

HRD Climate and its Outcomes of Academics: A Study of Professional Institutions in India

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:
MGT-2022-10025256

Volume: 10

Issue: 2

Month: October

Year: 2022

P-ISSN: 2321-4643

E-ISSN: 2581-9402

Received: 28.06.2022

Accepted: 23.09.2022

Published: 01.10.2022

Citation:

Ravichandran, A. "HRD Climate and Its Outcomes of Academics: A Study of Professional Institutions in India." *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2022, pp. 38–48.

DOI:


<https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v10i2.5256>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

A. Ravichandran

*Associate Professor, Satyawati College (Evening)
University of Delhi, New Delhi, India*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5437-7805>

Abstract

Retaining competent faculty and faculty stability has been a major cause of concern affecting the quality of professional higher education in India particularly in the private sector. Conducive work climate and higher job satisfaction level are essential for better performance of both faculty members and the institute and also stability of the competent faculty members. This paper seeks to explore and examine the influence of ownership on HRD Climate, Job Satisfaction and Academic Achievements level and also Intention to Stay/Quit behavior of faculty members across public and private academic institutions offering professional degree courses in India. It is also sought to explore the inter-relationship between HRD Climate, Job Satisfaction and Academic Achievements level, and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior and the effect of HRD Climate dimensions on the level of both Job Satisfaction (JS) and Academic Achievements (AA). The paper is based on a survey among 972 faculty members in engineering and management institutes across three Provinces in India. Findings of the study revealed that ownership has significant influence on the HRD climate, JS and AA level and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior. Faculty in most private institutes expressed less desire to stay (the current employer) compared to their counterparts in government. The results support to both theoretical and empirical aspects for the proposed hypotheses.

Keywords: Ownership, HRD climate, Job Satisfaction, Intention to Quit/Stay Behavior, Professional Institutions, and Academic Achievements.

Introduction

Quality of higher education in any country is inextricably linked with number of determinants such as innovative curriculum, effective application of information and communication technology tools, infrastructure, teaching-learning process, intellectual capital (research and development, faculty publications, patents), mode of admission, student and teachers' development activities, etc. But quality and stability of faculty plays a significant role in the success of any Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs). The attracting and retaining the competent faculty largely depend on supportive Human Resource (HR) policies and systems which could develop climate conducive to Human Resource Development. There is significant volume of research literature explaining the inter-relationship between HRD climate, Job Satisfaction and Intention to stay or quit behavior. However, there is lack of research evidence in influence of ownership of the institute on HRDC and its outcomes of Academics in India. Faculty attrition, retention, inter-institutional mobility, and 'poaching' are topics of continuing debate in India (Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015). This paper seeks to explore and examine the ownership influence on HRDC, Job Satisfaction (JS), Academic Achievements (AA) and faculty stability (intention to quit behavior) across public and private professional institutions in India. This paper also seeks to examine HRDC and its outcomes of faculty members such as JS, AA and intention to stay/quit behavior.

Literature Review

HRD Climate

HRD Climate is defined as “perceptions of employees about a set of HR policies, systems and practices in an organization and it is an integral part of organizational climate” (Rao & Abraham, 1986). While significant contributions to the concept of organizational climate were made as early as 1968, by Tauri and Litwin (1968) and Litwin and Stringer (1968), contributions to the HRD climate are relatively recent in origin (Roa and Abraham, 1986). Studies in the past have used a number of dimensions. Rao and Abraham (1986) grouped HRD climate into three broad categories viz., General climate, OCTAPACE (i.e., Openness, Confrontation, Trust, Authenticity, Pro-activity, Autonomy, Collaboration and Experimentation) and HRD mechanisms. Hassan, Hashim and Ismail (2006) used 4 dimensions (Career systems, Work systems, Development system, and Self renewal system). Rodrigues (2005) used 7 dimensions such as Scope for advancement, Supervision, Training and development, Inter personal relations, Objectivity and rationality, Monetary benefits and Participate management. Rao (1991), Parthasarathy (1998) and Chandrasekar (1993) proposed 10 dimensions to measure HRD climate. They were: Openness, Team spirit, Trust, Autonomy, Co-operation, Recognition, Participation, Fair compensation, Counseling and Problem solving. Mufeed and Gurkoo (2006) also used these dimensions. HRDC has been varied according to the ownership of the organization i.e., Public, Private, MNC, etc. for example, Purang (2006) found that HRD climate is a key factor for productivity in public and private sector enterprises and results indicated that private and MNCs outperformed the public sector ones. Contrast to this, researcher’s own studies Ravichandran and Venkat Raman (2015 and 2021), Ravichandran and Garg (2021) and Ravichandran (2021) found that HRD Climate was higher in public funded higher educational institutions than Private and Self-Funded (PSF) institutions. Few research studies have conducted in higher educational sector about HRDC (Mufeed and Gurkoo, 2006; Rao 1991; and Rodrigues 2005) and their results indicate that HRDC perception was moderate and above moderate level.

