International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research (IJAPR)
ISSN: 2643-9123
Vol. 9 Issue 10 October - 2025, Pages: 113-122

The Pedagogical Deficit: A Comparative Analysis of Lecturer Preparedness and its Impact on Education Quality in the East African Community

Dr. Arinaitwe Julius[1], Ahumuza Audrey[2]

1,2 Metropolitan International University

ABSTRACT: Background: *Despite the critical role of lecturer pedagogical preparedness in higher education quality, systematic comparative evidence across the East African Community (EAC) region remained limited, hindering evidence-based policy development and regional harmonization efforts.* ***Objective:*** *This study conducted a comparative analysis of lecturer pedagogical preparedness across EAC member states and assessed its impact on higher education quality to identify effective practices and policy interventions for strengthening teaching capacity.* ***Methods:*** *A mixed-methods comparative design was employed with 2,134 lecturers from 72 universities across all six EAC countries sampled through stratified random sampling between January and December 2024. Data were collected using validated pedagogical preparedness questionnaires, institutional records, and semi-structured interviews, with analyses including descriptive statistics, ANOVA, correlation analyses, multiple linear regression, and hierarchical linear modeling.* ***Results:*** *Hierarchical linear modeling confirmed that pedagogical preparedness significantly predicted student learning outcomes (coefficient = 0.487, $p < 0.001$) while accounting for university-level (ICC = 0.191) and country-level (ICC = 0.102) clustering effects.* ***Conclusion:*** *Lecturer pedagogical preparedness constituted a foundational yet variable determinant of higher education quality across the EAC region, with substantial disparities reflecting differential investments in faculty development frameworks, quality assurance systems, and institutional capacity. Multi-level interventions addressing individual preparedness, institutional systems, and national policies were required for sustainable quality enhancement.* ***Recommendations:*** *The study recommended establishing regional minimum standards for mandatory pedagogical certification, strengthening institutional teaching and learning centers with coordinated EAC support, and implementing integrated multi-level quality assurance mechanisms with targeted capacity building for lower-performing systems, particularly South Sudan and Burundi.*

Keywords: pedagogical preparedness, lecturer competencies, higher education quality, teaching effectiveness, East African Community.

Introduction

The quality of higher education ultimately rests substantially on the competence of faculty members who design curricula, facilitate learning, assess student achievement, and mentor emerging scholars, making lecturer preparedness—encompassing both content expertise and pedagogical skill—a critical determinant of whether universities fulfill their educational mission of developing student knowledge, skills, and critical thinking capacities (Darussyamsu et al., 2021; Iffath Unnisa Begum, 2024). However, the rapid expansion of higher education across the East African Community, driven by demographic pressures, economic aspirations, and political commitments to increased access, has outpaced development of adequately prepared teaching staff, potentially creating what might be characterized as a pedagogical deficit where lecturers possess subject matter knowledge yet lack formal training in teaching methodologies, learning theories, assessment design, or other pedagogical competencies essential for effective instruction (Deepa et al., 2022; Veselinović et al., 2020). This comparative analysis examines lecturer preparedness across East African Community member states including Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, and South Sudan, exploring patterns in faculty qualifications, pedagogical training, teaching loads, professional development opportunities, and institutional support for teaching excellence, while investigating how variations in lecturer preparedness correlate with educational quality indicators and what regional lessons might be learned from comparative examination of different national approaches to ensuring teaching competency in higher education (Abelha et al., 2020; Ralston, 2021; Tulibaleka, 2022).

Background

Higher education expansion across the East African Community has followed similar trajectories in all member states with dramatic increases in student enrollment, proliferation of private universities supplementing historically dominant public institutions, diversification of program offerings responding to perceived market demands, and persistent challenges of quality assurance amid rapid growth, yet significant variations exist across countries in regulatory frameworks, funding models, qualification requirements for lecturers, and institutional cultures regarding teaching quality that create opportunities for comparative analysis (Haleem et al., 2022; Kamal, 2002; Sullivan et al., 2023). Lecturer preparedness encompasses multiple dimensions including terminal degree attainment where the standard expectation increasingly demands doctoral qualifications for university teaching though substantial proportions of faculty across the region hold only master's degrees particularly in newer private institutions and in professional fields; disciplinary expertise measured through research productivity, publication records, and continuing engagement with evolving knowledge in fields of specialization; pedagogical training which most lecturers across the region lack entirely having received no

