree</b> |

**Source:** Primary Data

The results in Table 3 reveal that generally, respondents agreed (mean=3.93, SD=0.85) to teaching effectively. They agreed they give students opportunities to present their findings (mean=4.35, SD=.70), allow students chance to do things practically during the lessons (mean=4.20, SD=.83), students ask several questions during my lessons (mean=4.23, SD=.78), students can use the knowledge acquired in class to solve day-to-day challenges (mean=4.06, SD=.76) and students can use the knowledge acquired in class under different circumstances (mean=4.07, SD=.76). So, most respondents believed their teaching methods fostered student engagement, practical application, and active participation, there was variability in perceptions of student attentiveness and focus. Additionally, although group work and the

assignment of roles are common, they are not universally implemented across lessons.

On the use of various methods, one Head of the Department stated as follows: “We use a variety of methods when lecturing. However, this depends on the faculty. For example, in the agriculture and education faculties, there is more use of demonstration, field trips, and projects”. Another HoD stated that they used two modes of instruction, namely synchronous and asynchronous in their university. Whereas the synchronous mode was used mainly for undergraduate students, the asynchronous method was used for postgraduate students because they were required to manage their learning.

**Table 4: Descriptive Statistics on Assessment of Learning**

| Aspect  | MeanSDRating |          |
|---|--------------|----------|
| Assessment of Learning (Aggregate Mean=4.22; SD= 0.75)                |              |          |
| I can give clear reasons why I have to judge my students' performance | 4.18         | .91Agree |
| I describe what I have to assess/judge about my students              | 4.11         | .85Agree |
| I can explain the different methods of assessment                     | 4.30         | .79Agree |
| I have a clear knowledge of how to use assessment information         | 4.30         | .72Agree |
| I have a clear knowledge of the different tools of assessment         | 3.85         | .48Agree |
| I have a clear knowledge of the different types of assessment         | 4.30         | .72Agree |
| I have a clear knowledge of the learners' cognitive ability           | 4.19         | .71Agree |
| I provide my students with feedback regarding their coursework        | 4.40         | .76Agree |
| I provide feedback to my students in time                             | 4.30         | .79Agree |
| Assessment of learning in this university is effective.               | 4.25         | .75Agree |
| Score   | 4.22         | .75Agree |

**Source:** Primary Data

In connection with the assessment of learning, respondents affirmed that (mean = 4.22, SD = .75) they do well in most areas of assessment. This was the case with explaining the different methods of assessment (mean = 4.30, SD = .79), having clear knowledge of how to use assessment information (mean = 4.30, SD = .72), having clear knowledge of the different types of assessment (mean = 4.30, SD = .72), providing students with feedback regarding their coursework (mean = 4.40, SD = .79), and providing feedback to students in time (mean = 4.30, SD = .79), hence there was strong agreement on provision of feedback practices and the ability to

explain assessment methods. However, there was variability in opinions about the reasons for judging student performance, which may indicate differing understandings or approaches. Knowledge of assessment tools is the weakest area, suggesting potential for professional development or training in this aspect.

Although assessment was a well-conducted activity in the universities, one Head of Department complained as follows:

*“We are experiencing a situation whereby too much attention is given to the examinations at the expense of instruction. The semesters are short, and there is hardly enough time for teaching. Ample time should be spent on teaching, and examinations should come at the end of the year”.*

Another Head of Department informed the researcher about the negative consequences that have been brought by Artificial Intelligence when assessing students. She said, *“With the advent of Artificial Intelligence, students are putting minimal effort into their work”*. However, the university is cracking down on such students by subjecting every essay that is submitted to an anti-plagiarism test.

