

INFLUENCE OF SELECTION PRACTICE ON LECTURERS' PERFORMANCE IN KENYAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

^{1*} **Robby Otieno Wyckliffe**
robirowa@gmail.com

¹ *School of Arts, Social Sciences & Business, Rongo University, Kenya*

Abstract: *Public universities spur Kenya Vision 2030's pursuit for globally acclaimed education, training and research. However, higher education stakeholders including World Bank, employers Commission for University Education and scholars fault the quality and relevance of their academic programmes. Decline is attributed to reduced rigour on recruitment, promotion and retention criteria; and alleged lecturers' incompetence which point to possible ineffective selection practice (SP). Studies relating SP to Employee Performance do not entirely investigate its descriptors like: Candidates' Assessment; Choice and Offer of Employment. The study's objective was to assess the influence of SP on Lecturers' Performance (LP) in Kenyan Public Universities. Correlation results revealed a positive statistically significant relationship between SP and LP ($r=.507, p=.000$); Multiple regression results revealed that the SP was a significant predictor of LP: $SP=F(2,133) =24.226, p=.000, (Adjusted R^2=.256)$. Findings will benefit researchers, HRM practitioners, organizational behaviourists and theorists, and management of public universities.*

Keywords: *Selection practice, candidates' assessment; choice and offer of employment*

INTRODUCTION

According to World Bank (2017), higher education spurs growth, creates more job opportunities, enhances competitiveness and can potentially accelerate economic transformation by enhancing basic education, moulding professionals and skilled manpower, and catalyzing research. Accordingly, the Kenya Vision 2030 endeavours to provide education, training and research whose quality is acclaimed globally to facilitate individual development and well being (Republic of Kenya, 2007a) through the intervention of public universities among other institutions.

Global Higher education is, however, characterized by myriad challenges that impact performance and application of education (Lemoine, Jenkins and Richardson, 2017). Some of these challenges manifest themselves in stakeholders' misgivings about the standards and relevance, economic value and resource allocation in the sector (World Bank, 2017). Higher education is a function of all the higher learning institutions including the university (Alemu (2018). Adeyemi (2017) faults the academic quality of the output from the university system which in his observation appears to have taken a downward trajectory in a majority of African countries. Many scholars also decry the declining standards in their states (Agarwhe and Ugborugbo, 2009; Alderman, 2010; Bisht, 2015; Ishaya, 2016) as cited in Adeyemi (2017). The diminishing quality in African universities is evident in poor examination scores, less rigorous recruitment and promotion criteria, declining research and incompetent graduates (World Bank, 1996). Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley (2009) confirm that quality of university education, especially in lower-income African, Asia and Latin American countries has been negatively affected by the rapid expansion of universities as demonstrated by irrelevant curricular and unqualified academic staff.

While one of the objectives of Kenyan university education is to advance knowledge through quality teaching, scholarly research and scientific investigation (Republic of Kenya, 2012; Commission for University Education, 2016), stakeholders express misgivings about the quality and relevance of the programmes offered therein (Yego, 2016; Kaburu and Embeywa, 2014, Martin and Anthony, 2007; Ajayi, 1996), the increased access to university education notwithstanding. Kenyan university graduates lack the desired skills, knowledge and attitudes (Kara, Tanui and Kalai, 2020; Ponge, 2013; Amimo, 2012; Kamaara, 2011; Riechi, 2010). A World Bank Report on “*Kenya’s Education Achievement and Challenges*” actually faults her education system for breeding graduates who lack knowledge and skills compatible with Vision 2030 (Wanzala, 2015). Specifically, the Inter-university Council for East Africa observed in one of their reports that approximately 49% of University graduates are inept in their areas of specialization (Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley, 2009).

Extant literature demonstrates that quality of education, training and learning received by a student is domiciled in the quality of lecturers among other factors (Kara, Tanui and Kalai, 2020) and (UNICEF, 2000) as cited in Wanzala (2013). Oanda and Jowi (2012) gauge quality in terms of calibre and sufficiency of academic staff, learning and teaching facilities, contact hours, entry behaviour of learners and governance structures – variables that they observed to be lacking in universities. Ajao (2001) confirms that the students’ academic performance has been linked over time with the effectiveness of the teacher (lecturer) in terms of teaching and learning. While Ngare and Muindi (2008) in Mukhanji, Ndiku and Obaki (2016) attribute the decline in quality to insufficient resources, inability to attract and retain quality teaching staff due to poor remuneration and working conditions, Ngolovoi (2006) attributes it to increased workload and alleged incompetence of lecturers thus the interest in their performance amidst the declining quality.

