

## **Influence of Selection on Academic Staff Retention in Universities in Kenya**

**Mamuli, Catherine Laura<sup>1</sup>; Namasaka David Butali<sup>1</sup>; Getty Wekesa<sup>1</sup>& Khayinga Consolata Muyuka<sup>2</sup>**

1-Kibabii University, P.O. BOX 1699, Bungoma

2-Kenyatta University School of Business, P.O Box 43884-00100, Nairobi, Kenya

Corresponding e-mail: [lmamuli@kibu.ac.ke](mailto:lmamuli@kibu.ac.ke)

---

### **Abstract**

*Kenyan universities are operating in a highly competitive environment where supply of qualified academic staff is in deficit. One of the challenges these universities face is academic staff retention. This study sought to establish the influence of selection practices on academic staff retention in Universities in Kenya. The study was conducted in four public and four private universities and data was collected between the period June to September, 2016. The literature was reviewed as per the study objective. The study used mixed method research design. The target population was 2,768 academic staff from 8 (4 public and 4 private) universities. The sample size of 284 (276 departmental academic staff plus 8 (HR) registrars) was drawn. Data was collected using questionnaires and interview schedule. A validity index of 0.80 was obtained. Reliability of the questionnaires was measured and calculated using Cronbach's alpha and a correlation coefficient of 0.84 was achieved. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to present data. Pearson correlation on commitment as a moderating variable was done and results showed that commitment affected selection practices significantly with the Pearson's correlation of 0.4000 and p-value of 0.000. Additionally, commitment did not affect retention significantly with a correlation of 0.021 and p-value of 0.764. The findings of the study revealed that selection practices had an influence on academic staff retention in universities with a frequency of 131 and a percentage of 64.8 %. The overall conclusion of this study is that selection practices had significance influence on academic staff retention in universities in Kenya. The study recommended that universities should review their practices on selection so as to help them to achieve and enhance academic staff retention.*

**Key Words:** *Academic staff, Retention, Selection*

### **1.0 Introduction**

Human Resource Management refers to the process of attracting, hiring, training, motivating and maintaining employees in an organization. Human resource management practices refer to organizational activities directed at managing the pool of human resources and ensuring that the resources are employed towards the fulfillment of organizational goals (Ng'ethe, 2012). Organizations practice HRM in order to attract and develop human capital. Human capital is the process that relate to training, education and other professional initiatives in order to increase the levels of knowledge, skills, abilities, values, and social assets of an employee which will lead to the employee's satisfaction and performance, and eventually on organizational performance. In Higher Education Institutions, HRM is one of the main functions that is normally undertaken because one of the core functions of HEIs is training and developing human resources. In the current global market, organizations are composed of competitors, regardless of their nature. To develop a competitive advantage, it is important that HEIs truly leverage on the workforce as a competitive weapon. A lot of emphasis of 'good' employment practices has however been placed on strategies towards retaining staff, (Hutchings and Burke 2006).

According to this study, selection is defined as the process by which specific instruments are engaged to choose from the pool of individuals most suitable for the job available (Ofori & Aryeetey, 2011). Selection involves the use of one or more methods to assess an applicant's suitability in order to make the correct selection decision and can be alternatively seen as a process of rejection as it rejects a number of applicants and select only a few applicants to fill the vacancy. Thus, selection function may be a negative function rather than a positive function (Gamage, 2014). It is perceived that the university that selects high quality employees gets substantial benefits, which recur every year the employee is on the payroll. On the other hand, poor selection decisions can cause irreversible damage. It is often claimed that selection of workers occurs not just to replace departing employees or add to a workforce but rather aims to put in place workers who can perform at a high level and demonstrate commitment (Ballantyne, 2009).

Research undertaken on recruitment and selection practices include, Njine (2006) who did a study on 'employee recruitment and selection practices at nongovernmental organizations operating in Kenya' who concluded that there is need to have variety of recruitment and selection practices. Mugao (2004) who did a study on 'recruitment and selection practices of pilots among commercial aviation firms in Kenya,' observed that Kenya Aviation firms do not have an elaborate Human Resource department to foresee recruitment and selection. Kagwaini (2008) did a survey of 'recruitment and selection practices among SMEs in Nairobi' and concluded that more human resources management skills and expertise are required to handle recruitment and selection. However, from the above literature reviewed, it is discovered that most studies have been done on staff selection and organizational performance and minimal studies have been done on the influence of selection practices on academic staff retention in universities in Kenya. This study therefore, intended to fill this research gap.