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Student Support Services**

| Aspect   | MeanSDRating          |
|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Student Support Services (Aggregate Mean = 3.89; SD = 0.83)</i>                                     |                       |
| My students are aware of the different university offices they can go to for help                      | 4.13 .89 Agree        |
| My students seek the services of the University Counselor  | 3.38 .92 Agree        |
| I get time to help those students who have problems with my lectures                                   | 4.04 .77 Agree        |
| I equip my students with the necessary study skills, such as library skills, planning, and note-taking | 4.10 .78 Agree        |
| My students are aware of the most up-to-date relevant textbooks regarding their course                 | 3.87 .82 Agree        |
| My students are aware of the various career options available to them                                  | 3.96 .82 Agree        |
| My students are aware of the current developments in their careers                                     | 3.83 .83 Agree        |
| My students can use the most up-to-date applications of ICT in their learning                          | 3.81 .84 Agree        |
| The students' support services at this university are generally good.                                  | 3.85 .79 Agree        |
| <b>Score</b>   | <b>3.89 .83 Agree</b> |

**Source:** Primary Data

As far as student support is concerned, results in Table 5 show that respondents agreed (mean=3.89, SD=.83) that their students were generally well-supported. They agreed that students are aware of the different university offices they can go to for help (mean=4.13, SD=.89), they get time to help those students who have problems with my lectures (mean=4.04, SD=.77), equip my students with the necessary study skills such as library skills, planning and note-taking (mean=4.10, SD=.78), students are aware of the most up-to-date relevant textbooks regarding their course (mean=3.87, SD=.82), students are aware of the various career options available to them (mean=3.96, SD=.82) and their students are aware of the current developments in their careers (mean=3.83, SD=.83). However,

there was weakness in counseling services and the latest ICT applications and equipping students with the necessary study skills such as library skills. Although results showed that counselling services are wanted across the universities, interviews with the heads of departments showed there was a counselling department in every university. Contrary, the HoDs indicated that students were supported in terms of ICT.

### Performance Management

This section looked at the status of performance management, the independent variable. This included performance planning, performance monitoring, performance appraisal, and performance rewarding.



### Goal Setting

This sub-section on goal setting assessed respondents' perceptions regarding the effectiveness

and inclusion of goal-setting practices in the teaching process at the university.

**Table 6: Descriptive Statistics on Goal Setting**

| Aspect   | Mean        | SD         | Rating       |
|--|-------------|------------|--------------|
| <b>Performance Management Items</b>  |             |            |              |
| <i>Goal setting (Aggregate mean = 3.94; SD =0.85)</i>  |             |            |              |
| I have set goals concerning teaching   | 4.23        | .87        | Agree        |
| I am willing to include my colleagues in the goal-setting process  | 4.01        | .82        | Agree        |
| I have enough resources available (action plans, tactics, training, people, and feedback) to achieve goals | 3.56        | .95        | Agree        |
| Work-related goals are included in the performance appraisal process                                       | 3.96        | .77        | Agree        |
| Work-related goals are prioritised by the management   | 3.91        | .86        | Agree        |
| The goal-setting process at this university is generally effective.  | 3.97        | .81        | Agree        |
| <b>Score</b>   | <b>3.94</b> | <b>.85</b> | <b>Agree</b> |

**Source:** Primary Data

As far as goal setting is concerned, Table 6 shows that respondents agreed (mean=3.94, SD=.85) to participate in setting their performance goals. They intimated they have set goals concerning teaching (mean=4.23, SD=.87), are willing to include their colleagues in the goal-setting process (mean=4.01, SD=.82), work-related goals are included in the performance appraisal process (mean=3.96, SD=.77) and the goal setting process in this university is generally effective (mean=3.97, SD=.81). In summary, the majority of respondents believe they have clear teaching goals and are open to including colleagues in the goal- setting process.

Most lecturers also feel that work-related goals are aligned with performance appraisals and well-prioritised by management. However, a notable percentage remains neutral about the availability of resources to achieve their goals, indicating a potential area for improvement.

