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Abstract

The quality of job performance of employees, regardless of context, cannot be any better than the quality of Human Resource Management Practices (HRMPs) at the place of work. This cross-sectional survey study provides insights regarding the relationship between satisfaction with HRMPs and the job performance of academic staff in public universities in Uganda. The study comprised a sample of 198 from a population of 406 full-time academic staff of Kyambogo University. Data was collected using a questionnaire and analysed using SPSS for descriptive analysis and SmartPLS for Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). Descriptive results showed that teaching performance was high while research and publication and community service performance were moderate. The results revealed that satisfaction with placement, development, engagement and talent retention HRMPs was moderate while satisfaction with human resource (HR) recruitment was slightly high. Overall, job performance was high while satisfaction with HRMPs was moderate. SEM revealed that while HR recruitment practices and placement had a positive significant influence on job performance, the influence of HR development, retention and engagement practices was insignificant. It was concluded that high and moderate satisfaction of academic staff with HR recruitment and placement, respectively, is imperative for their job performance. However, moderate satisfaction with HR development, engagement and talent retention practices impedes job performance of academic staff. This study recommended that university managers should ensure that HR recruitment and placement practices implemented provide satisfaction to academic staff. University managers should also ensure that satisfying HR development, engagement and talent retention are designed and implemented.
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Introduction

Job performance of academic staff centres on three main roles on which universities are founded, and these are teaching, research and publication, and interaction with society or community service. However, on all the three central mandates of academic staff, performance remains low in public universities in Uganda (Mugizi, 2018). With respect to teaching, the criticism is that the quality of teaching is low, with academic staff not using appropriate teaching methods such as the student-centred teaching approaches that engage students but instead the easy-to-implement teacher-centred practices which involve reading out of content to students, thus promoting memorisation of content and hindering critical thinking, which thwarts skills development among students (Muganga & Ssenkusu, 2019). Academic staff are also accused of interacting with students for only half of the expected contact hours, absenting themselves and being inconsistent in attending to classes (Atwebembeire et al., 2018). A number of academic staff also exhibit lack of commitment to excellence by failing to accurately mark examinations but, instead, create fake marks and cheat examinations for students, and others fail to prepare for lectures but rely on plagiarised online notes (Mugizi et al., 2015). Most of the academic staff involved in supervising postgraduate research show low commitment to it, with the majority of students failing to graduate in time or complete the programmes (Muriisa & Bergen, 2015; Oyugi, 2020). For instance, while at master’s degree level over 70% of graduate students successfully complete the classroom phase on time, the average completion rates stand at less than 30% (Malunda et al., 2021).

With regard to research, the performance of academic staff in Ugandan universities is also low, with limited academic research publication and inability to attract and win research projects (Rwothumio et al., 2020). The high-performing academic staff in terms of research and publication are those of Makerere University, with an average of two publications in 10 years per academic member of staff out of the total number of permanent staff, which is still very low (Cloete et al., 2018). In relation to community service, while universities in Uganda recognise it as part of the university function, the number of academic staff engaged in it is very low. Notwithstanding the iterative calls for and discourses on community engagement and outreach in universities, even research on the subject in Uganda is rare in literature (Musinguzi et al., 2016). Nanyanzi et al. (2021), in a study involving academic staff in higher education institutions, found that in Uganda faculty members hardly ever got engaged with communities because of the many course units they taught and other teaching-related activities, including handling coursework as well as administering tests and examinations.

Strategies that universities employ to promote job performance of academic staff include HRMPs (Emeribe, 2020), leadership (Jameel & Ahmad, 2019), promoting job satisfaction, organisational culture, staff motivation, employee engagement and establishing a better workplace environment (Theresia et al., 2018; Wahyudi, 2022). However, in the recent past, the management of Kyambogo University, which is the context of this study, has made pronouncements pertaining to HRMPs which have attracted an outcry from academic staff as being unfair and likely to stifle academic staff commitment and thus affecting job performance. A case in point is the issuance, on 3rd July 2022, of a circular by the Director HR to academic staff declaring that the promotion of academic staff would only follow internal advertisement of vacant positions. Another circular, issued on 20th July 2022 by the Vice Chancellor, indicated that for promotion to take place, staff would be informed through their respective heads of departments about promotional positions that have fallen or would fall vacant in a financial year. These pronouncements ran counter to the provisions in the HR manual (Kyambogo University Human Resource Manual, 2014) which stipulates the development
requirements for academic staff, which include having the necessary qualifications in a relevant discipline, publications, contribution to community service and supervision of graduate students.

