

Need for HRD Interventions in Higher Education System – an Empirical Study

F.A.Gurkoo & S.A.Mufeed

Being run by the aid of the state most of the Indian universities' work culture seems to suffer from the government sector syndrome, their systems of working do not allow them to keep pace with the changing global scenario and respond positively to the changes that happen within and outside. These institutions need to review their HRD policy in regard to the development of their academic and non-academic staff. The mechanisms that are usually tapped to develop the human resources of an institution make a significant contribution to its working efficiency. This paper attempts to make an assessment of the prevailing status of the HRD mechanisms in a sample of universities.

F.A.Gurkoo is Deputy Registrar & **S.A.Mufeed** (Email: mufeedku@yahoo.com) is Dean, School of Business Studies & Professor, Dept of Management Studies, University of Kashmir, J&K

Introduction

Human resource constitutes the basic input to any system. Its significance to the educational system is quite overwhelmingly fundamental since educational administration is purely concerned with the development of the human resources to feed other sectors of the human activity. Progressive organizations worldwide have treated their people as their most important asset and probably have therefore become what they are today. The effective management of human resource is the key strategic issue for organization to face challenges of competition (Shah & Manzoor, 2015). Our colleges and universities, however, continue with the traditional form of HR governance. In the wake of globalization coupled with the emergence of private sector, the question of survival and the maintenance of standards for the universities are going to be hard tasks for the educational administrators in the near future, given the competition around them and the ever squeezing funding from the state governments. The scenario ahead is likely to bring new tensions together with unprecedented opportunities. To enable the universities to benefit from the

changed circumstances will require new designs of human resource development. This calls for adoption of the HRD philosophy by the top brass of the educational institutions. Successful implementation of HRD philosophy, among others, involves the process of establishing an integrated system of HRD mechanisms. HRD mechanisms include: performance appraisal, potential appraisal, career planning, performance rewards, feedback and counseling, training, employee welfare, quality of work life, job rotation etc. The HRD subsystems or mechanisms deliver the results when put to work together in an integrated system. In an integrated system the outcomes of performance appraisals provide inputs for training needs assessments, rewards, career planning, and feedback and performance coaching. Mufeed & Qurrat (2015) and Mufeed & Jennifur (2016) stressed that HRD mechanisms are instrumental in creating learning organizations with a focus to improve individual's performance and attain overall institutional efficiency.

HRD Mechanisms

The study of HRD mechanisms attempts to measure the extent to which these mechanisms are implemented seriously. If implemented properly integrated HRD systems can contribute significantly to positive cultural changes, increased productivity and excellence in organization. Apart from training and development dimensions with which it is generally associated, HRD interventions can be effectively used to achieve behavioral changes, work culture, produc-

tive efficiency, quality and integration. The HRD mechanisms both for managerial and non-managerial cadres which are in vogue in the organizational context are: performance appraisal, feedback and counseling, potential appraisal, training and development, career planning and development, rewards mechanisms, employee welfare, quality of work life, job rotation, quality circles, workers participation and grievance mechanisms etc. Research studies indicate that the HRD system, barring a few exceptions, has not been adopted in its integrated form properly as yet at the organizational level. As far as universities are concerned HRD mechanisms need to be implemented to an optimum level since these mechanisms have a significant role in developing the personnel who have prime responsibility of developing the human resource of a country to meet cross sector demands.

Research studies report a mixed response on the status of HRD mechanisms. However, very few studies have reported its status at a good level. While Bhardwaj and Mishra (2002) in their empirical study found that senior managers obtained higher scores on 'HRD mechanisms', Rohmetra (1998) found 'the position depressing in the sample bank'. Shakeel (1999) found the status of 'HRD mechanisms' in both the sample universities at a 'low' degree. Rao et al (2001) in the study of 12 organizations that opted for audit of their HRD practices found that the integrated systems approach had not been implemented properly. The systems are not well integrated. The HRD subsystems, however, have evolved and matured to a substan-

tial degree. The staff working in a university or any higher educational institution can broadly be divided into i) teachers ii) officers and iii) administrative staff. The HRD needs of all the three cadres are to be addressed in different perspectives, although some mechanisms for their development can be identical in some cases.

