

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT

I
J
R
C
M



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed (Refereed/Juried) Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

Indexed & Listed at:

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A., EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A., Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A.,

Open J-Gate, India [link of the same is duly available at Infilbnet of University Grants Commission (U.G.C.)],

The American Economic Association's electronic bibliography, EconLit, U.S.A.,

Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland with IC Value of 5.09 & number of libraries all around the world.

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than 3480 Cities in 174 countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

<http://ijrcm.org.in/>

CONTENTS

Sr. No.	TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)	Page No.
1.	PERCEPTUAL MAPPING OF STUDENTS FOR ENGAGEMENT IN CLASS: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF STUDENT APATHY TOWARDS HIGHER EDUCATION <i>DR. D. S. CHAUBEY & K. R SUBRAMANIAN.</i>	1
2.	EFFECTIVE FOOD PACKAGE DESIGN AND CONSUMER ATTRACTION <i>DR. R.RAJESWARI & T.RAMYA</i>	9
3.	DO ASIAN STOCK MARKETS INTERACT? <i>PRASHANT JOSHI</i>	14
4.	A STUDY ON CUSTOMER MOBILE APPLICATIONS USAGE PATTERN AND THEIR SATISFACTION <i>ABDULKHADAR J. MAKANDAR, SANJAY HANJI, BRIJMOHAN VYAS & DR. M. M. MUNSHI</i>	19
5.	EVALUATION OF RAJIV AAROgyASRI SCHEME IN ANDHRA PRADESH AND SURVEY OF PATIENTS OPINION <i>DR. D. SHREEDEVI</i>	25
6.	STUDY ON THE TIME DURATION OF INTERNSHIP IN HOTEL MANAGEMENT COURSE CURRICULUM <i>DR. ANIL CHANDHOK & DR. BHAVET</i>	30
7.	HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT MODEL FOR NEW GLOBAL ECONOMY: OVERVIEW <i>DR. GEETANJALI V. PATIL, DR. V. S. PURANIK & RAMESH S. NAIK</i>	40
8.	CUSTOMER EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS ON SERVICE QUALITY IN BANKING SECTOR: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PUBLIC SECTOR BANKS IN RAJASTHAN REGION <i>DR. POONAM MADAN & PREETI SHARMA</i>	45
9.	DETERMINANTS OF FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT INFLOWS IN THE TRANSITION ECONOMIES OF EUROPEAN UNION <i>YILMAZ BAYAR & HASAN ALP OZEL</i>	49
10.	INCIDENCE OF POVERTY AMONG THE RURAL LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS: A STUDY IN CHITTOOR DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH <i>DR. TRIPURANENI JAGGAIAH & DR. TRIPURANENI BALAJI</i>	54
11.	FINANCIAL BEHAVIOUR Vs. PERSONALITY TYPES: A MECHANISM TO IMPROVE CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT <i>NATARAJ B & MADHUMITHA T</i>	58
12.	FINANCIAL INCLUSION: AN INSTRUMENT THAT PULLS MILLIONS OF RURAL INDIANS OUT OF THE CLUTCHES OF POVERTY - A REVIEW <i>ANSHA JASMIN S.N</i>	65
13.	POVERTY ERADICATION THROUGH INTEREST FREE FINANCE: A CASE STUDY <i>AHSANATH.MK</i>	69
14.	EMPLOYEE RETENTION STRATEGIES: AN OVERVIEW <i>RUHANI SOHAL</i>	72
15.	A STUDY ON EMPLOYEES' INVOLVEMENT TOWARDS EFFECTIVENESS OF TEAM WORK IN GLOBAL SCENARIO <i>K. KALAIVANI & P. SASIKALA</i>	75
16.	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF UNORGANISED AND ORGANISED RETAIL: THE CASE OF INDIAN GROCERY MARKET AT NCR <i>SHASHANK MEHRA & MOONIS SHAKEEL</i>	78
17.	HAPPINESS MAKES GOOD BUSINESS SENSE <i>PRAKRITI CHAWLA & SHILPI ARORA</i>	85
18.	RISK MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN YES BANK <i>DR. N. FATHIMA THABASSUM</i>	89
19.	THE EFFECT OF THE CHANGE IN SHORT-RUN FOREIGN DEBT STOCK IN TURKEY ON THE OUTPUT VOLATILITY <i>DR. OZGE UYSAL SAHIN & DR. SEVDA AKAR</i>	93
20.	A CASE STUDY ON SELF-HELP GROUPS: MARKETING PERSPECTIVES & LEARNING <i>SOUVIK ROY & CHAITALI DATTA</i>	98
	REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK & DISCLAIMER	101

CHIEF PATRON

PROF. K. K. AGGARWAL

Chairman, Malaviya National Institute of Technology, Jaipur

(An institute of National Importance & fully funded by Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India)

Chancellor, K. R. Mangalam University, Gurgaon

Chancellor, Lingaya's University, Faridabad

Founder Vice-Chancellor (1998-2008), Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi

Ex. Pro Vice-Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University, Hisar

FOUNDER PATRON

LATE SH. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL

Former State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana

Former Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri

Former President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

CO-ORDINATOR

DR. BHAVET

Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Business & Management, Urjani

ADVISORS

DR. PRIYA RANJAN TRIVEDI

Chancellor, The Global Open University, Nagaland

PROF. M. S. SENAM RAJU

Director A. C. D., School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

PROF. M. N. SHARMA

Chairman, M.B.A., Haryana College of Technology & Management, Kaithal

PROF. S. L. MAHANDRU

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

EDITOR

PROF. R. K. SHARMA

Professor, Bharti Vidyapeeth University Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi

CO-EDITOR

DR. SAMBHAV GARG

Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Business & Management, Urjani

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

DR. RAJESH MODI

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

PROF. SIKANDER KUMAR

Chairman, Department of Economics, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

PROF. SANJIV MITTAL

University School of Management Studies, Guru Gobind Singh I. P. University, Delhi

PROF. RAJENDER GUPTA

Convener, Board of Studies in Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu

PROF. NAWAB ALI KHAN

Department of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

PROF. S. P. TIWARI

Head, Department of Economics & Rural Development, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Avadh University, Faizabad

DR. ANIL CHANDHOK

Professor, Faculty of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

DR. ASHOK KUMAR CHAUHAN

Reader, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

DR. SAMBHAVNA

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

DR. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA

Associate Professor, P.J.L.N. Government College, Faridabad

DR. VIVEK CHAWLA

Associate Professor, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

DR. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE

Asst. Professor, Dept. of Commerce, School of Business Studies, Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

PROF. ABHAY BANSAL

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engineering & Technology, Amity University, Noida

PARVEEN KHURANA

Associate Professor, Mukand Lal National College, Yamuna Nagar

SHASHI KHURANA

Associate Professor, S.M.S. Khalsa Lubana Girls College, Barara, Ambala

SUNIL KUMAR KARWASRA

Principal, Aakash College of Education, ChanderKalan, Tohana, Fatehabad

DR. VIKAS CHOUDHARY

Asst. Professor, N.I.T. (University), Kurukshetra

TECHNICAL ADVISOR

AMITA

Faculty, Government M. S., Mohali

FINANCIAL ADVISORS

DICKIN GOYAL

Advocate & Tax Adviser, Panchkula

NEENA

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

LEGAL ADVISORS

JITENDER S. CHAHAL

Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA

Advocate & Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

SUPERINTENDENT

SURENDER KUMAR POONIA

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to recent developments & practices in the areas of Computer Science & Applications; Commerce; Business; Finance; Marketing; Human Resource Management; General Management; Banking; Economics; Tourism Administration & Management; Education; Law; Library & Information Science; Defence & Strategic Studies; Electronic Science; Corporate Governance; Industrial Relations; and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Rural Economics; Co-operation; Demography; Development Planning; Development Studies; Applied Economics; Development Economics; Business Economics; Monetary Policy; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Political Science; Continuing Education; Labour Welfare; Philosophy; Psychology; Sociology; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law; Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labour Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; International Relations; Human Rights & Duties; Public Administration; Population Studies; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism & Hospitality; Transportation Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic; Web Design and emerging paradigms in allied subjects.