Further, at Kyambogo University, many academic positions remain vacant, creating high work overload (Kyambogo University Staff Establishment, 2022), the recruitment process is unsatisfactory (Rwothumio et al., 2016) and HR development, engagement and retention practices are poor because of lack of a coherent staff development system, characterised by the challenges of lack of adequate training, inappropriate training, good development policy (Kasule & Abooki, 2014) and appointment and removal of academic staff without adhering to the HR manual and the national guiding Acts, laws and standing orders (Ayebare et al., 2016). The above contextual evidence shows that in Ugandan universities, there is low job performance among academic staff, and particularly for Kyambogo University, there are glaring challenges in HRMPs. This contextual gap prompted this study to investigate academic staff satisfaction with HRMPs and how it influenced job performance among academic staff. Academic staff job performance was operationalized in terms of teaching performance, research and publication, and community service (Abba & Mugizi, 2018). In this paper, HRMPs were operationalized in terms of recruitment practices (Demo et al., 2012; Nieves & Quintana, 2018), placement (Haueter et al., 2003), development (Demo et al., 2012; Nieves & Quintana, 2018) and engagement and talent retention (Mujtaba et al., 2022). Therefore, the study tested the hypothesis to the effect that:

H1: Satisfaction with HR recruitment practices significantly influences the job performance of academic staff.

H2: Satisfaction with HRs placement significantly influences the job performance of academic staff.

H3: Satisfaction with HR development practices significantly influences the job performance of academic staff.

H4: Satisfaction with HRs engagement significantly influences the job performance of academic staff.

H5: Satisfaction with HRs talent retention significantly influences the job performance of academic staff.

**Theoretical review**

The Perceived Organisational Support Theory (POST) by Eisenberger et al. (1986) was the basis for this article. The POST posits that employees develop an overall perception regarding the degree to which institutions care about their well-being and appreciate their contribution (Kurtessis et al., 2017). Therefore, POST is about the employees’ overall belief that managers of organisations recognise their work effort and that they are mindful of their wellbeing (Xu & Yang, 2021). The main antecedents of POS include leaders’ support, fairness, work conditions and HRMPs (Eisenberger et al., 2020). Employees with a high perception of organisational support, this may result in attitudes such as job satisfaction and commitment to work, leading to greater job performance. Therefore, when workers perceive that their employer is supportive, their job performance effort increases (Kurtessis et al., 2017). The theory portrays a give-and-take concept, suggesting that when employees feel that they are supported by the organisation, they reciprocate with high work effort (Mugizi et al., 2019). The weakness of POST is that when managers treat employees unfairly, organisations are blamed instead of the managers because of the tendency to associate superiors with the organisation. This might affect their work effort, leading to reduced work effort or counterproductive behaviours against the organisation (Neves & Eisenberger, 2014). Significantly, POST generally postulates that when employees receive satisfying support from the organisation, they develop positive work attitudes,
hence higher job performance. Therefore, basing on POST, this study examined whether academic staff satisfaction with HRMPs of the university in terms of HR recruitment, placement, development, engagement and talent retention significantly influenced their job satisfaction.

