(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

Instructional supervision and students' grades at completion in private and public universities, Kampala, Uganda

Asmaa ElSayed Emara, Sofia Sol Gaite, Muhammad Kibuuka and Specioza Asiimwe [*]

Department of Foundations, College of Education, Open, Distance and E-Learning, Kampala International University, Uganda.

Abstract

This study investigated the effect of instructional supervision on students' grades at completion in public and private universities, Kampala Uganda. Using a descriptive correlational and a cross sectional survey design, the objective was set to examine the effect of instructional supervision on students' grades at completion. .The study targeted university staff and sampled 750 lecturers from two public and two private universities. A researcher constructed questionnaire was employed to collect data on effectiveness of instructional supervision. While secondary data on students' grades at completion for two years, 2019 and 2022, was obtained from the four universities. Data analysis was done using descriptive statistics; frequencies as well as means and standard deviations at a university level. At a bivariate level, student's two independent samples t-test, one way ANOVA and Pearson's linear correlation coefficient were used. At multivariate level, multiple linear regression and multivariate analysis of variance and covariates (MANOVA) was used to test the hypothesis. The findings revealed that; instructional supervision was generally weak among the four universities studied (overall mean = 2.41= Weak IS; SD =0 .725); students' grades at completion were generally fair, with only less than 55% of the students graduating what is considered good grades (first class and second class upper) degrees, while about 45% attained what is considered poor grades (second class lower and pass) degrees; the GLM MANOVA revealed that instructional supervision significantly affects students' grades at completion (Wilks' Lambda = 0.967; F= 2.029;Sig. =.019;Partial Eta2 =0 .011). .The researcher recommends that, to improve students' grades at completion, university managers and administrators should strengthen instructional supervision through involving academic staff, HODs, Deans/ principals and Director academic affairs, in supervision planning, ensuring that lecture monitoring is done by professional and competent staff, regularly and consistently from the beginning to the end and improving feedback provision, ensuring that lecturers are given immediate feedback about their strength and weaknesses and supporting them through simple discussions and dialogue with more experienced lecture observers .

Keywords: Instructional; Supervision; Students; Grades; Completion; Private Universities; Public Universities

1. Introduction

Higher education institutions no matter their location and ownership status are expected to contribute greatly towards the achievement national education goals through producing graduates with brilliant performance both in grades and in the field of work. The quality of students' grades and performance at work places, highly depends on the 'quality of instruction provided by the instructors in these institutions (Usman, 2015). These days, many education stakeholders complain about the poor performance of students in higher education institutions. Different factors are given to be responsible for the poor grades including students' slim focus on studies, poor quality of instruction, poor management and inadequate facilitation from parents, among others. However, many experts point at institutional management and factors related to it such as instructional supervision (Olaleye, 2013, Asiimwe & Steyn 20213). One of such managerial

[*] Corresponding author: Specioza Asiimwe

factors mainly blamed for poor grades and low quality of graduates is the weak supervision and follow-up of the various actions and activities of the staff (Tesfaw & Hofman, 2014, Funke, Gaite & Asiimwe, 2023). It is believed that instructional **s**upervision plays a key role in promoting the quality education delivery in educational institutions.

Grading system in the education environment can powerfully frame the professional development of students. The primary purpose of any grading system is to measure student grade at completion. In the context of higher education, the semester grade point average (GPA) outcomes was established but the grading system differ in philosophy and practice from one country to another (Abdikair andGhimuec, 2018, Ryatura, Serunjogi &Asiimwe, 2023).

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Despite existence of bodies like NCHE, DES and the ministry of education to monitor and regulate the quality of education delivery in Uganda, the performance of many graduating students from higher learning institutions is still poor (Apolot, Otaala, Kamanyire, &Komakech, 2018; Okurut *et al*., 2018). Okurut (2021) reports that there is an increasing decline of bachelor's students' grades at completion from 2019 to 2021. It shows that students cumulative grade point average (CGPA) are declining.The poor grades at completion among university graduates in Uganda and the general poor performance of these graduates, can be caused by many factors such as weak instructional supervision, professional incompetence and inexperience of the instructors, low motivation, inadequate resources and university environment among others. Despite these poor grades and their continued negative consequences on the whole nation, studies on factors responsible for poor grades among university students are scanty. Even the few studies available (e.g. Apolot et al., 2018; Tesfaw & Hofman, 2014; Usman, 2015) none of them examined the effect of instructional supervision on students grades at completion in Ugandan private universities, leave alone public universities.