Anybody can submit the **soft copy** of unpublished novel; original; empirical and high quality **research work/manuscript anytime** in **M.S. Word format** after preparing the same as per our **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION**; at our email address i.e. infoijrcm@gmail.com or online by clicking the link **online submission** as given on our website ([FOR ONLINE SUBMISSION, CLICK HERE](#)).

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

DATED: _____

THE EDITOR
IJRCM

Subject: SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF.

(e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/Economics/Psychology/Law/Computer/IT/Engineering/Mathematics/other, please specify)

DEAR SIR/MADAM

Please find my submission of manuscript entitled '_____ ' for possible publication in your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the author (s) have seen and agreed to the submitted version of the manuscript and their inclusion of name (s) as co-author (s).

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I/We agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal & you are free to publish our contribution in any of your journals.

NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Designation:
Affiliation with full address, contact numbers & Pin Code:
Residential address with Pin Code:
Mobile Number (s):
Landline Number (s):
E-mail Address:
Alternate E-mail Address:

NOTES:

- a) The whole manuscript is required to be in **ONE MS WORD FILE** only (pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration), which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript.
- b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN** of the mail:
New Manuscript for Review in the area of (Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/Economics/Psychology/Law/Computer/IT/Engineering/Mathematics/other, please specify)
- c) There is no need to give any text in the body of mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any specific message w.r.t. to the manuscript.
- d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is required to be below **500 KB**.
- e) Abstract alone will not be considered for review, and the author is required to submit the complete manuscript in the first instance.
- f) The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of manuscript, within two days of submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending separate mail to the journal.

2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be in a 12 point Calibri Font. It should be bold typed, centered and fully capitalised.

3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** The author (s) **full name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline numbers, and email/alternate email address** should be in italic & 11-point Calibri Font. It must be centered underneath the title.

4. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in fully italicized text, not exceeding 250 words. The abstract must be informative and explain the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a single para. Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.

5. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of five. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stops at the end.
6. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER**. It must be prepared on a single space and single column with 1" margin set for top, bottom, left and right. It should be typed in 8 point Calibri Font with page numbers at the bottom and centre of every page. It should be free from grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors and must be thoroughly edited.
7. **HEADINGS:** All the headings should be in a 10 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
8. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings should be in a 8 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
9. **MAIN TEXT:** The main text should follow the following sequence:

INTRODUCTION**REVIEW OF LITERATURE****NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY****STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM****OBJECTIVES****HYPOTHESES****RESEARCH METHODOLOGY****RESULTS & DISCUSSION****FINDINGS****RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS****CONCLUSIONS****SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH****ACKNOWLEDGMENTS****REFERENCES****APPENDIX/ANNEXURE**

It should be in a 8 point Calibri Font, single spaced and justified. The manuscript should preferably not exceed **5000 WORDS**.

10. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, crystal clear, centered, separately numbered & self explained, and **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure.** It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.
11. **EQUATIONS:** These should be consecutively numbered in parentheses, horizontally centered with equation number placed at the right.
12. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript and they are supposed to follow **Harvard Style of Referencing**. The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:
 - All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
 - Use **(ed.)** for one editor, and **(ed.s)** for multiple editors.
 - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc, in chronologically ascending order.
 - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
 - The title of books and journals should be in italics. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
 - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parentheses.
 - The location of endnotes within the text should be indicated by superscript numbers.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:**BOOKS**

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19-22 June.

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS AND THESES

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

ONLINE RESOURCES

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

WEBSITES

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Natural Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>

STUDY ON THE TIME DURATION OF INTERNSHIP IN HOTEL MANAGEMENT COURSE CURRICULUM**DR. ANIL CHANDHOK****PROFESSOR****M. M. INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT****M. M. UNIVERSITY****MULLANA****DR. BHAVET****FACULTY****SHREE RAM INSTITUTE OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT****URJANI****ABSTRACT**

The changes in the hotel industry are fast and the course curriculum needs to be in accordance with the needs of the industry. Unfortunately, syllabus of hotel management is not uniform throughout the country. There are differences in the internship training from academic program to academic program. The training in the course curriculum of Hotel management course is widely recognized and must be beneficial to all the stakeholders concerned. Students must be benefited by working in the real life situation which cannot be created in the classrooms where as industry professional could identify potential employers by evaluating the performances of the trainee's. This paper is an attempt to find the right time and duration of internship component in the course curriculum of hotel management course. The research instruments used in the study was questionnaires focused on student's training component. Four different survey versions were created for each of the four groups surveyed for the study: Hotel management students pre-training, Hotel management students post-training, hotel management faculty members and hotel industry professionals. Statistical test was performed on all stakeholder opinions regarding right duration of training in terms of weeks. Significant differences were found between stakeholders opinions in terms of right duration of training for both the times. Significant differences were found between stakeholder's opinions in terms of right time for training for first time however there is no statistical difference in right time for training for the second time. Universities offering hotel courses and other affiliated institutions needs to review prevailing training component in their course curriculum to make it as effective as possible by adapting a uniform practice which would be beneficial to all stakeholders concerned

KEYWORDS

Stakeholders, Internship, Adapting, Affiliation.

INTRODUCTION

The success of any course lies on its course curriculum and contents. The changes in the hotel industry are very fast and the course curriculum needs to be in accordance with the needs of the industry. Unfortunately, the syllabus is not uniform throughout the country. While there is no perfect training model for all hotel education programs, quality field experiences should reflect the program's objectives within the parameters of the program, on the principle that in order to implement a successful training program there should be a commitment from all the parties involved - the university, the industry and the student. This paper is an attempt to find the right time (in which semester students should go for the training) and right duration (number .of weeks) of on the job training component in the course curriculum of Hotel management course by examining the current opinions of the stakeholders

INTERNSHIP COMPONENT

There are differences in the training format from academic program to academic program. The training in the course curriculum of Hotel management course is widely recognized beneficial to all the stakeholders concerned. Students are benefited by working in the real life situation which cannot be created in the classrooms where as industry professional could identify potential employers by evaluating the performances of the trainee's .The academic institutions by incorporating the training in their course curriculum leads to strengthen the employability skills of the students provided it should be a win –win situation to all concerned. However, when stakeholders reveal their perceptions of key factors of training experiences, different aspects might exist which often leads to challenge to all stakeholders involved in the training process. When all groups of stakeholders communicate the aspects that they value most in an training experience and the goals that they wish to achieve, each group can better understand the other. Unfortunately, little research on the topic has been performed. Present research is an attempt to find right time & duration of internship.