## **2.0 Methodology**

Mixed methods research design was used which represents more of an approach to examining a research problem than a methodology. Mixed method is characterized by a focus on research problems that require, an examination of real-life contextual understandings, multi-level perspectives, and cultural influences; an intentional application of rigorous quantitative research assessing magnitude and frequency of constructs and rigorous qualitative research exploring the meaning and understanding of the constructs; and, an objective of drawing on the strengths of quantitative and qualitative data gathering techniques to formulate a holistic interpretive framework for generating possible solutions or new understandings of the problem, Creswell and Tashakkori (2007). The design enabled the researcher to combine both quantitative and qualitative research approaches. Qualitative approaches enabled collection of data in form of words rather than numbers. Simiyu (2012) observed that while qualitative approach underscores details, quantitative approach strives for precision by focusing on items that can be counted into predetermined categories and subjected to statistical analysis.

In this research, the study was done in eight purposively sampled universities in Kenya, namely: Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology (MMUST); Kenyatta University (KU); Technical University of Mombasa (TUM); University of Kabianga (UoK); Catholic University of Eastern Africa (CUEA); University of Eastern Africa, Baraton (UAEB); Great Lakes University, Kisumu (GLUK) and Kabarak University (KBU). Four public and four private universities were purposively sampled with regard to their duration of existence since inception and their location; MMUST, KU (public universities) and CUEA, UAEB (private universities) have been in existence for over ten years and TUM, UoK (public universities), GLUK, Kabarak (private universities) have been in existence for less than ten years. (CUE, 2015). The target population was 2,768 teaching staff from 8 (4 public and 4 private) universities out of the 67 public and private universities in Kenya listed by Commission for University Education, (CUE,

2015). The target respondents included all the academic staff members and Registrars (HR) in the eight (8) purposively sampled public and private universities in Kenya which is in the approved range of 10% to 30% of the total population, Mugenda and Mugenda (2003). Stratified random sampling was used to choose the eight (8) universities from which the sample population was drawn and the census method was used to choose the Registrars (HR). The sample size of 284 (276 departmental academic staff plus 8 Registrars HR) was drawn as at August 2015. Sample Proportional to the Size (SPS) of academic staff in each of the selected universities and census were employed respectively

Questionnaires were used to collect data from the academic staff and interview schedules were used to collect data from Registrars in charge of Human Resources. This study used internal and external validity. To achieve internal and external validity, questionnaires and interview schedules for HROs were used, and then triangulation was used to determine validity of the results. A validity index of 0.80 was obtained which is more than .70 the least accepted value of validity in survey research (Amin 2005). Data reliability was measured using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient which ranges between 0 and 1 (Kipkebut,2010). A correlation coefficient of 0.87 was achieved and was considered sufficient for yielding consistent results for the study. Data collected from the field was coded and analyzed using computer supported software to adduce descriptive statistics, Pearson Correlation, Multiple regression analysis and ANOVA to produce results as per the study objective.

**3.0 Findings and Discussions**

**3.1 Respondents’ Profile**

The section presents data on the response rate and distribution of respondents by gender in the eight sampled universities in Kenya.

**Table 3.1: Response rate in the Eight Universities under the study**

University	Questionnaires	Respondents	Response Rate
MMUST	32	28	87.5%
KU	150	81	54%
TUM	23	22	95.6%
UoK	14	14	100%
CUEA	22	21	95.4%
UAEB	15	15	100%
KBU	13	13	100%
GLUK	9	8	88.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>72.2%</b>

Source: Research Data, 2016

As indicated in table 3.1, the highest number of respondents were received from Kenyatta University with 40.0% (81), followed by MMUST 13.8 % ( 28), then TUM 10.8 % (22), CUEA 10.3% (21), UEAB had 7.4% (15), UoK about 6.9% (14) , KBU had 6.4% (13) and GLUK 3.9% (8). This reflects the population of the academic staff in each of the universities (Sample Proportional to Size) with Kenyatta University having the highest number of academic staff since it is the largest and the oldest among the public universities in the study sample. GLUK had the least number of respondents due to its size and the nature of the programmes it offers.

