

Comparative Study on Thestrategic Paradigms across Key Functional Areas of Human Resources Management in Corporate and Traditional Universities

Tripti Bajpai

Research Scholar, University of Jammu,
Jammu and Kashmir, India

Abstract:

The paper attempts to systematically analyse the available literature and draw conclusions on Strategic paradigms across the Human resource management of Traditional Universities vis-a-vis Corporate Universities. The prime focus of the paper is on three key HR areas- Functionality, Selection Process and Training and development with respect to these two diverse kind of organisations. The study concludes that though they plough similar soils, the seeds they sow differ, the harvest they reap is not the same.

Key words: Strategic paradigms, Traditional University, Corporate University, Strategic HRM, functionality, Selection Process, Training and development.

I. INTRODUCTION

A Corporate university (CU) is a department or function which is based on strategic approach of combining the effort of peoples' performance as both team and individuals and totally as a whole organization by connecting with customers and suppliers, by carrying out wide-range research to facilitate the content delivery and by carrying out effort to construct a superior team for leadership (Meister, 1998). Allen (2002) stated that CU is an entity for education and strategic tool developed for assisting its parent organization to achieve its mission to carry out activities which motivate organizational and individual learning, wisdom and knowledge.

CUs are units for in-house training facilitating programs for education of staff from fundamental training to programs which are high level and which equate to courses conventionally provided by higher education universities and bodies. As corporations establish their involvement for giving programs for education to staff, most of them are developing partnerships between the traditional and corporate universities for providing accredited awards for university especially for complementing their in-house training and study programs (Kirkpatrick and Hawk, 2006).

II. OBJECTIVE

Aim of this research is to compare and contrast the strategic paradigms across the Key functional areas of Human resorces management with specific reference to corporate universities and traditional universities.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

This paper has compared and reviewed the strategic paradigms across functional areas of management by taking into consideration the factors namely functionality, selection process and training and development with specific reference to corporate and traditional universities through systematic review of prior literature review.

Functionality:

Hirayama et al (2004) stated that CUs involve functionality or vision for employees for lifelong development in the vocational department; CUs involve the functionality for formation of training and educational programs, conferring of academic degrees which are identified by other firms and creating program for vocational development which are gainful for a number of firms; CUs have the functionality to nurture general skills which are found and required in labour market instead of skills that are needed in specific firms. On the other hand conventionally, universities have depended mostly on formal systems of publication for ensuring dissemination and their main key area function is new scholarship. At the same time digital technologies have shown the way to a broader and extra range of dissemination probabilities and have developed totally new content forms which have to be shared. Such transformation demands the universities that they have to focus on knowledge dissemination which is facilitated by their institutions-both for present and in future (AAU, 2009).

According to Paton et.al (2005) when industry or corporate leaders are supposed to develop or re-develop a corporate university then they first decide how they wish to frame the structure and shape of what is envisaged. They also take formative decisions in terms of initiative functions which encompass its main contribution and role to parent institution; its organizational form-encompassing strategic choices over how virtual and real it might be or how much to buy or make; its funding and governance-encompassing choices related to how it could be efficiently integrated in the wider system which has to be developed for serving. In contrast, major functionality of traditional universities are namely

support, development and incentives. Function of development deals with policies which promote the culture on research and broader building the capability like further academic studies and advancement. Support deals with particular skills, mostly financial and legal assistance for grant applications, commercialisation and management for funds among others. Functions concentrating on direct incentives are mostly based on output; on the other hand indirect incentives are oriented towards developing the career and high-status awards (Bunting, 2013).

Strategic or corporate issues to which corporate university shape its major purposes are expressed in 3 main areas: initiative scope, learners' range and contribution nature.

Initiative scope: Does it possess a tight remittance as illustrated, concentrated around leadership or focused around wide range of learning.

Learners' range: Range of learner reflects the initiative's scope and probabilities range from a best set of learners through a more or less open approach or mass approach.

Contribution nature: Some corporate universities are focused based on programme i.e. their role is focused on directly addressing specific needs of learning. Main contribution consideration is more to give some form of infrastructure for learning.

