

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

## 4.2 HR Academicians perception of HR Management education

Part A : Descriptive analysis

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

- a. Present designation
- b. Type of institution
- c. Age group

---

The above mentioned are detailed below

Part A : Socio-demographic data.

Table No 4.2.1 : Frequency and percent responses by HR Academician respondents based on their present designation and gender

Present Designation of the HR Academician	F and %	Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Guest Lecturer	F	0	2	2
	%	0.0%	11.8%	5.1%
Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 2 and 3	F	5	6	11
	%	22.7%	35.3%	28.2%
Senior Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 1	F	7	5	12
	%	31.8%	29.4%	30.8%
Associate Prof	F	3	4	7
	%	13.6%	23.5%	17.9%
Professor	F	5	0	5
	%	22.7%	0.0%	12.8%
Prof and HoD	F	2	0	2
	%	9.1%	0.0%	5.1%
Total	F	22	17	39
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

(F = Frequency; % = Percentage)

A total of 17 female HR Academicians and 22 male HR Academicians were the respondents. At the level of Senior Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 1, we find 30.8% of the population; followed by 28.2% at the level of Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 2 and 3; Associate Professors have come in at 17.9%; Professors at 12.8%, Prof and HoDs at 5% of the population studied.

Table No 4.2.2 : Frequency and percent responses by HR Academician respondents based on their present designation and age groups

Present designation	F and %	Age groups of the HR Academicians						Total
		23 to 27	28 to 32	33 to 37	38 to 42	43 to 52	53 +	
1	F	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
	%	0.0%	16.7%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%
2	F	2	4	3	1	0	1	11
	%	50.0%	66.7%	30.0%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	28.2%
3	F	2	1	6	2	1	0	12
	%	50.0%	16.7%	60.0%	33.3%	14.3%	0.0%	30.8%
4	F	0	0	0	3	3	1	7

	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	42.9%	16.7%	17.9%
5	F	0	0	0	0	3	2	5
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	33.3%	12.8%
6	F	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	5.1%
Total	F	4	6	10	6	7	6	39
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

1= Guest Lecturer; 2 = Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 2 and 3; 3 = Senior Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 1; 4 = Associate Prof; 5 = Professor; 6 = Prof and HoD

At the level of Senior Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 1, we find about 30.8% of the Academicians; followed by 28.2% at the level of Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 2 and 3; lastly, Associate Professors have come in at 17.9%. Less number of Professor at 12.8% and Prof and HoDs at 5% of the population studied. In the age group of 23 to 27 years, have replied that at 50% (twice) "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3" and "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof 1". In the 28 to 32 years age group, have replied that at 66.7% at "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3", followed by 16.7% at "Guest Lecturer" and "Senior Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 1" respectively. In the 33 to 37 years, 60.6% are found in the "Senior Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 1" and 30% are found in the "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3". In the 38 to 42 years age group, have replied that 50% at "Senior Lecturer / Assistant Prof Grade 1"; followed by 16.7% at "Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 2 and 3". In the 43 to 52 years age group, have replied that 42.9% at Associate Prof and Professor levels respectively. Among the 53+ years age group, have replied that 33.3% at "Professor" and "Professor and Head" respectively.

Table No 4.2.3 : Frequency and percent responses by HR Academicians respondents based on their present place of work and gender

Name of the University / Institute in which HR Academician is working	F and %	Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Manipal University, Manipal	F	1	0	1
	%	4.5%	0.0%	2.6%
Acharya School of Management, Bengaluru	F	1	1	2
	%	4.5%	5.9%	5.1%
Jain University, Bengaluru	F	1	0	1
	%	4.5%	0.0%	2.6%

Karnataka State Women's University, Bijapur	F	2	0	2
	%	9.1%	0.0%	5.1%
Gulbarga University, Gulbarga	F	0	1	1
	%	0.0%	5.9%	2.6%
Tumkur University, Tumkur	F	1	1	2
	%	4.5%	5.9%	5.1%
Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga	F	0	1	1
	%	0.0%	5.9%	2.6%
Visveswaraiah Technical University, Belgaum	F	2	2	4
	%	9.1%	11.8%	10.3%
Kuvempu University, Shivmogga	F	0	1	1
	%	0.0%	5.9%	2.6%
St Joseph's College of Business Administration, Bengaluru	F	1	1	2
	%	4.5%	5.9%	5.1%
National Institute of Technology Karnataka, Mangalore	F	1	0	1
	%	4.5%	0.0%	2.6%
MS Ramaiah Institute of Management Science, Bengaluru	F	0	1	1
	%	0.0%	5.9%	2.6%
Mangalore University, Mangalore.	F	1	0	1
	%	4.5%	0.0%	2.6%
Mount Carmel Institute of Management, Bengaluru	F	0	4	4
	%	0.0%	23.5%	10.3%
Vijayanagara Sri Krishnadevaraya University Bellary	F	2	0	2
	%	9.1%	0.0%	5.1%
Christ University, Bengaluru	F	2	0	2
	%	9.1%	0.0%	5.1%
University of Mysore, Mysore	F	2	1	3
	%	9.1%	5.9%	7.7%
Davangere University, Davangere	F	0	1	1
	%	0.0%	5.9%	2.6%
Xavier's Institute of Management and Entrepreneurship, Bengaluru	F	2	0	2
	%	9.1%	0.0%	5.1%
Bangalore University, Bengaluru	F	3	1	4

	%	13.6%	5.9%	10.3%
Symbiosis Institute of Management Science, Bengaluru	F	1	0	1
	%	4.5%	0.0%	2.6%
Total	F	22	17	39
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The table depicts a total of 39 respondents, with 22 male HR Academicians and 17 female HR Academicians. Bangalore University, Mounts Carmel Institute of Management Science, Visveswaraiiah Technological University, have 10.3% for each of the Institute as the highest number of HR Academicians. University of Mysore has 7.1% of Academicians. On similar lines, Acharya School of Management, Karnataka State Women's University Bijapur, Tumkur University Tumkur, St Joseph's College of Business Administration Bengaluru, Vijayanagara Sri Krishnadevaraya University Bellary, Christ University Bengaluru and Xavier's Institute of Management and Entrepreneurship Bengaluru, have 5.1% of the population in each of Institution.

Table No 4.2.4 : Frequency and percent responses by HR Academicians respondents based on their experience in handling MBA students and gender

Experience in years in handling MBA students	F and %	Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
< 3 yrs	F	7	6	13
	%	31.8%	35.3%	33.3%
4 to 7 yrs	F	3	3	6
	%	13.6%	17.6%	15.4%
8 to 10 yrs	F	2	4	6
	%	9.1%	23.5%	15.4%
11 + Yrs	F	10	4	14
	%	45.5%	23.5%	35.9%
Total	F	22	17	39
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Academicians possessing 11+ years of work experience are more at 35.9% are the highest, followed by Academicians with < 3 years at 33.3%. At 15.4% each, Academicians with 4 to 7 years and 8 to 10 years of work experience were observed. Amongst the male Academicians, we see 45.5% with 11 + years of work experience; followed by 31.8% having < 3years of work experience;

Amongst the female Academicians, the highest is at < 3 years with 35.3%; and with 23.5% at 8 to 10 years and 11+ years of work experience.

Table No 4.2.5 : Frequency and percent responses by HR Academicians respondents based on their present designation and educational qualification

Present designation	F and %	Educational Qualifications						Total
		MBA	MBA and NET	MBA, MPhil	MBA, PhD	MBA, NET, PhD	MBA, MPhil, NET, PhD	
1	F	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
	%	8.3%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%
2	F	6	1	1	0	1	2	11
	%	50.0%	12.5%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	28.2%
3	F	4	4	1	0	2	1	12
	%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	12.5%	30.8%
4	F	1	2	2	1	0	1	7
	%	8.3%	25.0%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	12.5%	17.9%
5	F	0	0	2	0	1	2	5
	%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	12.8%
6	F	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	5.1%
Total	F	12	8	6	1	4	8	39
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

1= Guest Lecturer; 2 = Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 2 and 3; 3 = Senior Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 1; 4 = Associate Professor ; 5 = Professor; 6 = Prof and HoD

Amongst the educational qualifications, the largest number of Academicians were at 30.8%, with "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1" designation. This was followed by the "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3" with 28.2% of the population. at 17.9%, the Associate Professors came in as the third largest group. In the "MBA" only qualification, have replied that 50% at "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3"; followed by "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1" at 33.3%. Amongst those who have "MBA and NET", the highest is seen at 50% amongst "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1" level, followed by 25% amongst "Associate Professors". Those HR Academicians having "MBA and MPhil" are seen with 33.3% "Associate Professors" and "Professors" and at 16.7% amongst "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1". Those with "MBA and PhD", one Academician fulfills the criteria. Amongst those Academicians with "MBA, NET, PhD", have replied that 50% at the level of Senior Lecturer

/ Asst Prof Grade 1" and 25% at the level of "Associate Professor". Those with "MBA, MPhil, NET, PhD", are at 25% amongst "Lecturer /Assistant Prof Grade 2 and 3", " Professor and Prof and HoD" levels.