2. Related Literature

Several researchers' have tried to link instructional supervision and academic performance variables. Most of the researches have assessed the effect of instructional supervision on students' academic performance (e.g. Charles, Chris and Kosgei, 2012; Ekundayo, Oyerinde, Kolawole, 2013; Dangara, 2015; Usman, 2015; Heaven & Bourne, 2016; Comfort, Aina and Idowu, 2017; Mwendia, 2018). It has been argued that instructional occupies a unique place in the entire education system and it becomes expedient to give it prominent attention. In contemporary Nigeria, instructional supervision is regarded as a process of enhancing the personal growth of academic staff, the curriculum and improving techniques of teaching (Okendo,2012, Ryatura, Serunjogi &Asiimwe, 2023) Instructional supervision according to Nakapodia (2006), in the modern era centers on improvement of the teaching- learning situation to benefit the academic staff and learners. If the university is not supervised adequately, it will have inimical effect on students output and educational objectives may not be achieved. According instructional process and supervision help a lot in improving academic performance of students.

Accepted wisdom suggests that applicants with higher results in their entry qualifications should perform better at degree level. One wonders if this wisdom is scientifically proven. The last decade has seen an increase in literature relating to predictors of academic performance with much debate on whether conventional measures of academic achievement are the best determinants of future performance at university. In Uganda today, the main admission criteria to universities is prior performance either at A' level, at Diploma or at Mature age examinations (Universities and Tertiary Institutions Act, 2018). This, according to the literature reviewed is being practiced worldwide, admission boards elsewhere in the world use prior academic performance to select students for admission. For example in the United States, Minnesota measures (2016), in the United Kingdom, Waller and Foy (2015), in South Africa, Swart (1999) and in Kuwait, Mohammad and Almaheed (2018) among many. Several countries use these standards of admission because according to Staffolani and Bratti, (2018), measures of prior educational performance are the most important determinants of student performance an argument supported by The Universities Admission Centre (2018) report in which it is stated that tertiary institutions in Austria have found that a selection rank based on a student's overall academic achievement is the best single predictor of tertiary success for most tertiary courses.

In their study on validity of high school grades in predicting student success beyond the freshman year Geiser and Santelices (2016), Ryatura, Serunjogi and Asiimwe (2023) found that high school grade point average is consistently the best predictor of college grades. They cite Geiser and Studley (2016) who sampled 80,000 students admitted to the University of California and tracked 4 year college outcomes including cumulative grade point average and graduation in order to examine the relative contribution of high school record in predicting longer term college performance, and their key findings were that high school grades were the strongest in predicting four year college outcomes for all academic disciplines. A view similar to that of Geiser and Santelics (2016) was held by Anderson, Benjamin and Fuss (2018) who carried out a study on the determinants of success in university and found out that students who

performed well in high school also performed better in college. Geiser and Santelics (2016) and Anderson, Benjamin and Fuss (2018) all from the United States found evidence to suggest that high school grades were without doubt the best predictors of academic performance.

However, these studies were based on a sample of students whose system of education has four years of secondary school (O'level), which is totally different from Uganda's system, which has six years of secondary level, and this may not be applicable to Uganda. In addition, Waller and Foy (2015) showed in their study that O'levels were an inferior predictor of success at university. The researcher found it useful to compare the results with countries that have the same system of education as that of Uganda for the results of such studies provide a more uniform and valid yardstick of assessing and comparing student ability and achievement. For example a study on the British school system which is almost similar to the Uganda system of education, Waller and Foy (2015) carried out an investigative study of British school examinations as a predictor of university performance in pharmacy, they used the Pearson product moment correlation using the SPSS to analyze their data and in their conclusion stated that pre-university performance is significantly correlated with undergraduate performance.