### Development Planning

Development planning is an inevitable component of performance planning. The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7: Descriptive Statistics on Development Planning**

| Aspect  | Mean        | SD          | Rating       |
|---|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| <i>Development planning (Aggregate mean =4.03; SD =0.82)</i>                                |             |             |              |
| I have a skills development plan  | 4.00        | .86         | Agree        |
| My skills development plan is geared towards quality Instruction                            | 4.06        | .75         | Agree        |
| My skills development plan is in line with the identified goals for quality instruction     | 4.06        | .72         | Agree        |
| My skills development plan identifies strategies for instructional improvement              | 4.07        | .83         | Agree        |
| My skills development plan spells out the needs and resources required for quality teaching | 4.06        | .83         | Agree        |
| The development planning process at this university is effective.                           | 3.90        | .92         | Agree        |
| <b>Score</b>  | <b>4.03</b> | <b>0.82</b> | <b>Agree</b> |

Concerning development planning, respondents generally agreed (mean=4.03, SD=.82) to having an effective development planning program. They agreed they have a skills development plan (mean=4.00, SD=.86), their skills development plan is geared towards quality instruction (mean=4.06, SD=.75), their skills development plan is in line with the identified goals for quality instruction (mean=4.06, SD=.72), their skills development plan

identifies strategies for instructional improvement (mean=4.07, SD=.83), and skills development plan spells out the needs and resources required for quality teaching (mean=4.06, SD=.83). In summary, the majority of respondents have skills development plans that focus on improving instructional quality and align with their goals. They also feel their plans include strategies and resources for instructional improvement.

**Table 8: Descriptive Statistics on Performance Monitoring**

| Aspect   | Mean        | SD          | Rating       |
|--|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| <i>Performance monitoring items (Aggregate mean = 3.83; SD = 0.92)</i>             |             |             |              |
| <i>Supervisor monitoring</i>   |             |             |              |
| My supervisor uses well-developed tools/forms whenever he monitors my teaching     | 3.56        | .92         | Agree        |
| My supervisor has clearly defined objectives when he/she is monitoring my teaching | 3.73        | .93         | Agree        |
| My supervisor gives me constructive feedback after monitoring the teaching         | 3.67        | .98         | Agree        |
| My supervisor uses good interpersonal skills when monitoring my teaching           | 3.79        | .94         | Agree        |
| My supervisor refers to my performance to find out if I have made any improvements | 3.66        | .96         | Agree        |
| Supervisor's monitoring in this university is effective                            | 3.66        | 1.01        | Agree        |
| <b>Score</b>   | <b>3.68</b> | <b>0.96</b> | <b>Agree</b> |
| <i>Student monitoring</i>  |             |             |              |
| I am positive about the feedback that students give regarding my way of teaching   | 4.15        | .83         | Agree        |
| My students have a clear knowledge of what to evaluate when I am teaching          | 3.92        | .84         | Agree        |
| My students are genuine whenever they evaluate my Teaching                         | 3.77        | .97         | Agree        |
| In this university, students' evaluation is taken seriously to improve my teaching | 4.00        | .97         | Agree        |
| Students' evaluation has improved my teaching                                      | 4.12        | .80         | Agree        |
| Students' evaluation of this university is generally effective.                    | 3.90        | .91         | Agree        |
| <b>Score</b>   | <b>3.98</b> | <b>0.89</b> | <b>Agree</b> |
| <b>Overall score</b>   | <b>3.83</b> | <b>0.92</b> | <b>Agree</b> |

**Source:** Primary Data

As far as performance monitoring is concerned, respondents generally agreed (mean=3.83, SD=.92) that it is done well. They agreed (mean=3.68, SD=.96), that supervisors do their monitoring by clearly defining objectives when they are monitoring teaching (mean=3.73, SD=.93), give constructive feedback after monitoring teaching (mean=3.67, SD=.98), and use good interpersonal skills when monitoring teaching (mean=3.79, SD=.94). They also agreed (mean=3.98, SD=.89), that students' monitoring and feedback informed their teaching (mean=4.15, SD=.83), students have a clear knowledge of what to evaluate when I am

teaching (mean=3.92, SD=.83), students' evaluation is taken seriously to improve their teaching (mean=4.00, SD=.97), and students' evaluation in this university is generally effective (mean=4.12, SD=.80). Overall, respondents feel that their supervisors use well-developed tools, have clear objectives, and provide constructive feedback with good interpersonal skills during the monitoring process. They also hold positive views toward student evaluations. Most believe students have a clear understanding of evaluation criteria, are genuine in their feedback, and that the process contributes to improving teaching.

## Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal was assessed relating to the assessment of teaching output and assessment of research output.

**Table 9: Descriptive Statistics on Performance Appraisal**

| Aspect   | Mean        | SD          | Rating       |
|--|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| <i>Performance appraisal items (Aggregate mean =3.83; SD =0.69)</i>                                |             |             |              |
| <i>Teaching output</i>   |             |             |              |
| Performance appraisal has enabled me to state the goals and objectives of my lectures more clearly | 3.99        | .84         | Agree        |
| Performance appraisal has enabled me to present material/content in a more organised manner        | 4.08        | .78         | Agree        |
| Performance appraisal has enabled me to use audio-visual materials to deliver effectively          | 3.82        | .88         | Agree        |
| Performance appraisal has helped me to improve the production of teaching materials                | 3.94        | .76         | Agree        |
| Performance appraisal has enabled me to assess students' learning/understanding.                   | 3.88        | .87         | Agree        |
| <b>Score</b>   | <b>3.94</b> | <b>0.83</b> | <b>Agree</b> |
| <i>Research output</i>   |             |             |              |
| Performance appraisal has enabled me to conduct more research                                      | 3.89        | .92         | Agree        |
| Performance appraisal has enabled me to publish high-quality articles                              | 3.39        | 1.03        | Agree        |
| Performance appraisal has encouraged me to publish in high-quality journals                        | 3.47        | 1.06        | Agree        |
| Performance appraisal has improved my supervision of students' research work                       | 3.76        | .90         | Agree        |
| Performance appraisal has enabled me to develop my knowledge                                       | 4.04        | .84         | Agree        |
| Performance appraisal has generally improved my research skills.                                   | 3.86        | .93         | Agree        |
| <b>Score</b>   | <b>3.74</b> | <b>0.95</b> | <b>Agree</b> |

**Source:** Primary Data

As far as performance appraisal is concerned, respondents generally agreed (mean=3.83, SD=.89) that it is organised and focused on improving performance. They agreed (mean=3.94, SD=.83) teaching output is well appraised, for performance appraisal has enabled them to state the goals and objectives of their lectures more clearly (mean=3.99, SD=.84), enabled them to present material/content in a more organized manner (mean=4.08, SD=.78), helped them to improve the production of teaching materials (mean=3.94, SD=.76) and has enabled them to assess students' learning/understanding (mean=3.88, SD=.87).

They also intimated that performance appraisal has helped them (mean=3.74, SD=.95) in their research output, for it has enabled them to conduct more research (mean=3.89, SD=.92), improve their

supervision of students' research work (mean=3.76, SD=.90), develop my knowledge (mean=4.04, SD=.84), and improve on their research skills (mean=3.86, SD=.93). In summary, the majority of teachers feel that performance appraisals have positively impacted their teaching output, particularly in clarifying lecture goals, organizing content, and using audio-visual materials effectively. Appraisals also appear to improve the production of teaching materials and the assessment of students' understanding. Also, a significant number of respondents believed that appraisals help them conduct more research, develop knowledge, and improve their research skills.

## Performance Rewards

This section evaluates the perceptions of lecturers regarding their intrinsic, extrinsic, and total rewards based on various statements.