HRD Mechanisms for Teachers & Officers

Development of employees' competencies is a continuous process and most of it should take place on the job in the work place. The role of teaching staff in influencing the quality of educational process and its product is beyond question. S.Radhakrishnan, the then President of India, while discussing the role of teachers in education sector said, "the teacher acts as the pivot for the transmission of intellectual traditions and technical skills from generation and helps to keep the lamp of civilizations burning". Teaching is a complex activity and requires a good subject knowledge besides possessing necessary pedagogical techniques. While the competence in former is subject to change from time to time, the latter also needs to be improved. Mere possession of highest degrees is not sufficient for teachers. They need to have proficiency over their professional skills. Most of the teachers also feel that teaching can be adequately done without depending on any other academic source. But instances are rampant where university teachers with the highest academic excellence fail miserably in the class room (Sharma, 2000). This cadre continuously needs to update their knowledge. Oth-

erwise, teachers of educational institutions tend to be rigid, conventional and conformistic with the passage of time. This is because in most educational institutions the teachers are expected to keep on teaching the same subject year after year.

Teachers of educational institutions tend to be rigid, conventional and conformistic with the passage of time.

Most of the literature on HRD initiatives in public and private sector suggests the mechanisms for managerial cadre. In fact, the mechanisms and systems were, right from the inception of integrated HRD initiatives in corporate sector with a professional outlook, devised for managerial/officer's cadres in 1975. The published work for this section of employees is in such abundance that some researchers/experts even feel that the literature on HRD was biased in favor of managerial cadre. It was felt that developing a specific section of employees leaving the other cadres aside could hardly develop an organization. This is true especially now when the non supervisory white collar employees are highly educated, possess a desire for self development and have developed a global outlook. The mechanisms that have been practiced in corporate sector can easily be adopted in higher education sector too. These may be: performance appraisal, potential appraisal, feedback and counseling, career planning, training and organization development. HRD system aims at creating mechanisms and processes in organizations to continuously

develop the competencies of employees, so that they can perform their present jobs well, are equipped to perform future roles, the changing organization may demand and thus contribute to organizational vitality and growth.

HRD Mechanism for Administrative Staff

In any organization workers constitute 70 to 80% of the workforce. If organizational efforts are directed to develop this resource to unleash the latent potential in them, the organization will bloom with energy. In many organizations 40 to 50% of their first line executives come from workmen category. Thus, development of workers assumes critical significance both for present as well as for future (Khandelwal, 2002). A pilot study made in this context in the universities of J&K State revealed that the first line officers (gazetted) constitute 70% of the total strength of officers on the administrative side. If section officers (non-gazetted) who are line managers (for HRD purposes) act as immediate officers of the employees in the offices, the percentage of these first line officers rises to 90% of the total officers' strength. As per this study 80% of these officers in the former and 90% in the latter case come from non-gazetted employees cadres. This statistics clearly indicates the significance of the development of non-gazetted employees in universities on the clerical/secretarial cadres. Today workers are no more silent spectators. They are articulate, educated, knowledgeable and demanding. Organizations need to provide opportunities for

workers growth and development. If they are neglected then they will feel alienated and can prove to be a social liability (Sen, 1995).

The need for HRD for administrative staff has not received adequate attention of academicians and management experts in India. "Even the conceptual writings on HRD have mostly shown bias towards development of managerial resources evident by neglect of workers affairs which seems to have been relegated to IR. This academic as well as managerial insensitivity towards workers affairs is likely to create a sort of HRD which will become 'elitist' in character and will ultimately contribute to the development of managerial resources only" (Kandelwal, 2002). Among workers there is even a resentment that they have been left out of the maintenance of HRD activity. There is now a greater desire and ability to participate in HRD efforts. Any development efforts directed on a particular group of employees would be inadequate and their impact in the organizational growth and development will be marginal unless the developmental efforts are directed to cover all sections of employees. Even the most 'developed' managers would find it difficult to achieve corporate objectives in the com-

There has now been realization, though belatedly, in many organizations about the need to involve and develop latent potential of workers to create in them a sense of involvement.

pany of stagnant, alienated and de-motivated workforce. If competent and qualified managers could alone run the organization workers would not have been needed (Khandelwal, 2002). "There has now been realization, though belatedly, in many organizations about the need to involve and develop latent potential of workers to create in them a sense of involvement" (Khandelwal, 2002).