This study, therefore, sought to examine the influence of Selection Practice on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan public universities. The interest in public universities arose from the fact that they account for 72% of the total university teaching staff (Commission for University Education, 2016) besides having greater quality of education challenges compared to private universities (Gudo, Oanda and Olel, 2011; Kaburu and Embeywa, 2014). Besides being established during the massification period when student enrolment and the number of public universities soared (Kaburu and Embeywa, 2014; Misaro, Jonyo and Kariuki, 2013; Owuor, 2012; Jowi, 2003; Scott, 1995), the chartered public universities established between 2009 and 2019 were targeted because of the staffing challenges they are faced with (Ikama, 2010) and pressure exerted on them to provide employment (Mukhwana, Oure, Too and Some, 2016). The student-lecturer ration became more worrisome in the year 2009 hence the focus on 2009-2019 (Owuor, 2012). The study was anchored on Decision-making Theory (Simon, 1945; Mintzberg, 1973; Iyayi, 2002) and supported by The Resource Based View (Barney, 1991); and Adam Smith’s Human Capital Theory (Terence, 1976).

Selection Practice which is the process of identifying the best candidate or candidates for jobs from among the pool of qualified applicants developed during the recruitment process (DeNisi and Griffin, 1998) involves assessing candidates by various means, making a choice, and offering employment (Graham and Bennett, 1998). With respect to Lecturers’ Performance, Dugguh and Ayaga (2014) explain that performance is a multi-dimensional construct that incorporates both behaviour and results (Brumbach, 1998) and Snell (2006), Employee performance refers to the job-related activities expected of employees and how well they execute them (Dugguh and Ayaga, 2014). Based on the foregoing, Lecturers’ Performance was conceptualized as the job related behaviours and results expected of lecturers. It was measured by: Quality of Teaching and Learning, Research and Publication, Administration and Responsibilities, and Community Engagement and Other Contributions (Commission for University Education, 2014a and 2014b).

EMPIRICAL LITERATURE ON SELECTION PRACTICE AND LECTURERS' PERFORMANCE

The reviewed empirical literature relate Selection Practice and Employee Performance variously. While Matolo, Iravo, and Waititu (2019); Jolaosho, Shodiya, Oladije and Akintan (2018); Onyaeghala and Hyacinth (2016); Makhamara, Waiganjo and Kwasira (2016); Mwangale, Gachunga and Mukhweso (2015); and Mahmood, Iqbal and Sahu (2014) investigated the relationship between various aspects of selection and employee performance, Munialo and Simiyu (2019); Ekwaoba, Ikeije and Ufoma (2015); and Afiriye and Blankson (2013) investigated the relationship between various aspects of recruitment and selection practice and organizational performance.

With regards to the results of the studies that examined the relationship of various aspects of Selection Practice and employee performance, five studies (Matolo, Iravo, & Waititu, 2019; Jolaosho, Shodiya, Oladije & Akintan, 2018; Makhamara, Waiganjo & Kwasira, 2016; Mwangale, Gachunga & Mukhweso, 2015; and Mahmood, Iqbal & Sahu, 2014) found positive statistically relationship while one study (Onyaeghala and Hyacinth, 2016) basically compared selection methods between public and private sectors without investigating relationship between the two variables of interest. Furthermore, all these studies were in context other than public universities as in the current studies except Mwangale, Gachunga & Mukhweso (2015) who looked at both the performance of academic and non-teaching staff. The present study was focused on the performance of lecturers (academic staff) and, therefore, looked at performance parameters specific to lecturers.

With respect to the study variables specific to selection practice and employee performance, Matolo, Iravo and Waititu (2019) considered the following as its indicators of recruitment and selection: recruitment and selection methods; and matching job descriptions and specifications while employee performance was indicated by: achievement of goals; innovations; creativity; job satisfaction and low turnover. Jolaosho, Shodiya, Oladije and Akintan (2018) indicated job (employee) performance by: product knowledge, quality report, absenteeism, schedule adherence, login hours and handling time. Onyaeghala and Hyacinth (2016) used the following facets of employee selection process: experience, educational achievements, salary requirements, location, skills and gender. Makhamara, Waiganjo and Kwasira (2016) measured strategic recruitment and selection through: internal promotion, transparency in recruitment and selection, qualifications and tests used, and attitude towards work while employee performance was indicated by staff turnover, quality of work, customer feedback reports, and staff attitude. Mwangale, Gachunga and Mukhweso (2015) used selection methods and competencies of managers involved in the selection process as the descriptors of selection practice. Mahmood, Iqbal and Sahu (2014) adopted the broader concept of human resource practices which comprised: reward, recruitment and selection and training.

