



---

## SECTORAL VARIATIONS IN HIGH PERFORMANCE WORK PRACTICES: THE INDIAN SCENE

Dr. Naval Garg\*

---

**Abstract:** *Increasing popularity of Neo-human relation and Neo-behaviorist schools has emphasized the concepts of employee involvement and employee empowerment. And in this pursuit High Performance Work Practices have gained great significance. Simultaneously there are visible differences in the performance of the public and private sector organizations with private sector firms clearly having an edge over public sector firms. Thus in this light it is interesting to discuss the difference in employees' perception regarding awareness, availability and effectiveness of HPWPs among public and private sector. Here Hypothesis testing concluded significant differences in all three levels among private and public sector. Further all three levels of HPWPs have also been explored through various demographic variables like gender and across various types of organizations like public, private, manufacturing, service etc. Factorial Design has been used to explore interaction effect between various demographic variables and two sectors. Further segmentation of 35 HPWPs has been done using factor analysis and T-test has highlighted significance of differences in extracted factors among public and private organizations.*

**Keywords:** *High performance work practices, High performance organizations, Sector, Variations.*

---

\*Administrative Officer, Oriental Insurance Company Limited



## **INTRODUCTION**

There are visible differences in the performance of the public and private sector organizations with private sector firms clearly having an edge over public sector firms. Private sector organizations are generally attributed with manifold turnover and profits over a period of time. Situation was grim for public sector prior to liberalization and privatization, as they were seen as a liability for the government. However, after 1991 tenants of professionalism, management, innovation and customer orientation gets imbibed into working culture of public sector organizations. Now, India takes great pride in some of its prominent public sector undertaking like SAIL, CIL, NTPC etc. But still difference is wide enough for discussion. After the introduction of High Performance Work System in Indian settings, it has become more imperative to analyze that how both sectors look at high performance paradigm. Because different treatment to such a revolutionary work system could lead to substantial difference in overall outcome of the firms. Hence sectoral differences among public and private sector organizations has been regarded as one of the most highlighted aspect of the modern high performance work practitioner.

## **PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR**

Lane (1993) explored literature and based on his exploration he concluded that there are distinct differences between private and public organizations. Firstly, most of the public sector organizations were found to possess significantly lower level of strategic freedom than private sector companies. It could be understood from the fact that strategic goals of public organizations are decided by politicians while that of private organizations by seasoned master and professionals of the respective fields. And decisions taken by political leaders were constrained and shaped by several political forces like essentiality of public welfare, bureaucratic structure etc. This puts severe restraint on public organizations' ability to operate at large (Lane, 1993). Moreover availability of resources available to public and private sector organizations also differs. Further Lane (1993) also stated that most of the public sector organizations have a very limited operating room in various aspects of human resource management. For instance a number of public sector employees are covered under collective bargaining agreements and these agreements limit the public firms' use of innovative and performance based incentive plans in relation to employees. And in comparison private firms are multiplying their productivity through newly and tailor made



incentive plans.

Andaleeb, Siddiqui and Khandakar (2007) proposed a Doctors' Service Orientation (DSO) scale and used it to compare the services received in public, private and foreign hospitals in a developing country from the point of view of the patient. They found that on 10 out of 12 measures of doctors' service orientation, there was significant difference in their perceived behaviors between public and private hospitals. Similarly significant differences were noticed in service orientation of doctors of public and foreign hospital doctors.

Additionally, Olsson and Pringle (2004) highlighted the parallels and differences in culture between public and private sector sites for the advancement of women. They found that women are generally underrepresented in top management positions particularly in the private sector. Private sector witnesses targeting of individually talented women, who demonstrate high performance, confidence, potential and ambition only. On contrary, as a public sector company follows rule based promotion policy thus chances of biased behavior are comparatively less.

