International Journal of Technology and Management



The Role Of Management Practices On Academic Staff Performance In Private Universities In Uganda: A Case Of Bishop Stuart University

Speciouza Birungi
Mbarara University of Science and Technology
Email: birungispec@yahoo.com

Dr. J. M. O. Tukei
Uganda Technology and Management University
Email: tukeiokwadi@yahoo.co.uk

Assoc. Prof. Charles Tushabomwe-Kazooba
Mbarara University of Science and Technology
Email: tkazooba@must.ac.ug

Assoc. Prof. Adrian Rwekaza Mwesigye
Mbarara University of Science and Technology
Email: adrianmwesigye@gmail.com

IJOTM
ISSN 2518-8623
DOI: 10.67610/ijotm.6.1.009
Volume 6. Issue I
pp. 1-16, June 2021
ijotm.utamu.ac.ug
email: ijotm@utamu.ac.ug

Abstract

Management practices relate to specific practices, formal policies and philosophies that are designed to attract, develop, motivate, and retain employees who ensure the effective functioning and survival of the organization. This paper examined the effects of management practices on staff performance in private universities. The study majorly employed a quantitative approach using a cross-sectional study design with some qualitative elements. 142 respondents were carefully chosen using different sampling techniques. Use of the survey, interviews focused group discussions together with documentary analysis were employed for both quantitative and qualitative approaches respectively. A total of 142 respondents played a part in the study. Data were analyzed using different statistical techniques that mainly included descriptive and inferential statistics respectively. Results were found to be statistically related to staff performance. For that matter, it was concluded that a number of elements of management practices were found to be influencing the performance of academic staff and these included recruitment and selection practices, compensation system (rewards incentives and penalties), employment security, training and development, use of information, performance appraisals, evaluating academic staff, development opportunities, and handling of performance misconduct.

This is because these influenced academic staff's professional conduct, promoted ethical standards and values, promoted organizational identity among staff and top management.

Keywords: Management Practices, Academic performance, Bishop Stuart University

Introduction

University employees bring their own backgrounds to the workplace, where they must learn the rules for expected behavior. Work environment in a university setting or institution of higher learning affects employees' performance. Hence, given that the core function of universities is academic, academic staff performance as a means to the final output (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke 2002; Aquino, Galperin, & Bennett, 2004; Lee, Ashton, & Shin, 2005). For example, performance of the academic staff directly affects the students' academic performance, corporate image of the institution, fellow employees, collaborations, regulatory agencies and service providers

Methods

Study Design and settings

The study adopted both a cross sectional survey as well as a case study design. This was useful in obtaining information on the current status of the phenomena in order to describe what exists. (Ilona and Natasha, 2011) This method is also justifiable as a means of investigating the relationship between variables which seeks to determine changes over time. This design further described the nature and pattern of the study where both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analyzed. Qualitative approach is justifiable as it helped in the generation of non-numerical data. While quantitative approach on the other hand is useful for generating quantitative data. Both approaches are considered useful as they enrich the study methods (Ritchie, Lewis, Lewis, Nicholls and Ormston, 2013).

Sample size and study variables

The study population was derived from quantitative data, the study respondents were academic staff since the study aimed at examining the relationship between organisational behaviour and performance of the academic staff. It should be noted that BSU has a total of 219 fulltime and part-time academic staff (Bishop Stuart University 2017). For qualitative data, the study respondents included: The Vice Chancellor, Academic Registrar, University Secretary, Human Resource Manager and Quality Assurance Director. These formed the key informants' interviews whereas the students' program coordinators formed the Focus Group Discussions. Respondents for the qualitative data were purposively selected because of their knowledge in the BSU Organizational behavior and the performance of academic staff.

The academic staff in this study because the study problem was premised on their performance, which required them to give an expert opinion. Administrators such as the Vice Chancellor, Academic Registrar, University Secretary, Human Resource Manager and Quality Assurance Director were considered to give more insight on organizational behavior of BSU in terms of how it conforms with the NCHE standards and Christian values as a Christian founded institution. Student program coordinators were considered to give more in-depth insight about organizational behavior and academic staff performance since they are primary beneficiaries.