None of the reviewed studies (Matolo, Iravo and Waititu, 2019; Jolaosho, Shodiya, Oladije and Akintan, 2018; Onyaeghala and Hyacinth, 2016; Makhamara, Waiganjo and Kwasira, 2016; Mwangale, Gachunga and Mukhweso, 2015); Fahad, Nadeem and Sahu, 2014) used indicators of Selection Practice such as candidates' assessment, candidates' choice and offer of employment in their entirety (Graham & Bennett, 1998) or those of Lecturers' Performance such as: quality of teaching and learning; research and publication; administration and other responsibilities; and community engagement and other contributions (CUE, 2014b) as in the current study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Higher Education (HE) stakeholders, particularly the World Bank, employers and scholars have faulted the quality and relevance of programmes they offer. Previous studies on selection and lecturers' performance failed

to focus on the facets of selection practice such as: candidates’ assessment; and candidates’ choice and offer of employment, in their entirety. In addition, they ignored descriptors of Lecturers’ Performance such as: quality of teaching and learning; research and publication; community engagement and other contributions; and administration and responsibilities.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objective of the study was to assess the influence of Selection Practice on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan public universities.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Anchored on Decision Making Theory and supported by Resource Based View and Human Capital Theory, it adopted cross-sectional correlational study design with a target population of 1,653 lecturers in 14 chartered public universities established between 2009 and 2019. Multi-stage sampling technique yielded a final census of 158 academic heads of departments having used 20 in piloting. KPUs which experience greater quality challenges comprise 72% of total university academics. Primary data was collected using semi-structured questionnaire while secondary data obtained from relevant secondary sources. Using Cronbach’s α , the questionnaire was consistent at 0.796 (SD=0.067). Content validity was ascertained by reviewing relevant literature and corroborating with experts. Pearson’s r revealed that all items were valid (construct) except one that was excluded from final analysis.

Model Specification

The study sought to establish the influence of Selection Practice on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan public universities. This objective was investigated by testing the null hypothesis that: *Selection Practice has no influence on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan public universities*. Selection Practice was measured using two sub-scales namely: Candidates’ Assessment; and Candidate’s Choice and Offer of Employment. The data for each of the two sub-scales was collected using a 5- point Likert scaled items and the responses converted in continuous scale data by computing the mean response in each item. Accordingly, the multiple regression model that follows in Equation 1 was used to explore the hypothetical influence of the two aspects of Selection Practice on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan public universities. The model was adapted from Cooper and Schindler (2008).

$$LP_i = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 X_{31i} + \beta_2 X_{32i} + \epsilon_i \dots\dots\dots \text{(Equation 1)}$$

Where:

LP_i = Lecturers’ Performance which is the dependent variable had its data measured using a 5-point Likert scaled items which were converted into continuous scale data by computing the mean response in each item. The measures of Lecturers’ Performance were: Quality of Teaching and Learning, Research and Publication, Administration and Responsibilities, and Community Engagement and Other Contributions.

$X_{3i} (i=1,2)$ = This is a continuous predictor variable extracted from mean response in each item representing perceived Selection Practice in which:

X_{31} =Candidates’ Assessment

X_{32} =Candidate’s Choice and Offer of Employment

B_{3i} = Represents regression co-efficient which is a vector of parameters to be estimated.

ϵ_i = This represents the error term. The error term is an assumed random variable (real number) with a normal distribution i.e. $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics on Lecturers' Performance

Lecturers' Performance was summarized in four sub-scales which the researcher used as its dimensions: Quality of Teaching and Learning; Research and Publication; Administration and Responsibilities; and Community Engagement and other Contributions. Table 3 that follows provides the ratings of Lecturers' Performance using means and standard deviation.

Table 1: Summary of Sub-Scales of Lecturers' Performance

Sub-Scales in Lecturers Performance	Mean	SD
Quality of Teaching and Learning	4.27	0.53
Research and Publication	3.82	0.65
Administration and Responsibilities	4.22	0.54
Community Engagement and Other Contributions	3.75	0.76
Overall Mean Rating	4.01	0.62

Source: Survey Data (2020).