formal instruction in teaching methods during their graduate education which focused exclusively on research training (Mpaata & Mpaata, 2018; Sharif, 2019); teaching experience which varies from novice lecturers with no prior teaching to senior faculty with decades of classroom practice though experience alone without pedagogical reflection may not ensure teaching effectiveness; and technological competence increasingly relevant as educational technology integration becomes expected yet challenging for faculty trained in pre-digital eras (Alan et al., 2023; Lozano et al., 2022). The pedagogical deficit manifests through observable patterns including lecture-dominated instruction where faculty rely almost exclusively on knowledge transmission through lectures without incorporating active learning, discussion, problem-based learning, or other pedagogical approaches that educational research shows enhance learning; poor assessment practices where examinations test memorization rather than higher-order thinking and faculty provide minimal feedback to support student learning; inability to address diverse learning needs in increasingly heterogeneous classrooms including students with varying preparation levels, learning styles, and backgrounds (Kazaara, 2023; Milliam & Dominic, 2022); limited integration of technology beyond basic PowerPoint use despite availability of learning management systems, multimedia resources, and online collaboration tools; and resistance to pedagogical innovation or student-centered approaches reflecting both lack of knowledge about alternatives and institutional cultures that do not value teaching excellence or provide incentives for pedagogical improvement (Bala et al., 2020; Kibuuka, 2022). Comparative patterns across EAC member states reveal variations including differences in regulatory requirements where some countries mandate pedagogical training for new faculty while others have no such requirements; variations in faculty workload policies affecting time available for teaching preparation and student interaction; differences in institutional investment in teaching and learning centers, faculty development programs, and pedagogical support resources

Problem Statement

The quality of higher education in the East African Community (EAC) is fundamentally constrained by a pedagogical deficit among university lecturers, many of whom possess advanced subject matter expertise but lack formal training in teaching methodologies, curriculum design, assessment practices, and student-centered learning approaches (Davis et al., 2013; Ninsiima et al., 2020). Across EAC member states—Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda—the predominant pathway to university teaching positions emphasizes research credentials and disciplinary knowledge while assuming that content expertise automatically translates into effective teaching. This assumption has proven problematic, as evidenced by student complaints about poor instruction, high failure rates, disengagement from learning, and graduate competency gaps that employers attribute partly to inadequate pedagogical delivery (Alzyoudi et al., 2021; Odama, 2023).

The impact of these varying approaches on education quality remains underexamined, despite their obvious relevance to regional harmonization efforts and the EAC's aspirations for competitive higher education. Furthermore, the pedagogical deficit intersects with other challenges including large class sizes, limited instructional technology, outdated curricula, and assessment systems that emphasize recall over higher-order thinking. Without systematic comparison of lecturer preparedness across the EAC and evidence-based understanding of how pedagogical competence affects educational outcomes, member states will struggle to implement effective faculty development policies or achieve the quality benchmarks necessary for international competitiveness.

Main Objective

To conduct a comparative analysis of lecturer pedagogical preparedness across East African Community member states and assess its impact on higher education quality, identifying effective practices and policy interventions for strengthening teaching capacity.

Specific Objectives

1. To assess the levels of pedagogical preparedness among university lecturers across EAC member states, examining variations in pre-service training, in-service professional development, and teaching competencies.
2. To analyze the relationship between lecturer pedagogical preparedness and indicators of education quality including student learning outcomes, teaching effectiveness ratings, and graduate employability.
3. To identify effective policies and practices for enhancing lecturer pedagogical capacity across the EAC region and recommend strategies for regional harmonization of faculty development standards.

Research Questions

1. How does lecturer pedagogical preparedness vary across East African Community member states, and what factors explain these variations?
2. What is the relationship between lecturer pedagogical competence and education quality indicators in EAC universities?
3. What policies and practices have proven most effective in enhancing lecturer pedagogical capacity in the EAC region, and how can these be scaled or harmonized across member states?

Methods.

This study employed a mixed-methods comparative design to examine lecturer pedagogical preparedness across all six East African Community member states (Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda) between January 2024 and December 2024. A stratified random sampling approach was utilized, with universities stratified by country, institutional type (public/private), and size, while lecturers were stratified by discipline cluster (STEM, humanities, social sciences, business) and career stage (early,

mid, senior). Power analysis calculations determined that a minimum sample of 1,680 lecturers (280 per country) was required to detect medium effect sizes (Cohen's d = 0.5) with 80% power at α = 0.05, accounting for potential clustering effects (ICC = 0.15) and an anticipated 20% non-response rate; the final sample comprised 2,134 lecturers from 72 universities.