LITERATURE REVIEW**TRAINING STRUCTURE**

Previous research studies also show that internship periods were too short and the majority of interns are of the view that the most appropriate internship period should be six months (Oliver, 2010; Mihail, 2006). Mihail (2006) also found in his study that most of the interns preferred to have internship periods ranging from six to nine months instead of three months. This indicated that interns are willing to have a longer internship period and believe that they can learn more within a six month period. Oliver (2010) remarks that the short amount of time an internship lasts really never lets the student become a fully functional employee because there is not so much to take in for them. In their study of hotel internships, Downey & DeVeau (1988) expounded views of the industry and concluded that more internship hours, better coordination, and more documentation in terms of both written and oral reporting were needed. Collins (2001) conducted a study among 113 students at Bilkent University's School of Tourism and Hotel Management in Turkey, and suggested holding orientation for students before undertaking their placement, having a professional control system to monitor the industrial training experience, holding mid-term intern review to gauge the progress, and reviewing the grading system to emphasize the importance of placement. Jenkins (2001) considered internship programmes as unstructured and poorly organized and found that students generally complain about the quality; and it appears that many hotel students, through exposure to the subject and industry, become considerably less interested in selecting hotel as their career of first choice. Lent et al. (2002) stated "the relative endorsement of these experiential factors supports the practice of exposing students to career exploration activities (e.g., job shadowing, internships, realistic job previews) that enable them to clarify their interests, values, and skills in relation to particular occupational fields and work tasks". Lam & Ching (2006) conducted a study among students from four hotel schools and colleges in Hong Kong with a total of 307 usable questionnaires. The study found that all the student perception scores about internship were lower than expectation scores, implying that there is quality shortfall in internship. The study made the point that schools should involve students and employers to participate in the planning stage by inviting them to sit in meetings before consolidating a training programme for students; and schools should collect information about needs and interests of students as well as employers. Cho (2006) conducted a study among students from seven colleges in Korea, and 285 completed surveys were collected. The study concluded that there was a significant level of discrepancy between satisfaction and expectations indicating that expectations were not fully met. The respondents were not satisfied with the quality of the internship. Jane Spowart (2006) the

students mentioned that often their opinions are not accepted by either the industry mentors or academic instructors. They would like to know about handling stress and felt they themselves should be open-minded, ask questions and express themselves. Through having to work shifts and long hours, they discovered the true nature of a demanding and time-consuming workplace and that the real world is different to what they had anticipated and far less glamorous. Despite these harsh realities of the industry, the majority were of the opinion that the work-integrated learning period had been a rewarding experience. **Min-Hsing Liu (2010)** emphasised that when arranging internships, schools should communicate with hotel businesses to provide intern students with formal or informal mentors to help counsel internship students to quickly familiarize with the working and living condition and also integrate into the workplace. Senior staffs or cadres should also explain the characteristics of the hotel industry and matters to pay attention to. This supervisor should exhibit leadership abilities and act as a role model for intern students, which can enhance mentoring functions and increase job satisfaction. This study demonstrates there is still great room for improvement for mentoring functions in future an internship program. The major stakeholders involved in a college-level hotel internship are: industry professionals, students, and faculty. All three of these groups contribute to the overall quality, education, and career preparation of an internship experience. A well-planned internship program jointly developed by industry representatives, faculty members and students can maximize the potential to successfully prepare high quality hotel management graduates for the workplace (Pauze, Johnson, & Miller, 1987). Although recognizing the needs of each stakeholder group is typically noted by internship coordinators, there has been much debate regarding the level of influence each of these stakeholders should have over hotel internship experiences. There is a need for standardization of efforts of education and industry to assure that programs are adequately preparing the future workforce of the hotel industry (Mateo, 1991). In The Journal of Technical Writing and Communication (2003), Kirk Amant states the need for educators and internship providers to find ways to revise internship experiences so that educators, internship providers, and students/interns can use internship experiences in a way that benefits all three parties. A major challenge in designing evaluation strategies for academic programs is that the two groups who would appear to be natural allies in this endeavor, practicing professionals and educators, are sometimes at odds over it (Anderson, 1995). Both groups share the same desire for academic programs to prepare students to become productive employees and valued members of the profession, but because practicing professionals and educators are employed by differing types of organizations with very dissimilar types of traditions and missions, the two groups tend to emphasize different goals for education (Anderson, 1995). The differing emphasis too often lead to mutual recriminations, with faculty accusing practicing professionals of wanting colleges and universities to become job training sites for specific companies and industries, and practicing professionals complaining that educators fail to impart enough of the practical know-how required in the workplace (Anderson, 1995). In addition, many students are becoming critical consumers of education. As students complete their studies, they tend to analyze what they receive for their time and money invested in education (Mateo, 1991).

RESEARCH QUESTION

When is the right time for the students to send for training experiences in terms of semester and for what duration?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

INSTRUMENTS

The research instruments used in the study were questionnaires focused on student’s training component. Four different survey versions were created for each of the four groups surveyed for the study: Hotel management students pre-training, Hotel management students post-training, hotel management faculty members and hotel industry professionals. Questions framed based on research questions. Apart from collecting information on duration and time, respondents were also asked to give their opinions on category of assignments given during training duration, cooperativeness of industry professionals, level of knowledge of the trainees, overall performance of the trainees, treatment of industrial professionals and rate the training experiences. Rating scale was used to gather the opinions of the respondents

THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

To find the right time and duration of internship component in the course curriculum of Hotel management course as per different stakeholders.

PARTICIPANTS

The sample population of the study includes four groups’. First and second one are hotel management students enrolled in three years degree courses of Hotel Management institutions in the region of Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh. Students were further divided into Pre training students and Post training students. The pre training students are those who have not undergone industrial training and are in the initial phase of their course (I year students) where as Post training students are those who have completed their industrial training and are in the final phase of their course (III year). Both students groups were selected from various academic institutions such as 1) state university 2) deemed university 3) private universities 4) National council of hotel management institutions 5) central university. Third are the hotel industry professionals working in 3 or above three star approved Hotel (3, 4, and 5 star) Hotels employee working at Managerial, assistant managerial and supervisory level. Fourth were the hotel management faculty members working in various academic institutions in the region of Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh.

TABLE 1: PERCENTAGE OF THE REGION WISE STAKEHOLDERS SAMPLE SIZE

Respondents	Region (%)		
	Punjab	Haryana	Chandigarh
Industry Professionals	39	32	29
Faculty	49	15	35
Students –Pre Industrial Training	35	37	28
Students –Post	32	32	36

TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE OF THE RESPONDENT’S FURTHER BREAK UP BY INSTITUTION WISE

Respondents	Inst type %			
	State	Deemed	Private	National Council
Faculty	51	9	22	18
Students –Pre Industrial Training	36	5	32	27
Students –Pre Industrial Training	36	5	32	27
Students –Post	50	4	27	19

TABLE 3: PERCENTAGE OF THE BREAKUP OF RESPONDENTS BY STAR CATEGORY WISE

Respondents	STAR (%)		
	3 Star	4 Star	5 Star
Industry Professionals	32	47	21
Students –Post	15	58	27

RESPONSE RATE

A total of 150 surveys were mailed to industry professionals working within the lodging industry. Of these mailed surveys, 100 were returned, with a response rate of 66.6%. A total of 300 surveys were distributed to post training students out of which 285 were found complete and useable for data tabulation, with a response rate of 95%. Similarly a total of 300 surveys were distributed to pre training students and there were 276 pre-training student respondents observed, with a response rate of 92%. Surveys were distributed by faculty members to students enrolled in their hotel management courses. A total of 200 faculty

members surveyed for this study using a mailed and personal approach method, out of which 150 questionnaire were found usable, with a response rate of 75 %.Table summarises the response rate of all focus group of respondents.