**Table 3.2: Gender representation in public and private universities**

Type of University	Male	Female	Total
Public	69 (47.6%)	76 (52.4%)	145 (100.0%)
Private	32(56.1%)	25 (43.9%)	57 (100.0%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>101 (50%)</b>	<b>101 (50%)</b>	<b>202</b>

Source: Research Data, 2016

Out of the 202 respondents 69 (47.6%) males were from the public universities under the study, 76 (52.4%) were female and 32 (56.1%) were male and 25 (43.9%) were female from the sampled private universities as provided in Table 3.2. This indicates that generally there were more female respondents from the sampled public universities in comparison to the male respondents and more male respondents from private universities in comparison to the female respondents. This indicates the wide discrepancy between male and females in employment of this cadre of staff in the public and private universities. Concerted efforts have to be put in place to encourage female enrolment in postgraduate programmes in private universities, support them to stay in those programmes, ensure that they are able to complete their programmes successfully, and to mentor them to pursue academic careers. These efforts will lead to growth in the numbers of female staff who can then serve as role models and mentors for subsequent generations of female students and help them sustain their careers when they become academics.

### 3.2 Selection practices on academic staff retention in Universities in Kenya

This section gives results and discussions of the second objective which was to establish the Influence of selection practices on academic staff retention in Universities in Kenya as follows:

**Table 3.3: Influence of selection practices on academic staff retention in Universities in Kenya**

Selection Practices	Type of University	SA	A	NA/DA	DA	SDA
Academic departments are normally involved in the shortlisting exercise	Public	27 (18.6%)	34 (23.4%)	29 (20.0%)	29 (20.0%)	26 (17.9%)
	Private	17 (29.8%)	22 (38.6%)	12 (21.1%)	6 (10.5%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	44 (21.8%)	56 (27.7%)	41 (20.3%)	35 (17.3%)	26 (12.9%)
The departments normally help the HR department in developing the shortlisting criteria	Public	22 (15.2%)	47 (32.4%)	20 (13.8%)	30 (20.7%)	26 (17.9%)
	Private	17 (29.8%)	28 (49.1%)	12 (21.1%)	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	39 (19.3%)	75 (37.1%)	32 (15.8%)	30 (14.9%)	26 (12.9%)
Interviewing exercise does not involve any member of the department	Public	12 (8.3%)	15 (10.3%)	41 (28.3%)	42 (29.0%)	35 (24.1%)
	Private	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)	24 (42.1%)	33 (57.9%)
	Total	12 (5.9%)	15 (7.4%)	41 (20.3%)	66 (32.7%)	68 (33.7%)
There are many types of interviews that are normally carried out to determine the best candidate	Public	5 (3.4%)	26 (17.9%)	56 (38.6%)	25 (17.2%)	33 (22.8%)
	Private	6 (10.5%)	0 (00.0%)	6 (10.5%)	24 (42.1%)	21 (36.8%)
	Total	11 (5.4%)	26 (12.9%)	62 (30.7%)	49 (24.3%)	54 (26.7%)
The chair of the department has a say in who to be employed for their respective departments	Public	17 (11.7%)	21 (14.5%)	19 (13.1%)	63 (43.4%)	25 (17.2%)
	Private	27 (47.4%)	24 (42.1%)	6 (10.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	44 (21.8%)	45 (22.3%)	25 (12.4%)	63 (31.2%)	25 (12.4%)
The CoD normally orients new staff to the department and the university	Public	21 (14.5%)	46 (31.7%)	32 (22.1%)	36 (24.8%)	10 (6.9%)
	Private	39 (68.4%)	12 (21.1%)	6 (10.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	60 (29.7%)	58 (28.7%)	38 (18.8%)	36 (17.8%)	10 (5.0%)
When new staffs report they are normally oriented to the university by the HR department	Public	13 (9.0%)	28 (19.3%)	52 (35.9%)	32 (22.1%)	20 (13.8%)
	Private	27 (47.4%)	24 (42.1%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (10.5%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	40 (19.8%)	52 (25.7%)	52 (25.7%)	38 (18.8%)	20 (9.9%)
Academic staff are normally placed correctly in the departments	Public	25 (17.2%)	33 (22.8%)	25 (17.2%)	30 (20.7%)	32 (22.1%)
	Private	27 (47.4%)	24 (42.1%)	0 (0.00%)	6 (10.5%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	52 (25.7%)	57 (28.2%)	25 (12.4%)	36 (17.8%)	32 (15.8%)
Academic staff have offices in which they work from	Public	4 (2.8%)	23 (15.9%)	50 (34.5%)	39 (26.9%)	29 (20.0%)
	Private	27 (47.4%)	18 (31.6%)	6 (10.5%)	6 (10.5%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	31 (15.3%)	41 (20.3%)	56 (27.7%)	45 (22.3%)	29 (14.4%)