Past research indicates that HRD mechanisms and instruments for administrative staff shall have to be framed according to their needs. Though mechanisms that are common in nature such as training, performance appraisal etc. can also be applied in their case. Yet their nature of duties and job content demands other instruments as well. Besides, these mechanisms may have limited applicability or relevance and cannot be replicated for them who at a particular stage of their development may have limited utility for these mechanisms. It would be difficult to propose that administrative staff as a group will have common needs for their development because in different work areas, the focus and direction of HRD for this group of employees may be different (Mufeed & Gurchoo, 2006, Mufeed & Mir, 2012). In recent years various HRD mechanisms have been introduced by Indian organizations for this staff with considerable success. These mechanisms are (a) training/ behavioral trainings (b) workers participation in management (WPM) (c) counseling, (d) quality of work life (QWL) (e) employee welfare (f) grievance mechanisms and (g) quality circles etc.

To sum up human resources of higher educational institutions especially the universities can be truly developed to meet the National Accreditation and international standards only by instituting instruments through an integrated HRD system which in addition to other requirements needs a separate staff development section with a well trained staff and a suitable budgetary provision. Some of these mechanisms both for managers as well as for non-managers are discussed in detail below. The enlarged focus will, however, remain on two main mechanisms viz. performance appraisals and training and development.

Objectives of the Present Study

In the light of the domain for research having been identified, the following objectives have been set for the present study:

- i. To make a comparative study of the existing 'HRD mechanisms' of the sample study universities
- ii. To assess the employee's perception on the existing status of 'HRD mechanisms' in the sample universities.

Hypotheses

In consonance with the above objectives it has been hypothesized that:

- H1. The status of HRD mechanisms together with employee's perceptions on the existing human resource development practices under 'HRD mechanisms' variables in the three

universities does not significantly differ from one another

Methodology

The three major universities of J&K State which were chosen for the study of human resource development practices are (a) University of Kashmir, Srinagar (K U) (b) University of Jammu, Jammu (J U) and (c) Sher-i-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology, Srinagar (SKUAST). The selection of these universities for the project as study units has been made on their being the largest and foremost educational institutions of the state of J&K. A sample staff of 521 from the three universities under reference with a range of 152 to 211 employees from each university covering various categories from both academic and non-academic staff was taken up for the study. The study is based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected through administering questionnaires and conducting interviews. Secondary data was obtained from the existing personnel policy, annual reports, financial estimates, university calendars, record of files and other published materials. In order to elicit the required information from the academic and non-academic staff a systematic and pre-tested questionnaire was used.

Results & Discussion

An overall view of the HRD mechanisms in the sample universities on 20 statements concerning various dimensions of human resource development is given in Table 1. The total mean and percentage scores for all the 20 statements

reveal that HRD mechanisms have been perceived at an above average level at 3.23 by the respondents in JU while it has been perceived as 'poor' at 2.60 and 2.69 in KU and SKUAST.

Testing the Objectives

ANOVA of 20 'HRD mechanisms' statements concerning various HRD practices has been made in consonance with the objectives laid down for the purpose with a view 'to make a comparative study of the existing 'HRD mechanisms' of the sample universities and 'to assess the employee's perception on the existing status of HRD practices under 'HRD mechanisms' variables in the sample universities. This objective is examined by testing the hypotheses laid down in this regard using the technique of One Way ANOVA.