Data Analysis

Richard and Pherson (2010) define data analysis as a process in which raw data is ordered and organized, modeled and transformed into useful information. The data in the current study is analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Generally, the process of analyzing data involved categorizing and coding interview notes using analytical coding that represented the themes of the key research questions of the study. Statements with similar viewpoints were clustered and labeled with the same code. The codes were grouped by similarity, and themes and relationships were identified so that patterns, commonalities and differences emerged. Generalizations that explained the themes and relationships identified in the data were developed after careful inspection and review of the initial coding and categorization of the data (Flintsch & McGhee, 2009). The analysis of qualitative and quantitative data was aided by the use of SPSS software.

Results

The study obtained results on management practices such as employment security; training and development, use of information and performance appraisal on the academic staff performance were obtained through a three level Linkert scale. Participants were made to Agree, Disagree or remain undecided. To make the analysis more explicit, the mean and standard deviations of items were computed to aid the analysis. In this aspect, a mean above 1.5 meant that participants were in agreement with the statements put to them while the mean below 1.5 implied that participants were not in agreement with the statements put to them. Also, the standard deviation close 1 indicated that participants were in agreement with the statement put to them whereas the standard deviation close to zero implied that participants disagreed with the statements put to them. The elicited responses are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Employment Security, Training and Development, Use of Information and Performance Appraisal Statement

	Agree		Disagree		Undecided		Mean	Std.
	F	%	F	%		%		
Employment security								
Employment security maintains a climate of commitment to the job	73	51.4	57	40.1	12	8.5	1.61	.511
Explores possible alternatives to avoid layoff through proportionately	71	50	34	23.1	37	26.1	1.41	.589
Training and Development								
Presence of clear processes for research development and mentoring of junior staff	85	59.9	35	24.6	22	15.5	1.91	.897
Processes are reviewed and opportunities for improvement are actively sought	119	83.8	23	16.2	0	0.0	2.80	.810
Management supports technology advances and innovations	109	76.8	33	23.2	0	0.0	2.29	.956
Management supports staff in terms of training and self-development	97	68.3	45	31.7	0	0.0	1.99	.812
Use of Information								
Management communicates key performance measures,	107	75.4	22	15.5	13	9.2	2.30	.648
Smooth information flow systems, networks are efficient	60	42.3	46	32.4	36	25.4	1.30	.361
Performance Appraisal								
The overall performance is tracked using meaningful metrics	73	51.4	34	23.9	35	24.6	1.61	.589
Performance of individual academic staff is reviewed in a comprehensive and systematic way	63	44.4	44	31	35	24.6	1.03	.197
Individual performance review is well structured	71	50	58	40.8	13	9.2	1.48	.400
Differing levels of personal performance lead to different consequences	62	43.7	56	39.4	24	16.9	1.38	.256
Performance measures are easily understood and openly communicated	83	58.5	46	32.4	13	9.2	1.99	.512

Source: *Primary Data,2019*

Table 1 indicates that majority of the participants, (51.4%), agreed that employment security maintains a climate of commitment to the job (Mean= 1.61; Standard deviation= 0.511). Also, 50% agreed that the administration explores possible alternatives to avoid layoff through proportionately reducing working hours, reducing wages to reduce labour costs, freezing recruitment to prevent overstaffing rather than enforcing compulsory layoffs and down-sizing. This implies that employment security influenced academic staff performance and inculcated a sense of commitment to their job and thus fostering performance. In fact, one of the key informants when probed about job security of staff, she said that

All our staff are appraised six months to the expiry of their contracts and every staff member whether fulltime or part-time had a running contract which is legal and binding . . . this in some way largely guarantees job security of our staff. (Participant 5, 4th April 2019).

Such a strong assertion and a sense of job security would make one to confidently show that academic staff in Bishop Stuart University with running appointment letters would perform to the expected standards basing on the experience of BSU.

Findings further indicates that majority of the participants, (59.9%), agreed that presence of clear processes for research development and mentoring of junior staff influenced academic staff performance at Bishop Stuart University (Mean= 1.91; Standard deviation= 0.897). The fact that majority participants agreed that availability of clear processes for research development and mentoring of junior staff influences performance of the academic staff at BSU, it gives a limelight that these factors influence the performance of the academic staff. The analysis further shows that majority of the participants, 83.8%, agreed that processes were reviewed and opportunities for improvement were actively sought (Mean= 2.80; Standard deviation= 0. .810).