Findings similar to those made by Waller and Foy (2015) were confirmed by Mohammad and Almaheed (2018) whose study on evaluation of traditional admissions standards in predicting Kuwait students' academic performance revealed that secondary school scores proved to be instrumental in predicting university performance. However, Reddy and Talcott (2018), Ryatura, Serunjogi and Asiimwe (2023) disagree with the view that academic performance is determined by prior academic performance. In their study on the relationship between previous academic performance and subsequent success at university, found that subjects studied at A' level and grades obtained did not predict academic performance a university. They cite Pearson and Johnson (2018) who demonstrated that there was an overall mark association of only 0.28 between A' level grades and degree performance. A view held by the Academic Admission Council of Oregon State University (2016); in their study on undergraduate admissions who found that traditional measures of academic potential such as high school Grade Point Average (GPA) scores at best explain only 30% of the variation in first year at college GPA. It should be noted that even if these studies do not agree with the previous scholars who found that prior performance affects future performance, they do acknowledge that admission points are related to academic performance at university but to a very small extent. Thus confirming McDonald, Newton, Whetton and Benefield (2018) and Staffolani and Bratti (2018) who demonstrated that A' level scores still out perform any other single measure of cognitive aptitude in predicting success at university.

Another form of entry to university is through diploma and mature age entry, surprisingly for a subject of such importance, few studies have been reported linking other forms of entry to academic performance. Ringland and Pearson (2016) carried out a study on the differences between diploma entrants and direct A' level entrants and how each category performed. They sampled 608 respondents of which 154 were diploma entrants, and found that there were no significant differences between groups in terms of academic performance and concluded that performance of one prior to university affected performance at university. The findings of Ringland and Pearson (2016) are supported by Wiley and Sisson (2016) whose results in the study on success of non- traditional students in an undergraduate program showed that there was no difference in performance of non-traditional entrants and traditional entrants as long as both categories had performed well at their previous qualifications.

Mpofu (2016), Funke, Gaite, and Asiimwe (2023) investigated academic performance on mature students in higher education and argued that mature age is a second chance scheme for those who could not obtain the necessary formal qualification for university, however before these people are finally admitted to university, they must have proven record of capability for this level of study as demonstrated by their level of performance in a set examination by the university. Mpofu (2016) concluded that these students perform as well as the regular students admitted under the direct entry scheme. A view similar to that of Mpofu (2016) was held by Parameswaran (2018) whose study compared academic success of mature students and traditional students and Richardson (2018) who investigated academic performance of mature age students in higher education and concluded that mature students perform as successfully as direct entry students. However Parameswaran (2018), Ryatura, Serunjigi and Asiimwe (2023) attributed this performance not just to grade but also to age, saying that mature age students are older than direct entry student.

3. Methodology

The study employed a descriptive correlational and a cross–sectional survey design to establish the effect of instructional supervision on students' grade at completion. The descriptive survey design enabled the researcher to describe the state of affairs as they are and report the findings (Kombo &Tromp, 2009). The study adopted both qualitative and quantitative approaches to collect the data making it mixed method approach. Questionnaires was used

for quantitative approach in order to generate quantifiable data that can explain the effect between instructional supervision on students' grade at completion. The interview guide was used for qualitative approach. The qualitative approach was used to capture views and the opinions of respondents in regards to instructional supervision and students' grade at completion. The triangulation of both qualitative and quantitative approaches helped generate both quantity and quality information about the topic under study.

4. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

4.1. Instructional Supervision (IS)

For this objective had 38 question items were presented to respondents under five constructs (Supervision Planning with 09 question items, Class room Monitoring 09 question items, Feedback Provision 06question items, Instructional Support Strategies 06 question items and E-learning Supervision, 09 question items). All the 38 question items were in form of statements, based on a five point Likert scale, with rating scales ranging from 0 to 4, where; 0=Not applicable/Dont know; 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 =agree and 4= strongly agree. Respondents were asked to rate effectiveness of instructional supervision in their respective universities, by indicating the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement. Their responses were analysed using descriptive statistics for means and standard deviations. Confirmatory factor analysis was also done to test for validity of the data and its suitability for bivariate and multivariate correlations and regression analyses. Results of confirmatory factor analysis are presented in the table. Interpretation of the means was done based on the following mean ranges;