HRD Climate and its Outcomes

HRD Climate has several outcomes of both individual and organizational level. There were significant research studies which established a strong relationship between HRDC and JS level of employees (Solkhe and Chaudhary, 2011; Rohmetra, 1998; Kumar and Patnaik, 2002; Babushe and Narendranath, 2013; Ravichandran, 2021; and Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015) Further HRDC has led several other individual outcomes such as employee’s positive attitude (Bhardwaj and Mishra, 2002), better performance of employees (Babu, 2018; Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015; Ravichandran and Garg, 2021), organizational commitment of employees (Daftuar, 1996; Benjamin, 2012; Uraon, 2018; Ramadevi and Pujitha, 2013; Mojtahedzadeh et al. 2011; and Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2021), intention to quit behavior of employees (Benjamin, 2012; and effectiveness on organizational performance (Pillai and Prakash, 2008; Delaney and Huselid, 1996; and Katou and Budhwar, 2006).

Research Gap

It is evident that considerable research has been conducted on the relationship between climate perception, job satisfaction and intention to quit/ stay. There is lack of research studies except few (Venkat Raman, 1998; Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015; and Ravichandran and Dua, 2021) to examine ownership influence on HRDC, JS and AA level, Intention to Stay/Quit behavior among faculty members in the Indian HEIs. There is also a felt need to analyze the relationship between HRD climate, job satisfaction and turn over intention among faculty members as faculty attrition, retention and flow of faculty into and out of higher education as well as between the institutions are major concern in India (Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015). Therefore, based on the above theoretical considerations, this paper proposes to empirically test some of the hypotheses relevant in the understanding of the ownership influence, relationship between HRDC, JS and AA level and turn over intention specifically academic workforce in the engineering and management institutes.

Research Questions

There are limited research studies on HRD climate in the professional higher educational institutions in India. This study is an attempt to compare between Government (GOVT) and Private and Self-Financed (PSF) professional institutions in HRD Climate, Job Satisfaction (JS), Academic Achievements (AA) and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior of the faculty members. Also, the study tries to find out the significant effect of HRD Climate (HRDC) on JS and AA. Thus, the study makes an attempt to answer the following research questions.

1. Does ownership of the institute significantly influence the attributes of HRDC, JS, and AA, and also Intention to Stay/Quit behavior?
2. Is there any significant and positive relationship between HRDC, JS, AA, and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior?
3. Does HRDC has significant and positive effect on JS and AA?
4. Are there any implications from the findings of the study?

Hypotheses

After an extensive review of the relevant research literature and in accordance with the research questions stated as above the following hypotheses are proposed and these hypotheses were subject to qualitative and statistical analyses and inferences.

Hypothesis 1: Ownership of the institute is likely to be significantly influenced the HRD climate, JS, AA, and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior.

Hypothesis 2: Faculty members in GOVT institute are likely to be greater HRDC than the PSF.

Hypothesis 3: Faculty members in GOVT institute are likely to be greater JS level than the PSF.

Hypothesis 4: Faculty members in GOVT institute are likely to be greater AA than the PSF.

Hypothesis 5: Faculty members in GOVT institutes are likely to have greater intention to stay behavior than PSF institutes.

Hypothesis 6: HRD climate is likely to be significant and positive relationship with JS, AA, and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior.

Hypothesis 7: HRD Climate is likely to be significant and positive effect on the level of JS.