**Table 10: Descriptive Statistics on Rewards**

| Aspect   | Mean        | SD          | Rating          |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| <i>Rewards items (aggregate mean=3.43; SD=1.10)</i>                                  |             |             |                 |
| Intrinsic Rewards  |             |             |                 |
| I am respected by my superiors as a lecturer of this University                      | 4.09        | .81         | Agree           |
| My university has made my work as a lecturer enjoyable                               | 3.81        | .91         | Agree           |
| My university has conducive work policies  | 3.71        | .95         | Agree           |
| I have a feeling of accomplishment as a lecturer of this University                  | 3.89        | .97         | Agree           |
| My university has enabled me to grow professionally                                  | 4.11        | .96         | Agree           |
| In this university, salary increment is based on quality Teaching                    | 2.73        | 1.24        | Not sure        |
| In this university, awards are given to lecturers                                    | 2.98        | 1.22        | Not sure        |
| <b>Score</b>   | <b>3.62</b> | <b>1.01</b> | <b>Agree</b>    |
| Extrinsic rewards  |             |             |                 |
| In this university, lecturers are promoted based on Publications                     | 3.68        | 1.14        | Agree           |
| In this university, lecturers who excel are given a share of the profits             | 2.64        | 1.22        | Not sure        |
| In this university, lecturers who excel are given a certificate of merit             | 3.07        | 1.31        | Not sure        |
| <b>Score</b>   | <b>3.13</b> | <b>1.22</b> | <b>Not sure</b> |
| Total rewards  |             |             |                 |
| TT1 Monetary rewards (salary, bonuses) make me teach better in this university       | 3.15        | 1.24        | Not sure        |
| TT2 non-monetary rewards (awards, promotion) make me teach better in this university | 3.26        | 1.23        | Not sure        |
| <b>Score</b>   | <b>3.21</b> | <b>1.23</b> | <b>Not sure</b> |
| <b>Overall score</b>   | <b>3.43</b> | <b>1.10</b> | <b>Not sure</b> |

**Source:** Primary Data

The findings in Table 10 show that respondents were not sure (mean=3.43, SD=1.1) that they get satisfactory rewards. They were not sure (mean=3.9, SD=.89) they get good extrinsic rewards (mean=3.13, SD=1.22) and total rewards (mean=3.21, SD=1.23). However they agreed they get good enough intrinsic rewards (mean=3.62, SD=1.01) for they are respected by their superiors as a lecturer of their university (mean=4.9, SD=.81), university has made their work as a lecturer

enjoyable (mean=3.81, SD=.91), university has conducive work policies (mean=3.71, SD=.95), have a feeling of accomplishment as a lecturer of their university (mean=3.89, SD=.97) and their university has enabled them to grow professionally (mean=4.11, SD=.96).

Overall, intrinsic rewards are generally well-regarded, especially respect from superiors and professional growth, though there is room for improvement in creating a more conducive work

environment. Extrinsic rewards show significant dissatisfaction, particularly with salary increments, profit-sharing, and financial recognition for excellence, indicating that monetary rewards are perceived as lacking. Total Rewards were not seen as strong motivators. Hence, intrinsic rewards (e.g., respect, professional growth) play a more significant role in motivating lecturers than extrinsic rewards (e.g., salary, bonuses), which are viewed less favourably.

### To Examine the Relationship between Performance Management and Quality Instruction in Private Universities in Uganda.

The objective of the study was to examine the relationship between performance management and quality instruction in private universities in Uganda. It had been hypothesised that no statistically significant relationship existed between performance management and quality instruction in private universities. Pearson's correlation was used to ascertain whether performance management was related to quality instruction. The findings are presented in Table 10.

**Table 11: Correlation Matrix for Performance Management and Quality Instruction**

| Variables                | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7      | 8      | 9 |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---|
| 1-Quality Teaching       | 1      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |   |
| 2-Teaching methods       | .735** | 1      |        |        |        |        |        |        |   |
| 3-Student support        | .700** | .410** | 1      |        |        |        |        |        |   |
| 4-Assessment of learning | .731** | .256** | .251** | 1      |        |        |        |        |   |
| 5-Performance management | .470** | .284** | .515** | .299** | 1      |        |        |        |   |
| 6-Performance Planning   | .592** | .311** | .539** | .516** | .745** | 1      |        |        |   |
| 7-Performance monitoring | .448** | .285** | .421** | .341** | .840** | .619** | 1      |        |   |
| 8-Performance appraisal  | .384** | .314** | .457** | .151** | .819** | .497** | .588** | 1      |   |
| 9-Performance rewarding  | -.009  | -.012  | .148** | -.119* | .606** | .146** | .342** | .370** | 1 |