Moreover Kangis and Kareklis (2001) surveyed the managers of private and public sector banks. A different working climate was observed in banks of two sectors. In complete opposition of public sector banks, managers in private banks showed greater alignment of interests with the objectives of the bank. In private sector pay of managers was more closely related to outcomes and they were more mobile in their jobs. Moreover private banks have more stringent control mechanisms to align interests of their managers. Goodwin (2004) found that there are differences in status between internal audits in the two sectors. Public sector internal auditors are less likely to report to the chief financial officer than their counterparts in private sector organizations. Moreover public sector organizations are more likely to outsource to the external auditor. Additionally private sector internal audit is perceived to result in greater reduction in audit fees compared to that in the public sector. In addition to above discussed researches that differentiate public and private sector organizations, there are thousands of studies available.

Porter and Tanner (1998) found that in spite of the differences between private and public organizations they are often treated in the same way. This is especially true in relation to holistic management models and in relation to human resource models. And, hence unluckily it is being assumed that both types of the organizations can adapt these



frameworks without any need for alterations. This may cause mismatch in potential benefits that can be reaped through adoption of an activity in two types of organizations. And same is also true in case of High Performance Work Practices. Thus it is imperative to explore the perceptual differences among the employees of public and private sector organizations regarding HPWPs. Further following methodology and objectives have been framed.

## **OBJECTIVES & METHODOLOGY**

The prime objective of the present research has been to give an insight into sectoral difference regarding High Performance Work Practices and also to discuss the significance of such differences. The incidental objectives of the present research were as under:

- To examine the awareness, availability and effectiveness level of two sectors for HPWPs and to discuss the significance of the difference.
- To execute factorial design for in-depth understanding of sectoral difference across two genders and organizations.
- To study the extracted factors of HPWPs and perceptual differences based on sector.

The present study is based upon exploratory-cum-descriptive research design and has used primary data. For data collection, a structured questionnaire consisting of 35 High Performance Work Practices has been used. In addition to it, there were eight other variables related to general information of respondents. Stratified random sampling has been used to collect data from eight industries each from manufacturing and service sector. The industries mainly included banking, insurance, textile, BPO, sugar, shoe, consultancy, cold drink, rice etc, Sample size of 350 comprises of 200 respondents from private sector and 150 respondents from public sector organizations. The questionnaire used has been designed on a five-point scale ranging from 'unaware' (one) to 'strongly aware' (five), 'ineffective' (one) to 'highly effective' (five) and 'unavailable' (one) to "highly available" (five). Employees were taken from top and middle level keeping in view the consideration that they are more likely to encounter High Performance work Practices. For analysis purpose, it has been strictly supervised that an array of manufacturing, service, private, public, Indian and foreign companies are approached. Further while administering questionnaire to employees, it has been ensured that data comes from all category like male, female, highly experienced to less experienced one, aged personnel to fresh recruits etc.



Reliability of data is checked using Cronbach's alpha which is calculated through SPSS. Factor analysis has been used to reduce data to bring broader dimensions forward. Here also appropriateness of data for factor analysis is ensured through KMO and Bartlett test of sphericity. Moreover, t-test has been used to study the difference of awareness among various categories of respondents. Factorial design has been used to discuss the interaction effect of more than two variables and the significance of these interactions has been adjudged with the help of ANOVA.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The various aspects of High Performance Work Practices have been studied through three different angles i.e. employees' awareness level for HPWPs and employees' perception regarding availability and effectiveness of 35 HPWPs taken in the present paper. A tabular representation of public and private sector employees has been given herewith.

**Table-1: Sectoral Description of Various Levels of HPWPs (Mean)**

SECTOR	Awareness Level		Availability Level		Effectiveness Level	
	Mean	Rating	Mean	Rating	Mean	Rating
Public	3.50	Aware	2.60	Fairly Available	3.30	Effective
Private	3.74	Aware	2.92	Fairly Available	3.55	Effective

Table-1 depicts that there exists difference in awareness, availability and effectiveness level of HPWPs among employees of public and private sector organizations. Maximum difference lies in employee's perception regarding availability of HPWPs with mean value of 2.92 and 2.60 for public and private sector employees respectively. Further private sector employees (mean=3.74) are more aware for high performance work practices than respondents of public sector organizations (mean=3.50). However perceptual difference regarding effectiveness of HPWPs is also found considerable. It is interesting to observe the differences in the perception of public and private sector employees although employees of both sectors are subjected to similar opportunities and challenges in the open market. The data signifies the need of familiarizing and acquainting public sector employees more with various paradigm of High performance Work Practices.



