

ROURKELA STEEL PLANT'S HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT CLIMATE: A STUDY

Prof. (Dr.) Smruti Ranjan Rath, Srikanta Mohapatra

Dean - Commerce & Management, AISECT University, Hazaribag, Jharkhand

Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, AISECT University, Hazaribag,
Jharkhand

ABSTRACT

The public sector in India today finds itself facing competition in an increasingly volatile environment, brought by globalization as well as by liberalization of the domestic market. To stay in the competition, steel producers like Steel Authority of India Limited have to develop new competencies among employees like their strong counterparts. Given the opportunities and by providing the right type of climate in the organization, the employees can be helped to give full contribution to their potentials, to achieve the goals of the organization, and thereby ensuring optimization of human resources. Thus, an optimal level of HRD Climate is essential for facilitating HRD at major manufacturing units of the organization like Rourkela Steel Plant. The study is aimed at assessing the extent of developmental climate prevailing, through identifying and measuring the perceived organizational culture and its various dimensions. 644 responses to the five-point scale 38-item questionnaire developed by T.V. Rao and E. Abraham were obtained from the plant and in addition to this, only the executives among them were asked to give responses to the four-point scale questionnaire based on the OCTAPACE profile developed by Udai Pareek. The findings of the study helped to identify the weaker aspects of culture in terms of values and beliefs that prevail in the organization. On the basis of these diagnoses the management can take the opportunity to work upon the identified weaker aspects and develop better organizational culture.

KEY WORDS: Human Resource Development Climate, Organizational Culture, OCTAPACE Culture

INTRODUCTION

HRD means building three Cs- Capabilities, Commitment and Culture. Capability building requires developing the knowledge and skills of the person. Capability has to be supported by commitment which comes through desire to excel, positive attitude towards work, co-operation, involvement and concern for one's own self and society. Another important factor of HRD is building culture. Culture is a way of life. It involves creating an awareness of what is ideal and desirable. Today most of the larger public and private sector organizations in India are using the techniques and approaches of HRD to develop their workforce for the attainment of organizational goals along with individual satisfaction and growth.

Organizations are not static systems but keep evolving and developing forced by the ever changing environment and stemmed by their own needs. These dynamic efforts ensure the

success and survival of the organizations in turbulent environments. Over the years of functioning, the impact of various leaders and the environmental adjustments would have forced every organization to develop certain psychological characteristics relating to its internal work environment. These characteristics or traits of the organization are called its culture.

The culture of the organization determines what the organization ought to be and look like, how it should deal with its external and internal environment, how to manage and integrate its internal subsystems and their inter-relationship and what kind of an image it should project to the external environment. Cultural elements and their relationship create a pattern that is distinct to an organization. Different names are coined by theorists to specify a particular pattern of culture in an organization. Now, one of the challenges for HRD specialists is to ensure the development and management of an appropriate HRD climate since the HRD culture facilitates effective implementation of HR systems.

Literature Review

A review of literature in area of 'HRD Climate' reveals that it has emerged as crucial factor for competitive advantage in current business scenario. Nadler (1969) in his study on HRD at different organizations of the United States has linked HRD to three activities, namely – training, education and development and emphasized the need for designing a series of activities to produce behavioral change with specified frame. In this context, Deal & Kennedy (1982) and Peter & Waterman (1982) suggest that organizational culture can influence performance and commitment in an organization and a high degree of organization performance is related to a strong culture that is a culture with well integrated and effective set of values, belief and behaviors. Also the investigations of Guzley (1992) on employees of a large service organization in the south-west of the USA proved that an individual's organizational commitment is related positively to perception of organizational climate and of communication climate, as the results were in favor of hypotheses undertaken in the study. It has also been established in Helena et.al. (2003) investigation to find out how the perceived organizational climate of a work place was related to symptoms both of the organization and the employees and how these factors varied according to socio-demographic and work-related characteristics, it was found that part of the impact of the organizational climate on sickness absence was not caused by an increase in work-related symptoms. Even organizational climate seems to correspond not only with organizational practices and leadership but also with the occupational health. The organizational climate is used as research tool and it attempts to reduce the work-related, ill-health and sickness absenteeism. HRD climate has emerged as the key differentiator in sustaining growth and to counter competition.