With regard to technology advances and innovations, majority of the participants, 76.8%, agreed that the management supports technology advances and innovations (Mean= 2.29, Standard deviation= 0.95). Also, findings show that 68.3% of the participants agreed that management recognized world complexity and supported staff in terms of training and self-development (Mean= 1.99; Standard deviation= 0.812). These results indicate that the BSU management ensures training and development and this ultimately, positively influences staff academic performance. Note that self-development is a major performance indicator of academic staff world over.

So, one would argue that university management practices that would encourage staff self-development would be spurring their academic staff performance and thereby increase university ranking in terms of research, collaboration, alumni and community engagement, among other performance indicators. However although the findings from the key informants and the academic staff painted a picture of continuous training exhibited through staff development program for Masters and PhDs, some of the views from the Focus Group Discussion of Students' Program Coordinators presented varying opinions from these findings;

The university has not done enough towards investing in research and mentoring of junior academic staff. . We only hear them talking about research during events like graduation ceremonies but we have no living examples of people who have won grants and support from this university. This may not help in promoting staff as the university leaves the staff do it on their own…" (Students' Program Coordinators FGD 2, 14th April 2019).

The variance in opinion could be expected since some of the staff development management practices may not be known to students. The university needed to do more in publicizing these policies to students who need to be aware of them.

Table 1 further shows that the majority of the participants, 75.4%, agreed that the management communicated key performance measures, key success factors, strategies and plans are effectively specified and ensures no significant omissions (Mean= 2.30; Standard deviation= 0.648). However, further analysis shows that though management had channels for communicating key performance measures, and other expectations

from staff, less than half of the participants, 42.3%, agreed that there was smooth information flow systems and networks that ensured efficient performance of academic staff (Mean= 1.30; Standard deviation= 0.361). With regard to performance appraisal, the majority of the participants, 51.4%, agreed that the overall performance is tracked using meaningful metrics and with appropriate regularity (Mean= 1.61; standard deviation= 0.589). This is an indication that the performance appraisal of the academic staff at Bishop Stuart University is conducted using meaningful metrics and with appropriate regularity.

Also, 44.4% agreed that performance of individual academic staff is reviewed in a comprehensive and systematic way (Mean= 1.03; Standard deviation= 0.197). The findings further showed that majority of the participants, 50%, agreed that individual performance review was well structured (Mean= 1.48; Standard deviation= 0.400).

It was also found out that 43.7% differing levels of personal performance led to different consequences (Mean= 1.38; Standard deviation= 0.256). Also, the majority of the participants, 58.5%, agreed that performance measures were easily understood and openly communicated (Mean= 1.99, Standard deviation= 0.512).

This could mean that performance appraisal could be a bone of contention that needed the management of the university to work through and improve so that it could encourage the performance of the majority of the academic staff.

Discussion

Results on the management practices that influenced the performance of academic staff in private universities in Bishop Stuart University revealed that there was satisfactory recruitment and clearly spelt out job description, academic staff were interviewed before joining service and only those who met selection criteria were appointed and the selection procedure was done objectively by matching job description and person specification against what is offered. This kind of recruitment and selection criteria has been commended by various human resource specialists since it determines the kind of quality of performance of staff. Cain, Niko and Brian, H, (2002) argue that, the way in which the process of staff recruitment and selection is handled determines the quality of staff in place and this largely determines the nature of performance likely to be obtained by the business in the long run. It is therefore right to conclude that the selection procedure and recruitment practiced by the management of BSU met criterion for hiring competent staff who were most likely to perform to the expectations of the university.

Whereas the above argument is true, results showed that close to a half of the participants were undecided on whether the university criteria of selection enabled efficient use of human capital. This implied that the criteria of selection had nothing to do with utilization of human capital. These findings were contested by the views captured in Focus Group Discussions with students' program coordinators, where members agreed with

one of the participants who argued that the recruitment procedures of the university favoured sons and daughters of the Clergy, irrespective of whether they were the best performers or not. On the contrary though, one of the key informants, seconded what was already obtained from the academic staff through questionnaires by categorically stating that the university followed the guidelines as they were laid down in the

university human resource manual. Basing on the majority of the responses and the arguments of the key informants about the recruitment and selection criteria, it is important to note that the resourcing strategy employed by BSU also involved placement of the most innovative personnel in their rightful positions and this influenced performance of staff. These findings are in line with the argument that, matching the applicant's skills and educational background to the job description and job specification is the first step in the placement process that ensures quality performance (Arthur 2007).