**Table-2: Sector Based Description of Various Levels of HPWPs (Percentage)**

Awareness	Pu	Pr	Availability	Pu	Pr	Effectiveness	Pu	Pr
Highly Aware	23	49	Highly Available	04	10	Highly Effective	13	47
Aware	43	31	Available	20	20	Effective	50	34
Fairly Aware	16	16	Fairly Available	40	60	Fairly Effective	33	19
Partially Aware	18	04	Partially Available	36	10	Partially Effective	04	00
Unaware	00	00	Unavailable	00	00	Ineffective	00	00

(Pu denotes Public Sector & Pr denotes Private sector)

Table-2 found that 23 and 43 percentage of employees of public sector rated HPWPs as 'highly aware' and 'aware' and in contrast corresponding figures for private sector employees are 49 and 31. A very few employees rated HPWPs as 'highly available' as only 4% public sector employees and 10% private sector employees consider so. However 60% of private sector respondents and 40% of public sector respondents consider HPWPs as 'fairly available'. Interestingly more employees of private sector have rated HPWPs as 'highly effective' than employees of public sector but opposite case is observed in 'effective' category where higher percentage of public sector employees is observed. Moreover none of the employees was found in the lowest category of five-point rating scale i.e. 'unaware', 'ineffective' and 'unavailable'.

## **HYPOTHESIS TESTING**

Hypothesis is an assumption through which a researcher tries to come to population parameters with the help of sample statistics. The paper has three hypotheses that try to adjudge the significance of the difference in public and private sector employees' perception for various variables taken in the study.

### **Hypothesis 1:**

**H0 (Null hypothesis):** There is no variation in the awareness of public and private sector employees for High Performance Work Practices.

**H1 (Alternate Hypothesis):** Awareness of public and private sector employees for HPWPs varies significantly. Here two-tailed test would be used.

### **Hypothesis 2:**

**H0 (Null hypothesis):** There is no variation in the perception of public and private sector employees regarding availability of High Performance Work Practices.



**H1 (Alternate Hypothesis):** There exists significant variation in perception of the employees of public and private sector regarding availability of HPWPs.

**Hypothesis 3:**

**H0 (Null hypothesis):** There is no variation in the perception of the employees of public and private sector regarding effectiveness of High Performance Work Practices.

**H1 (Alternate Hypothesis):** There exists significant variation in the perception of public and private sector employees regarding effectiveness of HPWPs.

**Table-3: Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis	Z Value	Critical Value*	Result
Hypothesis-1	5.71	1.96	Accepted
Hypothesis-2	9.79	1.96	Accepted
Hypothesis-3	8.79	1.96	Accepted

\*Critical value at 95% Level of Significance

Table-3 highlighted the result of Hypothesis test applied to adjudge the significance of difference among two sectors regarding awareness, availability and effectiveness level of HPWPs. Here if calculated Z value comes out to be greater than critical value (1.96) then null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted. It was observed that difference in awareness level of two sectors was significant and table-1 depicted that mean for private sector employees are higher than that of public sector employees. On the same front difference in perception regarding availability and effectiveness of HPWPs is also found significant and here too mean is greater for private sector respondents. The findings make it clear that sector (Public or Private) has some impact on the way HPWPs are perceived by the employees. Employees of private sector organizations are found to have more positive outlook for high performance practices.

**FACTORIAL DESIGN**

A factorial experiment helps a researcher to observe the combined impact of two independent variables on dependent variable. Various permutation and combinations of all independent variables are taken into consideration to give a look at different realms of the study. Here employees of both sectors are studied to analyze variations based on gender or nature of organization i.e. manufacturing or service firms.