Data were collected through a validated pedagogical preparedness questionnaire (Cronbach's α = 0.89) covering pre-service training, professional development participation, teaching competencies, and self-efficacy; institutional records provided data on teaching effectiveness ratings, student performance metrics, and graduate employability outcomes; while semi-structured interviews with 96 purposively selected lecturers and 36 academic leaders provided qualitative insights. Univariate analyses included descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies), normality tests (Shapiro-Wilk), and data visualization through histograms and boxplots to characterize pedagogical preparedness levels and quality indicators across countries. Bivariate analyses employed independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA with post-hoc Tukey tests to compare preparedness across countries and institutional types, Pearson and Spearman correlations to examine associations between preparedness and quality indicators, and chi-square tests for categorical relationships.

Multivariate analyses included multiple linear regression to predict teaching effectiveness and student outcomes from pedagogical preparedness dimensions while controlling for lecturer demographics and institutional characteristics, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to account for nested data structures (lecturers within universities within countries), structural equation modeling (SEM) to test hypothesized pathways between preparedness components and quality outcomes, and binary logistic regression to predict graduate employability. Additional analyses comprised principal component analysis (PCA) to identify underlying dimensions of pedagogical preparedness, cluster analysis (k-means) to identify distinct lecturer profiles, and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to examine simultaneous country differences across multiple quality indicators. Qualitative data from interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis with NVivo software to identify effective practices and policy mechanisms, which were subsequently triangulated with quantitative findings. All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS version 28 and R version 4.3, with statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$, and missing data were handled using multiple imputation techniques to ensure robust estimates (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023).

RESULTS

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and One-Way ANOVA of Pedagogical Preparedness Scores by Country

Country	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	SE
Burundi	342	62.4	12.8	28	95	0.69
Kenya	378	74.2	11.3	38	98	0.58
Rwanda	356	71.8	10.9	42	96	0.58
South Sudan	298	58.3	14.2	24	92	0.82
Tanzania	384	68.5	12.1	32	97	0.62
Uganda	376	72.3	11.6	36	99	0.60

ANOVA Results

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	45682.4	5	9136.48	64.28	<0.001
Within Groups	302456.8	2128	142.14	-	-
Total	348139.2	2133	-	-	-

Note: Pedagogical preparedness scores ranged from 0-100. Post-hoc Tukey HSD tests revealed significant differences between all country pairs ($p < 0.05$) except South Sudan-Burundi ($p = 0.182$) and Rwanda-Uganda ($p = 0.412$). Effect size: $\eta^2 = 0.131$ (large effect).

Statistical Interpretation

The descriptive statistics revealed substantial variation in pedagogical preparedness scores across the six EAC member states, with means ranging from 58.3 (South Sudan) to 74.2 (Kenya). The one-way ANOVA demonstrated statistically significant differences in pedagogical preparedness among countries, $F(5, 2128) = 64.28$, $p < 0.001$, with a large effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.131$), indicating that approximately 13.1% of the variance in pedagogical preparedness was attributable to country-level differences. Kenya exhibited the highest mean preparedness score ($M = 74.2$, $SD = 11.3$), followed by Uganda ($M = 72.3$, $SD = 11.6$) and Rwanda ($M = 71.8$, $SD = 10.9$), while South Sudan ($M = 58.3$, $SD = 14.2$) and Burundi ($M = 62.4$, $SD = 12.8$) demonstrated significantly lower preparedness levels. The standard errors were consistently small across all countries (ranging from 0.58 to 0.82), indicating precise estimates of the population means. Notably, South Sudan exhibited the highest variability in scores ($SD = 14.2$), suggesting greater heterogeneity in lecturer preparedness within this context, while Rwanda demonstrated the most homogeneous preparedness levels ($SD = 10.9$). The Levene's test for homogeneity of variance was significant ($p = 0.023$), indicating some violation of the equal variance assumption; however, given the large sample sizes and robustness of ANOVA to moderate heterogeneity, the results remained interpretable with appropriate caution.

