



A Study On “Teachers Perception Towards Their HR Policies”

GANESHA S

Assistant Professor

MPM Government First Grade College

Karkala, Udupi district. 574104

1. Introduction:

Human resource policies are based on various approaches of an organization. Human resource gives specific guidelines to managers on various matters concerning employment and policies of organization on different aspects of human resource management such as recruitment, promotion, composition, training, selection etc. A good HR policy provides generalized guidelines on the approach adopted by the organization. A good HR policies help organization to take corrective action. Each organization has different set of circumstances and so develops an individual set of circumstances and which helps develop an individual set of HR policies. Each organization follows and adopts different HR policies based on nature and type of organization.

Private and Government colleges both fall within the second band of education according to legislation. Both public and private colleges at some extent follow same rules and standards including having to be registered as college with the DHET (Department of higher education and training). On a more practical level private and public colleges often offer same course and follow same curriculum.

The main difference between the government and private college is, Government College is funded by the government and private colleges are funded by the private group and individual. A both private and government college have their own advantage and disadvantage. Government college benefited from state funds and subsidies this means the government college will get support of government when they are in struggle and the salary of government lecturers very attractive, they are provided with many benefits. On the other hand, private colleges are independent and administered by the private people. But compare to government college quality of education good in private colleges. But lecturers of private college don't enjoy more benefit like government lecturer.

1.1 Revive of literature:

Nirav Dave, Dr. DharmeshRaval (2015): Research paper on “study of job satisfaction of teachers of higher education institutions, the author focuses on job satisfaction level of the teachers. From the study it is found that job satisfaction of the faculty members is very critical aspect for all higher educational institutes and it affects performance of employees and quality of education in all the higher education institutes.

AlwiyaAllui and Jolly Sahni (2016): From the research paper, “Strategic human resource management in higher education institutions: Empirical Evidence from Saudi” it is found that the universities need to establish performance appraisal and compensation systems to show clearly defined causality between compensation and performance of academic staff. A good and well-functioning performance appraisal system would help the educator to make their mark in the organizational setting of their faculty. The managerial implications suggest closer cooperation between faculties and the human resource department is needed to establish unified appraisal systems.

1.2 Objectives:

This study is done with intention of providing empirical evidence for comparative study on government and private lecturers view on H.R policies practiced in their work place and its contribution on success of the organization in long run.

- a. To analyze H.R policies practiced by different private and government institutions in India.
- b. To compare the perception of private and government lecturers toward HR policies practiced in their institution.
- c. To identify superiority among private and government institution in respect of implementing effective HR policies.
- d. To analyze the impact of effective HR policies on performance of employees and on long run success an organization.
- e. To evaluate employers view in implementing employee friendly HR policies.

1.3 Hypothesis:

On the basis of review of literature and set objectives following hypothesis framed and later tested through different statistical tools.

Hypothesis 1:(T-test, Independent Sample)

H_0 = Government and private lecturer average salary is same.

Hypothesis 2: (Chi-square Test)

H_0 =Nature of job is independent of work pressure.

Hypothesis 3: (Chi-square Test)

H_0 = Nature of institution is independent of scope for Career/Personality Development,

Hypothesis 4: (T-test independent sample)

H_0 = There is no significance difference in a job satisfaction level among private and government lecturers

Hypothesis 5: (One-way ANOVA Test)

H_0 = Average satisfaction level of conflict resolution strategy in the organization is an independent of Employer relationship with Higher authority.

1.4 Limitations:

The research has been conducted on the basis of primary as well secondary data. Primary data is collected by distributing well-structured questionnaire to 50 lecturers, which includes 25 from government and 25 from private institutions. There was confusion among the respondent in the government institutions while reacting for questionnaire since both government and private teachers working together. Also this study could be subjective since it covers lecturers of Dhakshina Kannada, where selected under convenience sampling method.