Key: Levels of significance: \*\*= $P < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; no asterisk = not significant

The results in Table 11 show that the relationship between performance management and quality instruction was positive and significant ( $r = .47$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). The relationship between quality instruction and the indicators of performance management, namely performance planning ( $r = .592$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), performance monitoring ( $r = .448$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and performance appraisal ( $r = .384$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), was positive and significant. However, the performance rewards ( $r = .009$ ,  $p = \text{NS}$ ) were so small and insignificant. Therefore, when universities conduct performance planning, performance monitoring, performance appraisal, and performance rewards, the likelihood of their lecturers providing quality instruction increases. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a statistically significant relationship between performance management and quality instruction in private universities.

This finding is supported by Boyitie (2021), who noted a correlation between effective planning as an aspect of performance management and teaching and learning in the Delta State of Nigeria. More so, the finding is in line with Rwothumio et al. (2021), who underscored that there was a moderate positive relationship between performance appraisal and academic staff teaching in public universities. This finding is further supported by Anyango et al. (2022), who also found that there is a statistically significant relationship between performance management and the quality of services offered by lecturers at Makerere University.

Similarly, Atwebembeire et al. (2018a) study, which was conducted in public universities in Uganda, supports the findings of this study when they revealed that performance monitoring significantly accounted for quality instruction and



research among the faculty. That performance management is related to quality instruction is further supported by Windasari and Yahya (2021), who established a relationship between performance management in terms of compensation (rewards) and quality instruction among the academic staff in the university. Moreover, Ahamed et al (2021) corroborated the findings of this study when they observed a positive relationship between performance appraisal and the job performance of academic staff at Thi-Qur Sumer University. On his part, Paul (2021) agrees with the current finding when they discovered a link between support supervision and quality instruction.

On the other hand, the finding of this study is antagonistic with the results advanced by Padhaya

et al. (2021), and Hoque et al. (2020), who discovered that there was no statistically significant relationship between performance appraisal and quality instruction, and no significant relationship between performance monitoring and quality instruction respectively. The findings of the current study are supported by the previous scholars, hence it can be construed that performance management is a predictor of quality instruction in private universities in Uganda.

### Regression Analysis for Performance Management and Quality Instruction

A multi-regression analysis was conducted to determine the effect of performance management on quality instruction in private universities in Uganda. The results are presented in Table 11.

**Table 11: Multiple Regression of Performance Management and Quality Instruction**

| Performance Management | Standardized Coefficients | Significance |
|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
|                        | Beta ( $\beta$ )          | (p)          |
| Performance Planning   | .457                      | .000         |
| Performance monitoring | .149                      | .033         |
| Performance appraisal  | .159                      | .013         |
| Performance Rewarding  | -.183                     | .001         |
| $R^2=0.408$            |                           |              |
| Adjusted $R^2 = 0.398$ |                           |              |
| $F = 42.67, p = 0.000$ |                           |              |

a. *Dependent Variable: quality instruction*

b. *Predictors: performance planning, monitoring, appraisal, rewarding*

The results in Table 11 show that performance management explained 40.8% of the variation in quality instruction ( $R^2 = .408$ ). This means that 59.2 % of the variation in quality instruction was accounted for by other factors not considered under this model. Performance, planning made a higher contribution ( $\beta = .457, p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ), followed by Performance appraisal ( $\beta = .159, p = 0.013 < 0.05$ ) and Performance monitoring ( $\beta = .149, p = 0.033 < 0.05$ ). Performance rewarding  $\beta = -.183, p = 0.033 < 0.05$ , on the other hand, made a negative contribution.