From Table 1, it is evident that the overall lecturer's performance in Kenyan public universities was above average. Using the scale of 1 to 5, the study established an overall rating of 4.01 (SD=0.62) indicating a fairly strong level of performance among the lecturers. Quality of teaching, as a dimension of performance, had the highest rating at 4.27 with a standard deviation of 0.53, implying that lecturers performed best in Teaching and Learning compared to other dimensions of performance. This was closely followed by Administration and Responsibilities at 4.22 with a standard deviation of 0.54. Research and Publication acme third with a mean rating of 3.82 (SD=0.65) while Community Engagement and Other Contributions came last with mean rating of 3.75 (SD=0.76) respectively. Considering the above average means in all the dimensions, Kenyan university lecturers generally performed well in discharging their duties. The findings support those of Kara, Tanui and Kalai (2020) who established that a majority of lecturers in Kenyan public universities had the desired professional quality and engaged in quality instructional practices.

Descriptive Statistics on Selection Practice

The two sub-scales of Selection Practice were summarized using means and standard deviations and findings presented in Table 2 that follows.

Table 2: Summary of Selection Practice

Sub-scales	Mean	Standard Deviation
Candidates' Assessment	4.70	0.54
Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment	3.84	0.86
Overall Mean rating of Selection Practice	4.27	0.43

Source: Survey Data (2020)

The results in Table 2 demonstrate that public universities in Kenya generally have very high ratings in their selection practices. This was mirrored by an overall mean rating of 4.27 with a standard deviation of 0.43 in a scale of 1 to 5. The dimension of Candidates’ Assessment received the highest rating ($Mean=4.70$; $SD=0.54$), suggesting that many of the universities effectively screen candidates to determine their suitability for the specific lecturer positions in consideration. Candidates’ Choice and Offer of Employment, as a dimension of Selection Practice, received a mean rating of $3.84(SD=0.86)$ which is a fairly strong rating. This is suggestive of the fact that the universities appoint candidates on the basis of merit. Relative to Candidates Assessment, the low rating could be as a result of the contention that accompanies universities’ efforts to enhance affirmative action therein.

Relationship between Selection Practice and Lecturers’ Performance

The study sought to investigate the relationship between Selection Practice and Lecturers’ Performance. Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis was used to establish the magnitude and direction of the relationships between the individual aspects of Selection Practice and Lecturers’ Performance, and a similar relationship between the overall Selection Practice and Lecturers’ Performance. The significance value was set at 0.05; hence, a p-value greater than 0.05 would lead to the conclusion that the correlation is not statistically significant. The results are summarized in Table 3 that follows.

Table 3: Correlations between Selection Practice and Lecturers’ Performance

Indicator	N	r	p
Candidates' Assessment	136	.491	.000
Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment	136	.420	.000
Overall Selection Practice	136	.507	.000

Source: Survey Data (2020)

It is evident from Table 3 that both aspects of Selection Practice are directly correlated with Lecturers’ Performance. A stronger relationship was between Candidates’ Assessment, as a dimension of Selection Practice, and Lecturers’ Performance. This was reflected by a significant correlation coefficient ($r=.491$, $p=.000$) which was positive, but moderate. Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment recorded a comparatively low correlation with Lecturers’ Performance, but the correlation was positive and significant ($r=.420$, $p=.000$).

When the correlation between the overall measure of Selection Practice and Lecturers’ Performance was sought, the results showed that it was higher than in each of its individual aspects. This suggests that the combined constructs have a higher association with Lecturers’ Performance than when they are dealt with individually. The coefficient value of their combined correlation was ($r=.507$, $p=.000$) suggesting a fairly moderate positive association between the two variables, such that when the overall Selection Practice is enhanced in Kenyan public universities then there would be a corresponding positive improvement in Lecturers’ Performance. The findings are in concurrence with those of Matolo, Iravo and Waititu (2019); Jolaosho, Shodiya, Oladije and Akintan (2018); and Makhamara, Waiganjo and Kwasira (2016) although they used different indicators of recruitment and treated recruitment and selection as single variable.

Further, regression analysis was used establish the influence of Selection Practice on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan public universities, as shown in Table 6.

Influence of Selection Practice on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan Public Universities

H₀₁: *Selection Practice has no influence on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan public universities.*

To establish whether Selection Practice has any influence on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan public universities, the null hypothesis that “*Selection Practice has no influence on Lecturers’ Performance in Kenyan public universities*” was tested. Since the selection process was measured using two dimensions: Candidates’ Assessment, and Candidates’ Choice and Offer of Employment, a multiple regression analysis was employed, with the investigated null hypothesis being $H_0: \beta_1=\beta_2=0$ and the corresponding alternative hypothesis being H_1 : at least one $\beta_i \neq 0$. If the null hypothesis is true, then from $E(Y_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_{i=1,2} X_{i=1,2}$ the population mean of Y_i is $\beta=0$ for every X_i value, which indicates that X_i (Selection Practice) has no influence on Y_i (Lecturers’ Performance) in Kenyan public universities, and the alternative being that X_i (Selection Practice) influences Y_i (Lecturers’ Performance) in Kenyan public universities.