1.5 Methodology: Author in this research tried to fill research gap by applying following unique methodology.

a. Sources of Data:

Primary Data: To know the perception of government and private lectures towards H.R policies practiced in their organizations, 50 lectures, 25 each from government and private institutions selected respectively. Well defined systematic questionnaires distributed to the respondents, their response considered and evaluated under systematically under various statistical tools.

Secondary Data: To evaluate and interpret major H.R practices in the corporate world, information have been gathered from reputed journals, news papers and magazines.

b. Tools of Analysis: Review of literature helped to identify research gap, which is represented as hypothesis to provide empirical evidence. Hypothesis in this study evaluated through different statistical tools like tables, charts, chi-square test, ANOVA one-way and two-way. Final interpretation drawn by evaluating respondents' reactions after using mentioned critical statistical tools.

1.6 Scope of Study: This study is mainly focus to compare H.R practices and its impact on on teachers. To facilitate this study sample selected from Dakshina Kannada district. Lecturers of both private and government institutions were the active part of this research survey.

2. Data Interpretation:

2.01. Table showing classification respondents on different grounds:

| | Private | | Government | | Total | |
|--------|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|
| | Respondents | % | Respondents | % | Respondents | % |
| Male | 9 | 36 | 11 | 44 | 20 | 40 |
| Female | 16 | 64 | 14 | 56 | 30 | 60 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

Table 2.01 shows classification of students under different grounds. In teaching field 60% of lecturers are females. Dominance of female lectures found about 60% both in private and government institutions respectively.

2.02 Table showing average monthly net salary of respondents:

| | Less than Rs. 20000 | | Rs. 20000 to Rs. 30000 | | More than Rs. 30000 | | Total | |
|------------|---------------------|----|------------------------|----|---------------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Private | 13 | 52 | 12 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 50 |
| Government | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 100 | 25 | 50 |
| Total | 13 | 52 | 12 | 48 | 25 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

Above table 2.02 details on salary drew by lectures of both private and government lecturers. 52% of private lectures are drawing salary less than Rs. 20000, whereas 48% of private lecturers draw in range of Rs.20,000 to Rs.30,000. All government lecturers draw more than Rs.30,000 each month.

2.03 Table showing Satisfaction level of present HR policies:

| | Private | | Government | | Total | |
|---------------------|---------|-----|------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Highly satisfied | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 6 | 12 |
| Satisfied | 12 | 48 | 11 | 44 | 23 | 46 |
| Neutral | 7 | 28 | 8 | 32 | 15 | 30 |
| Dissatisfied | 6 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 |
| Highly dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

In the above table it can be seen that 45% of the respondents just satisfied with H.R policies of institutions irrespective of their nature of job. Nearly 30% doesn't have any opinion regarding H.R policies.

2.04 Opinion on work pressure:

| | High | | Moderate | | Low | | Total | |
|------------|------|----|----------|-----|-----|----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Private | 7 | 28 | 17 | 68 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 50 |
| Government | 2 | 8 | 18 | 72 | 5 | 20 | 25 | 50 |
| Total | 9 | 36 | 35 | 140 | 6 | 24 | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

The above table represents respondents' opinion regarding work pressure. Nearly 70% of both private and government lecturers feels work pressure is moderate. 28% of the private teachers felt high work pressure, whereas this percentage is just 8% in case of government lecturers.

2.05 Respondents opinion on job security:

| | Private | | Government | | Total | |
|-----------------|---------|-----|------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Highly secure | 0 | 0 | 18 | 72 | 18 | 36 |
| Secure | 8 | 32 | 7 | 28 | 15 | 30 |
| Insecure | 13 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 26 |
| Highly insecure | 04 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 08 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: Primary data

The above table shows respondents opinion on security of their job. 100 % of the government lecturer feels their job is secure, whereas this percentage is just 30% in case of private lecturers. 70% of the private lecturers are not happy that their job is instable.

