

## PhD in Management Work

### MANAGEMENT EDUCATORS AND STAKEHOLDERS ON HR EDUCATION IN B-SCHOOLS

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment for  
the award of Doctor of Philosophy Degree (PhD)  
in Management

By Gururaj B Urs Research Scholar

Under the Guidance of  
M M Bagali, PhD

Professor of Management & HR Research Guide,  
Jain University

Faculty of Management Studies

Jain University, Bengaluru August 2016

## Chapter 4

### Analysis of Results

The analysis of results of the present study, for the ease of convenience and understanding, has been discussed briefly under three major headings, viz., HR students, HR Academicians and HR Practitioners. The details are given as under :

#### 4.1 HR students perception of HR Management education

Part A : Descriptive analysis

Part B : Analysis has been categorized as per the following variables

- a. Type of institution presently studying in
- b. Age group
- c. Domicile
- d. Learning styles

4.1 : HR Students Perception of HR Management Education.

Part A : Descriptive Analysis

Table No 4.1.1 : Frequency and percent responses by HR student respondents studying in different institutions by their gender

Name of the University / Institute in which HR education is being pursued	F and %	Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Christ University, Bengaluru	F	3	10	13
	%	3.3%	6.8%	5.5%
Acharya School of Management, Bengaluru	F	1	3	4
	%	1.1%	2.0%	1.7%
University of Mysore, Mysuru	F	4	10	14
	%	4.4%	6.8%	5.9%
VT University, Belagavi	F	1	10	11
	%	1.1%	6.8%	4.6%
Jain University, Bengaluru	F	9	10	19
	%	10.0%	6.8%	8.0%
Central University of Karnataka, Kalburgi	F	1	6	7
	%	1.1%	4.1%	2.9%
Gulbarga University, Kalburgi	F	8	3	11
	%	8.9%	2.0%	4.6%
Karnataka State Women's University, Vijayapura	F	2	15	17
	%	2.2%	10.1%	7.1%
VKS University, Ballari	F	4	4	8
	%	4.4%	2.7%	3.4%
Tumkur University, Tumkuru	F	14	8	22
	%	15.6%	5.4%	9.2%
Kuvempu University, Shankaraghatta, Shivmogga	F	4	16	20
	%	4.4%	10.8%	8.4%
Davangere University, Davangere	F	1	1	2
	%	1.1%	.7%	.8%
Bangalore University, Bengaluru	F	6	7	13
	%	6.7%	4.7%	5.5%
St Josephs College of Business Admin, Bengaluru	F	1	2	3
	%	1.1%	1.4%	1.3%

Manipal University, Manipal	F	5	8	13
	%	5.6%	5.4%	5.5%
Karnatak University, Dharwad	F	1	8	9
	%	1.1%	5.4%	3.8%
Mangalore University, Mangaluru	F	7	5	12
	%	7.8%	3.4%	5.0%
NITK Suratkal, Mangaluru	F	5	10	15
	%	5.6%	6.8%	6.3%
MSRIMS, Bengaluru	F	4	4	8
	%	4.4%	2.7%	3.4%
Mounts Carmel Institute of Management, Bengaluru	F	9	8	17
	%	10.0%	5.4%	7.1%
Total	F	90	148	238
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

(F = Frequency ; % = Percentage)

A total of 90 male and 148 female HR students were the respondents. The highest number of total number of students came from Tumkur University with 9% (a total of 22 students, as in 14 male and 8 female); they were followed by 8.5% (a total of 20 students, as in 4 male and 16 female) of Kuvempu University. The least number of students came from Davangere University with 0.8% (a total of 2 students, 1 each of male and female).

Table No 4.1.2 : Frequency and percent responses by HR students respondents based on their academic scores and gender

Classification of HR students based on academic scores	F and %	Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Top 10%	F	16	42	58
	%	17.8%	28.4%	24.4%
Top 11 to 25%	F	37	55	92
	%	41.1%	37.2%	38.7%
Average	F	36	47	83
	%	40.0%	31.8%	34.9%
Poor scorers	F	1	4	5
	%	1.1%	2.7%	2.1%

Total	F	90	148	238
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

(F = Frequency ; % = Percentage)

A total of 90 male and 148 female HR students were the respondents. The highest number of students came from top 11 to 25% of the class at 38.7%; followed by average academic rank of the class with 34.9%. A good number of students at 24.4% were from the top 10% of the class. Very less number of students were found at poor scores of the class at 2.1%.

Table No 4.1.3 : Frequency and percent responses by HR student respondents based on their learning styles and age groups

Types of Learning Styles	F and %	Age groups			Total
		22-26 yrs	27-31 yrs	32+ yrs	
Self Study (1)	F	50	4	2	56
	%	23.8%	15.4%	100.0%	23.5%
Lecture Classes (2)	F	4	7	0	11
	%	1.9%	26.9%	0.0%	4.6%
Class notes (3)	F	29	0	0	29
	%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	12.2%
Internet Download (4)	F	17	6	0	23
	%	8.1%	23.1%	0.0%	9.7%
Group Study with Friends (5)	F	18	4	0	22
	%	8.6%	15.4%	0.0%	9.2%
Tutions (6)	F	9	1	0	10
	%	4.3%	3.8%	0.0%	4.2%
Other method (7)*	F	7	0	0	7
	%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%
1, 3 and 4	F	15	0	0	15
	%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%
1,2,3,4 and 5	F	31	4	0	35
	%	14.8%	15.4%	0.0%	14.7%
5, 6 and 7	F	30	0	0	30
	%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	12.6%
Total	F	201	26	2	238

<b>total</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
--------------	----------	-------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

\*Other methods (e.g., studying during the last few days before exams; solving question papers only; studying important chapters only); F = Frequency; % = Percentage

The largest number of students (n=201) were found in the age group of 22 to 26 years; followed by (n=26) in the age group 27-31 years. Only 2 students were found in the 32+ years age group. The type of learning style adopted by most of the students was self study at 23.5%; followed by a combination of self study, lecture classes, internet download and group study with friends (1,2,3,4 and 5) at 14.7%; the combination of group study with friends, tuitions and other methods (5,6 and 7) at 12.6% constituted the third highest category. The least used methodology of study was at 2.9%, i.e., using other learning methods, as in for example, studying during the last few days of the semester.

Table No 4.1.4 : Frequency and percent responses by HR student respondents based on their learning styles and background in Bachelor's degree

Learning style	F and %	Background in Bachelor's Degree			Total
		Traditional (BA, BSc)	Managerial (BCom, BBM)	Technological (BE, BTech)	
Self Study (1)	F	5	43	8	56
	%	13.2%	24.3%	34.8%	23.5%
Lecture Classes (2)	F	2	7	2	11
	%	5.3%	4.0%	8.7%	4.6%
Class notes (3)	F	4	25	0	29
	%	10.5%	14.1%	0.0%	12.2%
Internet Download (4)	F	6	16	1	23
	%	15.8%	9.0%	4.3%	9.7%
Group Study with Friends (5)	F	6	16	0	22
	%	15.8%	9.0%	0.0%	9.2%
Tutions (6)	F	3	7	0	10
	%	7.9%	4.0%	0.0%	4.2%
Other method (7)*	F	1	6	0	7
	%	2.6%	3.4%	0.0%	2.9%
1, 3 and 4	F	0	12	3	15
	%	0.0%	6.8%	13.0%	6.3%

1,2,3,4 and 5	F	7	23	5	35
	%	18.4%	13.0%	21.7%	14.7%
5, 6 and 7	F	4	22	4	30
	%	10.5%	12.4%	17.4%	12.6%
Total	F	38	177	23	238
	%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

(F= Frequency ; % = Percentage) (\*Other methods - studying just before the exams)

The type of learning style adopted by most of the students was self study at 23.5%; followed by a combination of self study, lecture classes, internet download and group study with friends at 14.7%; The least used methodology of study was at 2.9%, i.e., using other methods which as in for example, studying during the last few days of the semester. The largest number of students (n=177) were found amongst students with the managerial background, i.e., BCom and BBM; followed by (n=38) in the traditional degree, i.e., BA and BSc. The least number (n=23) of students were found with technical background, i.e., BE and BTech.

Table No 4.1.5 : Frequency and percent responses by HR student respondents based on their reasons to move from their native place and to the institution presently studying

a- State University; b - Central University; c- Deemed University; d - Autonomous b-school; e-NITK

1 = Reputation of the University; 2 = Reputation of the b-school; 3 = Reputation of the HR Program; 4 = Influence of the Family; 5 = Financial considerations; 6 = 1,3 and 5; 7 = 1,2 and 5; 8 = 2,4, and 5

The largest number of students have shifted from their native place to the place of study (n = 97), based on the reputation of the Institute. This was followed by those HR students (n = 41), who informed that the reputation of the b-school and the reputation of the HR program was important to them, hence they have shifted to the place of study. Further, the largest number of students came from the State Universities at 58.4% (n=139), followed by students from Deemed University at 18.9% (n=45), and at 13.2% (n= 32) from Autonomous b-schools. The least number of students came from the Central University of Karnataka at 2.9% (n=7).

Table No 4.1.6 : Frequency and percent responses by HR student respondents based on the background of their Bachelors degree and the type of Institution

Type of University	F and %	Background in Bachelor's Degree			Total
		Traditional (BA, BSc)	Managerial (BCom, BBM)	Technological (BE, BTech)	

State University	F	25	108	6	139
	%	65.8%	61.0%	26.1%	58.4%
Central University	F	2	3	2	7
	%	5.3%	1.7%	8.7%	2.9%
Deemed University	F	6	31	8	45
	%	15.8%	17.5%	34.8%	18.9%
Autonomous b-schools	F	2	29	1	32
	%	5.3%	16.4%	4.3%	13.4%
National Institute of Technology	F	3	6	6	15
	%	7.9%	3.4%	26.1%	6.3%
Total	F	38	177	23	238
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The largest number of students (n=177) were found with managerial background in their graduation, i.e., BCom and BBM. This was followed by (n=38) those HR students possessing the traditional degrees, i.e., BA and BSc. Least number (n = 23) of HR students were found amongst those with technical background. Further, the largest number of students came from the State University at 58.4% (n=139), followed by students coming from Deemed University at 18.9% (n=45), followed by 13.2% (n=32) from Autonomous b-schools. The least number of students came from the Central University of Karnataka, at 2.9% (n=7).