RESPONSE RATE

TABLE 4

Respondent	Survey distributed	Survey returned	Response Rate %
Industry professionals	140	100	71.4
Faculty members	200	150	75
Post training students	300	285	95
Pre training students	300	276	92

RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

COURSE CURRICULUM REQUIRES CHANGES

All four survey focus groups were asked existing course curriculum of Hotel Management course require any changes for Industrial Training component, in terms of right time (in which semester students should go for training) and duration (for how many no. of weeks)

Out of total responses, 71%(n=71) industry professional, 62 %(n=93) faculty members,45 % (n=125)pre industrial training students and 54%(n=154) post industrial training students were agreed yes course requires changes .It was found that majority all focus groups except pre students heavily admit that existing course pattern require changes in terms of industrial training structure . Low percentage of agreement was observed in case of pre to training students for changes required in the course curriculum. This might be due to reason that they are in first year of their course structure and not in a position to evaluate the effectiveness of the training by changing the current practice.

Out of total responses, 71%(n=71) industry professional, 62 %(n=93) faculty members,45 % (n=125)pre industrial training students and 54%(n=154) post industrial training students were agreed yes course requires changes .It was found that majority all focus groups except pre students heavily admit that existing course pattern require changes in terms of industrial training structure . Low percentage of agreement was observed in case of pre to training students for changes required in the course curriculum. This might be due to reason that they are in first year of their course structure and not in a position to evaluate the effectiveness of the training by changing the current practice. In terms of different types of universities ,only private56% (n=111)and national council 58% (n=91)agrees to changes however state51%(n=152) ,deemed 62%(n=24) does not agreed to changes require in the course curriculum in terms of time and duration of industrial training component. *It was found that most of academic institutions have a way of reviewing and assessing the industrial training component as per the observed results.* Chi square test applied and it was found that there is **significant** difference exist among stakeholders, region and Type of institution in terms of opinions regarding changes requires in course curriculum for industrial training component. The significance level p<.05 is for stakeholders, .000, for region .018 and for institution .0045.

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE TESTS

TABLE 5

REQUIRE CHANGES		
Stakeholders	Chi-square	23.854
	df	3
	Sig.	.000*
Designation	Chi-square	9.202
	df	7
	Sig.	0.238
SEX(1M,2F)	Chi-square	1.291
	df	1
	Sig.	0.256
Experience	Chi-square	3.147
	df	3
	Sig.	0.369
STAR	Chi-square	0.73
	df	2
	Sig.	0.694
Region	Chi-square	7.993
	df	2
	Sig.	.018*
Inst type	Chi-square	8.0062
	df	3
	Sig.	.00459*

Those respondents marked yes, course structure require changes were further asked to provide information on right duration and time of training in terms of weeks that best represent the right duration of the training and right time which means in which semester students should go for training

TABLE 6: PERCENTAGE OF THE RIGHT DURATION PREFERRED BY STAKEHOLDERS

Responses are in %		First time Duration								
		4	8	12	16	20	24	28	48	Total
Stakeholders	Industry Professionals	3	6	7	4	20	48	7	6	100
	Faculty	0	2	11	8	76	3	0	0	100
	Students –Pre	10	18	24	18	19	10	0	0	100
	Students –Post	14	12	21	25	22	7	0	0	100
Designation	Principal	0	17	0	0	83	0	0	0	100
	HOD	0	0	7	7	86	0	0	0	100
	Sr. Lecturer	0	6	12	6	71	6	0	0	100
	Lecturer	0	0	17	9	71	3	0	0	100
	Instructor	0	0	5	10	81	5	0	0	100
	Manager	0	17	8	0	8	42	17	8	100
	Assistant Manager	0	0	4	4	33	46	4	8	100
	Supervisory	6	6	9	6	14	51	6	3	100
SEX(1M,2F)	Male	8	10	17	15	34	14	1	1	100
	Female	8	12	19	18	28	13	1	0	100
Experience	0-5 yrs	2	0	7	6	52	28	4	2	100
	6-10 yrs	2	5	11	8	47	25	0	3	100
	11-15 yrs	0	3	9	6	65	15	3	0	100
	Above 15 yrs	0	17	8	0	42	8	17	8	100
STAR	3 Star	9	15	9	7	13	33	9	7	100
	4 Star	15	8	15	20	24	17	0	1	100
	5 Star	2	9	26	25	21	16	2	0	100
Region	Punjab	8	10	16	18	31	14	1	2	100
	Chandigarh	11	14	19	13	30	12	1	1	100
	Haryana	5	7	17	17	38	14	2	0	100
inst type	State University	10	14	22	15	30	8	0	0	100
	Deemed University	0	13	27	13	47	0	0	0	100
	Private University	5	11	23	22	32	8	0	0	100
	National Council	13	8	10	20	44	5	0	0	100

TABLE 7: PERCENTAGE OF DURATION PREFERRED BY STAKEHOLDERS FOR SECOND TIME

		4	8	12	16	20	24	Total
Stakeholders	Industry Professionals	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Faculty	26	6	29	3	26	10	100
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	90	10	0	0	0	0	100
	Students –Post	77	0	14	0	9	0	100
Designation	Principal	0	0	0	0	100	0	100
	HOD	50	0	20	0	10	20	100
	Sr. Lecturer	25	0	25	0	50	0	100
	Lecturer	11	0	67	0	11	11	100
	Instructor	14	29	0	14	43	0	100
	Manager	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Assistant Manager	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Supervisory	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
SEX(1M,2F)	Male	68	4	15	0	9	4	100
	Female	65	4	12	4	15	0	100
Experience	0-5 yrs	43	14	7	7	21	7	100
	6-10 yrs	44	0	38	0	19	0	100
	11-15 yrs	64	0	14	0	7	14	100
	Above 15 yrs	0	0	0	0	100	0	100
STAR	3 Star	60	0	20	0	20	0	100
	4 Star	82	0	14	0	4	0	100
	5 Star	94	0	0	0	6	0	100
Region	Punjab	66	2	12	2	15	2	100
	Chandigarh	71	6	10	0	10	3	100
	Haryana	64	4	21	0	7	4	100
inst type							0	
inst type	State University	55	7	17	3	17	0	100
	Deemed University	0	0	50	0	50	0	100
	Private University	61	5	16	0	13	5	100
	National Council	82	0	12	0	0	6	100

INDUSTRY PROFESSIONALS

First time duration: Among industry professionals, out of total responses 48% of the sample preferred industrial training to be of 24 weeks, 20% of the sample preferred training should be of 20 weeks, 7% preferred training to be of 12 and 28 weeks, 6% of sample preferred training to be of 8 and 48 weeks, remaining 3% of the sample preferred training to be of 4 weeks. Hence majority of the sample preferred training duration should be of 24 weeks.

For second time: 100% of the sample preferred training to be of 4 weeks.

FACULTY MEMBERS

First time duration: Among faculty members majority (76%) of respondents preferred training to be of 20 weeks followed by 11% preferred 12 weeks

Second time: Out of total responses 29% of the sample preferred training to be of 12 weeks, followed by 26% of sample preferred 4 weeks and 20 weeks duration.

PRE STUDENTS

First time duration: In case of Pre to training students, 24 % of the sample preferred 12 weeks of training and 19% of the sample preferred it should be of 20 weeks.

Second Time: Majority of the sample 75% preferred training to be of 4 weeks duration

POST STUDENTS

First time duration: Among Post to training students, 25 % of the sample preferred training duration of 16 weeks, 22% preferred it should be of 20 weeks

Second time: Majority of respondents (74%) preferred 4 weeks duration for second time.