However, from the literature survey it can be seen that limited studies on HRD climate has been carried out related to public sector units, particularly the steel industry. Pestonjee and Desai (1993) proved the relationship between the factors of learned helplessness and organizational roles stress with motivational climate of the organization. The sample comprised 220 respondents belonging to the middle management of 5 units of engineering industry located in western India. Results revealed that the climate of the organization is related to trust among the members, affect the learned helplessness and pressurize the executives. Management of

reward was the other dimension of organizational climate which had a significant bearing on the dependent variable of learned helplessness and organizational roles stress. Organizational and HRD climate of one of the largest engineering and manufacturing enterprise in India (BHEL) was surveyed by Krishna and Rao (1997). The study revealed that the middle and senior rank managers favored and promoted an environment of openness but were silent on the point of autonomy. In addition to the above result, the authors found that value by experimentation was responded favorable by middle and senior managers. Mangaraj (1999) in her study of the HRD system in the Rourkela Steel Plant has found that the employees' opportunities to express their view-points are quite successful. Any private sector or multinational company coming up in the steel business or related industries target at the experienced professionals of steel PSUs in order to meet their requirements. In such a situation, seemingly disadvantageous and vulnerable to steel PSUs, a need is felt to have a deep insight in-to the issues and challenges faced by these companies in HRD climate.

To conclude, in current business scenario, creating and managing an effective HRD climate has become far more challenging than in the past, requiring new approaches on part of the organization.

Need of the Study

The public sector in India today finds itself facing competition in an increasingly volatile environment, brought by globalization as well as by liberalization of the domestic market. Many private players including steel majors like POSCO and Vedanta Resources have entered India keeping in mind the availability of resources in this geography and the potential of the market in the region. The public sector steel plant at Rourkela, too, is faced with the challenges of the new liberalized global economic environment and it has to ensure a congenial HRD climate to grow by creating a competitive advantage over others and achieve its ultimate business goal. This study is an attempt at understanding the HRD Climate in Rourkela Steel Plant. It makes a sincere effort to gauge the employees' perception on the core aspects of HRD Climate i.e. 1) General Supportive Climate, 2) Functioning of HRD Mechanisms and 3) HRD Cultural Dimensions and OCTAPACE Culture.

Research Objectives

The main objectives of the study are:

1. To assess the organizational climate of the company, especially OCTAPACE culture.
2. To assess the existence of functioning of HRD mechanism.
3. To review HRD mechanisms of sub-system for internationalization of HRD Culture.
4. To asses general view of employees regarding top management commitment for development of it employees.
5. To make comparative study among major groups like, Production, maintenance of service with regards to functioning of HRD mechanism, management concern for employee development of employee view towards HR development in their area of working.

Apart from these specific objectives, one important object of this study is to create a learning environment in the organization. Learning environment implies the following characteristics.

1. A motivation environment.
2. Where employees enjoy their work, feel happy to contribute to the satisfaction for organization.
3. Where collaboration and team-spirit characterize the culture.
4. Where problems are discussed openly.

METHODS

Full time employees belonging to Rourkela Steel Plant constituted the respondents of the study. The present study being a problem identification research, a sample size of 650 was targeted and finally a sample size of 644 was achieved. The technique of quota sampling was employed to ensure a representative cross section of the respondents. During the sample design some of the control categories/characteristics (based on the nature of population) were developed/ identified like work groups, hierarchical levels, age, length of service and function and the quotas were assigned so that the proportion of the sample elements possessing the control characteristics will be the same as the proportion of population elements with these characteristics.

The 38-item instrument of HRD climate survey (as developed by T. V. Rao and E. Abraham) is used for assessing the HRD climate of the company and the 40-item instrument of OCTAPACE profile (as developed by Udai Pareek) is used for assessing how much the organization's ethos on eight values

i.e. openness, confrontation, trust, autonomy, pro-activity, authenticity, collaboration and experimentation are valued and promoted in the organization. Broadly two different types (based on their nature) of hypotheses are taken in the present study to identify the differences in the sample statistics. First, it has been assumed that there are no significant differences between the item-wise mean values and the respective parameter mean values. Second, it has been assumed that there are no significant differences between the group means (i.e. work group wise, hierarchical level wise, age wise, tenure of service wise and function wise) and also in comparison to the all level means. MS Excel has been used to compute the values and compare it with the critical values of the standard normal variate Z. In order to test the reliability and consistency the Cronbach's Alpha which is the most common form of internal consistency reliability coefficient was planned to implement and Minitab 15 has been used for this purpose.

Determining the Sample Size

The sample size refers to the number of elements to be included in the study. The following table gives an idea about the sample sizes used in research studies.

Table- 2. 1: Sample Sizes Used in Research Studies

Type of Study	Minimum Size
Problem identification research	500
Problem solving research	200
Source: Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation by Naresh K. Malhotra, Fourth Edition, Pearson Press	

Keeping in view the following factors;

1. The importance of decisions
2. The nature of the research (i.e. Problem identification research)
3. The number of variables
4. The nature of analysis
5. Sample sizes used in similar studies (i.e. RSP and Bokaro Steel Plant)
6. Resource constraints

A sample size of 650 had been planned for the present study. The sample sizes in each category were decided on the basis of their proportional strengths in the aggregate population. In order to study individuals and group scores, it has been ensured that more than 30 respondents were covered in each group.

Research Hypothesis

Based on extant literature and objectives of the study, eleven null hypotheses (H01 to H11) were formed. As segmentation (grouping) based on categories/levels is an important attribute for HRD climate, hence the hypothesis was developed to measure the overall difference in perception of various categories of employees on various dimensions of HRD climate. Broadly two different types of hypotheses (based on their nature) are taken in the present study to identify the differences in the sample statistics. First, it has been assumed that there are no significant differences between the item-wise mean values and the respective parameter mean values. Second, it has been assumed that there are no significant differences between the group means (i.e. work group wise, hierarchical level wise, age wise, tenure of service wise and function wise) and also in comparison to the all level means. The null hypotheses considered for the study are listed below:

H01: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between item-wise mean values and parameter wise scores.

H02: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between different work groups.

H03: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between any work group and all level scores.

H04: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP

between different hierarchical levels.

H05: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between any hierarchical level and all level scores.

H06: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between different age groups.

H07: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between any age group and all level scores.

H08: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between different lengths of services.

H09: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between any length of service and all level scores.

H10: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between different functional groups.

H11: Significant differences do not exist in the perception regarding HRD climate in the RSP between any functional group and all level scores.

Since most of the theoretical distributions in statistics like Binomial, Poisson, Beta, Gamma, t, F, χ^2 , etc. conform to Normal Distribution for large values of n, we can use the Normal Test of Significance for large sample. However, for small n, usually less than 30, the exact sample tests are used. In the present study since we have taken sample more than 30 i.e. large sample for each of the groups/classes, we have adopted the large sample test as the measure of testing the hypothesis which can be computed (for testing the difference between mean of two samples drawn from a single population).

Limitations of Study

Every study has its share of limitations and shortcomings, although efforts were made to minimize, if not eliminate the limitations. At the same time, despite limitations, the study is expected to contribute in helping steel companies like RSP, BSL etc. in improving HRD climate in their organizations.

Key limitations are as follows:

1. It was difficult to get cooperation from many respondents. Researcher had to personally persuade the respondents.
2. The extent of the study being RSP, the present study has become the first of its kind for analyzing HRD climate at RSP and therefore no scope for comparative analysis was left.
3. This study shall provide insight in-to the HRD climate in the organization under study. The findings of this study may not be applicable to other public and private sector steel plants of India due to varying nature of various influencing factors.

RESULTS

The analysis is done based on the responses of the sampled employees working in Rourkela Steel Plant on the three categories of HRD climate: General Supportive Climate, Functioning of HRD Mechanisms, HRD Cultural Dimensions and OCTAPACE Culture.

Demographic Profile of Sample

The demographic profile of respondents for the HRD Climate survey is presented in Table 3.1.