Testing the Hypothesis

Ho: Status of HRD mechanisms together with employee's perceptions on the existing status of human resource development practices under 'HRD mechanisms' variables in the three universities do not significantly differ from one another.

Table 1 reveals that the significance in most of the cases is 0.000 and below 0.05 and 0.01. Since the difference is significant at both 0.05% and 0.01% levels our null hypothesis (Ho) to the effect that 'Employee's perceptions on the existing status of human resource development practices under 'HRD mechanisms' variables in the three universities do not sig-

Table 1 HRD Mechanisms in Sample Universities

S.N	K.UN=211			J.UN=152			SKUAST-KN=158			F	Sig.
	M.S	SD(ó)	%to M.S	M.S	SD(ó)	%to M.S	M.S	SD(ó)	%to M.S		
1/13	2.58	1.15	39.50	3.28	1.20	57.00	2.68	1.12	42.00	17.42	.000
2/16	1.89@	1.06	22.25	2.51	1.26	37.75	2.16	1.12	29.00	13.23	.000
3/17	2.15	1.07	28.75	3.13	1.17	53.25	2.61	1.10	40.25	34.67	.000
4/18	2.66	1.25	41.50	3.13	1.18	53.25	3.12	1.21	53.00	9.08	.000
5/20	2.68	1.14	42.00	2.96	1.01	49.00	2.65	1.17	41.25	3.71	.025*
6/21	2.71	1.16	42.75	3.16	1.24	54.00	2.68	1.30	42.00	7.66	.001**
7/22	2.82	1.06	45.50	3.18	1.12	54.50	2.78	1.13	44.50	6.54	.002**
8/23	2.58	1.07	39.50	3.14	.94	53.50	2.61	1.24	40.25	13.66	.000
9/24	3.49	1.07	62.25	4.08@@	.92	77.00	3.63	1.04	65.75	15.51	.000
10/25	2.43	1.21	35.75	3.59	.89	64.75	3.18	.97	54.50	57.22	.000
11/26	2.52	1.16	38.00	3.50	1.26	62.50	3.30	1.09	57.50	36.86	.000
12/27	2.37	1.08	34.25	3.42	1.02	60.50	2.32	1.19	33.00	51.05	.000
13/01	2.29	1.21	32.25	3.09	1.26	52.25	2.25	1.10	31.25	25.37	.000
14/28	2.85	1.12	46.25	3.33	1.10	58.25	2.37	1.21	34.25	27.52	.000
15/30	2.88	1.25	47.00	3.43	1.10	60.75	2.46	1.03	36.50	28.69	.000
16/31	3.18	1.13	54.50	3.05	1.27	51.25	2.63	1.02	40.75	10.66	.000
17/32	2.26	1.06	31.50	2.99	1.02	49.75	2.26	1.11	31.50	25.20	.000
18/33	2.32	1.10	33.00	2.93	.98	48.25	2.25	.98	31.25	21.25	.000
1934	2.95	1.10	48.75	3.49	.97	62.25	3.22	1.07	55.50	11.41	.000
20/36	2.53	1.04	38.25	3.25	1.19	56.25	2.77	1.07	44.25	19.22	.000
Total	2.60	0.35	40.00	3.23	0.30	55.75	2.69	0.39	42.25		

Note: i)* Significance value < 0.05** Significance value < 0.01

ii)@@ Highest mean score @ lowest mean score

iii) SN denotes the serial number of the statement in the questionnaire

iv) K.U = University of Kashmir, Srinagar J. U = University of Jammu, Jammu. S.K.U = Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology, Kashmir, Srinagar. M.S = Mean Score, SD=Standard Deviation

‘Employee’s perceptions on the existing status of human resource development practices under ‘HRD mechanisms’ variables in the three universities do not significantly differ from one another’ is rejected at 5% level of significance.

