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ABSTRACT

The purpose of education is to make an individual learn which leads to positive changes in a person. In order to sustain individual and societal improvement, education plays a major role. Education has become a must remedy for every country to help its existence and development economically. The future of the nation is in the hands of the youth and that future is determined by the education they receive today. Education is a stepping stone for a society’s advancement. In today’s technology driven world, the teachers carry the role of a parent, mentor, role model, and many more. The teachers are facing lots of challenges in making the students learn. Teachers are encouraged to really tune into how each individual student learns, and try to really challenge and inspire them to learn. The importance of teachers is something that cannot be understated. The study aimed at measuring the perception of school teachers on HRD climate, HRM Effectiveness and Organisational Effectiveness. Primary data is collected from 349 teachers working in government and private schools located in Coimbatore city. Focus should be given on improving the quality of teachers by providing appropriate training programmes.
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INTRODUCTION:

In an educational institution with a high extent of humanistic relationship, collegiality, and participation, the teaching effectiveness will be high, leading to a higher success of education. Schools are the stepping stones for higher education. So, schools need to focus persistently in providing healthy work environment for the teachers which is the need of the hour. It is necessary to identify teachers’ drives and needs and to channelise their behaviour to motivate them towards better performance.

HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT:

The human resource of an organisation must be best managed for its development and success. Human Resources Management has been defined as “the total knowledge, skill, creative abilities, talents, attitudes and beliefs of the individuals involved”. (Magginison Leon C, 1977). Thus, Human Resource Management is a long-term perspective and a development function. Climate is the atmosphere in which individuals help, judge, reward, constrain and find out about each other. It influences morale and the attitudes of the individual toward his work and his environment.

HRD CLIMATE:

HRD Climate contributes to the organisations’ overall health and self-renewing capabilities which in turn, increase
the enabling capabilities of individual, dyads, team and the entire organisation.

HRD Climate is the perception that the employee can have on the development environment of an organisation (Rao and Abraham, 1986).

The elements of HRD Climate can be grouped into three broad categories – General Climate, OCTAPAC Culture and HRD Mechanisms. The general climate items deal with the importance given to human resources development in general by the top management and line managers. The OCTAPAC items deal with the extent to which Openness, Confrontation, Trust, Autonomy, Proactivity, Authenticity and Collaboration are valued and promoted in the organisation. The items dealing with HRD Mechanisms measure the extent to which HRD Mechanisms are implemented seriously.

**SCOPE OF THE STUDY:**

The outcome of the research will enable the government, policy makers, teachers, administrators, researchers and educationists to understand the existing working culture of teachers at schools and will help to identify the areas of improvement.

**RESEARCH GAP:**

The detailed review of literature reveals that most of the empirical studies were done to study the Human Resource Development (HRD) Climate at schools and very limited studies pertaining to schools in India were done. The present study aims to bridge that gap found in the literature.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:**

To study the perception of school teachers on Human Resource Development Climate prevailing in Private, Government, Government aided and Corporation higher secondary schools in Coimbatore city.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:**

1. Some of the respondents were reluctant to answer the questionnaire and there is a chance of personal bias.
2. The sample size was restricted to 349 teachers working in 43 higher secondary schools comprising of corporation, government aided, government and private higher secondary schools located in coimbatore city.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE:**

Arif Hassan et al., (2006) conducted a study to measure employees’ perception of human resource development practices as determinant of HRD Climate and quality orientation and found that large inter-organisational differences exists in HRD practices. Karunesh Saxena and Pankaj Tiwari (2009) made an attempt to find out the type of HRD Climate that is prevailing in public sector banks in Ahmedabad and found that the HRD climate in public sector banks was average and the perception of employees regarding the HRD Climate did not differ significantly on the basis of gender, qualification and designation but it differs significantly on the basis of age. Huang and Fraser (2009) using work pressure as school environment variable, observed that male science teachers perceive lower work pressure than their female counterparts. More female science teachers felt constant pressure to work long hours to complete their work resulting in higher work pressure than males. Gupta and Malhotra (2012) carried out HRD Climate survey in 13 selected different information technology organisations and found most of the employees are highly satisfied with the prevailing human resource development practices, policies and climate in different organisations. Anitha Thomas and Avijan Dutta (2013) studied the relationship between types of OCTAPACE and psychological contract in hotel industry. Full-time employee working for the hotel were the respondents. The results showed that the perceived organisational support and psychological contract fulfilment are important factors that shape the quality of work values.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:**