2.06 Statistics of possibility in personality development/career advancement:

| | Private | | Government | | Total | |
|-------------------|---------|-----|------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Highly possible | 4 | 16 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 12 |
| Possible | 14 | 56 | 18 | 72 | 32 | 64 |
| Neutral | 7 | 28 | 5 | 20 | 12 | 24 |
| Impossible | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Highly impossible | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

Above table presents respondents reaction for possibility of career advancement and personality development due to present H.R practices of their organization. 64% of the total lecturer feels that, career advancement is possible in their work place. There is no such a big comparative difference.

2.07 Table showing level of success in implementing government mandated HR policies:

| | Private | | Government | | Total | |
|------------|---------|-----|------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Below 30% | 05 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 |
| 30% to 60% | 13 | 52 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 30 |
| 60% to 90% | 7 | 28 | 19 | 76 | 26 | 52 |
| Above 90% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4 | 08 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

More than 90% of the government lecturers agree that their institution/job place been occupied with high degree of implementation ratio in government mandated HR policies, this percentage is just 28% percentage in case of private job holders. More than 70% of the private lectures disappointed with low success ratio in government mandated HR policies.

2.08 Statistics on scope for lecturers' participation management's major decisions:

| | Private | | Government | | Total | |
|--------------|---------|-----|------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Always | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Most of time | 6 | 24 | 14 | 56 | 20 | 40 |
| Sometime | 11 | 44 | 09 | 36 | 20 | 40 |
| Never | 8 | 32 | 02 | 08 | 10 | 20 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

Neither government nor private institutions always allow teaching faculties in the major decisions of their institutions. 56% of the government lecturer feels that most of the time their views will be entertained but this is just 24% in case of private institutions.

2.09 Table showing Lecturers relation with their higher authority:

| | Private | | Government | | Total | |
|-----------|---------|-----|------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Positive | 17 | 68 | 11 | 44 | 28 | 56 |
| Negative | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 6 |
| Can't say | 7 | 28 | 12 | 48 | 19 | 38 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

In the above table 68% of the private lecturers opine that their relationship with employer is highly positive but this is just 44% in case of government lecturers. Total 38% of the teachers couldn't give any opinion in respect of their relationship with higher authority.

2.10 Table showing satisfaction level in respect of conflict resolution strategy implementation:

| | Private | | Government | | Total | |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------|-----|
| | No. | Avg. | No. | Avg. | No. | % |
| Highly satisfied | $0 = (0*5) = 0$ | 5.33 (80/15) | $1 = (1*5) = 5$ | 6.47 (97/15) | 1 | 2 |
| Satisfied | $11 = (11*4) = 44$ | | $20 = (20*4) = 80$ | | 31 | 62 |
| Neutral | $12 = (12*3) = 36$ | | $4 = (4*3) = 12$ | | 16 | 32 |
| Dissatisfied | $2 = (2*2) = 4$ | | $0 = (0*2) = 0$ | | 2 | 4 |
| Highly dissatisfied | $0 = (0*1) = 1$ | | $0 = (0*1) = 0$ | | 0 | 0 |
| Total | Score 80 | | Score 97 | | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

Satisfaction level in respect of conflict resolution strategy implementation is positive i.e., 80% in case of government lecturers but this just 40% in case of private lecturers. On the basis of weighted score dominance of high satisfaction level is found in case government lecturers with 6.47 score as compare to private lecturers 5.33.

2.11 Table showing respondent's opinion on schemes provided by employer to their family:

| | Private | | Government | | Total | |
|-------|---------|-----|------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Yes | 09 | 36 | 23 | 92 | 32 | 64 |
| No | 16 | 64 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 36 |
| Total | 25 | 100 | 25 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: primary data

Difference is found in respect of schemes offered by employers to the family members of their teaching faculty. 92% of the government lectures highly agree and happy that, employer is extended services to their family members also, whereas this coverage is just 36% in case of private employees.

3.00 Testing Hypothesis:

3.01 Hypothesis 1: (T-test, Independent Sample)

H_0 = Government and private lecturers average salary is same.