**HRMPs and job performance**

Human Resource Management Practices (HRMPs) describe a system that attracts, develops, motivates and retains employees to ensure the effective implementation and the survival of the organisation (Ngwenya & Aigbavboa, 2017). These practices, which are designed in line with organisational policies, are implemented to facilitate the human capital of an organisation to contribute to the achievement of its objectives (Mugizi & Bakkabulindi, 2018). The HRMPs include recruitment practices, placement, development, engagement and talent retention (Demo et al., 2012; Haueter et al., 2003; Mujtaba et al., 2022; Nieves & Quintana, 2018). Studies (Al Aina & Atan, 2020; Adaoma & Onuoha, 2022; Ashraf, 2017; Lestari et al., 2020; Mira et al., 2019; Manzoor et al., 2019; Oaya et al., 2017; Sutanto & Kurniawan, 2016) examined the relationship between recruitment and the job performance of academic staff. These studies shed light on the relationship between recruitment and job performance. However, empirical and contextual gaps emerge from the studies above. For instance, Al Aina and Atan (2020) indicated that recruitment did not have a significant relationship with job performance, contrary to the other scholars, which suggested that the position on the two variables needed further investigation. At contextual level, except for the study by Manzoor et al. (2019) done in universities, all the other studies were done outside universities, yet the internal dynamics of organisations other than universities are different, hence the need for further research.

There are scholars (Agbo, 2020; Ekhsan et al., 2020; Eyina & Orlu, 2021; Ihekoronye et al., 2020; Mahmood et al., 2022; Yusuf & Arrywibowo, 2017; Raub et al. 2021) who studied HR placement and employee job performance. One area in which all these studies were consistent was that HR placement practices had a positive and significant relationship with employee performance. These studies indicate that HR placement is essential for job performance. However, the studies raised contextual gaps, with none capturing the Ugandan context and universities, which made it essential that this study be carried out in the context of universities in Uganda. Further, some studies (Al Aina & Atan, 2020; Bibi, 2018; Lee & Lee, 2018; Kareem & Hussein, 2019; Kaewnaknaew et al., 2022; Nguyen & Duong, 2020; Samwel, 2018; Shafiq & Hamza, 2017) investigated the relationship between HR development and employee performance. These studies revealed that efforts have been made to study the relationship between HR development and employee performance. However, these studies revealed contextual, population and empirical gaps. At contextual level, all the studies were done outside Uganda and outside universities. The only study done in a university (Kareem & Hussein, 2019) did not consider academic staff. At empirical level, the studies (Samwel, 2018; Shafiq & Hamza, 2017) contradicted others, indicating that HR development was not related to job performance by employees. These gaps made it imperative for this study to be carried out in the context of academic staff in universities in Uganda.

A number of studies (Afolabi et al., 2022; Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017; Badrianto & Ekhsan, 2020; Bosire et al., 2021; Hafeez et al., 2019; Oyo-Ita et al., 2020; Stanikzai, 2017; Tabiu et al., 2020; Tran et al., 2018; Udo et al., 2018; Zafar et al., 2017) investigated the relationship between HR engagement practices and job performance. HR engagement practices included practices such as promoting employee autonomy, participation, trust relationships, quality communication and employee recognition, as well as providing a good physical working environment (Mujtaba et al., 2022). The studies above identify essential HR engagement practices for organisations such as
universities. However, none of the studies captured the Ugandan context, while the study by Zafar et al. (2017) indicated that the practice of providing a good working environment had no significant relationship with employee performance, suggesting that the importance of engagement practices is not conclusive. These gaps necessitated the investigations of this study in the context of a university in Uganda.

Further, a number of studies (Davidescu et al., 2020; Kustini et al., 2022; Mughal & Iraqi, 2020; Permana & Bharoto, 2021; Msuya & Kumar, 2022; Sanyal & Hisam, 2018; Soomro et al., 2018; Szostek, 2020; Zikanga et al., 2021) related HR retention practices and employee job performance. HR retention practices include attractive rewards/remuneration, a unique family atmosphere, open communication, respect of staff, promotion of teamwork, good interpersonal relationships, flexible working arrangements, and enabling a work-life balance (Mujtaba et al., 2022). However, empirical gaps emerged from the above studies, with the study by Zikanga et al. (2021) done in secondary schools in Uganda indicating that pay, bonuses and allowances insignificantly influenced teachers’ job performance contrary to other studies. On the other hand, Szostek (2020), in a study done in Poland, revealed that work relations differed in private and public sector institutions, with the quality of relations being higher in the private sector, which necessitated ascertaining this in a public institution in Uganda. Therefore, these empirical gaps attracted examination of the relationship between HR retention practices and employee job performance in the context of a public university in Uganda.