Hypothesis 8: HRD Climate is likely to be significant and positive effect on the level of AA.

Methodology

Variables and its Measure

The study is focused on five sets of concepts and related variables. These are: i) Institutional Ownership (Public and Private and Self-Financed); ii) HRD climate (sub-variables are: Fairness in HR systems HRF, 6 statements; Opportunity for Professional Development (OPD 4 statements; Empowerment EMT 4 statements; Autonomy AUT 3 statements; and Scope for Innovation SFI3 statements); iii) Job Satisfaction (JS) (Its sub- variables are: Monetary Benefits, MB4 statements; Job Content JC 5 statements; Interpersonal Relationship IPR 3 statements; and Physical Working Conditions, PWC5 statements); iv) Academic Achievements (AA) (sub-variables are: Publication5 statements; and Professional Development Activities PDA 5 statements); and v) Intention to Quit/Stay behavior and it measured by a single item in the questionnaire. It is pertinent to state that: the HRDC was adopted from Rao and Abraham (2007); JS from Venkat Raman (1998); and a self-administered questionnaire for Academic Achievements based on UGC/AICTE standard operating procedure. A survey methodology was adopted with a structured questionnaire in both print and online (Google form) version for the convenience of the respondent. The questionnaire comprised in 5 sections i.e., demographic details of respondent in section 1; and remaining sections for HRDC, JS, AA, and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior. While demographic details of the respondent were measured as nominal data, HRDC, JS, and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior were measured as a five-point Likert-type scale to be rated ranging from 5=strongly agree to 1= strongly disagree. The AA was originally measured as actual data and later on it was converted into five-point Likert-type scale for data analysis purpose. A pre-survey was conducted with 100 respondent faculty members to check reliability of scale items for HRDC, JS and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior using the Cronbach Alpha test. The scale's Alpha reliability value for HRDC, JS, and Intention to Stay/Quit variables were .728 and .825 and .756 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.

Sampling Data Collection and Organization of Data Analysis

The survey was conducted among educational institutions imparting technical (engineering) and management education during the academic year 2009-10. Data collection was carried out from 80 institutes in three different states in India, viz., Delhi, Haryana and Tamil Nadu. These institutes were owned by Government (GOVT) and Private and Self-Financed (PSF) in the select above three states. Selection of the sample institute is based on a primary criterion that is AICTE approved (verified at AICTE website www.aicte.ernet.in). Further, only those institutes that disclosed its “mandatory disclosure” in their website with full details of institute and faculty members including their contact details for the purpose of extracting basic information about the institute and faculty members.

The data was collected from the faculty members regarding their perceived HRD Climate, Job Satisfaction, Intention to Stay/Quit Behavior and Academic Achievements. For the purpose of

adequate representation of teachers from various departments and from each category, a stratified-random sampling method was favored. Based on the above stratified sampling method, the questionnaire was distributed and collected from respondent faculty members. A total of 972 responses (Tamil Nadu, 537; Delhi, 201; and Haryana, 234) were subjected to further analysis. Statistical tools of independent “t” test, Karl-Pearson correlation co-efficiency and multiple-regression analysis were applied to examine the significant variations between GOVT and PSF institutes, inter-relationship HRDC and its outcome variables and predictors of HRDC on the level of JS and AA.

Results and Discussion

Government and Private Institute: Comparison

The data analysis from independent “t” test (table 1) depicts that the ownership of the institute has significantly influenced the HRDC, JS, AA, as there are significant variations between GOVT and PSF institutes in all the HRDC attributes including

Table 1 Independent “t” Test for Comparison between GOVT & PSF Institute

Variables	Ownership	Mean	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Fairness in HR systems	GOVT	3.3556	3.269	.001
	PSF	3.1728		
Opportunity for Professional Development	GOVT	3.9900	6.217	.000
	PSF	3.5696		
Empowerment	GOVT	3.7154	8.676	.000
	PSF	3.0275		
Professional Autonomy	GOVT	4.0714	5.892	.000
	PSF	3.6720		
Scope for Innovation	GOVT	3.5921	2.864	.004
	PSF	3.3809		
Overall Human Resource Development Climate	GOVT	3.6950	5.366	.000
	PSF	3.4132		
Monetary Benefits	GOVT	3.1596	1.373	.170
	PSF	3.0680		
Job Content	GOVT	3.9184	5.746	.000
	PSF	3.5964		
Interpersonal Relationship	GOVT	4.0776	.039	.969
	PSF	4.0758		
Physical Working Conditions	GOVT	3.4471	-2.693	.007
	PSF	3.6119		

