

An Analytical Study of Human Resource Management Practices and Faculty Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutions in the National Capital Region (NCR)

Neeraj Sehgal

Research Scholar, School of Business, Sushant University, Gurugram

Ashish Kumar

Assistant professor, School of Business, Sushant University, Gurugram

Abstract

This study investigates the influence of Human Resource Management (HRM) practices on faculty motivation, job satisfaction, retention, and academic productivity in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in India. Using a descriptive research design, data were collected from 120 faculty members across public and private universities through a structured questionnaire covering five HRM dimensions: recruitment and selection, training and development, performance appraisal, compensation, and employee welfare. Descriptive and regression analyses reveal that HRM practices are moderately implemented, with training and development and employee welfare being rated as the highest. Training and development emerged as the strongest predictor of motivation, satisfaction, and retention, while compensation had the most significant influence on retention. HRM practices collectively showed a substantial positive effect on academic productivity. The findings highlight the critical role of strategic HRM in enhancing faculty outcomes and institutional performance, offering valuable insights for improving HRM frameworks in HEIs.

Keywords: HRM practices, Higher Education Institutions, Faculty satisfaction, Recruitment, Performance appraisal, NCR.

1. Introduction

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) increasingly recognize that their long-term competitiveness and academic quality depend on the effective management of their human resources. As faculty members constitute the intellectual and operational backbone of universities, Human Resource Management (HRM) practices have a direct influence on their satisfaction, motivation, and performance. Studies across various educational settings confirm that well-structured HRM systems, encompassing recruitment, training, performance appraisal, compensation, promotion, and work environment, serve as critical levers for enhancing employee commitment, job satisfaction, and institutional outcomes (Alharbi et al., 2022; Amin et al., 2014; Manzoor et al., 2019).

Faculty satisfaction has emerged as a central construct in HRM research due to its strong association with productivity, retention, and teaching quality. In academic institutions, job satisfaction is shaped not only by HRM policies but also by contextual factors such as job autonomy, workload, work–life balance, career advancement, and the socio-psychological

climate of the workplace. Empirical studies have shown that autonomy enhances intrinsic motivation and contributes positively to performance and creativity, particularly in knowledge-based roles such as teaching and research (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2011; Jaiswal & Dhar, 2017; Johari et al., 2018). Conversely, high workload and poor work–life balance negatively affect job satisfaction and overall performance among university lecturers (Meilani et al., 2022; Fairchild et al., 2012).

Compensation and promotion opportunities remain among the most influential determinants of satisfaction in higher education. When faculty perceive that reward systems and promotional criteria are equitable, motivation and organizational commitment improve significantly (Mustapha & Zakaria, 2013; Rathidevi & Brindha, 2020). Similarly, supervisor support and developmental initiatives, such as training and mentorship programs, enhance employee retention and strengthen institutional loyalty (Bibi et al., 2018; Haryono et al., 2020).

In recent years, global challenges, including digital transformation and the COVID-19 crisis, have further underscored the importance of adaptive HRM strategies. HRM approaches that integrate technology, flexibility, and employee well-being have been shown to enhance job attitudes, resilience, and organizational performance (Bieńkowska et al., 2022; Farhan et al., 2021). Moreover, sustainable HRM frameworks, which emphasize fairness, development, and empowerment, contribute to long-term job satisfaction and reduce turnover tendencies among academic staff (Manzoor et al., 2019; Khan et al., 2020).

Despite these developments, significant gaps persist in understanding how HRM practices collectively influence faculty satisfaction in higher education systems, especially in developing and transitional contexts. Prior research highlights inconsistencies in HRM implementation, lack of strategic alignment, and limited support mechanisms in academic organizations (Iqbal et al., 2011; Nor, 2018; Kavanaugh et al., 2006). Furthermore, demographic and institutional variations often shape how faculty perceive HRM policies, suggesting the need for localized and empirically grounded investigations (Kooij et al., 2010; Yucel & Bektas, 2012).

Given this backdrop, the present study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of HRM practices and their influence on **faculty satisfaction** within Higher Education Institutions. By integrating key variables such as training and development, compensation, promotion opportunities, performance appraisal, job autonomy, workload, supervisor support, work–life balance, and institutional environment, the study seeks to deepen the understanding of how HRM mechanisms shape faculty experiences and contribute to organizational effectiveness. The insights derived from this study are expected to support policymakers and educational leaders in designing evidence-based HRM strategies that foster faculty well-being, enhance institutional performance, and strengthen the overall quality of higher education.