4.1 : Analysis has been categorized as per the following variables -

- a. Type of institution presently studying
- b. Age group
- c. Domicile
- d. Learning styles

a. Type of institution presently studying

Table No 4.1.7 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR subjects termed as redundant in the HR program" and the results of test statistics

HR Subjects which are redundant	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
1	F	64	0	14	4	0	82	X <sup>2</sup> = 161.22; p=.000  CC=.635; p=.000
	%	46.1%	0.0%	31.1%	12.5%	0.0%	34.5%	
2	F	29	0	5	15	1	50	
	%	20.9%	0.0%	11.1%	46.9%	6.7%	21.0%	
3	F	5	0	9	1	0	15	
	%	3.6%	0.0%	20.0%	3.1%	0.0%	6.3%	
4	F	4	0	14	4	14	36	

	%	2.9%	0.0%	31.1%	12.5%	93.3%	15.1%
5	F	37	7	3	8	0	55
	%	26.6%	100.0%	6.7%	25.0%	0.0%	23.1%
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

1= HR Skills / Human Resources Development / Human Asset Management / Training and Developing / Performance Appraisal and Counseling/ Strategic HR / International Human Resources Management; 2 = Industrial Relations and collective Bargaining / Labor Laws / Employee Relationship Management; 3 = Compensation and Benefits / Recruitment and selection; 4 = Organizational Development and Management of Change; 5 = Others (All subjects are OK / Every subject is important / All subjects are needed)

Comparison amongst the type of institutions that students are studying in, revealed that 34.5% of the students have opined that HR subjects with titles like HR Skills / Human Resources Development / Human Asset Management / Training and Development / Performance Appraisal and Counseling/ Strategic HR / International Human Resource Management, were redundant. This followed by HR subjects with titles like Industrial Relations and collective Bargaining / Labor Laws / Employee Relationship Management at 21%. Lastly, 15.1% of the students have opined that HR subjects with titles like Organizational Development and Management of Change, were termed redundant. But there is another group of students at 23.1% who opined that "all subjects are OK / every subject is important / all subjects are needed". Chi-square revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=161.22$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating a differential response across students amongst the types of institutions, in terms of redundant HR subjects.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists amongst the groups of frequencies ( $CC=.635$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that respondents in State run universities were of the opinion that subjects like, HR Skills / Human Resources Development / Human Asset Management / Training and Development / Performance Appraisal and Counseling/ Strategic HR / International Human Resource Management were redundant at 46.1%. At 26.6%, students felt that all subjects were ok / every subject is important / all subjects are needed. The Central University students (at 100%), have informed that all the HR subjects were ok / every HR subject is important / all HR subjects are needed.

The Deemed University students, (at 31.1% each), have informed that subjects like HR Skills / Human Resources Development / Human Asset Management / Training and Development/ Performance Appraisal and Counseling/ Strategic HR / International Human Resource Management, Organizational Development and Management of Change are redundant. In the case of students from Autonomous b-schools, (at 46.9%) HR subjects with titles such as Industrial Relations and collective Bargaining / Labor Laws / Employee Relationship Management, however other students (at 25%) have informed that all HR subjects are OK / Every HR subject is important / All HR subjects are needed. In National Institute of Technology Karnataka (NITK), students have opined (at 93.3%) that subjects with titles like Organizational Development and Management of Change were redundant. Thus, we find that there is differential labeling of the HR subjects as redundant and that, this varies significantly from students of one institution to another.



Table No 4.1.8 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR subjects termed redundant in 1<sup>st</sup> semester" and the result of test statistics

HR subjects being termed redundant in 1st Sem	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
a	F	24	7	9	0	0	40	X <sup>2</sup> =154.21 7 p=.000
	%	17.3%	100.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.8%	
b	F	17	0	3	4	0	24	CC = .627 p=.000
	%	12.2%	0.0%	6.7%	12.5%	0.0%	10.1%	
c	F	83	0	1	4	14	102	
	%	59.7%	0.0%	2.2%	12.5%	93.3%	42.9%	
d	F	15	0	32	24	1	72	
	%	10.8%	0.0%	71.1%	75.0%	6.7%	30.3%	
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

a= Planning and Development / Managing Organizations / Management Principles and Practices; b= HRM /International Human Resources Management / Performance Management / Labour Law and Industrial Relations; c = Organizational Behavior; d = Others (Not Applicable / Not taught at all / syllabus is ok).

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect to the redundancy amongst HR subjects has revealed that at 42.9 % of the students, have opined that Organizational Behavior as a subject was redundant. This was to be followed by 30.3% of students, who reported that "this question is not applicable / syllabus is ok". Lastly, at 16.8% of the students, have replied that the subject titled "Planning and Development / Managing Organizations / Management Principles and Practices" as redundant in the first semester. Chi-square test revealed a significant difference between these frequencies (X<sup>2</sup>=154.217; p=.000), thus informing that HR students differed in their responses about the redundancy of HR subjects in the first semester.

Contingency coefficient revealed the existence of a significant association (CC=.627; p=.000), between the frequencies, indicating that State run University students with "Organizational Behavior" at 59.7%, "Planning and Development / Managing Organizations / Management Principles and Practices" at 17.3% were redundant. Amongst all the Central University students at 100% have replied with "Planning and Development / Managing Organizations / Management Principles and Practices" as being redundant.

Deemed University students have replied differently with "not applicable / not taught at all / syllabus is ok" at 71%; whilst 20% of it students informed that "Planning and Development / Managing Organizations / Management Principles and Practices" are redundant. At 75% of the students of Autonomous b-schools, informed that "not applicable / not taught at all / syllabus is ok". Lastly the students of NITK, at 93% have opined that "Organizational Behavior" as a subject has been termed redundant. Thus, indicating the existence of a differential response in the perception of HR students regarding the redundancy of HR subjects, across types of institutions.

Table No 4.1.9 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR subjects termed redundant in 2<sup>nd</sup> semester" and the result of test statistics

HR subjects being termed redundant in 2nd Sem	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
1	F	3	0	11	5	0	19	$X^2 = 76.568$ $p = .000$  $CC = .493$ $p = .000$
	%	2.2%	0.0%	24.4%	15.6%	0.0%	8.0%	
2	F	87	0	16	6	14	123	
	%	62.6%	0.0%	35.6%	18.8%	93.3%	51.7%	
3	F	11	0	0	0	0	11	
	%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%	
4	F	38	7	18	21	1	85	
	%	27.3%	100.0%	40.0%	65.6%	6.7%	35.7%	
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

1 = Organizational change and design / Women and Health; 2 = Ethics and Leadership / Performance Appraisal / HRM / Human Asset Management / Resource Management / Labour law; 3 = Strategic HR / Knowledge Management; 4 = Others (HR is only theory / Not very practical / HR with IT would have been helpful).

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with their responses to the statement "HR subjects termed redundant in 2<sup>nd</sup> semester", has revealed that at 51.7 % of students, have opined that "Ethics and Leadership / Performance Appraisal / HRM / Human Asset Management / Resource Management / Labour law" were redundant and at 35.7% of students reported that "HR is only theory / Not very practical / HR with IT would have been helpful". Chi-square test has revealed a significant difference between these frequencies ( $X^2=76.568$ ;  $p=.000$ ), thus informing that HR students differed sig-

nificantly in their responses regarding the redundancy of HR subjects, being studied in the second semester.

Contingency coefficient revealed the existence of a significant association (CC=.627; p=.000), between the frequencies, indicating that amongst the State run University students HR subjects with titles "Ethics and Leadership / Performance Appraisal / HRM / Human Asset Management / Resource Management / Labour law" were termed redundant at 62.6%, followed by 27.3% of the students reporting that "HR is only theory / not very practical / HR with IT would have been helpful". All the Central University students at 100% have opined that "HR is only theory / not very practical / HR with IT would have been helpful".

Deemed University students have informed that "HR is only theory / not very practical / IT would have been helpful" at 40%, whilst 35% of it students informed that "Ethics and Leadership / Performance Appraisal / HRM / Human Asset Management / Resource Management / Labour law" are redundant; lastly at 24.4% of the students have informed that "Organizational change and design / Women and Health" were subjects that were termed as redundant. 65.5% of the Autonomous b-school students, have opined that "HR is only theory / not very practical / HR with IT would have been helpful", followed by 18.8% of students informing that "Ethics and Leadership / Performance Appraisal / HRM / Human Asset Management / Resource Management / Labour law" can be termed redundant. Lastly the students of NITK, at 93% have opined that 'Ethics and Leadership / Performance Appraisal / HRM / Human Asset Management / Resource Management / Labour law" as a group of subjects have been termed redundant. Thus, indicating the existence of a differential response in the perception of HR students regarding the redundancy of the HR subjects being presently taught, across types of institutions.

Table No 4.1.10 : Frequency and percent responses for "strengths and opportunities of the HR program" and results of test statistics

Strengths and Opportunities	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
1,2 and 3	F	20	1	9	0	1	31	X <sup>2</sup> = 12.207 p=.429
	%	14.4%	14.3%	20.0%	0.0%	6.7%	13.0%	
4,5, 5a and 6	F	40	2	13	12	2	69	CC = .221 p=.429
	%	28.8%	28.6%	28.9%	37.5%	13.3%	29.0%	
1,2,3,5 and 5a	F	44	3	12	11	5	75	
	%	31.7%	42.9%	26.7%	34.4%	33.3%	31.5%	
3, 4, 5 and 5a	F	35	1	11	9	7	63	
	%	25.2%	14.3%	24.4%	28.1%	46.7%	26.5%	
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

1 = Teaching Learning Ambiance and exposure; 2 = HR Academician; 3 = Guest Academician from Industry; 4 = Campus Placements and Career; 5 = HR Curriculum; 5a = Flexibility and Innovativeness in Curriculum; and 6 = Co and Extra-curricular Activities.