Part B : HR Academicians perception

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

- a. Present designation
- b. Type of institution
- c. Age group

a. Present designation

Table No 4.2.6 : Frequency and percent responses for "role and responsibilities of HR Academician" and the results of test statistics

Role and responsibilities of HR Academician	F and %	Present Designation of HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
1,2,3,4	F	1	3	10	2	0	0	16	$X^2=44.182$ $p=.000$ $CC=.729;$ $p=.000$
	%	50.0%	27.3%	83.3%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	41.0%	
4,5,6,1	F	0	2	1	4	0	0	7	
	%	0.0%	18.2%	8.3%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	17.9%	
1,3,4,5,6	F	0	4	0	0	5	2	11	
	%	0.0%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	28.2%	
5,6,1,2,3	F	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	
	%	50.0%	18.2%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	
Did not reveal / NA	F	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

1. Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; 2. Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; 3. Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend; 4. Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support; 5. Student affairs coordinator / Proctors / Mentor / campus minister; 6. Department Administration support / Documentation / IA Coordinator

a = Guest Lecturer; b = Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3; c = Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1; d = Associate Prof; e = Professor; f = Prof and HoD

Comparison amongst the present designation of HR Academicians, revealed that at 41%, the roles and responsibilities comprised of "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support". This was followed by 28.2% of the Academicians informing that their roles and responsibilities comprised of "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support; Student affairs coordinator / Proctors / Mentor / campus minister; Department Administration support / Documentation / IA Coordinator. Lastly at 17.9%, have replied that "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support; Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work". Chi-square revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=44.182$ ;  $p=.000$ ), informing that the "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support" was considered as the most important of the HR Academicians roles and responsibilities.

Contingency co-efficient revealed that a significant association exists between these set of frequencies ( $CC=.729$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that amongst the Guest lecturers at 50% (each) are two sets of role and responsibility which are "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support" and "Student affairs coordinator / Proctors / Mentor / campus minister; Department Administration support / Documentation / IA Coordinator; Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend.

Amongst "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3", have replied that at 36.4% informing that "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support; Student affairs coordinator / Proctors / Mentor / campus minister; Department Administration support / Documentation / IA Coordinator; and at 27.3%, of them informing that "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support".

The "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1" at 83.3% informs that "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support" is primary to them.

At the Associate Professors level, have replied that at 57.1% informing that " Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support; Student affairs coordinator / Proctors / Mentor / campus minister; Department Administration support / Documentation / IA Coordinator". These are followed by 28.6% of them informing that "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops - Conduct and Attend; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support".



Amongst the Professors and Professor and HoD, have replied that at 100% each, informing that "Teaching / Guiding / Training during field work; Research projects / Paper Publications and Presentations; Conferences / Seminar / Workshops – Conduct and Attend; Placements / Training for student placement / Admission support; Student affairs coordinator / Proctors / Mentor / campus minister; Department Administration support / Documentation / IA Coordinator" as their role and responsibilities respectively.

Table No 4.2.7 : Frequency and percent responses for "publications of research articles / papers in Journals" and the results of test statistics

Publications of research articles / papers in Journals	F and %	Present Designation of HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
< 2	F	1	1	1	1	0	0	4	$X^2=49.585;$ $p=.000$  $CC=.748;$ $p=.000$
	%	50.0%	9.1%	8.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	
3 to 8	F	0	1	3	2	0	1	7	
	%	0.0%	9.1%	25.0%	28.6%	0.0%	50.0%	17.9%	
9 to 14	F	0	0	0	1	5	1	7	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	100.0%	50.0%	17.9%	
15+	F	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	
NA	F	1	9	8	1	0	0	19	
	%	50.0%	81.8%	66.7%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	48.7%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

a = Guest Lecturer; b = Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3; c = Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1; d = Associate Prof; e = Professor; f = Prof and HoD

Comparison among the various designations of HR Academicians with reference "to the number of publications in terms of research articles and papers in journals" where in HR Academician have published research articles in journals ranging in number from 3 to 8 articles and 9 to 14 articles, at 17.9% articles. But a majority of the population at 48.7% have not been able to publish any papers. Chi-square revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=49.585;$   $p=.000$ ), informing that majority of the HR Academicians, especially at the lower designations have not published articles / papers in Journals and most number of published articles and papers have come from HR Professors and Associate Professors.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association between the frequencies ( $CC=.748$ ;  $p=.000$ ), where in HR Academician at Guest Lecturer level, has less than two papers published. Amongst the "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3", and "Senior Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 1" with 81.9% and 66.7% have no publications respectively. The Associate Professor level has at 28.6% (twice) with 3 to 8 and 15+ publications; followed by 14.3% (twice) with < 2 and 9 to 14 publications to their credit. Amongst the Professor level, have replied that at 100% with 9 to 14 publications; to be followed by Professor and HoD's level with 50% (twice) of 3 to 8 and 9 to 14 publications to their credit respectively. In this regard, most number of published articles have come from HR Professors and Associate Professors, which is good, but on the other side, the lecturers and Senior lecturers must also keep pace with their Senior HR Academicians by publishing articles and papers in journals.

Table No 4.2.8 : Frequency and percent responses for "other important roles of HR Academician" and the results of test statistics

Other important roles of HR Academician	F and %	Present Designation of HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
7	F	0	0	1	0	5	1	7	$X^2=37.417;$ $p=.000$ $CC=.700;$ $p=.000$
	%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%	17.9%	
8	F	1	7	4	5	0	0	17	
	%	50.0%	63.6%	33.3%	71.4%	0.0%	0.0%	43.6%	
9	F	1	3	7	1	0	1	13	
	%	50.0%	27.3%	58.3%	14.3%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%	
10	F	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	
	%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	

1= To train and guide HR students; 2 = To provide academic counseling; 3 = To provide networking opportunities; 4 = To provide career advice; 5 = To give good references when applying for job positions; 6 = To provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training; 7 = To conduct research in HR; 8 = 1 to 6; 9 = 1,3, 4,5,6 and 7 ; 10 = 1,2,4 and 6

a = Guest Lecturer; b = Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3; c = Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1; d = Associate Prof; e = Professor; f = Prof and HoD

Comparison amongst the different designations of the HR Academician's with reference to the other important roles of the HR Academicians has revealed that at 43.6% of them informing that "To train and guide HR students; To provide academic counseling; To provide networking opportunities; To provide career advice; To give good references when applying for job positions; To provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training". These were followed by 33.3% of them informing that "To train and guide HR students; To provide networking opportunities; To provide career advice; To give good references when applying for job positions; To provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training; To conduct research in HR" and lastly at 17.9% of them revealing that "To conduct research in HR". Here, we observe that Chi-square test revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=37.417;$   $p=.000$ ), informing that HR Academicians' designations were in the better understanding of their positions, at the level of Senior Lecturer; as in at these levels, these Academicians are experienced in teaching, training, guiding, research work, also with some experience with administrative issues as well, so the fulcrum between the inexperienced junior

Academician and the senior Academician, on the other hand is found to be balanced.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists between the frequencies ( $CC=0.700$ ;  $p=0.000$ ), indicating that at the level of "Guest Lecturer" and "Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 2 and 3" level with 50% and 63.6%, as in "To train and guide HR students; To provide academic counseling; To provide networking opportunities; To provide career advice; To give good references when applying for job positions; To provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training" respectively. With scores at 50% and 27.3% at both the levels of designations, the roles include "To train and guide HR students; To provide networking opportunities; To provide career advice; To give good references when applying for job positions; To provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training; To conduct research in HR" respectively.

Amongst the "Senior Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 1" and Associate Professor levels, have replied that at 58.3% and 14.3% of them informing that their roles included "To train and guide HR students; To provide networking opportunities; To provide career advice; To give good references when applying for job positions; To provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training; To conduct research in HR". To be followed by 33.3% and 71.4% of them informing that "To train and guide HR students; To provide academic counseling; To provide networking opportunities; To provide career advice; To give good references when applying for job positions; To provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training" respectively.

The Professors and Professor and HoDs at 100% and at 50% have informed that their roles primarily include "To conduct research in HR" respectively. Further amongst the Professors and HoDs, have replied that at 50% informing that their role includes "To train and guide HR students; To provide networking opportunities; To provide career advice; To give good references when applying for job positions; To provide opportunities for HR Students to participate in research and training; To conduct research in HR". Thus the Academicians are aware of their role and responsibilities, along with their designations.

Table No 4.2.9 : Frequency and percent responses by for "redundancy of HR subjects in 4th semester" and the results of test statistics

Redundancy of HR subjects in 4th semester	F and %	Present Designation of HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
1	F	0	0	3	1	0	0	4	$X^2 = 45.035$ ; $p=0.000$  $CC=0.732$ ; $p=0.000$
	%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	
2	F	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	
	%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	5.1%	
3	F	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
	%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	
4	F	1	8	3	5	0	0	17	
	%	50.0%	72.7%	25.0%	71.4%	0.0%	0.0%	43.6%	
NA	F	0	1	6	1	5	1	14	

	%	0.0%	9.1%	50.0%	14.3%	100.0%	50.0%	35.9%
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%

a = Deemed University; b= Autonomous b-school; c = State run universities; d = Central University; e = NITK; f = Technical University

1= Performance Management / Global HRM / Labour Laws / Compensation and Benefits; 2 = Organizational Development (its contents are old) / Managing interpersonal and group process; 3 = Creativity and Innovative Management / Leadership; 4 = All subjects are useful; but need to upgraded only in content at appropriate time; 5 = NA

Comparison amongst the different designations of the HR Academician's with respect to the "redundancy of HR subjects being presently taught" have at 43.6% have reported that "All subjects are useful; but need to upgraded only in content at appropriate time", which means that changes in the content as per the changes in the industry and elsewhere are basically required. This was followed by 10.3% of the HR Academicians reporting that subjects with titles "Performance Management concepts / Global HRM / Labour Laws / Compensation and Benefits" are redundant. Meanwhile, at 5.1%, HR subjects like "Creativity and Innovative Management / Leadership" have been termed redundant, as in "Organizational Development (its contents are old) / Managing interpersonal and group process; Creativity and Innovative Management / Leadership". On the other hand, 35.9% of the HR Academicians have felt that the HR subjects are all right as they are and there is no need for change, neither in content nor in title. Here, we observe that Chi-square test revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=45.035$ ;  $p=.000$ ), informing that majority of the HR Academicians agree to the issue that many subjects and their contents have become redundant and they have to changed as per the circumstances and the needs of the stakeholders.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association between these groups of frequencies as revealed by Coefficient of Correlation test ( $CC=.732$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that a significant association exists, where in HR Academicians at the level of "Guest Lecturer" with 50% (twice), with subjects like "Organizational Development (its contents are old) / Managing interpersonal and group process" and "All subjects are useful; but need to upgraded only in content at appropriate time". Amongst the "Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 2 and 3" level, have replied that at 72.7% with "All subjects are useful; but need to upgraded only in content at appropriate time"; to be followed by 18.2% with subjects like "Creativity and Innovative Management / Leadership" as being redundant.