**Table-4: Sector Based Awareness Level across Genders (Male and Female)**

Mean	Male	Female	Overall
Public Sector	3.60	3.38	3.50
Private Sector	3.75	3.55	3.74
Overall	3.71	3.49	3.62

Table-4 determined that the awareness level of employees for male and female employees for Public and Private sector. It highlights that awareness level differs across two sectors. Awareness of male employees is higher for private sector (mean=3.75) than males of public sector (mean=3.60). Similarly females of private sector (mean=3.55) are more aware than that of public sector (mean=3.38). The significance of such difference in awareness level is adjudged later on using ANOVA.

**Table-5: Sector Based Awareness Level across Manufacturing and Service Organizations**

Mean	Manufacturing Organizations	Service Organizations	Overall
Public Sector	3.57	3.43	3.50
Private Sector	3.67	3.81	3.74
Overall	3.61	3.76	3.62

The table-5 illustrates that awareness level of public and private sector for manufacturing and service organizations' employees. Here, perception of employees of manufacturing and service companies do not vary greatly across public sector. But the difference is wide across among employees of public and private sector for employees of service organizations. Clearly employees of private sector working in service organizations (mean=3.81) are most aware for HPWPs.

**Table-6: Significance in Factorial Design (Awareness Level)**

S. No	Independent Variable 1	Independent Variable 2	Sig. Value*
1	Sector- Public & Private	Gender- Male & Female	0.045
2	Sector- Public & Private	Organization-Manufacturing & Service	0.061

Table-6 illustrates the significance of various factorial design used in the research work. Here significant value of both designs have a value greater than .05, thus all differences are insignificant. As a result of which interaction effect of any two variable has been discarded herewith.





**Table-7: Sector Based Availability of HPWPs across Genders (Male & Female)**

Mean	Male	Female	Overall
Public Sector	2.66	2.52	2.60
Private Sector	3.20	2.52	2.92
Overall	2.94	2.52	2.76

Table-7 highlights that perception of public sector employees differs across two genders, while that of private sector employees varies to a larger extent. Male employees of private sector (mean=3.20) perceives HPWPs as more available than male employees of public sector (mean=2.66). The significance of such difference in awareness level is adjudged later on using ANOVA.

**Table-8: Sector Based Availability across Manufacturing and Service Organizations**

Mean	Manufacturing Organizations	Service Organizations	Overall
Public Sector	2.59	2.61	2.60
Private Sector	3.13	2.69	2.92
Overall	2.65	2.87	2.76

Table-8 illustrates perception regarding availability of HPWPs for public and private sector employees working in manufacturing and service companies. Here, perception of employees of manufacturing and service sector do not vary greatly across public sector. But the difference is wide across employees of manufacturing and service companies in private sector.

**Table-9: Significance in Factorial Design (Availability Level)**

S. No	Independent Variable 1	Independent Variable 2	Sig. Value
1	Sector- Public & Private	Gender- Male & Female	0.812
2	Sector- Public & Private	Organizations-Manufacturing & Service	<b>0.001</b>

Table-9 illustrates the significance of various factorial design used to access interaction effect for perception regarding availability of HPWPs. Here significant value of first design have a value greater than .05, thus the difference in perception is insignificant. But interaction effect of sector (public and private) and companies (Manufacturing and Service) is found significant. It means that employees' perception in public sector manufacturing and service firm differs significantly and same is also true in case of private sector employees.



**Table-10: Sector Based Effectiveness across Genders (Male and Female)**

Mean	Male	Female	Overall
Public Sector	3.42	3.04	3.20
Private Sector	3.57	3.44	3.50
Overall	3.50	3.37	3.43

Table-10 defines that male employees of both manufacturing and service sector perceive HPWPs as more effective than their female counterparts. Male employees of service sector (mean=3.57) considers HPWPs as more effective than male employees of manufacturing sector (mean=3.42). Similarly female employees of manufacturing sector (mean=3.04) have lower perceptual mean than female employees of service sector (mean=3.44).

