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Abstract Human resource has been the pivotal factor for sustainable development of any organization. The study aims at finding the effects of institutional activities of human resource development currently in place in the public and private universities in Pakistan and to develop an appropriate faculty development framework/model to improve current level of performance. The research was limited to the Punjab province. The sample of the study included executive and administrative heads, HR managers and faculty members of social sciences department of ten randomly selected universities of Punjab. Data from was gathered through a self-developed and piloted questionnaire HRDAS and analyzed using statistical software (AMOS) version 21 and a Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) framework/model. The results reflect that the formation and recruitment process for human capital, training and development, compensation and profit and mentoring, contribute significantly to the growth of faculties and organizations. The suggested model will improve faculty and institutional performance.


Introduction

Human resources development aimed to develop knowledgeable and skilled individuals who work for the productivity of an organization, community, nation and humanity (McLean & McLean 2001). HR development is a crucial strategy that enables employees to adapt themselves according to the changing environment. In this dynamic world of research, methodologies, tools and technologies, inventions, and economic dominance human resource development is a pivotal stratagem. Like all other organizations of a country higher education institutions needs to undergo pivotal changes. These changes desired new
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managerial and leadership competencies and approaches (Pellert, 2007). The liability of universities has shifted from administering to managing staff. For successful adaption higher education institutions needs to adopt different strategies for better deployment of their human resources (Evans & Chun 2012).

**Selection and Recruitment**

Selection and recruitment is specific and sophisticated processing of selecting talented personals for the development of an organization (Kuldeep, 2004). The selection and recruitment is a vibrant practice that must meet the needs of an organization. Cascio (2006) theorized that the process of selection and recruitment based on the specification of when and how many people are required for smooth functioning of an organization. Similarly, Dessler (2006) affirms that skilled and potential people can give better results if recruited. In this competitive globe, organizations can survive and compete only by recruiting and selecting skilled and capable people (Boxal & Purcell, 2003).

**Training and Development**

Training and development involve uninterrupted exertion of systematic practices to develop potentialities of employees for better outcomes (Monday, 2010). Training and development are believed as compulsory component of HR development program (Weil & Woodall, 2005). Abbas and Yaqoob ‘s study (2009) asserted that the outcomes of professional development and training and the employee are positively correlated. Similarly, Saleem and Amin (2013) propagated that supported role of administration and organizations boosts the performance of employees. The study of Ginns, Kitay, and Prosser (2010) examined the correlation among T&D, working environment and quality of work and found that all these factors are positively correlated. Training bridges the gap between desired and acquired and level of knowledge and skills (Abdullah, 2009).

**Mentoring**

Mentoring means a systematic and planned transition of professional support and guidance to the mentees that enables them to tackle the future challenges. In other words, mentoring is a transitional process where an experienced instructor supervises and supports the unskilled fellows to improve their job skills. Similarly, Bozeman and Feeney (2009) clarified that the mentor possesses the higher skill, experience, vision and wisdom than mentees. Mentoring is a sharing, leading, guiding and learning process in which experienced people transmit their expertise and knowledge to those who want to improve. In this teaching learning process, the seeker as termed as protégé, apprentice or mentee. The experience of mentoring
can be made more effective if highly trained and experienced mentors are employed on merit. The mentor should also have the best ability to share his/her knowledge and experiences. Bozeman and Feeney (2008) again declared mentorship as a process of knowledge transmission, psychosocial assistance and mentee problem solving.

**Compensation and Benefits Practices**

Compensation and benefits mean all types of monitory rewards and benefits being paid by an organization to their employees in return for the duty performed (Williams, 2008). Likewise, Chenevertt and Tremblay (2009) conceptualized compensation and benefits such monitory attributes provided by an organization to their employees against the work performed. Similarly, Weeratunga, (2009), elaborated compensation and benefits as a reward for workforce in return for work performed. Awards, rewards, incentives, pay, promotion, appreciation and acknowledgment are motivational factors that stimulate the employee’s performance, commitment and retention (Williams, 2005). Furthermore, Summers and Hyman (2005), conceived that financial participation scheme was more fruitful than the allied cost if planned in a way that emphasizes the desired behavior. The study conducted by Arshad (2003), assumed that universities faculty accept the challenge of extra workload if they are provided with extra monitory benefits. For better performance, commitment, and retention the employers have to decide how employees are being paid and how to make financial package better.