Discussion

These findings revealed critical disparities in lecturer pedagogical preparedness across the EAC region, with clear stratification into three distinct performance tiers. The superior performance of Kenya, Uganda, and Rwanda likely reflected their more established higher education quality assurance frameworks, mandatory faculty development requirements, and substantial investments in teaching and learning centers at major universities. Kenya's leading position was consistent with its Universities Act (2012) provisions requiring pedagogical training for all academic staff and its robust Commission for University Education oversight mechanisms. Conversely, the significantly lower preparedness levels in South Sudan and Burundi appeared to reflect the combined effects of protracted conflict, limited infrastructure, brain drain of qualified academics, and nascent quality assurance systems. The large effect size observed suggested that country-level contextual factors including policy frameworks, resource allocation, institutional capacity, and historical development trajectories played substantial roles in shaping lecturer preparedness. The high within-country variance, particularly in South Sudan, pointed to uneven distribution of professional development opportunities between well-resourced flagship institutions and peripheral universities, as well as disparities between disciplines and career stages. These results underscored the urgent need for regional harmonization of minimum faculty development standards while simultaneously acknowledging the necessity for context-sensitive implementation strategies that account for varying national capacities and institutional realities across the EAC partnership.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix of Pedagogical Preparedness and Higher Education Quality Indicators

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Pedagogical Preparedness	1.000				
2. Teaching Effectiveness	0.624***	1.000			
3. Student Learning Outcomes	0.587***	0.693***	1.000		
4. Student Satisfaction	0.512***	0.541***	0.612***	1.000	
5. Graduate Employability	0.468***	0.489***	0.523***	0.456***	1.000

*Note: $N = 2,134$. *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed). All correlations remained significant after Bonferroni correction ($\alpha = 0.005$).*

Statistical Interpretation

The Pearson correlation analysis revealed statistically significant positive associations between pedagogical preparedness and all examined indicators of higher education quality, with all correlations significant at $p < 0.001$ and remaining robust after Bonferroni

correction for multiple comparisons. Pedagogical preparedness demonstrated a strong positive correlation with teaching effectiveness ratings ($r = 0.624$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that lecturers with higher preparedness scores received substantially better teaching evaluations from students and peers. A moderately strong positive correlation was observed between pedagogical preparedness and student learning outcomes ($r = 0.587$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting that better-prepared lecturers facilitated superior academic achievement among their students. The relationship between pedagogical preparedness and student satisfaction ($r = 0.512$, $p < 0.001$) was moderate and positive, while the association with graduate employability ($r = 0.468$, $p < 0.001$) was also moderate, indicating that lecturer preparedness indirectly influenced post-graduation labor market outcomes. Notably, teaching effectiveness ratings exhibited the strongest correlation with student learning outcomes ($r = 0.693$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting these constructs were closely aligned yet distinct dimensions of educational quality. The correlation matrix demonstrated no evidence of multicollinearity concerns (all $r < 0.70$), with variance inflation factors calculated in subsequent regression analyses all below 2.5, confirming the appropriateness of including these variables in multivariate models. The symmetry and consistency of the correlation patterns across all quality indicators provided convergent validity evidence for the pedagogical preparedness construct.

Discussion

These correlation patterns provided compelling empirical evidence supporting the theoretical proposition that lecturer pedagogical preparedness constituted a foundational determinant of higher education quality across the EAC region. The strong association between preparedness and teaching effectiveness validated institutional investments in faculty development programs and supported policy frameworks mandating pedagogical training for university academics. The meaningful relationship between preparedness and student learning outcomes was particularly significant, as it demonstrated that pedagogical competence translated into tangible improvements in student academic performance, moving beyond mere satisfaction or perception metrics. The moderate correlation with graduate employability suggested that pedagogical preparedness influenced quality through multiple pathways, including development of students' critical thinking, problem-solving, and transferable skills that enhanced labor market competitiveness. However, the moderate rather than strong magnitude of this relationship indicated that employability was a complex, multifaceted outcome influenced by numerous factors beyond lecturer preparedness, including curriculum relevance, industry partnerships, economic conditions, and individual student characteristics. The relatively weaker correlation between preparedness and employability compared to other quality indicators underscored the importance of complementary interventions such as career development services, internship programs, and industry engagement alongside pedagogical capacity building. The consistency of positive correlations across all quality dimensions suggested that enhancing lecturer pedagogical preparedness would yield broad-spectrum improvements in higher education quality, making it a high-leverage intervention point for regional quality enhancement initiatives and justifying coordinated EAC-level investments in faculty development infrastructure and standards harmonization.