**Table-11: Sector Based Effectiveness across Manufacturing and Service Organizations**

Mean	Manufacturing Organizations	Service Organizations	Overall
Public Sector	3.37	3.01	3.30
Private Sector	3.60	3.68	3.55
Overall	3.20	3.50	3.43

The table-11 highlights that employees' perception regarding effectiveness of HPWPs of manufacturing and service organizations' employees for public and private sector. Here, employees of public sector are found to have relatively lesser mean than employees of private sector in both types of organizations i.e. manufacturing and service. It suggests that employees of private sector of both manufacturing and service firm perceive HPWPs as more effective than respective counterparts in public sector.

**Table-12: Significance in Factorial Design (Effectiveness Level)**

S. No	Independent Variable 1	Independent Variable 2	Sig. Value
1	Sector- Public & Private	Gender- Male & Female	0.810
2	Sector- Public & Private	Organizations-Manufacturing and Service	<b>0.007</b>

The table adjudges the significance of interaction effect of various variables for employees' perception regarding effectiveness of HPWPs. Here interaction effect between sector (Public and Private) and organizations (manufacturing and service) comes out to be significant. It means that employees' perception regarding effectiveness of HPWPs differs significantly for two types of organizations in both public and private sectors.



## SEGMENTATION OF HPWPS

35 dimensions of HPWPs were subjected to principal components factor analysis in which to define factors (scales) clearly, loadings exceeding 0.4 were considered and included in a factor. In all nine factors were extracted. The extracted factors as defined and named as follows: - F-1: Reward Oriented HPWPs, F-2: Traditional HRM Practices, F-3: Value Creating HPWPs, F-4: Employee Engagement HPWPs, F-5: Team Oriented HPWPs, F-6: Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs, F-7: Employee Empowerment HPWPs, F-8: Procedural Improvement HPWPs and F-9: Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs.

## AN INSIGHT INTO NINE FACTORS OF HPWPS

Nine factors extracted after factors analysis are studied differently to give further insights into implication of gender on High Performance Work Practices. Perceptual differences based on various parameters have also been discussed using T-test. Here, firstly all these factors were studied to check awareness, availability and effectiveness level of employees. Then t-test is administered to check out the significance of variations among public and private sector for all three variables of the study.

**Table-13: Employees' Awareness for Nine Factors of HPWPs (Mean)**

Factor No.	Factor Name	Public Sector	Private Sector
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	3.73	3.91
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	3.78	3.92
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	3.11	3.62
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	3.27	3.66
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	3.30	3.64
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	4.05	4.08
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	3.32	3.36
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	3.56	3.76
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	3.12	3.42

Above table found that awareness level of private sector employees is higher than public sector employees in all nine factors. It reflects the relatively poor condition of awareness level for HPWPs in public sector organizations. Employees of both public and private sector have maximum awareness for as factor-6 (public sector mean= 4.05, private sector mean= 4.08), factor-2 (public sector mean= 3.78, private sector mean= 3.92). But factor differs when both sectors are studied for least awareness. As far as public sector is concerned, employees have least awareness for Value creating HPWPs (mean=3.11) and Psycho-strengthening



HPWPs (mean=3.12) .Whereas employees of private sector are least aware for Employee empowerment related HPWPs (mean=3.36), Psycho-strengthening HPWPs.

**Table-14: Sectoral Variations in Employees' Awareness for HPWPs**

Factor No.	FACTORS	Public v/s Private Sector		
		t-Value	d.f	Degree of Sig.
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	3.856	348	0.043
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	1.442	348	0.150
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	2.753	348	0.006
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	2.919	348	0.004
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	4.221	348	0.000
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	0.377	348	0.706
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	1.365	348	0.173
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	2.306	348	0.040
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	1.408	348	0.160