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect to the components of strengths and opportunities of their respective HR programs, is highest at 31.5% as the students have revealed that "teaching learning ambiance and exposure; HR Academician; guest Academician from Industry; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum" are important components; they were followed at 29% by those students who opined that "campus placements and career; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum; Co and extra-curricular activities" formed the second level. Lastly, at 26.5% of the students informed that "guest Academician from industry; campus placements and career; HR Curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum" formed the third level of components, in terms of strengths and opportunities, in their respective HR program. Chi-square test revealed no difference between these frequencies ( $X^2=12.207$ ;  $p=.429$ ), even though students had expressed various responses about the strengths and opportunities of their respective HR programs.

Contingency coefficient revealed a non-significant association ( $CC=.221$ ;  $p=.429$ ), between these frequencies, indicating that amongst those in the State run University students at 31.7% who reported that "teaching learning Ambiance and exposure; HR Academician; guest Academician from Industry; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum"; this was followed by 28.8% of the students informing that "campus placements and career; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum; Co-curricular and extra-curricular activities". Lastly, at 25.2% "guest Academician from industry; campus placements and career; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum" as the strengths and opportunities in the HR program.

Amongst the Central University students at 42.9% have opined that "teaching learning Ambiance and exposure; HR Academician; guest Academician from industry; campus placements and career; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum"; this was followed by 28.6% of the student population reporting that "campus placements and career; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum; Co and extra-curricular activities" as the strengths and opportunities in their HR program.

Students in Deemed Universities have reported that at 28.9% have "campus placements and career; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum; Co and extra-curricular activities "; this was followed by 26.7% of the students with "teaching learning Ambiance and exposure; HR Academician; guest Academician from Industry; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum" as the strengths and opportunities in their HR program.

The students at NITK have reported that at 46.7% of the population that "guest Academician from Industry; campus placements and career; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum"; this was followed by 33.3% of the student population informing that "teaching learning Ambiance and exposure; HR Academician; guest Academician from Industry; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum", as the strengths and opportunities of their HR program.

Lastly, amongst the students of Autonomous b-schools, at 37.5% of the population have opined that "campus placements and career; HR curriculum; flexibility and innovativeness in curriculum; Co and extra-curricular Activities"; these were followed by 34.4% of the population informing that "teaching learning ambiance and exposure; HR Academician; guest Academician from industry; campus placements and career; HR curriculum; flexibility and

innovativeness in curriculum", as the strengths and opportunities of their HR program. Thus, no difference was revealed between these groups of frequencies, even though students had expressed various responses about the strengths and opportunities of their respective HR programs, across different types of institutions. Thus, we can say that the strengths and opportunities in any HR program, must involve a deep look and to strengthen, by the interest and knowledge of all the stake holders concerned, there by helping the HR program and the institution to grow and evolve as per the needs of its environment.

Table No 4.1.11 : Frequency and percent responses for "weaknesses and threats of the HR program" and results of test statistics

Weaknesses and threats	F and %	Type of Institution						Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5	Total	
1,2,3	F	23	1	6	5	1	36	X <sup>2</sup> = 10.207 p=.586  CC = .204 p=.586
	%	16.5%	14.3%	13.3%	15.6%	6.7%	15.1%	
4,5,6	F	37	3	17	14	3	74	
	%	26.6%	42.9%	37.8%	43.8%	20.0%	31.1%	
1,7 and 8	F	46	2	13	10	5	76	
	%	33.1%	28.6%	28.9%	31.3%	33.3%	31.9%	
2,3, 7 and 8	F	33	1	9	3	6	52	
	%	23.7%	14.3%	20.0%	9.4%	40.0%	21.8%	
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

1 = Everything is Mandatory / Compulsory; 2 = HR as a discipline is looked down by people, other specializations; 3 = HR Academician are biased and Lack knowledge; 4 = Type of Academic term based; 5 = Less Placements (Qualitatively and Quantitatively) in HR; 6 = Location of the Campus / College; 7 = Academic - Industry gap is huge and 8 = Exposure to practical / corporate world is the need.

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect the weakness and threats of their respective HR programs, at 31.9% of the students have revealed that "everything is mandatory / compulsory; HR as a discipline is looked down by people, specializations; HR Academician are biased and lack knowledge", they were followed by 31.1% of the students who opined that "type of Academic term based; less Placements (Qualitatively and Quantitatively) in HR; location of the campus / college". Lastly at 21.8% of the respondents who informed that "HR as a discipline is looked down by people; HR Academicians are biased and lack knowledge; academic-industry gap is

huge and exposure to practical / corporate world is the need". Chi-square test revealed no difference between these frequencies ( $X^2=10.207$ ;  $p=.586$ ), thus informing that students had differential responses HR regarding the components of weaknesses and threats of their respective HR programs.

Contingency coefficient revealed the existence of a non-significant association ( $CC=.204$ ;  $p=.586$ ), between the frequencies, indicating that amongst the State run University students at 33.1% reported that "everything is mandatory / compulsory; academic - industry gap is huge and exposure to practical / corporate world is the need, type of academic term based; less placements (qualitatively and quantitatively) in HR; location of the campus / college". At 26.6% the respondents have replied that the "type of academic term based; less placements (qualitatively and quantitatively) in HR; location of the campus / college" is important. Lastly, followed by 23.7% of the respondents saying that "HR as a discipline is looked down by people, specializations; HR Academician are biased and lack knowledge".

Amongst the Central University students at 42.9% who have opined that "type of academic term based; less placements (qualitatively and quantitatively) in HR; location of the campus / college; in curriculum"; At 28.6% of students have informed that "everything is mandatory / compulsory; academic - industry gap is huge and exposure to practical / corporate world is the need" as components of weakness and threats of their HR program.

The Deemed University students at 37.8% opined that "type of academic term based; less placements (qualitatively and quantitatively) in HR; location of the campus / college". This was followed by 28.9% of the respondents "everything is mandatory / compulsory; academic - industry gap is huge and exposure to practical / corporate world is the need" as components of weakness and threats of their HR program.

The Autonomous b-school students informed that at 43.8% "type of academic term based; less placements (qualitatively and quantitatively) in HR; location of the campus / college" was important; they are followed at 31.3% of the students with "everything is mandatory / compulsory. academic - industry gap is huge and exposure to practical / corporate world is the need". They are followed by 15.6% of the population who informed that "everything is mandatory / compulsory; HR as a discipline is looked down by people, specializations; HR Academician are biased and lack knowledge; type of academic term based; less placements (qualitatively and quantitatively) in HR; location of the campus / college; academic - industry gap is huge and exposure to practical / corporate world is the need" as components of weakness and threats of their HR program.

In the NITK, with 40% of students having opined that "HR as a discipline is looked down by people, other specializations; HR Academician are biased and lack knowledge; academic - industry gap is huge and exposure to practical / corporate world is the need". They are followed by 33.3% of the respondents, opined that "everything is mandatory / compulsory; academic - industry gap is huge and exposure to practical / corporate world is the need". Thus, we can say that the weaknesses and threats of the HR program, must be looked into and eliminated completely by all the stake holders concerned. There by helping the program and the institution to grow and evolve as per the needs of its environment and its people.

Table No 4.1.12 : Frequency and percent responses for "issues not strengthened by the HR program" and results of test statistics

Issues not strengthened by HR	F and %	Type of Institution	Test Statistics
-------------------------------	---------	---------------------	-----------------

Cited by HR program		1	2	3	4	5	Total	$\chi^2 = 57.351$ $p = .000$ $CC = .441$ $p = .000$
1	F	4	0	1	2	0	7	
	%	2.9%	0.0%	2.2%	6.3%	0.0%	2.9%	
2	F	10	3	8	2	6	29	
	%	7.2%	42.9%	17.8%	6.3%	40.0%	12.2%	
3	F	14	0	9	7	7	37	
	%	10.1%	0.0%	20.0%	21.9%	46.7%	15.5%	
4	F	4	0	4	0	0	8	
	%	2.9%	0.0%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	
5	F	10	0	1	0	0	11	
	%	7.2%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%	
6	F	3	0	0	0	0	3	
	%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	
7	F	94	4	22	21	2	143	
	%	67.6%	57.1%	48.9%	65.6%	13.3%	60.1%	
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

1= Practical HR / New Theories and concepts from the HR Industry; 2 = In-depth analysis of HR trends / Real time analysis of any scenario; 3 = Core HR concept / HR Analytics; 4 = Current happenings in HR industry / Global HR situation; 5 = Career guidance / HR - KSA needed upon entry into the industry; 6 = Avoid too many internal tests and giving more work load during the semester; 7 = NA / Do not know.

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect "issues not strengthened by the HR program", has revealed that 60.1% of the respondents reported that "they do not know / NA". They were followed by 15.5% of HR students, who reported that "core HR / HR Analytics" could be added to strengthen the program. These were followed by 12.2% who informed that "in-depth analysis of HR trends / real time analysis of any scenario" is important which could change the HR program. Chi-square test revealed significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $\chi^2=57.351$ ;  $p=.000$ ), thus informing that students differed significantly in their responses regarding their perception of issues leading to strengthening the HR program.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.441$ ;  $p=.000$ ) between the groups of frequencies, i.e., amongst the State and Central University students at 67.9% and 57.1% of them reporting that "NA / do not know". This was followed by 10.1% and 42.9% of the students reporting that "core HR concept /HR Analytics" respectively were important. Amongst the Deemed and Autonomous b-schools, at 48.9% and 65.6% of

the respondents who have replied that "NA / do not know" respectively. They are followed by 20% and 21.9% of the respondents replying "core HR concepts / HR Analytics" respectively. Amongst the NITK students, 46.7% and 40% have replied that "core HR concepts / HR Analytics" and "in-depth analysis of HR trends / real time analysis of any scenario" respectively. Lastly, at 13.3% of the respondents replied with "NA / Do not know", as the answer. Thus, we can say that some of the issues pertaining to HR concepts, subjects, scope and such issues have to be strengthened in the HR program by the students, Academicians and Staff concerned in the respective institution, only then would HR students be able to appreciate the program.