Source: Research Data, 2016

Table 3.3 show results of the selection practices; the first question was on whether Academic departments are normally involved in the shortlisting exercise, the following were the responses from public and private universities respectively; 27 (18.6 %),17 (29.8 %) strongly agreed, 34 (23.4%),22 (38.6%) agreed, 29 (20.0%),12

(21.1%) neither agreed or disagreed, 29 (20.0%),6 (10.5%) disagreed and 26 (17.9%),0 (00.0%) strongly disagreed. From these results majority of the respondents from public and private universities 61 (42.0%),39 (68.4%) agreed respectively. These findings reiterate the fact that since the recruitment exercise normally stems from the user department, then it follows that the CoD is involved in the selection exercise. Both public and private universities CoDs are normally involved in the academic staff shortlisting exercise in order to guide the rest of the members of the shortlisting committee on the relevant skills required by the job holder. On being asked whether the departments normally help the HR department in developing the shortlisting marking scheme, the following were the responses from public and private universities respectively; 22 (15.2 %),17 (29.8 %)strongly agreed, 47 (32.4%),28 (49.1%) agreed, 20 (13.8%),12 (21.1%) neither agreed or disagreed, 30 (20.7%),0 (00.0%) disagreed and 26 (17.9%),0 (00.0%) strongly disagreed. From these results majority of the respondents from public and private universities 69 (47.6%), 45 (78.9%) agreed respectively. The findings are in agreement with the fact that the CoDs were normally involved in the development of the shortlisting marking scheme since the marking scheme is normally developed as per the advertisement.

On being asked whether the interviewing exercise does not involve any member of the department, the following were the responses from public and private universities ; 12 (8.3 %),0 (00.0 %)strongly agreed, 15 (10.3%),0 (00.0%) agreed, 41 (28.3%),0 (00.0%) neither agreed or disagreed, 42 (29.0%),24 (42.1%) disagreed and 35 (24.1%), 33 (57.9%) strongly disagreed. From these results majority of the respondents from public and private universities 77 (53.1%),57 (100.0%) disagreed respectively. Since the CoD is normally involved in requisitioning of the required academic staff in his/her department then he/she must be involved in the interviewing exercise since he/she is the key determinant on the kind of academic staff required by the department. On being asked whether there are many types of interviews normally carried out to determine the best candidate, the following were the responses from public and private universities respectively ; 5 (3.4 %),6 (10.5 %)strongly agreed, 26 (17.9%),0 (00.0%) agreed, 56 (38.6%),6 (10.5%) neither agreed or disagreed, 25 (17.2%),24 (42.1%) disagreed and 33 (22.8%), 21 (36.8%) strongly disagreed. From these results majority of the respondents from public and private universities 58 (40.0%), 45 (78.9%) disagreed respectively. The findings showed that both public and private universities use only one type of interviewing method. This could be because the method has been used over time and proven to be the best for this cadre of staff.