Table- 3.1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N=644, HRD Climate Survey)

Stratification Variables	Category	Frequency	Percent
Work Groups	Executives	256	40%
	Non-Executives	388	60%
Hierarchical Levels	Junior Management	435	68%
	Middle & Senior Management	209	32%
Length of Service	Less than 20 Years	348	54%
	More than 20 Years	296	46%
Age	Less than 45 Years	307	48%
	More than 45 Years	337	52%
Function	Engineering	450	70%
	Service	194	30%

The demographic profile of respondents for the OCTAPACE Profile is presented in Table 3.2.

Table- 3.2: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N=256, OCTAPACE Profile)

Stratification Variables	Category	Frequency	Percent
Hierarchical Levels	Junior Management	96	38%
	Middle & Senior Management	160	63%
Length of Service	Less than 20 Years	108	42%
	More than 20 Years	148	58%
Age	Less than 45 Years	106	41%
	More than 45 Years	150	59%
Function	Engineering	148	58%
	Service	108	42%

Reliability Analysis

By convention, a lenient cut-off of 0.6 is acceptable in exploratory research. The data was tested for reliability and yielded a Cronbach alpha score ranging from 0.8616 to 0.9621.

The inter-item correlations are high; it is evident that the items are measuring the same underlying construct.

Table-3.3: Reliability Analysis: Cronbach ALPHA

	Cronbach	Inter-Item
HRD Climate Survey		
Overall (38 Items)	0.9621	0.402228
GROUP I General Supportive Climate (9 Items)	0.8650	0.419806
GROUP II Functioning of HRD Mechanisms (9 Items)	0.8830	0.457583
GROUP III HRD Cultural Dimensions (20 Items)	0.9371	0.429495

Table-3.4: Sensitivity of Cronbach Alpha to Exclusion of an Item (Cronbach Alpha = 0.9621)

Excluded Item	Alpha	Excluded Item	Alpha
1	0.9613	20	0.9614
2	0.9613	21	0.9608
3	0.9611	22	0.9611
4	0.9614	23	0.9607
5	0.9611	24	0.9609
6	0.9614	25	0.961
7	0.9608	26	0.961
8	0.9615	27	0.9613
9	0.9611	28	0.9609
10	0.9607	29	0.9612
11	0.9609	30	0.9614
12	0.9612	31	0.961
13	0.9614	32	0.9613
14	0.961	33	0.9615
15	0.9611	34	0.9612
16	0.9612	35	0.961
17	0.9608	36	0.9608
18	0.961	37	0.9607
19	0.9618	38	0.9612

General Supportive Climate

In order to assess general supportive climate prevailing in the organization, 9 items were identified from the questionnaire and the scores on responses of the sampled employees in the organization have been calculated. Means and percentage score of Rourkela Steel Plant under study have been presented in Table-1. It is found from the table that the overall mean scores for these 9 items put together is 2.66 (Percentage score 66.40) on a 5-point scale. Thereby it can be stated that the general supportive climate prevailing in the Rourkela Steel Plant is above the theoretical average (i.e. 50% of maximum obtainable score).

Table-3.5: General Supportive Climate

General Supportive Climate Attributes	N	Mean	Percentage	Ran
Top Management Support to HRD	644	2.33*	58.15	9
Top Management Belief in HRD	644	<u>2.89</u>	72.13	1
Importance Given to HRD	644	2.55*	63.74	8
Conduciveness of Personnel Policies	644	2.69	67.20	4
Time & Resources for HRD	644	2.65	66.19	6
Managers' Support to HRD	644	<u>2.77</u>	69.25	3
Help for Competence Development	644	2.55*	63.86	7
Managers' Belief in HRD	644	<u>2.81</u>	70.34	2
Conduciveness of Psychological Climate	644	2.67	66.73	5
Average =	644	2.66	66.40	2 nd
Note: '*' □ Significantly lower @ 95% Level & '_' □ Significantly higher @ 95% Level compared with group-average				

Three important factors contributing to general supportive climate for HRD are namely, "Top management belief in HRD", "Managers support to HRD" and "Managers' belief in HRD" with their individual mean values 2.89, 2.77 and 2.81 respectively which are significantly higher (significance at 5% level) than the group average i.e. 2.66. However, there are some factors that do not score that well: "Top management support to HRD", "Importance given to HRD" and "Help for competence development" with their individual mean values of 2.33, 2.55 and 2.55 respectively which are significantly lower (significance at 5% level) than the group average. The findings indicate that there is a gap between top management belief and action towards development of its human resources. Further, the line managers are believed to be neither considering the development of their subordinates an important part of their job nor helping people lacking their competence. This indicates considerable room for improvement in these areas.

Functioning of HRD Mechanisms

In the questionnaire, another 9 items were identified which deal with the functioning of HRD mechanisms. The functioning of HRD mechanism (as perceived by employees) has been shown rank- wise in Table-2. The three important HRD mechanisms as per the present

survey namely, “Reward mechanism”, “Appreciation by supervisors” and “Management information system” are having their mean values of 2.79, 2.86 and 2.74 respectively, significantly higher (significance at 5% level) than the group average i.e. 2.60. It indicates that supervisors do appreciate their subordinates for good performance. Reward mechanism and management information system are properly functional.

Table-3.6: Functioning of HRD Mechanisms

HRD Mechanisms Attributes	N	Mean	Percentage	Ran
Identification of Employee's Potential	644	2.45*	61.34	7
Rationality of Promotion Decisions	644	2.44*	60.99	8
Reward Mechanism	644	2.79	69.84	2
Appreciation by Supervisors	644	2.86	71.47	1
Performance Appraisal – Objectivity	644	2.67	66.69	4
Non-Threatening Performance Feedback	644	2.51*	62.66	6
Management Information System	644	2.74	68.40	3
Employee's Welfare Activities	644	2.43*	60.75	9
Job Rotation	644	2.55	63.74	5
Average =	644	2.60	65.10	3rd
Note: ‘*’ □ Significantly lower @ 95% Level & ‘_’ □ Significantly higher @ 95% Level compared with group-average				

The major problem areas in HRD mechanisms that emerge in this survey are: “Identification of employees’ potential”, “Rationality of promotion decisions”, “Non-threatening performance feedback” and “Employees’ welfare activities” with their mean values 2.45, 2.44, 2.51 and 2.43 respectively which are significantly lower (significance at 5% level) than the group average. It appears that minimum importance is given to employees’ welfare. Promotion decisions seem to have no link with employee potential. The employees seem to be feeling insecure under the performance feedback system.

HRD Cultural Dimensions

Under the category of cultural dimensions, data has been collected on 20 different items.

Scores obtained have been ranked in Table-3.6.

Table-3.7: HRD Cultural Dimensions

HRD Cultural Dimensions	N	Mean	Percentage	Ran
Helping Attitude among Employees	644	2.89	72.24	1
Informal Discussion with Seniors	644	2.73	68.21	7
Guidance to Juniors	644	2.76	69.02	5
Free from Biased Impression	644	2.57*	64.13	15
Encouragement for Innovation	644	2.66	66.54	11
Understanding and Help in Case of Mistake	644	2.69	67.16	9

Self-Development Initiative based on Feedback	644	2.68	67.08	10
Initiative to Know Self Strength and Weakness	644	2.54*	63.43	18
Concern for Learning During Training	644	2.72	67.90	8
Opportunity for Applying Knowledge after Training	644	2.37*	59.20	20
Need based Sponsorship of Trainees	644	2.55*	63.86	17
Trust among Employees	644	2.80	69.88	3
Expression of Feelings to Seniors	644	2.62	65.53	12
Expression of Feelings to Juniors	644	2.77	69.25	4
Actions without Close Supervision	644	2.49*	62.27	19
Delegation of Authority	644	2.60	64.91	13
Initiative for taking Higher Responsibility	644	2.57*	64.32	14
Team Spirit among Employees	644	2.86	71.51	2
Team approach to Problem Solving	644	2.73	68.28	6
Concern for Career Development of Subordinates	644	2.57*	64.13	16
Average =	644	2.66	66.44	1st
Note: '*' □ Significantly lower @ 95% Level & '_' □ Significantly higher @ 95% Level compared with group-average				

The seven most important cultural dimensions (as perceived by employees) are: "Helping attitude among employees", "informal discussions with seniors", "Guidance to juniors", "Trust among employees", "Expression of feelings to juniors", "Team spirit among employees" and "Team approach to problem solving" with their individual mean values 2.89, 2.73, 2.76, 2.80, 2.77, 2.86 and 2.73 respectively which are significantly higher (significance at 5% level) than the group average i.e. 2.66. The analysis of data reveals that relationship between seniors, juniors and colleagues is cordial and often they are helpful to each other. Juniors get guidance from their seniors. They trust each other, work in a team and jointly solve problems.