‘Employee’s perceptions on the existing status of human resource development practices under ‘HRD mechanisms’ variables in the three universities do not significantly differ from one another’ is rejected at 5% level of significance. Subsequently our alternate hypothesis (H1) suggesting following findings is accepted:

- Employees across the sample study universities significantly differ in their perception of ‘HRD mechanisms’
- ‘HRD mechanisms’ in the three sample universities differ significantly with one another
- Employees across the three sample universities significantly differ in their level of satisfaction with the HRD practices in vogue.

Table 2 Employees' Perceptions on HRD Mechanisms across Hierarchies

Management Hierarchies	N	PAM M.S[ó]	TR M.S[ó]	CAR M.S[ó]	JR M.S[ó]	WEL M.S[ó]	RD M.S[ó]	QWL M.S[ó]	GRM M.S[ó]	EP M.S[ó]
Top Management	07	2.61[0.41]	2.62[0.44]	2.29[1.11]	3.29[1.38]	2.86[0.90]	2.35[0.35]	2.86[0.0]	2.57[0.79]	3.28[0.38]
Middle Management	06	3.00[0.46]	2.66[0.35]	2.83[1.72]	2.67[1.21]	3.0[1.26]	3.0[0.33]	2.58[0.41]	3.33[1.21]	2.83[0.31]
Lower Management	24	2.68[0.18]	2.59[0.57]	2.29[1.12]	2.46[1.22]	2.46[1.14]	2.18[0.10]	2.54[0.08]	2.62[1.17]	2.76[0.43]
Non-Managers	50	2.35[0.50]	2.36#[0.76]	2.20#[1.20]	2.46[0.97]	2.12[1.19]	1.42#[0.08]	2.12[0.0]	2.14[1.44]	2.71[0.51]
Professors	27	2.66[0.20]	2.91[0.30]	2.59[1.05]	3.15[0.82]	2.37[0.97]	2.26[0.15]	2.44[0.07]	2.74[1.02]	2.65[0.29]
Readers/ Associate	30	2.56[0.24]	2.95[0.37]	2.67[1.35]	3.03[1.33]	2.33[1.12]	2.08[0.08]	2.23[0.10]	2.77[1.17]	2.6[0.30]
Professor										
Lecturers / Asstt Professors	67	2.65[0.18]	3.06[0.37]	2.54[0.97]	3.06[1.09]	2.45[0.99]	2.16[0.15]	2.34[0.10]	3.0[1.06]	2.61[0.32]
Top Management	06	3.27[0.22]	3.89[0.15]	2.67[1.37]	4.00*[0.0]	3.33[1.03]	3.16[0.16]	4.03*[0.67]	3.67[0.52]	3.55*[0.49]
Middle Management	04	3.08[0.34]	3.33[0.23]	2.50[0.58]	3.0[0.0]	3.0[1.15]	2.50[0.50]	3.02[0.0]	2.50[1.73]	3.33[0.47]
Lower Management	26	3.34[0.40]	3.95[0.20]	2.77[1.07]	3.15[1.54]	3.54[1.03]	3.34[0.34]	3.23[0.31]	3.15[0.67]	3.19[0.34]
Non-Managers	36	3.14[0.40]	3.81[0.49]	3.0[1.26]	3.0[1.17]	3.78*[0.93]	2.61[0.39]	3.39[0.39]	2.56[0.97]	2.86[0.60]
Professors	26	3.27[0.28]	3.64[0.25]	3.15[1.05]	3.31[0.74]	3.46[0.76]	2.84[0.39]	3.42[0.04]	3.23[0.82]	3.43[0.24]
Readers/ Associate	24	3.10[0.29]	3.58[0.13]	2.25[0.85]	3.67[0.96]	3.0[1.18]	2.5[0.25]	2.91[0.08]	2.92[1.28]	3.13[0.32]
Professors										
Lecturers / Asstt Professors	30	3.13[0.19]	3.62[0.28]	2.67[1.21]	3.53[0.97]	3.27[1.08]	2.83[0.16]	3.13[0.13]	3.0[1.05]	3.31[0.24]
Top Management	04	2.66[0.42]	3.25[0.40]	3.25[0.50]	2.5[1.91]	2.50[0.58]	2.37[0.37]	2.50[0.0]	1.75[0.96]	2.54[0.52]
Middle Management	04	3.70*[0.46]	4.08*[0.23]	4.25*[0.96]	3.5[1.29]	3.0[1.41]	3.37*[0.37]	3.12[0.12]	4.00*[0.82]	3.12[0.53]
Lower Management	10	3.45[0.39]	3.66[0.20]	3.20[1.32]	3.00[0.94]	3.10[0.99]	3.0[0.3]	3.05[0.05]	3.5[1.43]	3.11[0.33]