On being asked whether the CoD has a say on who to be employed in their respective departments, the following were the responses from public and private universities respectively ; 17 (11.7 %),27 (47.4 %)strongly agreed, 21 (14.5%),24 (42.1%) agreed, 19 (13.1%),6 (10.5%) neither agreed or disagreed, 63 (43.4%),0 (0.00%) disagreed and 25 (17.2%), 0 (0.00%) strongly disagreed. From the results majority of the respondents 88 (60.6%) disagreed from public universities and 51 (89.5%) agreed from private universities. The findings from public universities were negative since the new entrants are employed as per the CUE guidelines, so if the views of the CoD are at variance then they will not be followed while in private universities, the CoD has a say since the CUE guidelines are normally customized to suit their needs as at the time of staff selection. Findings on whether the CoD normally orients the new staff to the department and the university as a whole from public and private universities were;21(14.5%),39 (68.4%) strongly agreed,46 (31.7%),12 (21.1%) agreed,32 (22.1%),6 (10.5%) neither agreed or disagreed,36 (24.8%),0 (0.00%) disagreed and 10 (6.9%),0 (00.0%) strongly disagreed respectively. Majority of the respondents from public and private universities 67 (46.2%), 51 (89.5%) agreed respectively. This practice is common in public and private universities. When the right people are hired, it is important that they work in a favorable work environment so that they are able to increase the output of the organization. Gupta (2002) agrees with the findings of this study by asserting that, if workers are mentally assured that they are operating under safe working conditions, their morale will be high and they will work with more consideration and thus

productivity will increase. Another way to increase productivity is when the staff is given a clear job description on the first day that he/she is hired. Stahl, *et.al.* (2007) says that institutions can improve productivity by giving employees clear and specific descriptions of their job, roles, responsibilities, performance, performance expectation and job requirements.

Findings on when new staff report are normally oriented to the university and to the departments by the HR department from public and private universities were;13(9.0%),27 (47.4%) strongly agreed,28 (19.3%),24 (42.1%) agreed,52 (35.9%),0 (0.00%) neither agreed or disagreed,32 (22.1%),6 (10.5%) disagreed and 20 (13.8%),0 (00.0%) strongly disagreed respectively. Majority of the respondents from public and private universities 52 (35.9%), 51 (89.5%) agreed respectively and 52 (35.9%) respondents from public universities neither agreed nor disagreed. The findings from public universities show that respondents were not sure whether the orientation was normally done by the HR department or not while respondents from private universities were sure that the HR department normally carried out the function. Communication of relevant information to one's job is very critical since they will be in a better position to understand the institution in which they work in and therefore increase their retention level.

Findings on whether academic staffs are normally placed correctly in the departments from public and private universities were;25(17.2%),27 (47.4%) strongly agreed,33 (22.8%),24 (42.1%) agreed,25 (17.2%),0 (0.00%) neither agreed or disagreed,30 (20.7%),6 (10.5%) disagreed and 32 (22.1%),0 (00.0%) strongly disagreed respectively. Majority of the respondents from both public and private universities 62 (42.8%), 51 (89.5%) agreed respectively. These results are in agreement that private and public universities follow the CUE guidelines on staff selection leading to the correct placement of the new hires'.

Findings on whether academic staffs are normally provided with offices from public and private universities were;4(2.8%),27 (47.4%) strongly agreed,23 (15.9%),18 (31.6%) agreed,50 (34.5%),6 (10.5%) neither agreed or disagreed,39 (26.9%),6 (10.5%) disagreed and 29 (20.0%),0 (00.0%) strongly disagreed respectively. Majority of the respondents from public universities 68 (46.9%), disagreed and majority of respondents from private universities 45 (79%) agreed. The findings show that most academic staffs in private universities are provided with offices while their counterparts from public universities do not have offices. Physical infrastructure in public universities is a major problem. Most academic staffs operate from their vehicles or common rooms within the universities making it difficult for students to access their lecturers for consultation. Lack of offices has also made most academic staffs to only report for duty when they have lectures thus reducing their commitment level in the institutions in which they work.

As evidenced in strategic plans and brochures, public universities have concentrated all their resources in catering for the student's welfare which includes construction of learning facilities forgetting the employee's needs. The rise of many universities to meet the need of the university education in Kenya has also affected the provision of offices for the academic staffs since students have been given priority in terms of catering for their physical infrastructure and equipment. The service provider (academic staff) has to find their own way of working in terms of finding where to work from and equipment for use within the public universities in Kenya.