Mean range	Response range	Interpretation
3.26-4.00	Strongly agree	Very strong IS
2.51-3.25	Agree	strong IS
1.76-2.50	Disagree	Weak IS
1.00-1.75	Strongly disagree	Very weak IS

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics on effectiveness of instructional supervision

Items on Supervision Planning	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Rank
I get adequate College support in preparing lecture instructional materials (e.g., projectors, computers, markers, manillas, etc)	2.85	1.112	Effective IS	1
Lecture observation objectives focus on best instructional practices	2.83	1.085	Strong IS	2
I am clearly aware of targets/objectives for lecture supervision	2.74	1.139	Strong IS	3
I am adequately involved in developing lecture supervision targets	2.56	1.142	Strong IS	4
Lecturers' views are sought/included in lecture observation plans	2.55	1.122	Strong IS	5
Lecture observation schedules are well discussed with lecturers	2.53	1.131	Strong IS	6
I am adequately involved in the plans for lecture observation	2.46	1.224	Weak IS	7
Quality assurance and College administrators usually meet with academic staff to discuss the quality of instruction	2.44	1.124	Weak IS	8
My lecture preparation files are always checked by college boss	2.29	1.150	Weak IS	9
Average Mean for Supervision Planning	2.58	0.779	Strong IS	
Items on Class room Monitoring				
Lecture monitors usually focusses on teaching quality	2.53	1.162	Strong IS	1
Lecture monitors/supervisors are always professional	2.47	1.258	Weak IS	2
My HOD/Principle usually participates in monitoring my lectures.	2.45	1.123	Weak IS	3

My lectures are usually monitored by competent staff	2.40	1.184	Weak IS	4
Quality Assurance head usually participate in lecture monitoring	2.27	1.186	Weak IS	5
My Lectures are regularly supervised/monitored	2.22	1.165	Weak IS	6
Lecture monitors always come on time to observe my lectures	2.16	1.177	Weak IS	7
Lecture monitors always observe lectures from the start to the end	2.11	1.212	Weak IS	8
Iam informed whenever my lecture observation is to be done	2.01	1.248	Weak IS	9
Average Mean for Class room Monitoring	2.29	.856	Weak IS	
Items on Feedback Provision				
The feedback provided to me after lecture observation has always helped me to improve the quality of my instruction	2.55	1.240	Strong IS	1
Feedback provided after lecture observation helps identify my weakness	2.47	1.278	Weak IS	2
The feedback I get from supervisors is always very useful.	2.44	1.209	Weak IS	3
I am very happy with immediate supervision feedback provided	2.26	1.169	Weak IS	4
Monitors always discuss with me their observation outcomes	2.25	1.157	Weak IS	5
Lecture monitors always give immediate feedback after lectures	1.98	1.183	Weak IS	6
Average Mean for Feedback Provision	2.33	0.963	Weak IS	
Items on Instructional Support Strategies				
Supervisors always recognize my creativity during lecturing	2.42	1.167	Weak IS	1
I get open discussion with bosses on instructional improvement	2.41	1.230	Weak IS	2
I always get instructional advises after lecture observation	2.40	1.115	Weak IS	3
Lecture observation records are fairly interpreted without bias	2.31	1.231	Weak IS	4
Lecture observation records are considered in staff promotions	2.19	1.230	Weak IS	5
Based on lecture observation records the best performing staff are always rewarded and appreciated by management	2.02	1.284	Weak IS	6
Average Mean for Instructional Support Strategies	2.29	0.905	Weak IS	
Items on E-learning Supervision				
My university has trained staff to assist on e-learning problems	2.69	1.189	Strong IS	1
Lecture monitoring also caters for online teaching	2.67	1.213	Strong IS	2
There is a well-developed system to monitor e-learning classes	2.63	1.250	Strong IS	3
Feedback for online lectures are provided via E-learning platforms	2.61	1.241	Strong IS	4
I am aware of the online class monitoring	2.59	1.268	Strong IS	5
E-learning monitors assist me when there are network obstacles	2.51	1.218	Strong IS	6
Online lecture preparations (notes) are monitored before lecture time.	2.43	1.231	Weak IS	7
E-learning monitors follow other platform lectures other than LMS	2.28	1.278	Weak IS	8
Average Mean for E-learning Supervision	2.55	0.901	Strong IS	
Overall Mean for Instructional Supervision	2.41	0.725	Weak IS	

The above table presents the means and standard deviations on the extent to which academic staff rated the effectiveness of instructional supervision (IS) in their respective universities. The results in this table indicate an overall

mean of 2.41, with a standard deviation of 0.725, which suggests that on average, respondents reported the level of IS to be generally weak, with minimal deviations.