**Methods**

The study adopted the cross-sectional survey design because the data collection time horizon is cross-sectional or short, involving the collection of data about what is going on at that specific point in time (Melnikovas, 2018). The cross-sectional design helped in collecting the survey data necessary for statistical inference since it allows the collection of data using a questionnaire survey (Cohen et al., 2017). The population of the study comprised 406 full-time academic staff of Kyambogo University, from which a sample of 198 academic staff was drawn using the Table for Small Sample Technique by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). The study used the quantitative approach since survey data was collected. This helped in testing whether the independent variable (satisfaction with HRMPs) predicted the dependent variable (job performance of academic staff). Simple random sampling was the technique used to obtain the respondents that provided the data. This gave every academic staff member the chance to participate in the study, enabling collection of the data necessary for generalising the findings. Data was collected from academic staff using a self-administered questionnaire and they were traced in their offices. Data collected from the academic staff because they could easily report on the HRMPs of the university and their own performance.

**Measures of the variables**

The measures of HRMPs the independent variable were HR recruitment practices (Demo et al., 2012; Nieves & Quintana, 2018), placement (Haueter et al., 2003), development (Demo et al., 2012; Nieves & Quintana, 2018), engagement and talent retention (Mujtaba et al., 2022). The measures of job performance of academic staff the dependent variable were teaching performance, research and publication, and community service (Abba & Mugizi, 2018). The indicators for the constructs were measured using a five-point Likert scale anchor (where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = moderately agree, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree). The anchors helped in collecting ordinal data that could be used for quantitative analysis.
**Data analysis method**

Data analysis involved building models that included measurement models and structural models. The measurement models helped to establish whether the indicators measuring the different constructs were appropriate and consistent. The structural models helped to show the causal linkages between the predictor and criterion variables. SmartPLS 4 for partial least square structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) was used to construct the models. This was because it had the efficacy to spontaneously generate higher-order constructs and estimate complex models with numerous latent variables. SmartPLS shows predictive links between variables building on strong theoretical support that shows causal relationships. SmartPLS helped to identify the indicators for different constructs and to draw measurement models showing paths between the different variables. The PLS-SEM approach using SmartPLS was relevant as it facilitated testing of the causal-effect linkages in the hypothesised model because the sample was 100 (n = 198) (Hair Jr et al., 2021). Therefore, through using SmartPLS, the influence of satisfaction with HRMPs on job performance of academic staff was revealed.

**Findings**

This covers the empirical results from the investigations of the study. The results include the demographic profiles of academic staff, measurement models, and structural equation models.

**Demographic profiles of academic staff**

Table 1 presents results on the demographic profiles of the academic staff that participated in the study. The demographic profiles included the sex, age groups, education levels and academic ranks of the academic staff.

**Table 1: Demographic profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Up to 30 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 40 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 years and above</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD degree</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data on the demographic profiles of academic staff in Table 1 reveals that the modal percentage (67.2%) was of males while the females were 32.8%. The majority percentage was of those 40 years and above (82.3%) while 13.1% were below 40 years and 4.5% were up to 30 years. Further, the majority percentage (79.3%) was PhD holders while 20.7% were master’s degree holders. In addition, the majority percentage (65.7%) of those participating in the study was lecturers, 16.2% were assistant lecturers, 4.5% were associate professors and 1.5% were professors. The results suggest that academic staff with various demographic profiles provided responses.

Measurement models
Measurement models including AVE, Heterotrait Monotrait (HTMT) Discriminant Validity, and reliability and collinearity were developed. The results are indicated in Tables 2 and 3.