Results about compensation system, a construct of management practices that influenced performance of staff showed that, most of the participants agreed that good performance was rewarded proportionately. These finding are in agreement with scholars who argue that reward management is practiced in various aspects to help improve on employee performance and may include financial as well as non-financial rewards (Cafferkey et al. 2018). Findings showed that half of the participants agreed that the University instituted penalties against poor performance standards although the other half disagreed with this opinion. It would appear that the policy of instituting penalties against poor performance standards at BSU was not clearly defined or structured so that it spurs performance of academic staff across the board. This finding is in agreement with some of the views that emerged from one of the FGDs where a member argued that punishing poorly performing staff was not uniform.

This was because some academic staff who were allegedly reported to top management for poor performance by students were the very staff who received promotions. On the whole, results about compensation and reward management practices of BSU revealed that most of the academic staff were satisfied with the way compensation was made on time but not in the amount received. This energized staff to work harder since they were confident of an agreeable pay.

Note that since Bishop Stuart University is a relatively small university as compared to public universities in Uganda, it is probable that the university had financial constraints to pay their staff a reasonable amount of money. However, this notwithstanding, the results are further in line with arguments that, small firms may offer lower wages, but they portray a relaxed and informal environment, employee and employer relationship, and personal atmosphere where employees have the opportunity to make decisions, take responsibility, thus fostering performance of staff (Brown et al. 2010).

Similarly results on the influence of management practices, on academic staff performance, such as, employment security, training and development, use of information and performance appraisal on the academic staff, showed that majority of the participants agreed that employment security maintains a climate of commitment to the job. Such findings are in line with arguments that small organizations struggle to maintain their staff by ensuring their development through continuous training and learning that enhances the employee's talent and knowledge, thereby improving performance of both staff and the organization (Shutan 2008).

It is little wonder therefore that participants agreed that BSU management explored possible alternatives to avoid layoff through proportionately reducing working hours, reducing wages to reduce labour costs, freezing recruitment to prevent overstaffing rather than enforcing compulsory layoffs and down-sizing. These were in agreement with those from one of the key informant's interviews where it was argued that staffs at BSU were appraised six months prior to their contract expiry dates and all university academic staff had running contracts. Basing on such findings one would argue that such employment security positively influenced performance of academic staff since it would lead to commitment to work.

Results further indicated that majority of the participants agreed that presence of clear processes for research development and mentoring of junior staff influenced academic staff performance at BSU. Such findings resonate with the argument of scholars who contend that enhancing knowledge and mentoring of junior staff by management is an effective way of ensuring that organizations keep on improving business performance (Gold, A, Malhortra, and Segras, A 2013; Zhou and Volkwein, J 2013). Similarly results showed that majority of the participants agreed that processes were reviewed and opportunities for improvement were actively sought.

This transparent way of reviewing opportunities for improvement, it is assumed, influenced performance of academic staff. With regard to technology advances and innovations, majority of the participants agreed that the management supports technology advances and innovations. Also, findings show that the participants agreed that management recognized world complexity and supported staff in terms of training and self-development.

These results indicate that the BSU management ensured training and development and this ultimately influenced staff academic performance. However, although the findings from the key informants and the academic staff painted a picture of continuous training exhibited through staff development program for Masters and PhDs, some of the views from the Focus Group Discussion presented varying opinions from these findings as members argued that the university had not done enough towards investing in research and mentoring of junior academic staff. Apparently, that research was only talked about at major university events like graduation. Therefore, this did not promote staff performance. The variation in opinion between student leaders and academic staff could be expected since some of the staff development management practices may not be known to students.