Mean response across a set of statements of Likert-type scale responses in the domain of Selection Practice was computed to create an approximately continuous variable, within an open interval of 1 to 5 as determined to be suitable for the use of parametric data by Johnson and Creech (1983) and Sullivan and Artino (2013). High scale ratings implied high perceived Selection Practice and Lecturers’ Performance. This was done after reversing all the negatively worded statements. The priori significance level was set at 0.05, such that if the p -value was less than 0.05, then the null hypothesis would be rejected and conclusion reached that Selection Practice has statistically significant influence on Lecturers’ Performance. If the p -value was larger than 0.05, it would be concluded that a significant difference exists. Table 4 shows the results of the regression model.

Table 4: Regression Model Summary on Influence of Selection Practice on Lecturers’ Performance

Variable	B	SE	Beta	T	Sig.	95% CI	Part correlation
(Constant)	.020	.519		.039	.969	(-1.007, 1.047)	
Candidates' Assessment	.246	.113	.200	2.170	.032	(.022, 0.470)	.161
Candidates' Choice & Offer of Employment	.549	.136	.373	4.050	.000	(.281, 0.817)	.301

$R=.517$; *Adjusted R Square*= .256 ($SE=.53254$); $F(2, 133)=24.226, p=.000, df(df_1 = 2, df_2=133)$

Dependent Variable: Lecturers’ Performance. **Source:** Survey Data (2020).

Table 4 estimates Equation 1 and can be depicted as Equation 2 with p -values in parentheses.

$$\hat{Y}_i = \underset{(.0969)}{.020} + \underset{(.032)}{.246}X_1 + \underset{(.000)}{.549}X_2 \dots\dots\dots(\text{Equation 2})$$

The model summary shows that selection practice, as measured by Candidates’ Assessment, and Candidates’ Choice and Offer of Employment accounts for 25.6% ($Adjusted R^2=.256$) of the variation in the performance of lecturers in Kenyan public universities. Disparity in the level of performance among lecturers in Kenyan public universities would, therefore, be explained by differences in Selection Practices, as measured by Candidates’ Assessment, and Candidates’ Choice and Offer of Employment. Furthermore, the two dimensions of Selection Practice: Candidates’ Assessment, and Candidates’ Choice and Offer of Employment had a moderate joint correlation ($R=.517$) with lecturer’s performance. In addition, the ANOVA output results show

that the level of Selection Practice, as measured by Candidates' Assessment, and Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment, is a significant predictor of performance among lecturers in Kenyan public universities, $F(2, 133)=24.226, p=.000$. Therefore, knowledge on the level of Selection Practice in Kenyan public universities can significantly be used to predict Lecturers' Performance.

Furthermore, the two dimensions of Selection Practice reflected different levels of influence on Lecturers' Performance. Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment had a higher influence on public university Lecturers' Performance as indicated by a significant p -value ($t=4.050; p=.000$), unstandardized coefficient value of .549 within a 95% $C.I.(.281, .817)$. This suggests that when Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment, as a dimension of Selection Practice, is improved by one unit there would be a corresponding improvement in Lecturers' Performance by 0.549 units. Similarly, one standard deviation improvement in Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment results in an improvement in Lecturers' Performance by .373 ($Beta=0.373$) standard deviations only.

While Candidates' Assessment had a relatively lower influence on Lecturers' Performance, its influence was significant ($t=2.170, p=.032$). This was reflected by an unstandardized coefficient value of .246. This means that when Candidates' Assessment is improved by one unit, there would be an ensuing improvement in Lecturers' Performance by .246 units. Likewise, one standard deviation improvement in Candidates' Assessment would result in an improvement in Lecturers' Performance by .200 ($Beta=0.200$) standard deviations only. While Duncan (1975) argues for the use unstandardized (not betas) regression coefficients to measure the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable, Field (2016) contends that a rough indication of the relative importance of the variables could be arrived at by comparing the absolute values of standardized regression coefficients, which is expressed in terms of standard deviations.

Using part correlation coefficients, the results of the study revealed that the two aspects of Selection Practice have varied contribution to the total Adjusted R squared. The results revealed that Candidates' Assessment has a part correlation coefficient of .161 while Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment has a part correlation coefficient of .301. Squaring these values show how much of the total variance in the Lecturers' Performance is uniquely explained by the variable and how much R squared would drop if it was removed from the model. For instance, Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment uniquely contributes 9.1% to the model, while Candidates' Assessment uniquely explains 2.6% of the variance in Lecturers' Performance. The sum of all the squared part correlation values is less than the total Adjusted R^2 value of .256 (25.6%) since overlaps or shared variance were removed in each case. Nonetheless, given that the two dimensions had significant unstandardized co-efficient values, there was sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis ($H_0: \beta_1=\beta_2=0$) because $H_0: \text{at least one } \beta_i \neq 0$. Subsequently, the alternative hypothesis was supported and it was concluded that selection practice has statistically significant influence on Lecturers' Performance in Kenyan public universities.

The findings support various theoretical arguments, for instance the Decision-making Theory (Simon, 1945; Mintzberg, 1973; Iyayi, 2002) which is the overarching theory, in addition to the findings of other past studies. The theory is based on the fact that decision-making is at the very heart of business success in any organization (Gberevie, 2006; Tonwe, 1994). Decision-making theorists hold that decisions are the selection of a proposed course of action (Butler, 1992; Iyayi, 2002) which could be in the area of selection among others. Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart and Wright (2004) posit that through employee selection, organizations make decisions about whom to hire, for instance. Other decisions will be made on the most suitable selection tools and techniques to use in the identification of the best fit in the best interest of the organization. Managers will also

decide on the most appropriate means of assessing an individual's qualifications relative to the standards of the job and the extent to which those qualifications best prepare and give an individual the requisite skills and abilities for the position. In addition, decisions will have to be made on the composition of the interview panels and basis for ranking of candidates. It is believed that prudent decisions facilitate the acquisition and retention of performing employees.

There are also empirical studies that corroborate the findings of this study. In Kenya, for instance, Matolo, Iravo and Waititu (2019) found a weak, but statistically positive relationship between recruitment and selection, and performance of employees of technical training institutes. Regression results also revealed that Recruitment and Selection Practice accounted for 18.4% of variation in Lecturers' Performance although the two variables were treated as one entity. It is worth noting that they used indicators other than candidates' assessment, and candidates' choice and offer of employment as in the current study.

In Nigeria, Jolaosho, Shodiya, Oladije and Akintan (2018) also established that recruitment and selection process accounted for some variance in job performance in the telecommunication industry. While a positive statistically significant relationship between the two variables was also unearthed, the study used indicators of recruitment and selection other than Candidates' Assessment, and Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment as in the current study. Similarly, the indicators of job performance were different from Quality of Teaching and Learning; Research and Publication; Administration and Other Responsibilities; and Community Engagement and Other Contributions as in the current study. Moreover, the study did not decouple recruitment and selection as to establish the direction and/or extent of individual correlation or influence as in the current study.

In another study in Kenya, Mwanagale, Gachunga and Mukhweso (2015) established a strong positive correlation with employee performance. The regression results also revealed that selection practices accounted for 72% variance in employee performance in public universities. However, the descriptors of Selection Practice were different from Candidates' assessment, and Candidates' Choice and Offer of Employment as in the current study. This implies that Selection Practice can be used to predict Lecturers' Performance. Mahmood, Iqbal and Sahu (2014) also found a positive statistically significant relationship between recruitment and selection and employee performance, but just like in some of the studies so far discussed, recruitment and selection were treated as a single variable unlike in the current study in which they have been decoupled.

CONCLUSION

The study was aimed at establishing the influence of Selection Practice on Lecturers' Performance in Kenyan Public Universities. In consonance with the findings of other previous studies, Selection Practice emerged as a significant predictor of Lecturers' Performance. Fidelity to effective and objective Selection Practice would, therefore, enhance Lecturers' Performance in Kenyan Public Universities. It is, however, recommended that Kenyan Public Universities improve on the dimension of Assessing candidates since it displayed a relatively low influence on Lecturers' Performance.

REFERENCES

- Adeyemi, S. B. (2017). Lecturers' variables as predictors of academic performance in universities. *Journal of Social Science* (50)1-3, 14-26
- Ajao, W. (2001). Cadbury is determined to move education forward. *Vanguard*, December 27, 2001, P. 16.