Table No 4.1.13 : Frequency and percent responses for "the issues to be made clear to the HR student before the entry into the HR program" and results of test statistics

Issues to be made clear to the HR student before the entry into the HR program	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
a	F	6	0	5	1	0	12	$X^2=52.874$ $p=.000$ $CC = .426$ $p=.000$
	%	4.3%	0.0%	11.1%	3.1%	0.0%	5.0%	
b	F	13	0	10	5	1	29	
	%	9.4%	0.0%	22.2%	15.6%	6.7%	12.2%	
c	F	12	0	0	4	2	18	
	%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	13.3%	7.6%	
d	F	5	0	4	5	0	14	
	%	3.6%	0.0%	8.9%	15.6%	0.0%	5.9%	
e	F	14	0	9	10	0	33	
	%	10.1%	0.0%	20.0%	31.3%	0.0%	13.9%	
f	F	89	7	17	7	12	132	
	%	64.0%	100.0%	37.8%	21.9%	80.0%	55.5%	
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

a= Need industry exposure since the beginning of the HR program; b = Admit students with industry experience; c = Give lot of Learning and Development inputs to students; d = By providing chance and guiding students to do research in HR; e = Need to study organizational / industry requirements and then develop curriculum accordingly; f = NA / Do not know



Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect the "issues to be made clear to the HR student before the entry into the HR program", has revealed that 55.5% of the respondents that "NA / do not know"; followed by 13.9% of them saying that "need to study organizational / industry requirements and then develop curriculum accordingly"; lastly followed by 12.1% of the respondents saying that "admit students with industry experience". Chi-square test revealed significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=52.874$ ;  $p=.000$ ), thus informing that informing that students differed significantly in their responses regarding their perception of issues to be made clear to the HR student before the entry into the HR program.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.426$ ;  $p=.000$ ) between the groups of frequencies, i.e., indicating that before HR students joined the HR program, certain pre-requirements were observed as important. State and Central universities students reported that at 64% and 100 said "not applicable" respectively. They were followed by 10.1% of the State University respondents saying that "need to study organizational / industry requirements and then develop curriculum accordingly". Deemed University students at 37.8% reported that "NA / do not know". They were followed by 22.2% of them saying that "admit students with industry experience". Lastly being followed at "need to study organizational / industry requirements and then develop curriculum accordingly" at 20%.

Autonomous b-schools students reported at 31.3% with "need to study organizational / industry requirements and then develop curriculum accordingly"; to be followed by "NA / do not know" at 21.9%. Lastly being followed by 15.6% of them reporting that "by providing chance and guiding students to do research in HR" and "admit students with industry experience". NITK students reported at 80% that "NA / do not know" and followed by 13.3 % with "give lot of Learning and Development inputs to students". Thus, we can say that certain issues are to be made clear to the HR student before the entry into the HR program by the faculty and other staff concerned in the respective b-school, institution, only then the students would be able to better appreciate the worth of a program.

Table No 4.1.14 : Frequency and percent responses for "standards as benchmark" set during assessment of the quality of the program and results of test statistics

Standards set as benchmark	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
Course of study	F	4	1	4	4	2	15	$X^2 = 54.435$ $p = .008$  $CC = .431$ $p = .008$
	%	2.9%	14.3%	8.9%	12.5%	13.3%	6.3%	
Quality Accreditation Status	F	59	3	10	11	3	86	
	%	42.4%	42.9%	22.2%	34.4%	20.0%	36.1%	
Prestigious Academician	F	3	0	0	0	0	3	
	%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	

Low student to Academician ratio	F	2	0	1	2	0	5
	%	1.4%	0.0%	2.2%	6.3%	0.0%	2.1%
Facilities/ Resources	F	16	0	1	0	0	17
	%	11.5%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%
Job-placement of graduates	F	14	1	1	0	0	16
	%	10.1%	14.3%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%
1 to 6	F	21	2	17	7	3	50
	%	15.1%	28.6%	37.8%	21.9%	20.0%	21.0%
1 to 3	F	14	0	6	6	4	30
	%	10.1%	0.0%	13.3%	18.8%	26.7%	12.6%
4 to 6	F	6	0	5	2	3	16
	%	4.3%	0.0%	11.1%	6.3%	20.0%	6.7%
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

1= Course of study; 2 = Quality Accreditation Status; 3 = Prestigious Academician; 4 = Low student to Academician ratio; 5 = Facilities and resources; 6 = Job placement of graduates; 7 = 1 to 6; 8 = 1 to 3; 9 = 4 to 6; 10 = 2, 3, 5, 6.

Comparison amongst the Institutions with respect to the "standards set as benchmark for the evaluation of the b-school", has revealed that 36.1% of the respondents revealed that they looked for "quality Accreditation status"; followed by 21% with respondents looking for "course of study, quality accreditation status, presence of prestigious Academicians, low student to Academician ratio, facilities and resources, job placement of graduates" as standards set for benchmark. Lastly, at 12.6% have replied with "course of study, quality accreditation status, presence of prestigious Academicians". Chi-square test revealed no difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=54.535$ ;  $p=.008$ ), thus informing that majority of the students have diverse thoughts about the components of standards set for benchmark for evaluation of the b-school.

Contingency coefficient revealed no association ( $CC=.431$ ;  $p=.008$ ) between the groups of frequencies, i.e., indicating that with State and Central University students at 42.2% and 42.9% reported that "quality accreditation status" was of prime importance to them; followed by 15.1% and 28.6% who observed that "course of study, quality accreditation status, presence of prestigious Academicians, facilities and resources, job placement of graduates" as a group of standards for setting of benchmark of any b-school. Lastly at 11.5% of the State University students have reported that "facilities and resources" as important.

Amongst the Deemed University students at 37.8% of the students have reported that "course of study, quality accreditation status, presence of prestigious Academicians, Facilities and resources, Job placement of graduates" is important; to be followed by "quality accreditation status" at 22.2% and lastly at 13.3% have replied that "course of study, quality accreditation status, presence of prestigious Academicians".

The Autonomous b-school students at 34.4% have "quality accreditation status" as important; followed by "course of study; quality accreditation status; prestigious Academician; low student to Academician ratio; facilities and resources and job placement of graduates" at 21.9%. Lastly at 18.8% of the population have replied with "course of study, quality accreditation status, presence of prestigious Academicians".

The NITK students, at 26.7% of the population have replied with "course of study, quality accreditation status, presence of prestigious Academicians"; this was followed by 20% of the students with "course of study, quality accreditation status, presence of prestigious Academicians, facilities and resources, job placement of graduates" and "low student to Academician ratio, facilities and resources, and job placement of graduates". Thus, we can say that HR students gave adequate weightage to all forms of quality measures adopted in their respective HR program and the concerned institution.

Table No 4.1.15 : Frequency and percent responses for "level of satisfaction with the activities and programs of the placement department" and results of test statistics

Level of satisfaction with the activities and programs of the Placement department	F and %	Type of Institution					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Almost Always	F	18	0	3	5	0	26
	%	12.9%	0.0%	6.7%	15.6%	0.0%	10.9%
Quite Often	F	24	0	11	5	0	40
	%	17.3%	0.0%	24.4%	15.6%	0.0%	16.8%
Some times	F	19	4	16	5	0	44
	%	13.7%	57.1%	35.6%	15.6%	0.0%	18.5%
Rarely	F	25	0	9	9	0	43
	%	18.0%	0.0%	20.0%	28.1%	0.0%	18.1%
Never	F	42	1	4	6	7	60
	%	30.2%	14.3%	8.9%	18.8%	46.7%	25.2%
NA / Do not know	F	11	2	2	2	8	25
	%	7.9%	28.6%	4.4%	6.3%	53.3%	10.5%
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238

	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%
Tests of Significance	X <sup>2</sup> = 74.011; p=.000    CC = .345; p=.000						

1 = State University, 2 = Central University, 3 = Deemed University, 4 = Autonomous b-schools; 5 = NIT K.

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect to "level of satisfaction with the activities and programs of the placement department" is at 25.2% of the population who have informed that "never" was the level of satisfaction; followed by 18.5% informing that "sometimes" and lastly at 18.1% have replied with "rarely". Chi-square test has revealed a significant difference between these frequencies (X<sup>2</sup>=74.011; p=.000), thus informing that the level of satisfaction with the activities and programs of placement department varied with the students studying in various Institutes.

Further, Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association (CC=.345; p=.429), amongst the frequencies, where in the State University students at 30.2%, 18% and 17.3% have replied that "never, rarely and quite often" respectively were their levels of satisfaction. The Central University students, have replied with 57.1%, 28.6% and 14.3% for "sometimes, not applicable / do not know and never" respectively were their levels of satisfaction. The Deemed University students, with 35.6%, 24.4% and 20% for "sometimes, rarely and quite often" respectively as their levels of satisfaction. The Autonomous b-schools students, at 28.1%, 18.8% and 15.6% for "rarely, never and sometimes / quite often / almost always" were their levels of satisfaction. Lastly, the NITK students with 53.3% and 46.7% for "not applicable / do not know and never", respectively as their levels of satisfaction towards the activities and programs of the placement department of their respective institution.