At the level of Associate Professor, at 71.4% informing that "All subjects are useful; but need to upgraded only in content at appropriate time"; followed by 14.3% (twice) with subjects like "Performance Management / Global HRM / Labour Laws / Compensation and Benefits" and redundancy "not applicable" to subjects respectively. At the Professor level, it is found that at 100% , it is not applicable. Lastly, at the level of Professor and Head, with 50% (twice), for subject like "Organizational Development (its contents are old)" being redundant and redundancy "not applicable" to subjects, respectively. Thus, majority of the faculty amongst the junior designations are of the opinion that many of the subjects being presently taught are redundant and ought to be changed in content and title; whilst

amongst the senior designations, the faculty are of the opinion that redundancy is very less and one subject may be redundant, but otherwise most of the subjects require no change.

Table No 4.2.10 : Frequency and percent responses for "attendance and participation in Alumni meetings" and the results of test statistics

Attendance to Alumni Meetings	F and %	Present Designation of HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
Yes	F	2	11	12	7	5	1	38	X <sup>2</sup> = 18.987; p=.000 CC=.572; p=.000
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50.0%	97.4%	
No	F	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	2.6%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	

a = Guest Lecturer; b = Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3; c = Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1; d = Associate Prof; e = Professor; f = Prof and HoD

Comparison amongst the different designations of the HR Academician's with respect to the "attendance to alumni meetings" have at 97.4%, have reported that they attend their respective alumni meetings on a regular basis and do not miss any of such occasions. Only 2.6% of the HR Academicians, did not make it to such meetings. Chi-square revealed a significant difference between the frequencies (X<sup>2</sup>=18.987; p=.000), thus being able to infer, that almost all the alumni attend to their alma matter's get-togethers on a very regular basis.

Further, Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association (CC=.572; p=.000), indicating that HR Academicians at all designations like Guest lecturer, Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 2 and 3, Senior Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 1, Associate Professor and Professor have all informed that they attend their alumni meetings on a regular basis. Only one Academician, at the level of Professor and Head, may not be interested / may not be attending such alumni meetings on a regular basis.

Table No 4.2.11 : Frequency and percent responses for "reasons for meeting the HR Practitioners (by HR Academicians)" and the results of test statistics

Reasons for meeting the HR Practitioners	F and %	Present Designation of HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
1	F	2	3	5	3	0	1	14	X <sup>2</sup> = 15.713; p=.108  CC=.536; p=.108
	%	100.0%	27.3%	41.7%	42.9%	0.0%	50.0%	35.9%	
2	F	0	3	5	1	0	0	9	
	%	0.0%	27.3%	41.7%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	
3	F	0	5	2	3	5	1	16	
	%	0.0%	45.5%	16.7%	42.9%	100%	50.0%	41.0%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

1 = 1,2,3;    2 = 4,5,1;    3 = 4,3,5

1. Bridge the gap between teaching and industry / To know about latest HR trends / Academic platform / Research projects; 2. Students internship (permission sought); 3. Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction; 4. Campus placements / Job related opportunities; 5. Guest Lectureship / Invite for conference and seminar / Industry visit / Training for HR students; and 6. Have not met any HR professional.

Comparison amongst the designations of the HR Academicians with respect to the "reasons for meeting the HR Practitioners by the HR Academician" has revealed that at 41%, the reasons were to "Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction; Campus placements / Job related opportunities; Guest Lectureship / Invite for conference and seminar / Industry visit / Training for HR students". These are followed by 35.9% of the Academicians informing that the reasons were to "Bridge the gap between teaching and industry / To know about latest HR trends / Academic platform / Research projects; Students internship (permission sought); Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction". Lastly, at 23.1%, HR Academicians have provided reasons such as "Campus placements / Job related opportunities; Guest Lectureship / Invite for conference and seminar / Industry visit / Training for HR students; Bridge the gap between teaching and industry / To know about latest HR trends / Academic platform / Research projects". Chi-square revealed no difference between these groups of frequencies (X<sup>2</sup>=15.713; p=.108), which help us to infer that the major reasons were "Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction; Campus placements / Job related opportunities; Guest Lectureship / Invite for conference and seminar / Industry visit / Training for HR students".

Contingency coefficient revealed that no association exists (CC=.536; p=.108), between the frequencies, which indicates that amongst the "Guest lecturers" the reasons to meet the HR Practitioners were "Bridge the gap between teaching and industry / To know about latest HR trends / Academic platform / Research projects; Students internship (permission sought); Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction". Amongst the "Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 2 and 3", the reasons majorly were "Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction; Campus placements / Job related opportunities; Guest Lectureship / Invite for confer-

ence and seminar / Industry visit / Training for HR students"; but followed at 27.3% (twice) with reasons such as "Bridge the gap between teaching and industry / To know about latest HR trends / Academic platform / Research projects; Students internship (permission sought); Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction" and "Campus placements / Job related opportunities; Guest Lectureship / Invite for conference and seminar / Industry visit / Training for HR students" respectively.

Amongst the "Senior lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 1" levels, the reasons are at 41% (twice) as in "Bridge the gap between teaching and industry / To know about latest HR trends / Academic platform / Research projects; Students internship (permission sought); Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction" and "Campus placements / Job related opportunities; Guest Lectureship / Invite for conference and seminar / Industry visit / Training for HR students" respectively.

Amongst the "Associate Professor" and "Professor and Head" levels, the reasons at 42.9% (twice) and 50% (twice), are "Bridge the gap between teaching and industry / To know about latest HR trends / Academic platform / Research projects; Students internship (permission sought); Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction" and " Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction" and "Campus placements / Job related opportunities; Guest Lectureship / Invite for conference and seminar / Industry visit / Training for HR students" respectively. The Professor level reasons for meeting the HR Practitioners are at 100% with "Friends and Known contacts / During networking interaction; Campus placements / Job related opportunities; Guest Lectureship / Invite for conference and seminar / Industry visit / Training for HR students".

Table No 4.2.12 : Frequency and percent responses for "major limitations and threats of the HR program" and the results of test statistics

Major limitations and threats of the HR program	F and %	Present Designation of the HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
1,2,3	F	2	2	1	0	0	0	5	X <sup>2</sup> = 21.013; p=.136  CC=.592; p=.136
	%	100.0%	18.2%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%	
4,5,6,	F	0	2	3	4	0	0	9	
	%	0.0%	18.2%	25.0%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	
7,1,2,3, 8	F	0	2	3	3	0	0	8	
	%	0.0%	18.2%	25.0%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	20.5%	
4,5,6,7, 8	F	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	
	%	0.0%	27.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	
9	F	0	2	4	0	5	2	13	
	%	0.0%	18.2%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	33.3%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	



1 = 1,2,3      2 = 4,5,6,

3 = 7,1,2,3, 8      4 = 4,5,6,7, 8      5 = 9

1 = Threats from other b-schools, including foreign b-schools / There is need to introduce new courses (SAP, ERP, HRIS), Behavioral dynamics lab / Courses do not make managers / Too many b-schools and MBA departments.

2 = MBA scope is reducing / Placement is less / It's a University set up / MSWs are a major threat (e.g., Roshini Nilaya) / Industry prefer MSWs in HR/ There is a need to go beyond recruitment and training.

3 = Quality of students is reducing / Attitude of students is worry factor / Students are to be motivated and are to be pushy / It is difficult to send girl students in late evenings, industries placed at the extremities of the city / HR students are required to be pushy, but are not / Obtaining good students (across a few parameters at least) is very difficult.

4 = Lack of awareness in technology and other issues / Lack of exposure to the corporate world / Less provision for practical knowledge / No stringent assessment and accreditation system.

5 = MBA students are shifting to MCom and other such courses.

6 = HR is too much theory and very less practical / HR is not being brought to the students / Syllabus to be changed to suit industry requirements.

7 = Attitude of faculty is left a lot to be desired / Need lot of industry interaction with HR practitioners / lack of infrastructure / Placement / Not much of an input from students / Vacancies are less in industry / HR Department in the industry is at times neglected.

8 = Industry is bleak, as there are not many new companies starting.

9 = NA / Un aware / Do not want to respond / Not many.

Comparison amongst the designations of the HR Academician's with reference to the "major limitations and threats to the HR program" has revealed that at 23.1%, the threats and limitations observed are "Lack of awareness in technology and other issues / Lack of exposure to the corporate world / Less provision for practical knowledge / No stringent assessment and accreditation system. MBA students are shifting to MCom and other such courses. HR is too much theory and very less practical / HR is not being brought to the students / Syllabus to be changed to suit industry requirements".