Table 3: Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Teaching Effectiveness from Pedagogical Preparedness Components

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI
Pre-service Training	0.342	0.048	0.289	7.125	<0.001	[0.248, 0.436]
In-service PD Hours	0.186	0.041	0.178	4.537	<0.001	[0.106, 0.266]
Teaching Competencies	0.428	0.052	0.354	8.231	<0.001	[0.326, 0.530]
Years of Experience	0.124	0.038	0.112	3.263	0.001	[0.049, 0.199]
Institutional Support	0.215	0.045	0.196	4.778	<0.001	[0.127, 0.303]
PhD Qualification	0.168	0.056	0.108	3.000	0.003	[0.058, 0.278]

Model Fit: $R = 0.742$, $R^2 = 0.551$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.548$, $F(6, 2127) = 260.84$, $p < 0.001$, Durbin-Watson = 1.98

Note: Dependent variable: Teaching Effectiveness Rating (0-100). N = 2,134. All continuous predictors were standardized. Institutional type (public/private) and discipline cluster were included as control variables. VIF values ranged from 1.23 to 2.34, indicating no multicollinearity concerns. Residuals were normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk p = 0.086) with no evidence of heteroscedasticity (Breusch-Pagan p = 0.154).

Statistical Interpretation

The multiple linear regression model demonstrated excellent explanatory power, accounting for 55.1% of the variance in teaching effectiveness ratings ($R^2 = 0.551$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.548$), with the overall model being highly statistically significant, $F(6, 2127) = 260.84$, $p < 0.001$. All six predictor variables contributed significantly and uniquely to teaching effectiveness. Teaching competencies emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.354$, $t = 8.231$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that for every one standard deviation increase in teaching competencies, teaching effectiveness increased by 0.354 standard deviations when holding all other variables constant. Pre-service training was the second strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.289$, $t = 7.125$, $p < 0.001$), followed by institutional support ($\beta = 0.196$, $t = 4.778$, $p < 0.001$) and in-service professional development hours ($\beta = 0.178$, $t = 4.537$, $p < 0.001$). Years of experience ($\beta = 0.112$, $t = 3.263$, $p = 0.001$) and PhD qualification ($\beta = 0.108$, $t = 3.000$, $p = 0.003$) demonstrated smaller but still statistically significant effects.

The 95% confidence intervals for all regression coefficients excluded zero, reinforcing the statistical significance of each predictor. Model diagnostics indicated that all regression assumptions were adequately met: the Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.98 suggested no problematic autocorrelation, residuals approximated normality (Shapiro-Wilk $p = 0.086$), and the Breusch-Pagan test ($p = 0.154$) indicated homoscedasticity. Variance inflation factors ranged from 1.23 to 2.34, well below the threshold of 5, confirming absence of multicollinearity.

Discussion

These regression findings provided critical insights into the relative contributions of different pedagogical preparedness components to teaching effectiveness, with important implications for resource allocation and policy prioritization. The dominant effect of teaching competencies underscored that practical pedagogical skills including lesson planning, active learning strategies, assessment design, and classroom management constituted the most proximal determinants of effective teaching practice. This finding suggested that professional development interventions should prioritize hands-on skill development and practice-based learning rather than purely theoretical pedagogical knowledge. The substantial effect of pre-service training highlighted the importance of initial teacher preparation programs and supported arguments for mandatory pedagogical qualifications prior to university teaching appointments, a requirement already implemented in Kenya and Rwanda but inconsistently applied across other EAC states. The significant contribution of institutional support indicated that individual lecturer preparedness alone was insufficient; organizational factors including mentoring systems, teaching observation and feedback mechanisms, access to educational technology, and recognition of teaching excellence in promotion decisions created enabling environments that translated preparedness into effective practice.

The modest yet significant effect of in-service professional development hours suggested that ongoing learning opportunities contributed incrementally to teaching effectiveness, validating institutional investments in continuing professional development programs. Interestingly, while PhD qualification and years of experience both predicted teaching effectiveness, their relatively smaller standardized coefficients challenged traditional assumptions that content expertise and seniority automatically translated into pedagogical excellence. This finding reinforced the necessity of explicit pedagogical training regardless of academic credentials or experience level, supporting EAC moves toward mandatory certification programs for university teaching. The high R^2 value indicated that the model captured the majority of systematic variance in teaching effectiveness, though 44.9% of variance remained unexplained, likely attributable to individual differences in teaching aptitude, motivation, contextual factors, and measurement error.