The main problem areas in the HRD cultural dimensions identified in the survey are: "Free from biased impressions", "Initiative to know self-strength and weakness", "Opportunity for applying knowledge after training", "Need based sponsorship of trainees", "Actions without close supervision", "Initiative for taking higher responsibilities" and "Concern for career development of subordinates" with their individual mean values 2.57, 2.54, 2.37, 2.55, 2.49, 2.57 and 2.57 respectively which are significantly lower (significance at 5% level) than the group average. It appears that neither the

Employees have any interest to know their strengths and weaknesses for their own

development nor their seniors show any concern for the career development of their juniors. There seems to be a gap between training needs and sponsorship. Further, employees do not get opportunity to apply their knowledge after getting training. Study reveals that seniors do not like to do close supervision and even the climate is not free from biased impressions. The analysis of data also establishes that employees do not show initiative to take responsibilities. However, the total mean score of HRD Climate in the present study has been found to be 100.49, which is considerably higher than the theoretical total average of 768.

Octapace Culture

The 40 statement OCTAPACE questionnaire helps us understand organization's ethos on eight values. In order to study OCTAPACE culture, the questionnaire has been administered on the executives only. The mean score of each variable could theoretically range from 5 to 20. The data collected through the instrument have been compiled and presented in Table-4. Analysis of results reveal that the mean values of all the eight values i.e. Openness, Confrontation, Trust, Authenticity, Proaction, Autonomy, Collaboration and Experimentation follows the norms of the OCTAPACE Profile.

Table-3.8: OCTAPACE Profile Score

OCTAPACE Dimensions	N	Mean	Percentage	Ran
Openness	256	14.28	71.41	4
Confrontation	256	14.29	71.43	3
Trust	256	14.38	71.88	2
Authenticity	256	12.57	62.87	7
Proaction	256	15.46	77.30	1
Autonomy	256	12.49	62.44	8
Collaboration	256	13.82	69.08	6
Experimentation	256	13.90	69.49	5

Analyzing "Openness" based on the individual mean values of its different dimensions within the group, it has been found that there is free interaction among employees, each respecting other's feelings, competence and sense of judgment. There is free discussion and communication between seniors and subordinates. Further, there is free and frank communication between various levels which helps in solving problems. But, it has been found that significantly a higher number of employees believe that effective managers put a lid on their feelings.

Under "Confrontation" it has been found that employees always have a positive tendency to face and not shy away from problems. Facing challenges is inherent in the work situation and employees are found to believe that identifying problems is not enough, rather they should find the solution for them. But, there is a gap between these beliefs and actions as significantly a higher number of employees are found to pass the buck tactfully when there is

an actual problem.

Looking at the “Trust” components, it has been discovered that employees offer moral support and help to employee and colleagues in crisis. There is interpersonal contact and support among people. Most of the employees do believe that trust begets (results in) trust. But, the survey results reveal that a significantly higher proportion of employees tend to rely on themselves when the chips are down which means that people cannot rely on others in times of crisis.

Studying “Authenticity”, the study establishes that there is minimum gap between what people say and do inside the organization which means there is congruity between feelings and expressed behavior. And people were found to owning up to mistakes. But, significantly higher numbers of employee believe that tactfulness, smartness and even a little manipulation are applied to get things done inside the organization. Even a significantly higher proportion of employees believe that telling a polite lie is preferable to telling the unpleasant truth.

Analyzing “Proaction” based on the individual mean values of its different dimensions within the group, it has been found that it is strongly believed inside the organization that prevention is better than cure. A stitch in time saves nine. But, a significantly higher number of employees found to believe that seniors do not encourage their subordinates to think about their development and take action. Even most of the employees believe that they do not consider both positive and negative aspects before taking action.

Under “Autonomy” it has been found that people are taking work and team spirit. And also the employees believe that a good way to motivate employees is to give them autonomy to plan their work. But, a significantly higher number of employees are deprived of close supervision. They are to first focus on obeying and checking with seniors rather than acting on their own. It is believed by them that freedom to employees breeds indiscipline.