Table-14 discusses the significance of difference in awareness level among male and female employees for all nine factor extracted from factor analysis. Here degree of freedom is 348. So if significant value comes out to be greater than .05 so implied null hypothesis is accepted. In other cases, null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis i.e. difference in awareness level of male and female is significant is accepted. So when t-test is applied on all nine factors, five factors showed that the difference in the awareness level of Public and Private sector employees is significant. And for rest of four factors difference in awareness level of employees of public and private is insignificant. Factors for which significant value is less than .05 are Reward Oriented HPWPs, Value creating HPWPs, Employee engagement Practices, Team oriented HPWPs, and Procedural improvement HPWPs. In these all five factors Private sector employees have higher awareness than employees of Private sector employees. It highlights the need of awareness enhancement program for Public sector employees. Another four factors that includes Traditional HRM practices, Employee empowerment HPWPs, Social and safety need driven HPWPs and Psycho-strengthening HPWPs although showed difference in awareness level but clearly this difference is not significant.



**Table-15: Employees' Perception Regarding Availability of Nine Factors of HPWPs**

Factor No.	Factor Name	Public Sector	Private sector
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	2.81	2.97
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	3.02	3.03
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	2.37	2.54
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	2.57	2.78
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	2.88	2.92
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	3.05	3.16
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	2.80	2.85
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	2.88	2.97
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	2.61	2.67

Table-15 revealed that employee's perception regarding availability for nine factors of high performance paradigm is more positive for private sector employees than public sector employees. Moreover employees of both public and private sector have rated maximum availability of factor-6 i.e. Social and safety need driven HPWPs (Public sector mean=3.05, private sector mean=3.16). Similarly employees of both sector have rated Value creating HPWPs as least available practices (Public sector mean=2.37, private sector mean=2.54). Similarly both sector employees have rated same factors as factor-2 and factor-6 as 'Fairly Available'. The mean for public sector employees are 3.02 and 3.05 and that for private sector employees is 3.03 and 3.16 respectively. Further for four factors the mean is almost equal for both sectors. These factors are Traditional HRM Practices, Value creating HPWPs, Employee empowerment HPWPs and Psycho-strengthening HPWPs.

**Table-16: Sectoral Variations in Employees' Perception Regarding Availability**

Factor No.	FACTORS	Public v/s Private Sector		
		t-Value	d.f	Degree of Sig.
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	3.191	348	0.666
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	2.890	348	<b>0.000</b>
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	3.283	348	0.120
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	7.048	348	0.060
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	3.980	348	<b>0.000</b>
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	0.401	348	<b>0.003</b>
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	2.650	348	<b>0.000</b>
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	4.210	348	0.712
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	2.173	348	0.099



Table-16 showed that for four factors difference in the perception of the employees of Public and Private sector employees is significant. And for rest of five factors difference in perception across two sectors is insignificant. Factors for which significant values are less than .05 are Traditional HRM Practices, Team oriented HPWPs, Employee empowerment HPWPs, Social and safety need driven HPWPs. As a result of which alternate hypothesis is accepted, which suggest that difference in perception for these four factors is significant. In these all four factors Private sector employees' perception is more positive than employees of Private sector employees. It highlights the need of availability enhancement program for Public sector employees.

**Table-17: Employees' Perception Regarding Effectiveness of Nine Factors of HPWPs**

Factor No.	Factor Name	Public Sector	Private sector
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	3.31	3.71
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	3.37	3.71
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	2.86	2.46
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	3.08	3.62
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	3.14	3.64
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	3.61	3.81
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	3.21	3.66
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	3.20	3.60
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	2.98	3.54

Table-17 reported that employee's perception regarding effectiveness for nine factors of high performance paradigm is more positive for private sector employees than public sector employees. It reflects the relatively poor perception regarding effectiveness level for HPWPs in public sector organizations. Only factor for which public factor employees have better perception than private sector employees is Value creating HPWPs (Public sector employees mean=2.86, Private sector employees mean=2.46). Moreover employees of both public and private sector have rated maximum effectiveness of factor-6 i.e. Social and safety need driven HPWPs (Public sector mean=3.61, private sector mean=3.81). Similarly employees of both sector have rated Value creating HPWPs as least effective practices (Public sector mean=2.86, private sector mean=2.46). Similarly both sector employees have rated same factors as factor-3 and factor-9 as 'Fairly Effective'. The mean for private sector employees are 2.46 and 3.54 and that for public sector employees is 2.86 and 2.98 respectively.