**Sources of Data:**

The present study had used both primary and secondary data. The primary data were collected from the respondents by administering a well structured questionnaire personally. The secondary data were collected from the Tamilnadu government’s official websites and its publications, research publications and books relevant to the study.
Population and Sample Description:
The higher secondary school teachers were identified to be the primary respondents for the study. Out of the total population frame of 6001 teachers in 138 schools (Government/ Aided/Corporation/Private) across North/South/West/East/Central zones, 43 schools were selected based on few criteria as follows: schools which had been established and running for a minimum of 3 years, with higher secondary sections, with at least 25 numbers of teachers and with a minimum student strength of 200 were only considered for the study. Stratified proportionate random sampling method was adopted to select the respondents from each type of schools. Out of 1099 teachers in 43 schools, 419 questionnaires were administered and 349 responses were taken for the study.

Measuring Instrument:
A structured questionnaire was used to study the perception of school teachers on Human Resource Development Climate and factors influencing it. The HRD Climate survey developed by Rao and Abraham at Centre for HRD Xavier Labour Relations Institute (XLRI, India) was used in the study. The demographic portion of the instrument was developed by the researcher to sort out the demographic information. A pilot study was done to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:

Table 1: Classification of respondents based on demographic characteristics

| Demographic Variables       | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Age of the teacher          |           |            |
| Below 30                    | 53        | 15.2       |
| 31-40                       | 120       | 34.4       |
| 41-50                       | 118       | 33.8       |
| Above 50                    | 58        | 16.6       |
| **Total**                   | 349       | 100.0      |
| Gender of the teacher       |           |            |
| Male                        | 45        | 12.9       |
| Female                      | 304       | 87.1       |
| **Total**                   | 349       | 100.0      |
| Educational Qualification of Teachers | | |
| UG                           | 41        | 11.8       |
| PG                           | 35        | 10.0       |
| UG, Bed                     | 65        | 18.6       |
| PG,Bed,M.Phil               | 190       | 54.4       |
| Others                      | 18        | 5.2        |
| **Total**                   | 349       | 100.0      |
| Experience of the teacher   |           |            |
| Below 5 years               | 58        | 16.6       |
| 5-10 years                  | 103       | 29.5       |
| 11-15 years                 | 52        | 14.9       |
| 16-20 years                 | 70        | 20.1       |
| 21-25 years                 | 44        | 12.6       |
| Above 25 years              | 22        | 6.3        |
| **Total**                   | 349       | 100.0      |
| Monthly Income of the Teacher |         |            |
| Below 5000                  | 15        | 4.2        |
| 5001-10000                  | 111       | 31.8       |
| 10001-15000                 | 68        | 19.5       |
| 15001-20000                 | 18        | 5.2        |
| Above 20000                 | 137       | 39.3       |
| **Total**                   | 349       | 100.0      |
OVERALL PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL TEACHERS ON HRD CLIMATE:

FACTORS:

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation of HRD Climate factors

| HRD Climate variables       | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. deviation |
|-----------------------------|----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| General climate             | 349| 1.84    | 5.00    | 4.2515| .64298         |
| Openness                    | 349| 1.50    | 5.00    | 4.0086| .79370         |
| Collaboration               | 349| 2.00    | 5.00    | 4.2913| .76740         |
| Trust                       | 349| 1.67    | 5.00    | 4.0745| .85407         |
| Authenticity                | 349| 1.67    | 5.00    | 4.3849| .62913         |
| Proactivity                 | 349| 1.00    | 5.00    | 4.3582| .87466         |
| Autonomy                    | 349| 1.00    | 5.00    | 4.1060| .92705         |
| Confrontation               | 349| 2.00    | 5.00    | 4.2092| .80271         |
| Overall octapac culture     | 349| 1.93    | 5.00    | 4.2047| .63194         |
| HRD Mechanism               | 349| 2.08    | 5.00    | 4.2127| .65711         |
| HRD Climate=gen,oct,hrd     | 349| 2.17    | 5.00    | 4.2108| .61207         |

General Climate:
Teacher’s perception towards general climate of the schools under HRD climate was 4.2515 which denoted that most of the teachers were working in a good climate. The factors upon which the teachers hold a less favourable opinion were revision of job description which was not done periodically, less interest shown by senior teachers towards the learning process) and development of colleagues or junior teachers teachers were little reluctant to place their problems before the management and juniors teachers were of the opinion that the seniors played a less role in motivating them.