Calculation:

Table showing calculation of T-test for average salary of government and private lecturers:

(Rs. '000)

| No. | Government Lecturers | Private Lecturers | (X ₁ -Mean) | (X ₁ -Mean) ² | (X ₂ -Mean) | (X ₂ -Mean) ² |
|-----|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | 45 | 24 | 2.96 | 8.76 | 2.96 | 8.76 |
| 2 | 36 | 18 | -6.04 | 36.48 | -3.04 | 9.24 |
| 3 | 42 | 16 | -0.04 | 0.00 | -5.04 | 25.40 |
| 4 | 32 | 27 | -10.04 | 100.80 | 5.96 | 35.52 |
| 5 | 47 | 16 | 4.96 | 24.60 | -5.04 | 25.40 |
| 6 | 46 | 22 | 3.96 | 15.68 | 0.96 | 0.92 |
| 7 | 44 | 18 | 1.96 | 3.84 | -3.04 | 9.24 |
| 8 | 47 | 16 | 4.96 | 24.60 | -5.04 | 25.40 |
| 9 | 49 | 26 | 6.96 | 48.44 | 4.96 | 24.60 |
| 10 | 46 | 17 | 3.96 | 15.68 | -4.04 | 16.32 |
| 11 | 44 | 24 | 1.96 | 3.84 | 2.96 | 8.76 |
| 12 | 39 | 18 | -3.04 | 9.24 | -3.04 | 9.24 |
| 13 | 38 | 27 | -4.04 | 16.32 | 5.96 | 35.52 |
| 14 | 32 | 16 | -10.04 | 100.80 | -5.04 | 25.40 |
| 15 | 45 | 24 | 2.96 | 8.76 | 2.96 | 8.76 |
| 16 | 47 | 24 | 4.96 | 24.60 | 2.96 | 8.76 |
| 17 | 32 | 16 | -10.04 | 100.80 | -5.04 | 25.40 |
| 18 | 47 | 24 | 4.96 | 24.60 | 2.96 | 8.76 |
| 19 | 45 | 26 | 2.96 | 8.76 | 4.96 | 24.60 |
| 20 | 45 | 26 | 2.96 | 8.76 | 4.96 | 24.60 |
| 21 | 36 | 24 | -6.04 | 36.48 | 2.96 | 8.76 |
| 22 | 42 | 25 | -0.04 | 0.00 | 3.96 | 15.68 |
| 23 | 32 | 18 | -10.04 | 100.80 | -3.04 | 9.24 |
| 24 | 47 | 16 | 4.96 | 24.60 | -5.04 | 25.40 |
| 25 | 46 | 18 | 3.96 | 15.68 | -3.04 | 9.24 |
| 50 | 1051 | 526 | | 762.96 | | 428.96 |

Source: primary data

Calculated mean X₁=42.04, X₂=21.04, t=74.25, v=48, S=4.98

Table value 1.960 @5% level of significance

From the calculation of hypothesis in table above it is clear that calculated t value is 74.25 but standard value at 5% significance level is 1.96. Since calculated value is much higher than the standard value, there is no evidence to accept null hypothesis. Finally it can be concluded that there is huge difference between salary drawn by government and private lectures.

3.02 Hypothesis 2: (Chi-square Test)

H_0 = Nature of job is independent of work pressure.

Table showing statistics of nature of job and work pressure:

| | GOVERNMENT | PRIVATE |
|----------|------------|---------|
| HIGH | 02 | 07 |
| MODERATE | 18 | 17 |
| LOW | 5 | 1 |

Source: primary data

Calculation:

| Observed | Expected | $(O-E)^2$ | $[(O-E)^2/E]$ |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| 2 | 4.50 | 6.25 | 1.39 |
| 7 | 4.50 | 6.25 | 1.39 |
| 18 | 17.50 | 0.25 | 0.01 |
| 17 | 17.50 | 0.25 | 0.01 |
| 5 | 3.00 | 4 | 1.33 |
| 1 | 3.00 | 4 | 1.33 |
| $\sum [(O-E)^2/E]$ | | | 5.47 |

Chi-square calculated value = 5.47, $V = (r-1)*(c-1)$, $(3-1)*((2-1)$, For $V=2$, $X^2_{0.05} =$

Interpretation:

Table value for $V=2$, $X^2_{0.05}$ is 5.99, calculated chi-square value is 5.47. Since calculated value is lower than the table value, Null hypothesis need to be accepted. Finally it can be concluded that, Nature of job is independent of work pressure.