From the qualitative data on whether failure to involve the CoD in the selection of academic staff to his/her department was one of the major reasons why academic staffs left universities for employment elsewhere reiterated that that was one of the major reasons. The responses indicated that failure to regard the CoD as the key stakeholder would make them not to receive the new entrants well. Further, it was stated that CoDs should always be the source of the requisition for new staffs in their respective departments. In public

universities, the respondents stated that that lack of involvement of the CoD in academic staff selection was one of the reasons why staffs left but it was not major. This was because CoDs in public universities engage more in academic oriented roles than administrative roles. This is because of the large numbers of students in comparison to the lean academic staff population in the public universities. The CoDs in public universities are involved more in curriculum development and review, course allocation, playing the roles of academic advisors and internal chief examiner, managing the staffs and students in their departments among other duties. These multiple roles culminate in work overload not commensurate to the remuneration paid thus demotivating the CoDs and thus reducing their intention to stay long in the university.

The development of a selection programme is a formidable task when dealing with the measurement issues. It becomes even more complex when the legal policies are added that must be considered. These policies influence the records that must be kept on all employment decisions, the determination of fair treatment of all applicants, and the methods for identifying the job relatedness of selection devices, Barrick et al. (2011). Conversely, if the organization does not attend to these legal policies in the development and use of selection programmes, it will be vulnerable to charges of discrimination. It is imperative that the HR specialist has a thorough understanding of the legal guidelines for selection decisions. Furthermore, every selection programme should have two objectives, firstly, maximizing the probability of making accurate selection decisions about applicants, and secondly, ensuring that these selection decisions are carried out in such a manner as to minimize the chance of a judgment of unfair discrimination being made against the organization, Barrick et al. (2011). The two are not mutually exclusive objectives and overlap considerably in necessary procedures and data. HR professionals are the key individuals within organizations who must develop and enforce policies and procedures that protect members of the diversified workforce against unfair discrimination. The various legislative acts that apply to recruitment and selection must be understood in detail by HR administrators and any other staff involved in the recruitment and selection exercise.

Contrarily, results from interviews on whether or not involving the CoD in the academic staff selection exercise contributed to the staff leaving, showed that CoDs were always involved in the selection process but since the job requirements are as stipulated by CUE it compels CoDs to comply. On promotion, teaching experience is not regarded as key before an academic staff is promoted but possessing a PhD, publications in refereed journals and attraction of funds to the institution are the major requirements that an academic staff should meet before being considered for promotion to a higher level. The interview results reiterated that CUE requirements on employment of staff had made it difficult for the academic staffs to be selected and retained within the same universities for a long time. This was because some universities customize the CUE requirements to meet their specific needs. Therefore, it is at the jurisdiction of an individual university to determine how they select their staffs in the various academic positions therefore contributing to reduced or increased academic staff retention.

### 3.3 Multiple Regression Analysis

**Table 3.4: Regression Results for Selection Practices**

<b>Model Summary</b>							
type of university	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
public	1	.343 <sup>a</sup>	.117	.111	4.314		
private	1	.613 <sup>a</sup>	.376	.365	1.806		
a. Predictors: (Constant), Staff selection							
<b>ANOVA<sup>a</sup></b>							
type of university	Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
public	1	Regression	354.096	1	354.096	19.024	.000 <sup>b</sup>
		Residual	2661.669	143	18.613		
		Total	3015.766	144			
private	1	Regression	108.169	1	108.169	33.180	.000 <sup>b</sup>
		Residual	179.304	55	3.260		
		Total	287.474	56			
a. Dependent Variable: staff retention							
b. Predictors: (Constant), Staff selection							
<b>Coefficients<sup>a</sup></b>							
type of university	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error			
public	1	(Constant)	7.423	1.400		5.303	.000
		Staff selection	.206	.047	.343	4.362	.000
		(Constant)	25.068	1.214		20.645	.000
private	1	Staff selection	-.328	.057	-.613	-5.760	.000

a. Dependent Variable: staff retention

Source: Research data, 2016

From the results presented in Table 3.4, staff selection accounts for 11.7% of the unit staff retention in public universities and 37.6% of staff retention in private universities. The increase is statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) with  $p = 0.000$  for both public and private universities.