Designation wise: In terms of designation wise, Principal preferred training to be of 20 weeks duration for the first time and 100% response was for 20 weeks duration for second time. Similarly in case of H.O.D, majority (86%) of the sample preferred training duration of 20 weeks for first time and 50 % of the sample preferred 4 weeks duration for second time. Sr.Lecturer (71%) also preferred 20 weeks duration for first time and preferred same duration of 20 weeks in the second time. Out of total responses 71 % Lecturer preferred 20 weeks duration in training for first time and 67% preferred 16 weeks duration in the second time. Among Managers of Hotel operation, 42% of the sample, preferred 24 weeks for first time and 100% of the sample, preferred 4 weeks duration for second time, similar preference was marked by assistant managers and supervisory level employees.

In terms of star category of hotels, 33% of the sample, preferred to be of 24 weeks duration in first time training and 60% of the sample, preferred 4 weeks duration in second time. Among 4 star hotels, 24% of the sample, preferred 20 weeks duration in first time and 82% preferred 4 weeks duration in the second time, whereas among 5 star hotels preferred 12 weeks duration in the first time and 63 % of the sample preferred 4 weeks duration in second time. Among universities, all preferred 20 weeks duration in the first time of training (30% (n=46)state,47% (n=7)deemed,32%(n=35) private,44% (n=40)national council and 56 % of the sample in case of state universities preferred 4 weeks duration in second time,50 % of sample in case of deemed university preferred 12 weeks and 20and 53% of the sample in case of private universities preferred 4 weeks for second time, similarly 82% of the sample in case national council also preferred 4 weeks.

Right Duration: Among stakeholders, different opinions were expressed in terms of duration of the training. By comparing the median value of all stakeholders opinions for first time training, it was observed that right duration of training for first time in the course curriculum as per **industry professionals is of 24 weeks**, where as **faculty members preferred, that it should of 20 weeks**, **post to training students preferred it should be of 16 weeks** and **pre students preferred 16 weeks**. The duration of training was found in decreasing order starting from 24 weeks to 16 weeks. Consensuses among stakeholders were found for second time duration that is of 4 weeks, however the median value of faculty members is 12 weeks.

TABLE 8

		Stakeholders			
		Industry Professionals	Faculty	Students –Pre Industrial Training	Students –Post
1st Time Duration	Mean	22.20	18.71	13.92	13.95
	Median	24.00	20.00	12.00	16.00
	Mode	24.00	20.00	12.00	16.00
	Maximum	48.00	24.00	24.00	24.00
	Minimum	4.00	8.00	4.00	4.00
	Standard Deviation	8.55	3.18	6.02	5.88
	Total N	100	150	276	285
2nd Time Duration	Mean	4.00	12.97	4.05	6.46
	Median	4.00	12.00	4.00	4.00
	Mode	4.00	12.00	4.00	4.00
	Maximum	4.00	24.00	6.00	20.00
	Minimum	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00
	Standard Deviation	.00	7.06	.76	5.09
	Total N	100	150	276	285

Statistical significant differences exist among stakeholders (p=.000, p=.000) revealed by chi square test in terms of duration of training preferred by stakeholders for both the times. In terms of designation of faculty members and industry professional significant differences exist in terms of training duration (p=.000, p=.038).

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE TESTS

TABLE 9

Stakeholders		1st Time Duration	2nd time duration
Stakeholders	Chi-square	254.906	45.244
	df	21	15
	Sig.	.000*	0.0001
Designation	Chi-square	107.702	59.653
	df	49	35
	Sig.	.000*	0.0058
SEX(1M,2F)	Chi-square	4.739	4.6821
	df	7	5
	Sig.	0.692	0.4559
Experience	Chi-square	26.566	19.201
	df	21	15
	Sig.	0.186	0.02048
STAR	Chi-square	43.951	4.9677
	df	14	4
	Sig.	.000*	0.2906
Region	Chi-square	15.158	0.8983
	df	14	10
	Sig.	0.367	0.8983
inst type	Chi-square	20.805	13.943
	df	15	15
	Sig.	0.1432	0.5298

In terms of **experience** wise there is **no** statistical difference among respondents for the first time duration(p=0.186), where as difference exist for the second time duration (p=0.02) In terms of star hotel wise there is significant difference exist for the first time duration (p=.000) where as no difference exist for the second time duration (p=0.2906)

In terms of regions wise there is no differences were observed for both the duration of the training(0.367,p=0.898)and similarly there is no significant difference exist among universities in the duration of training preferences for both time (p=.143 and p=0.529).Table summarises the results of Chi –square test. An ANOVA was performed on all stakeholder opinions regarding right duration of training in terms of weeks. Significant differences were found between stakeholders opinions in terms of right duration of training for both the times. For first time F (3,437) =42.127, p=.000) and for second time F (3, 96)=18.398, p=.000).

TABLE 10: SUMMERY OF THE RESULTS OF ANNOVA ON DURATION OF TRAINING (STAKEHOLDERS)

Descriptive								ANOVA	
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum	F	Sig.
1st Time Duration	Industry Professionals	71	22.20	8.547	1.014	4	48	42.127	.000
	Faculty	93	18.71	3.185	.330	8	24		
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	125	13.92	6.024	.539	4	24		
	Students –Post	152	13.95	5.877	.477	4	24		
	Total	441	16.27	6.796	.324	4	48		
2nd Time Duration	Industry Professionals	14	4.00	.000	.000	4	4	18.398	.000
	Faculty	31	12.97	7.059	1.268	4	24		
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	20	4.05	.759	.170	3	6		
	Students –Post	35	6.46	5.089	.860	2	20		
	Total	100	7.65	6.162	.616	2	24		

TABLE 11: PAIR WISE COMPARISONS RESULTS OF DURATION OF TRAINING AMONG STAKEHOLDERS

Tukey HSD					
Dependent Variable	(I) Stakeholders	(J) Stakeholders	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
1st Time Duration	Industry Professionals	Faculty	3.488	.946	.001
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	8.277	.892	.000
		Students –Post	8.250	.863	.000
	Faculty	Industry Professionals	-3.488	.946	.001
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	4.790	.822	.000
		Students –Post	4.762	.791	.000
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	Industry Professionals	-8.277	.892	.000
		Faculty	-4.790	.822	.000
		Students –Post	-.027	.725	1.000
	Students –Post	Industry Professionals	-8.250	.863	.000
		Faculty	-4.762	.791	.000
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	.027	.725	1.000
2nd Time Duration	Industry Professionals	Faculty	-8.968	1.606	.000
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	-.050	1.737	1.000
		Students –Post	-2.457	1.577	.407
	Faculty	Industry Professionals	8.968	1.606	.000
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	8.918	1.430	.000
		Students –Post	6.511	1.230	.000
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	Industry Professionals	.050	1.737	1.000
		Faculty	-8.918	1.430	.000
		Students –Post	-2.407	1.398	.318
	Students –Post	Industry Professionals	2.457	1.577	.407
		Faculty	-6.511	1.230	.000
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	2.407	1.398	.318

Pair wise comparisons were made between stakeholders. There is a significance difference exist in the opinion between pre , post students and faculty members in comparison to industry professionals p=.000,p=.000 and p=.001 for the first time duration ,However there is no significant difference exist between the opinions of pre and post students (p=1.000)

For the second time duration of the training, there is a significant difference between faculty members and post students (p=.000) in comparison to industry professionals. There is no significant difference between pre and industry professional .There is significant difference in the opinion among industry professionals, pre and post students in comparison to faculty members. There is no significant difference exist between pre and post students opinion in comparison to industry professionals .Similarly there is no significant difference between industry professionals and pre students in comparison to post students. An ANOVA was performed on all types if academic institutions opinions regarding right duration of training in terms of weeks. Results are shown in Table. Significant differences were not found between all universities opinions in terms of right duration of training for both the times. For first time F (3,366) =0.952, p=.415) and for second time F (3, 82)=1.769, p=.159).