Results indicate that out of the five aspects of IS, only two were rated to be effective, with Supervision Planning being rated as the most effective, with an average mean rating of 2.58, followed by e-learning supervision, with a mean rating of 2.55. This finding suggests that supervision planning is adequately attended to, which takes place at the strategic level of management. Respondents indicated that; they "get adequate College support in preparing lecture instructional materials (e.g., projectors, computers, markers, manilas, etc)"; "lecture observation objectives focus on best instructional practices"; they are "clearly aware of targets/objectives for lecture supervision"; they are "adequately involved in developing lecture supervision targets"; their "views are sought and included in lecture observation plans" and "lecture observation schedules are well discussed with lecturers". On average most respondents agreed with those statements, indicating that they are contented about the way supervision planning is done. It also indicates that they are aware of the targets of IS. This kind of appreciation is important implementing the IS strategies and in improving the quality of instruction, which can result into improved students grades at completion.

The results further indicate that majority of the respondents disagreed with most of the question items on classroom monitoring, feedback provision and instructional support strategies. This suggested that IS on these aspects is generally weak, yet these are concerned with actual implementation and conduct of IS. This implies that even though the management of thee universities make good plans for IS, on ground little is being implemented. Supervision is more of action oriented therefore, if classroom teaching is not effectively monitored, the whole function of IS becomes weak. Instructional supervision through effective lecture observation helps to identify the strength and weaknesses of the instructors and through feedback as well the discussion monitors hold with lecturers, teaching and learning are expected to improve and this will have a positive significant effect on students' academic grades at completion.

Moreover, the element of lecture monitoring (Mean index = 2.29) was equal to the element of instructional support strategies, implying that, the two are connected. The instructional support strategies are the recommendations discussed between the lecturer and the supervisors/monitors. But the issues they discuss come from what was observed by the person who monitored the lecture going on. Lecture monitoring is done by a professional, who has the knowledge and skills of good classroom instruction. Through lecture observation, the observer will identify the strong points of the lecturer as well as the weak points. After the lecturer, the observer will discuss with the lecturer, what he/she was able to see and seek the lecturer's opinion on how it can be done better. The two reach a conclusion/agreement on areas to improve next time. When this process is done continuously, the lecturer becomes more and more effective in teaching and the resulting effect will be improved students' learning outcomes, one of which are the grades at completion. This discussion suggest that IS is a process with many activities which are inter-connected and feed into one another. So if one activity such as classroom monitoring is not effectively done, it negatively affects the rest of the activities ahead of it, such as feedback provision and discussions of instruction support strategies. This may partly explain why the grand average score on IS is generally low (2.41).

4.2. Students' Grades at Completion

Table 2 Escriptive Statistics on Students' Grades at Completion by Year

Grade	Year	Percentage Mean	Std. Dev	t-statistic	Sig.
First Class	2019	5.6092	7.35957	-2.184	0.029
	2022	7.2119	12.18752		
Second Class Upper	2019	46.6397	18.17734	-3.281	0.001
	2022	51.0685	18.18644		
Second Class Lower	2019	45.4450	20.01935	3.093	0.002
	2022	40.7997	20.47650		
Pass	2019	2.3092	5.21235	4.593	0.000
	2022	0.9261	1.98519		

The study sought to establish the factors that predict students' grade at completion, using two predictors; instructional supervision and academic staff job satisfaction. Secondary data on students' academic grades or Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) was collected from the four universities. The data on students' final CGPA at graduation, was collected

for two years, those who graduated in 2019 and those who graduated in 2022. The table presents the descriptive statistics of students' grades at completion by year, level of instructional supervision and by the four universities under study.