**Table-18: Sectoral Variations in Employees' Perception Regarding Effectiveness**

Factor No.	FACTORS	Public v/s Private Sector		
		t-Value	d.f	Degree of Sig.
F-1	Reward Oriented HPWPs	4.158	348	<b>0.001</b>
F-2	Traditional HRM Practices	3.461	348	<b>0.000</b>
F-3	Value Creating HPWPs	6.250	348	<b>0.000</b>
F-4	Employee Engagement HPWPs	6.186	348	<b>0.000</b>
F-5	Team Oriented HPWPs	4.612	348	<b>0.000</b>
F-6	Social and Safety Need driven HPWPs	2.160	348	<b>0.031</b>
F-7	Employee Empowerment HPWPs	4.652	348	<b>0.000</b>
F-8	Procedural Improvement HPWPs	4.390	348	<b>0.000</b>
F-9	Psycho-Strengthening HPWPs	6.225	348	<b>0.000</b>

Table-18 claimed that for all nine factors difference in the perception of the employees of Public and Private sector employees is significant. It signifies that there are significant differences in perception of employees of public and private sector regarding effectiveness of HPWPs. Clearly perception of employees of both sectors differs significantly for all nine factors of HPWPs.

## CONCLUSION

In this age of persistent and throat cut competition, HPWPs have established themselves as distinct and important paradigm of performance excellence. High performance organization looks for certain innovative and unconventional practices to achieve desired goal. In this background the present paper has successfully highlighted the employees' awareness, availability and effectiveness level for HPWPs for public and private sector organizations. The categorization of HPWPs through factor analysis brought broader dimensions of HPWPs into light and a total of 35 HPWPs were reduced in nine factors. This segregation will help future researchers to explore their study as further researchers can use broader dimensions extracted here instead of dealing with a large number of dimensions with HPWPs. Further differences in employees' perception described in the paper could be used by HPWPs practitioners to explore different mechanism for adoption of high performance practices differently in two distinct sectors.

## REFERENCES

1. Abraham, J.Y. and Knight, D.J. 2001. Strategies Innovation: Leveraging Creative Action for More Profitable Growth. *Strategy and Leadership*, 29(1): 21-27.



2. Ancona, D.G. and Caldwell, D.F. 1992. Demography and Design: Predictors of New Product of Team Performance. *Organization Science*, 3(3): 321–341.
3. Andaleeb, S. S., Siddiqui, N. and Khandakar, S. 2007. Doctors' Service Orientation in Public, Private, and Foreign Hospitals .*International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 20(3): 253 – 263.
4. Baird, C.L. and Reynold, J. R. 2004 .Employee Awareness of Family Leave Benefit: The Effects of Family, Work, and Gender. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 45(2): 325-353.
5. Baker, K., Olson, J., and Morisseau, D. 1994. Work Practices, Fatigue and Nuclear Power Plant Safety Performance. *Human Factors*, 36(2): 244-257.
6. Becker, B. and Gerhart, B. 1996 .The Impact of Human Resource Management on Performance: Progress and Prospects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4): 779-801.
7. Boxall, P. and Macky, K. 2009. Research and Theory on High-Performance Work Systems: Progressing the High-Involvement Stream. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19(1): 3-23.
8. Brown, C. and Reich, M. 1997. Micro-Macro Linkages in High Performance Employment Systems .*Organizational Studies*, 18(5): 765-781.
9. Combs, J., Liu, Y., Hall, A. and Ketchen, D. 2006 .How much do High Performance Work Practices Matter? A Meta–Analysis of their Effects on Organizational Performance .*Personnel Psychology*, 59(3): 501-528.
10. Cox, T. J. and Blake, S. 1991 .Managing Cultural Diversity: Implications for Organizational Competitiveness. *The Executive*, 5(3): 45-56.
11. David, R. 1998 .Exploding the Myth of High Performance Teams .*Team Performance Management*, 4(7): 306-311.
12. Delaney, J. T. and Godard, J. 2001. An Industrial Relations Perspective on the High Performance Paradigm .*Human Resource Management Review*. 11(4): 395-429.
13. Egan, T. M. 2005. Creativity in the Context of Team Diversity: Team Leader Perspective. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(1): 207-225.
14. Gilbert, G.R., Burnett, M.F, Phau, I. and Haar, J. 2010. Does Gender Matter? A Review of Work-Related Gender Commonalities . *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 25(8): 676 – 699.