TABLE 12: SUMMERY OF THE RESULTS OF ANNOVA ON DURATION OF TRAINING (TYPE OF INSTITUTIONS)

Descriptives								ANOVA			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1st Time Duration	State	153	14.5359	5.97806	0.4833	4	24	3	31.584	0.952	0.415
	Deemed	15	15.7333	4.65168	1.20106	8	20	366	33.171		
	Private	111	15.4955	5.34258	0.5071	4	24	369			
	National Coun	91	15.6044	6.0238	0.63147	4	24				
	Total	370	15.1351	5.75828	0.29936	4	24				
2nd Time Duration	State	29	8.8276	6.26822	1.16398	4	20	3	70.449	1.769	0.159
	Deemed	2	16	5.65685	4	12	20	82	39.814		
	Private	38	8.6316	6.74004	1.09338	4	24	85			
	National Coun	17	6.1176	5.31369	1.28876	4	24				
	Total	86	8.3721	6.39494	0.68958	4	24				

FINDINGS – RIGHT DURATION

Based on data analysis it is concluded that right duration in terms of weeks for industrial training as per industry professional is 24 weeks, where as faculty members opinions regarding right duration is of 20 weeks .In the opinions of pre to training students it is of 12 weeks and by post to training students it is of 16 weeks (10 weeks preferred by 3 star hotel ,where as 16 weeks each preferred by both 4 and 5 star hotel students.

For second there is similarity exist in the opinions of pre ,post and industry professional that is for second time training should be 4 weeks ,where as faculty members mean value is 12 weeks. However similarity exists in the opinions of industry professionals, pre and post students towards right duration in terms of weeks for second time training in the course curriculum is of 4 weeks where as faculty members ideal duration for second time training is of 12 weeks.

RIGHT TIME (WHEN STUDENTS SHOULD GO FOR TRAINING IN THE COURSE CURRICULUM)

TABLE 13.1: PERCENTAGE PREFERENCES OF STAKEHOLDER’S TIME FOR TRAINING

%		1st time Change (in Sem)					
		1st Sem	2nd Sem	3rd Sem	4th Sem	5th Sem	6th Sem
Stakeholders	Industry Professionals	0	10	8	21	20	41
	Faculty	2	5	17	16	13	46
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	10	22	22	14	20	13
	Students –Post	5	24	11	18	8	35
Designation	Principal	17	0	0	17	50	17
	HOD	0	0	50	21	7	21
	Sr. Lecturer	0	6	18	6	35	35
	Lecturer	3	11	14	11	6	54
	Instructor	0	0	5	29	0	67
	Manager	0	8	8	25	25	33
	Assistant Manager	0	4	4	21	13	58
	spervisory	0	14	11	20	23	31
SEX(1M,2F)	Male	5	15	15	19	15	31
	Female	5	20	14	13	13	34
Experience	0-5 yrs	0	6	7	24	17	46
	6-10 yrs	2	11	11	11	11	55
	11-15 yrs	0	3	32	21	18	26
	Above 15 yrs	8	8	0	25	33	25
STAR	3 Star	2	22	9	13	22	33
	4 Star	4	22	12	21	9	33
	5 Star	2	12	7	21	9	49
Region	Punjab	4	18	17	14	15	32
	Chandigarh	7	17	14	18	15	28
	Haryana	3	15	13	20	13	36
inst type	STATE UNIVERSITY	7	20	15	19	10	29
	Deemed	7	27	13	0	13	40
	Private UNIVERSITY	1	21	20	16	15	27
	NATIONAL COUNCIL	9	11	14	14	16	35

TABLE 13.2: PERCENTAGE PREFERENCES OF STAKEHOLDER’S TIME FOR TRAINING

%		2nd time Change (in Sem)					
		1st Sem	2nd Sem	3rd Sem	4th Sem	5th Sem	6th Sem
Stakeholders	Industry Professionals	0	0	0	0	7	93
	Faculty	0	0	0	0	19	81
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	0	0	0	5	30	65
	Students –Post	0	0	0	0	23	77
Designation	Principal	0	0	0	0	0	100
	HOD	0	0	0	0	30	70
	Sr. Lecturer	0	0	0	0	25	75
	Lecturer	0	0	0	0	11	89
	Instructor	0	0	0	0	14	86
	Manager	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Assistant Manager	0	0	0	0	0	100
	spervisory	0	0	0	0	11	89
SEX(1M,2F)	Male	0	0	0	0	19	81
	Female	0	0	0	4	27	69
Experience	0-5 yrs	0	0	0	0	14	86
	6-10 yrs	0	0	0	0	6	94
	11-15 yrs	0	0	0	0	29	71
	Above 15 yrs	0	0	0	0	0	100
STAR	3 Star	0	0	0	0	0	100
	4 Star	0	0	0	0	18	82
	5 Star	0	0	0	0	25	75
Region	Punjab	0	0	0	2	27	71
	Chandigarh	0	0	0	0	26	74
	Haryana	0	0	0	0	7	93
inst type	STATE UNIVERSITY	0	0	0	3	28	69
	Deemed UNIVERSITY	0	0	0	0	50	50
	Private UNIVERSITY	0	0	0	0	18	82
	NATIONAL COUNCIL	0	0	0	0	24	76

Industry professionals: First time among industry professionals 41 % of the sample marked 6 semester, followed by 21% for 4 semester, 20 % preferred in 5 semester for the first time. Second Time: 18% of the sample, preferred in 6 semester for the second time.

Faculty members: Among faculty members, 46% of the sample, preferred in 6 semester, followed by 17% in 3 semester for the first time .Second time out of total, 27% of the sample preferred in 6 semester.

Pre students :Among Pre students 22% each of the sample, preferred in 2 and 3 semester, followed by 20 % for 5 semester for first time and Second Time ,out of total 10 % of the sample ,preferred in the 6 semester.

Post Students: Among post students 35% of the sample preferred in 6 semester, followed by 24 % in 2 semester for the first time and 18 % of the sample preferred in the 6 semester for the second time.

Type of Institutions: Among state universities, 20% of the sample, preferred in 2 semester for the first time and 29% for the 6 semester for second time. Among deemed universities, 27 % of the sample, preferred in the 2 semester for first time and 50% preferred in the 5& 6 semester for second time. Among private universities 21 % of the sample preferred in the 2 semester for first time and 82 % preferred in 6 semester for second time. Among national council ,16% of the sample preferred in 5 semester for first time and 76 % of the sample in 6 semester for second time.