The results reveal significant differences in students' grades at completion in the two years studied (2019 and 2022). The significant differences mainly favour grades in the year 2022, sincein most cases, more students passed in better grades (first class and second upper) compared to those in 2019 and on the other hand, more students in low grades (low class degrees) in 2019. For example, on average, more students (7.2%) got first class degrees in 2022 compared to 2019 (5.6%). In the same way, more students (over 51%) got second-class upper degrees in 2022 compared to 2019 (46.6%). On the lower side of completion grades, more students (45.4%) got second-class lower degrees in 2019 compared to 2022 (40.8%) and a similar trend is seen for pass degrees, which occurred more in 2019 (2.3%) than in 2022 (0.93%). The reason why students' grades at completion are better in 2022 than in 2019 requires investigation. The table shows analysis of students' grades at completion by level of instructional supervision.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics on Students' Grades at Completion by Level of Instructional Supervision

Grade	Level of instructional supervision	Mean	Std. Dev.	F	Sig.
First Class	Very weak IS	5.17	5.804	1.935	0.123
	Weak IS	6.84	11.261		
	Strong IS	5.83	8.936		
	Very Strong IS	10.22	10.814		
	Total	6.35	9.911		
Second Class Upper	Very weak IS	50.56	17.513	0.590	0.622
	Weak IS	48.59	17.973		
	Strong IS	48.07	19.064		
	Very Strong IS	51.88	15.778		
	Total	48.68	18.303		
Second Class Lower	Very weak IS	43.05	19.158	.797	0.496
	Weak IS	43.20	20.429		
	Strong IS	43.94	20.612		
	Very Strong IS	36.72	19.916		
	Total	43.30	20.350		
Pass	Very weak IS	1.22	3.295	2.427	0.064
	Weak IS	1.38	3.835		
	Strong IS	2.17	4.638		
	Very Strong IS	1.16	2.490		
	Total	1.67	4.111		

The results do not reveal any significant differences in students' grades at completion due to level of instructional supervision. However, though insignificant, in most cases, better grades are seen where the instructional supervision is stronger. For example, while on average, 6.35% of the students in the universities studied, got first class degrees, where instructional supervision was rated very strong, the average percentage of students who got first class was highest at 10.22% and where instructional supervision was rated very weak, the average percentage of students who got first class was lowest at 5.17%. This happens to be the same trend with, more students who got second-class upper degrees. But when it comes to average percentage of students with lower completion grades, weaker instructional supervision is seen with more students scoring second-class lower and pass degrees. However, there are no statistical evidences to conclude that these grades at completion are better explained by the level of instructional supervision.

4.3. Testing Hypothesis: There is no significant effect between instructional supervision and students' grades at completion in private and public universities in Kampala, Uganda

In the objective, we tested the effect of instructional supervision (IS) on students' grade at completion. The null hypothesis tested was that; instructional supervision is not a significant determinant of students' grades at completion. This null hypothesis was tested using the General Linear Model (GLM) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Given that students' grades at completion (DV) had four numerical measures (number of First Class, Second Class Upper, Second Class Lower and Pass), the GLM's MANOVA was deemed fit instead of ANOVA from the multiple linear regression models (Hasan, 2020; Taylor, 2011; Bauer & Curran, 2005). The results are presented in table.

Table 4 Testing Hypothesis

Multivariate Tests[c]							
Effect		**Value**	**F**	**Hypothesis df**	**Error df**	**Sig.**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	1.000	2.154E8[a]	4.000	723.000	.000	1.000
	Wilks' Lambda	0.000	2.154E8[a]	4.000	723.000	.000	1.000
	Hotelling's Trace	1.192E6	2.154E8[a]	4.000	723.000	.000	1.000
	Roy's Largest Root	1.192E6	2.154E8[a]	4.000	723.000	.000	1.000
IS	Pillai's Trace	0.033	2.027	12.000	2.175E3	0.019	0.011
	Wilks' Lambda	0.967	2.029	12.000	1.913E3	0.019	0.011
	Hotelling's Trace	0.034	2.029	12.000	2.165E3	0.019	0.011
	Roy's Largest Root	0.022	4.024[b]	4.000	725.000	0.003	0.022
a. Exact statistic; b. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the;							
significance level.; c. Design: Intercept + ISordinal							