Management	48	1.94#[0.19]	2.87[0.05]	2.25[1.21]	1.63#[0.79]	1.44#[0.71]	1.59[0.21]	1.65#[0.21]	1.88#[0.94]	2.15#[0.43]
Non-Managers	08	3.10[0.25]	3.25[0.27]	3.50[0.76]	2.63[1.41]	2.50[0.76]	2.69[0.44]	2.68[0.18]	2.63[1.06]	2.75[0.40]
Professors	36	3.12[0.32]	3.77[0.39]	3.39[0.60]	2.44[1.18]	2.56[1.27]	2.75[0.14]	2.56[0.0]	3.06[0.98]	2.73[0.40]
Readers/ Associate Professors and Technology Sciences										
Agricultural and Technology Sciences										
Professors / Lecturers / Asstt Professors	48	2.99[0.07]	3.46[0.39]	2.77[0.97]	2.77[1.21]	2.77[1.17]	2.65[0.23]	2.39[0.37]	2.92[1.07]	2.76[0.25]

Note M.S = Mean Score, SD=Standard Deviation, PAM=Performance Appraisal Management, TR=Training, CAR=Career planning, JR=Job Rotation, WEL=Welfare, RD= Reward Mechanism, QWL= Quality of Work life, EP=Employee Participation, GRM=Grievances Mechanism, EP=Employee Participation. Highest (*) and lowest (#) mean scores of each individual construct across hierarchy among the sample universities.

Table 2 presents hierarchies-wise perceptions of universities across the sample on the existing status of HRD mechanisms. The mean scores across the universities range between 1.42 and 4.25. In University of Kashmir the highest mean score towards various HRD mechanisms across various hierarchies have been found towards grievance mechanism by middle management with mean score of 3.33 while lowest mean score 1.42 was found towards reward by non-managers. In University of Jammu, the highest mean score was shown by quality of work life as reported by top management with mean score of 4.08 and lowest mean score was found towards career planning as reported by associate professors with mean a score of 2.25. Lastly, in SKAUST, the highest mean score was found in the case of career planning 4.25 as reported by middle management while welfare measure was seen least favorably with a mean score of 1.44 as reported by non-managers.

Table 3 sketches the perceptions of various employees' cadres across the three sample universities on various HRD mechanisms. With respect to performance appraisal system, the managers in all the three sample universities have shown highest satisfaction level with mean scores of 2.72, 3.30 and 3.33 in KU, JU and SKAUST respectively as compared to other cadres. The lowest mean score towards performance appraisal system was found in non managers of SKAUST and KU with respective mean scores of 1.94 and 2.35.

As regards training mechanism the mean scores across the three universities range between 2.36 and 3.87. Highest mean score has been perceived by managers in J.U at 3.87. The lowest mean score on this mechanism has been recorded in KU against non-managers at 2.36.

The mean scores on the mechanism of career planning & development range between 2.2 and 3.44.