Overall, Job Satisfaction	GOVT	3.6623	1.970	.049
	PSF	3.5680		
Publication	GOVT	3.5344	15.473	.000
	PSF	2.8020		
Professional Development Activities	GOVT	3.1706	11.334	.000
	PSF	2.5999		
Academic Achievements	GOVT	3.3525	17.224	.000
	PSF	2.7010		
Intention to Stay Behavior	GOVT	4.1270	16.891	.000
	PSF	2.6245		

Overall HRDC, JS attributes of JC, PWC, and overall JS, all the attributes of AA and also Intention to stay behavior as $p < .05$. However, there is no significant variation between GOVT and PSF institutes in the JS attributions of monetary benefits and Interpersonal Relations (IPR) as $p > .05$. Therefore, the data analysis partially supports to Hypothesis 1 “Ownership is likely to be significantly influenced the attributes of HRDC, JS, and AA, and also Intention to Stay/Quit behavior”

Table 2 Relationship between HRDC, JS, AA and Intention to Stay/Quit Behavior

		HRDC	Overall JS	AA	Intention to stay/quit
HRDC	Pearson Correlation				
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N	972			
Overall JS	Pearson Correlation	.706**			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
	N	972	972		
AA	Pearson Correlation	.128**	.145**		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		
	N	972	972	972	
Intention to stay/quit	Pearson Correlation	.067*	.065*	.296**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.040	.043	.000	
	N	972	972	972	972
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); HRDC=Human Resource Development Climate; JS= Job Satisfaction					
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); AA= Academic Achievements					

Further, faculty members working in GOVT institutes have greater perception in all the HRDC attributes and thus the results strongly supports to hypothesis 2 “Faculty members in GOVT institute are likely to be greater HRDC than the PSF”. This result is contradiction with that of Purang (2006) where HRDC is greater in private sector than public sector undertaking and in consonance with researcher’s own studies of (Ravichandran and Garg, 2021; Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2021; and Ravichandran, 2021). Similarly, faculty members

working in GOVT institutes have greater JS level in the Job Content (JC) (mean value is 3.91 and 3.60 respectively in GOVT and PSF institutes) and overall JS (mean value is 3.66 and 3.57 in GOVT and PSF institutes respectively). Contrast to this faculty members working in PSF institutes have greater JS level than GOVT in Physical Working Conditions as mean value is 3.61 and 3.44 respectively and thus this data analysis partially supports to hypothesis 3 “faculty members in GOVT institutes are likely to be greater JS level than the PSF. Also, faculty members

in GOVT institutes have greater AA than PSF in all the attributes and therefore the data analysis strongly supports to hypothesis 4 “faculty members in GOVT institute are likely to be greater AA than the PSF”. Moreover, faculty members working in GOVT institutes have greater intention to stay behavior than PSF institutes as mean value is 4.12 in GOVT institute and 2.62 in PSF and the result strongly supports to hypothesis 5 “faculty members in GOVT institutes are likely to have greater intention to stay behavior than PSF institutes”.

Relationship between HRDC, JS, AA and Intention to Stay Behavior

There is clear indication from data analysis of Karl Pearson correlation (table 2) that the HRDC have strong and positive correlation with JS and AA at 1% level and intention to stay behavior at 5% level. Also, AA have strong and positive correlation with intention to stay behavior at 1% level. Further, there is positive and strong correlation between JS and AA at 1% level and between JS and intention to

stay at 5% level. Thus, hypothesis 6 “HRD climate is likely to be significant and positive relationship with JS, AA, and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior” is fully accepted. It seems that faculty members in government institutes have expressed low desire (intention) to quit than its counter part of the private institutes where faculty members expressed more intention to quit from the present institute. Existing research studies have suggested that HRD climate and JS are strongly associated with intention to stay/quit behavior (Lucas, Atwood, and Taunton, Kramptiz, and Woods, 1989; Hinghaw, Smetzer, and Atwood, 1987; Griffeth, 2000; and Robbins, 1979). The present study also provides evidence to support the past research.

