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Abstract: This study examined human resource development practices and their impact on academic staff performance. Specifically, it investigated whether training, promotion, job enrichment and organisational policies significantly influence the job performance of academic staff. The study surveyed 158 academic staff members at Bishop Stuart University in Uganda using a quantitative approach and a correlational research design. Data were collected through self-administered questionnaires and analysed using partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM). The findings revealed that job enrichment and organisational policies had a positive and significant impact on academic staff performance. In contrast, training had a negative but significant influence on academic staff performance, and promotion had a positive but insignificant influence on the job performance of academic staff. The study concluded that effective human resource practices, specifically job enrichment and organisational policies, play a crucial role in enhancing academic staff performance. However, limited training opportunities hindered the performance of academic staff. Furthermore, unsatisfactory promotion practices minimally contribute to the job performance of academic staff. The study recommended that university managers implement human resource development practices, namely job enrichment, organisational policies, training, and promotion, to promote job performance.
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1. Introduction

The performance of university academic staff is of utmost importance and should not be underestimated. Their effective job performance has a direct impact on student satisfaction, societal well-being, and university development (Maki et al., 2015). When academics perform well, universities benefit from high-quality research, publications, and graduates who are well-prepared for the workforce. This, in turn, leads to increased productivity and national development (Agasisti et al., 2019). Academics have three main responsibilities: teaching, research and publication, and community engagement (Mugizi, 2018). In terms of teaching and research, academics are accountable for delivering effective instruction, conducting high-level research, supervising student research and internships, and engaging with students outside of the classroom (Burroughs et al., 2020; Fry et al., 2014). Regarding community service, they are expected to actively participate in community service activities through interactions with society and the practical application of university knowledge (Mugizi, 2018).

Academics have been under constant pressure to perform, particularly in the areas of teaching and research, especially since the 20th century. Specifically, at the beginning of the 1980s, pressure for higher job performance of academic staff mounted with the ranking of universities. The United States of America (USA) is where the practice first appeared, after which it spread to other countries. This phenomenon triggered the start of a global ranking system of universities all around the world.
(Sanoff et al., 2007). The ranking of the universities has been mainly based on research excellence, teaching quality, employability of students from the universities, and the international outlook of the universities (Okebukola, 2019). While the United States, the United Kingdom, and Switzerland collectively account for 80% of the top 20 universities, and the top 100 universities are institutions from Germany, France, the Netherlands, Canada, Japan, and Sweden (Vernon et al., 2018), hardly any African universities appear in the top 500 universities except for a few South African universities (Aiyedun et al., 2021). This is an indicator of the low-level job performance of academic staff in African universities.

In Uganda, academics have been criticised for their subpar performance in the three core areas of teaching, research, and community engagement. Specifically, their teaching methods have been deemed inadequate, as they often rely on teacher-centred approaches that prioritise content recitation over student engagement and critical thinking (Kasule et al., 2022). This has led to students merely memorising content rather than developing essential skills. Furthermore, academics have been accused of not meeting the expected contact hours with students, frequently absconding from classes, and displaying inconsistency in their attendance. Many academics dodge lectures and cover less content than outlined in the programs (Kato et al., 2023). Moreover, some staff members have demonstrated a lack of commitment to excellence by falsifying examination marks, cheating on behalf of students, and relying on plagiarised online notes instead of preparing their own lectures (Mugizi et al., 2015; Turyahikayo et al., 2023). Additionally, those supervising postgraduate research have shown low dedication, resulting in a high percentage of students failing to graduate, with the average completion rates of master's students standing at less than 30%, despite about 70% completing their coursework activities (Kato et al., 2023).

Universities employ various strategies to enhance the performance of academic staff, such as human resource development practices like training, financial rewards, promotions, and job enrichment (Kasule et al., 2022; Morales-Sánchez & Pasamar, 2019). However, the implementation of these practices in Ugandan universities has encountered challenges. For example, there has been considerable outcry among academic staff at Kyambogo University due to recent pronouncements. On July 3, 2022, the Director of Human Resources announced that promotions would only be granted after internal advertisement of vacant positions. Furthermore, on July 20, 2022, the Vice Chancellor declared that staff would be informed about promotional positions through their department heads. These pronouncements contradict the guidelines outlined in the university's human resource manual, which specify development requirements such as qualifications, publications, community service, and graduate student supervision (Kyambogo University Human Resource Manual, 2014). While these pronouncements may be a result of austerity measures imposed by the government, private institutions like Bishop Stuart University may not face the same constraints as public universities like Kyambogo. This study aims to evaluate the human resource development practices at Bishop Stuart University and their impact on the performance of academic staff. The study will test the following hypotheses:

- Training has a significant influence on job performance of academic staff.
- Promotion has a significant influence on job performance of academic staff.
- Job enrichment has a significant influence on job performance of academic staff.
- Organisational policies have a significant influence on job performance of academic staff.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical review

This study is grounded in the Perceived Organisational Support Theory (POST) introduced by Eisenberger et al. (1986). POST posits that employees perceive organisational support when they feel that their contributions are valued and their well-being is considered (Roemer & Harris, 2018). This
perception leads to a sense of reciprocity, where employees feel obligated to support the organisation in achieving its goals and expect greater rewards for their efforts (Kurtessis et al., 2017). POST expound that employees develop global beliefs about the extent to which the organisation values their contributions and cares about their well-being based on their experiences and perceptions of favourable or unfavourable treatment (Satardien et al., 2019). When employees feel supported, they reciprocate with increased work effort and meet effective work demands based on their evaluation of the gains from their increased effort (Scanlan et al., 2018). POST is influenced by various aspects of employee treatment, including human resource development practices such as training, financial rewards, promotion, job enrichment, and organisational policies (Amjad et al., 2021). The theory reveals that the implementation of supportive human resource development practices leads to higher job performance (Eisenberger et al., 2014). This study applied POST to investigate the relationship between supportive human resource development practices and academic staff job performance.

2.2 Human resource development practices and job performance

Human Resource Development (HRD) practices refer to strategic initiatives implemented by organisations to enhance employees’ knowledge, skills, productivity, and job satisfaction, ultimately benefiting the organisation (Tizikara & Mugizi, 2017). HRD practices are systematic and planned activities designed to provide employees with opportunities to acquire the necessary skills to meet current and future job demands (Potnuru et al., 2018). These practices aim to improve business performance by enhancing employees’ overall skills, abilities, and behaviours (Arubayi et al., 2020). In this study, HRD practices were operationalised as training, promotion, job enrichment, and organisational policies. Training, which is a fundamental function of human resources management, involves a systematic process to help employees acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to perform their jobs effectively (Yimam, 2022). Training activities are designed to equip employees with the skills necessary to meet current and future job demands, ultimately enhancing their capabilities and improving overall job performance (Otoo & Mishra, 2018).

Several studies (Al Khawaldeh, 2023; Ashmond et al., 2022; Gebrehiwot & Elantheraiyan, 2023; Kuruppu et al., 2021; Mvuyisi & Mbukanma, 2023; Otoo & Mishra, 2018; Sendawula et al., 2018; Sugirati, 2022; Yimam, 2022; Wulandari et al., 2023) have investigated the relationship between training and employee job performance, consistently demonstrating a positive and significant influence. However, despite this consensus, several gaps have emerged. Empirically, there is a lack of studies in the Ugandan context, with the exception of Sendawula et al.’s (2018) study, which focused on health workers and, therefore, had different job dynamics compared to academic staff. Methodologically, some studies, such as Mvuyisi and Mbukanma’s (2023), were solely qualitative, limiting the generalizability of their findings. These gaps necessitated the present quantitative study, which aims to investigate the relationship between training and academic staff job performance in the Ugandan context for greater generalizability.

Promotion, a fundamental practice in human resource development, pertains to elevating an employee to a higher position within an organisation. This typically entails greater responsibilities, status, and rewards (Ligare et al., 2020). Its significance lies in the advancement of employee careers, as it brings about recognition, financial advantages, and an enhanced reputation while also benefiting employers through improved job assignments. Promotions serve as a motivating factor for employees to exert greater effort, as they are associated with increased job amenities, authority, and a boost to one's self-esteem (Mugizi, 2019). Effective job promotions contribute to employee satisfaction, heightened work effort, and enhanced performance (Haryono et al., 2020). However, appointing external candidates to coveted positions can demotivate employees, resulting in reduced performance and morale (Ratemo et al., 2021). Promotions are a vital component of human resource development, enabling employees to expand their skills and embrace new challenges (Mugizi et al., 2020).
Numerous studies (Duru et al., 2023; Haryono et al., 2020; Ligare et al., 2020; Gultom et al., 2023; Muhati & Makharama, 2023; Nurpi & Syam, 2023; Ratemo et al., 2021; Rinny et al., 2020; Setyawati et al., 2022; Xie & Yang, 2021) have consistently demonstrated a significant positive relationship between promotion and job performance. Nonetheless, there are gaps in the existing literature, as none of these studies have specifically examined the Ugandan context. Furthermore, with the exception of Rinny et al. (2020), which focused on university academic staff, all other investigations have involved different populations whose workplace dynamics differ from those of academic staff. Consequently, this research is necessary to address this gap and explore the connection between promotion and job performance among academic staff in Uganda.

Job enrichment pertains to augmenting job satisfaction by increasing autonomy, feedback, and significance while providing opportunities for growth, recognition, and responsibility (Asl et al., 2015). It involves reconfiguring jobs to make them more challenging, rewarding, and meaningful and can be accomplished through the expansion of job responsibilities, provision of training and development opportunities, and encouragement of employee involvement in decision-making (Magaji et al., 2017). Job enrichment is grounded in the motivation-hygiene theory, which posits that employees are motivated by factors such as autonomy, feedback, and recognition rather than solely by financial rewards (Awan et al., 2023). It entails effecting changes in job dimensions, physical conditions, and fundamental tasks to augment job satisfaction and employee engagement (Tayeh, 2021). Job enrichment can be accomplished through various strategies, including task identity, skill variety, task significance, and autonomy, and can result in increased employee motivation, commitment, and performance (Annamalai, 2022). Moreover, job enrichment can help mitigate employee dissatisfaction, monotony, and demotivation, and enhance employee loyalty and commitment, thereby improving employee job performance (Mac-Ozigbo & Daniel, 2020).

Several scholars (Alsafadi & Altahat, 2021; Asl et al., 2015; Awan et al., 2023; Bennia et al., 2017; Chilgong et al., 2021; Haroon & Shakil, 2021; Mac-Ozigbo & Daniel, 2020; Tayeh, 2021) have explored the relationship between job enrichment and employee job performance. However, their investigations have uncovered empirical and population gaps. In terms of empirical gaps, a review of the literature revealed no studies conducted in the context of Uganda. Regarding the population gap, aside from the studies by Awan et al. (2023) conducted in Pakistan and Mac-Ozigbo and Daniel (2020) conducted in Nigeria, all other studies did not consider academic staff. These empirical and population gaps have necessitated this study in the context of Uganda, involving academic staff, to address the identified gaps and thus contribute to the existing body of knowledge and offer insights for organisational improvement in the Ugandan context.

Organisational policies represent the guiding principles that delineate the expected behaviours and actions within an employment relationship (Pacifique & D'Silva, 2021). These policies establish a standardised framework for decision-making and ensure adherence to internal controls (Porter, 2018). They define acceptable conduct, offer guidance on employee relationships, and outline procedures for appointment, promotion, and reward systems (Makau & Muna, 2020). Moreover, they foster awareness among employees regarding the imperative to ethically and effectively achieve organisational goals. Policies play a crucial role in institutional management, sustainability, and transformation, lending official support to all actions and activities (Dzogbede & Asimah, 2020).