CUs are developed for various functions. Some are designed for bringing new life to traditional department for training and development. Some others are developed for bringing change and embracing a different new initiatives and strategies. Main function of CUs must be clarified and enterprises must identify its vision, mission, purpose, strategic focus and values (Phillips, 2014). The major functionality in traditional universities is shared governance. A well-functioning traditional university ensures that all staff and faculty from librarians to staff of development support, full Professors to adjunct lecturers have appropriate arrangement for communicating and provided efficient importance in taking decisions which affect operation and mission of the institution (Feldman et al, n,d).

Selection Process:

Simard and Gammal (2014) pointed out the selection process in the corporate universities. Apply broad institutional and individual criteria to the selection effort; re-consider the meaning of cultural-fit for broadening the talent pool and restrict the impact of hidden bias and revise descriptions for jobs for reducing gender stereotypes. Changing demographics, legal, social, political and educational environment, economics have prompted most of the institutions for reviewing and modifying their approaching for selecting students. Transformation in the conventions of traditional admissions like early action applications and rise in early decision and technology, for example electronic transcripts, online applications, imaging, undoubtedly, will pursue to urge institutions for rethinking how to manage their students' applications (Rigol, 2003).

In case of conventional or traditional universities, selection process differs as a function of institutions or personnel for admission evaluate student performance and credentials. Conventionally, admissions personnel of college or university use HSGPA (high school grade point averages), standardized tests of cognitive ability (SAT) relative to mathematical and verbal skills and in few case achievement records in particular subject would be taken into consideration for accessing potential of the student. Each factor gives applicant's unique information. Recommendation letters, interviews, essays are being used by institutions for complementing these SAT and HSGPA scores as pointed out by Kuncel, Thomas and Crede, 2005 and Kuncel and Hezlett, 2007. On the other hand it was identified by GMAC (2012) that corporate universities when choosing candidates to interview from schools for business, recruiters would also see the prior work experiences of the candidates. The main criteria for selection encompass industry, functionality of job, and years of work experience. Moreover, they also seek leadership traits and skills which assist corporate firms to improve their effectiveness, innovate, and facilitate direction and effect change.

Training and Development:

CUs have the ability for ensuring the organizations for providing effective and efficient training and development for their workers in terms of continuous learning (Gould, 2005). Strategies of training outside the CUs are used for implementing the plans on the basis on proven theories by considering how employees learn and models for training are developed relative to understanding their actual results and effectiveness (Kirkpatrick, 2005). At the same time, it was pointed out by Shaprio (2000) that staff training is chance given for re-designing and enhancing university practices for teaching. At the same, training and development program are carried out for students as well for enhancing their solving abilities, leadership skills and more.

CUs carry out in-house training programs especially for their workers which are more cost effective and beneficial. In the traditional set ups, training section tries to focus on specific proficiency of job while department of corporate would be proactive with an extra strategic approach. Program for training and development is a planned component for education and with exceptional method to share the organizational culture which shifts from one job skills to understanding of the the skill for workplace, innovative thinking, developing leadership and solving the issues (Rosenwald, 2000). It was pointed out by Gerbamn (2000) that the programs for employee development encompass a different technique for teaching, schedule and assisting learning environment which assure employee for enhancing their skills and later, applied on their jobs. At the same time, it was mentioned by Newton et al (2002) that training and development programs in the educational context is a necessary avenue to implement in the traditional universities. Apart from these, it was stated by Clarke and Hermens (2001) that training and development programs is necessary in the traditional universities since it assists to identify the large ability commitment of resources and time to the development, upgrading and maintaining these system and the main resource and financial drain has to be placed on the institutions.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Strategic Paradigms across functional areas of management in corporate and traditional universities