Table Cadre-Wise Employees’ Perceptions on HRD Mechanisms Variables

HRD Mechanisms	University of Kashmir			University of Jammu			S.K University		
	Managers N=37	Non Managers N=50	Faculty =124	Managers N=36	Non Managers N=36	Faculty N=80	Managers N=18	Non Managers N=48	Faculty N=92
	M.S (%) (ó)	M.S (%) (ó)	M.S (%) (ó)	M.S (%) (ó)	M.S (%) (ó)	M.S (%) (ó)	M.S (%) (ó)	M.S (%) (ó)	M.S (%) (ó)
PAM	2.72 (43.1) [0.16]	2.35 (33.7) [0.50]	2.63 (40.75) [0.17]	3.30 (57.5) [0.25]	3.14 (53.5) [0.4]	3.12 (53.0) [0.14]	3.33@@ (58.2) [0.35]	1.94@ (23.5) [0.19]	3.05 (51.2) [0.17]
TR	2.61 (40.3) [0.47]	2.36@ (34.0) [0.76]	3.0 (50.0) [0.34]	3.87@@ (71.7) [0.18]	3.81 (7.2) [0.49]	3.61 (65.2) [0.20]	3.66 (66.5) [0.25]	2.87 (46.7) [0.05]	3.57 (64.2) [0.29]
CAR	2.38 (34.5) [1.21]	2.20@ (30.0) [1.2]	2.58 (39.5) [1.08]	2.72 (43.0) [1.06]	3.0 (50.0) [1.26]	2.7 (42.5) [1.11]	3.44@@ (61.0) [1.15]	2.25 (31.2) [1.21]	3.08 (52.0) [0.88]
JR	2.65 (41.25) [1.25]	2.46 (36.5) [0.97]	3.07 (51.7) [1.09]	3.28 (57.0) [1.34]	3.0 (5.00) [1.17]	3.5@@ (62.5) [0.9]	3.0 (50.0) [1.24]	1.63@ (15.7) [0.79]	2.63 (40.7) [1.21]
WEL	2.62 (40.5) [1.11]	2.12 (28.0) [1.19]	2.40 (35.0) [1.01]	3.44 (61.0) [1.03]	3.78@@ (69.5) [0.93]	3.25 (56.2) [1.03]	2.94 (48.5) [1.0]	1.44@ (11.0) [0.71]	2.66 (41.5) [1.18]
RD	2.35 (33.7) [0.19]	1.42@ (10.5) [0.08]	2.16 (29.0) [0.13]	3.22@@ (55.5) [0.33]	2.61 (40.25) [0.39]	2.74 (43.5) [0.26]	2.95 (48.5) [0.33]	1.59 (14.75) [0.21]	2.69 (42.2) [0.21]
QWL	2.60 (40.0) [0.01]	2.12@ (28.0) [0.0]	2.33 (33.25) [0.06]	3.33 (58.2) [0.11]	3.39@@ (59.7) [0.39]	3.16 (54.0) [0.08]	2.94 (48.5) [0.0]	1.65 (16.2) [0.21]	2.48 (37.0) [0.18]
GRM	2.73 (43.2) [1.12]	2.14 (28.5) [1.14]	2.89 (47.2) [1.08]	3.17 (54.2) [0.85]	2.56 (39.0) [0.97]	3.05 (51.2) [1.05]	3.22@@ (55.5) [1.44]	1.88@ (22.0) [0.94]	2.95 (48.7) [1.03]
EP	2.87 (46.8) [0.36]	2.71 (42.7) [0.51]	2.61 (40.2) [0.28]	3.26 (56.6) [0.31]	2.86 (46.5) [0.6]	3.29@@ (57.2) [0.2]	2.99 (49.7) [0.37]	2.15@ (28.7) [0.43]	2.75 (43.7) [0.3]

@@Highest mean score

@lowest mean score

Note: M.S = Mean Score SD=Standard Deviation, PAM=Performance Appraisal Management, TR=Training, CAR=Career planning, R=Job Rotation, WEL=Welfare, RD= Reward , QWL= Quality of Work life, EP=Employee Participation, GRM=Grievances Mechanism, EP=Employee Participation

The maximum score on this mechanism has been perceived by the managerial category of SKUAST while non-mangers of KU have reported lowest mean score of 2.20.