Table 4: Hierarchical Linear Modeling Results Predicting Student Learning Outcomes

Effect	Parameter	Coefficient	SE	t	p	95% CI
Fixed Effects						
	Intercept	45.23	2.14	21.14	<0.001	[41.04, 49.42]
	Pedagogical Preparedness	0.487	0.038	12.82	<0.001	[0.412, 0.562]
	Country (Ref: Burundi)					
	Kenya	8.45	1.87	4.52	<0.001	[4.78, 12.12]
	Rwanda	6.82	1.92	3.55	<0.001	[3.05, 10.59]
	South Sudan	-2.34	2.08	-1.12	0.262	[-6.42, 1.74]

	Tanzania	4.56	1.84	2.48	0.013	[0.95, 8.17]
	Uganda	7.23	1.89	3.83	<0.001	[3.52, 10.94]
Random Effects						
	University-level variance (τ^2)	34.68	8.92			[19.32, 50.04]
	Country-level variance (τ^2)	18.45	6.34			[8.21, 28.69]
	Residual variance (σ^2)	128.73	3.45			[121.97, 135.49]
Model Fit						
	ICC (University)	0.191				
	ICC (Country)	0.102				
	AIC	16847.3				
	BIC	16923.8				

Note: Dependent variable: Student Learning Outcomes (average course grades, 0-100). N = 2,134 lecturers nested within 72 universities across 6 countries. Model controlled for lecturer gender, discipline, career stage, and institutional type. Likelihood ratio tests confirmed significant random effects at both university ($\chi^2 = 287.45$, $p < 0.001$) and country levels ($\chi^2 = 156.23$, $p < 0.001$).

Statistical Interpretation

The hierarchical linear model revealed that pedagogical preparedness significantly predicted student learning outcomes even after accounting for the nested structure of data and country-level variation, with a fixed effect coefficient of 0.487 (SE = 0.038, t = 12.82, $p < 0.001$), indicating that a one-unit increase in pedagogical preparedness was associated with a 0.487-point increase in student learning outcomes. The random effects structure demonstrated substantial clustering of outcomes, with the intraclass correlation coefficient at the university level (ICC = 0.191) indicating that 19.1% of the variance in student learning outcomes was attributable to differences between universities, while the country-level ICC (0.102) showed that 10.2% of variance existed between countries.

The remaining 70.7% of variance occurred at the individual lecturer level. Country fixed effects revealed that compared to Burundi (reference category), students of lecturers in Kenya scored 8.45 points higher (SE = 1.87, t = 4.52, $p < 0.001$), Uganda 7.23 points higher (SE = 1.89, t = 3.83, $p < 0.001$), Rwanda 6.82 points higher (SE = 1.92, t = 3.55, $p < 0.001$), and Tanzania 4.56 points higher (SE = 1.84, t = 2.48, p = 0.013), while South Sudan showed no significant difference (coefficient = -2.34, SE = 2.08, t = -1.12, p = 0.262). All significant country effects maintained their significance when controlling for pedagogical preparedness, suggesting these represented additional contextual influences beyond lecturer preparation. The likelihood ratio tests confirmed that including random effects at both university ($\chi^2 = 287.45$, $p < 0.001$) and country levels ($\chi^2 = 156.23$, $p < 0.001$) significantly improved model fit compared to simpler models, justifying the hierarchical structure. Model fit indices (AIC = 16847.3, BIC = 16923.8) were substantially lower than those of competing models tested.

Discussion

The hierarchical linear modeling results provided nuanced evidence that pedagogical preparedness operated as a critical determinant of student learning outcomes across multiple organizational levels, while simultaneously revealing the substantial influence of institutional and national contexts. The strong and significant effect of pedagogical preparedness on student learning outcomes, even after controlling for clustering and contextual factors, reinforced the causal pathway from lecturer preparation to student achievement and validated regional investments in faculty development as a mechanism for improving educational quality. The substantial university-level variance (19.1%) suggested that institutional characteristics including leadership quality, resource availability, academic culture, quality assurance mechanisms, and peer effects created differential learning environments that amplified or

constrained the impact of individual lecturer preparedness. This finding highlighted the importance of institutional-level interventions complementing individual capacity building, including strengthening teaching and learning centers, implementing robust quality assurance systems, and fostering cultures of teaching excellence.

The country-level variance (10.2%) reflected broader systemic factors including national policy frameworks, funding levels, governance structures, and socio-economic conditions that shaped higher education quality. The persistent country effects after controlling for pedagogical preparedness indicated that Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Tanzania possessed additional systemic advantages that enhanced student learning beyond lecturer preparation alone, likely including stronger quality assurance frameworks, better educational infrastructure, more rigorous academic standards, and supportive policy environments. The non-significant difference between Burundi and South Sudan, despite their low preparedness levels, suggested these contexts faced comparable systemic challenges requiring comprehensive reform beyond faculty development. The finding that pedagogical preparedness effects remained consistent across all hierarchical levels suggested this represented a universal quality determinant, though its magnitude varied across contexts based on enabling or constraining environmental factors.

CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis of lecturer pedagogical preparedness across the six East African Community member states successfully achieved its primary objectives by revealing significant disparities in preparedness levels, establishing robust empirical linkages between preparedness and education quality indicators, and identifying effective practices for regional capacity enhancement. The study demonstrated that pedagogical preparedness varied substantially across EAC countries, with Kenya ($M = 74.2$), Uganda ($M = 72.3$), and Rwanda ($M = 71.8$) exhibiting significantly higher preparedness levels than Tanzania ($M = 68.5$), Burundi ($M = 62.4$), and South Sudan ($M = 58.3$), $F(5, 2128) = 64.28$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.131$. These disparities reflected differential investments in quality assurance frameworks, mandatory faculty development requirements, and institutional capacity across the region. The bivariate analyses confirmed strong positive correlations between pedagogical preparedness and all examined quality indicators, including teaching effectiveness ($r = 0.624$, $p < 0.001$), student learning outcomes ($r = 0.587$, $p < 0.001$), student satisfaction ($r = 0.512$, $p < 0.001$), and graduate employability ($r = 0.468$, $p < 0.001$), establishing pedagogical preparedness as a foundational determinant of higher education quality. The multiple regression model revealed that teaching competencies ($\beta = 0.354$), pre-service training ($\beta = 0.289$), institutional support ($\beta = 0.196$), and in-service professional development ($\beta = 0.178$) emerged as the most influential components of preparedness, collectively explaining 55.1% of variance in teaching effectiveness.

The hierarchical linear modeling analyses further established that pedagogical preparedness significantly predicted student learning outcomes (coefficient = 0.487, $p < 0.001$) even after accounting for substantial university-level (ICC = 0.191) and country-level (ICC = 0.102) clustering effects, confirming its role as a universal quality determinant operating across multiple organizational levels. However, the persistence of significant country effects after controlling for preparedness indicated that systemic factors including policy frameworks, resource allocation, governance structures, and quality assurance mechanisms moderated the translation of individual lecturer capacity into educational outcomes. These findings underscored that effective regional quality enhancement required multi-level interventions addressing individual preparedness, institutional systems, and national policies simultaneously. The study identified that mandatory pedagogical certification requirements, establishment of university teaching and learning centers, implementation of peer observation and mentoring systems, and integration of teaching excellence in promotion criteria represented effective practices in higher-performing countries that warranted regional adoption. The results provided compelling evidence for EAC-level harmonization of minimum faculty development standards while maintaining flexibility for context-sensitive implementation strategies that accommodated varying national capacities and institutional realities across the partnership.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Establish Regional Minimum Standards for Pedagogical Certification: The EAC should develop and mandate regional minimum standards requiring all university lecturers to complete accredited pedagogical training programs before assuming teaching responsibilities, with certification frameworks recognizing both pre-service qualifications and structured in-service professional development pathways. This harmonized approach should build upon Kenya's and Rwanda's existing mandatory certification models while providing capacity-building support and extended implementation timelines for countries with less developed quality assurance infrastructure, particularly South Sudan and Burundi, ensuring equitable regional standards without disadvantaging resource-constrained contexts.

Strengthen Institutional Teaching and Learning Centers Across the Region: Member states should prioritize establishment and strengthening of well-resourced teaching and learning centers at all universities, with technical and financial support coordinated

through the Inter-University Council for East Africa to ensure consistency in service delivery. These centers should provide evidence-based pedagogical training, mentoring programs, teaching observation and feedback systems, educational technology support, and scholarly teaching resources, while serving as hubs for continuous professional development and communities of practice that sustain teaching excellence beyond initial certification.

Implement Multi-Level Quality Assurance Mechanisms with Regional Coordination: EAC should develop integrated quality assurance frameworks operating at lecturer, institutional, and national levels, including standardized teaching effectiveness evaluation systems, regular pedagogical competency assessments, institutional accreditation standards emphasizing teaching quality, and regional benchmarking mechanisms. Priority interventions should target South Sudan and Burundi through capacity-building partnerships with higher-performing systems, while regional knowledge-sharing platforms facilitate dissemination of effective practices and support continuous improvement across all member states, with particular emphasis on linking pedagogical preparedness to promotion criteria and recognizing teaching excellence in academic career progression frameworks.

References.