Results indicate that the main effect of instructional supervision on students' grades at completion is statistically significant (Wilks' Lambda = .967; F= 2.029;Sig. = 0.019;Partial Eta^2 = .011). Apart from the main effect tests, a4×4 (IS Vs Grades at completion) between-subjects/ pairwise multivariate analysis of variance is also performed on the four levels of the dependent variable: first class degrees, second upper degrees, second lower degrees and pass degrees and levels of the independent variable (very weak IS, weak IS, strong IS and very strong IS) and the results are presented in table. Pair-wise comparisons indicate that the significant difference is between universities with weak instructional supervision and those with strong supervision, only on pass degrees. Specifically, weak instructional supervision is more associated with significantly higher percentages of students who graduate with pass degrees

5. Discussions

The findings from this study revealed that instructional supervision was generally weak among the four universities studied. On the other hand, the grades at completion were fair, with slightly above 50% of the students who graduated within the two years under study, attaining what is considered good grades (first class and second class upper) degrees, while close to 45% attained what is considered poor grades (second class lower and pass) degrees. The findings from the GLM MANOV revealed that instructional supervision significantly affect students' grades at completion. The findings indicate that the big number of students who graduate with poor grades may be attributed to the weak instructional supervision which characterises these universities. In other words, there is evidence that if instructional supervision is strengthened, students' grades at completion will improve and vice versa. Therefore, strong/good instructional supervision is associated with big numbers of students who graduate with good grades and reduced numbers with poor grades.

Recommendation

In order to improve students' grades at completion, the management and administrators of universities should strengthen instructional supervision. Thus, in order to increase the numbers of students who graduate with good grades (first class and second upper) and so reduce the number of students who graduate with poor grades (second class lower

and pass), these instructional supervision issues should be addresses; by making a follow up on both lectures and students.

6. Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study and those of previous studies, the researcher concludes that strong/good instructional supervision is associated with good grades at completion in the selected public and private universities in Kampala. Therefore, the stronger the instructional supervision, the bigger the numbers of students who graduate with good grades (first class and second upper) and the fewer the number of students who graduate with poor grades (second class lower and pass) and vice versa. So the big number of students who grade with poor grades in these universities and probably others, is due to the weak instructional supervision.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

Statement of informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Sponsorship

This article was sponsored by the authors themselves.

References

[1]   Aatif, S. (2021). The impact of grade point average on students' future career prospects: A case study. International Journal of Education and Research, 9(2), 31-42.

[2]   Asiimwe, S. and G. M Steyn (2013). Obstacles Hindering the Effective Governance of Universities in Uganda. J Soc Sci, 34(1):17-27 (2013).

[3]   Asiimwe, S. and G. M Steyn (2014). Building Blocks to Effective and Sustainable University Governance in Uganda. J Soc Sci, 34 (1): 17-27.

[4]   Akitunde, L. (2016). Supervision as Oversight. In K. A. Ericsson & J. G. Prieto (Eds.), Supervision and Evaluation for Learning and Growth: Strategies for Teacher and School Leader Improvement (pp. 15-29). Springer.

[5]   Apolot, H.M., Otaala, J., Kamanyire, V. and Komakech, R.A. (2018). School Practice Supervision and Performance of Student Teachers in Higher Institutions of Learning in Uganda: Empirical Evidence from Kyambogo University and Ndejje University. Journal of Education and Entrepreneurship. 5(2) 16-35.

[6]   Boardman, C. A. (n.d.). Supervision as a Means of Promoting Professional Growth. In K. S. Goodman & H. S. Phillips (Eds.), Paradigms for Supervision: An Innovation, Differentiation, and Evaluation Model (pp. 8-9). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

[7]   Cayetano, J. (2011). Instructional Leadership and Student Achievement in Belizean Secondary Schools. PhD dissertation, Oklahoma State University, USA. Cognitive Science International Journal of Science education, 28(2-3), 143-178. [2]

[8]   Creswell, J. W., and Creswell, J. D. (2018).Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methodsapproaches (5thEd.).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Education, 7(1), 13

[9]   Dhuey, E., & Smith, J. (2014). How school principals influence student learning. Discussion Paper No. 7949. Bonn: The Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA).