Results further showed that majority of the participants agreed that the management communicated key performance measures, key success factors, strategies and plans. These are effectively specified and it ensures no significant omissions. This implies that there were clear communication channels that disseminate performance measures, key success factors, its strategies and plans which have a significant impact on the performance of academic staff. However, a further analysis showed that though management had channels for communicating key performance measures, and other expectations from staff, a significant number of participants agreed that there was no smooth information flow systems and networks that ensured efficient performance of academic staff. Such a mismatch of communication procedures could either negatively or positively influence the performance of academic staff.

With regard to performance appraisal, slightly above half of the participants agreed that the overall performance was tracked using meaningful metrics and with appropriate regularity. Also, results showed that performance of individual academic staff was reviewed in a comprehensive and systematic way. The findings further showed that individual performance review was well structured and that performance measures were easily understood and openly communicated. This analysis shows that participants appreciated the appraisal system as a management practice. Almost another half of the participants showed some elements of dissatisfaction.

This could mean that performance appraisal could be a point of contention that needed the management of the university to work through and improve so that it could encourage performance of the majority of the academic staff. Similarly, the findings are in agreement with previous scholars who argue that performance appraisal involves a continuous process of identifying, measuring and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning performance with the strategic goals of the organization. This is because appraisals result into agreement, feedback, positive reinforcement, dialogue and agreement thus proceeding to continuous improvement of the staff and the organization (Chandrachud and Athavale 2020)

Results concerning evaluating academic staff as a management practice that influenced performance of academic staff in this study showed that employing a leadership style based on assessing the needs of individuals was an evaluation technique that influenced performance of the academic staff. In addition, results showed that addressing individual needs through coaching and teaching to improve learning enhanced performance just as coaching others on how to anticipate, define and solve problems was another management practice.

Such findings agree with other scholars who contend that employee evaluation involves providing performance feedback as a basis for the joint analysis of strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement and an agreement on a personal development plan and learning contract. Employee evaluation assesses the performance of employees as a basis for making decisions on job reassignment, promotion or performance-related reward (Aguinis and Kraiger 2009). The findings further showed that open sharing of information and resources was another effective behaviour evaluation strategy of the academic staff.

Results revealed that monitoring and evaluating performance regularly, accurately and fairly was an acceptable management practice among the academic staff. Also, results showed that dealing with performance problems directly, fairly, and in a timely manner, providing current, complete and practical positive or corrective feedback that supported academic staff was an acceptable management practice.

Results further showed that enabling staff to take appropriate risks, encouraging and promoting decision making and accountability at all levels was another method of evaluating staff and that it promoted performance. Empowering teams to achieve goals by providing resources, training, responsibility and authority equally promoted staff performance. Findings revealed that majority of the participants agreed that sharing successes with team members was an acceptable strategy for evaluating the academic staff performance at BSU. However, qualitative data from the Focus Group Discussions revealed that there were unnecessary bureaucracies in the process of evaluating staff and sometimes this compromised the core values of integrity, compassion and honesty upon which the university is anchored.

Results about the way management handled academic staff development opportunities influenced their (academic staff) performance. Participants agreed that providing information, tools, resources and opportunities helped academic staff improve their abilities. Also helping academic staff to identify areas for development was an approach to staff development that influenced their performance. Results showed that supporting appropriate development opportunities was another approach to staff development. The study revealed that majority of the participants agreed that giving challenging assignments to develop staff capabilities was an acceptable management practice that would promote staff performance. Majority of the participants consented that promoting systems and processes encouraged the reward of academic staff development at all levels of academia.

The majority of participants agreed that research grants at BSU be separated from the general recurrent expenditure of the university in order to ensure purposeful expenditure. Such findings are in agreement with arguments that performing and winning organizations were those that continuously engaged their staff in career development and planning. This is because this shape the progression of individuals within an organization in accordance with assessments of organizational needs, defined employee success profiles and performance, potential and preferences of individual members of the enterprise (Mathis, R and Jackson, J 2010). Staff development also involves career counselling to help people develop their careers to their advantage, as well as that of the organization (LePine, J et al. 2008). With such arguments and evidence from previous scholarly works, one would argue that BSU was doing whatever is possible to ensure that academic staff progress in their careers and this would result in better performance.