Earlier investigations conducted by Alkalha et al. (2012), Hazra et al. (2013), Jawaad et al. (2022), and Pacifique and D'Silva (2021) have explored the impact of organisational policies on employee job performance. However, in the particular context of Uganda and among university academic staff, there exists a research gap which this study aims to fill. The absence of studies addressing this specific context and population necessitated the present research to contribute to the existing body of knowledge and provide insights into the setting of Ugandan universities.
3. Methodology

This study employed a quantitative research approach, utilising a correlational research design to examine the relationships between variables and determine the degree of association among them (Devi et al., 2022). This design allowed for the identification of patterns and associations between variables, providing valuable insights into the strength and direction of these relationships. The study's sample consisted of all 184 academic staff members at Bishop Stuart University, as the population was small enough to be studied in its entirety. However, only 158 (85.9%) fully completed questionnaires were retrieved. Nevertheless, this sample size was considered sufficient, as Pielsticker and Hiebl (2020) suggest that a response rate of 50% is adequate in social science research.

The researcher utilised a self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) to collect data from academic staff, measuring two primary variables: job performance and human resource development practices. Job performance was assessed considering teaching, research and publication, and community service (Abba & Mugizi, 2018). Human resource development practices were evaluated in terms of training (Mugizi, 2019; Truitt, 2012), promotion (Mugizi, 2019; Liu et al., 2015), job enrichment (Vijay & Indradevi, 2015), and organisational policies (Van Engen, 2017). The questionnaire items were adapted from existing, validated tools to ensure reliability and validity. A five-point Likert Scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = moderately agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree) was employed to facilitate the ranking of the items by the respondents. Self-administered questionnaires offer an efficient means of collecting data from a large number of respondents in a short timeframe while also ensuring ease of understanding and appropriateness of data collection (Harris & Brown, 2019). This enabled the collection of quantitative data necessary for analysis.

3.1 Data quality control

To ensure data quality, validity and reliability were established through a rigorous process. Content validity was assessed using SmartPLS 4, employing convergent and discriminant validity tests. Convergent validity was evaluated using Average Variance Extracted (AVE), while discriminant validity was examined through the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations. The results are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>ASP</th>
<th>CSP</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>HRDP</th>
<th>JE</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASP = academic staff performance, CSP = Community service performance, HRDP = human resource development practices, JE = job enrichment, OP = organisational policies, PR = promotion, RP = research performance, TR = Training

The convergent validity results, as indicated by the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values, reveal that all values exceeded the minimum threshold of 0.5, demonstrating the convergence of the
constructs on their respective variables (Purwanto & Sudargini, 2021). This suggests that the measures used to assess the variables were appropriate and valid. Furthermore, the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations was below the maximum threshold of 0.90, indicating that the constructs were independent and distinct, thereby demonstrating discriminant validity. This ascertained that the measures used were not only valid but also able to differentiate between the various variables, supporting the instrument's overall validity and reliability.

3.2 Reliability of the instrument

Reliability was established using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability. While Cronbach's Alpha is a widely used measure, it has a limitation in that it assumes equal indicator characteristics in the population, which can impact reliability values (Viladrich et al., 2017). Therefore, Composite Reliability (CR) was also utilised to potentially increase the number of indicators meeting reliability standards. The results of the reliability analysis are presented in Table 2, providing insight into the consistency and dependability of the data collection instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Performance</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Performance</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Enrichment</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Policies</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability results presented in Table 2 indicate that both Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values exceeded the minimum threshold of 0.70 (Purwanto & Sudargini, 2021), suggesting that the indicators for each construct measuring the variables demonstrated satisfactory reliability. This implies that the indicators within each measure were highly correlated and interrelated, thereby collecting reliable data. The reliability values above 0.70 confirm the consistency and dependability of the data collection instrument, providing confidence in the accuracy of the data.

3.3 Data analysis

Quantitative data analysis employed Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS 4 to examine the relationships between variables and indicators (Hair Jr et al., 2017). PLS-SEM enabled the creation of path estimates and models, revealing the complex relationships between the variables. This analytical approach allowed for statistical inferences to be made, enabling the generalisation of findings to a broader population. By utilising PLS-SEM, the study was able to uncover the underlying structural relationships between the variables, providing a comprehensive understanding of the variables under study.

3.4 Ethical Considerations

This study rigorously adhered to ethical standards in order to safeguard the integrity and protection of the respondents. Prior approval for conducting the research was obtained from the institutional review board at Bishop Stuart University, ensuring that all procedures adhered to ethical guidelines. Prior to participating, respondents were fully informed about the nature and purpose of the study and provided their informed consent. Anonymity was ensured by assigning pseudonyms to all respondents and by refraining from collecting any identifying information. Furthermore, respondents were assured of their freedom to withdraw from the study at any time without facing any negative consequences. These measures were implemented to ensure that the research was conducted with utmost respect for the dignity and rights of all participants.
4. Presentation of Results

4.1 Demographic profiles of the respondents

The demographic profiles of the academic staff were examined, encompassing five key variables: sex, age, highest academic qualification, years of service in the university, and position in the hierarchy. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Background characteristics of academic staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest academic qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years working in the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in the hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on gender distribution show a slightly higher proportion of male respondents (62.7%) compared to females (37.3%), ensuring a range of perspectives. The age distribution indicates that most respondents (74.7%) were aged 40 or older, with a smaller proportion (1.3%) aged 30 or younger, suggesting that the views of experienced academic staff are well-represented. In terms of the highest level of education, the majority (74.1%) held master's degrees, followed by those with PhD degrees (13.9%), indicating that academic staff of different educational levels participated in the study. The length of service in the current university shows that most respondents had worked for over 10 years (47.5%) or 5-10 years (39.9%), capturing a range of experiences and perspectives from academic staff with varying levels of seniority. Finally, the academic rank distribution reveals that assistant lecturers made up the largest proportion (74.1%), followed by teaching assistants, lecturers, and associate/full professors, indicating that the data represents a diverse range of academic staff across different levels, making the findings representative of the various categories of academic staff.

4.2 Human resource development practices and job performance of academic staff

To investigate the impact of human resource development practices on the job performance of academic staff in universities, a structural model was developed to examine the causal relationships between these practices and job performance. The model tested four hypotheses: (H1) training has a significant influence on job performance, (H2) promotion has a significant influence on job performance, (H3) job enrichment has a significant influence on job performance, and (H4)
organisational policies have a significant influence on job performance. The results of the structural model are presented in Figure 1 and the path estimates table (Table 4), which provide insights into the strength and direction of the relationships between human resource development practices and job performance.

The results presented in Figure 1 reveal that human resource development practices are indeed a multi-dimensional concept comprising four distinct dimensions: training, promotion, job enrichment, and organisational policies. Factor analysis confirmed the retention of all indicators for training and organisational policies, while eight out of 10 indicators were retained for promotion and eight out of 11 for job enrichment. Notably, all retained indicators exhibited factor loadings above 0.50, which is the minimum accepted threshold, indicating that they are valid measures of their respective constructs. Therefore, these four dimensions effectively capture the essence of human resource development practices, providing a comprehensive framework for understanding this complex concept.

The structural equation estimates presented in Table 4.29 reveal that among the human resource development practices, job enrichment ($\beta = 0.712, t = 10.959, p = 0.000 < 0.05$) and organisational policies ($\beta = 0.125, t = 2.075, p = 0.038 < 0.05$) have a positive and significant impact on academic staff performance.
performance. In contrast, training ($\beta = -0.196, t = 2.282, p = 0.023 < 0.05$) had a negative but significant influence on academic staff performance and promotion ($\beta = 0.140, t = 1.548, p = 0.122 < 0.05$) had a positive but insignificant influence on academic staff job performance. The R-squared value indicates that the four human resource development practices elements explain 57.6% ($R^2 = 0.576$) of the variation in academic staff performance. The adjusted R-squared value shows that the significant aspects of job enrichment, organisational policies, and training explain 56.5% (adjusted $R^2 = 0.565$) of the variation, indicating that these three factors make a substantial contribution to academic staff performance. Notably, job promotion did not have a significant influence on academic staff performance. These findings highlight the importance of job enrichment, organisational policies, and training in enhancing academic staff performance while suggesting that job promotion may require re-evaluation.

5. Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study emphasise the critical role of job enrichment and organisational policies in enhancing the performance of academic staff. While promotion showed a positive but insignificant influence, training surprisingly had a negative and significant impact. The significant positive influence of job enrichment on academic staff performance is consistent with the findings of previous studies (Alsaftadi & Alatahat, 2021; Awan et al., 2023; Chilgong et al., 2021; Haroon & Shakil, 2021; Mac-Ozigbo & Daniel, 2020; Tayeh, 2021). This consistency in findings underscores the importance of job enrichment in fostering the performance of academic staff. The significant positive impact of organisational policies on the job performance of academic staff resonates with the findings of previous researchers (Alkalha et al., 2012; Hazra et al., 2013; Jawaad et al., 2022; Pacifique & D'Silva, 2021). This consistency in findings underscores the vital role of organisational policies in creating a supportive environment that enhances academic staff performance.

Nonetheless, the finding that training had a negative and significant influence on academic staff performance diverges from the consensus of previous researchers (Al Khawaldeh, 2023; Gebrehiwot & Elantheraiyen, 2023; Mvuyisi & Mboyanma, 2023; Yimam, 2022; Wulandar et al., 2023), who consistently reported a positive and significant impact. This discrepancy can be attributed to the limited training opportunities provided to academic staff, which failed to meet the demands of their job performance. The finding that promotion had a positive but insignificant influence on academic staff job performance contradicts the findings of previous researchers (Duru et al., 2023; Haryono et al., 2020; Ligare et al., 2020; Gultom et al., 2023; Muhai & Makhamara, 2023; Nurpi & Syam, 2023; Xie and Yang, 2021), who reported a significant positive impact. However, this discrepancy can be attributed to the limited promotion opportunities available to academic staff in universities, which may have mitigated the potential positive effects of promotion on job performance.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

Effective human resource practices, specifically job enrichment and organisational policies, play a crucial role in enhancing the performance of academic staff. Job enrichment involves providing academic staff with opportunities to utilise their skills, aligning their goals and values with the objectives of the university, and encouraging them to take on diverse responsibilities. Organisational policies, on the other hand, should facilitate the achievement of relevant goals, enable academic staff to effectively perform their duties, and involve them in the development of policies that affect them. However, limited training opportunities hinder academic staff performance. This includes inadequate provision of necessary skills, insufficient investment in training, limited opportunities for professional and career advancement, and failure to instil institutional values and facilitate learning from seniors. Furthermore, unsatisfactory promotion practices minimally contribute to academic staff job performance. This is attributed to non-merit-based promotions, unclear promotion requirements, poor communication of promotion policies, and unsatisfying promotional
opportunities. Additionally, this occurs when there is uncertainty about future promotions and when jobs do not allow for the accumulation of the abundant experience needed for promotion.

Managers of universities should implement human resource development practices that promote job performance among academic staff. Therefore, job enrichment, organisational policies, training, and promotion should all be used to enhance job performance. In order to achieve this, job enrichment should provide opportunities for skill utilisation, goal alignment, and diverse responsibilities. Organisational policies should facilitate goal attainment, effective duty performance, and policy involvement. Training should offer necessary skills, professional development, career advancement, and institutional values while also enabling learning from experienced colleagues. Promotion practices should be merit-based, with clear requirements, effective communication, and satisfying opportunities. This will provide certainty of promotion and opportunities for accumulating the experience needed for advancement. By implementing these practices, universities can create a supportive environment that fosters the performance of their academic staff.

7. Limitation

This study highlights the significance of human resource development practices in improving the job performance of academic staff, but certain limitations have been identified. Particularly, the findings deviate from previous research as they indicate that training and promotion have a negligible impact on academic staff job performance. This inconsistency calls for further investigation into these variables and their correlation with academic staff performance across multiple institutions. Subsequent studies can expand on this research by including various private universities and even public universities, thereby allowing for a more comprehensive understanding. Additionally, while this study utilised a quantitative approach to enable statistical inference, future research should incorporate a predominantly qualitative approach to facilitate a more thorough analysis and offer more profound insights into the intricacies of human resource development practices and academic staff performance.
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