- Ajayi, J.F.A. (1996). *The African experience with higher education*. The Association of African Universities, Accra.
- Altbach, P.G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L.E. (2009). *Trends in global Higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Paris: UNESCO
- Alemu, S. K. (2018). The meaning, idea and history of university/ higher education in Africa: A brief literature review. *Forum for International Research in Education* (4) 3, 210- 227
- Amimo, C. A. (2012). Tailoring higher education in Kenya to the demands of the post-industrial work place. *Baraton Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 2 (1), 52-58.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A Handbook of human resource management practice (10thed.)*. London: Kogan Page.
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *Armstrong's hand book of human resource management practice*. (11th Ed.). London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Barney, J.B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Brumbach, G. B. (1998). Some ideas, issues and predictions about performance management. *Public Personnel Management*, winter: 387 -402.
- Butler, R. (1992). *Designing organizations: A decision making perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Cascio, F. W. (1998). *Managing human resources (5th ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Commission for University Education (2014a). *State of University Education in Kenya*. (1st ed.). Nairobi: CUE
- Commission for University Education (2014b). *Harmonized criteria and guidelines for appointment and promotion of academic staff in Universities in Kenya*. Nairobi: CUE
- Commission for University Education (2016). *Universities standards and guidelines, 2014*. Nairobi: CUE
- Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. (2008). *Business research methods (10th ed.)*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Denisi, S.A., & Griffin, R. W. (2009). *Human resource management (2nded.)*. New Delhi; Biztanra.
- Dugguh, S.I. & Ayaga, D (2014). Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*.16 (5), 11-18.
- Duncan, O. D. (1975). *Introduction to structural equation models*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ekwaoba, J. O., Ikeije, U. U., & Ufoma, N. (2015). The impact of recruitment and selection criteria on organizational performance. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(2), 22-33.
- Field, F. S. (2016). *Practical Business Statistics (7th ed.)*. London: Academic Press – Elsevier Inc.
- Graham, H.T., & Bennett, R. (1998). *Human resources management (9thed.)*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Gudo, C.O., Olel, M., & Oanda, I.O (2011). University expansion in Kenya and issues of quality education: Challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 2(20), 203-214.
- Ikama, A. (2010). *Benefits and challenges of workforce diversity: A case study of Consultancy Group on International Agricultural Research Centres (CGIAR) in Kenya*. Unpublished MBA Thesis, University of Nairobi, Nairobi – Kenya