Results indicated that majority of the participants agreed that helping employees to quickly and effectively understand and adjust to new roles, challenges and changes in the University environment was a good organizational management practice that enabled performance of academic staff. Staying up-to-date with key trends and opportunities had an impact on supporting the objectives of the university and encouraged better performance of staff. In addition, results showed that initiating change instead of reacting to external pressures for change, supports the achievement of the objectives and was a management practice construct that also improved performance of academic staff. Such findings are in agreement with Shutan, (2008) who argues that strategic communication conveys to people what doing a good job means and entails, ensures relationship building, creates stronger work relationships by bringing managers and those they manage together regularly to review performance achievements (Shutan 2008).

All these would in turn influence the performance of staff. Furthermore, results revealed that majority of the participants agreed that making sure technical/functional decisions were based on department priorities supported staff performance in achieving of university objectives. The findings further indicate that over half of the participants agreed that using available resources (people, funds, time, and material, support) to coordinate and manage staff development opportunities within and those outside the organization played a role in supporting staff performance.

Results also indicated that majority of the participants agreed that actively supporting individuals for key positions regardless of differences was a supportive environment for the academic staff. Actively supporting the development of others regardless of differences was considered a supportive environment for the academic staff performance. Such management practices could spur the innovativeness of academic staff and impart a sense of organizational ownership among staff members, thus influencing their commitment and performance levels.

In addition, results indicated that respecting the talent and unique contributions of every individual, culture and ethnic group to increase effectiveness was a supportive environment for the academic staff. Influencing culture in ways that value and support diversity was one way of providing a supportive environment to the academic staff performance. Such results resonate to a sense of employee acceptability, liberty and non-discrimination attitudes which are management qualities that accelerate staff performance (McCabe and Trevino 1993).

On the contrary, views from the Focus Group Discussion showed that the university administration had engaged in too many activities without prioritizing and thus neglected creating opportunities for staff development. Whereas the university had embarked on the many physical development projects, it is also true that very many academic staff had been supported to complete their studies through financing their research projects.

Results about how the handling of performance misconduct of academic staff at BSU influenced their performance showed that majority of the participants agreed that all parties had the right to be heard and judged without bias. Issues were adequately investigated as one of the approaches of handling performance misconduct of the academic staff at BSU. Results also indicate that standards of conduct or job performance required were made clear to the academic staff by documentation or during interviews. Academic personnel was made aware of the likely steps in the event that satisfactory performance or conduct is not maintained. Also, participants agreed that when a complaint about academic staff performance or conduct is brought to the supervisor's attention by a third party, the substance of the complaint was verified before any action would be taken on the matter.

Such findings are in line with scholars who argue that one of the more traditional approaches toward managing academic misconduct is deterrence. This usually takes the form of a misconduct policy that sets out the consequences of being caught engaging in such behaviour (Bruystegem et al. 2008; Joyce 2018). This is very true in the case of BSU that has a human resource policy that provides for the procedure for handling staff misconduct, with the argument that rigorously imposing and publicizing potential penalties will assist in reducing the incidence of academic misconduct.

It was found out that the majority of the participants agreed that procedures do not replace the normal responsibility of a supervisor to discuss work or conduct issues with academic staff members. In addition, the latter had a clear understanding of the work and conduct expected of them and appropriate feedback on their performance is provided. Results showed that emphasis was always on early intervention and informal

resolution of a problem, as opposed to a more formal intervention at a later time. These findings are in agreement with Niyivuga, Otara, and Tuyishime, (2019) who argue that Heads of Departments (HODs) are the ones entrusted with the supervisory role of the faculty members. Thus, the way HODs execute this role as supervisors, including the quality of feedback provided, has direct impact on the teaching staff's behavior, hence their motivation to work (Niyivuga et al. 2019).

Also, participants agreed that formal disciplinary process was commenced when it became clear to the supervisor that a work performance or conduct problem had not been corrected through relatively informal discussions between the supervisor and academic staff unless the matter is of a serious nature. Results further

showed that nothing in these procedures precluded the University from terminating the employment of an academic staff for unsatisfactory performance and unbecoming behavior. Such findings refer to the core values of the University; Compassion, honesty, and integrity (Bishop Stuart University 2017).