From the table of coefficients, the regression equation is:

$$\text{Staff Retention} = 7.423 + (0.206 \times \text{Staff Selection}_{\text{Public}}) + (25.068 \times \text{Staff Selection}_{\text{Private}}) + (-0.328 \times \text{Staff Selection}_{\text{Private}})$$

In the hypothesis criteria, the study was to reject  $H_{01}$  if  $\beta_2 \neq 0$ . From the results in Table 3.4, the correlation between the mean of Selection Practices and the mean of Staff retention had a beta term  $\beta_2 = .343$  at  $p = 0.00$  for public universities. For public universities, the study therefore rejects the null hypothesis and concludes that selection practices have a statistically significant positive influence on academic staff retention in universities in Kenya. However, for private universities the correlation between the mean of Staff Selection Practices and the mean of Staff retention had a beta term  $\beta_2 = -0.613$  at  $p = 0.000$ . The study therefore accepted the  $H_{a2}$  and concluded that Staff Selection Practices significantly influence academic staff retention in private universities in Kenya.

### 4.0 Conclusions

The study purposed to determine the influence of selection practices on academic staff retention in universities in Kenya. From the findings of this study, it was observed that public universities have only one method of interviewing unlike private universities that have several methods. Selection exercise should be taken seriously by public universities and due diligence be done on the candidates who qualify to ascertain that the best candidate has been selected. On testing the hypothesis, the correlation between the



mean of Selection Practices and the mean of Staff retention had a beta term  $\beta_2 = .343$  at  $p=0.00$  for public universities. However, for private universities the correlation between the mean of Staff Selection Practices and the mean of Staff retention had a beta term  $\beta_2 = -.613$  at  $p=0.000$ . The study rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that selection practices significantly influence academic staff retention in universities in Kenya.

## References

- Amin, M. E. (2005). *Social science research: Conception, methodology and analysis*. Kampala: Makerere University Printery.
- Ballantyne, I. (2009). Recruiting and selecting staff in organizations. In S. Gilmore and Williams, S.(eds) *Human Resource Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barrick, M., Feild, H.S and Gatewood, R.D 2011. *Selection in Human Resource Management*. 7th Ed. South-Western:Canada.
- Commission for University Education (2015). *Status of Universities in Kenya*. [Online] Available:<http://www.cue.or.ke>.
- Creswell, J.W. , & Tashakkori, A. (2007). Developing publishable mixed methods manuscripts. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1,107-111
- Gamage, A. S. (2014). *Recruitment and selection practices in manufacturing SMEs in Japan: An analysis of the link with business performance*. *Ruhuna Journal of Management and Finance*, 1(1), 37 - 52
- Government of Kenya (GoK), (2006). *Transformation of Higher Education and Training in Kenya*: Report of the Public Universities Inspection Board. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Government of Kenya (GoK), (2007). *Code of Regulations for Civil Servants Kenya*:Nairobi. Government Printers.
- Gupta, A., Govindarajan, V., (2002). Cultivating a global mindset. *Academy of Management Executive* 16 (1), 116–126.
- Kipkebut, D. J. (2010). *Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction in Higher Educational Institutions: The Kenyan Case*. PhD Thesis, Middlesex University.
- Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) *Research methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Africa Centre of Technology Studies, Nairobi.
- Mugenda, A.G. (2009) *Social science research*. Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Ng'ethe, J.M., Iravo, M.E. and Namusonge, G.S.(2012). Determinants of Academic Staff Retention in Public Universities in Kenya: Empirical Review. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(13), 205 - 212.
- Ofori, D., & Aryeetey, M. (2011). Recruitment and selection practices in small and medium enterprises. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 2(3):45-60.
- Selesho, J. M. (2014). Academic staff retention as a human resource factor: University Perspective. *International Business and Economics Research Journal*, 13 (2).
- Simiyu, A. N. (2012). *Performance Contract as a Tool for Improving Performance in Local Authorities in Kenya*. PhD Thesis. Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.
- Stahl, G., Bjorkman, I., Farndale, E., Morris, S., Paauwe, J., Stiles, P., Trevor, J., Wright, P., (2007). *Global talent management: how leading multinationals build and sustain their talent pipeline*: INSEAD Working Paper Series