[10]   Funke, T. Sofia, G. Asiimwe, S. 2023. The Correlation between Age Diversity and Academic Staff Productivity in Private Chartered Universities in Central Uganda, JARIIE-ISSN(O)-2395-4396, Vol-9 Issue-3 2023

[11]   Funke, T. Sofia, G. Asiimwe, S. 2023. The Relationship between Gender Diversity and Academic Staff Productivity in Private Chartered Universities in Central Uganda, JARIIE-ISSN(O)-2395-4396, Vol-9 Issue-3 2023

[12] Funke, T. Sofia, G. Asiimwe, S. 2023. Workforce Diversity and Academic Staff Productivity in Private Chartered Universities in Central Uganda, JARIIE-ISSN(O)-2395-4396, Vol-9 Issue-3 2023

[13] Geiser, S and Santelices, V. M. (2016). Validity of high school grades in predicting student success beyond the freshman year. Retrieved on February 8, 2018 from http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/docs/ROPS.GEISER_SAT_6.12.07.pdf

[14] Glanz, J. (2018). Instructional supervision: Principles and practices. Routledge.

[15] Gordon, A. (2018). Instructional supervision: A guide for education professionals (3rd ed.). Wiley.

[16] Hompashe, D. (2018). Instructional leadership and academic performance: Eastern Cape educators' perceptions and quantitative evidence. Stellenbosch Economic Working Papers: WP13/2018. Department of Economics and the Bureau for Economic Research, University of Stellenbosch

[17] Ismail, Z. (2015). Instructional Supervision in Higher Education: A Case Study of a Malaysian University. Educational Research and Reviews, 10(23), 2605-2614.

[18] Jared, A. (2011). Instructional Supervision in Schools. In B. McGaw, E. Baker, & P. Peterson (Eds.), International Encyclopedia of Education (3rd ed., pp. 209-214). Elsevier.

[19] KCCA Strategic Plan 2014/15 – 2019/20, Report

[20] Krijsman et al. (2017) - Motivational impact of grading and its relationship with students' focus on achieving good grades.

[21] Lineburg, P.N. (2010). The influence of the instructional leadership of principals on change in teachers' instructional practices (Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia State University).

[22] Lyonga, N.A.N. (2018). Supervision and teachers' work performances in primary schools in Konye Sub-Division in Cameroon. Journal of Educational and Social Research, 8(2), 115- 124

[23] Mugenda Olive M. and Mugenda Abel. (2015) Research Methods-Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. Monrovia: Acts Press.

[24] NCHE (National Council for Higher Education). (2020). Guidelines for the classification of degrees in universities in Uganda. Retrieved from [URL]NCHE Catalogue, March 2020.

[25] Ryatura, J. Serunjogi, C.D, Asiimwe, S. 2023. Competency-Based Teaching Approaches and Student-Teachers' Academic Performance in Public Grade A Teachers' Colleges in Lake- Zone, Tanzania, International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, Vol 4, no 11, pp 563-574 November 2023

[26] Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2017). Supervision: A redefinition. Routledge.1182.

[27] Tariq Eid Al-Dulaimi. (2018). Contemporary Educational Supervision: A Global Perspective. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

[28] Tesfaw, A. T., & Hofman, W. H. (2014). Factors Affecting Students' Performance: The Role of Assessment. Journal of Education and Practice, 5(6), 101-111.

[29] Tesfaw, T.A & Hofman, R.H (2014). Relationship between instructional supervision and professional development. The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives, 13 (1), 82-99. Retrieved May 18, 2023 from http://iejcomparative.org.

[30] Tyogi, B. (2010). Instructional Supervision: A Tool for Improving Teaching and Learning Process. Journal of Education and Practice, 1(1), 1-5. Universities and Tertiary Institutions Act, 2018 University, Ondo State, Nigeria). International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences, 1(2), 157-163.

[31] Usman, A. (2015). Quality of instruction and students' academic performance in higher education institutions. International Journal of Education and Research, 3(12), 85-98.

[32] Usman, B. I. (2015). Factors Affecting Students' Academic Performance in Colleges of Education in Nigeria. Journal of Education and Practice, 6(6), 59-65.

[33] Usman, Y.D. (2015). The Impact of Instructional Supervision on Academic Performance of Secondary School Students in Nasarawa State, Nigerira. Journal of Education and Practice, 10(6), 160-167.