- Iyayi, F. I. O. (2002). Decision-Making in underdeveloped organizations: An exploratory investigation. *Nigeria Journal of Business Administration* 4(1), 1-22.
- Johnson, D. R., & Creech, J. C. (1983). Ordinal measures in multiple indicator models: A simulation study of categorization error. *American Sociological Review*, 48(3), 398–407. doi.org/10.2307/2095231
- Jolaosho, S. O., Shodiya, O. A., Oladije, A. R., & Akintan, I. O. (2018). The effect of recruitment and selection process on job performance in telecommunication industry in Nigeria: An assessment of MTN Customer Care Service Centre Abeokuta. *International Journal of Management and Economics* 4(2), 1639 -1651.
- Jowi, J. (2003, June 29- July 4.). Governing higher education in the stakeholder society: Rethinking the role of the state in Kenya’s higher education. Paper presented at the CHEPS Summer School, University of Maribor, Slovenia.
- Kaburu, J.K. & Embeywa, G.H. (2014). An evaluation of quality of university education in Kenya during this massification era. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5(5), 345- 349
- Kamaara, E. K. (2011). Towards a culture of quality management at SASS, Moi University: Changing lecturers’ attitudes to student assessment/QM. In Mayer, P., Wilde, M., Dinku, A., JuttaFedrowitz, J., Shitemi, N. L., Wahlers, M., Ziegele, F. (Eds.) Challenges for faculty management at African higher education institutions (pp. 15-32). Osnabrück, Germany: University of Applied Sciences. Retrieved April 15, 2013 from course.org/uploads/media/Challenges_for_faculty_management.pdf
- Kara, M. A., Tanui, E & Kalai, J.M. (2020). Lecturer quality in public universities in Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies* (7)10, 302-324. Doi: 10.46827/ejes.v7i10.3306
- Lemoine, P.A., Jenkins, W. M., & Richardson, M. D. (2017). Global higher education: Development and implications. *Journal of Education and Development* (1)1, 58-71.
- Mahmood, F., Iqbal, N. & Sahu, S. R. (2014). The impact of human resource practices on employee performance in the Banking Industry of Pakistan. *Euro-Asian Journal of Economics and Finance*, 2(1) 86-99.
- Makhamara, F. H., & Waiganjo, E.W., & Kwasira, J. (2016). Influence of strategic recruitment and selection on employee performance in the Health Sector in Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management* 3(21). 347-361.
- Martin, M., & Anthony, S (2007). External quality assurance in higher education: Making choices. *Fundamentals of education*. Plan No. 85, Paris: II-UNESCO
- Matolo, S. R., Iravo, M., & Waititu, G. A. (2019). Study on relationship between recruitment and selection and employee performance in technical training institutes in Kenya. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management* 7(3), 441- 451.
- Mbwesa, J.K. (2006). *Introduction to management research: A students’ handbook*. Nairobi: Modern Management Consultants.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Misaro, J., Jonyo, F. O., & Kariuki, D. K. (2013). A review of the impact of massification on the quality of higher education in Kenya. *Research Journal in Organizational Psychology & Educational Studies* 2(4), 139-149
- Molefe, G. N. (2010). Performance measurement dimensions for lecturers at selected universities: An international perspective. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8(1).
Doi:10.402/sajhrm.v8i1.243.
- Mukhanji, J.M., Ndiku, J. M., and Obaki, S. (2016). Effect of increased student enrolment on teaching and learning resources in Maseno University, Kenya. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Human Invention* 3(3), 1938 – 1947.
- Mukhwana, E., Oure, S., Too, J. and Some, D. (2016). *State of Post Graduate Research Training in Kenya*. Nairobi: Commission for University Education.
- Munialo, M. J., & Simiyu. A. (2019). Influence of employee resourcing and development strategies on performance of Kibos Sugar and Allied Limited, Kenya. *International Journal of Social Science and Information Technology* V(III), 1-10.
- Mwangale, L. M. A., Gachunga, H., & Mukhweso, G.C. (2015). Effects of selection practices on employee performance in Public Universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Science and Research* 4(5), 3143-3146.
- Ngolovoi, M. (2006). Means testing of student loans in Kenya. Presented at the Comparative and International Higher Education Policy: Issues and Analysis Workshop: University at Albany.
- Noe, R.A., Hollenbeck, J.R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P.M. (2004). *Fundamentals of human resource Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill/ Irwin.
- Nzuve, S. N. M. (2010), *Management of human resources – A Kenyan perspective* (4thed.). Nairobi: Basic Modern management Consultants and Publisher.
- Oanda, I. O., & Jowi, J. (2012). University expansion and the challenges to social developments in Kenya: Dilemmas and pitfalls. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 10 (1), 49-71.
- O'Brien, F., Meadows, M., & Murtland, M (2007). Creating and using scenarios: Exploring alternative possible futures and their impact on strategic decisions. In O'Brien, F. & Dyson, R (Eds.), *Supporting strategy, frameworks, methods and models* (pp. 211-248) Sussex: Wiley.
- Onyeaghala, O.H., & Hyacinth, M.I. (2016). Effects of employee selection process on productivity in the public and private sectors: A case of Benue State. *Business and Economics Journal* 7(4). Doi: 104172/2151-6219.100273.
- Owuor, N. A. (2012). Higher education in Kenya: The rising tension between quantity and quality in the post-massification period. *Higher Education Studies* 2(4), 126-136.
- Ponge, A. (2013). Graduate unemployment and un-employability in Kenya: Transforming university education to cope with market demands and the lessons for Africa. *International Journal of Social Science Tomorrow* 2(3), 1-12.
- Republic of Kenya (2007a). *Kenya Vision 2030: the popular version*. Nairobi: Government Printer
- Republic of Kenya (2012). *The Universities Act No. 42 of 2012*. Nairobi: Government Printer

- Riechi, A. R. O. (2010). Demand for academic programmes offered in Kenya public universities and their relevance to labour market. Retrieved February 12, 2013 from www.csae.ox.ac.uk/
- Scott, P. (1995). *The meanings of mass higher education*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Simon, H.A. (1945). *Administrative behaviour* (2nd Ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Snell, A. (2006). Researching onboarding best practice: Using research to connect onboarding processes with employee satisfaction. *Strategic HR Review*, 5(6), 32–35
- Sullivan, G., & Artino, A. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from likert-type scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education* 5 (4), 541–542. doi.org/10.4300/JGME-5-4- 18
- Terence, H (1976). Adam Smith and the wealth of nations. *The Journal of Law and Economics* 19(3), 507-528
- Tonwe, D.A. (1994). *Public administration: An introduction*. Ibadan: Amfitop Book Company.
- Wanzala, O. (2015, October, 3). Suspension of courses puts regulator on the spot. *Saturday Nation*, Kenya, P.11.
- Wanzala, W. (2013) Quest for quality and relevant higher education, training and learning in Kenya: An overview. *Educational Journal* 2(2), 36-49.
- World Bank (1996). *Teaching capacity in African Universities*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (2017). *Higher Education for development: An evaluation of the World Bank group's support*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Yego H.C. (2016). Challenges facing higher education management of privately sponsored students programmes in Kenya. *British Journal of Education* 4(8), 52-62.