**Organizational Development**

The purpose of organizational development is to promote coordination among different units, groups and other stakeholders of the organizations. It aims at holistic organizational development based on long-term and sustainable planning to enhance overall productivity of an organization (Werner & DeSimone, 2012). In the point of view of higher education foundations of Pakistan, the staff improvement program of Pakistani colleges needs such maintainable arranging and techniques. The Naqvi and Raza survey (2011) revealed that Pakistani advanced educational organizations have less skills. This limits hierarchical yield and development. Similarly, Saleem and Amin (2013), studied the contribution of supportive role of organizations towards their employees and propagated that democratic organizational atmosphere positively influences organizational development. It has been demonstrated by various examinations that hierarchical improvement relies on expert and self-improvement and self-improvement depends on preparing and advancement openings offered to the representatives.

The literature survey shows that the selection, recruitment and education, mentoring, compensation and benefits factors, and the corporate development of
HRD are factors that have a significant role the working of an organization. Keeping in view the importance, the researchers tried to investigate HRD practices in the development of learning environment in the local universities.

**Purpose of the Study**

This research aimed to review current activities in the public and private higher education sectors for professional development. Furthermore, this study would explore the correlation among various HR development factors. Based on the results of analysis an applicable model would be suggested for faculty development program of Pakistani universities.

**Delimitations**

This study is restricted to public and private universities in Pakistan's Punjab province under the umbrella of university education.

**Hypothesis**

The hypotheses were used to evaluate the effect on institutional organizational development of the strategic human resource development issue.

- **H1**: There is a significant correlation between selection and recruitment and organizational development.
- **H2**: There is a significant and positive correlation between training and development and organizational development.
- **H3**: There is a significant and positive correlation between mentoring and organizational development mentoring.
- **H4**: There is a significant and positive correlation between compensation and benefits practices and organizational development.

**Population of the Study**

The study population was included in public and private universities in Punjab province.

**Sample of the Study**

Ten universities from each sector have been selected for the study using a random sample technique, with 525 faculty members collecting data, executive and administrative heads and HR managers of social sciences department of the selected universities.
Methodology

Data was collected from faculty members, administrative and executive heads of social sciences department of randomly selected universities. The collection of data was based on a self-developed and pilot questionnaire. Of the 700 participants, 525 were invaluable, displaying a 75 percent response rate. Data have been analyzed with version 21 of the software for statistical (AMOS) and structural equation modeling has been developed. The detail of analysis and conclusion drawn are given below.

**Table 1. Cutoff Criteria for model fit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>CMIM/DF</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>P Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrible</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>&lt;0.90</td>
<td>&gt;0.10</td>
<td>&gt; 0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>&gt; 3</td>
<td>&lt;0.95</td>
<td>&gt;0.08</td>
<td>&gt; 0.06</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>&gt; 1</td>
<td>&gt;0.95</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>&gt; 0.06</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Hu and Bentler (1999) Source: 'Cutoff Fit Index Criteria in the Analysis of Covariance Structure'*

**Table 2. Model Fit Measures of the study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CMIM/DF</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>P Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Between 1 and 3</td>
<td>&gt;0.95</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.06</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>797.79</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1.999</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Congratulations, your model fit is acceptable (Source: Amos output file; primary Data)*

**Table 3. Model Fit Summary. CMIN (Minimum Discrepancy)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>NPAR</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default model</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>797.796</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence model</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6034.328</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>12.977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Amos output; primary Data*

The CMIN and DF have no definite cutoff value for a fit model, while the CMIN divided by/DF (CMIN/DF) ought to be between 1 and 3 for a good model fit. The CMIN/DF value of the recommended model was 1.999 which revealed the developed model a good fit (See table 1 & 3).
Table 4. Baseline Comparisons of the structural model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>NFI Delta 1</th>
<th>RFI rho1</th>
<th>IFI Delta 2</th>
<th>TLI rho2</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default model</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence model</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Amos output; primary Data

Comparative Fit Index (CFI) weighs up the general perfection of a suggested model. A CFI of 0.90 or higher indicates adequacy of a fit model. Comparative index of fit (CFI) value of the recommended model was .928 which illustrated the goodness of suggested model (see Table 1 & 4). In addition to the indices above, other two more criteria were also taken into consideration to assess the appropriateness of model fit (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2006). The details of the criterion are as under

Table 5. Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>LO90</th>
<th>HI90</th>
<th>PCLOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default model</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence model</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Amos output; primary Data

Root Mean square Approximation Error (RMSEA) estimates the degree taking into account the complexity of the model, the model approximates the data. A RMSEA of .05 or below is considered a good work, and a value of .08 or below suggests acceptable work (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). To estimate the function goodness of the 5-factor model, a maximum-likelihood approach was used. The suggested model 's estimated RMSEA price was .044, which affirms a decent work to the prompt model (see Table one & 5).