Table No 4.1.16 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR internship has prepared the HR students for a career ahead in HR" and results of test statistics

HR Internship has prepared the HR student for career ahead in HR	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
Almost Always	F	63	1	12	4	0	80	X <sup>2</sup> =49.186 p= .000  CC=.414 p=.000
	%	45.3%	14.3%	26.7%	12.5%	0.0%	33.6%	
Quite Often	F	33	1	18	18	10	80	
	%	23.7%	14.3%	40.0%	56.3%	66.7%	33.6%	
Some times	F	23	4	9	7	4	47	
	%	16.5%	57.1%	20.0%	21.9%	26.7%	19.7%	
Rarely	F	7	0	5	1	1	14	

	%	5.0%	0.0%	11.1%	3.1%	6.7%	5.9%
Never	F	6	0	1	2	0	9
	%	4.3%	0.0%	2.2%	6.3%	0.0%	3.8%
NA / Do not Know	F	7	1	0	0	0	8
	%	5.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect to issue of "HR internship preparing the HR student for a career ahead in HR" has revealed that at 33.8% of the population have informed that they have been "almost always" and "quite often" have benefitted from the HR internship; these were followed by 19.7% of the population who have informed that "sometimes" they were benefitted from the HR internship. Chi-square test revealed significant difference between these frequencies ( $X^2=49.186$ ;  $p=.000$ ), thus informing that a majority of the students expressed positive feelings of benefitting from the HR Internship.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.414$ ;  $p=.000$ ), amongst the frequencies, with the State University students informing that at 45.3%, 23.7% and 16.5% were scores for "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" as the level of satisfaction of students towards HR internship. The students of the Central University, had 57.1%, 14.3% as scores for "sometimes" and "almost always" / "quite often" / not applicable / do not know" as the level of satisfaction of students towards HR internship.

The students at the Deemed University, have scores like 40%, 26.7% and 20% scores for "quite often, almost always and sometimes" as their levels of satisfaction of students towards HR internship respectively. The students of the Autonomous b-schools, have scores like 56.3%, 21.9% and 12.5% for "quite often, sometimes and almost always" respectively. Lastly, the students at NITK, have opined with scores like 66.7% and 26.7% for "quite often and sometimes" respectively. Thus we can say that the HR Internship has given enough impetus and has to a large extent prepared, the HR student for a career ahead in HR.

Table No 4.1.17: Frequency and percent responses for "extent of syllabus covered in the HR subjects" and results of test statistics

Extent of Syllabus Covered in the HR subjects	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
Almost Always	F	89	2	20	15	10	136	$X^2=48.996$ $p=.000$
	%	64.0%	28.6%	44.4%	46.9%	66.7%	57.1%	

Quite Often	F	22	1	13	10	1	47	CC = .413 p=.000
	%	15.8%	14.3%	28.9%	31.3%	6.7%	19.7%	
Some times	F	10	0	9	4	4	27	
	%	7.2%	0.0%	20.0%	12.5%	26.7%	11.3%	
Rarely	F	11	4	1	1	0	17	
	%	7.9%	57.1%	2.2%	3.1%	0.0%	7.1%	
Never	F	7	0	2	2	0	11	
	%	5.0%	0.0%	4.4%	6.3%	0.0%	4.6%	
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect to the extent of syllabus covered in the HR subjects, have revealed that at 57.1%, 19.7% and 11.3%, for "almost always, quite often and sometimes", in their respective HR programs of their institutions. Chi-square test has revealed significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=48.996$ ;  $p=.000$ ), thus informing that most of the HR students have opined that almost always the syllabus is covered in their respective HR subjects being presently taught.

Contingency coefficient has revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.413$ ;  $p=.000$ ), amongst the frequencies, indicating that amongst the State universities, HR students have opined that at 64%, 15.8% and 7.2%, for "almost always, quite often and sometimes"; a small minority of students at 7.9% have informed that coverage of syllabus is 'rarely'. Amongst the Central University students, have replied with 57.1% informing that it is 'rarely' done, although at 28.6% and 14.3% of its students opined that it is "almost always" and "quite often".

In the Deemed University, HR students have opined that at 44.4%, 29.9% and 20%, for "almost always, quite often and sometimes". Amongst the Autonomous b-schools students, have replied with 46.9%, 31.3% and 12.5%, for "almost always, quite often and sometimes". Lastly, amongst the NITK students, have replied with 66.7% and 26.7% of the students opined that "almost always" and "sometimes" as the extent of syllabus covered in their HR subjects of the HR programs in their respective institutions.

Table No 4.1.18 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR student's perception of the other important roles of HR Academician" and results of test statistics

HR student's perception of the other important roles of HR Academician	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		

1	F	24	1	10	7	5	47	$\chi^2=56.294$ $p=.000$	
	%	17.3%	14.3%	22.2%	21.9%	33.3%	19.7%		
2	F	14	1	3	5	3	26		CC=.437 $p=.000$
	%	10.1%	14.3%	6.7%	15.6%	20.0%	10.9%		
3	F	36	1	15	8	1	61		
	%	25.9%	14.3%	33.3%	25.0%	6.7%	25.6%		
4	F	5	3	8	8	3	27		
	%	3.6%	42.9%	17.8%	25.0%	20.0%	11.3%		
5	F	9	0	0	1	0	10		
	%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	4.2%		
6	F	44	1	6	3	3	57		
	%	31.7%	14.3%	13.3%	9.4%	20.0%	23.9%		
7	F	5	0	0	0	0	5		
	%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%		
8	F	0	0	2	0	0	2		
	%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	.8%		
9	F	2	0	1	0	0	3		
	%	1.4%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%		
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238		
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%		

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

1= To provide academic counseling; 2 = To provide networking opportunities; 3 = To provide career advice; 4 = To give good references when applying for positions; 5 = To conduct research in HR; 6 = To provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training; 7 = Do not know; 8 = 1,3,4,5; 9 = 1,2,3,4,6.

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect to the HR student's perception of the other important roles of HR Academician, have replied with 25.6% for "to provide career advice"; followed by 23.9% for "to provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training" and lastly at 19.7% for "to provide academic counseling" as the most important roles of the HR Academician as perceived by the HR student. Chi-square test revealed significant difference between the frequencies ( $\chi^2=56.294$ ;  $p=.000$ ), thus informing that HR students perception of the HR Academician's role comprises of differential responses, across various institutes.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists (CC=.437;  $p=.000$ ), amongst the frequencies, indicating that amongst the

State University students, 31.7% have opined that "to provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training"; this was followed by 25.9%, opined that "to provide career advice"; lastly 17.3% of the students have opined that "to provide academic counseling" were the other important roles of the HR Academician. The Central University students, at 42.9% opined that "to give good references when applying for positions outside"; followed by 14.3% of the students providing multiple responses as in "to provide academic counseling; to provide networking opportunities; to provide career advice; to provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training". In the Deemed universities, students have replied that 33.3% of them are of the opinion that "to provide career advice"; followed by 22.2% of the students with "to provide academic counseling"; lastly, 17.8% of the students have informed that "to give good references when applying for positions outside" were one of the many roles of the HR Academician, as perceived by the HR student.

The HR students at the Autonomous b-schools have replied with 25% each with "to provide career advice" and "to give good references when applying for positions"; this was followed by 21.9% of the students informing "to provide academic counseling"; lastly at 15.6% of the students informed that "to provide networking opportunities" as other important roles of the HR Academician. Lastly, at NITK students have replied with 33.3% saying "to provide academic counseling", followed by 20% each saying "to provide networking opportunities" and "to give good references when applying for positions". Thus the HR students studying in various types of institutions have given diverse responses to their perception of the other important roles of HR Academician.

Table No 4.1.19 : Frequency and percent responses for "is there a proctor assigned by the department to guide the student" and results of test statistics

Is there a Proctor assigned by the Dept to guide you	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
Almost Always	F	53	0	26	16	3	98	$X^2 = 69.663$ $p = .000$  $CC = .476$ $p = .000$
	%	38.1%	0.0%	57.8%	50.0%	20.0%	41.2%	
Quite Often	F	28	0	9	9	2	48	
	%	20.1%	0.0%	20.0%	28.1%	13.3%	20.2%	
Some times	F	18	0	5	3	1	27	
	%	12.9%	0.0%	11.1%	9.4%	6.7%	11.3%	
Rarely	F	15	0	1	3	0	19	
	%	10.8%	0.0%	2.2%	9.4%	0.0%	8.0%	
Never	F	19	4	4	1	5	33	
	%	13.7%	57.1%	8.9%	3.1%	33.3%	13.9%	



NA / Do not Know	F	6	3	0	0	4	13
	%	4.3%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	26.7%	5.5%
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect to the "issue of a proctor being assigned by the department to guide the student", has revealed that at 41.2%, 20.2% and 13.9% for "almost always", "quite often" and "never" were the responses respectively. Chi-square test has revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=69.663$ ;  $p=.000$ ), thus informing that majority of the students have a proctor assigned; where as a small minority never had a proctor, assigned by the department.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.476$ ;  $p=.000$ ), amongst the frequencies, indicating that amongst the State University students at 38.1%, 20.1% and 13.7% for "almost always", "quite often" and "never" respectively. The Central University students with 57.1% and 42.9% for "never" and "NA / Do not know" respectively. The Deemed University student's responses were 57.8%, 20% and 11% for the "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively. The Autonomous b-schools students responses were 50%, 28% and 9.4% for the responses "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes / rarely" respectively. Lastly, at 33.3% and 26.7% for "never", and "NA / Do not know". Thus, the HR students differ in their responses towards the provision of having a Proctor assigned by the department to guide and help the student.

#### b. Age groups

Table No 4.1.20 : Frequency and percent responses for "factors which helped to decide whether to move (to the institute of study)" and results of test statistics

Factors which helped to decide whether to shift or not to shift	F and %	Age groups (in years)			Total	Test statistics
		22-26	27-31	32+		
Reputation of the University	F	89	8	0	97	$X^2=43.186$ ; $p=.000$  $CC=.392$ ; $p=.000$
	%	42.4%	30.8%	0.0%	40.8%	
Reputation of the Business school	F	32	9	0	41	
	%	15.2%	34.6%	0.0%	17.2%	
Reputation of the HR program	F	36	5	0	41	
	%	17.1%	19.2%	0.0%	17.2%	
Influence of family	F	8	1	0	9	
	%	3.8%	3.8%	0.0%	3.8%	

Financial considerations	F	24	3	0	27
	%	11.4%	11.5%	0.0%	11.3%
*Combination of 1, 3 and 5	F	11	0	2	13
	%	5.2%	0.0%	100.0%	5.5%
*Combination of 1, 2 and 5,	F	8	0	0	8
	%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
*Combination of 1, 4 and 5	F	2	0	0	2
	%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.8%

\*Combination of - 1 = Reputation of the University; 2 = Reputation of the B school; 3= Reputation of HR program; 4 = Influence of the family; 5 = Financial considerations

Age wise comparison amongst the HR students, has revealed that at 40.8% of the study population felt that reputation of the University was important, the reputation of the b-school and HR program were second at 17.2%; lastly, about 11.3% opined that financial considerations was important, along with combinations of the factors. Here, we observe that influence of the family is very less at 3.8%. Chi-square test revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=43.186$ ;  $p=.000$ ), helping to understand that the reputation of the University / b school / HR program were significant in helping the student decide their postgraduate education.

Further, Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association ( $CC=.392$ ;  $p=.000$ ), across the frequencies, indicating that the respondents in the age group of 22-26 years, felt that reputation of the University at 42.4% and reputation of the HR program at 17.1%, followed by reputation of the b-school at 15.2% were important in helping them to make a choice. On the other hand, the 27 to 31 years age group felt that reputation of the b-school at 34.6%, followed by reputation of the University at 30.8%, and reputation of the HR program at 19.2% were important in helping them to make a choice. Lastly, for the age group of 32+ years, the main reason would be the mix of reputation of the University and financial considerations along with the influence of the family, being the important reasons for choosing their respective institutes' for study.

Table No 4.1.21 : Frequency and percent responses for "learning styles of HR students" and results of test statistics

Learning styles of students	F and %	Age groups (in years)			Total	Test statistics
		22-26	27-31	32+		
Self Study	F	50	4	2	56	$X^2= 55.250$ ; $p=.000$
	%	23.8%	15.4%	100.0%	23.5%	
Lecture Classes	F	4	7	0	11	
	%	1.9%	26.9%	0.0%	4.6%	
Class notes	F	29	0	0	29	$CC= .424$

	%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	12.2%	CC=.434; p=.000
Internet Download	F	17	6	0	23	
	%	8.1%	23.1%	0.0%	9.7%	
Group Study with Friends	F	18	4	0	22	
	%	8.6%	15.4%	0.0%	9.2%	
Tutions	F	9	1	0	10	
	%	4.3%	3.8%	0.0%	4.2%	
*Combination of 1 and 2	F	7	0	0	7	
	%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	
*Combination of 1, 3 and 4,	F	15	0	0	15	
	%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	
*Combination of 1,2,3,4 and 5	F	31	4	0	35	
	%	14.8%	15.4%	0.0%	14.7%	
*Combination of 5, 6, 7, and 8	F	30	0	0	30	
	%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	12.6%	

\* Combination of - 1 = Self study, 2 = Lecture classes, 3 = Class notes, 4 = Internet download, 5 = Group study, 6 =Tutions; 7 = study at the end of the semester; 8 = Others

Comparison amongst the age groups has revealed that 23.5% of the total population are comfortable with self study, followed by a combinations of all the procedures like self study, lecture classes, class notes, internet resources, group study and private tuitions at 14.7%; and at 12.6%, represented group study, tuitions, study at the end of the semester and others. Lastly, class notes are used to study at 12.2%. Chi-square revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=55.250$ ;  $p=.000$ ), helping us to infer that the number of respondents preferred self study than to any other procedure of study.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association ( $CC=.434$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that respondents in the age group of 22-26 years, were used to learning by self at 23.8%; followed by combination of self study, lecture classes, class notes, internet download and group study at 14.8%; lastly at 14.3% of the HR students opined that group study, tuitions, study at the end of the semester and other issues, were considered as important means to study. Amongst the 27-31 years, majority of the students were comfortable learning through lecture classes at 26.9% and using internet to download information at 23.1%, lastly at 15.4% of the population have replied with "self study" and "group study with friends". The age group of 32+ years, has revealed that students prefer self study only. Thus, we can infer, that younger the age group, the dependency is more on self, rather than any other procedure of study.

Table No 4.1.22 : Frequency and percent responses for "development of self confidence as an employability skill" and "HR degree being helpful and guiding in his/her professional HR career" and results of test statistics

Variables			Age groups (in years)			Total	Test statistics		
			22-26	27-31	32+				
Development of Self Confidence as an employability skill	Excellent	F	63	9	0	72	$X^2=79.19$ ; $p=.000$  $CC=.500$ ; $p=.000$		
		%	30.0%	34.6%	0.0%	30.3%			
	Very good	F	74	7	0	81			
		%	35.2%	26.9%	0.0%	34.0%			
	Good	F	47	7	0	54			
		%	22.4%	26.9%	0.0%	22.7%			
	Average	F	22	3	0	25			
		%	10.5%	11.5%	0.0%	10.5%			
	Poor	F	4	0	2	6			
		%	1.9%	0.1%	100%	2.50%			
	HR degree being helpful and guiding in his / her professional HR career	Almost Always	F	49	7	0		56	$X^2=25.61$ ; $p=.000$  $CC=.720$ ; $p=.000$
			%	23.3%	26.9%	0.0%		23.5%	
		Quite Often	F	87	5	0		92	
			%	41.4%	19.2%	0.0%		38.7%	
Some times		F	52	5	0	57			
		%	24.8%	19.2%	0.0%	23.9%			
Rarely		F	11	7	0	18			
		%	5.2%	26.9%	0.0%	7.6%			
Never		F	0	0	2	2			
		%	0%	0%	100%	6.30%			

#### Development of self confidence as an employability skill

Comparison across the different age groups for the statement "HR as a subject helped students in developing self confidence as an employability skill", reveals that as in a large majority of 87% (34% as very good, 30.3% as excellent and 22.7% as good) have given a positive response. Chi square revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=79.19$ ;  $p=.000$ ), which says HR as a subject has a significant influence on developing self confidence as an employability skill amongst HR students.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association ( $CC=.500$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that respondents in the youngest age group of 22-26 years, have replied with 35.2%, 30% and 22.4% for "very good", "excellent" and "good" respectively. Amongst the 27-31 years age group, have replied with 34.6% and 26.9% for "excellent" and "very good" and "good" respectively. Lastly, the age group of 32+ years, has all the students reporting it

at "poor". Thus, there exists a variation in the development of Self Confidence as an employability skill being provided by HR as a subject, amongst the three age groups.

HR degree being helpful and guiding in his/her professional HR career

Comparison across the different age groups concerning the statement "HR degree being helpful and guiding in his / her professional HR career", reveals that as in a majority of 84% (23.5% as almost always, 38.7% as quite often and 23.9% as sometimes) have given a positive response. Chi square revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=25.61$ ;  $p= .000$ ), which says HR as a subject has a significant influence on developing self confidence as an employability skill amongst HR students.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association ( $CC=.720$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that respondents in the youngest age group of 22-26 years, have replied with 23.3%, 41.4% and 24.8% for "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively. Amongst the 27-31 years age group, students have replied with 26.9% and 19.2% for "almost always" and "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively. Lastly, the age group of 32+ years, has all the students reporting at "never". Thus there exists a variation amongst the age groups about the statement HR degree in being helpful and guiding in his / her professional HR career.

Table No 4.1.23 : Frequency and percent responses for "the level of audibility in the voice of HR Academician in the class room" and "the HR Academician makes you think analytically in the lecture classes" and results of test statistics

Variables			Age groups (in years)			Total	Test statistics
			22-26	27-31	32+		
The level of audibility in the voice of HR Academician in the class room	Almost Always	F	159	18	0	177	$X^2=80.119$ ; $p=.000$ $CC=.502$ ; $p=.000$
		%	75.7%	69.2%	0.0%	74.4%	
	Quite Often	F	36	6	0	42	
		%	17.1%	23.1%	0.0%	17.6%	
	Some times	F	8	2	0	10	
		%	3.8%	7.7%	0.0%	4.2%	
	Rarely	F	4	0	2	6	
		%	1.9%	0.0%	100.0%	2.5%	
Never	F	3	0	0	3		
	%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%		
	Almost Always	F	59	7	0	66	$X^2=38.345$ ; $p=.000$
		%	28.1%	26.9%	0.0%	27.7%	
	Quite Often	F	59	6	0	65	

The HR Academician makes the HR student to think analytically in the lecture classes		%	28.1%	23.1%	0.0%	27.3%	CC = .373; p=.000
	Some times	F	57	12	0	69	
		%	27.1%	46.2%	0.0%	29.0%	
	Rarely	F	22	0	0	22	
		%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	9.2%	
	Never	F	11	1	2	14	
		%	5.2%	3.8%	100.0%	5.9%	
	Do not Know	F	2	0	0	2	
		%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	

The level of audibility in the voice of HR Academician in the class room

Comparison across the different age groups relating to the statement "the level of audibility in the voice of the HR Academician in the class room" is well heard by a large majority at 92% (74.4% as almost always and 17.6% at quite often) have provided a positive response. Chi square revealed a significant difference between the age groups of frequencies ( $X^2=80.199$ ;  $p=.000$ ) which could be inferred that HR Academician are good in using their voice while teaching in the classroom; it also denotes that those Academician who are good in their subject knowledge will use their voice to reach out to the entire class.

Contingency Co-efficient has revealed a significant association between the frequencies of the age groups ( $CC=.502$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that the respondents in the age group of 22-26 years, have responded with 75.7% and 17.1% for "almost always" and "quite often" respectively. Amongst the 27-31 years age group, have replied with 69.2% and 23.1% for "almost always" and "quite often" respectively. Lastly, the age group of 32+ years, has all the students reporting at "rarely". Thus there exists variation in the perception of the HR Academicians voice in reaching the students.

The HR Academician makes you think analytically in the lecture classes

Comparison across the different age groups relating to the statement "the HR Academician makes you think analytically in the lecture classes" as informed by a total positive score at 94% (27.7% at "almost always", 27.3% at "quite often" and 29% is sometimes). Chi square has revealed a significant difference between the age groups of frequencies ( $X^2=38.345$ ;  $p=.000$ ) which could be inferred that HR Academician makes the student think analytically.

Further, Contingency Co-efficient has revealed a significant association between the frequencies and HR Academician makes the HR students think analytically during the lecture classes ( $CC =.373$ ;  $p=.000$ ), that the respondents in the age group of 22-26 years, have responded with 28.1% and 27.1% for "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively. Amongst the 27-31 years age group, have replied with 46.2%, 26.9% and 23.1% for "sometimes", "almost always" and "quite often" respectively. Lastly, the age group of 32+ years, has all the students reporting at "never". Thus there exists variation in the perception that the HR Academician makes one think analytically, in the lecture classes.

Table No 4.1.24 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR Academician encourages HR students to ask questions and discuss in the class" and "are the HR Assignments and Internal tests challenging" and results of test statistics

Variables			Age groups (in years)			Total	Test statistics
			22-26	27-31	32+		
HR Academician encourages HR students to ask Questions and discuss in the Class?	Almost Always	F	129	17	0	146	$X^2 = 48.351;$ $p=.000$ $CC=.411;$ $p=.000$
		%	61.4%	65.4%	0.0%	61.3%	
	Quite Often	F	52	5	0	57	
		%	24.8%	19.2%	0.0%	23.9%	
	Some times	F	19	4	0	23	
		%	9.0%	15.4%	0.0%	9.7%	
	Rarely	F	8	0	2	10	
		%	3.8%	0.0%	100.0%	4.2%	
Never	F	2	0	0	2		
	%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.8%		
Are the HR Assignments and Internal tests challenging?	Almost Always	F	58	8	0	66	$X^2 = 47.723$ $p=.000$ $CC = .409;$ $p=.000$
		%	27.6%	30.8%	0.0%	27.7%	
	Quite Often	F	58	7	0	65	
		%	27.6%	26.9%	0.0%	27.3%	
	Some times	F	59	9	0	68	
		%	28.1%	34.6%	0.0%	28.6%	
	Rarely	F	27	2	0	29	
		%	12.9%	7.7%	0.0%	12.2%	
Never	F	8	0	2	10		
	%	3.8%	0.0%	100.0%	4.2%		

HR Academician encourages HR students to ask questions and discuss in the class

Comparison across the different age groups relating to the statement "HR Academician encourages HR students to ask Questions and discuss in the Class ?" reveals that at 61.3%, 23.9% and 9.7% for "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively. Chi square revealed a significant difference between the age groups of frequencies ( $X^2=48.351;$   $p=.000$ ) which could be inferred that HR Academician are good in making the HR students to ask questions and discuss in the lecture class; it also denotes that those Academician who are good in their subject knowledge will use this technique

to control and take the understanding of the concept a notch higher, in their respective lecture classes.

While Contingency Co-efficient has revealed a significant association between the age groups concerning the statement "HR Academician makes the HR students ask questions and discuss in the lecture class" (CC =.441; p=.000) which is indicated amongst the age group of 22-26 years by scores such as 61.4%, 24.8% and 9% for "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively. For the age group of 27-31 years age group, have replied with scores such as 65.4%, 19.2% and 15.4% for "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively. Amongst the 32+ years age group, all students have complied with "rarely" as the response. Thus majority of the HR students, are of the opinion that HR Academician encourages HR students to ask Questions and discuss in the Class room.

Are the HR Assignments and Internal tests challenging

Comparison amongst the different age groups in relation to the statement does the HR Academician is able to "set up challenging questions both in assignments and internal assessment", as informed by 27.7% at almost always and 27.3% at quite often and 28.3% is sometimes. Chi square has revealed a significant difference between the age groups of frequencies ( $X^2=47.723$ ;  $p=.000$ ) which could be inferred that HR Academician is able to set up challenging questions in assignments and internal assessment.

Further, Contingency Co-efficient has revealed a significant association between the age groups and HR Academician are setting up challenging questions both in assignments and internal assessment (CC=.409; p=.000), which is indicated amongst the age group of 22-26 years by scores such as 27.6% (twice), and 28.1 for "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively. For the age group of 27-31 years age group, have replied with scores such as 30.8%, 26.9% and 34.6% for "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively. Amongst the 32+ years age group, all students have complied with "never" as the response. Thus majority of the HR students, are of the opinion that HR Academician is able to set up challenging questions in assignments and internal assessment.

Table No 4.1.25 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR students perception regarding the placement activities" and results of test statistics

Perception regarding the Placement activities	F and %	Type of Institution					Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5		
Good	F	31	0	8	8	0	47	$X^2 = 45.158$ ; $p = .000$  $CC = .399$ $p = .000$
	%	22.3%	0.0%	17.8%	25.0%	0.0%	19.7%	
Average	F	68	5	31	14	0	118	
	%	48.9%	71.4%	68.9%	43.8%	0.0%	49.6%	
Bad	F	40	2	6	10	15	73	
	%	28.8%	28.6%	13.3%	31.3%	100.0%	30.7%	
Total	F	139	7	45	32	15	238	



	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%
--	---	------	------	------	------	------	--------

1- State University; 2 - Central University; 3- Deemed University; 4 - Autonomous b-school; 5-NITK.

Institution wise comparison amongst HR students with respect to the "perception regarding the placement activities" has revealed that at 49.6% and 19.7% as "average" and "good"; on the other hand, students have replied with 30.7% as "bad". Chi-square test revealed significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=45.168$ ;  $p=.000$ ), thus informing that HR students perception is good as majority have given positive responses.

Further, Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.399$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that amongst the State University students, have replied with 22.3% and 48.9% as "good" and "average" respectively; followed by 28.8% of the students informing that it is "bad".

The Central University students, have replied with 71.4% as "average", followed by 28.6% as "bad". The students at the Deemed universities, have opined at 68.9% and 17.8% as "average" and "good"; followed by 13.3% of the students informing that is "bad". All the students at the NITK have informed that their response is "bad". However, the students at the Autonomous organizations, have informed at 43.8% and 25.8% for "average" and "good"; followed by 31.3% as "bad". Thus, there is variation in the responses of the students towards the work done by the respective placement departments in their institutions.

c. Domicile

Table No 4.1.26 : Frequency and percent responses for "support / help received from sources in obtaining internship in the industry" and results of test statistics

Support / Help received from sources in obtaining internship in industry	F and %	Domicile (of the HR student)			Total	Test statistics
		Urban	Semi Urban	Rural		
Referral from Placement Office	F	26	9	19	54	$X^2 = 32.167$ $p=.000$  $CC = .345$ $p=.000$
	%	24.5%	24.3%	20.0%	22.7%	
Referral from a HR Academician	F	19	10	25	54	
	%	17.9%	27.0%	26.3%	22.7%	
Networking through classmates	F	13	6	27	46	
	%	12.3%	16.2%	28.4%	19.3%	
Networking through professional organizations	F	25	4	16	45	
	%	23.6%	10.8%	16.8%	18.9%	
Relatives / Friends / personal contact	F	17	3	6	26	
	%	16.0%	8.1%	6.3%	10.9%	

Parents	F	5	1	2	8
	%	4.7%	2.7%	2.1%	3.4%
Others : Direct contact / Websites	F	1	4	0	5
	%	.9%	10.8%	0.0%	2.1%
Total	F	106	37	95	238
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Comparison based on the domicile of the HR students has revealed that 22.7% were referred from the Placement Office (at their respective Institution) and 22.7% used the HR Academician's reference to obtain the internship in the industry. Networking through the classmates to obtain internships were placed a distinct third at 19.3%, followed by use of Networking through Professional organizations at 18.9% at the fourth place. Chi-square revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=32.167$ ;  $p=.000$ ), thus informing that a majority of HR students obtained their referrals (in order to obtain internships in the industry) from their respective Placement Offices and HR Academicians.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.345$ ;  $p=.000$ ), amongst the frequencies, indicating that HR students hailed the most from urban areas, closely followed by rural students. Among the urban students, referral from placement office was highest at 24.5%, followed by networking through professional organizations at 23.6%. Amongst the rural students, Networking through classmates were the highest at 28.4%, followed by referral by a HR Academician at 26.3% to obtain Internships. Lastly, semi-urban students, who obtained highest referrals from the HR Academicians are at 27%, followed by referral from placement office at 24.3% and lastly the networking with classmates at 16.2%. Thus, the choice of obtaining the internship in the industry varies across the different types of domicile amongst the HR students.

Table No 4.1.27 : Frequency and percent responses for "types of pre-placement training programs received" and results of test statistics

Pre-placement Training	F and %	Domicile of HR student			Total	Test statistics
		Urban	Semi Urban	Rural		
1,2,3,4,6	F	50	5	13	68	$X^2 = 47.136$ $p=.000$
	%	47.2%	13.5%	13.7%	28.6%	
1,2,3,4,7	F	34	14	59	107	$CC = .407$ $p=.000$
	%	32.1%	37.8%	62.1%	45.0%	
1,2,3,4,8	F	5	9	7	21	
	%	4.7%	24.3%	7.4%	8.8%	
1,3,4,5,7,8	F	17	9	16	42	

	%	16.0%	24.3%	16.8%	17.6%
Total	F	106	37	95	238
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1 = Aptitude training / Knowledge and Communication skills; 2 = Mentoring / Counseling / Career guidance / SWOT; 3 = GD / Interview + Mock; 4 = Current Affairs / Daily news update; 5 = SPSS / MS Excel / ERP Training; 6 = College to Corporate meet / Information about job interviews; 7 = Personal growth lab; 8 = Evaluation of training programs

Comparison amongst the various mix of pre-placement training programs received by HR students, has revealed that the training combination of "Aptitude training / Knowledge and Communication skills; Mentoring / Counseling / Career guidance / SWOT; GD / Interview + Mock; Current Affairs / Daily news update; and College to Corporate meet / Information about job interviews" at 45% is the highest; followed by 28.6% by the training combination of "Aptitude training / Knowledge and Communication skills; Mentoring / Counseling / Career guidance / SWOT; GD / Interview + Mock; Current Affairs / Daily news update; and Personal growth lab".

The crucial issue which separates these two types of training combinations are "College to Corporate Meet / Information about Job Interviews"; and "Exposure to personal growth laboratory". Chi-square revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=47.136$ ;  $p=.000$ ), informing that the number of HR students receiving the 2nd training combination, which had exposure to personal growth lab as the crucial factor, as an issue which made a difference.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.407$ ;  $p=.000$ ), among the frequencies, indicating that urbanite HR students received the training combination of "Aptitude training / Knowledge and Communication skills; Mentoring / Counseling / Career guidance / SWOT; GD / Interview + Mock; Current Affairs / Daily news update; and Personal growth lab" at 47.2% is the highest; followed by 32.1% by the training combination of "Aptitude training / Knowledge and Communication skills; Mentoring / Counseling / Career guidance / SWOT; GD / Interview + Mock; Current Affairs / Daily news update; and College to Corporate meet / Information about job interviews"

Amongst the rural HR students, the training combination received was "Aptitude training / Knowledge and Communication skills; Mentoring / Counseling / Career guidance / SWOT; GD / Interview + Mock; Current Affairs / Daily news update; and College to Corporate meet / Information about job interviews" with 62.1%, to be followed by the received training combination of "Aptitude training / Knowledge and Communication skills; GD / Interview + Mock; Current Affairs / Daily news update; SPSS / MS Excel / ERP Training; Personal growth lab; and Evaluation of training programs" at 13.7%. Thus inferring that Urban HR students received the component of "College to Corporate meet / Information about Job Interviews", where as the rural HR students received the "exposure to personal growth laboratory" as their crucial differential choice.

Table No 4.1.28 : Frequency and percent responses for "redundancy of HR subjects" and results of test statistics

Redundant HR subjects	F and %	Age groups (in years)			Total	Test statistics
		Urban	Semi Urban	Rural		
1	F	44	12	26	82	$X^2 = 32.167$ $p=.000$  $CC = .345$ $p=.000$
	%	41.8%	32.4%	27.4%	34.5%	
2	F	28	2	20	50	
	%	26.4%	5.4%	21.1%	21.0%	
3	F	9	2	4	15	
	%	8.5%	5.4%	4.2%	6.3%	
4	F	17	7	12	36	
	%	16.0%	18.9%	12.6%	15.1%	
5	F	8	14	33	55	
	%	7.5%	37.8%	34.7%	23.1%	
Overall	F	106	37	95	238	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100	

1= HR Skills / HRD / Human Asset Management / Training and Development / Performance Appraisal and Counseling/ Strategic HR / International Human Resources Management; 2 = Industrial Relations and collective Bargaining / Labor Laws / Employee Relationship Management; 3 = Comp and Benefits / Recruitment and selection; 4 = Organizational Development and Management of Change; 5 = Others (All subjects are OK / Every subject is important / NA / All subjects are needed)

Comparison amongst the redundant HR subjects (as in 4th sem / 4th and 5th trimester) revealed that 34.5% of the study population felt that HR subjects titled "HR Skills / HRD / Human Asset Management / Training and Development / Performance Appraisal and Counseling/ Strategic HR / International Human Resources Management" were at the high scores of redundancy; followed by subjects titled "Industrial Relations and collective Bargaining / Labour Laws / Employee Relationship Management" at 21%; to be closely followed by issues like "All subjects are OK / Every subject is important / NA / All subjects are needed" at 23.1%. Here, we observe that Chi-square test revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=32.167$ ;  $p=.000$ ), informing that HR subjects were highly redundant in lieu of the demands of the market and the industry.

Further, Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association ( $CC=.345$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that that HR subjects titled "HR Skills / HRD / Human Asset Management / Training and Development / Performance Appraisal and Counseling/ Strategic HR / International Human Resources Man-

agement" were highly redundant as indicated by urbanites (41.8%), semi urbanites (32.4%) and ruralites (27.4%) respectively. This was followed by HR subjects titled "Industrial Relations and collective Bargaining / Labour Laws / Employee Relationship Management" with urbanite HR (26.4%), followed by ruralites (21.1%). Lastly, semi-urbanites (37.8%) and ruralites (34.and%) have revealed that with issues like "All HR subjects are OK / Every HR subject is important / NA / All HR subjects are needed". Thus the HR students from various institutions, have expressed differential responses to the redundancy of HR subjects in their fourth semester of their education standards.

Table No 4.1.29 : Frequency and percent responses for "process which could be adopted to better prepare HR students, in tune with the requirements of the industry / Entry into HR specialization" and results of test statistics

Process which could be adopted to better prepare HR students, in tune with the requirements of the industry / Entry Into HR specialization	F and %	Domicile of HR student			Total	Test statistics
		Urban	Semi Urban	Rural		
1	F	4	1	7	12	$X^2 = 37.154$ $p = .000$ $CC = .367$ $p = .000$
	%	3.8%	2.7%	7.4%	5.0%	
2	F	19	1	9	29	
	%	17.9%	2.7%	9.5%	12.2%	
3	F	6	1	11	18	
	%	5.7%	2.7%	11.6%	7.6%	
4	F	12	0	2	14	
	%	11.3%	0.0%	2.1%	5.9%	
5	F	21	2	10	33	
	%	19.8%	5.4%	10.5%	13.9%	
6	F	44	32	56	132	
	%	41.5%	86.5%	58.9%	55.5%	
Total	F	106	37	95	238	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

1 = Need industry exposure since the beginning of the HR program; 2 = Admit students with industry experience; 3 = Provide lot of Land D inputs to students; 4= By providing chance and guiding students to do research in HR; 5 = Need to study organizational / industry requirements and then develop curriculum accordingly; 6 = No processes are needed to enhance the functioning of HR students to do better in the industry / no response

Domicile wise comparison amongst HR students with respect to entry into HR specialization, has revealed that 55.5% of the study population felt that "no processes are needed to enhance the functioning of HR students to do better in the industry / no response"; to be followed by 13.9% who informed that "need to study organizational / industry requirements and then develop curriculum accordingly", to be closely followed by "admit students with industry experience" at 12.2%. Chi-square test revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=37.154$ ;  $p=.000$ ), statistically proving that students did not need anything more to help themselves do well in the industry after they were well placed in the campus placements program.

Further, Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists amongst the frequencies ( $CC=.367$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that HR students have revealed that "no processes are needed to enhance the functioning of HR students to do better in the industry / no response" as their response with 86.5%, 58.6% and 41.5% of Semi urban, rural and urbanite persons respectively. This is followed by "need to study organizational / industry requirements and then develop curriculum accordingly" at 19.8% among the urbanite HR students; lastly at 17.9% the urbanite HR students have revealed that to "admit students with industry experience". Thus the HR students studying in various institutions have given differential responses regarding the Process which could be adopted to better prepare HR students, in tune with the requirements of the industry / entry into HR specialization, based on their domicile status.

#### d. Learning Style

Table No 4.1.30 : Frequency and percent responses for "redundancy of the HR subjects" and results of test statistics

Redundancy in HR subjects	F and %	Learning Style										Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
A	F	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	5	19
	%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	14.3%	13.3%	14.3%	16.7%	8.0%
B	F	35	7	19	16	15	9	3	6	8	5	123
	%	62.5%	63.6%	65.5%	69.6%	68.2%	90.0%	42.9%	40.0%	22.9%	16.7%	51.7%
C	F	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	11
	%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	16.7%	4.6%
D	F	14	4	10	7	4	1	3	7	20	15	85
	%	25.0%	36.4%	34.5%	30.4%	18.2%	10.0%	42.9%	46.7%	57.1%	50.0%	35.7%
Total	F	56	11	29	23	22	10	7	15	35	30	238
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Test statistics	$X^2 = 60.531$ ; $p = .000$ ; $CC = .450$ ; $p = .000$
-----------------	--------------------------------------------------------

A = Organizational change and design / Women and Health; B = Ethics and Leadership / Performance Appraisal / HRM / Human Asset Management / Resource Management / Labour law; C = Strategic HR / Knowledge Management; D = Others (HR is only theory / Not very practical / IT would have been helpful)

1 = Self Study; 2 = Lecture Classes; 3 = Class notes; 4 = Internet Download; 5 = Group Study with Friends; 6 = Tutions; 7 = Guest and expert lectures and input; 8 = 1, 3 and 4; 9 = 1,2,3,4 and 5; 10 = 5, 6, 7, and 8

Comparison amongst the learning styles amongst HR students revealed that 23.5% of the total population are comfortable with self study, followed by a combination of all the procedures like self study, lecture classes, class notes, internet resources, group study and private tutions at 14.7%. Class notes was a distinct third with their usage at 12.8% amongst HR students. Chi-square revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=60.531$ ;  $p=.000$ ), statistically proving that number of HR students preferred self study than to any other procedure of study.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.450$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that HR students were of the opinion that HR subjects (as in 3rd sem / 2nd and 3rd trimester) with titles "Ethics and Leadership / Performance Appraisal / HRM / Human Asset Management / Resource Management / Labour law" had the highest redundancy at 51.7%, followed by issues like "HR is only theory / Not very practical / IT would have been helpful" at 35.7%, and lastly HR subjects with titles like "Organizational change and design / Women and Health" had 8% of responses.

To summarize, the HR student's perception of the HR education has been discussed with respect to the demographic variables and further with the type of institution, age group, domicile and learning styles relating to other variables.