Specifications	Corporate Universities	Traditional universities
Functionality	<p>1. CUs involve functionality or vision for employees for lifelong development in the vocational department; CUs involve the functionality for conferment for formation of training and educational programs, academic degrees which are identified by other firms and creating program for vocational development which gain a number of firms; CUs have the functionality to nurture general skills which are found in labour market instead of skills that are needed in specific firms (Hirayama et al (2004).</p> <p>2. When industry or corporate leaders are supposed to develop or re-develop- a corporate university then they first decide how they wish to frame the structure and shape of what is envisaged. They also take formative decisions in terms of initiative function-encompass its main contribution and role to parent institution (Paton et al, 2005)</p> <p>3. Strategic or corporate issues to which corporate university shape its major purposes. They are expressed in 3 main areas: initiative scope, learners' range and contribution nature. Initiative scope: does it possesses a tight remit, as illustrated concentrated around leadership or focused around wide range of learning. Learners range: Range of learner reflects the initiative's scope and probabilities range from a best set of learners through to more or less open approach or mass approach. Contribution nature: some corporate universities are focused based on programme i.e. their role is focused on directly addressing specific needs of learning. Main contribution considers more to give some form of infrastructure for learning (Phillips, 2014).</p>	<p>1. Conventionally, universities have depended mostly on formal systems for publication for ensuring dissemination and their main key area function in new scholarship, and digital technologies have shown the way to a broader and extra range of dissemination probabilities and have developed totally new content forms which has to be shared. Such transformation demands that the universities have to focus on knowledge dissemination which is facilitated by their institutions-both for present and in future (AAU, 2009).</p> <p>2. Major functionality of traditional universities namely support, development and incentives (Bunting, 2013).</p> <p>3. The major functionality in traditional universities is shared governance. A well-functioning traditional university ensures that all staff and faculty from librarians to staff of development support, full professors to adjunct lecturers have appropriate arrangement for communicating and provided efficient weight in taking decisions which affect operation and mission of the institution (Feldman et al, n,d).</p>

<p>Selection process</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selection process in the corporate universities. Apply broad institutional and individual criteria to the selection effort; re-consider the meaning of cultural-fit for broadening the talent pool and restrict the impact of hidden bias and revise descriptions for jobs for reducing gender stereotypes (Simard and Gammal, 2014). 2. Corporate universities when choosing candidates to interview from schools for business, recruiters would also see the prior work experiences of the candidates. The main criteria for selection encompass industry, functionality of job, and years of work experience. Moreover, they also seek leadership traits and skills which assist corporate firms to improve their effectiveness, innovate, and facilitate direction and effect change (GMAC, 2012). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Changing demographics, legal, social, political and educational environment, economics have prompted most of the institutions for reviewing and modifying their approaching for selecting students. Transformation in the conventions of traditional admissions like early action applications and rise in early decision and technology for example electronic transcripts, online applications, imaging, undoubtedly will pursue to urge institutions for rethinking how to manage their students' applications (Rigol, 2003). 2. In terms of educational, selection process differs as a function of institutions or personnel for admission evaluate student performance and credentials. Conventionally, admissions personnel of college or university use HSGPA (high school grade point averages), standardized tests of cognitive ability (SAT) relative to mathematical and verbal skills and in few case achievement records in particular subject would be taken into consideration for access potential of the student
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CUs have the ability for ensuring the organizations for providing effective and efficient training and development for their workers in terms of continuous learning (Gould, 2005). Strategies of training outside the CUs are used for implementing the plans on the basis on proven theories by considering the how employee learn and models for training are emerged relative to understanding their actual results and effectiveness (Kirkpatrick, 2005). 2. CUs carry out in-house training programs especially for their workers which are more cheap and beneficial. In the CUs, training section tries to focus on specific proficiency of job on the other hand department of corporate would be proactive with 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff training is chance given for re-designing and enhancing university practices for teaching. At the same time, training and development program would be carried out for students as well for enhancing the solving abilities, leadership skills and more (Shaprio, 2000). 2. Training and development programs in the educational context are a necessary avenue to implement in the traditional universities (Newton et al, 2002). Training and development programs is necessary in the traditional universities since it assists to identify the large ability commitment of resources and time to the development, upgrading and maintaining these system, main resource and

	an extra strategic approach. Program for training and development is a planned component for education and with exceptional method to share the organizational culture which shifts from one job skills for understanding the skill for workplace, innovative thinking, developing leadership and solving the issue (Rosenwald, 2000).	financial drain has to be placed on the institutions (Clarke and Hermens (2001)).
--	--	---

Table 1 depicts the comparative analysis of strategic paradigms across key functional areas of Human resources management in corporate and traditional universities.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has compared and reviewed the strategic paradigms across functional areas of management by taking into consideration the factors namely functionality, selection process and training and development with specific reference to corporate and traditional universities through systematic review of prior literature review. Approaches of corporate universities and traditional universities vary in terms of functionality, selection process and training and development. It was recognized that corporate and traditional universities are two separate approaches. From the findings of the analysis, it was clear that corporate universities excel in the training and development programs given to the employees than the traditional universities. As far as selection Process goes the two types of universities focus on more or less similar credentials though level of commitment and involvement differs. In future, this study will compare and review the strategic paradigms across functional areas of management by taking into consideration of performance management in corporate and traditional universities, career management in corporate and traditional universities, and leadership development in corporate and traditional universities.

REFERENCES

- [1] AAU (2009), The University's Role in the Dissemination Research and Scholarship-A Call to Action, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.
- [2] Allen, M. (2002). The corporate university handbook. Designing, managing, and growing a successful program AMACOM.
- [3] Bunting (2013), Programme on Innovation, Higher Education and Research for Development, OECD.
- [4] Clarke, T., & Hermens, A. (2001). Corporate developments and strategic alliances in e-learning. *Education + Training*, 43 (4), 256-267.
- [5] Feldman, S et al (n,d), Shared Governance in Colleges and Universities, Higher Education Program and Policy Council.
- [6] Gerbman, R. V. (2000, February). Corporate Universities 101. *HR Magazine*, 45 (2), 101-106
- [7] GMAC (2014), Corporate Recruiters Survey, Graduate Management Admission Council
- [8] Gould, K.E. (2005) The Corporate University – A Model for Sustaining and Expert Workforce in the Human Services,
- [9] Behaviour Modification, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 508-520
- [10] Hirayama, M et al (2004), Research On Corporate Universities, JILPT Research Report.
- [11] Kirkpatrick, J. (2005) Transferring Learning to Behaviour, American Society for Training and Development, <http://www.astd.org/astd> 12:54
- [12] Kirkpatrick, J., & Hawk, L. (2006). Curricula and evaluation: Maximizing results. *T+D*, 60(6), 61-62.
- [13] Kuncel, N. R., Crede, M., & Thomas, L. L. (2005). The validity of self-reported grade point averages, class ranks, and test scores: A meta-analysis and review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 75, 63-82.
- [14] Kuncel, N.R., & Hezlett, S.A. (2007). Standardized tests predict graduate students' success. *Science*, 315, 1080-1081.
- [15] Newton, D., Haase, S., & Ellis, A. (2002). Effective implementation of online learning: A case study of the Queensland mining industry. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 14 (4), 156-165.
- [16] Paton, R et al (2005), Corporate Education Strategies: Corporate Universities in Practice, Retrieved on: 15th Sep 2015, Retrieved from: http://www7.open.ac.uk/oubs/research/pdf/Corporate_education_Paton_2005.pdf
- [17] Phillips, J (2014), Twelve Success Factors for Corporate Universities, Retrieved on: 15th Sep 2015, Retrieved from: <http://www.roiinstitute.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Twelve-Success-Factors-for-Corporate-Universities.pdf>
- [18] Rigol, W (2003), Admissions Decision-Making Models, Retrieved on: 15th Sep 2015, Retrieved from: http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/press/adm_decision_making.pdf

- [19] Rosenwald, M. (2000, October 15). Working class: More companies are creating corporate universities to help employees sharpen skills and learn new ones. Boston Globe, H1.
- [20] Simard.C and Gammal.D (2014), Solutions to Recruit Technical Women, Retrieved on: 15th Sep 2015, Retrieved from: http://anitaborg.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/AnitaBorgInstitute_SolutionsToRecruitTechnicalWomen_2012.pdf
- [21] Wheeler, K. (1998). The uses and misuses of the term corporate university. Retrieved on: 15th Sep 2015, Retrieved from: http://www.gresources.com/corp_ed/whatcu.htm

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY



The Author, Tripti Bajpai is a Research Scholar and a Management Faculty with a qualification of B.Sc, MBA and presently pursuing her PhD from University of Jammu.