Table 6. Root Mean Square (RMR) and GFI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>PGFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default model</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence model</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Amos output; primary Data

Goodness of fit index (GFI): AN absolute fit index model, GFI in multiple regression analysis is analogous to a model R2. The GFI .90 Value or higher than
significance an adequate model match. The GFI of the projected model was .911 fit reflected the suggested model a good match (see Table one & 6).

**Table 7. Covariances: (Group number 1 - Default model)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Ment</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>7.932***</td>
<td>par_29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>7.366***</td>
<td>par_52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>7.593***</td>
<td>par_55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td>Ment</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>6.841***</td>
<td>par_56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>6.756***</td>
<td>par_57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Ment</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>7.695***</td>
<td>par_58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8. Model Validity Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>MSV</th>
<th>MaxR(H)</th>
<th>Recruit</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Ment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.803**</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.600***</td>
<td>0.593***</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ment</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.683**</td>
<td>0.729***</td>
<td>0.724***</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Figure 1. Faculty development Model**
Discussion

This research has a broad impact and different implications on organizational and institutional success in the field of human resources practices. It's acknowledged across the globe that the event of a country mostly depends on the standard of education notably the upper education and quality of upper education entirely depend on the standard of faculty. The quality of faculty in Pakistani universities needs immediate and solid uplift. There are many faculty development frameworks/models in developing as well as developed countries. This is key focus point, the specific social, economic and educational scenario of Pakistan the researchers suggested a framework/model. The proposed Framework/model based on constructs of human resources development practices the way is that first the employee selection and recruitment, and then provided training and development, mentoring, compensation and benefits. The study considered the factor of development of human resources (HRD) as an organization’s mediator.

Four hypotheses were tested and results were as under:

**H1:** It was deduced from the analysis of first hypothesis that selection and recruitment and organizational development are strongly correlated. Merit based recruitment and selection will significantly improve the quality of faculty. The principle of selecting right person for the right job highly contributes to faculty development. The results of this study are consistent with Dessler’s study (2006), in which skills and potential employees can produce better results when recruited.

**H2:** The analysis of the second hypothesis affirmed that continuous professional development and training enhance the performance of academia. The findings from a similar Abbas and Yaqoob (2009) research confirmed the results of this report, which indicates that training and development (T&D) and the success of employees are strongly correlated.

**H3:** In the analysis of the hypothesis in hand revealed that mentoring is positively associated/correlated with organizational development. Mentoring helps in removing the shortcomings and enables the employees to face the challenges with confidence and they perform faultlessly.

**H4:** The analysis revealed that compensation and benefits practices and faculty performance are positively correlated. All types of monetary awards, rewards, incentives, cash prizes, appreciations are source of motivation for employees and they put their maximum for higher outcomes. The study by Frye (2004) found that equity compensation is linked to organizational performance. In addition, the Arshad (2003) study results also support the results of the study underway and show that faculties are accepting additional workloads if extra financial remuneration is provided.
Conclusion

The development of an academic organization’s human resources is largely dependent on its development. The importance of human resource development practices and their proper implementations has already now been acknowledged by the universities and are taking adequate measures for their executions. Realizing the importance of human resources government of Pakistan, in collaboration with the higher education of Pakistan (HEC) has taken numerous initiatives to promote higher education particularly faculty development. Some universities have established their HRD departments and have started applying various HR development activities. Despite all these initiatives much more need to be done to make the higher education sector more spirited. Higher education institutions HEIs needs to establish well designed and well powered HRD department for faculty and ministerial staff development to cope with future challenges

Recommendations

Based on the above recommendations, a recommendation on the establishment of faculty has been made.

1- Selection and recruitment process should be made transparent and recruitments should be made purely on merit.
2- There is a strong need for induction as well as on the job training for faculty development.
3- Universities should establish a vigilant mentoring mechanism to mentor the mentees.
4- In order to attract and retain the staff and employees, universities should apply a transparent compensation and benefits mechanism based on equity.
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