OCTAPAC Culture:
It was observed from the above table that the mean score of openness was found to be 4.0086 which indicates that high degree of openness was present in schools as teachers feel free to discuss their problems with each other. The mean score of collaboration was 4.29. Collaboration was there among the teachers in accepting interdependencies, to be helpful to each other and work as teams. During occasions like school annual day celebrations, Children’s Day celebrations, preparing students for competitions, teachers worked as teams. It was found that the mean score of Trust was 4.07. The teachers were of the opinion that an atmosphere of friendship and trust coexisted at schools. The mean score of Authenticity was 4.38. Teachers were genuinely interested to learn from training programmes and they were given sufficient opportunities to try out new thoughts and strategies learnt during the training programmes. The mean score of Proactivity was 4.35. The school management are interested to identify the capability of teachers in advance and entrust them with tasks matching their skill set. The mean score of Autonomy was 4.10 and it showed that teachers were given freedom to work independently with responsibility. Confrontation is bringing out problems and issues into the open with a view to solving them rather than hiding them for fear of hurting or getting hurt (T.V. Rao). It was observed from the above table that the majority of the teachers agreed that they got an opportunity to discuss their drawbacks or incompetence in teaching and even arrived at a solution.

HRD Mechanism:
The mean score of HRD mechanism stood at 4.21 that favour healthy HRM practices.

HRD Climate:
The mean score of HRD Climate was found to be 4.2108. It denoted that good HRD Climate was prevailing in the schools.
Table 3: Test of significant difference in the perception of corporation, government aided, government and private school teachers on Human Resource Development Climate

| Variables          | Sum of squares | Mean squares | F       | Sig     |
|--------------------|----------------|--------------|---------|---------|
|                    | Between groups | Within groups | Total   | Between groups | Within groups | Total   | Between groups | Within groups | Total   |
| General climate    | 2.297          | 141.576      | 143.873 | 3        | 345       | 348     | .766          | .410          | 1.866   | .135    |
| Openness           | 2.253          | 216.972      | 219.224 | 3        | 345       | 348     | .751          | .629          | 1.194   | .312    |
| Collaboration      | 1.138          | 203.801      | 204.939 | 3        | 345       | 348     | .379          | .591          | .642    | .588    |
| Trust              | 8.425          | 245.416      | 253.841 | 3        | 345       | 348     | 2.808         | .711          | 3.948   | .009    |
| Authenticity       | .931           | 136.808      | 137.738 | 3        | 345       | 348     | .310          | .397          | .782    | .504    |
| Proactivity        | .343           | 265.886      | 266.229 | 3        | 345       | 348     | .114          | .771          | .148    | .931    |
| Autonomy           | 2.342          | 296.736      | 299.077 | 3        | 345       | 348     | .781          | .860          | .908    | .438    |
| Confrontation      | .783           | 223.448      | 224.231 | 3        | 345       | 348     | .261          | .648          | .403    | .751    |
| HRD Mechanism      | 2.351          | 147.914      | 150.265 | 3        | 345       | 348     | .784          | .429          | 1.828   | .142    |
| Climate=gen,oct,hrd| .983           | 129.389      | 130.371 | 3        | 345       | 348     | .328          | .375          | .874    | .455    |

Null Hypothesis Ho1: No significant difference exists in the perception of school teachers on HRD Climate across corporation, government aided, government and private higher secondary schools.

The significant value for the perception of teachers across schools on HRD Climate was greater than 0.05 (5% level of significance) hence, the null hypothesis Ho1 was accepted for this variable.

Table 4: Test of significant difference in the perception of male and female teachers across schools