This was followed by 20.5%, of the HR Academicians who observed that the limitations and threats are "Threats from other b-schools, including foreign b-schools / There is need to introduce new courses (SAP, ERP, HRIS), Behavioral dynamics lab / Courses do not make managers / Too many b-schools and MBA departments. MBA scope is reducing / Placement is less / It's a University set up / MSWs are a major threat (e.g., those MSWs coming from Roshini Nilaya School of Social Work, Mangalore) / Industry prefer MSWs in HR/ There is a need to go beyond recruitment and training. Quality of students is reducing / Attitude of students is worry factor / Students are to be motivated and are to be pushy / It is difficult to send girl students in late evenings, industries placed at the extremities of the city / HR students are required to be pushy, but are not / Obtaining good students (across a few parameters at least) is very difficult. Attitude of faculty is left a lot to be desired / Need lot of industry interaction with HR practitioners / lack of infrastructure / Placement / Not much of an input from students / Vacancies are less in industry / HR Department in the in-

dustry is at times neglected. Industry is bleak, as there are not many new companies starting".

Lastly, at 23.1% the major threats observed are "Threats from other b-schools, including foreign b-schools / There is need to introduce new courses (SAP, ERP, HRIS), Behavioral dynamics lab / Courses do not make managers / Too many b-schools and MBA departments. MBA scope is reducing / Placement is less / It's a University set up / MSWs are a major threat (e.g., Roshini Nilaya) / Industry prefer MSWs in HR/ There is a need to go beyond recruitment and training. Quality of students is reducing / Attitude of students is worry factor / Students are to be motivated and are to be pushy / It is difficult to send girl students in late evenings, industries placed at the extremities of the city / HR students are required to be pushy, but are not / Obtaining good students (across a few parameters at least) is very difficult". However, at 33.3%, many of the HR Academicians, were "NA / Un aware / Do not want to respond" on the issue of limitations and threats concerning their respective management programs. Chi-square revealed no difference exists between the frequencies ( $X^2=21.013$ ;  $p=.136$ ) in this regard.

Contingency coefficient revealed that no association exists ( $CC=.592$ ;  $p=.136$ ), between the frequencies, as informed by the "Guest lecturers" that the major threats were "threats from other b-schools / need to introduce new courses / MBA scope is reducing / Placements are less / University set up makes things rigid; MSWs are major threat; Need to go beyond recruitment and training; Quality of students are reducing / Attitude of students is a worry factor and is their motivation / obtaining good students in HR is very difficult". Amongst the "Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 2 and 3" category have revealed the threats and limitations are at 27% "Lack of awareness and exposure to technology, corporate world; No stringent accreditation systems; MBA students are shifting to MCom and other courses; HR is too much theory and less of practice; syllabus to change as per the needs; Attitude of faculty is poor; Need to have industry interaction / Poor placement / vacancies for HR is less in the industry / Industrial scenario is bleak". These were followed by 18.2% (four times), which covers all the listed threats and limitations to the management program.

The "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1" and "Professors" category have revealed their issues at 33.3% with "NA / Un aware / Do not want to respond / Not many" respectively. They were followed by 25% (twice) with the issues as "% "Lack of awareness and exposure to technology, corporate world; No stringent accreditation systems; MBA students are shifting to MCom and other courses; HR is too much theory and less of practice; syllabus to change as per the needs; Attitude of faculty is poor; Need to have industry interaction / Poor placement / vacancies for HR is less in the industry / Industrial scenario is bleak" and "threats from other b-schools; MBA scope is reducing / Attitude of students is a worry factor; MSWs are a major threat ; Quality of students is reducing / Attitude of students is worry factor; Industry is bleak, as there are not many new companies starting"

The Associate Professor levels, revealed that at 51.7% and 42.9%, the reasons are "Lack of awareness and exposure to technology, corporate world; No stringent accreditation systems; MBA students are shifting to MCom and other courses; HR is too much theory and less of practice; syllabus to change as per the needs; Attitude of faculty is poor; Need to have industry interaction / Poor placement / vacancies for HR is less in the industry / Industrial scenario is bleak" and "Threats from other b-schools; MBA scope is reducing / Attitude of students is a worry factor; MSWs are a major threat ; Quality of students is reducing". Thus, there is not much difference in the understanding of major threats and limitations of HR program amongst the HR Academicians.

Table No 4.2.13 : Frequency and percent responses for "only internships in organization" and the results of test statistics

Only Internship in Organization	F and %	Present Designation of the HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
<4 weeks	F	0	4	1	1	0	0	6	X <sup>2</sup> =24.998; p=.202  CC=.625; p=.202
	%	0.0%	36.4%	8.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	
4 to 7 weeks	F	0	1	8	2	5	2	18	
	%	0.0%	9.1%	66.7%	28.6%	100%	100.0%	46.2%	
8 to 10 weeks	F	1	4	2	2	0	0	9	
	%	50.0%	36.4%	16.7%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	
11 weeks +	F	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	
	%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	
NA	F	1	1	1	1	0	0	4	
	%	50.0%	9.1%	8.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Comparison amongst the designations of the HR Academician's with reference to the statement " only internships in organizations" has revealed that at 46.2% believe that a period of 4 to 7 weeks were sufficient for a HR student to complete an internship in any organization. This was followed by 23.1% of the population, observing that 8 to 10 weeks of duration of internship would suffice for any HR student. Lastly, at 15.4%, HR Academicians informed that less than 4 weeks was sufficient for students to conduct an internship in any company / industry. Chi-square revealed no difference between these groups of frequencies (X<sup>2</sup>=24.998; p=.202).

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists (CC=.625; p=.202), indicating that HR Academicians, at the level of "Guest Lecturer", have replied that 50% (twice) informing that at "8 to 10 weeks would be suitable" and "Not applicable" (as in internship is termed redundant). Amongst the "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3" level, 36.4% (twice) have revealed that the duration is "< 4 weeks" and "8 to 10 weeks" would go well. Amongst the "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1" level, at 66.7%, with "4 to 7 weeks". The Associate Professors at 28.6% have informed that "4 to 7 weeks" and "8 to 10 weeks" were sufficient to complete the internship. The "Professors", as well as "Professors and Heads", have at 100% each, informed that their duration of the internship stands at "4 to 7 weeks". Hence, as informed by the HR Academician, the best option for the internship would be 8 to 10 weeks.

Table No 4.2.14 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR Academicians being helpful in findings jobs to HR students" and the results of test statistics

HR Academicians being helpful in finding internships to HR students	F and %	Present Designation of the HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
Almost Always	F	0	2	11	5	5	2	25	$X^2 = 33.285;$ $p=.004$ $CC=.679;$ $p=.004$
	%	0.0%	18.2%	91.7%	71.4%	100%	100%	64.1%	
Quite Often	F	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
	%	50.0%	18.2%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	
Some times	F	0	6	0	2	0	0	8	
	%	0.0%	54.5%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	20.5%	
Rarely	F	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
	%	50.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

a = Guest Lecturer; b = Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3; c = Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1; d = Associate Prof; e = Professor; f = Prof and HoD

A comparison amongst the different types of designations of HR Academicians with reference to the statement "HR Academicians being helpful in finding internships for HR students" has revealed that at 64.1%, 20.5% and 10.3% as "almost always", "sometimes" and "quite often" that HR Academicians have been helpful in finding internships. Chi-square revealed no difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=33.285$ ;  $p=.004$ ), thus leading to understand that majority of HR Academicians have almost always been helpful in finding internships for their students.

Contingency coefficient revealed that no significant association exists amongst the sets of frequencies ( $CC=.679$ ;  $p=.004$ ), indicating that at the Guest lecturer level, have replied that 50% (twice) informing that it is "Quite often" and 'rarely' that help is provided by an HR Academician. Amongst the "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3", have replied that 54.5% and 18.2% (twice) for "sometimes" and "almost always" and "quite often" being helped by the HR Academician. Amongst the "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1", have replied that at 91.7% as "almost ways" helping the HR students in their quest for finding internships in organizations. Further the "Associate Professor" levels have revealed that at 71.4% and 28.6% as "almost always" and "sometimes" that the HR Academician has been helpful. Lastly, the Professor, Professor and Head have revealed that at 100% each, "almost always" being helpful in finding the internship for HR students. Thus, HR Academicians have always been helpful in obtaining internships to HR students.

Table No 4.2.15 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR Education helps its learner to possess the ability to manage oneself, and also display appropriate leadership abilities" and the results of test statistics

HR Education helps its learner to possess the ability to manage oneself, and also display appropriate leadership abilities	F and %	Present Designation of the HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
Almost Always	F	0	2	8	5	5	1	21	$X^2 = 33.988;$ $p=.000$  $CC = .698;$ $p=.000$
	%	0.0%	18.2%	66.7%	71.4%	100%	50.0%	53.8%	
Quite Often	F	0	8	4	2	0	1	15	
	%	0.0%	72.7%	33.3%	28.6%	0.0%	50.0%	38.5%	
Rarely	F	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
	%	100	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

a = Guest Lecturer; b = Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3; c = Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1; d = Associate Prof; e = Professor; f = Prof and HoD

Comparison amongst the designations of the HR Academician's with reference to the statement "HR Education helps its learner to possess the ability to manage oneself, and also display appropriate leadership abilities" has revealed that HR Academicians were of the opinion that HR education almost always helped its learner to possess the ability to manage oneself and display leadership abilities at its highest at 53.8%. This was followed by 38.5% of the HR Academicians who observed that it is 'quite often'. Lastly, at 7.7% of the population, HR Academicians opined that HR education 'rarely' provided the ability to manage oneself and show leadership qualities. Chi-square revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=33.998$ ;  $p=.000$ ), revealing that almost always the HR Education helps its learner to possess the ability to manage oneself, and also display appropriate leadership abilities

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists amongst the sets of frequencies ( $CC=.698$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that at the level of "Guest Lecturer" at 100% is "rarely". This is followed by "Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3" at 72.7% with "Quite Often", followed by 18.2% with "almost always". Amongst the "Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1" at 66.7% with "almost always" and 33.3% as "quite often".