The mean scores on the mechanism of job rotation range between 1.63 and 3.50. The maximum score on this mechanism has been perceived by the faculty of JU where as non-managers of SKAUST have reported lowest mean score of 1.63. As regards welfare measure the mean scores across the three universities ranges between 1.44 and 3.78. Highest mean score on it has been perceived by non-managers in J.U at 3.78. The lowest mean score on this mechanism has been recorded in SKAUST against non-managers at 1.44. The mean scores on the mechanism of reward range between 1.42 and 3.22. The maximum score on this mechanism has been perceived by the managerial category of JU (3.22) while non-managers of KU have reported lowest mean score of 1.42. The maximum score on the mechanism QWL has been perceived by the non-managerial category of JU (3.39) while non-managers of KU have reported the lowest mean score of 2.12.

Similarly, with respect to grievance mechanism, the highest mean score was reported by managerial staff of SKAUST (3.88) while the lowest mean score was reported by non-managerial staff of SKAUST (1.88). Lastly, the faculty members of JU have reported highest satisfaction level with mean score of 3.29 while non-managers of SKAUST have reported lowest satisfaction level with mean score of 2.15 towards the mechanism employee participation.

Conclusions & Policy Implications

This study has important implications for both individuals as well as institutions

The focus on development of the university communities in accordance with the changing global scenario is missing.

since it has the necessary potential to benefit both. The sample study universities should think of going for assessing HRD needs since continuous growth and expansion substantially necessitates the requirement of more human resources. A cursory look at the major findings of the study reveals that the focus on development of the university communities in accordance with the changing global scenario is missing. Management in general and top officers in particular in the sample study universities shall have to recognize the significance of human resources as the most important input to the university system and attach top priority to its development. HRD mechanisms in an integrated form are yet to be introduced in universities. Even research in this field is in its beginning. This study has important implication in that it brings out the status of HRD mechanisms prevailing in the universities. There is an immediate need for the universities to have a look at their staff development priorities. Promotion of learning culture is a social responsibility of a university; it is their prime responsibility to promote these mechanisms in an integrated form.

References

- Bhardwaj, G & Mishra, P. (2002), "HRD Climate: an Empirical Study Among Private Sector Managers", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38 (1), 66-80.

- Khandelwal, A.K.(2002), "HRD for Workers: Role of Unions", in Rao.T.V, Verma.K.K, Khandelwai. Anii. K, Abraham.E.S.J (Eds), *Alternative Approaches and Strategies of HRD* (1997) Reprint (2002), National HRD Network, Rawat Publications, Jaipur and New Delhi.
- Mufeed, S. A.,Gurkoo, F. A. (2006), "Enhancing Educational Institutions Effectiveness through HRD Climate: An Empirical Assessment", *Management and Change*, 10 (2), 25-64.
- Mufeed, S. A. & Mir, A. A. (2012), "Need for Human Resource Development (HRD) Practices in Indian Universities: A key for Educational Excellence", *Journal of Human Values*, 18(2): 113-32.
- Mufeed. S.A & Jennifer, M. (2016), "Performance Appraisal System-An Instrument for Training for Trainers", *International Journal of Trend in Research and Development*, 3(2): 646-50
- Mufeed, S.A. & Qurrat, A. H. (2015), "HRD mechanisms in Health Care Sector in J & K: A Comparative Study", *European Journal of Business and Administration* 7(6): 204-213
- Shah, P.A & Manzoor, S. (2015), "A Look at Job Satisfaction through Octapace Culture: an Empirical Study of Private School Teachers", *International Journal of Human Resource & Industrial Research*, 2(6): 1-11
- Rao T.V, Rao, Raju & Yadav, Tam (2001), "A Study of HRD Concepts, Structure of HRD Departments, and HRD Practices in India", *Vikalpa*, 26(1): 49-64
- Rohmetra, Neelu (1998), "Towards Creating a Learning Organization-the HRD Climate Focus", *Paradigm*, 2(1): 56-63
- Sen A.K. (1995), "HRD: Concepts and Context", *Indian Journal of Training and Development*, xxv (2)
- Shakeel, Ahmad (1999), *Human Resource Development in Universities*, APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi