

## **Effect of HRD Climate on Organizational Commitment: A Comparative Study of Higher Educational institutions in a Province of India**

**Dr. A. Ravichandran**

*Associate Professor, Department of Commerce  
Satyawati College (Evening)  
(University of Delhi)  
Delhi-110 052*

**Dr. A. Venkat Raman**

*Professor, Faculty of Management Studies  
(University of Delhi)  
Delhi-110 007*

*Corresponding Author Dr. A. Ravichandran*

---

### **Abstract**

*It is essential to sustain quality of human resources in Higher Educational Institutions particularly in the context of competition for skills in the fast changing economic and technological developments. This is possible only through supportive HR policies that foster a climate of development, work life balance, job satisfaction in academic sphere at workplace. Positive HRD climate would lead outcomes such as better teaching, productive research output, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and greater retention (or less intention to quit) among faculty members.. This paper seeks to explore the Human Resource Development Climate and its effect on Organizational Commitment in three categories of higher educational institutions- Government, Government Aided and Private and Self-Financed Colleges -in Tamil Nadu Province, India. Based on a survey among 656 faculty members, the findings of the study clearly indicate that there is significant difference in the perception of Human Resource Development Climate and Organizational Commitment between these three categories of the Colleges; and Human Resource Development Climate also predicts on Organizational Commitment in all the three categories of the College.*

**Key Words:** *HRD Climate, Organizational Commitment, Government, Government Aided, and Private and Self-Financed Colleges*

---

Date of Submission: 08-07-2021

Date of Acceptance: 23-07-2021

---

### **I. Introduction**

Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) are the agents of Human Capital formation and Human Resource Development (HRD) for any country. The quality of Human Resources (HR) in a country largely depends on the quality of higher education which not only the physical infrastructure but also the teaching-learning process, admission process, curricular and extracurricular activities, skill development, personality and aptitude of students etc. But the key determinant factor is the quality of faculty and staff (human resources) who plays a significant role in the effective performance of academic institutions, i.e., - teaching, research and placement of students. It is therefore essential to maintain quality of human resource in HEIs. This is possible only through supportive HR management policies, a climate conducive for career development, work life balance, job satisfaction etc. Positive HRD climate would lead to several outcomes such as better teaching and research performance, Organizational Commitment (OC), productivity, organizational citizenship behavior and greater retention (less intention to quit). This paper seeks to explore the prevailing HRD Climate (HRDC) and its effect on OC in Government (GOVT), Government Aided (GA) and private and Self-Financed (PSF) Liberal Arts and Science Colleges in Tamil Nadu Province (TNP), India.

### **II. Literature Review**

#### **2.1 HRD Climate**

Denison (1990) defined climate as a set of conditions that exist and have an impact on individual's behavior in any organization. 'Climate' in the context of organization can be classified into two categories i.e. 'Organizational Climate and HRD Climate. Organizational Climate is a set of characters which could be perceived and shared by its members. Reichers and Schneider (1990:22) defined Organizational Climate as the shared perceptions of organizational policies, practices, and procedures, both formal and informal". HRD climate on the other hand is a developmental nature which considers the employee as the most important resource and it is separated from the organizational climate in the recent past to pay more attention for the

development of employees. It was first coined by Leonard Nadler in 1969 in the American Society for Training and Development. He defined it as a series of learning experiences organized within a specified time to bring about the possibility of behavioral change. Rao and Abraham (1985) was introduced this concept in the Indian context and defined it as a set of HRD attributes which can be perceived and that may distinguish one organization from other (Rao & Abraham, 1986). A series of research studies in the past have been undertaken to understand the state of both organizational and HRD Climate and its outcomes. Studies in Indian organizations have largely focused on the Organizational and HRD climate which includes health care, banking and finance, manufacturing, information technology, educational sector etc. and these studies have measured mostly by “fairness in HR systems” “recognition, training and development, participative management, superior-subordinate relationship, trust, autonomy, standard, process, formalization, etc. (Peterson et al. 1986; Venkat Raman 1998; Mufeed and Gurkoo, 2006; Chaudhary et al, (2013), Purang, 2008; Srimannarayana, 2008; Saraswathi, 2010; Jain & Premkumar, 2011; Chaudhary, Rangnekar, & Barua, 2012; and Rangnekar, & Barua, 2013. The above climate factors have significantly varied according to the ownership of organization (Venkat Raman 1998; Bhardwaj & Mishra, 2002; Mufeed and Gurkoo, 2006; Purang, 2006; Srimannarayana, 2008; Mittal, 2013; and Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015) and also influenced several outcomes. Some of the outcomes were job satisfaction (Venkat Raman, 1998; Dutka, 2002; Dash & Mohapatra, 2012; Kaur, 2015; and Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015), job performance of employees (Podsakoff et al. 1996; Zheng, 2006; Jianwei 2010; Ozge 2016; Li and Mahadevan 2017; Supriyati et al. 2019; and Obeng, Zhu, Azinga and Quansah 2021), Organizational Commitment (Mojtahedzadeh et al. 2011; Benjamin, 2012; Ramadevi and Pujitha, 2013; and Mittal, Gupta, and Motiani, 2016) and intention to quit or stay behavior (McMurray & Adela, 2003; SaketJeswani et al., 2012; and Mehrdad Goudarzv & Cheigini, 2012).

## **2.2 Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment refers to the affiliation and involvement of an employee with his/her organization (Steers, 1977). It has been identified as an important human factor which is a major determinant of organizational effectiveness (Alsiewi and Agil, 2014) and it is one of the most fundamental concepts that have been explored in relation to workforce motivation and productivity (Tolentino, 2013). The commitment of employees is at the heart of human resource management (HRM) practice (Gbadamosi et al., 2007), the achievement of organizational goals (Khalili and Asmawi, 2012) and the success of any organizations (Yavuz, 2010). The level of OC has been significantly varied according to ownership of the organization (Bano, Ishrat and Mishra 2019; and Sharma, 2015). Though employees are the most priceless assets of any organization (Voon et al., 2011), academic employees are the backbone of universities and high turnover rates among academic employees have detrimental effects on the development of universities, student learning and achievement (McInerney et al., 2015, and Lovakov, 2016) and the image of the academic sector in general (Alzubi, 2018). Since highly committed academic staff play an important role in the success of any tertiary institution (Ahmad et al., 2017), managers of higher education institutions seeking competitive advantage and thus essential to understand the organizational commitment of academic employees to their universities and the factors associated with such commitment.

Organizational commitment of university academic employees implies their considerable identification and involvement with the university (Markovits et al., 2010), a belief in and acceptance of the university’s goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the university and loyalty or a strong desire to maintain membership in the university (Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1979). Folorunso, Adewale and Abodunde (2014) examined the impact of OC on the performance of academic employees and the results indicated that OC dimensions have jointly and independently influence the performance of academics. There are stronger affective and normative commitments among Indian teachers as compared with stronger normative and continuance commitment among Iranian teachers (Joolideh & Yeshodhara, 2009).

## **2.3 Relationship between HRDC and OC**

Purang (2008) tested the relationship between various dimensions of HRD climate and organizational commitment in Indian organizations. The study measured HRD climate using the instrument developed by Daftuar (1996) which has ten dimensions of the HRD climate. Results of the study suggested that four dimensions of HRD climate, namely, career planning, appraisal, job enrichment and organizational development were significant predictors of OC of middle level managers. Benjamin (2012) from Nigeria has tested the relationship between HRD climate and employee commitment in Nigerian banks revealed that HRD climate influenced affective commitment more than it does for continuance and normative commitment. Uraon, (2018) and Ramadevi and Pujitha, (2013) examined the relationship between HRDC and OC in Indian software industries and the results shown that there was strong and positive impact of HRDC on OC. Mojtahedzadeh et al. (2011) found that positive climate of Higher Learning Institute have strong and positive correlation with academics’ commitment towards to both profession and to Institute.

### **2.3 Research Gap**

The review of literature shows that HRDC and the OC level of employees have been well explored in the Indian organizations. However, there is lack of research evidence for the effect of HRDC on the OC in general and particularly in the Indian higher educational sector. Thus, it is believed that there is a research gap in this aspect and the present research work is an attempt to address this gap.

### **SIGNIFICANT OF THE STUDY**

The quality and performance of higher educational institutions in India has become an emergent issue in the context of global ratings of Indian educational sector. Besides, skill gaps and employability of university graduates is increasingly under scrutiny as studies have indicated acute shortage of employable human resource. Also only few Indian Universities figure among top 100 Universities in the world though India ranks as 3<sup>rd</sup> highest number of higher educational institutions- after USA and China. Since quality and performance of higher educational institutions are closely tied to HRDC, it would be important to study and understand quality of HR practices that lead to HRDC. Thus, the present research work is intended to identify HRDC factor(s) that are required to enhance in the higher educational sector to attract more qualified and committed academic workforce.

## **III. Methodology**

### **4.1 Research objectives**

As stated in the earlier paragraphs, there is lack of empirical evidence which compare and the effect of HRDC on OC in the Indian higher educational sector. This paper is an attempt to compare and analyze the effect of HRDC on OC. Based on the above theoretical considerations the following objectives are framed.

1. To study and understand differences if any in HRDC and OC according to ownership of the institute; and
2. To identify the significant predictors of HRDC dimensions on OC.

### **4.2 Hypotheses**

**H<sub>1</sub>:** HRD Climate would significantly vary according to ownership of the HEI.

Existing research studies in the industrial organization provide strong evidence that ownership of the organization has significant influence on the HRD climate (Purang, 2006; Malhotra and Jairath, 1999; and Virmani and Guptan, 1999).

**H<sub>2</sub>:** There are significant differences in OC level according to the ownership of HEI.

There are research evidence (Bano, Ishrat and Mishra 2019; and Sharma, 2015) that significant variation in the OC level between government and private organization.

**H<sub>3a</sub>:** HRD Climate dimensions will have effective predictors on AC.

**H<sub>3b</sub>:** HRD Climate dimensions will have effective predictors on NC.

**H<sub>3c</sub>:** HRD Climate dimensions will have effective predictors on CC.

Studies in the past (Purang, 2008; Mittal, Gupta, and Motiani, 2016; Mojtahedzadeh, Hoda. Boroomandfar, suzan, Gholamhosini & Mastaneh, 2011; and Uraon, 2018) found that dimensions of both HRDC and Organizational Climate have significant impact on the Organizational Commitment.

### **4.3 Variables and its measurement**

This paper is focused on three sets of concepts and related variables. These are: i) Institutional Ownership, ii) HRD climate and iii) Organizational Commitment. The institutional ownership is classified by three categories i.e. GOVT, GA and PSF Colleges. In India HEIs are functioning by three methods; the first one is College which is fully funded and administered by either state or Union Government known as Government Colleges, the second one the College which is funded by either of the Government but owned and administered by private bodies through established trust known as Government Aided Colleges (GA) and the third one the College which is fully funded and administered by private bodies either by a group of individual through established trust or corporate sector known as private and Self-Financed Colleges (PSF).

The HRDC is measured by four dimensions in this study and they are: Fairness in HR systems (HRF), Opportunity for Professional Development (OPD), Professional Autonomy (AUT), and Faculty Empowerment (EMT). The HRF is the perception of faculty members that HR practices (such as recruitment, pay and allowances, promotion, opportunities, etc.) are equal, fair and just and it is measured by 6 items in the questionnaire. Opportunity for Professional Development is defined as the perception of faculty members regarding support from the College to enhance professional competencies of individual faculty members (e.g. sponsorship for training and development programs including national and international conferences/seminars, conduct workshops, create opportunities for research and consultancy, etc.) and it is measured in 4 statements. Professional Autonomy (also known as academic freedom) is the perception of faculty members that degree to which job provides substantial

freedom to decide teaching methodology, research activities, discretion and control over one's own work. The professional autonomy is measured by 3 statements. The Faculty Empowerment has been defined as the perception of faculty members that they feel important members in the College and possess sufficient freedom to express their opinions and give suggestions in any forum without fear of harassment or negative consequences to themselves and there are adequate faculty representation in various committees (such as building, purchasing, recruitment board, College governing body, students admission committee, etc.).

Organizational Commitment is measured by three dimensions i.e. Affective (AC), Normative (NC), and Continuance Commitment (CC). AC is the desire to remain a member of an organization because of an emotional attachment and psychological bond to the organization whereas NC is a desire to remain a member of an organization due to a feeling of obligation and CC is a desire to remain a member of organization because of awareness of the cost associated with leaving it (Allen & Meyer, 1990). These dimensions were measured by 3 statements each to AC and NC and 2 statements for CC.

It is pertinent to mention that HRDC was adopted from Rao and Abraham and OC was adopted from Meyer and Allen. The study is based on survey methodology using structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was composed of closed ended items and had two parts. Part one focused on HRDC and part two on OC. The questionnaire consisted of 17 items for HRDC on four dimensions; and 8 items for OC on three dimensions. Each item was measured using a five point Likert- scale ranging from 5= strongly agree to 1= strongly disagree for both HRDC and OC among faculty members. Scores of three negatively-keyed items (one from HRDC and two from OC) were reversed as per the scale manual of scoring. A pilot test was conducted with 50 faculty members to check reliability of scale items for both HRDC and OC using the Cronbach Alpha test. The scale's Alpha reliability value for HRDC and OC variables were .728 and .695 respectively. Nunally and Bernstein (1994) suggested coefficients Alpha of value .70 to be considered as good and a value exceeding .60 to be acceptable level of internal consistency.

#### **4.4 Data Collection and Sampling**

The survey was conducted among educational institutions imparting general higher education (Arts and Science Stream) from Tamil Nadu Province (India) during the academic year 2019-2020 and the data collection was completed before announcement of general lockdown due to outbreak of covid-19. This province is geographically divided into four regions i.e. East, West, North and South. Data collection was carried from 36 institutions of higher education (Colleges) representing all zones. Selection of the Colleges was based on the criterion used by the provincial government [www.tndce.in](http://www.tndce.in). Further, only those Colleges that complied with "mandatory disclosure"- with full details of faculty profile including contact details of email address and phone number were selected for inclusion in the study. Colleges were also selected on the basis of year of establishment-only those colleges that were established in 1999 or before (20 years or above) were included in the study. It is assumed that these colleges would have some well-established HR management systems. The questionnaire was prepared both for offline (printed questionnaire) and online mode (Google form) to respond. For the purpose of adequate representation of faculty members from various demographic attributes, the researchers have distributed the questionnaire based on gender, age, educational qualification, academic rank, and teaching experience using stratified random sampling technique. Researchers mailed 25 questionnaires each College (36 colleges X 25 set of questionnaire = total of 900 questionnaire). Prior consent of the faculty members were sought before they completed the questionnaire. A total of 702 respondents filled and returned the questionnaire; of which 46 responses were found incomplete and the remaining 656 responses were taken for data analyses purpose.

#### **4.5 Organization of Data Analysis**

The researchers applied quantitative technique of data analysis in this study. The data collected from the faculty members pertaining to HRDC and OC were coded in a master table using IBM SPSS version 20. The coded data was tabulated and created three possible data sets based on ownership (GOVT, GA, and PSF). Descriptive statistics of mean value was obtained to assess the prevailing nature of HRDC and the levels of OC. The five point Likert-scale for the perception of HRDC and the level of OC were slightly modified into three stage to simplify and easy to understand. Thus, the range of average scores of HRDC perception and the level of OC were described as 1-2.49 to be interpreted as "less positive/commitment, 2.5 -3.49 to be as "moderate level" and 3.5-5 to be as more positive/higher level of commitment (Kassaw & Golga, 2019). One way ANOVA and Post Hoc test were used to find out significant difference, if any, in HRDC and the level of OC between three categories of HEIs; and multiple regression analysis was applied to identify the predictors of HRDC dimensions on OC.

### **IV. Results And Discussion**

#### **5.1 Comparison of HRDC and OC**

The one way ANOVA analysis (table 1) clearly explains that there is significant difference in the prevailing nature of HRDC in all the three categories of the HEI ( $p < .05$ ). Faculty members in GOVT and GA

HEIs perceived more positive than its counterpart of PSF on all factors. Further, Post Hoc multiple comparisons test was applied (table 2) to find out which category of the HEIs is significantly more different than the other. It is evident from this analysis, fairness in HR systems, professional autonomy, faculty empowerment and overall HRDC in the GOVT HEIs are significantly different from those of GA and PSF HEIs ( $p < .05$ ). However, opportunity for professional development is not significantly different between GOVT and other two categories of the HEIs ( $p > .05$ ). It is significantly different only between GA and PSF HEIs. It is evident from this analysis that ownership of the HEI has significant influence on the perception of HRDC. Over all perceived HRD climate is more positive in GOVT and GA HEIs than the PSF. This is because GOVT and GA HEIs in India are mandatory to enforce the HR management systems as per the guidelines framed by the established regulatory bodies such as UGC, AICTE, etc. But PSF HEIs generally do not adopt the same guidelines and adopt their own HR management practices which are undesirable and unacceptable. This could be the reason for variation of HRDC in GOVT and Private HEIs. This result is consonance with the findings of Mittal (2013), and Chaudhary, Rangnekar, and Barua (2012) but it is contradictory to the findings of Purang (2008) where perceived HRDC was more positive in private sector.

**Hypothesis-1: HRDC significantly vary according to ownership.** The one way ANOVA test provides partial support to this hypothesis as opportunity for professional development is not significantly different between GOVT and other two categories of the College ( $p > .05$ ). It is significantly different only between GA and PSF Colleges.

Further, one way ANOVA test (table 1) provides sufficient evident that there is significant difference between the group of ownership of the HEI in the level of organizational commitment ( $p < .05$ ). However, comparison between within the group of ownership as per Post Hoc test (table 2), there is no significant difference in the level of OC between GOVT and GA HEIs ( $p > .05$ ) in all the three types of commitment and there is high level of commitment when compared to PSF Colleges. The GOVT and GA HEIs are significantly different only with PSF HEIs ( $p < .05$ ). The findings of this study are confirmed with Sharma (2015) where the level of OC was greater in public funded technical institution than its counterpart of private technical schools. But it is contradiction with the results of Bano, Israt, and Mishra (2019) where overall commitment of private universities was more than the public universities because of better growth opportunity, promotion, quality of work-life and healthy working conditions.

**Hypothesis-2: There is likely to be significantly different in the level of OC between GOVT, GA, and PSF HEIs.** The findings of results indicate that both GOVT and GA HEIs are significantly varied only with PSF in all factors including over all OC and not within these two groups and therefore the data analysis partially support to this hypothesis.

**Table: 1. One way ANOVA for HRD Climate and OC**

Dependent Variables	Ownership	Mean	F	Sig.
HRF	GOVT	4.16	136.089	.000
	GA	3.68		
	PSF	3.36		
	Total	3.70		
OPD	GOVT	4.05	3.622	.027
	GA	4.17		
	PSF	3.97		
	Total	4.05		
AUT	GOVT	3.99	100.255	.000
	GA	3.77		
	PSF	3.23		
	Total	3.63		
EMPT	GOVT	4.11	57.181	.000
	GA	3.84		
	PSF	3.54		
	Total	3.80		
HRDC	GOVT	4.08	125.266	.000
	GA	3.86		
	PSF	3.52		
	Total	3.80		
AC	GOVT	4.2322	57.621	.000
	GA	4.3733		
	PSF	3.7608		
	Total	4.0920		
NC	GOVT	4.1609	38.871	.000
	GA	4.2417		
	PSF	3.7386		
	Total	4.0213		
CC	GOVT	4.0846	30.474	.000
	GA	4.2325		
	PSF	3.7431		
	Total	3.9970		
OC	GOVT	4.1592	81.879	.000
	GA	4.2825		
	PSF	3.7475		
	Total	4.0368		

HRF=Fairness in HR System; OPD=Opportunity for Development; AUT=Professional Autonomy; EMPT=Faculty Empowerment; HRDC=Human Resource Development Climate; GOVT= Government; GA=Government Aided; PSF=Private and Self-Financed; AC=Affectionate Commitment; NC= Normative Commitment; CC=Continuing Commitment; and OC= Organizational Commitment

**5.2 Impact of HRDC on OC**

The results from multiple regression analysis (table 3, 4 and 5) indicate that HRDC dimensions have significant impact on the different types of OC ( $p < .05$ ). The “OPD” is the highest significant predictors on AC ( $\beta = .316$ ;  $t = 8.944$ ) followed by “HRF” ( $\beta = .208$ ;  $t = 5.272$ ) and “AUT” ( $\beta = .163$ ;  $t = 4.391$ ). Similarly “OPD” is again the highest significant predictor on NC ( $\beta = .198$ ;  $t = 5.259$ ) followed by “AUT” ( $\beta = .161$ ;  $t = 4.062$ ) and “HRF” ( $\beta = .155$ ;  $t = 3.678$ ). With respect to HRDC dimensions on CC, the result shows that “AUT” is the highest significant predictor ( $\beta = .168$ ;  $t = 4.149$ ) followed by “OPD” ( $\beta = .130$ ;  $t = 3.375$ ) and “HRF” ( $\beta = .138$ ;  $t = 3.203$ ).

**Table 2: Post Hoc test for Organizational Commitment**

Dependent Variables	(I) Inst. ownership	(J) Inst. ownership	MD (I-J)	Sig.	Dependent Variables	(I) Inst. ownership	(J) Inst. ownership	MD (I-J)	Sig.
HRF	GOVT	GA	.48501*	.000*	AC	GOVT.	GA	-.14116	.073
		PSF	.80161*	.000*			PSF	.47139*	.000*
	GA	GOVT.	-.48501*	.000*		GA	GOVT	.14116	.073
		PSF	.31660*	.000*			PSF	.61255*	.000*
	PSF	GOVT.	-.80161*	.000*		PSF	GOVT	-.47139*	.000*
		GA	-.31660*	.000*			GA	-.61255*	.000*
OPD	GOVT	GA	-.11279	.319	NC	GOVT.	GA	-.08080	.440
		PSF	.08591	.474			PSF	.42230*	.000*
	GA	GOVT.	.11279	.319		GA	GOVT	.08080	.440
		PSF	.19870*	.020*			PSF	.50310*	.000*
	PSF	GOVT.	-.08591	.474		PSF	GOVT	-.42230*	.000*
		GA	-.19870*	.020*			GA	-.50310*	.000*
AUT	GOVT	GA	.22335*	.001*	CC	GOVT.	GA	-.14792	.082
		PSF	.76662*	.000*			PSF	.34144*	.000*
	GA	GOVT	-.22335*	.001*		GA	GOVT	.14792	.082
		PSF	.54327*	.000*			PSF	.48936*	.000*
	PSF	GOVT.	-.76662*	.000*		PSF	GOVT	-.34144*	.000*
		GA	-.54327*	.000*			GA	-.48936*	.000*
EMT	GOVT	GA	.27068*	.000*	OC	GOVT.	GA	-.12330*	.025*
		PSF	.57299*	.000*			PSF	.41171*	.000*
	GA	GOVT	-.27068*	.000*		GA	GOVT	.12330*	.025*
		PSF	.30230*	.000*			PSF	.53501*	.000*
	PSF	GOVT.	-.57299*	.000*		PSF	GOVT	-.41171*	.000*
		GA	-.30230*	.000*			GA	-.53501*	.000*
HRDC	GOVT	GA	.21656*	.000*					
		PSF	.55678*	.000*					
	GA	GOVT	-.21656*	.000*					
		PSF	.34022*	.000*					
	PSF	GOVT.	-.55678*	.000*					
		GA	-.34022*	.000*					

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The HRDC dimensions of faculty “EMPT” is invariably a weak predictor on all the types of OC. Over all the data analysis of regression shows that “OPD” is a strong predictor among the dimensions of HRDC. It could argue that academics who perceived more positively about opportunity for professional development also known as training and development (such as sponsorship for national and international conferences, creating opportunity for research and consultancy, organizing seminar, workshop, conference and other faculty development programs) would contribute higher level of academic performance and more committed workforce. The findings of this study consistent with that of Martin and O’Laughlin, 1984; Sharma, 1989; Mathiew, 1991; Bartlett, 2001; Kontoghiorghes & Bryant, 2001; and McMurray & Dorai, 2001 where formal workplace training has significant impact on OC and also HRDC was jointly and separately significant impact on OC (Benjamin & David, 2012).

**Table No. 3: Regression Results: HRDC dimensions with Affective Commitment**

Model Summary					
Model I	R=.497 <sup>b</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> =.247	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .243		
	Sum of square	Df.	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	78.772	4	19.693	53.514	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	239.568	651	368		
Total	318.340	655			
Variables	Unstandardized coefficient (β)	Std. error	Standardized coefficient (β)	T	Sig.
Constant	1.260	.212		5.935	.000
HRF	.236	.045	.208	5.272	.000
OPD	.325	.036	.316	8.944	.000
AUT	.166	.038	.163	4.391	.000
EMPT	.009	.042	.008	.225	.822

- a) Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment  
 b) Predictors: (Constant), HRF, OPD, AUT, EMPT

**H<sub>3a</sub>:** HRD Climate dimensions will have effective predictors on AC. The findings from the regression analysis (table 3) indicate that the HRDC dimensions of “OPD”, “HRF” and “AUT” have significant predictors on AC and faculty “EMPT” does not have significant impact. Therefore, this proposition is partially accepted.

**H<sub>3b</sub>:** HRD Climate dimensions will have effective predictors on NC. Similar to findings of previous hypothesis, “OPD”, “AUT” and “HRF” have significant predictors on AC and faculty “EMPT” does not have significant impact. Therefore this proposition is also partially accepted.

**Table No. 4: Regression Results: HRDC dimensions with Normative Commitment**

Model Summary					
Model I	R=.374 <sup>a</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> =.140	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .135		
	Sum of square	Df.	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	44.810	4	11.202	26.530	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	274.892	651	.422		
Total	319.701	655			
Variables	Un standardized coefficient (β)	Std. error	Standardized coefficient (β)	T	Sig.
Constant	1.854	.227		8.153	.000
HRF	.177	.048	.155	3.678	.000
OPD	.205	.039	.198	5.259	.000
AUT	.165	.041	.161	4.062	.000
EMPT	.022	.045	.020	.500	.617

- b) Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment  
 b) Predictors: (Constant), HR Fairness, OPD, AUT, EMPT

**H<sub>3c</sub>:** HRD Climate dimensions will have effective predictors on CC. The data analysis (table 5) shows that “AUT” is the highest significant predictor on CC followed by “OPD” and “HRF” and again faculty “EMPT” does not have significant impact on CC. Therefore, this proposition is partially accepted.

**Table No. 5: Regression Results: HRDC dimensions with Continuance Commitment**

Model Summary					
Model I	R=.327 <sup>a</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> =.107	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .101		
	Sum of square	Df.	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	36.371	4	9.093	19.464	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	304.123	651	.467		
Total	340.494	655			
Variables	Un standardized coefficient (β)	Std. error	Standardized coefficient (β)	T	Sig.
Constant	2.042	.239		8.537	.000
HRF	.162	.051	.138	3.203	.001
OPD	.138	.041	.130	3.375	.001
AUT	.177	.043	.168	4.149	.000
EMPT	.040	.047	.034	.851	.395

- c) Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment  
 b) Predictors: (Constant), HR Fairness, OPD, AUT, EMPT

## VI. Summary And Conclusion

The study provides a comprehensive understanding while managing HR in public and private HEIs. Overall the study says that there is significant variation in the prevailing nature of HRDC and OC level between the three categories of HEIs and the dimensions of HRDC have significant impact on OC. The study emphasizes to pay more attention for faculty “EMPT” which is the weak predictor on the level of OC. This could be done by holding frequent faculty council meeting in which faculty members are to be freely allowed to express their views and give suggestions without fear of harassment or negative consequences to themselves. It is also possible to enhance empowerment of faculty by adequate faculty representation in college governing body, recruitment board for faculty and staff, building and purchasing committee, and other important decision making bodies.

### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was not covered other higher educational sector such as engineering, management, law, medicine, agriculture, etc. and therefore the results/inferences of this study should be viewed in the context of only liberal arts and science HEIs. The complete dimensions of HRD climate such as HRD mechanism, General climate and OCTAPACE (Rao & Abraham, 1986) culture was not covered in this study and number of statements in OC is restricted to only 8 and not all 23 items of Meyer and Allen’s (1997). Since the present study restricts only Tamil Nadu Province, generalization from these results to overall higher educational sector in India needs to be kept in perspective.

### References

- [1]. Ahmad A, Bibi P, Majid AHA (2017), “The impact of training and development and transformational leadership over organizational commitment among academic staff in public tertiary institutions: The buffering role of coworker support”. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11(1):417-432.
- [2]. Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990), “The measurement and antecedents of affective, normative and continuance commitment to the organization”. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63: 1-18.
- [3]. Alsiewi, A.M, and Agil SOS (2014). “Factors that influence affective commitment to teaching in Libya”. *Journal of Business and Management* 16(2):37-46.
- [4]. Alzubi YZW (2018). Turnover intentions in Jordanian Universities: The role of leadership behaviour, organizational commitment and organizational culture. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences* 5(1):177-192.
- [5]. Bano.K, Ishrat.A, and Mishra.K.K. (2019), “Factors Affecting Organizational Commitment Of Teachers In Government And Private Universities” *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*: 8(11) 138-152.
- [6]. Bartlett, K.R. (2001), “The Relationship between Training and Organizational Commitment: A study in the Health care field”. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12, 335-352.
- [7]. Benjamin, A. & David, I. (2012), “Human Resource Development Climate and Employee Commitment in Recapitalized Nigerian Banks”. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 7(5): 91-99.
- [8]. Bhardwaj, G. & Mishra, P. (2002). “HRD Climate: An empirical study among private sector managers”, *IJIR*, July, Vol.38(1).
- [9]. Chaudhary, R., Rangnekar, S., & Barua, M. (2013).” Human resource development climate in India: Examining the psychometric properties of HRD climate survey instrument”. *Vision*, 17, 41-52. doi:10.1177/0972262912469564.
- [10]. Chaudhary, R., Rangnekar, S., & Barua, M. K. (2012), “Relationships between occupational self efficacy, human resource development climate, and work engagement. *Team Performance Management*”. *An International Journal*, 18, 370-383. doi:10.1108/135 2759121128 1110.
- [11]. Chaudhary. R, Rangnekar. S, and Barua. M.K. (2012), “Human Resource Development Climate in India: An Empirical Analysis”, *National Conference on Emerging Challenges for Sustainable Business*. ISBN-978-93-81583-46-3.
- [12]. Daftuar, C. (1996), “HRD Climate Questionnaire” pp.117–121, *Academy of HRD*, India.
- [13]. Dash. S. & Mohapatra, J. (2012). “HRD climate with job satisfaction of employees: An Empirical investigation on MCL, Burla, Sambalpur, Odisha”, is published in the *International Journal of Research in Business Management* 1(2), July 2013, 11-26
- [14]. Denison, D. (1990), “Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness”, *John Wiley & Sons*, NY.
- [15]. Denison, D. (1996) “What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native’s point of view on a decade of paradigm wars”. *Academy of Management Review*, 21 (3): 619–654.
- [16]. Dutka, A. (2002), “The relationship between job satisfaction and the organizational climate for women higher education administrators at five institutions”, Unpublished Theses, Boston college, USA. <http://scholarship.bc.edu/dissertations/AA13043396>.
- [17]. E. Thomas Moran & J. Fredericks Volkwein (1988), “Examining Organizational Climate in Institutions of Higher Education”. *Research in Higher Education*, 28(4): 367-383.
- [18]. Folorunso, O.O., Adewale, A.J., and Abodunde, S.M. (2014), “Exploring the Effect of Organizational Commitment Dimensions on Employees Performance: An Empirical Evidence from Academic Staff of Oyo State Owned Tertiary Institutions, Nigeria. *Internal Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(8):275-286.
- [19]. Gbadamosi G, Ndaba J, Oni F (2007). “Predicting charlatan behavior in a non-western setting: lack of trust or absence of commitment? *Journal of Management Development* 26(8):753-769.
- [20]. Gyekye S.A. (2005), “Workers” perceptions of workplace safety and job satisfaction”. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*
- [21]. Helena, R. & Mika. (2003). “Organizational Climate, Perceived work-related symptoms and Sickness Absence: A population-based survey”, *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, Vol. 45. No. 2, PP. 175-184.
- [22]. Jaime X. Castillo & Jamie Cano (2004), “Factors Explaining Job Satisfaction among Faculty”. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(3).
- [23]. Jain, R., & Premkumar, R. (2011). “HRD practices in Indian organizations and their impact on productivity of human resources: An empirical study”. *Management and Labor Studies*, 36, 5-30. doi:10.1177/0 258042X110360010.
- [24]. Joolideh, F., & Yeshodhara, K. (2009). “Organizational commitment among high school teachers of India and Iran”. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47, 127-136. doi:10. 1108/09578230910928115



- [25]. Kassaw, E.S. and Golga, D.N., “Employees’ Organizational Commitment in Higher Educational Setting”. Preprints **2019**, 2019040 029 (doi: 10.209 44/ preprints 201904. 0029.v2).
- [26]. Kaur, G. (2015), “A Study on HRD climate and its impact on Job Satisfaction in Public Sector Undertakings”. *International Journal of Human Resource and Industrial Research*, 2(6):12-18.
- [27]. Khalili A Asnawi A (2012). “Appraising the impact of gender differences on organizational commitment: Empirical evidence from a private SME in Iran”. *International Journal of Business and Management* 7(5):100-110.
- [28]. Kontoghiorghes, C., & Bryant, N. (2001), Exploring Organization Commitment in a Non-profit Service Organization, In O.A. Aliaga (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource Development* pp. 1056-1063. Baton Rouge, LA: AHRD.
- [29]. Li, Y.P., and Mahadevan, A. (2017), “A Study on the Impact of Organizational Climate on Employee Performance in a Malaysian Consultancy”. *International Journal of Accounting and Business Management*, 5(1).
- [30]. Lovakov. A. (2016) Antecedents of organizational commitment among faculty: an exploratory study, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 22:2, 149-170, DOI: 10.1080/13583883. 2016.1177583
- [31]. Markovits Y, Davis AJ, Fay D, Dick V (2010). The Link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment: differences between private and public sector employees. *International Public Management Journal* 13(2):177-196.
- [32]. Martin & O’Laughlin (1984), “Predictors of Organizational Commitment, The study of Part-Time Army Reservists. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*: 25, 270-283.
- [33]. McInerney DM, Ganotice FA, King RB, Marsh HW, Morin AJS (2015). “Exploring commitment and turnover intentions among teachers: What we can learn from Hong Kong teachers”. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 52:1123.
- [34]. McMurray & Adela J (2003), “The relationship between organizational climate and organizational culture”. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, Cambridge. 3(1/2).
- [35]. McMurray, A.J., and Dorai, R. (2001). *The Relationship between Workplace Training and Organizational Commitment in Australian Organizational Settings: A Preliminary Analysis*, A paper Presented at the Academy of Human Resource Development , Annual Conference, Oklahoma City, UK.
- [36]. Mehrdad Goudarzi and Chegini (2012). “The Study of the Relationship between Organizational Climate and the Staff’s Entrepreneurial Spirit”. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(12).
- [37]. Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997), “Commitment in the workplace, London, England: Sage.
- [38]. Mishra, P., Dhar, U. and Dhar, S. (1999) ‘Job-satisfaction as correlate of HRD climate-an empirical study’, *Indian Journal of Training and Development*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp.3–11.
- [39]. Mittal, S. (2013). HRD Climate in Public & Private Sector Banks. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 49(1), 123-131. Retrieved December 8, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23509804>
- [40]. Mittal, S., Gupta, V. and Motiani, M. (2016) ‘Relation between human resource development climate and organizational commitment: empirical study in Indian banking sector’, *Int. J. Indian Culture and Business Management*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp.204–223.
- [41]. Mojtahedzadeh, Hoda. Boroomandfar, suzan, Gholamhosini & Mastaneh (2011), “Relationship between Organizational Climate and Commitment staff in Sosangerd Azad Islamic University”. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(12).
- [42]. Mowday R, Steers R, Porter L (1979). “The measurement of organizational commitment”. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 14:224-247. *Occupational Safety and Ergonomics, (JOSE)*, 11(3): 291–302
- [43]. Mufeed, S.A. and Gurkoo, F.A. (2006), “Enhancing Educational Institutions Effectiveness Through HRD climate: An Empirical Assessment”. *Management and Change*, 10 (2): 45-70.
- [44]. Nunally, J.C. and Bernstein, I.H. (1994), “Psychometric theory”, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [45]. Obeng, A.F., Zhu, Y., Azinga, S.A., and Quansah, P.E. (2021), “Organizational Climate and Job Performance: Investigating the Mediating Role of Harmonious Work Passion and the Moderating Role of Leader-Member Exchange and Coaching”. *Sage Open* April-June 2021:1-14 DOI: 10.1177/21582440211008456
- [46]. Ozge, A. and Altindag, E. (2016), “The Effects of Re-engineering, Organizational Climate and Psychological Capital on the Firm Performance”. 12<sup>th</sup> International Strategic Management Conference, ISMC 2016, Antalya Turkey, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 235: 320-331
- [47]. Peterson, M. W., Cameron, K. S., Jones, P., Mets, L. A., & Ettington, D. (1986), “The organizational context for teaching and learning: A review of the research literature”. Ann Arbor, MI, National Center for Research to Improve Post secondary Teaching and Learning.
- [48]. Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., & Boomer, W. (1996), “Transformational leader behaviors Substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behavior”. *Journal of Management*, 22: 259-298.
- [49]. Purang, P (2006), “HRD Climate: A Comparative Analysis of public, private and multinational organizations,” *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41(3): 407-416.
- [50]. Purang, P. (2008), “Dimensions of HRD climate enhancing organizational commitment in Indian organizations”. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43, 528-546.
- [51]. Rama Devi, V. and Pujitha, V. (2013), “Influence of HRD Climate on Organizational Commitment”. *Golden Research Thoughts*, 2(7): 1-6.
- [52]. Rao T. V & E. Abraham S. J. (1985), “HRD Climate in Organisations”- Paper presented at the XLRI-L & T Joint National Seminar on HRD held at Bombay, February, 1985.
- [53]. Rao, T. V. & E. Abraham (1986), “Human Resource Development Climate in Indian Organizations”, *Recent Experiences in Human Resource Development*, New Delhi Oxford and IBH : 70-98.
- [54]. Ravichandran, A., & Venka Raman A. (2015). *Human Resource Management: Issues Confronting Indian Higher Education*. Scholars’ Press, Germany, ISBN No 978-3-639-66651-9.
- [55]. Reichers, A. E., & Schneider, B. (1990), “Climate and Culture: An Evolution of Constructs. In B.Schneider (Ed), *Organizational Climate and Culture* (5-39)”. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [56]. Saket Jeswani & Sumita Dave (2012). Impact of Organizational Climate on Turnover Intention: An Empirical Analysis on Faculty Members of Technical Education of India’. *International Journal of Business Management & Research*, 2(3), 26-44, (IJBMR), ISSN 2249-6920.
- [57]. Saraswathi, S. (2010). Human resources development climate: An empirical study. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 1, 174-179. doi:10.7763/IJIMT.2010. V1.32.
- [58]. Sharma P. (2015) “Organizational Commitment Among Faculty Members in India: A Study on Public and Private Technical Schools”, *G 1 o b a l Business and Organizational Excellence*, Published online in Wiley Online Library ([wileyonlinelibrary.com](http://wileyonlinelibrary.com)) DOI : 10. 1002/joe.21624•July/August 2015.
- [59]. Sharma, B.R. (1989), “A Study of the Relationship of Organizational Climate with Organizational; Commitment and Psychological Well being , PhD thesis , Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, India.
- [60]. Srimannarayana, M. (2008). Human resources development climate in India. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44, 248-255.
- [61]. Steers MR (1977). “Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment”. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 22(1):46-56.

## *Effect of HRD Climate on Organizational Commitment: A Comparative Study ..*

---

- [62]. Supriyati, S., Udin, U., Wahyudi, S., & Mahfudz., M. (2019), "Investigating the relationship between organizational climate, and organizational Performance". *International Journal of Financial Research*, 10 (6), 88-94.
- [63]. Syed Ahmad Raza (2010), "Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Performance of Teachers in Public and Private Colleges of Punjab University College of Education and Research" PirMehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture
- [64]. Tolentino RC (2013). "Organizational commitment and job performance of the academic and administrative personnel". *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management* 15(1):51-59. University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan
- [65]. Uraon, R.S. (2018), "Examining the impact of HRD Practices on Organizational Commitment and Intention to Stay within selected Software Companies in India". *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 20(1):11-43.
- [66]. Venkat Raman, A. (1998), "A Structural and Behavioral Analysis for Human Resource Planning in Health Care Organization," Ph.D Thesis, Faculty of Management Studies, University of Delhi, Delhi p. (384).
- [67]. Virmani, B.R. and Guptan, S.U. (1991), "Indian Management", *Vision*, New Delhi, 77-146.
- [68]. Voon ML, Lo MCN, Ngui KS, Ayob NB (2011). "The influence of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction in public sector organizations in Malaysia". *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Sciences* 2(1):24-32.
- [69]. Yavuz M (2010). The effects of teachers' perception of organizational justice and culture on organizational commitment". *African Journal of Business Management* 4(5):695-700.
- [70]. Zheng, C. (2006), "An empirical study of high Performance HRM practices in Chinese SMEs". *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(10):1772-1803.

Dr. A. Ravichandran. "Effect of HRD Climate on Organizational Commitment: A Comparative Study of Higher Educational institutions in a Province of India." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 23(07), 2021, pp. 36-45.