### CONCLUSIONS

In line with the objective of the study, it was concluded that performance management predicted and influenced quality instruction in private universities in Uganda. It was further established that private universities had not adequately made the best use of the Heads of Department regarding quality instruction, were grappling with infrastructural challenges, and worked with academic staff who were poorly remunerated.

### Recommendations

In light of the findings of this study, private universities should strengthen their performance

management. This should be done by involving the heads of the departments in monitoring the academic staff in the respective departments. Secondly, private universities should align performance appraisal with quality instruction. This should be done by factoring in aspects of effective methods, effective assessment, and student support services. Furthermore, private universities should make improvements to their infrastructure, especially by providing office space to the academic staff. Lastly, private universities should raise the morale of the academic staff by treating and paying them as per the recommended standards.

## REFERENCES

- Abiodun-Oyebanji, O., & Oluwatoyin, F. O. (2018). Quality of university education and employability of university graduates in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Review*, 10(1), 63–70.
- Afolabi, O. S., & Idowu, H. A. (2019). Insecurity and the feasibility of democratic governance in West Africa. In *International Relations and African Environmental Conflicts: Essays in Honour of Professor Victor Ojatorotu* (pp. 257–278).
- Akinlabi, B. H., Dogo, E. B., & Asikhia, O. (2021). Goal setting and employee performance: A study of Southwest universities' registry workers in Nigeria. *Global Scientific Journal*, 9(2), 315–327.
- Alemiga, J., & Kibukamusoke, M. (2019). Determinants of the quality of academic staff in the process of teaching and learning in private universities in Uganda. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 7(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.4102/apsdpr.v7i1.244>
- Anyango, M., Kamaduka, R., & Kaahwa, G. (2022). Performance management and quality of services offered by lecturers at Makerere University. *African Journal of Education, Science and Technology*, 7(2), 111–121. <https://doi.org/10.2022/ajest.v7i2.804>
- Atwebembeire, J., Musaazi, J. C. S., Namubiru, P., & Malunda, P. (2018a). Performance monitoring and quality teaching and research in private universities in Uganda. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 17(10), 70–85.
- Aung, K. T., Razak, R. A., & Nazry, N. N. M. (2021). Establishing validity and reliability of semi-structured interview questionnaire in developing risk communication module: A pilot study. *Edunesia: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 2 (3) 600-606.
- Azikuru, L. M. E., Onen, D., & Ezati, B. A. (2016). The influence of planning on the quality of teaching in public universities. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4(12), 121–131.
- Bisel, P., & Adame, E. (2017). Post-positivist/functionalist approaches. In *The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc168>
- Boyitie, O. I. (2021). The impact of effective planning on teaching and learning among some selected secondary school students in Ethiopia West Local Government Area. *Direct Research Journal of Education and Vocational Studies*, 3(1), 113– 120. <https://doi.org/10.26765/DRJE.VS01846327>
- Brown, T. C., O'Kane, P., MacCracken, M. G., & Mazumdar, B. (2017). Performance management: A systematic review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2017(1), 11987. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBP.P.2017.11987abstract>
- Cherulyot, R., Rop, W., & Kemboi, R. (2023). Goal-setting practices by teachers and service