Effect of HRDC on JS

Table 3 from multiple regression analysis shown that the HRDC has strong and positive impact on JS both jointly and independently as $p < .05$. Further, OPD factor of HRDC has Highest impact on the level of JS ($T = 8.427$) followed by HRF ($T = 7.149$),

Table 3 Effect of HRD Climate on Job Satisfaction

Model Summary					
Model I	R=.704 ^a	R ² =.496	Adjusted R ² = .494		
	Sum of square	Df.	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	165.032	5	33.006	185.423	.000b
Residual	167.504	941	.178		
Total	332.536	946			
Variables	Un standardized coefficient (β)	Std. error	Standardized coefficient (β)	T	Sig.
(Constant)	1.407	.077		18.252	.000
HRF	.174	.024	.204	7.149	.000
OPD	.227	.027	.321	8.427	.000
EMT	.070	.018	.119	3.954	.000
AUT	.106	.021	.152	5.023	.000
SFI	.052	.021	.077	2.428	.015

HRF= Fairness in HR systems; OPD= Opportunity for Professional Development; EMT= Empowerment; AUT=Autonomy; SFI=Scope for Innovation; JS= Overall Job Satisfaction

- b. Predictors: (Constant), HRF, OPD, EMT, AUT, SFI
- a. Dependent Variable: JS

AUT ($T = 5.023$), EMT ($T = 3.954$) and SFI ($T = 2.428$) and therefore hypothesis 7 “HRD Climate is likely to be significant and positive effect on the level of JS” fully accepted.

Table 3 Effect of HRD Climate on Academic Achievements

Model Summary					
Model I	R=.177 ^a	R ² =.031	Adjusted R ² =.026		
	Sum of square	Df.	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	8.054	5	1.611	6.095	.000b
Residual	249.215	943	.264		
Total	257.269	948			
Variables	Un standardized coefficient (β)	Std. error	Standardized coefficient (β)	T	Sig.
(Constant)	2.468	.094		26.310	.000
HRF	.004	.030	.005	.138	.890
OPD	.029	.033	.047	.894	.372
EMT	.064	.021	.124	2.966	.003
AUT	.050	.026	.083	1.968	.049
SFI	-.048	.026	-.081	-1.844	.065

HRF= Fairness in HR systems; OPD= Opportunity for Professional Development; EMT= Empowerment; AUT=Autonomy; SFI=Scope for Innovation; AA= Academic Achievements

b. Predictors: (Constant), HRF, OPD, EMT, AUT, SFI

a. Dependent Variable: AA

Effect of HRDC on AA

Table 4 clearly shows that HRDC has significant and positive impact on the level of Academic Achievements of faculty members jointly ($p < .05$) but not independently because the HRDC attributes of HRF, OPD and SFI have no significant and positive impact on the level of AA as $p > .05$. However, the HRDC attributes of EMT and AUT have significant and positive impact on the level of AA as $p < .05$ and also EMT has higher impact ($T = 2.966$) and it is followed by AUT ($T = 1.968$). It is, therefore, hypothesis 8 “HRD Climate is likely to be significant and positive effect on the level of AA” is partially accepted as all the HRDC attributes have not significant impact on the level of AA. The findings of this study is in consonance with the researcher’s earlier study Ravichandran and Garg (2021) and contradiction with that of Dadhabai and Mounika (2018).

Implications of the Study

The results from this study strongly support to theoretical aspect particularly Roa and Abraham, 1986 for measuring HRDC in different dimensions as perception of HRDC dimensions in this study are above moderate level. Similarly, the results also strongly support to theoretical aspect of JS to

Herzberg two factor theory i.e., hygiene factors such as Salary and Promotion, Interpersonal Relations and Physical working conditions as faculty members’ JS is above moderate level. Thus, this study is contributing and strengthening for well establishment of the above two theories. The other important theoretical implication from this study is measuring the Academic Achievements of faculty members. In the existing research literature, no research studies have measured the dimensions of academic achievements (i.e., performance of academic staff or faculty members) except researcher’s own studies (Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015; Ravichandran and Garg, 2021; and Ravichandran and Bharadwaj, 2021) though several research studies in the past have measured teaching performance of the academic staff/faculty members.

The findings from this research study also provide strong support to empirical aspects of “ownership influence on HRDC, JS, AA, and Intention to Stay/Quit behavior” for the proposed hypotheses and the impact of HRDC on its individual outcomes. Understanding the influence of ownership on HRDC and its outcomes of faculty members and the impact of HRDC on the level of JS, AA and intention to Stay/Quit behavior would enable the regulatory bodies for HEIs, policy makers and authorities of

educational institutions to formulate appropriate HR policies which would strengthen to be more HRDC, JS and higher performance level and more stability of competent faculty members. For example, as per the findings of this study faculty members in most private institutes generally consider HRD climate to be less positive, less satisfied in their job and more intention to quit from the present institution as compared to their counter parts of the government institutes. This intention to quit behavior is related with the actual turnover of faculty members in the private institutes i.e., about 30% of the total faculty members are leaving from the present institutes every year (Ravichandan and Venkat Raman, 2015). It is a major concern in the Indian higher educational sector particularly in private sector for attracting and retaining competent faculty. Higher rate of faculty attrition among academic staff would undermine the academic performance of the institute and intellectual creativity. However, minimum level attrition is inevitable and perhaps desirable but high rates of faculty attrition can be costly to the reputation of the institute and to the quality of instruction. The study also provides an understanding to the administrators on why faculty members join a particular institute, their expectations and aspirations as well as why they would leave or stay with the institute (Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015). Overall, this study provides a strong support to theoretical aspects and also empirical aspects for the proposed hypotheses.

Limitations of the Study

This study restricts to institutes imparting only engineering and management disciplines and not covered other professional disciplines like law, medicine, agriculture, etc. and thus the inferences from this study should be viewed in the context of only technical and management education (Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015). The present study also restricts only three select states as stated in earlier paragraph. Thus, generalization from these findings at national level and overall higher education in India needs to be kept in perspective (Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015 & 2021; Ravichandran and Dua, 2021 & 2022; Ravichandran and Bharadwaj, 2021 & 2022; and Ravichandran and Garg, 2021).

Acknowledgment

The author would like to acknowledge the research grant provided by University Grants Commission (UGC), India for the purpose of field work.

References

- Ahuja, Shobha. "Creating Corporate Advantage through HRD Vision." *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2002.
- Babu, T. Suresh. "A Study on HRD Climate and Its Impact of Job Performance in Medium Scale Engineering Industries in Coimbatore City." *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, vol. 5, no. 12, 2018.
- Babushe, Mulatu Takele, and K. Narendranath. "HRD Climate and Job Satisfaction in the Public Sector of Ethiopia: An Empirical Study in Amhara and Benishangul Gumuz Regions." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 13, no. 6, 2013, pp. 121-31.
- Baker, L., and J. Cantor. "Physician Satisfaction Under Managed Care." *Health Affairs*, vol. 12, 1993, pp. 252-70.
- Barnes, Laura, et al. "Effects of Job-Related Stress on Faculty Intention to Leave Academia." *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 39, 1998, pp. 457-69.
- Biswas, Soumendu, et al. "Examining the Role of HR Practices in Improving Individual Performance and Organizational Effectiveness." *Management and Labour Studies*, vol. 31, no. 2, 2006, pp. 111-33.
- Bluedorn, Allen C. "A Unified Model of Turnover from Organizations." *Human Relations*, vol. 35, no. 2, 1982, pp. 135-53.
- Caplow, Theodore, and Reece J. Mcgee. *The Academic Marketplace*. Basic Books, 1958.
- Carsten, Jeanne M., and Paul E. Spector. "Unemployment, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Turnover: A Meta Analytic Test of the Muchinsky Model." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 72, no. 3, 1987, pp. 374-81.
- Castillo, Jaime X., and Jamie Cano. "Factors Explaining Job Satisfaction among Faculty." *Journal of Agricultural Education*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2004, pp. 65-74.