Finally, the study found out that the majority of the participants agreed that managers should be adaptable in the style of behaviour towards academic staff, thus positively influencing their behavior and performance. This analysis also shows that BSU employs a number of practices in handling performance misconduct of academic staff depending on circumstances for improved performance.

The above findings notwithstanding, research from one of the focus group discussions showed that misbehavior management had some variations according to which academic staffs were on the spot, for instance, depending on how a particular academic staff was "highly" connected with university top management. Results in this section suggest that handling of staff conceived or perceived misconduct needed to be handled with utmost fairness and justice with the aim of promoting staff performance.

Conclusion

This objective sought to find out the management practices that influence the performance of academic staff in private universities in Uganda. From the results about this objective, it was concluded that a number of elements of management practices were found to be influencing performance of academic staff and these included recruitment and selection practices, compensation system (rewards incentives and penalties), employment security, training and development, use of information, performance appraisals, evaluating academic staff, development opportunities, and handling of performance misconduct. This is because these influenced academic staff's professional conduct, promoted ethical standards and values, promoted organizational identity among staff and top management. These characteristics would in turn result into academic staff individual's self-development, professional relations and commitment to quality service delivery.

Recommendation

The objective sought to find out the management practices that influence performance of academic staff in private universities in Uganda. Results about this objective, showed that a number of elements of management practices were found to be influencing performance of academic staff and these included recruitment and selection practices, compensation system (rewards incentives and penalties), employment security, training and development, use of information, performance appraisals, evaluating academic staff, development opportunities, receiving support of objectives environment and handling of performance misconduct. This is because these influenced academic staff's professional conduct, promoted ethical standards and values, promoted organizational identity among staff and top management. These characteristics in turn would result into academic staff individual's self-development, professional relations and commitment to quality service delivery. It is therefore recommended that top management is periodically engaged in current human resource management practices. This will ensure that top management is constantly aware of the proactive management practices since the entire

References

Abu-Doleh, J., and D. Weir. 2007. "Dimensions of Performance Appraisal System in Jordanian Private and

Public Organizations." International Journal of Human Resource Management 18(1):75-84. Adeniji, Falola', and Salau. 2014. "A Modelling Relationship between Work Satisfaction and Faculty Performance in the Nigerian Private Universities." European Scientific Journal 10(32):1857 – 7881.

Adriana, T., V. Reka, T, C. Vasile, and M. Alexandra. 2008. "Implementing the Balanced Scorecard in Public Institutions for Higher Education in Romania—an Innovative Project." European Journal of Management. Aguinis, Herman, and Kurt Kraiger. 2009. "Benefits of Training and Development for Individuals and Teams, Organizations, and Society;" Annual Review Psychology 60:451–74.

Aheisibwe, I., and R. Ntunguka, O. 2017. "Equipping University Academic Staff with Pedagogical
Competence: A Case of Bishop Stuart University." International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
6(6).
Ahmadi, A. 2007. "Suicide by Self-Immolation: Comprehensive Overview, Experiences and Suggestions."
Journal of Burn Care & Research. 1(28(1)):30–41.
Hernandez, M. 2007. "Stewardship: Theoretical Development and Empirical Test of Its Determinants." Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.
Herzberg, F. 1998. "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" Harvard Business Review 109–20.
Higgins, J, C. 2008. "Performance Measurement in Universities,." European Journal of Operational Research
38:38, 358–68.
Idogho, P, O. 2006. "Academic Staff Perception of the Organizational Climate in Universities in Edo State, Nigeria." Journal of Social Sciences 13(1):71-8.
Ishengoma, J, M. 2005. "Cost Sharing in Higher Education Fact or Fiction?"
Islam, R., H. Zaki, and A. Ismail. 2008. "Employee Motivation: A Malaysian Perspective." International
Journal of Commerce and Management 18(4):344-62.

Jacobs, M, R., D. Felmingham, C. Appelbaum, P, and N. Grüneberg, R. 2003. “The Alexander Project
1998–2000: Susceptibility of Pathogens Isolated from Community-Acquired Respiratory Tract
Infection to Commonly Used Antimicrobial Agents.” Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 53(2):229-
246.
Jiménez-Jiménez, J., and R. Sanz-Valle. 2005. “Innovation and Human Resource Management Fit: An
Empirical Study.” International Journal of Manpower 26(4):364-381.