| Variables          | Mean | Std. deviation | F       | Sig.     |
|--------------------|------|----------------|---------|----------|
|                    | Male | Female         | Total   | Within groups | Between groups | Total   | Between groups | Within groups | Result |        |
| General climate    | 4.1228 | 4.2706 | 4.2515 | 0.62668 | 0.64418 | 0.64298 | 2.077 | 0.15 | NS |
| Openness           | 3.7056 | 4.0535 | 4.0086 | 0.81584 | 0.78179 | 0.7937 | 7.676 | 0.006 | * |
| Collaboration      | 3.9926 | 4.3355 | 4.2913 | 0.7961 | 0.7544 | 0.7674 | 7.985 | 0.005 | * |
| Trust              | 3.963 | 4.091 | 4.0745 | 0.75953 | 0.8671 | 0.85407 | 0.881 | 0.349 | NS |
| Authenticity       | 4.1185 | 4.4243 | 4.3849 | 0.69324 | 0.61049 | 0.62913 | 9.488 | 0.002 | * |
| Proactivity        | 4.2889 | 4.3684 | 4.3582 | 0.84267 | 0.88018 | 0.87466 | 0.323 | 0.57 | NS |
| Autonomy           | 3.8444 | 4.1447 | 4.106 | 0.8779 | 0.92923 | 0.92705 | 4.15 | 0.042 | * |
| Confrontation      | 3.9889 | 4.2418 | 4.2092 | 0.84267 | 0.79287 | 0.80271 | 3.923 | 0.048 | * |
| HRD mechanism      | 4.1248 | 4.2257 | 4.2127 | 0.58704 | 0.66675 | 0.65711 | 0.924 | 0.337 | NS |
| Climate=gen,oct,hrd| 4.0166 | 4.2395 | 4.2108 | 0.60885 | 0.60828 | 0.61207 | 5.262 | 0.022 | * |

Ho2: No significant difference exists in the perception of male and female teachers on HRD Climate across schools.

The significant value was less than 0.05 (5% level of significance), hence the null hypothesis (Ho2) was rejected for HRD Climate. The difference in the perception across gender from various schools was mainly caused by variables such as collaboration, authenticity, autonomy and confrontation.
null qualification were more than 0.05 (5% level of significance), hence the null hypothesis (Ho3) was accepted for all the parameters.

| Climate-gen. mechanism | Confrontation | Autonomy | Proactivity | Authenticity | Trust | Collaboration | Openness | General Climate |
|------------------------|---------------|----------|-------------|--------------|-------|---------------|----------|-----------------|
| DTE                    | 4.232         | 4.182    | 4.048       | 4.390        | 4.504 | 3.943         | 4.406    | 4.042           |
| UG                     | 4.259         | 4.214    | 4.285       | 4.371        | 4.428 | 4.123         | 4.361    | 4.395           |
| PG                     | 4.234         | 4.207    | 4.046       | 4.461        | 4.430 | 4.005         | 4.282    | 4.069           |
| PG BEd MPhil           | 4.196         | 4.205    | 4.089       | 4.321        | 4.331 | 4.142         | 4.277    | 4.021           |
| PG MPhil Med           | 3.952         | 3.861    | 4.3        | 4            | 4.4   | 3.6           | 3.733    | 3.65            |
| PG MPhil               | 4.267         | 4.294    | 4.083       | 4.666        | 4.388 | 4.055         | 4.277    | 4.140           |
| PhD                    | 4.09          | 4.23     | 4           | 4            | 4     | 4.33          | 3.75     | 4.578           |
| UG DTM                 | 4.395         | 4.538    | 4.5         | 5            | 5     | 4.666         | 3.333    | 3.375           |
| Other                  | 4.285         | 4.423    | 4.75        | 4.5          | 4     | 4.833         | 3.666    | 4.174           |
| Total                  | 4.210         | 4.212    | 4.209       | 4.106        | 4.358 | 4.384         | 4.074    | 4.291           |
| Mean                   | 0.3846        | 0.3263   | 0.7071      | 0            | 0     | 1.1785        | 0.7071   | 0.2357          |
| Std. Deviation         | 0.6779        | 0.7704   | 0.8422      | 1.2237       | 1.0217| 0.5682        | 0.9395   | 0.7284          |
|                       | 0.5625        | 0.5830   | 0.6782      | 0.7100       | 0.9102| 0.6134        | 0.7005   | 0.6536          |
|                       | 0.6713        | 0.5823   | 0.8426      | 1.0522       | 0.8674| 0.6366        | 1.0077   | 0.8212          |
|                       | 0.6038        | 0.6769   | 0.8261      | 0.8590       | 0.8526| 0.6483        | 0.8145   | 0.7836          |
|                       | 0.4799        | 0.7757   | 0.5700      | 0.7071       | 1.2247| 0.4346        | 0.6411   | 0.9249          |
|                       | 0.5037        | 0.6443   | 0.6645      | 0.5164       | 0.5477| 0.6469        | 0.7123   | 0.6116          |
|                       | 0.2753        | 0.2175   | 0.7071      | 0            | 0     | 0.4714        | 1.4142   | 0.2357          |
|                       | 0.0701        | 0.0543   | 0.3535      | 0.7071       | 0     | 0.2357        | 0.4714   | 0.4714          |
|                       | 0.6120        | 0.6571   | 0.8027      | 0.9270       | 0.8746| 0.6291        | 0.8540   | 0.7674          |
|                       | 0.305         | 0.51     | 0.192       | 1.016        | 0.463 | 0.592         | 0.688    | 0.813           |
|                       | 0.973         | 0.867    | 0.995       | 0.426        | 0.899 | 0.804         | 0.719    | 0.604           |