- Chandrasekar, S. "HRD: Is the Spirit There?." *HRD News letter*, 1993.
- Cotton, John L., and Jeffrey M. Tuttle. "Employee Turnover: A Meta Analytic Review with Implications for Research." *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1986, pp. 55-70.
- Dadhabai, Sundari, and P. Mounika. "A Study on HRD Climate and its Impact on Employee Engagement in Andhra Bank." *International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology*, vol. 9, no. 5, 2018, pp. 692-702.
- Dalton, Dan R., and William D. Tudor. "Turnover Turned Over: An Expanded and Positive Perspective." *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1979, pp. 225-35.
- Delaney, John T., and Mark A. Huselid. "The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Perceptions of Organizational Performance." *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 39, no. 4, 1996, pp. 949-69.
- Flowers, Vincent S., and Charles L. Hughes. "Why Employees Stay." *Harvard Business Review*, 1973.
- Griffeth, Rodger W., et al. "A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Correlates of Employee Turnover: Update, Moderator Test, and Research Implications for the Next Millennium." *Journal of Management*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2000, pp. 463-88.
- Halder, Uday Kumar. *Human Resource Development*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Hassan, Arif, et al. "Human Resource Development Practices as Determinant of HRD Climate and Quality Orientation." *Journal of European Industrial Training*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2006, pp. 4-18.
- Hinshaw, A.S., et al. "Innovative Retention Strategies for Nursing Staff." *Journal of Nursing Administration*, vol. 17, no. 6, 1987, pp. 8-16.
- Hulin, C.L., et al. "Alternative Opportunities and Withdrawal Decisions: Empirical and Theoretical Discrepancies and an Integration." *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 97, no. 2, 1985, pp. 233-50.
- Johnsrud, Linda K., and Vicki J. Rosser. "Faculty Members' Morale and their Intentions to Leave: A Multilevel Explanation." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 2002.
- Kahn, Howard, and Ivan T. Robertson. "Training and Experience as Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Work Motivation when Using Computers: A Correlation Study." *Behavior and Information Technology*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1992, pp. 53-60.
- Katou, Anastasia, and Pawan Budhwar. "Human Resource Management Systems and Organizational Performance: Test of a Mediating Model in the Greek Manufacturing Context." *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 17, no. 7, 2006.
- Litwin, George H., and Robert A. Stringer. *Motivation and Organizational Climate*. Harvard Business School, 1968.
- Lucas, Mary D., et al. "Replication and Validation of Anticipated Turnover Model for Urban Registered Nurses." *Nursing Research*, vol. 42, no. 1, 1993, pp. 29-35.
- Malni, Vandna. "Job Commitment of Women Executives." *Management and Labor Studies*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2001, pp. 247-57.
- Manger, Terje, and Ole-Johan Eikeland. "Factors Predicting Staff's Intentions to Leave the University." *Higher Education*, vol. 19, no. 3, 1990, pp. 281-91.
- Matier, Michael W. "Retaining Faculty: A Tale of Two Campuses." *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1990, pp. 39-60.
- Mobley, William. "Some Unanswered Questions in Turnover and Withdrawal Research." *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1982, pp. 111-16.
- Mowday, R., et al. "The Psychology of the Withdrawal Process: A Cross Validation of Mobley's Inter-mediate Linkage Model of Turnover in Two samples." *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 27, 1984, pp. 79-94.
- Mufeed, S.A., and F.A. Gurkoo. "Enhancing Educational Institutions Effectiveness through HRD Climate: An Empirical Assessment." *Management and Change*, 2006.
- Mufeed, S.A. "The Need for a Focus on Key