- delivery in public secondary schools in Sotik Sub-County, Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 11(5), 160–176.
- Cobern, W. W., & Adams, B. A. J. (2020). When interviewing how many is enough? *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 7(1), 73–79.
- Gray, D. (2018). *Doing research in the real world* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Gillespie, A., Glăveanu, V., & de Saint Laurent, C. (2024). *Pragmatism and methodology: Doing research that matters with mixed methods*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hashim, M., Rafi, S., Kazmi, S. S. A., Ullah, M., & Kee, D. M. H. (2017). Impact of human resource practices on perceived performance: A study of teaching faculty in private universities of Peshawar, Pakistan. *City University Research Journal*, 7(1), 120–129.
- Hoque, K. E., Bt Kenayathulla, H. B., D/O Subramaniam, M. V., & Islam, R. (2020). Relationships between supervision and teachers' performance and attitude in secondary schools in Malaysia. *Sage Open*, 10(2), 2158244020925501.
- Kibaliwandu, M. M., & Mwesigye, A. R. (2021). Financial strategies and quality assurance implementation in universities under the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of the National Council for Higher Education*, 9(2), 1–20.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.
- Kyu-Seong, K. (2022). Methodology of non-probability sampling in survey research. *Am J Biomed Sci & Res* 15(6) AJBSR. MS.ID.002166. DOI: 10.34297/AJBSR.2022.15.002166
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 3(2), 157–189. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(68\)90004-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(68)90004-4)
- Lulat, Y. M. (2005). *A history of African higher education from antiquity to the present: A critical synthesis*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Mohd, N. N., & Ismail, F. (2021). The effect of performance appraisal towards employee performance and employee satisfaction among employees at University Hospital X. *Research in Management of Technology and Business*, 2(1), 184–200.
- Mwebi, B., & Simatwa, E. M. W. (2013). Expansion of private universities in Kenya and its implication on quality and completion rates: An analytical study. *Education Research*, 4(4), 352–366.
- Nagaraju, J. (2012, March 28). 32 professional colleges to be shut down soon. *Times of India*.
- Nangonzi, Y. (2020, March 26). NCHE revokes Nsaka, Kayiwa University licenses. *The Observer*.
- National Council for Higher Education. (2014). *Quality assurance framework for universities and the licensing process for higher education institutions*. NCHE, Kampala.
- Ngalomba, S. P. (2014). Job satisfaction among non-PhD academic staff in Tanzania's private and public universities. *Message from the TLHEC Proceedings Editor: Dr. Jaya Naidoo*, 163.
- Ogbeiwi, O. (2018). General concepts of goals and goal-setting in healthcare: Narrative review. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1–18.
- Otaka, R., Mugizi, W., & Rwothumio, J. (2023). Performance management and teacher

- effectiveness in primary schools in Bulaago Coordinating Centre, Bulambuli District, Uganda. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 6(2), 122–140.
- Padhaya, P. R., Bhattarai, L., Acharya, L. N., & Adhikari, S. (2021). Performance appraisal system and effectiveness of universities in Nepal. *International Journal of Advanced Research on Innovative Designs for Education*, 7, 43–48.
- Polit, D. F., Beck, C. T., & Owen, S. V. (2007). Is the CVI an Acceptable Indicator of Content Validity? Appraisal and Recommendations. *Journal of Research in Nursing and Health*.
- Rwothumio, J., Mbirihi, D. M., & Itolondo, W. (2020). Role of financial rewards in enhancing academic staff performance in public universities in Uganda. *East African Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(1), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajis.2.1.256>
- Rwothumio, J., Okaka, W., Kambaza, S., & Kyomukama, E. (2021). Influence of performance appraisal in determining academic staff performance in public universities in Uganda. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 3(1), 20–32. <https://doi.org/10.37284/ijar.3.1.281>
- Saraswati, D., Shrestha, S., & Giri, R. A. (2021). Mixed-methods research: A discussion on its types, challenges, and criticisms. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, 2(2), 25–36.
- Suresh, E. S. M., & Kumaravelu, A. (2017). The quality of education and its challenges in developing countries. *American Society for Engineering Education*, 2017, 1–10.
- Udoeye, O. N., & Chinwe, N. O. (2023). Performance management and organizational sustainability in public organizations in South-East, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Law Research*, 12(3), 10–23.
- Windasari, W., & Yahya, M. (2021). Does compensation matter? The effects of compensation on teachers' performance in vocational high schools. *Journal Kapendidikan*, 7(1), 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v7i1.3006>
- Woldegiorgis, E. T., & Doeverspeck, M. (2013). The changing role of higher education in Africa: A historical reflection. *Higher Education Studies*, 3(6), 35–45.