Table 5: Test of significant difference in the perception of teachers with varied educational qualification across schools.
### Table 6: Test of significant difference in the perception of school teachers with varied income levels across schools

| Variables               | Mean Below 5000 | Mean 5000-10000 | Mean 10000-15000 | Mean 15000-20000 | Mean &above | Std. deviation Below 5000 | Std. deviation 5000-10000 | Std. deviation 10000-15000 | Std. deviation 15000-20000 | Std. deviation &above | Total Between Groups | Total Between Groups |
|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| General climate         | 4.4947          | 4.2537           | 4.1517            | 4.3099           | 4.2651      | 4.2515                   | 0.511214                 | 0.61678                   | 0.63155                 | 0.56769             | 0.68687           | 0.64298           |
| Openness                | 4.25            | 3.973            | 3.918             | 3.8194           | 4.0839      | 4.0086                   | 0.44066                  | 0.84433                   | 0.83617                 | 0.70087             | 0.72335           | 0.7937           |
| Collaboration           | 4.7333          | 4.3033           | 4.1373            | 4.4444           | 4.2913      | 4.2913                   | 0.91039                  | 0.84433                   | 0.70087                 | 0.72335           | 0.7937           | 0.7937           |
| Trust                   | 4.0444          | 4.1081           | 4.0049            | 3.8898           | 4.0438      | 4.0745                   | 0.99096                  | 0.80298                   | 0.66592                 | 0.68687           | 0.64298           | 0.64298           |
| Authenticity            | 4.7333          | 4.3784           | 4.2941            | 4.4444           | 4.0745      | 4.2913                   | 0.44066                  | 0.84433                   | 0.70087                 | 0.72335           | 0.7937           | 0.7937           |
| Proactivity             | 4.6             | 4.2793           | 4.2206            | 4.4453           | 4.0438      | 4.2913                   | 0.44066                  | 0.84433                   | 0.70087                 | 0.72335           | 0.7937           | 0.7937           |
| Autonomy                | 4.47            | 4.1712           | 4.2206            | 4.2941           | 4.0438      | 4.2913                   | 0.44066                  | 0.84433                   | 0.70087                 | 0.72335           | 0.7937           | 0.7937           |
| Confrontation           | 4.4             | 4.0124           | 4.0588            | 4.4453           | 4.0438      | 4.2913                   | 0.44066                  | 0.84433                   | 0.70087                 | 0.72335           | 0.7937           | 0.7937           |
| HRD mechanism           | 4.4154          | 4.2134           | 4.2824            | 4.3843           | 4.0438      | 4.2913                   | 0.44066                  | 0.84433                   | 0.70087                 | 0.72335           | 0.7937           | 0.7937           |
| Climate=gen, oct, hrd   | 4.4154          | 4.2134           | 4.2824            | 4.3843           | 4.0438      | 4.2913                   | 0.44066                  | 0.84433                   | 0.70087                 | 0.72335           | 0.7937           | 0.7937           |

**Ho4:** No significant difference exists in the perception of teachers with varied income levels on HRD Climate across schools.
The significant values for the perception of school teachers with varied income levels were more than 0.05 (5% level of significance), hence the null hypothesis (Ho4) was accepted for all the parameters of HRD Climate.