- Elements of HRD Climate in Hospitals - An Empirical Study.” *Management and Labour Studies*, 2006.
- Nunnally, Jum, and Ira Bernstein. *Psychometric Theory*. McGraw-Hill, 1994.
- Panda, Tapan K. “Job Satisfaction of Dotcom Employees: an Indian Experiment.” *Management and Labor Studies*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2001, pp. 120-28.
- Pillai, Prakash R. “Influence of HRD Climate on the Learning Orientation of Bank Employees.” *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2008, pp. 406-18.
- Porter, Lyman W., and Richard M. Steers. “Organizational Work and Personal Factors in Employee Turnover and Absenteeism.” *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 80, no. 2, 1973, pp. 151-76.
- Purang, Pooja. “HRD Climate: A Comparative Analysis of Public, Private and Multinational Organizations.” *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 41, no. 3, 2006, pp. 407-16.
- Rao, T.V., and E. Abraham. “Human Resource Development Climate in Indian Organization.” *Recent Experiences in Human Resource Development*, Oxford & IBH Publishing, 1986, pp. 70-98.
- Rao, T.V. *HRD Audit: Evaluating the Human Resource Function for Business Improvement*. Sage Publication, 2007.
- Rao, T.V. *Readings in Human Resource Development*. Oxford and IBH Publishing, 1991.
- Ravichandran, A., and A. Venkat Raman. “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*, vol. 23, no. 7, 2021, pp. 36-45.
- Ravichandran, A., and P. Bhardwaj. “Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: A Study of General Higher Education in Tamil Nadu Province (India).” *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2022, pp. 25-41.
- Ravichandran, A., and P. Bhardwaj. “Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Performance of Academics: An Empirical Analysis of Public Institutions in Tamil Nadu Province (India).” *Primax International Journal of Management Research*, vol. 8, no. 4, 2021.
- Ravichandran, A., and V. Garg. “HRD Climate and Performance of Academic Employees: A Comparative Analysis of Public and Private Higher Educational Institutions.” *International Journal of Management, IT & Engineering*, vol. 11, no. 8, 2021, pp. 32-50.
- Ravichandran, A. *Human Resource Issues and Challenges in Higher Education: A Study on Professional Institutions in India*. University of Delhi, 2010.
- Ravichandran, A. “Impact of HRD Climate on Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Study of Liberal Arts and Science Colleges in Tamil Nadu Province (India).” *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 23, no. 8, 2021, pp. 18-27.
- Ravichandran, Appavoo, and A. Venkat Raman. *Human Resource Management: Issues Confronting Indian Higher Education*. Scholars’ Press, 2015.
- Rhodes, Susan R. “Age Related Differences in Work Attitudes and Behavior: A Review and Conceptual Analysis.” *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 93, no. 2, 1983, pp. 328-67.
- Rodrigues, Lewlyn L.R. “Industry-Institute Correlates of HRD Climate: Empirical Study based Implications.” *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2005, pp. 167-80.
- Rohmetra, Neelu. “Towards Creating a Learning Organization: The HRD Climate Focus.” *Paradigm: A Management Research Journal*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1998, pp. 56-63.
- Rosser, Vicki J. “Faculty Members’ Intentions to Leave: A National Study on their Worklife and Satisfaction.” *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2004, pp. 285-309.
- Sandberg, Jorgen. “Understanding Human Competence at Work: An Interpretive Approach.” *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2000, pp. 9-17.
- Sanderson, Allen, et al. *The American Faculty Poll*. National Opinion Research Center, 2000.

- Smart, John C. "A Casual Model of Faculty Turnover Intentions." *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 31, no. 5, 1990, pp. 405-24.
- Solkhe, Ajay, and Nirmala Chaudhary. "HRD Climate and Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Investigation." *International Journal of Computing and Business Research*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2011.
- Sorcinelli, Mary Deane, and Janet Near. "Relations between Work and Life away from Work among University Faculty." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 60, no. 1, 1989, pp. 59-81.
- Taguri, Renato, and George Litwin. *Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept*. Harvard University, 1968.
- Taunton, R.L., et al. "Manager Impact on Retention of Hospital Staff: Part 1." *Journal of Nursing Administration*, vol. 19, 1989, pp. 14-19.
- Venkat Raman, A. *A Structural and Behavioral Analysis for Human Resource Planning in Health Care Organization*. University of Delhi, 1998.
- Weiler, William C. "Why do Faculty Members Leave a University?" *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 23, no. 2, 1985, pp. 270-78.
- Zhou, Ying, and James Fredericks Volkwein. "Examining the Influences of Faculty Departure Intentions: A Comparison of Tenured versus Non-tenured Faculty at Research Universities using NSOPF-99." *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 45, 2004, pp. 139-76.

Author Details

Dr. A. Ravichandran, Associate Professor, Satyawati College (Evening), University of Delhi, New Delhi, India,
Email. Id: chandran.aravi2@gmail.com