Measurement model 1
The first measurement model includes descriptive statistics, AVE and Heterotrait Monotrait (HTMT) Discriminant Validity. Table 2 presents the results.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics, AVE and Heterotrait Monotrait (HTMT) Discriminant Validity assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>JPAS</th>
<th>CSP</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPAS</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>HRD</th>
<th>HRE</th>
<th>HRP</th>
<th>HRT</th>
<th>HRR</th>
<th>SHRMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRD</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRE</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRT</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRMP</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: JPAS = Job Performance of Academic Staff, TP = Teaching Performance, RP = Research and Publication Performance, CSP = community service, HRR= HR Recruitment Practices, HRP = Placement, HRD = Development, HRE = Engagement, HRT = talent retention, and SHRMP = Satisfaction with HRMPs

The results in Table 2 revealed that, overall, job performance of academic staff was high (mean = 3.58). This was because basing on the five-point Likert scale (where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = moderate agree, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree) that was used, the mean was close to code 4, corresponding to agreed or high. For the teaching performance aspect, it was reported to be high (mean = 4.24) while community service (mean = 3.13) and research and publication performance (mean = 3.38) were moderate (fair). With respect to satisfaction with HRMPs, overall satisfaction of academic staff with them was moderate (mean = 3.20). While academic staff were satisfied with HR recruitment practices (mean = 3.58), with regard to the other practices, namely HR placement (mean = 3.01), HR development (mean = 2.82), HR engagement (mean = 3.36), and HR talent retention (mean = 3.00), they were moderately or fairly satisfied.
The AVE results in Table 2 testing convergent validity showed that the various constructs were appropriate measures. All EVE values obtained were above the minimum level of 0.5, suggesting that the indicators were appropriate measures of the constructs (dos Santos & Cirillo, 2021). The Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations tested discriminant validity assessing whether the constructs studied were independent, hence able to predict the dependent variable independently. HTMT is a reflective test that identifies whether measures or concepts in a model are independent, thus their indicators define only a specific construct (Roemer et al., 2021). The Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT) correlations obtained (Table 2) satisfied the discriminant validity conditions because values for all the constructs were below the limit of 0.90 (Hair Jr et al., 2021). Therefore, the predictor variables, namely HR recruitment, placement, development, engagement and development, independently predicted the criterion variable of job performance of academic staff (teaching, research and publication and community service performance). Therefore, the results in Table 2 were fit for structural modelling.

**Measurement model 2**

The second measurement model presents reliability (Cronbach’s alpha [α] and composite reliability [CR]) and collinearity [VIF]) results. Reliability tests sought to establish whether the results for the different constructs were fit for structural modelling. Table 3 presents the results.

**Table 3: Reliability and collinearity results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Performance of Academic Staff</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Performance</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Publication</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Performance</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRMPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Development</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>2.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Engagement</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>1.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Placement</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>1.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Talent Retention</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>2.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRs Recruitment</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>1.555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that reliability tests in terms of Cronbach’s alpha (α) and composite reliability (CR) produced values above the threshold of 0.70, which indicated that the measures of the constructs were reliable. In addition, composite reliability was tested because the former is very sensitive, assuming that the traits of the indicators are the same across the population, which lowers reliability values. On the other hand, composite reliability is liberal as it considers outer traits, enabling a higher number of indicators to become reliable (Hair Jr et al., 2021).

**Structural model for job performance of academic staff**

Data was subjected to structural equation modelling to find out the measures of job performance of academic staff. Figure 1 presents the findings on the job performance of academic staff.
The structural model (Figure 1) for the job performance of academic staff shows that for the construct of teaching performance, four out of 11 indicators measuring the same loaded highly above the minimum value of 0.50 when using factor analysis (Hair Jr et al., 2021). For research and publication, seven out of 11 indicators loaded highly and for community service performance, all the six indicators loaded highly. This meant that the indicators retained for the constructs measuring academic performance in the model were appropriate valid measures of those constructs.