15. Godard, J. 1999. Do Implementation Processes and Rationales Matter? The Case of Workplace Reforms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(5): 679-704.
16. Godard, J. 2004 .Critical Assessment of High Performance Paradigm .*British Journal of Industrial Relation*, 42(2): 349-378.
17. Goodwin, J. 2004 .The relationship between the audit committee and the internal audit function: evidence from Australia and New Zealand .*International Journal of Auditing*, 7(3): 263-78
18. Guest, D. 2002 .Human Resource Management, Corporate Performance and Employee Well-Being: Building the Worker into HRM .*The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44(3): 335-358.
19. Guzmán, F. and Sierra, V. 2012 .Public-Private Collaborations: Branded Public Services? . *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(7/8): 994 – 1012.
20. Hirsh, E. and Kmec, J.A. 2009. HR Structures: Reducing Discrimination or Raising Right Awareness. *Industrial Relation: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 48(3): 512-523.
21. Hambrick, D.C., Cho, T.S. and Chen, M.J. 1996 .The Influence of Top Management Team Heterogeneity on Firms' Competitive Moves .*Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 659–684.
22. Kangis, P. and Kareklis, P. 2001 .Governance and Organizational Controls in Public and Private Banks .*Corporate Governance*, 1(1): 31 – 38.
23. Kochan, T.A. and Osterman, P. 1994 .The Mutual Gains Enterprise for going a Winning Partnership among Labour Management and Government .Retrieved September 26, 2011, from [http://www.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/ejrot/Vol4\\_1/Tilly.pdf](http://www.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/ejrot/Vol4_1/Tilly.pdf).
24. Lane, J. 1993. *The Public Sector*, Sage, London
25. Lepak, D. P. and Snell, S. A. 1999 .The Human Resource Architecture, Toward a Theory of Human Capital Allocation and Development .*Academy of Management Review*, 24(1): 31-48.
26. MacDuffie, J. P. 1995 .Human Resource Bundles and Manufacturing Performance-Organizational Logic and Flexible Productions Systems in the World Auto Industry .*Academy of Management Journal*, 48(2): 197-221.



27. Macky K. and Boxall P. 2007 .Research and Theory on High-Performance Work Systems: Progressing the High-Involvement Stream .Human Resource Management Journal, 19(1): 3-23.
28. McCartney, J. and Teague, P. 2004 .The Diffusion of High Performance Employment Practices in Republic of Ireland .International Journal of Manpower, 25(7): 598-617.
29. Milliken, F. J. and Martins, L. L. 1996 .Searching for Common Threads: Understanding the Multiple Effects of Diversity in Organizational Groups. The Academy of Management Review, 21(2): 402-433.
30. Osterman, P. 1994. How Common is Workplace Transformation and Who Adopts It? Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 47(2): 173-188.
31. Porter, L.J. and Tanner, S.J. 1998 .Assessing Business Excellence .Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
32. Thompson, P.2001. Systems of Production: Markets, Organizations and Performance. Employee Relation, 25(3): 627-629.
33. Van Buren, M. E. and Werner, J. M. 1996 .High Performance Work Systems .Business and Economic Review, 43(1): 15-35.
34. Wood, S. 1999 .Human Resource Management and Performance .International Journal for Management Review, 1(4): 367-413.
35. Youndt, M.A., Snell, S.A., Dean, J.W. and Lepak, D. P. 1996. Human Resource Management, Manufacturing Strategy and Firm Performance, Academy of Management Journal, 39(4): 836–866.