The Associate Professor revealed that at 71.4%, it is "almost always" and 28.6% is "quite often". At the level of Professor, it is 100% for "almost always" and for Professor and Head, it is 50% (twice) for "almost always" and "quite often" respectively. Hence, majority of the HR Academicians are

of the opinion that HR Education helps its learner to possess the ability to manage oneself, and also display appropriate leadership abilities.

Table No 4.2.16 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR education involves application of concepts in a given scenario" and the results of test statistics

HR education involves application of concepts in a given scenario.	F and %	Present Designation of the HR Academician						Total	Tests of Significance
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
Almost Always	F	0	1	6	6	5	1	19	$X^2 = 32.968$ $p = .000$ $CC = .677$ $p = .000$
	%	0.0%	9.1%	50.0%	85.7%	100.0%	50.0%	48.7%	
	Quite Often	F	0	8	6	0	0	1	
%	0.0%	72.7%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	38.5%		
Some times	F	2	2	0	1	0	0	5	
	%	100.0%	18.2%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

a = Guest Lecturer; b = Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3; c = Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1; d = Associate Prof; e = Professor; f = Prof and HoD

Comparison amongst the designations of the HR Academician with reference to statement "HR education involves application of concepts in a given scenario" has revealed that at 48.7%, 38.5% and 12.8% have replied that "almost always", "quite often" and "sometimes" respectively;. Chi-square has revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2 = 32.968$ ;  $p = .000$ ), revealing that HR education gives its graduates many work around, when faced with a scenario.

Contingency co-efficient revealed that a significant association exists amongst the groups of frequencies ( $CC = .677$ ;  $p = .000$ ), indicating that at the level of "Guest Lecturer" at 100% it is "sometimes". At the level of Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 2 and 3, it is "quite often" at 72.7%, followed by 18.2% "sometimes". Amongst the Senior lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1, have replied that 50% (twice) being "almost always" and "quite often". Amongst the levels of Associate Professor, Professor, and Professor and Head, at 85.7%, 100% and 50% at "almost always"; followed by Professor and Heads with 50% at "quite often". But on the whole, HR education has given its graduates many work and way around, when faced with a scenario.

Table No 4.2.17 : Frequency and percent responses by for "HR competencies one looks for during the promotion of HR Faculty in any department" and the results of test statistics

HR competencies and promotion	F and %	Present Designation of the HR Academician						Total	Tests of Significance
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
1 and 3	F	0	2	1	2	5	1	11	X <sup>2</sup> =25.633 p= 0.004  CC = .630 p=.004
	%	0.0%	18.2%	8.3%	28.6%	100.0%	50.0%	28.2%	
3 and 4	F	2	4	4	0	0	1	11	
	%	100.0%	36.4%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	28.2%	
4,3 and 1	F	0	5	7	5	0	0	17	
	%	0.0%	45.5%	58.3%	71.4%	0.0%	0.0%	43.6%	
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39	
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

a = Guest Lecturer; b = Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 2 and 3; c = Senior Lecturer / Asst Prof Grade 1; d = Associate Prof; e = Professor; f = Prof and HoD

1= 1 and 3; 2 = 3 and 4; 3 = 4,3,1; 4 = NA / Do not know. (1= Teaching / Training - students only / subject knowledge / workshops attended / qualifications achieved; 2 = 1 and Research projects; 3 = 2 and consultancy and MDP; 4 = Overall work experience)

Comparison amongst the designations of the HR Academician with reference to statement "HR competencies one looks for during the promotion of HR Faculty in any department" has revealed that at 43.6%, it is "overall work experience, consultancy, MDP, Research projects, Teaching and Training levels". This is followed twice by 28.2% with "consultancy and MDP, along with overall work experience" and "Teaching and Training levels along with research projects with consultancy and MDP". Chi-square has revealed a difference between the frequencies (X<sup>2</sup>= 25.633; p=.004), revealing that the promotion of the HR Academician to the next level depends on all sorts of issues i.e., overall work experience, MDP, Research projects, Teaching and Training levels.

Contingency coefficient revealed that an association exists (CC=.630; p=.004), indicating that at the level of Guest lecturer, it is at 100% for "overall work experience, consultancy, MDP, Research projects, Teaching and Training levels". At the Lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 2 and 3, have replied that at 45.5% with "overall work experience, consultancy, MDP, Re-

search projects, Teaching and Training levels". Amongst the Senior lecturer / Asst Professor Grade 1, have replied that at 58.3% with "overall work experience, consultancy, MDP, Research projects, Teaching and Training levels"; followed by 34.3%. Amongst the Associate Professor levels, have replied that at 71.4% the "overall work experience, consultancy, MDP, Research projects, Teaching and Training levels". At the level of Professor and Professor and Heads at 100% and 50%, have replied that "Teaching / Training - students / levels of subject knowledge / workshops attended / qualifications achieved". Thus, the promotion of the HR Academician depends on the holistic issues as in "overall work experience, consultancy, MDP, Research projects, Teaching and Training levels".

b : Type of Institution

Table No 4.2.18 : Frequency and percent responses for "open comments on HR discipline" and the results of test statistics

Open comments on HR Discipline	F and %	Type of Institution						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
1	F	2	3	6	0	0	2	13	$X^2=53.310$ ; $p=.001$  $CC=.754$ ; $p=.001$
	%	40.0%	27.3%	35.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	33.3%	
2	F	0	2	1	1	0	1	5	
	%	0.0%	18.2%	5.9%	100%	0.0%	25.0%	12.8%	
3	F	3	5	7	0	0	1	16	
	%	60.0%	45.5%	41.2%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	41.0%	
4	F	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	
	%	0.0%	9.1%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	
5	F	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	
6	F	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	2.6%	
Total	F	5	11	17	1	1	4	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

a = Deemed University; b= Autonomous b-school; c = State run universities; d = Central University; e = NITK; f = Technical University

1 = There is a need to give practice to students for all the core HR functions / Industry exposure is a must; 2 = Customize HR subjects depending on the type of industry; 3 = Your research work has covered all the areas of HR ; 4 = Knowledge of IR and HR / Health and Safety / Freedom of Association / Collective bargaining to be included; 5 = Who questions the officials in the University, whether they are compliant with the UGC, State and



Government rules; 6 = Lab component is missing across any MBA program / Human Dynamics Lab is very important; 7 = 7; 9 = 9

A comparison amongst the different types of institutions, with reference to the "open statements on HR discipline" has revealed that 41% of the HR Academicians opined that the research work done by this candidate was found to be good. This was followed by 33.3% of the population informing that "There is a need to give practice to students for all the core HR functions / Industry exposure is a must". This was followed by the comment "Customize HR subjects depending on the type of industry" with 12.8%. Chi-square revealed a difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=53.310$ ;  $p=.001$ ), revealing that the research work being done here is appreciated by many of the HR Academicians.

Contingency coefficient revealed that an association exists between the set of frequencies ( $CC=.754$ ;  $p=.001$ ), indicating that amongst the "Deemed University" based HR Academicians at 60% and 40%, the comments "Your research work has covered all the areas of HR" and "There is a need to give practice to students for all the core HR functions / Industry exposure is a must" respectively.

Amongst the "Autonomous b-schools" based HR Academicians at 45%, the major comment "Your research work has covered all the areas of HR"; followed by 27.3% of whom revealed that "There is a need to give practice to students for all the core HR functions / Industry exposure is a must" as a minor comment. The State run University based HR Academicians have revealed at 41.2% and 35.3% with major and minor comments such as "Your research work has covered all the areas of HR" and "There is a need to give practice to students for all the core HR functions / Industry exposure is a must" respectively.

Central University HR based Academicians reveal that at 100%, have replied that the comment "Customize HR subjects depending on the type of industry". Amongst the NITK Academicians the comment "Lab component is missing across any MBA program / Human Dynamics Lab is very important" at 100%. Lastly, the Technical University students, have informed that at 50% with the comment "There is a need to give practice to students for all the core HR functions / Industry exposure is a must"; followed by 25% with comments like "Customize HR subjects depending on the type of industry; Your research work has covered all the areas of HR". Thus there exists some differences in the perceptions of the HR Academicians regarding the general comments on HR discipline.

Table No 4.2.19 : Frequency and percent responses for "issues not stressed during teaching-learning process and during training sessions in b-schools" and the results of test statistics

Issues not stressed during teaching-learning process and during training sessions in b-schools	F and %	Type of Institution						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
1	F	1	4	3	2	0	0	10	$X^2=29.754$ ; $p=.013$ $CC=.658$ ; $p=.013$
	%	50.0%	36.4%	25.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	
2	F	1	2	1	3	0	0	7	

	%	50.0%	18.2%	8.3%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	17.9%
3	F	0	5	3	2	0	0	10
	%	0.0%	45.5%	25.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%
4	F	0	0	5	0	5	2	12
	%	0.0%	0.0%	41.7%	0.0%	100%	100%	30.8%
Total	F	2	11	12	7	5	2	39
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

a = Deemed University; b= Autonomous b-school; c = State run universities;  
d = Central University; e = NITK; f = Technical University;

1 = 1, 2 and 4; 2 = 2 and 3; 3 = 3, 1 and 4; 4 = NA;

1 = Managing Diversity / Coping with work stress / Motivation based Retention strategies / awareness of changes in HR industry / To have the practice of theoretical concepts / link HR concepts to business/ HR Practice / HR Analytics / HR concepts to be applied in the field / Practice application of concepts learned in the classrooms / Relevant HR concepts are left off, and some others which are not needed are taught as well / Practicality of the concepts to be understood.