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Theoretical Foundations

Human Resource Management (HRM) research is grounded in several foundational theories that explain how organizational practices influence employee attitudes, motivation, and performance. Social Exchange Theory (SET) proposes that employees reciprocate organizational support with stronger commitment, satisfaction, and performance (Bibi et al., 2018; Sepahvand & Bagherzadeh, 2021). Similarly, Self-Determination Theory (SDT) emphasizes autonomy,

competence, and relatedness as essential psychological needs that fuel intrinsic motivation and enhance performance (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2011). Within HRM scholarship, Ability–Motivation–Opportunity (AMO) Theory suggests that effective HRM practices enhance performance by developing employee abilities (training), strengthening motivation (compensation, appraisal), and offering opportunities to contribute meaningfully (autonomy, participation) (Amin et al., 2014; Manzoor et al., 2019). These theories collectively provide a conceptual lens for understanding faculty satisfaction within Higher Education Institutions, where autonomy, career opportunities, workload balance, intrinsic motivation, and professional development play decisive roles in shaping job satisfaction and performance (Jaiswal & Dhar, 2017; Johari et al., 2018). Thus, theoretical perspectives consistently emphasize that HRM systems influence faculty behaviour not only through structural mechanisms but also by fulfilling psychological and socio-emotional needs, making them central to academic workforce management.

2.2 Empirical Literature

Empirical research across developing and developed educational systems reinforces the importance of strategic HRM practices in shaping faculty satisfaction, retention, and performance. Studies consistently show that well-implemented HRM practices, such as training, compensation, promotion, and performance appraisal, lead to better employee outcomes (Alharbi et al., 2022; Amin et al., 2014; Alsayyed et al., 2023). Training and development have been found to improve retention and strengthen faculty motivation, especially when reinforced by supervisor support (Bibi et al., 2018; Haryono et al., 2020), while structured development opportunities enhance employee capability and reduce turnover (Hong et al., 2012; Kudaibergenov et al., 2021). Compensation and promotion remain strong predictors of job satisfaction, as demonstrated by Mustapha and Zakaria (2013) and Khan et al. (2020), who observed that fair rewards reduce turnover and enhance faculty morale. Another major theme in HRM research is job autonomy, which has a significant influence on creativity, intrinsic motivation, and performance (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2011; Jaiswal & Dhar, 2017). Workload and work–life balance also play critical roles, with empirical evidence showing that excessive workload reduces satisfaction and performance (Meilani et al., 2022; Fairchild et al., 2012), while supportive HR environments enhance well-being and productivity (Johari et al., 2018). Recent studies highlight how pandemic-driven HRM changes shaped job attitudes, with COVID-19-oriented HR systems improving employee adaptability and organizational performance (Bieńkowska et al., 2022). Consistent with AMO and SET assumptions, empirical findings collectively confirm that HRM practices, training, compensation, appraisal, autonomy, workload management, and technological support, substantially influence faculty satisfaction and institutional performance in HEIs.

3. Research Gap and Problem Statement

Although numerous studies acknowledge the significance of HRM practices in shaping employee attitudes and performance, existing research in higher education remains fragmented and lacks an integrated perspective. Prior work demonstrates the influence of training, compensation, performance appraisal, and promotion on employee satisfaction and organizational outcomes (Amin et al., 2014; Alharbi et al., 2022; Mustapha & Zakaria, 2013);

however, most of these studies focus on non-academic sectors or examine isolated HRM components rather than a comprehensive framework linking multiple HRM dimensions to faculty satisfaction. Even research conducted in HEIs, such as Hong et al. (2012), Khan et al. (2020), and Kudaibergenov et al. (2021), reveals inconsistencies in HRM implementation and a limited exploration of psychological variables, including autonomy, intrinsic motivation, and workload. Although theoretical perspectives, such as Self-Determination Theory and AMO Theory, highlight the importance of autonomy, motivation, and opportunity in shaping performance (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2011), empirical studies in higher education have seldom integrated these constructs with HRM practices. Recent insights on digital HRM and COVID-19-responsive HR strategies (Bienkowska et al., 2022; Farhan et al., 2021) further underscore shifts in employee expectations, yet these dynamics remain underexamined within existing HRM–faculty satisfaction models. Thus, there is a clear gap in synthesizing structural HRM practices and psychological job factors into a unified model explaining faculty satisfaction in contemporary HEIs.

Despite the centrality of faculty to institutional effectiveness, many higher education institutions continue to face persistent challenges related to faculty dissatisfaction, including limited career advancement, inadequate compensation, high workload, insufficient autonomy, and inconsistent HRM support systems. Evidence shows that ineffective HRM practices contribute to reduced motivation, higher turnover, and weaker organizational commitment among academic staff (Khan et al., 2020; Mustapha & Zakaria, 2013; Sepahvand & Bagherzadeh, 2021). Conversely, studies indicate that job autonomy, supportive work environments, training opportunities, and balanced workloads significantly enhance satisfaction and job performance (Johari et al., 2018; Meilani et al., 2022; Bibi et al., 2018). However, the collective impact of these HRM practices and psychological job characteristics on faculty satisfaction remains insufficiently explored. Therefore, the present study seeks to address the lack of empirical clarity by examining how an integrated set of HRM practices, including training, compensation, promotion, appraisal systems, autonomy, workload, and work–life balance, shapes faculty satisfaction in Higher Education Institutions, thereby offering actionable insights for strengthening academic HRM frameworks.

4. Objectives of the Study

- To examine the extent to which key HRM practices—recruitment and selection, training and development, performance appraisal, compensation, and employee welfare—are implemented in Higher Education Institutions in India.
- To analyze the influence of these HRM practices on faculty motivation, job satisfaction, and retention across public and private universities.
- To evaluate how effective HRM practices contribute to enhancing academic productivity and overall institutional performance in Higher Education Institutions.

5. Methodology Adopted

The present study employed a descriptive research design to investigate the impact of key Human Resource Management (HRM) practices, including recruitment and selection, training and development, performance appraisal, compensation, and employee welfare, on faculty

motivation, job satisfaction, and retention in Higher Education Institutions. Primary data were collected from a sample of 120 faculty members, drawn from both private and public universities, to ensure representation across different academic disciplines and institutional settings. A structured questionnaire based on validated HRM and employee outcome scales was used to gather responses on a five-point Likert scale, capturing faculty perceptions of HRM practices and their resulting motivational and satisfaction levels. The sampling approach ensured inclusivity and diversity, and the instrument underwent expert validation to ensure clarity and relevance. Data were coded and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques in SPSS, enabling the study to summarize faculty perceptions and explore the relationships among HRM practices, motivation, satisfaction, and retention. The methodological approach ensured reliability and rigour in assessing how HRM practices contribute to academic productivity and institutional effectiveness in the Indian higher education context.

6. Data Analysis and Discussion

The demographic profile of the 120 faculty respondents reveals nearly balanced gender representation (51.7% male and 48.3% female), indicating equal participation from both groups in academic roles. Most respondents fall within the 31–40 age range (35%), followed by those in the 41–50 age range (27.5%), indicating a predominantly mid-career workforce that is likely seeking growth, stability, and development opportunities. Most participants hold Ph.D. qualifications (59.2%), reflecting a highly educated faculty body with strong potential for research and academic contributions, while representation from Master's, M.Phil, and Post-Doctoral degree holders adds diversity to academic backgrounds.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Faculty Respondents

| Variable | Category | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Gender | Male | 62 | 51.7 |
| | Female | 58 | 48.3 |
| Age | Below 30 | 18 | 15.0 |
| | 31–40 | 42 | 35.0 |
| | 41–50 | 33 | 27.5 |
| | 51–60 | 19 | 15.8 |
| | Above 60 | 8 | 6.7 |
| Qualification | Master's | 22 | 18.3 |
| | M.Phil | 17 | 14.2 |
| | Ph.D. | 71 | 59.2 |
| | Post-Doctoral | 10 | 8.3 |
| Type of Institution | Public | 52 | 43.3 |
| | Private | 68 | 56.7 |
| Experience | 0–5 years | 28 | 23.3 |
| | 6–10 years | 39 | 32.5 |
| | 11–15 years | 27 | 22.5 |
| | >15 years | 26 | 21.7 |

The presence of respondents from both public (43.3%) and private institutions (56.7%) ensures the broad applicability of findings across HEIs. Experience levels are well distributed, with the largest share (32.5%) comprising individuals with 6–10 years of experience, followed by other groups in nearly equal proportions. These demographic characteristics suggest that institutions must adopt HRM practices that cater to a qualified and diverse faculty, providing training and development for early-career staff, growth opportunities for mid-career faculty, and recognition or flexible roles for senior academics, to enhance motivation, satisfaction, and long-term retention.

Table 2: Reliability Analysis for HRM Constructs

| Construct | Items | Cronbach's Alpha (α) |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Recruitment & Selection | 3 | 0.81 |
| Training & Development | 3 | 0.85 |
| Performance Appraisal | 3 | 0.83 |
| Compensation | 3 | 0.79 |
| Employee Welfare | 3 | 0.82 |

The reliability analysis shows that all HRM constructs used in the study are highly reliable, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.79 to 0.85. Recruitment and Selection (0.81), Training and Development (0.85), Performance Appraisal (0.83), and Employee Welfare (0.82) all demonstrate strong internal consistency, indicating that the items within each scale effectively measure the same concept. Even Compensation, with an alpha of 0.79, falls within the acceptable range for social science research. These results indicate that the questionnaire used to assess HRM practices is reliable and produces consistent responses, allowing the analysis to proceed with confidence that the measures are both stable and accurate.

6.1 Extent of HRM Practices Implementation in HEIs

The descriptive statistics show that key HRM practices in Higher Education Institutions are implemented at moderately strong levels, with Recruitment & Selection ($M = 3.84$), Training & Development ($M = 3.76$), and Employee Welfare ($M = 3.67$) receiving comparatively higher ratings. This suggests that institutions are making consistent efforts to hire qualified faculty, provide developmental opportunities, and ensure basic welfare support.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for HRM Practice Variables

| Construct | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
|-------------------------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Recruitment & Selection | 3.84 | 0.72 | 1 | 5 |
| Training & Development | 3.76 | 0.79 | 1 | 5 |
| Performance Appraisal | 3.58 | 0.83 | 1 | 5 |
| Compensation | 3.42 | 0.88 | 1 | 5 |
| Employee Welfare | 3.67 | 0.81 | 1 | 5 |
| Faculty Motivation | 3.89 | 0.71 | 1 | 5 |
| Job Satisfaction | 3.74 | 0.76 | 1 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|------|---|---|
| Retention Intent | 3.61 | 0.82 | 1 | 5 |
| Academic Productivity | 3.92 | 0.69 | 1 | 5 |

However, lower mean scores in Performance Appraisal (M = 3.58) and Compensation (M = 3.42) indicate areas that require improvement, as weaknesses in evaluation fairness and financial rewards may limit faculty satisfaction and long-term commitment. The moderately high means for Motivation (3.89), Job Satisfaction (3.74), Retention Intent (3.61), and Academic Productivity (3.92) suggest that HRM practices, when effectively implemented, positively influence faculty experiences and performance. These results highlight that strengthening compensation structures and appraisal systems could further enhance overall HRM effectiveness and better support the first objective of assessing HRM implementation in HEIs.

6.2 HRM Influence on Motivation, Satisfaction & Retention

The correlation-based hypothesis testing results indicate that all proposed hypotheses (H1–H5) are supported, demonstrating strong and significant positive relationships between HRM practices and faculty outcomes, consistent with prior research. Recruitment and Selection show significant associations with motivation, satisfaction, and retention, supporting H1 and aligning with Iqbal et al. (2011), who also found that transparent and merit-based hiring enhances faculty morale and institutional commitment. Training and Development exhibits the strongest correlations across all outcomes, confirming H2 and echoing the findings of Alharbi et al. (2022) and Manzoor et al. (2019), who emphasized that continuous professional development is a key driver of motivation and retention. Performance Appraisal also shows significant positive correlations, supporting H3 and aligning with Ramada (2020) and Jaiswal & Dhar (2017), who noted that fair and constructive evaluations positively shape employee attitudes. Compensation demonstrates a particularly strong relationship with retention, validating H4 and reflecting earlier results by Khan et al. (2020) and Mustapha & Zakaria (2013), which highlight financial incentives as a major factor in retaining academic staff. Employee Welfare presents solid positive correlations with all three outcomes, supporting H5 and reinforcing evidence from Meilani et al. (2022) and Fairchild et al. (2012), who found that supportive work environments significantly improve motivation and satisfaction. Overall, the significance of all correlations ($p < .01$) confirms that HRM practices are critical determinants of faculty motivation, job satisfaction, and retention, consistent with established HRM literature in higher education.

Table 4: Correlation Matrix (HRM Practices with Motivation, Job Satisfaction & Retention)

| Variables | Motivation | Job Satisfaction | Retention Intent | Hypothesis |
|-------------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Recruitment & Selection | .63** | .58** | .46** | H1 (Supported) |
| Training & Development | .67** | .63** | .52** | H2(Supported) |
| Performance Appraisal | .59** | .57** | .49** | H3(Supported) |
| Compensation | .49** | .53** | .55** | H4(Supported) |
| Employee Welfare | .61** | .60** | .50** | H5(Supported) |

Note: $p < .01$

The regression findings in Table 5 generally align with prior HRM research, confirming the relevance of established theories in higher education settings. Support for **H6a and H6b** aligns with earlier studies by Iqbal et al. (2011), who found that fair recruitment enhances motivation and satisfaction. The nonsignificant result for **H6c** is consistent with Mustapha and Zakaria (2013), who noted that retention depends more on ongoing HR support than initial hiring. Strong support for **H7a–H7c** is consistent with Alharbi et al. (2022) and Manzoor et al. (2019), reinforcing that training and development remain one of the most impactful HRM components. The significance of **H8a–H8c** confirms findings by Ramada (2020) and Jaiswal & Dhar (2017), showing that transparent appraisal systems improve faculty attitudes. Mixed outcomes for compensation, with **H9b and H9c supported** but **H9a not**, mirror Khan et al. (2020), who noted that compensation predicts satisfaction and retention more than intrinsic motivation. Finally, support for **H10a–H10c** aligns with Meilani et al. (2022), demonstrating that welfare provisions and supportive work environments significantly strengthen faculty commitment. Overall, the results validate past literature and reaffirm that development-oriented HRM practices are crucial for improving faculty outcomes.

Table 5: Regression Results for Faculty Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Retention Intent

| Hypothesis Code | Statement | Outcome Variable | β | t-value | p-value | Decision |
|-----------------|--|------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| H6a | Recruitment & Selection → Motivation | Motivation | .21 | 2.68 | .008 | Supported |
| H6b | Recruitment & Selection → Job Satisfaction | Job Satisfaction | .18 | 2.32 | .022 | Supported |
| H6c | Recruitment & Selection → Retention Intent | Retention Intent | .14 | 1.88 | .063 | Not Supported |
| H7a | Training & Development → Motivation | Motivation | .29 | 3.84 | .000 | Supported |
| H7b | Training & Development → Job Satisfaction | Job Satisfaction | .26 | 3.51 | .001 | Supported |
| H7c | Training & Development → Retention Intent | Retention Intent | .23 | 2.96 | .004 | Supported |
| H8a | Performance Appraisal → Motivation | Motivation | .17 | 2.23 | .027 | Supported |
| H8b | Performance Appraisal → Job Satisfaction | Job Satisfaction | .19 | 2.48 | .015 | Supported |
| H9c | Performance Appraisal → Retention Intent | Retention Intent | .16 | 2.14 | .034 | Supported |
| H10a | Compensation → Motivation | Motivation | .11 | 1.69 | .093 | Not Supported |
| H11b | Compensation → Job Satisfaction | Job Satisfaction | .21 | 2.97 | .004 | Supported |
| H11c | Compensation → Retention Intent | Retention Intent | .27 | 3.68 | .000 | Supported |
| H12a | Employee Welfare → Motivation | Motivation | .24 | 3.16 | .002 | Supported |
| H12b | Employee Welfare → Job Satisfaction | Job Satisfaction | .22 | 2.85 | .005 | Supported |
| H12c | Employee Welfare → Retention Intent | Retention Intent | .18 | 2.41 | .018 | Supported |

Table 6: Model Fit and Effect Sizes

| Outcome Variable | R ² | Adjusted R ² | F-value | p-value | Effect Size f ² |
|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------|---------|----------------------------|
| Motivation | .61 | .59 | 35.67 | < .001 | 1.56 (large) |
| Job Satisfaction | .58 | .56 | 31.42 | < .001 | 1.38 (large) |
| Retention Intent | .50 | .48 | 22.78 | < .001 | 1.00 (large) |

Effect Size (Cohen, 1988):

0.02 = small, 0.15 = medium, 0.35 = large → All models demonstrate **large effects**.

6.3 HRM Impact on Academic Productivity

The correlation results indicate that all HRM practices, Recruitment & Selection, Training & Development, Performance Appraisal, Compensation, and Employee Welfare, have significant positive relationships with academic productivity, thereby supporting hypotheses **H13–H17**. The strong correlation between recruitment and selection and academic productivity ($r = .57^{**}$) supports **H13** and aligns with earlier findings by Kudaibergenov et al. (2021), who noted that merit-based and competency-driven hiring led to higher institutional performance. Training & Development demonstrates the strongest association ($r = .64^{**}$), supporting **H14** and corroborating evidence from Alharbi et al. (2022) and Manzoor et al. (2019), which highlight that continuous faculty development directly enhances teaching quality, research output, and overall productivity. The significant correlation between Performance Appraisal and academic productivity ($r = .61^{**}$) supports **H15**, aligning with Jaiswal and Dhar (2017), who found that fair, developmental appraisals improve creative performance and academic contributions. Compensation also shows a meaningful relationship ($r = .48^{**}$), supporting **H16** and consistent with Khan et al. (2020), who emphasized that competitive compensation motivates faculty to perform better and remain committed to academic duties. Lastly, the significant relationship between Employee Welfare and productivity ($r = .58^{**}$) supports **H17** and resonates with Meilani et al. (2022), who showed that supportive work environments enhance faculty engagement and output. Overall, these results affirm that stronger HRM systems directly contribute to improved academic productivity, validating the central role of HR practices in elevating institutional performance in Higher Education Institutions.

Table 7: Correlation – HRM Variables with Academic Productivity

| HRM Construct | Academic Productivity (r) | Hypothesis Code | Hypothesis Statement | Result |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-----------|
| Recruitment & Selection | .57** | H13 | Recruitment & Selection → Academic Productivity | Supported |
| Training & Development | .64** | H14 | Training & Development → Academic Productivity | Supported |
| Performance Appraisal | .61** | H15 | Performance Appraisal → Academic Productivity | Supported |
| Compensation | .48** | H16 | Compensation → Academic Productivity | Supported |
| Employee Welfare | .58** | H17 | Employee Welfare → Academic Productivity | Supported |

Note: $p < .01$

The regression results for academic productivity support most hypotheses (H18–H22), indicating that HRM practices have a significant impact on faculty output and institutional performance. Recruitment & Selection has a positive and significant effect on academic productivity ($\beta = .19$, $p = .012$), supporting **H18** and aligning with Kudaibergenov et al. (2021), who emphasized that hiring qualified, competent faculty enhances institutional outcomes. Training & Development emerges as the strongest predictor ($\beta = .31$, $p < .001$), supporting **H19** and reinforcing findings by Alharbi et al. (2022) and Manzoor et al. (2019), who documented that continuous skill development directly boosts teaching effectiveness and research productivity. Performance Appraisal also has a significant impact ($\beta = .24$, $p = .002$), supporting **H20** and echoing Jaiswal & Dhar (2017), who found that transparent evaluations strengthen employee output and organizational contribution. Compensation, although positively related, does not reach statistical significance ($\beta = 0.12$, $p = 0.078$), leading to **H21 not being supported**. This result is consistent with Khan et al. (2020), who noted that compensation may influence retention more strongly than day-to-day performance. Finally, Employee Welfare significantly predicts academic productivity ($\beta = .20$, $p = .008$), supporting **H22** and aligning with Meilani et al. (2022), who concluded that supportive work environments enhance faculty engagement and performance. Overall, these findings confirm that developmental and supportive HRM practices, particularly training, welfare, and performance appraisal, are key drivers of academic productivity in higher education institutions.

Table 8: Regression – HRM Practices Predicting Academic Productivity

| Predictor Variables | β | t-value | p-value | VIF | Hypothesis Code | Hypothesis Statement | Result |
|--|---------|---------|---------|------|-----------------|---|----------------------|
| Recruitment & Selection | .19 | 2.54 | .012 | 1.96 | H18 | Recruitment & Selection → Academic Productivity | Supported |
| Training & Development | .31 | 4.21 | .000 | 2.28 | H19 | Training & Development → Academic Productivity | Supported |
| Performance Appraisal | .24 | 3.18 | .002 | 2.12 | H20 | Performance Appraisal → Academic Productivity | Supported |
| Compensation | .12 | 1.78 | .078 | 1.83 | H21 | Compensation → Academic Productivity | Not Supported |
| Employee Welfare | .20 | 2.69 | .008 | 1.92 | H22 | Employee Welfare → Academic Productivity | Supported |
| Model Summary: $R^2 = .66$; $F = 44.38$; $p < .001$ | | | | | | | |

7. Policy Implications

The findings highlight the need for Higher Education Institutions to adopt stronger, evidence-based HRM policies that prioritize faculty development, well-being, and fair evaluation systems. Policymakers should institutionalize mandatory Training & Development frameworks, ensuring regular skill enhancement, research support, and pedagogical training to boost productivity and

motivation. Transparent and standardized performance appraisal policies must be implemented across public and private universities to reduce inconsistencies and enhance faculty trust in evaluation outcomes. Given the strong influence of compensation on retention, national and institutional policies should focus on competitive pay structures, performance-linked incentives, and clear promotion pathways to prevent faculty turnover. Additionally, welfare policies, such as health benefits, counselling support, and work–life balance initiatives, should be strengthened to create a supportive academic environment. By integrating these HRM reforms into institutional policy, HEIs can improve faculty satisfaction, enhance academic productivity, and elevate overall institutional performance.

8. Conclusion & Recommendations

This study concludes that effective HRM practices, particularly training and development, employee welfare, performance appraisal, and strategic recruitment, play a central role in enhancing faculty motivation, job satisfaction, retention, and academic productivity in higher education institutions, with compensation emerging as a key factor in retaining faculty. Based on these findings, institutions should strengthen their developmental programs, implement transparent and supportive appraisal systems, revise compensation structures to align with performance and market standards, and expand welfare initiatives that promote well-being and work–life balance. Additionally, they should establish professionally managed HR units to ensure consistent policy implementation. Together, these measures can significantly improve faculty experiences and institutional performance. Future research may further examine the impact of digital and AI-driven HRM tools on faculty outcomes to understand emerging transformations in academic human resource systems.

References:

1. Alharbi, G., Jaafar, M., & Azizi, N. S. M. (2022). A review on the impact of human resource management practices on organizations' and employees' performance. *Journal of Hunan University Natural Sciences*, 49(12), 206–217. <https://doi.org/10.55463/issn.1674-2974.49.12.21>
2. Aliberti, S., D'Elia, F., & Cherubini, D. (2023). Tips for statistical tools for research methods in exercise and sport sciences. *Physical Education Theory and Methodology*, 23(3), 470–477. <https://doi.org/10.17309/tmfv.2023.3.20>
3. Alsayyed, N. M., Sweis, R. J., & Suifan, T. (2023). Improving the quality of strategic human resource development: An integrative model for developing countries. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*, 39(1), 120–136.
4. Amin, M., Ismail, W., Rasid, A. S., & Selemani, R. (2014). The impact of human resource management practices on performance. *The TQM Journal*, 26(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-10-2011-0062>
5. Babbie, E. R., Wagner, W. E., & Zaino, J. (2023). *Adventures in social research: Data analysis using IBM SPSS statistics* (11th ed.). Sage.
6. Bibi, P., Ahmad, A., & Majid, A. H. (2018). The impact of training and development and supervisor support on employees' retention in academic institutions: The moderating role of work environment. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 20(1), 113–136. <https://doi.org/10.22146/gamaijb.24020>

7. Bienkowska, A., Koszela, A., Sałamacha, A., & Tworek, K. (2022). COVID-19-oriented HRM strategies influence job and organizational performance through job-related attitudes. *PLOS ONE*, 17(4), e0266364. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0266364>
8. Burke, W. W. (2023). *Organization change: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Sage.
9. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.
10. Dysvik, A., & Kuvaas, B. (2011). Intrinsic motivation as a moderator on the relationship between perceived job autonomy and work performance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(3), 367–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594321003590630>
11. Fairchild, S., Tobias, R., Corcoran, S., Djukic, M., Kovner, C., & Noguera, P. (2012). White and Black teachers' job satisfaction. *Urban Education*, 47(1), 170–197. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085911429582>
12. Farhan, A., Salamzadeh, Y., & Richardson, C. (2021). The impact of e-HRM on employee satisfaction and productivity: Mediating role of innovation. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(6), 5033–5050.
13. Haryono, S., Supardi, S., & Udin, U. (2020). The effect of training and job promotion on work motivation and its implications on job satisfaction: Evidence from Indonesia. *Management Science Letters*, 10(9), 2107–2112. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.1.019>
14. Hong, C., Ng, E., Hao, L., Kumar, R., & Kadiresan, V. (2012). An effectiveness of human resource management practices on employee retention in institute of higher learning: A regression analysis. *International Journal of Business Research and Management*, 3(2), 60–79.
15. Iqbal, M., Arif, M., & Abbas, F. (2011). HRM practices in public and private universities of Pakistan: A comparative study. *International Education Studies*, 4(4), 215–222. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v4n4p215>
16. Jaiswal, D., & Dhar, R. (2017). Impact of human resources practices on employee creativity in the hotel industry: The impact of job autonomy. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 16(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2016.1202035>
17. Johari, J., Tan, F. Y., & Zulkarnain, Z. T. (2018). Autonomy, workload, work-life balance, and job performance among teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(1), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-10-2016-0226>
18. Kavanaugh, J., Duffy, J., & Lilly, J. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction and demographic variables for healthcare professionals. *Management Research News*, 29(6), 304–325. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170610683842>
19. Khan, S., Khan, M., Mohmand, A., & Misbah, S. (2020). Impact of HR practices on employee turnover and job satisfaction: Evidence from Pakistani universities. *Review of Economics and Development Studies*, 6(3), 607–624. <https://doi.org/10.47067/reads.v6i3.250>
20. Kooij, D. T. A. M., Jansen, P. G. W., Dikkers, J. S. E., & De Lange, A. H. (2010). The influence of age on the associations between HR practices and both affective commitment and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(8), 1111–1136. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.666>

21. Kudaibergenov, Z., Abilkassym, A., Izatullayeva, B., Agabekova, G., & Koptayeva, G. (2021). Analysis of human resources management practices in higher education institutions: A study on Kazakh universities. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 20(2S), 1–23. <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/analysis-of-human-resources-management-practices-in-higher-education-institutions-a-study-on-kazakh-universities-10931.html>
22. Manzoor, F., Wei, L., Bányai, T., Nurunnabi, M., & Subhan, Q. (2019). An examination of sustainable HRM practices on job satisfaction: An application of training as a moderator. *Sustainability*, 11(8), Article 2263. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11082263>
23. Meilani, Y. F. C. P., Bernardo, I., & Nahar, F. H. (2022). The relationship between autonomy, workload, and work-life balance to job satisfaction and performance of female lecturers at private universities during pandemic Covid-19. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 20(3), 477–487. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2022.020.03.02>
24. Mustapha, N., & Zakaria, C. Z. (2013). The effect of promotion opportunity in influencing job satisfaction among academics in higher public institutions in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 20–26.
25. Nor, A. (2018). Enhancing employee performance through human resource management practices: A literature review. *European Journal of Human Resource Management Studies*, 2(1), 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2528901>
26. Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS (7th ed.)*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003117452>
27. Ramada, M. G. (2020). Human resources management practices, job satisfaction, and faculty performance. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 2(2), 24–35. <https://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/jweep/article/view/24>
28. Rathidevi, G., & Brindha, G. (2020). HRM and higher technical education in India: Current realities. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine*, 7(11). <https://ejmcm.com/uploads/paper/ba240ed90007664f983219ed3f9ae771.pdf>
29. Sepahvand, R., & Bagherzadeh, R. K. (2021). Strategic human resource management practices and employee retention: A study of the moderating role of job engagement. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Management Studies*, 14(2), 437–468. <https://doi.org/10.22059/ijms.2020.291391.673843>
30. Yucel, I., & Bektas, C. (2012). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and demographic characteristics among teachers in Turkey: Younger is better? *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 1598–1608. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.346>
31. Zafar, M., Sarwar, A., Zafar, A., & Sheeraz, A. (2021). Impact of compensation practices on employee job performance: An empirical study. In J. Xu et al. (Eds.), *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing* (Vol. 1191, pp. 315–324). Springer.
32. Ziglari, L. (2024). Statistical approaches to interpret multiple regression results. *Methods in Psychology*, Article 100136.