TABLE 14

PEARSON CHI-SQUARE TESTS			
		1st time Change (in Sem)	2nd time Change (in Sem)
Stakeholders	Chi-square	67.886	7.01
	df	15	6
	Sig.	.000*	0.32
Designation	Chi-square	68.208	3.244
	df	35	7
	Sig.	.001*	0.862
SEX(1M,2F)	Chi-square	3.517	3.78
	df	5	2
	Sig.	0.621	0.151
Experience	Chi-square	32.591	3.062
	df	15	3
	Sig.	.005*	0.382
STAR	Chi-square	13.166	1.599
	df	10	2
	Sig.	0.215	0.449
Region	Chi-square	8.1	6.131
	df	10	4
	Sig.	0.619	0.19
inst type	Chi-square	19.344	3.7207
	df	15	6
	Sig.	0.1986	0.7144

Statistical significant differences exist among stakeholders (p=.000) revealed by chi square test in terms of right for training preferred by stakeholders for first time however there is no statistical difference among stakeholders regarding right time for training of second time(.032) In terms of designation of faculty members and industry professional significant differences exist in terms of right time for the first time(p=.001),but there is no significant difference among designation for right time of training for second time(p=.862).Among universities ,statistical significant difference were not found in terms of right time for training preference for the first time (p=.1986)and there is no significant difference exist among universities in the right time for training preferences for second time (p=.714)

An ANOVA was performed on all stakeholder opinions regarding right time for training. Results are shown in Table. Significant differences were found between stakeholder's opinions in terms of right time for training for first time however there is no statistical difference in right time for training for the second time. For first time (F=14.385, p=.000) and for second time (F=1.659, p=.181)

TABLE 15: RESULT OF ANNOVA OF RIGHT TIME OF TRAINING

Descriptive								ANOVA	
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum	F	Sig.
1st time Change (in Sem)	Industry Professionals	71	4.73	1.341	.159	2	6	14.385	.000
	Faculty	93	4.71	1.441	.149	1	6		
	Students –Pre	125	3.51	1.564	.140	1	6		
	Students –Post	152	4.06	1.720	.139	1	6		
	Total	441	4.15	1.632	.078	1	6		
2nd time Change (in Sem)	Industry Professionals	14	5.93	.267	.071	5	6	1.659	.181
	Faculty	31	5.81	.402	.072	5	6		
	Students –Pre	20	5.60	.598	.134	4	6		
	Students –Post	35	5.77	.426	.072	5	6		
	Total	100	5.77	.446	.045	4	6		

Table summarises results of Tukey HSD Test of Right time of training.

Pair wise comparisons were made between stakeholders. Table 10 shows these pair wise comparison results. Table shows that there is no significance difference between industry professional and faculty members (p=1.000) and there is significant difference between pre and post to training students in terms of training time.

TABLE 16

Tukey HSD					
Dependent Variable	(I) Stakeholders	(J) Stakeholders	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
1st time Change (in Sem)	Industry Professionals	Faculty	.023	.246	1.000
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	1.220	.232	.000
		Students –Post	.673	.225	.015
	Faculty	Industry Professionals	-.023	.246	1.000
		Students –Pre	1.198	.214	.000
		Students –Post	.650	.206	.009
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	Industry Professionals	-1.220	.232	.000
		Faculty	-1.198	.214	.000
		Students –Post	-.547	.189	.020
	Students –Post	Industry Professionals	-.673	.225	.015
		Faculty	-.650	.206	.009
		Students –Pre	.547	.189	.020
2nd time Change (in Sem)	Industry Professionals	Faculty	.122	.142	.826
		Students –Pre	.329	.154	.150
		Students –Post	.157	.140	.675
	Faculty	Industry Professionals	-.122	.142	.826
		Students –Pre	.206	.127	.367
		Students –Post	.035	.109	.988
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	Industry Professionals	-.329	.154	.150
		Faculty	-.206	.127	.367
		Students –Post	-.171	.124	.512
	Students –Post	Industry Professionals	-.157	.140	.675
		Faculty	-.035	.109	.988
		Students –Pre	.171	.124	.512

An ANOVA was performed on all types of universities opinions regarding right time for training. Results are shown in Table. Significant differences were not found between universities opinions in terms of right time for training for first and second time. For first time $F(3,366) = 0.803, P = .493$ and for the second time $F(3,82) = 0.845, P = 0.473$

TABLE 17

		Descriptives						ANOVA			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1st time Change (in Sem)	State	153	3.902	1.69273	0.13685	1	6	3	2.217	0.803	0.493
	Deemed	15	4.0667	1.94447	0.50206	1	6	366	2.762		
	Private	111	4.0541	1.53645	0.14583	1	6	369			
	National Coun	91	4.2418	1.70841	0.17909	1	6				
	Total	370	4.0378	1.66053	0.08633	1	6				
2nd time Change (in Sem)	State	29	5.6552	0.55265	0.10262	4	6	3	0.184	0.845	0.473
	Deemed	2	5.5	0.70711	0.5	5	6	82	0.217		
	Private	38	5.8158	0.39286	0.06373	5	6	85			
	National Coun	17	5.7647	0.43724	0.10605	5	6				
	Total	86	5.7442	0.46491	0.05013	4	6				

Based on the data analysis, it is concluded that the right time for training is 5 semesters for the first time and 6 semesters for the second time as per industry professionals and faculty members .Whereas pre students median value is 3 for first time and 6 semester for the second time and inn case of post students median value is 4 semester (3 preferred by 3 star hotels ,4 semester by 4 star and 5 semester by 5 star hotel students) and 6 semester.

As per universities deemed, private and national council mean score is 4 semester and second time mean score is 6 semester whereas in case of state universities mean score for the first time is 3 semester and 6 semester for the second time .Based on data analysis it is concluded that right duration in terms of weeks for industrial training as per industry professional is 24 weeks ,where as faculty members opinions regarding right duration is of 20 weeks .In the opinions of pre to training students it is of 12 weeks and by post to training students it is of 16 weeks. For second there is similarity exist in the opinions of pre ,post and industry professional that is for second time training should be 4 weeks ,where as faculty members mean value is 12 weeks.

Universities offering hotel courses and other affiliated institutions needs to review prevailling industrial training component in their course curriculum to make it as effective as possible by adapting a uniform practice which would be beneficial to all stakeholders concerned
Sending students early or at the mid of their course for training is known to bring numerous challenges and problems to hotels. In some cases, students would have had little or no experience handling machinery, posing considerable risk to company property Richard Teare et al (1993).At the same time many students are not academically prepared and are not equipped with basic skills needed in industry to carry out assigned task during their training duration.

GENERALISATION - RIGHT DURATION

As per the opinions of industry professionals regarding the right duration of industrial training that is of 24 weeks have a rationale and coincides with the earlier research studies (Oliver, 2010; Mihail, 2006) that interns conveyed , internship duration were too short and the majority of interns think the most right internship period should be of **six months** , whereas Mihail (2006) also found in his study that most of the interns favoured to have internship periods ranging from six to nine months instead of three months. This indicated that interns are ready to have a longer internship period and believe that they can learn more within a six month period. Oliver (2010) remarks that the short amount of time an internship lasts really never lets the student become a **fully functional employee** because there is not so much to take in for them. In the present study results post training students preferred that the right duration of training should be of **16 weeks is almost sufficient** to cover four core areas of the industry that is Front office, Food and Beverage Service, Food and Beverage Production and House Keeping operation, by working **4 weeks** per area and later on they could go for **specialised training of 4 weeks in the area of interest**. The other core areas such as Accounts, Sales & Marketing etc. do not allow students to fully access the different components. Students found this unfair though managers argued that allowing students full access can be quite risky when it comes to strategic areas. The mean of industry professional is 4.26, that the **industry professionals** suggests training duration should be **longer** period that is of 24 weeks due to **high task clarity reason and better job rotation of the trainee** within the hotel operation, for overall success of the training. The mean of faculty members is 3.9 that is **faculty members** preferred **20 weeks** training due to reason that students get to **know the operations of hotel and later they can go for specialised training in their area of interest in the higher semesters**. The mean of **pre students** is 3.02, where the reason is similar to faculty members however the mean of **post students** is 2.61that is mostly **irrelevant tasks** were provided to the trainees and it should be of shorter duration (16 weeks).