2 = Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships / Need access to HR software / Run various HR programs.

3 = Industry work experience for our faculty / build right attitude towards HR profession / Competency enhancements of faculty and students / Feedback to be obtained and further worked upon / Get a feedback of the work done by employees or staff.

4 = Application of the concept to the field has to be taught, rather than theory / Less or no practice of concepts either in class nor in the field / Less or no preciseness of concepts.

5 = NA.

Comparison amongst the different types of institutions, with reference to the "issues not stressed during teaching-learning process and during training sessions in b-schools" of HR Academician's has revealed that 30.8% of the total population have revealed that the above mentioned issues are not applicable. This is followed by 25.6% (twice) in which "Managing Diversity / Coping with work stress / Motivation based Retention strategies / awareness of changes in HR industry / To have the practice of theoretical concepts / link HR concepts to business/ HR Practice / HR Analytics; Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships / Need access to HR software / Application of the concept to the field has to be taught, rather than theory / Less or no practice of concepts either in class nor in the field" and "Industry work experience for our faculty / build right attitude towards HR profession / Competency enhancements of faculty and students / Feedback to be obtained and further worked upon; Managing Diversity / Coping with work stress / Motivation based Retention strategies / awareness of changes in HR industry / To have the practice of theoretical concepts / link HR concepts to business/ HR Practice / HR Analytics; Application of the concept to the field has to be taught, rather than theory / Less or no practice of concepts either in class nor in the

field. Chi-square revealed no difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=29.754$ ;  $p=.013$ ).

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists between the set of frequencies ( $CC=.754$ ;  $p=.013$ ), indicating that amongst "Deemed University" based HR Academicians, 50 % (twice) at "Managing Diversity / Coping with work stress / Motivation based Retention strategies / awareness of changes in HR industry / To have the practice of theoretical concepts / link HR concepts to business/ HR Practice / HR Analytics; Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships; Application of the concept to the field has to be taught, rather than theory / Less or no practice of concepts either in class nor in the field" and "Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships / Need access to HR software; Industry work experience for our faculty / build right attitude towards HR profession / Competency enhancements of faculty and students / Feedback to be obtained and further worked upon".

Amongst the "Autonomous b-schools" based HR Academicians, at 45.5% for "Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships / Need access to HR software; Industry work experience for our faculty / build right attitude towards HR profession / Competency enhancements of faculty and students / Feedback to be obtained and further worked upon" and at 36.4%, "Managing Diversity / Coping with work stress / Motivation based Retention strategies / awareness of changes in HR industry / To have the practice of theoretical concepts / link HR concepts to business/ HR Practice / HR Analytics; Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships".

Amongst the "State run universities" based HR Academicians at 41.7% it is "not applicable"; followed by 25% (twice) as in "Managing Diversity / Coping with work stress / Motivation based Retention strategies / awareness of changes in HR industry / To have the practice of theoretical concepts / link HR concepts to business/ HR Practice / HR Analytics; Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships; Application of the concept to the field has to be taught, rather than theory" and " Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships / Need access to HR software; Industry work experience for our faculty / build right attitude towards HR profession / Competency enhancements of faculty and students / Feedback to be obtained and further worked upon".

Amongst the HR Academicians of the Central Universities, at 42.9% for "Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships / Need access to HR software; Industry work experience for our faculty / build right attitude towards HR profession / Competency enhancements of faculty and students"; and at 28.6% (twice) have replied that "Managing Diversity / Coping with work stress / Motivation based Retention strategies / awareness of changes in HR industry / To have the practice of theoretical concepts / link HR concepts to; Application of the concept to the field has to be taught, rather than theory / Less or business/ HR Practice / HR Analytics; Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships no practice of concepts either in class nor in the field" and "Use of Case Methodology / Need more of industry visits, exposure and internships / Need access to HR software; Industry work experience for our faculty / build right attitude towards HR profession / Competency enhancements of faculty and students / Feedback to be obtained and further worked upon".

Lastly, amongst the HR Academicians of the NITK and Technical University, at 100% each, the comment "Application of the concept to the field has to be taught, rather than theory / Less or no practice of concepts either in class nor in the field / Less or no preciseness of concepts". Thus, we can

infer that there are many issues, which are not stressed during teaching-learning process and during training sessions in b-schools.

Table No 4.2.20 : Frequency and percent responses for "need to have CGPA in their respective HR Program " and the results of test statistics

Need to have CGPA in their respective HR Program	F and %	Type of Institution						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
Yes	F	3	9	14	0	0	3	29	X <sup>2</sup> = 31.771; p=.007  CC=.670; p=.007
	%	60.0%	81.8%	82.4%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	74.4%	
No	F	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	
	%	20.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	7.7%	
Do not know	F	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	
We already have it	F	1	2	1	0	1	0	5	
	%	20.0%	18.2%	5.9%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	12.8%	
Total	F	5	11	17	1	1	4	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

a = Deemed University; b= Autonomous b-school; c = State run universities; d = Central University; e = NITK; f = Technical University

A comparison amongst the different types of institutions with reference to the "need to have CGPA in their respective HR program" as revealed by 74.4% of the HR Academicians felt the need to have CGPA in their HR programs. This was followed by 12.8% observing that "they are having CGPA in their programs already". However, a 7.7% of the HR Academicians observed that they do not want to have CGPA. Followed by 5.1% reporting that they are undecided or do not know, whether they are in need of the CGPA or not. Chi-square revealed that no difference exists between these groups of frequencies (X<sup>2</sup>=31.771; p=.007), inferring that majority of the HR Academicians have opined that they need to have the CGPA in their respective HR program.

Contingency coefficient revealed that no significant association exists (CC=.670; p=.007), indicating that amongst the Deemed University based HR Academicians at 60% have given a "yes" and 20% of them have replied with "we already have it" and an equal number refusing. Amongst the Autonomous b-school and State University based HR Academicians at 81.8% and 82.4% saying "yes" and 18.2% and 5.9% reporting "we already have it" respectively. The Central University based HR Academician was not aware of it. The NITK based HR Academician reported with "we already have it". But the Technical University based HR Academicians reported with an "yes" at 75%, fol-

lowed by 25% as "no". Thus majority of the HR Academicians would like to have the CGPA in their respective HR program.

Table No 4.2.21 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR Academicians being helpful in finding internships to HR students" and the results of test statistics

HR Academicians being helpful in finding internships to HR students	F and %	Type of Institution						Total in %	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
Almost Always	F	5	7	15	0	0	0	27	$X^2 = 29.046;$ $p=.001$ $CC=.653;$ $p=.001$
	%	100%	63.6%	88.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	69.2	
Quite Often	F	0	3	2	0	1	2	8	
	%	0.0%	27.3%	11.8%	0.0%	100%	50.0%	20.5	
Some times	F	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	
	%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	50.0%	10.3	
Total	F	5	11	17	1	1	4	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

a = Deemed University; b= Autonomous b-school; c = State run universities; d = Central University; e = NITK; f = Technical University

A comparison amongst the different types of University based HR Academicians with reference to "HR Academicians being helpful in finding internships to HR student", has revealed that 69.2% of the HR Academicians have observed that they have 'almost always' helped HR students in finding internships to HR students in companies / Industry. This was followed by 20.5% observing that, they have helped HR students 'quite often' in finding internships. 10.3% of the HR Academicians observed that they 'sometimes' have helped HR students in finding internships to HR students. In totality, the HR Academicians have on an aggregate of 91% of the time, have always made it a rule to help the HR student in finding internships in companies / Industry. Chi-square revealed a significant difference between the frequencies ( $X^2=29.046$ ;  $p=.001$ ), thus helping to infer that HR Academicians being helpful in finding internships to HR students.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.653$ ;  $p=.001$ ), indicating that amongst the Deemed University based HR Academicians revealed a 100% confirmation to "almost always". This was followed by Autonomous b-school based HR Academicians with 63.6% as "almost always" and 27.3% reporting "quite often". Amongst the State run universities based HR Academicians with 88.2% for "almost always" and at 11.8% for "quite often". The Central University based HR Academician informed that it was "sometimes". The NITK based HR Academician informed that it was "quite often". Lastly the Technical University based HR Academicians informed that it was "quite often" and "sometimes" with 50% each. Thus HR Academicians are helpful to the HR students in finding HR based internships in companies and organizations.

Table No 4.2.22 : Frequency and percent responses for "HR Education provides its learner the ability to introspect within himself and help overcome one's shortcomings" and the results of test statistics

HR Education provides its learner the ability to introspect within himself and help overcome one's shortcomings	F and %	Type of Institution						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
Almost Always	F	5	7	12	0	0	2	26	$X^2=29.723$ ; $p=.013$  $CC=.658$ ; $p=.013$
	%	100%	63.6%	70.6%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	66.7%	
Quite Often	F	0	3	4	1	0	1	9	
	%	0.0%	27.3%	23.5%	100%	0.0%	25.0%	23.1%	
Sometimes	F	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	
	%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	5.1%	
Rarely	F	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	100	0.0%	5.1%	
Total	F	5	11	17	1	1	4	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

a = Deemed University; b= Autonomous b-school; c = State run universities; d = Central University; e = NITK; f = Technical University;

A comparison amongst the different types of University based HR Academicians reference to "HR Education provides its learner the ability to introspect within himself and help overcome one's shortcomings" has revealed that 66.7% of the HR Academicians have observed that the HR education has 'almost always' helped HR students in introspecting and changing one's shortcoming. This was followed by 23.1% observing that, HR education has helped HR students 'quite often' in analyzing and correcting themselves. 5.1% of the HR Academicians observed that they 'sometimes' HR education has helped in correcting themselves. In totality, the HR Academicians, have observed that HR education always helps the HR student to introspect within himself and help overcome one's shortcomings. Chi-square revealed no difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=29.723$ ;  $p=.013$ ).