**Structural model for satisfaction with HRMPs**

Data was subjected to structural equation modelling to establish the measures of academic staff satisfaction with HRMPs. Figure 2 presents the structural equation model findings for HRMPs.
The structural model (Figure 2) for satisfaction with HRMPs shows that for the construct of HR recruitment, five out of seven indicators measuring the same loaded highly above the minimum value of 0.50. For HR placement, all the nine indicators loaded highly, for HR development 10 out of 12 indicators loaded highly, for HR engagement seven out of eight indicators loaded highly and for HR talent retention, 10 out of 14 indicators loaded highly. The model suggested that the indicators retained for the constructs measuring academic performance in the model were appropriate measures of those constructs.
Structural equation model for HRMPs and job performance of academic staff

To establish the relationship between HRMPs and the job performance of academic staff, a structural equation model was carried out. Figure 3 presents the structural equation model findings for HRMPs and the job performance of academic staff.

*Figure 3: Structural equation model findings for HRMPs and job performance of academic staff*

Since structural models (Figures 1 and 2) confirmed the appropriateness of the constructs measuring satisfaction with HRMPs and job performance of academic staff, a structural model describing the relationship between satisfaction with HRMPs and job performance of academic staff was developed (Figure 3). However, the model showed that only the job performance academic staff concept of community services loaded for the test, suggesting that teaching performance and research and publication did not load in the model. The model results include path coefficients between constructs, coefficients of determination ($R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$) and related t statistics and p-values. $R^2$ examined the model’s predictive power. The model involved testing five hypotheses to the effect that satisfaction with HR recruitment practices (H1), HR placement (H2), HR development (H3), HR engagement (H4) and HR talent retention (H5) had a significant influence on the job performance of academic staff. Table 4 presents structural equation model estimates.
Table 4: Structural equation model estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRs Recruitment</th>
<th>Job Performance of Academic Staff</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR Placement</td>
<td>Job Performance of Academic Staff</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>4.414</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Development</td>
<td>Job Performance of Academic Staff</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Engagement</td>
<td>Job Performance of Academic Staff</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Talent Retention</td>
<td>Job Performance of Academic Staff</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = 0.341
Adjusted R² = 0.324

The results in Figure 3 and Table 4 revealed that HRs recruitment (β = 0.143, t = 1.971, p = 0.049 > 0.05) and HR placement (β = 0.380, t = 4.414, p = 0.000 < 0.05) had a significant positive influence on the job performance of academic staff. However, HR development (β = 0.068, t = 0.595, p = 0.552 > 0.05), engagement (β = 0.007, t = 0.090, p = 0.929 > 0.05) and retention (β = 0.114, t = 1.179, p = 0.239 > 0.05) had a positive but insignificant influence on the job performance of academic staff.

R² suggested that satisfaction with all the HRMPs explained 34.1% (R² = 0.341) of the variation in the job performance of academic staff. Adjusted R² indicated that two significant HRMPs, i.e. recruitment and placement, explained 32.4% (adjusted R² = 0.324). The coefficient of determination (R²) suggested that 65.9% of the variation in the job performance of academic staff was accounted for by factors other than the HRMPs implemented. The results implied that while Hypotheses One and Two (H1-H2) were accepted, Hypotheses Three to Five (H3-H5) were rejected.

Discussion

The study examined academic staff satisfaction with HRMPs, namely human resource (HR) recruitment, development, engagement and retention practices in relation to their job performance. The findings indicated that satisfaction with HR recruitment practices positively and significantly influenced the job performance of academic staff. This implies that HR recruitment practices are important for job performance. This is consistent with the findings of previous scholars (e.g. Adaoma & Onuoha, 2022; Ashraf, 2017; Lestari et al., 2020; Mira et al., 2019; Manzoor et al., 2019; Oaya et al., 2017; Sutanto & Kurniawan, 2016). This means that the HR recruitment practices of Kyambogo University enhance the job performance of academic staff. HR placement practices were also found to be positively and significantly associated with the job performance of academic staff. This finding supports the findings of Agbo (2020), Ekhsan et al. (2020), Eyina and Orlu (2021), Ihekonye et al. (2020), Mahmood et al. (2022), Yusuf and Arrywibowo (2017) and Raub et al. (2021). Therefore, the HR placement practices of the university had an impact on the job performance of academic staff. Nonetheless, the study revealed that the HR development practices had an insignificant influence the job performance of academic staff. This finding concurred with those of Samwel (2018) and Shafiq and Hamza (2017), who reported that HR development was not related to the job performance of employees. However, it did not concur with the findings of most scholars, such Al Aina and Atan (2020), Bibi (2018), Lee and Lee (2018), Kareem and Hussein (2019), Kaewnaknaew et al. (2022) and Nguyen and Duong (2020). This was so because satisfaction of academic staff with HR development practices was moderately low while they considered their job performance high.
This means that when HR development practices are lowly satisfying, the performance of academic staff in universities is negatively affected.

The study findings also indicated that HR engagement practices had an insignificant influence on the job performance of academic staff, which is in agreement with those of Zafar et al. (2017). Nonetheless, the findings were in disagreement with those of most scholars such as Al-Omari and Okasheh (2017), Hafeez et al. (2019), Oyo-Ita et al. (2020), Stanikzai (2017), Tran et al. (2018) and Udo et al. (2018). This was because while performance was rated to be high, engagement practices were rated as moderate. This suggests that when universities provide HR engagement practices that are satisfying, there will be higher job performance. Further, the study indicated that HR talent retention practices had an insignificant influence on the job performance of academic staff, thus concurring with Zikanga et al. (2021). Nevertheless, the finding was contrary to those of most scholars such as Davidescu et al. (2020) Kustini et al. (2022), Sanyal and Hisam (2018), Soomro et al. (2018) and Szostek (2020), who reported the existence of a significant relationship between. This was because, while academic staff rated their satisfaction with retention practices as moderate, they considered their job performance to be high. Therefore, satisfying HR retention practices significantly influence job performance. In the context of Kyambogo University, the influence was insignificant because HR retention practices were considered to be less satisfying by academic staff.

**Conclusion**

It was concluded that high and moderate satisfaction of academic staff with HR recruitment and placement, respectively, is imperative for their job performance. Satisfying HR recruitment involves wide dissemination of information about recruitment processes, impartial selection, attracting competent people, conducting an intensive selection process and carrying out effective background checks on the candidates. HR placement involves briefing new staff about objectives and goals, helping them know the different departments, as well as the history, operations and values of the organisation. Placement also involves providing information about the organisation’s policies, politics, job requirements and general management style. It was also concluded that moderate satisfaction with HR development, engagement and talent retention practices impede job performance of academic staff. HR development practices impede job performance if the appraisal had no strong influence performance and does not advance one’s career. HR development practices also impede job performance if there are limited in-house academic staff development programmes, there is limited coaching of new staff, career planning does not facilitate growth and there is low planning for employee growth and progression.

HR engagement practices impede job performance if employee autonomy is limited, participation in decision-making is low, the quality of communication is wanting, there is limited trust and interest in staff, and recognition is low. Further, HR talent retention practices inhibit job performance when rewards are inequitably distributed and inadequate, there is lack of a unique family atmosphere, open communication is limited and subordinates are not encouraged to speak up. HR talent retention practices also inhibit job performance when the ideas and input of staff are not valued, the staff have no chance to meet their superiors in one-to-one sessions, there is limited teamwork, interpersonal relationships are poor, working arrangements are inflexible and there is lack of respect for staff. This study recommends that university managers should ensure that the HR recruitment and placement practices implemented provide satisfaction to academic staff. University managers
should also ensure that satisfying HR development, engagement and talent retention practices are designed and implemented.

**Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research**

This study makes contributions by revealing how the job performance of academic staff can be enhanced using HRMPs. However, limitations emerged from the study, with some findings being contrary to what was hypothesised and the findings of most previous scholars. For example, the study revealed that HR development, engagement and retention insignificantly influenced the job performance of academic staff. This makes it necessary for future researchers to further examine the relationship between these HRMPs practices in more universities and other organisations in Uganda to confirm or disconfirm the findings of this study. In addition, this study was carried out in one public university. Therefore, future researchers should extend the study to more universities, including private ones.
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