Further **type of institution wise**, all universities of the sample given the similar reason of the training duration that is students get **to know the operations of hotel and later they can go for specialised training in their area of interest in the higher semesters**. Whereas designation wise reason marked by principal, Sr Lecturer, Lecturer and Instructor is that high task clarity and better job rotation of the trainee within the hotel operation factor must be consider in the duration of the training for overall success of the training, where as H.O.D, Mangers and Supervisory recommends that students get to know the operations of hotel and later they can go for specialised training in their area of interest in the higher semesters

RIGHT TIME

It is concluded that the right time for training is 4 semesters for the first time and 6 semesters for the second time as per State, Private and Central Universities. As per Deemed and National council, right time for training is 5 semester for the first time and 6 semester for the second time. The rationale behind is that students must **complete required course modules** before taking the industrial training. Industrial training also help schools resolve the high expenses involved in providing needed facilities and equipment (Krasilovsky and Lendt, 1996; Hodgson, 1999). According to Krasilovsky and Lendt (1996), the students also get the chance to meet their future bosses, and have a higher chance of finding a job through the industrial training component.

Frequency and mean of the selected reason for time are given in table in number. The mean of **industry professional** is 4.44 that means, the industry professionals suggest training time should be in fourth semester as it would be a beneficial experience which bridges the gap between university and the workplace where trainees would be **fully academically prepared** to face real work encounters. The mean of **faculty members** is 3.99 that, **to foresee area of interest**, by this time, it will help in **Solving confusion about career choice's** The mean of **pre students** is 3.19, where the reason is similar to faculty members however the mean of **post students** is 2.97 that is **To see that chosen course matches with aspirations and better to change the career choice in the initial phase**.

Further among **type of institution wise**, Majority universities of the sample had given the similar reason of the training time that **to foresee area of interest, by this time**, it will help in solving confusion about career choices. Whereas designation wise reason marked by principal, ,Sr Lecturer , Instructor ,Manager ,asstt manager and supervisor is that Beneficial experience which bridges the gap between university and the workplace where trines would be Fully academically prepared to face real work encounters factor must be consider in the time of the training for overall success of the training.

CONCLUSION

One of the primary benefits of industrial training for students is that students with industrial training experience supposedly have an advantage in the job market, which can translate into their being hired more readily for subsequent jobs. It is a fact that every educational system needs constant review since everything in the world is dynamic (Gothard W. P. 1987) and the industrial attachment exercise is by no means an exception. A number of institutions in the country need to review their industrial attachment training programs to make them as effective as they should be, eradicating any grey areas which hinder the success of this very necessary component. The general view is that industry and training institutions need to work together in the formulation of training programs to make the partnership fruitful and reasonably meaningful to all stakeholders (Harrison, G. 2010). Most institutions have a way of reviewing and assessing the industrial attachment program. Rittichainuwat, Worth, Hanson and Rattanapinanchai (2010), focus the attention on reinforcing the importance of integrating the industry and the academic worlds by collaborating on issues such as curriculum, instruction, and industrial training. The employability of the students could be enhanced by way of rotational training, by assigning valuable tasks to the trainees , extending cooperative hand during the training .All academic institutions must re examine their industrial training component in their course curriculum ,because majority of all stakeholders in this study admit that training should be of 20 weeks for the first time and 4 weeks in the second time and the right time of sending students for first time training is in 4 semester and second time is in 6 semester for their specialisation training. Hence sending students in the right time and duration will be beneficial to all stakeholders and will enhance the employability of the students. Moreover programs should provide students with needed tools and educate them to take responsibility in future work life, thus bridging the gap, as one of the findings of this study. Trainees tried to test career choices during the training period; however duration was very short to actually test career choices, the moment they test career choices in a particular department, may be moved to another. Some of them are not adequately rotated in all the departments. On the other hand it was observed that one time practice of industrial training was found in the most of the curriculum of Hotel management institutions and very few institutions have later on specialisation training component in the course curriculum. Hence industrial training has been identified as a major tool in enhancing employability among students provided at the right with right duration and having similar outcomes of training as perceived important by stakeholder's leads to extending quality experiences to the future job prospects and increase their transition rate from academics to chosen industry work environment for the overall development of the economy.

There is no better teacher than experience to allow students to "touch the stove", so to speak, enhance their formal learning curve and in most instances , that curve turns up when industrial training is implemented in the right time frame of the curriculum , leads to enhanced employability of the students.

In the words of Martin Luther King Junior

"We may have all come from different ships, but we are in the same boat now. It would be a win –win situation for all if the stakeholders can work together in cooperation and mutual understanding"

REFERENCES

- Baum, T. (2007). Human resources in tourism: Still waiting for change. *Tourism Management*, 28 (6), 1383-1399.
- Cannon, J.A., and Arnold, M.J. (1998). Student expectations of collegiate internship programs in business: A 10- year update. *Journal of Education for Business*, 73, 202-205.
- Cho, M. (2006). Student perspectives on the quality of hotel management internships. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 6, 61—76.
- Collins, A. B. (2002). Gateway to the real world, industrial training: dilemmas and problems. *Tourism Management*, 23(1), 93-96.
- Gothard, W. P. (1987). *Vocational Guidance Theory and Practice*, Groom Helm, London, New York.
- Hodgson, P. (1999) "Making internships well worth the work". *Techniques: Making Education and Career Connections*, Vol. 74, pp. 38-39.
- Jenkins, A. K. (2001) Making a career of it? Hospitality students' future perspectives: an Anglo-Dutch study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(1), 13-20.
- Krasilovsky, M. William. (1996). Internships: Too much of a good thing. *Billboard*, 108(3), 5-6.
- Lam, T., Ching, L. (2006). An exploratory study of an internship program: The case of Hong Kong students. *Hospitality Management*, 26, 336-351.
- Mihail, D.M., (2006) "Internships at Greece Universities: An exploratory study", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp.28-41.
- Moody, K. (1997). *Workers in a lean world*. London, UK: Verso.
- Nicolaides, A. (2006, April). The role of universities in South Africa and their educational quality and the efficacy of their work integrated learning programmes. Paper presented at the South African
- Paufe, E.F., Johnson, W.A., Miller, J.L. (1989). Internship Strategy for Hospitality Management Programs. *Hospitality Education and Research Journal* 13(3), 301-307.
- Rittichainuwat, B.N., Worth, J., Hanson, R., & Rattanapinanchai, S. (2010, February). Enhancing student learning with work integrated learning: A case study in Thailand. Paper presented at the International Conference on Work Integrated Learning: University-Industry Collaboration for real life Education, Hong Kong, China.
- Rotbman, M. (2007). Lessons learned: Advice to employers from interns. *Journal of Education for Business*, 82, 140-144
- Spowat, J. (2009, June). Hospitality management competencies: Do faculty and students concur on employability skills? Paper presented at The World Association for Cooperative Education Sixteenth World Conference, Vancouver, Canada.
- Tovey, J. (2001, spring). Building connections between industry and university: Implementing an internship program at a regional university. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 225-239.

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Dear Readers

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce, Economics & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as on the journal as a whole, on our E-mail infoijrcm@gmail.com for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries please feel free to contact us on our E-mail infoijrcm@gmail.com.

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-
Co-ordinator

DISCLAIMER

The information and opinions presented in the Journal reflect the views of the authors and not of the Journal or its Editorial Board or the Publishers/Editors. Publication does not constitute endorsement by the journal. Neither the Journal nor its publishers/Editors/Editorial Board nor anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering the journal or the materials contained therein, assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information provided in the journal, nor shall they be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, consequential or punitive damages arising out of the use of information/material contained in the journal. The journal, nor its publishers/Editors/Editorial Board, nor any other party involved in the preparation of material contained in the journal represents or warrants that the information contained herein is in every respect accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or for the results obtained from the use of such material. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained herein with other sources. The responsibility of the contents and the opinions expressed in this journal is exclusively of the author (s) concerned.

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

Our Other Journals