Contingency coefficient revealed that no association that exists ( $CC=.663$ ;  $p=.013$ ) amongst the groups of frequencies, indicating that amongst the Deemed University based HR Academicians, there is 100% confirmation for "almost always". The Autonomous b-schools based HR Academicians have reported that at 63.6% for "almost always and 27.3% for "quite often" for HR Education provides its learner the ability to introspect within himself.

Amongst those HR Academicians in State run universities, at 70.6% for "almost always" and 23.5% for "quite often". The Central University based HR Academician informed that it was "quite often". The NITK based HR Academician informed that it was "rarely". Lastly the Technical University based HR Academicians informed that it was "almost always" and "quite often " and "sometimes" with 25% each.

Table No 4.2.23 : Frequency and percent responses for "best of HR books read by HR Academicians" and the results of test statistics

Best of HR books read by HR Academicians		Types of Institution						Total	Tests Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
a	F	1	0	3	0	0	2	6	$\chi^2=63.953$ ; $p=.000$ $CC=.788$ ; $p=.000$
	%	20.0%	0.0%	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	15.4%	
b	F	0	3	2	0	0	2	7	
	%	0.0%	27.3%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	17.9%	
c	F	4	7	8	0	0	0	19	
	%	80.0%	63.6%	47.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	48.7%	
d	F	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	2.6%	
e	F	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	
	%	0.0%	9.1%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	
f	F	0	0	3	1	0	0	4	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	
Total	F	5	11	17	1	1	4	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

1= Deemed University; 2 = Autonomous b-schools; 3 = State Public University; 4 = Central University; 5 = NITK; 6 = Technical University.

a = How to build relationships / Talk to People ; b = OB - Robbins /Games People Play / High performers, Recruit and retain employees - Dubinsky and Skinner; c = SHRM - Pattanayak / Principles and practices of management - Vishwanathan; d = SAP HR - Time Management - Agarwal / SAP HR HCM Infotypes; e = First Break all the rules - Buckingham and Coffman / HR Champions - Ulrich; f = NA

A comparison amongst the different types of institutions based HR Academicians reference to " best of HR books read" has revealed that at 48.7% of the population, have opined that "SHRM - Pattanayak / Principles and practices of management - Vishwanathan" were some of the books that they read the most. This was followed by "OB - Robbins /Games People Play / High per-

formers, Recruit and retain employees - Dubinsky and Skinner" at 17.9% of the population. Lastly, at 15.4%, have replied that "How to build relationships / Talk to People" types of books read by HR Academicians. However at 10.3% of the population have opined that, they do not read much of any text books. Chi-square revealed a difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=63.953$ ;  $p=.000$ ), inferring that HR Academicians read variety of HR books, many of them have been prescribed as text books for management courses.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists amongst the groups of frequencies ( $CC=.788$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that HR Academicians in Deemed universities, Autonomous b-schools, and State run Universities at 80%, 63.7% and 47.1% focus on books like "SHRM - Pattanayak / Principles and practices of management by Vishwanathan". Further in Autonomous b-schools, have replied that at 27.3%, books being read with titles like "OB - Robbins /Games People Play / High performers, Recruit and retain employees - Dubinsky and Skinner".

Amongst the State run universities, have replied that at 17.6%, for books like "How to build relationships / Talk to People". The Central University HR Academician has informed that best HR books read is not applicable. Further the NITK based HR Academicians informs that "SAP HR - Time Management - Agarwal / SAP HR HCM Infotypes" would be good books to read. Lastly, have replied that the Technical University based HR Academicians inform that at 50% each reads books like " How to build relationships / Talk to People" and OB - Robbins /Games People Play / High performers, Recruit and retain employees - Dubinsky and Skinner. Thus, the HR Academicians vary in their choice of HR books being read, across different institutions.

Table No 4.2.24 : Frequency and percent responses for "pre-placement training" and the results of test statistics

Pre-placement training	F and %	Type of Institution						Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
1st semester onwards	F	1	4	2	0	0	0	7	$X^2=17.124$ ; $p=.000$  $CC=.552$ ; $p=.000$
	%	20.0%	36.4%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.9%	
2nd semester onwards	F	3	3	9	1	0	4	20	
	%	60.0%	27.3%	52.9%	100%	0.0%	100.0%	51.3%	
3rd semester onwards	F	1	2	6	0	1	0	10	
	%	20.0%	18.2%	35.3%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	25.6%	
4th semester onwards	F	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
	%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	
Total	F	5	11	17	1	1	4	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

1= Deemed University; 2 = Autonomous b-schools; 3 = State Public University; 4 = Central University; 5 = NITK; 6 = Technical University



A comparison amongst the different types of universities has revealed that HR Academicians were of the opinion that at 51.3%, that during the 2nd semester the pre-placement activities were initiated in their respective universities. Followed by 25.6% of the population with pre placement training initiated in the 3rd semester. Lastly, at 17.9% of the population HR Academicians have opined that during the 1st semester itself, the pre-placement training programs were initiated. Chi-square revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=17.124$ ;  $p=.000$ ), informing that HR Academicians differed significantly in their knowledge of pre-placement training being conducted in their respective institutions.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists amongst the groups of frequencies ( $CC=.552$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that amongst the Deemed University based HR Academicians at 60%, the pre-placement training has been initiated in the second semester itself, whilst 20% (twice) have informed that it has been done so during the "first" and "third" semester also. Amongst the Autonomous b-schools, the pre placement training began in the first semester amongst 36.4% and 27.3% were for the 2nd semester respectively.

Amongst the State University based HR Academician, the pre-placement training has been initiated in 2nd semester with 52.9% of the population; this was followed by 35.3% reporting that it was initiated in the 3rd semester of the program. The Central University based HR Academician, informed that the pre placement training began in the 2nd semester. The NITK based HR Academician informed that the pre placement training began in the 3rd semester. The Technical University based HR Academician informed that the pre-placement training began in the 2nd semester itself. Thus the pre-placement training program's initiation varies significantly across different institutions as perceived by HR Academicians.

Table No 4.2.25 : Frequency and percent responses by HR Academician respondents working in different institutions for the statement "are business schools doing a good job of preparing HR professionals for these changes? How" and the results of test statistics

Are b-schools schools doing a good job in preparing HR professionals ?	F and %	Type of Institution						Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
a	F	4	6	7	0	0	2	19	$X^2 = 21.013$ ; $p = .136$  $CC = .592$ ; $p = .136$
	%	80.0%	54.5%	41.2%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	48.7%	
b	F	1	3	4	0	0	2	10	
	%	20.0%	27.3%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	25.6%	
c	F	0	0	3	1	0	0	4	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	
d	F	0	2	3	0	1	0	6	
	%	0.0%	18.2%	17.6%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	15.4%	
Total	F	5	11	17	1	1	4	39	

Total	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
-------	---	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

1= Deemed University; 2 = Autonomous b-schools; 3 = State Public University; 4 = Central University; 5 = NITK; 6 = Technical University

a. Need to Improve / Average in its current outlook / Needs more practical orientation rather than theory / Upgrade the HR Portal in terms of Practical inputs / No initiatives are taken / Not doing a good job of preparation of students / changes in the market / community have to be adopted to / It is a question of the reputation of the institutions at stake / "Survival" / b-schools survival is at stake / Otherwise b-schools will or would close down .

b. B-schools are not responding to changes outside / Compete and change along with Corporate Culture in the industry / Industry based Guest Lecturers give it a fore taste / It is a duty basically / It is a mechanism to sustain in the education market / They have to cater to the needs of the society.

c. Faculty have no pride that they are teaching HR.

d. Faculty are doing good job / Students are given the admission based on CAT score / This is the b-schools' duty and responsibility / Longevity of survival in the market; viability of its courses in the today's scenario.

A comparison amongst the different types of universities has revealed that At 48.7% of the population the HR Academicians have opined that "Need to Improve / Average in its current outlook / Needs more practical orientation rather than theory / Upgrade the HR Portal in terms of Practical inputs / No initiatives are taken / Not doing a good job of preparation of students / changes in the market / community have to be adopted to / It is a question of the reputation of the institutions at stake / "Survival" / b-schools survival is at stake / Otherwise b-schools will or would close down". This was followed by 25.5% of the HR Academicians who observed that "B-schools are not responding to changes outside / Compete and change along with Corporate Culture in the industry / Industry based Guest Lecturers give it a fore taste / It is a duty basically / It is a mechanism to sustain in the education market / They have to cater to the needs of the society". Lastly, at 15.4%, the reasons given were "Faculty are doing good job / Students are given the admission based on CAT score / This is the B-schools' duty and responsibility / Longevity of survival in the market; viability of its courses in the today's scenario". Chi-square revealed no difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=21.013$ ;  $p=.136$ ).

Contingency coefficient revealed that no association exists ( $CC=.592$ ;  $p=.136$ ), amongst the groups of frequencies, but amongst those HR Academicians in Deemed universities, at 80% of the population opines that "Need to Improve / Average in its current outlook / Needs more practical orientation rather than theory / Upgrade the HR Portal in terms of Practical inputs / No initiatives are taken / Not doing a good job of preparation of students".