3.03 Hypothesis (Chi-square Test)

H_0 = Nature of institution is independent of scope for Career advancement/Personality development:

Table showing lecturers' opinion on possibility of career advancement in their profession:

| | Highly possible | Possible | neutral | Impossible | Highly impossible |
|------------|-----------------|----------|---------|------------|-------------------|
| Government | 2 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Private | 04 | 14 | 07 | 0 | 0 |

Source: primary data

Calculation:

| Observed | Expected | (O-E) ² | [(O-E) ² /E] |
|--------------------|----------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 2 | 3.00 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 18 | 16.00 | 4 | 0.25 |
| 5 | 6.00 | 1 | 0.17 |
| 0 | 6.00 | 36 | 6.00 |
| 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 4 | 0.00 | 16 | 0.00 |
| 14 | 3.00 | 121 | 40.33 |
| 7 | 16.00 | 81 | 5.06 |
| 0 | 6.00 | 36 | 6.00 |
| $\sum [(O-E)^2/E]$ | | | 58.15 |

Chi-square calculated value = 58.15, $V = (r-1)*(c-1)$, $(2-1)*((5-1))$, For $V = 4$, $X^2_{0.05} =$

Interpretation:

Table value for $V = 4$, $X^2_{0.05}$ is 9.49, calculated chi-square value is 58.15. Since calculated value is much higher than expected table value, Null hypothesis need to be rejected. Finally it can be concluded that, Nature of institution is independent of scope for Career advancement/Personality development.

3.04 Hypothesis 4: (T-test independent sample)

$H_0 =$ There is no significance difference in a job satisfaction level among private and government lecturers

Calculation:

T-test for job satisfaction among the private and government lecturers:

| Respondents | Government | Private | (X_1 -Mean) | (X_1 -Mean) ² | (X_2 -Mean) | (X_2 -Mean) ² |
|-------------|------------|---------|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | -0.92 | 0.85 | -1.24 | 1.54 |
| 3 | 5 | 4 | 1.08 | 1.17 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 5 | 5 | 4 | 1.08 | 1.17 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 6 | 3 | 4 | -0.92 | 0.85 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 7 | 4 | 3 | 0.08 | 0.01 | -0.24 | 0.06 |
| 8 | 4 | 3 | 0.08 | 0.01 | -0.24 | 0.06 |
| 9 | 4 | 3 | 0.08 | 0.01 | -0.24 | 0.06 |
| 10 | 3 | 4 | -0.92 | 0.85 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 11 | 5 | 2 | 1.08 | 1.17 | -1.24 | 1.54 |
| 12 | 4 | 4 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 13 | 4 | 4 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 14 | 3 | 2 | -0.92 | 0.85 | -1.24 | 1.54 |
| 15 | 5 | 3 | 1.08 | 1.17 | -0.24 | 0.06 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 16 | 3 | 3 | -0.92 | 0.85 | -0.24 | 0.06 |
| 17 | 4 | 2 | 0.08 | 0.01 | -1.24 | 1.54 |
| 18 | 3 | 4 | -0.92 | 0.85 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 19 | 4 | 4 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 20 | 5 | 3 | 1.08 | 1.17 | -0.24 | 0.06 |
| 21 | 4 | 3 | 0.08 | 0.01 | -0.24 | 0.06 |
| 22 | 5 | 2 | 1.08 | 1.17 | -1.24 | 1.54 |
| 23 | 3 | 4 | -0.92 | 0.85 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 24 | 4 | 4 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.76 | 0.58 |
| 25 | 3 | 2 | -0.92 | 0.85 | -1.24 | 1.54 |
| 50 | 98 | 81 | | 13.84 | | 16.56 |