Table 7: Test of significant difference in the perception of school teachers with varied years of experience across schools

| Variables               | Mean | Std.deviation | F    | Sig. |
|-------------------------|------|---------------|------|------|
| General climate         |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.39 | 4.33          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.29 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Openness                |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.41 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.39 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Collaboration           |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.41 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.39 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Trust                   |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.41 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.39 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Authenticity            |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.41 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.39 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Proactivity             |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.41 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.39 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Autonomy                |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.41 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.39 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Confrontation           |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.41 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.39 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| HRD mechanism           |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.41 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.39 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Climate=gen,o ct,hrd    |      |               |      |      |
| Below 5 years           | 4.41 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 5-10 years              | 4.39 | 4.04          |      |      |
| 10-15 years             | 4.45 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 15-20 years             | 4.31 | 4.03          |      |      |
| 20-25 years             | 4.48 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Above 25 years          | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
| Total                   | 4.41 | 4.03          |      |      |
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**Ho5:** No significant difference exists in the perception of teachers with varied years of experience on HRD Climate across schools. The significant values for the perception of school teachers with varied years of experience were more than 0.05 (5% level of significance), hence the null hypothesis (Ho5) was accepted for the parameters HRD Climate and Organisational Effectiveness.

**FACTOR ANALYSIS:**
Factor analysis is a multivariate technique also known as data reduction. It can be used in situations where large number of variables affecting a particular situation is studied. The results of the factor analysis are summarized as follows.

**Table 8: Correlation of Latent Variables - 1st Order**

|                       | General climate | OCTAPAC culture | HRD mechanism |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| General climate       | 1.000           |                 |              |
| OCTAPAC culture       | 0.667           | 1.000           |              |
| HRD mechanism         | 0.482           | 0.725           | 1.000        |

The above table shows that in first order, General Climate, HRD Mechanism, and OCTAPAC Culture were highly influencing HRD Climate.

**Table 9: Standardized Regression Weights**

|                     | Estimate |
|---------------------|----------|
| HRD climate         | --- General climate .121 |
| HRD climate         | --- HRD mechanism .124 |
| HRD climate         | --- OCTAPAC culture .795 |

79.5% of the variation in HRD Climate was explained by OCTAPAC, 12.4% of the variation in HRD Climate was explained by HRD mechanism and 12.1% of the variation in HRD Climate was explained by General Climate prevailing at schools.

**Table 10: Covariances**

|         | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P       | Label            |
|---------|----------|------|------|---------|------------------|
| Gencli  | Hrdmech  | .306 | .028 | 10.956  | p<0.001 Highly Significant |
| Gencli  | Octapac  | .328 | .028 | 11.706  | p<0.001 Highly Significant |
| Hrdmech | Octapac  | .338 | .029 | 11.752  | p<0.001 Highly Significant |

**Table 11: Correlations**

|        | Estimate |
|--------|----------|
| Gencli | hrdmech  | .726 |
| Gencli | octapac  | .806 |
| Hrdmech| octapac  | .811 |

From table 10 and table 11, it was observed that Bi directional relations (correlation and covariance) were established between the general climate, OCTAPAC culture and HRD mechanism. All correlation values were positive and stronger since they were greater than 0.7.

**FINDINGS:**
It was inferred that the perception of school teachers towards the general climate at schools is good. The general climate was perceived to be very good for corporation schools, followed by aided schools, private schools and
least for government schools. The overall OCTAPAC Culture prevailing in schools was good. The OCTAPAC Culture was perceived to be very good for corporation schools, followed by private schools and aided schools and least for government schools. Teachers had a very high and a favourable perception on HRM practices at schools. The HRM practices perceived to be very good for aided schools, followed by corporation schools and private schools and least for government schools.

The results indicated that no significant difference existed in the perception of teachers across schools on HRD Climate.

SUGGESTIONS:

In case of General Climate, Training programmes, Yoga classes for teachers, create situations to work with senior teachers as an opportunity for learning are few programmes that could be implemented to develop teachers’ performance in all types of schools. Developing team spirit, decent compensation packages and clear cut career development path for teachers can be used to improve OCTAPAC Culture. HRD Mechanism component needs to be given more attention by the top management of the schools with respect to the variables such as reward and appreciation and more importantly by providing feedback with focus on learning in all types of schools.

CONCLUSION:

The school administrators should create an environment of openness by giving enough opportunities to its employees to express their views, ideas and suggestions without fear. Professional interaction and socialising should be encouraged so that they can work together happily and enthusiastically. Teachers should accept ownership and responsibility for tasks so that it would not be necessary for the principal to exercise control over every task performed by them. For instilling good HRD Climate within schools, measures must be taken to enhance the climate of the schools by focusing on the goals, adequate communication, optimal use of available resources, higher level of cohesiveness, high morale, innovativeness, autonomy, high adaptations and problem-solving adequacy. With these criteria, good HRD Climate will definitely lead to high effectiveness.
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