Abelha, M., Fernandes, S., Mesquita, D., Seabra, F., & Ferreira-Oliveira, A. T. (2020). Graduate employability and competence development in higher education-A systematic literature review using PRISMA. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *12*(15). https://doi.org/10.3390/SU12155900

Alan, B., Zengin, F. K., & Kececi, G. (2023). Effects of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Education Using Algodoo to Prospective Science Teachers' Scientific Process and Education Orientation Skills. *Journal of Education*, *203*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/00220574211044542

Alzyoudi, M., Al Nuaimi, S., & Almazroui, K. (2021). Inclusive Education Practices for Children with Disabilities in the United Arab Emirates. In *Africa Education Review* (Vol. 18, Issues 1–2). https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2022.2105727

Bala, A. M., Yahaya, I., & Aliyu, J. (2020). Towards Socio-Economic Status of parents and Access to Quality Education in Secondary Schools Education in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI)* |, *VII*(V).

Darussyamsu, R., Suhaili, N., Mudjiran, M., & Nirwana, H. (2021). THE IMPORTANCE OF GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION; BIOLOGICAL EDUCATION STUDENT PERSPECTIVE. *Jurnal Perspektif Pendidikan*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.31540/jpp.v15i1.1273

Davis, D. J., Green-Derry, L. C., & Jones, B. (2013). The impact of federal financial aid policy upon higher education access. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *45*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2013.730502

Deepa, V., Sujatha, R., & Mohan, J. (2022). Unsung voices of technology in school education-findings using the constructivist grounded theory approach. *Smart Learning Environments*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-021-00182-7

Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004

Iffath Unnisa Begum. (2024). Role of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education- An Empirical Investigation. *International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management (IRJAEM)*, *2*(03). https://doi.org/10.47392/irjaem.2024.0009

Kamal, M. A. (2002). Barriers to Development in Open Learning and Distance Education: Bangladesh. *Pan-Commonwealth Conference (II)*, *1*.

Kazaara, A. I. (2023). THE IMPACT OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF EDUCATION SERVICES PROVIDED BY CURRENT EDUCATION ACTORS AND HUMANITARIAN EDUCATION AGENCIES TO THE REFUGEES SETTLING IN WEST NILE REGION FROM 2010-2023. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE* (Vol. 2, Issue 6).

Kibuuka, E. (2022). Equitable access, Retention and Successful Completion of Undergraduate Students in Higher Education in Uganda: The Uganda Students' Higher Education Financing Policy Perspective. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.5.2.757

Lozano, R., Barreiro-Gen, M., Pietikäinen, J., Gago-Cortes, C., Favi, C., Jimenez Munguia, M. T., Monus, F., Simão, J., Benayas, J., Desha, C., Bostanci, S., Djekic, I., Moneva, J. M., Sáenz, O., Awuzie, B., & Gladysz, B. (2022). Adopting sustainability competence-based education in academic disciplines: Insights from 13 higher education institutions. *Sustainable Development*, *30*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2253

Milliam, K., & Dominic, K. (2022). A Critical Analysis of the Compulsory Science Education Policy at the Secondary Level of Education in Uganda. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, *9*(8). https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.98.12895

Mpaata, K. A., & Mpaata, Z. (2018). The secondary school head teacher's leadership role in educational policy implementation in Uganda. *Journal of Educational and Practice*, *9*(17).

Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. *6*(7), 84–122.

Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. *7*(3), 124–145.

Ninsiima, A. B., Coene, G., Michielsen, K., Najjuka, S., Kemigisha, E., Ruzaaza, G. N., Nyakato, V. N., & Leye, E. (2020). Institutional and contextual obstacles to sexuality education policy implementation in Uganda. *Sex Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2019.1609437

Odama, S. (2023). Students' discipline and academic performance indices in Uganda certificate of education examinations. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.15739/ijeprr.23.004

Ralston, S. J. (2021). Higher Education's Microcredentialing Craze: a Postdigital-Deweyan Critique. *Postdigital Science and Education*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00121-8

Sharif, R. (2019). The relations between acculturation and creativity and innovation in higher education: A systematic literature review. In *Educational Research Review* (Vol. 28). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.100287

Sullivan, M., Kelly, A., & McLaughlan, P. (2023). ChatGPT in higher education: Considerations for academic integrity and student learning. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.17

Tulibaleka, P. O. (2022). Refugee education: Refugees perceptions of educational challenges in Uganda. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.5897/ijeaps2022.0729

Veselinović, L., Mangafić, J., & Turulja, L. (2020). The effect of education-job mismatch on net income: evidence from a developing country. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja* , *33*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2020.1723427