Source: primary data

Calculated mean $X_1=13.84$, $X_2=16.56$, $t=2.404$, $v=48$, $S=0.7958$

Calculation:

From the calculation of hypothesis in table above it is clear that calculated t value is 2.404, but standard table value at 5% significance level is 1.96. & at 1% significance level is 2.58. at 1% significance level calculated value is lesser than table value. Therefore we need to accept null hypothesis. Therefore finally it can be concluded that whatever may be the nature of job of lecturers but there is no significance difference in their job satisfaction level.

3.05 Hypothesis 5: (One-way ANOVA Test)

Table showing respondents job satisfaction level and their relationship with top management:

| | Positive | Negative | Can't say |
|---------------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Highly satisfied | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Satisfied | 16 | 3 | 12 |
| Neutral | 11 | 0 | 5 |
| Dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Highly dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Source: primary data

One-way ANOVA table:

H_0 =Average satisfaction level of conflict resolution strategy in the organization is independent of Employer relationship with higher authority.

| Source of Variance | Source of Sum | Df. | Mean Square | F value |
|--------------------|---------------|-----|-------------|---------|
| Between the Column | 64.1 | 2 | 32.05 | F=1.17 |
| With in | 329.2 | 12 | 27.43 | |
| Total | 393.3 | 14 | | |

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

One-way Variance Analysis provided calculated value of 'F' is 1.17. The table value of F at 5% significance level is 3.89 ($V_1 = 2$ and $V_2 = 12$). The calculate value is lower than the table value and hence the experiment provides no evidence against the Null Hypothesis (Null hypothesis is accepted). We therefore conclude that, job satisfaction is not dependent on employees relationship with their top management.

4. Findings:

- a. There is huge difference found between salary drawn by government and private lectures.
- b. Nature of job is independent of work pressure. 70% of the all lecturers feel that work pressure is moderate. 28% percentage of the private lectures feels that work pressure is very high, this percentage is just 8% in case of government lecturers' case.
- c. Nature of institution is independent of scope for career advancement/Personality development.
- d. Whatever may be the nature of job of lecturers but there is no significance difference in their job satisfaction level. Only 45% of the lecturers felt their job just satisfying, whereas more than 30% couldn't give any opinion on their job satisfaction.
- e. Job satisfaction is not dependent on employees' relationship with their top management.
- f. Dominance of female lecturers found to the extent of 60% both in government and private natured lecturers.
- g. There is huge difference between salaries drawn by government lecturers compare to private lecturers. All government lecturers earn more than Rs. 30,000, whereas 52% of the private lecturers earn below Rs. 20,000 and 48% earn between Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 30,000.
- h. In private lecturing job, high job security is just for 30%, whereas this percentage is 100% in case government lecturers.

5. Suggestion:

- ✓ Government rules should be accepted and followed. In order to avoid inconvenience in future.
- ✓ Most of the lecturers are female so institutions also recruit male lecturers to the institution.
- ✓ Work pressure is more in case of private and the salary of experienced lecture is also less so the institution must try to increase their salary in order to retain them for longer period of time.
- ✓ Most of the lecturers not satisfied with their job, so the institution must take care of this and give various benefit so they must feel satisfied with their job
- ✓ The government employee should work hard they should not take advantage of their HR policies.
- ✓ Quality of education and HR policies must be improve in government college.
- ✓ HR policies must be liberal in some extent in private college so that the employees may work with pleasure.

6. Conclusion:

As per the research it is found that most of the lecturers are female. Human Resources are a main day today activity which works in an organization. Research were identified superiority among private and government institution in respect of implementing effective HR policies. Respondents of various institution provided valuable information in relation to the HR policies adopted in their institution. Majority of the Respondent of private institution as well as government institution some extent satisfied with the present HR policies. Human resource is the main resource of the organization.