Amongst the Autonomous b-school based HR Academicians, at 54.4%, have replied that "Need to Improve / Average in its current outlook / Needs more practical orientation rather than theory / Upgrade the HR Portal in terms of Practical inputs / No initiatives are taken / Not doing a good job of preparation of students"; followed by ". B-schools are not responding to changes outside / Compete and change along with Corporate Culture in the industry / Industry based Guest Lecturers give it a fore taste / It is a duty basically" at 27.3%. Amongst the HR Academicians in the State run universities, at 41.2%, "Need to Improve / Average in its current outlook /

Needs more practical orientation rather than theory / Upgrade the HR Portal in terms of Practical inputs / No initiatives are taken / Not doing a good job of preparation of students"; this is followed by 23.5% "B-schools are not responding to changes outside / Compete and change along with Corporate Culture in the industry / Industry based Guest Lecturers give it a fore taste / It is a duty basically".

The Central University based HR Academician is of the opinion that "Faculty have no pride that they are teaching HR". The NITK based HR Academician is of the opinion that "Faculty are doing good job / Students are given the admission based on CAT score / This is the b-schools' duty and responsibility / Longevity of survival in the market; viability of its courses in the today's scenario".

Amongst the Technical University based HR Academicians, at 50% (twice) "Need to Improve / Average in its current outlook / Needs more practical orientation rather than theory / Upgrade the HR Portal in terms of Practical inputs / No initiatives are taken / Not doing a good job of preparation of students" and " b-schools are not responding to changes outside / Compete and change along with Corporate Culture in the industry / Industry based Guest Lecturers give it a fore taste / It is a duty basically". Thus, there exists lacunae in the b-schools in the process of preparing the HR students for a career in the industry.

Table No 4.2.26 : Frequency and percent responses for "only dissertation in organization" and the results of test statistics

Only Dissertation in Organization	F and %	Types of Institution						Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
4 to 7 weeks	F	3	7	7	0	0	1	18	X <sup>2</sup> =10.866; p=.368  CC=.467; p=.368
	%	60.0%	63.6%	41.2%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	46.2%	
8 to 10 weeks	F	1	1	6	1	1	3	13	
	%	20.0%	9.1%	35.3%	100%	100%	75.0%	33.3%	
11 weeks +	F	1	3	4	0	0	0	8	
	%	20.0%	27.3%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.5%	
Total	F	5	11	17	1	1	4	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

1= Deemed University; 2 = Autonomous b-schools; 3 = State Public University; 4 = Central University; 5 = NITK; 6 = Technical University.

A comparison amongst the different types of universities based HR Academicians with reference to "dissertation in organizations" has revealed that 46.2% of the total need to engage for 4 to 7 weeks only, followed by 28.20%, who wish to engage 8 to 10 weeks; lastly at 20.5% of the preferred the 11+ weeks of dissertation in organizations. Chi-square revealed no difference between these groups of frequencies (X<sup>2</sup>=10.866; p=.368).

Contingency coefficient revealed that no significant association exists amongst the groups of frequencies (CC=.467; p=.368), indicating that HR Academicians were of the opinion amongst the Deemed University HR Academician, at 60% , 20% (twice) for 4 to 7 weeks, 8 to 10 weeks and 11+ weeks respectively. Amongst the Autonomous b-schools, have replied that at 63.6% and 27.3%, for 4 to 7 weeks and 11weeks+ respectively as the term for the dissertation in organization. The State University based HR Academicians have at 41.2%, 35.5% and 23.5% for 4 to 7 weeks, 8 to 10 weeks and 11 weeks + for the dissertation in organizations. The Central University, NITK and Technical University based HR Academicians reveals that 8 to 10 weeks are sufficient to conduct the dissertation.

c : Age groups

Table No 4.2.27 : Frequency and percent responses "number of publications in Journals by HR Academicians" and the results of test statistics

No. of Publications in Journals by HR Academicians	F and %	Age group of the HR Academicians						Total	Test Statistics
		a	b	c	d	e	f		
< 2	F	0	1	0	3	0	0	4	$X^2=52.731$ ; $p=.000$ $CC=.758$ ; $p=.000$
	%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	
3 to 8	F	0	1	1	3	1	1	7	
	%	0.0%	16.7%	10.0%	50.0%	14.3%	16.7%	17.9%	
9 to 14	F	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	57.1%	50.0%	17.9%	
15+	F	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	5.1%	
NA	F	4	4	9	0	0	2	19	
	%	100%	66.7%	90.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	48.7%	
Total	F	4	6	10	6	7	6	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

a = 23 to 27; b = 28 to 32; c = 33 to 37; d = 38 to 42; e = 43 to 52; f = 53+

Comparison amongst the different age groups of HR Academicians, have published research articles in journals ranging in number from 3 to 8 articles and 9 to 14 articles, at 17.9% articles in each group. But a slight majority of the population at 48.7% have not been able to publish any papers. Chi-square revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=52.731$ ;  $p=.000$ ), informing that the HR Academicians have published articles / papers in the range of 3 to 8 and 9 to 14 papers.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association between these groups of frequencies (CC=.758; p=.000), where in HR Academicians in the age groups of 23 to 27 years have published no papers. In the age group of 28 to 32 years HR Academicians at 16.7% (twice) have published in the 3 to 8 papers and < 2 papers category. In the 33 to 37 years age group HR Academicians have published in the 3 to 8 papers category with 10%. In the 38 to 42 years age group HR Academicians at 50% (twice) have published in the 3 to 8 papers and < 2 papers category. In the 43 to 52 years age group at 57.1%, have published in the 9 to 14 papers, followed by 28.6% with 15+ publications. In the 53+ years age group have published 9 to 14 papers with 50%, followed by 16.8% with 3 to 8 publications.

Table No 4.2.28 : Frequency and percent responses for "best of HR journals read by HR Academicians" and the results of test statistics

Best of HR journals read by HR Academicians	F and %	Age group of the HR Academician						Total	Test Statistics
		1	2	3	4	5	6		
a	F	0	0	3	3	0	1	7	X <sup>2</sup> = 44.222; p = .046  CC = .729; p = .000
	%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	50.0%	0.0%	16.7%	17.9%	
b	F	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	
	%	50.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	
c	F	1	2	3	0	1	0	7	
	%	25.0%	33.3%	30.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	17.9%	
d	F	1	3	0	1	5	5	15	
	%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	16.7%	71.4%	83.3%	38.5%	
e	F	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	
f	F	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	
	%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	
g	F	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	
	%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	5.1%	
Total	F	4	6	10	6	7	6	39	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

1 = 23 to 27; 2 = 28 to 32; 3 = 33 to 37; 4 = 38 to 43; 5 = 43 to 52; 6 = 53+

a= Journal of OB; b = Journal of Performance Management / HR Development Review / South Asia Journal of HRM; c = Strategic HRM journal / HBR / AIMS / IIMB Management Review; d = International Labour Review / International Journal of Labour law; e = SHRM Journal / Journal of Management / Industrial Journal of Training and Development; f = Human Factor / Man-

agement and Labour Studies / HRM Review; g = HR capital / Smart Manager / HRD.

Comparison amongst the different age groups of HR Academicians with reference to the "best of HR journals being read" at 38.5% of the population, have opined that "International Labour Review / International Journal of Labour law" were some of the journals that they read the most. This was followed by "Journal of OB" and "Strategic HRM journal / HBR / AIMS / IIMB Management Review" at 17.9% of the population. Thirdly, at 7.7%, have replied that "Journal of Performance mgmt / HR Development Review / South Asia Journal of HRM" and "SHRM Journal / Journal of Management / Industrial Journal of Training and Development" types of Journals are read by HR Academicians. The least type of read journals at 5.1% of the population were "Human Factor / Management and Labour Studies / HRM Review" and "HR capital / Smart Manager / HRD". Chi-square revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies ( $X^2=44.222$ ;  $p=.000$ ), informing that the HR Academicians were highest in the age groups of 33 to 37 years, which is a very productive age group with lot of energy, motivation and learning on the other side.

Contingency coefficient revealed that a significant association exists ( $CC=.729$ ;  $p=.000$ ), indicating that HR Academicians in the age group of 23 to 27 years at 50% read " Journal of Performance Management / HR Development Review / South Asia Journal of HRM; followed by 25% (twice) with "Strategic HRM journal / HBR / AIMS / IIMB Management Review" and "International Labour Review / International Journal of Labour law".

In the age group of 28 to 32 years, at 33.3% and 50% read "Strategic HRM journal / HBR / AIMS / Vikasana" and "International Labour Review / International Journal of Labour law ". Amongst the 33 to 37 years age group, at 30% (twice), HR Academicians have read "Journal of OB" and "Strategic HRM journal / HBR / AIMS / IIMB Management Review" respectively. In the 38 to 42 years age group, at 50% reading of "Journal of OB" and at 16.7% of them reading " International Labour Review / International Journal of Labour law; SHRM Journal / Journal of Management / Indian Journal of Training and Development; Human Factor / Management and Labour Studies / HRM Review".

At the 43 to 52 years age group, journals being read are " International Labour Review / International Journal of Labour law" at 71.4%; followed by 14.3% reading "Strategic HRM journal / HBR / AIMS / IIMB Management Review" and " HR capital / Smart Manager / HRD". Lastly, amongst the age group of 53+, journals being read are "International Labour Review/ International Journal of Labour law" at 83.3%, followed by 16.7% of the population reading "Journal of OB". Thus there exists difference between the type of HR Journals being read by HR Academicians across different types of institutions.

To summarize, the perception of the HR Academicians have been analyzed and tabulated as per the independent variables and later has been classified under the present designation, type of Institution presently working in, age group and role and responsibility.