Looking at the “Collaboration” components, it has been discovered that employees strongly believe in team-work and team-spirit. They accept and appreciate help offered by others. It also holds true for them that employee’s involvement in developing an organization’s mission and goals contribute to productivity. But, a significantly higher proportion of employees are focused on performing immediate tasks rather than being concerned about large organizational goals. And they also believe that usually, emphasis on team work dilutes individual accountability.

Studying “Experimentation”, the study establishes that the employees are trying out innovative ways of solving problems. Employees are encouraged to a fresh look at how things are done and also making genuine attempts to change behavior on the basis of feedback. They are found to be strongly believing that thinking out and doing new things tone-up the organization’s vitality. But, it is widely accepted that in today’s competitive situation consolidation and stability are more important than experimentation.

Further, the data has been analyzed (significance at 5% level) on the basis of the groups; hierarchical levels, age, length of service and function and the comparative results have

CONCLUSIONS

This study is an attempt at understanding the HRD Climate in Rourkela Steel Plant. It makes a sincere effort to gauge the employees' perception of the above aspect of the plant. The following are the key findings of the study;

General Supportive Climate

The findings indicate that there is a gap between top management belief and action towards development of its human resources. Managers are found to be not only having a high degree of confidence in HRD but also are supporting employee development. But, they lack in help for their competence development.

Functioning of HRD Mechanisms

The study reveals that some of the HRD mechanisms are working better than others. For example, the employees are quite satisfied with the reward mechanism existing in the organization. Supervisors do appreciate their juniors' good performance. The management information system in the organization is highly efficient.

However, there are some mechanisms that do not score that well. For instance, there is a lack of proper tools to identify employee potential. There is a general feeling that promotion decisions are not based on uniform and rational policy. The performance feedback embarrasses and threatens the employees. Employees perceive that inadequate attention is given to welfare activities.

HRD Cultural Dimensions

Like HRD mechanisms, some cultural dimensions of HRD score are better than others. The dimensions that record better score are relationship and expression of feelings among employees, team approach towards problem-solving and positive team-spirit among employees. Employees trust each other and render help. Seniors provide adequate guidance to juniors and even do not hesitate to express their feelings to them.

However, there are some aspects that do not score that well. For instance, employees feel that sometimes there is a mismatch between training need and sponsorship of trainees. Further, trainees get limited opportunity to apply knowledge gained during training to their work. Employees also feel that the organization's internal environment is full of biased impressions. Seniors are least concerned about the career development of subordinates. Employees normally work under close supervision of seniors and get limited freedom to take decisions. There is a lack of initiative for taking higher responsibilities among the employees. In addition to the above another problem has been observed. Employees are normally not interested to know their own

strength and weaknesses and make inadequate efforts for self- development.

On the basis of the insights gained from this exercise certain suggestions have been made for improving HRD climate in the steel PSUs, especially SAIL.

General Supportive Climate

RSP's top management needs to take Necessary steps for developing resource plans, action plans and work environment plans needs to be taken by the top management to reduce the perception gap between managements' belief in and support for HRD among the employees. Further, continuous focus on competence development is required and mapping should be done for identifying needs of individual groups for competence development.

Functioning of HRD Mechanisms

Performance-potential matrix across all grades should be prepared and posting, promotions, job rotation and succession plan should be integrated with this. Further, the management should focus on to gain the confidence of employees in its welfare activities through reintroduction of the schemes, which were partially or completely withdrawn, gather information about employee's welfare needs through a systematic survey etc.

HRD Cultural Dimensions

There is a need to map individual training needs and develop a centralized data bank and design program inputs accordingly. Also, trainees need to be accountable in matters of learning and transfer learning to the job. Further, the employees should be encouraged to identify their strengths and weaknesses through a proper self-evaluation feedback system. Senior employees should be trained in the art of coaching and mentoring. The organization should empower and educate the employees in their work area and encourage them to take on higher responsibilities, joint decision-making, support for unintended failure, upgrading knowledge & skills, information sharing, joint goal-setting, and participation in task force and special assignments.

OCTAPACE Culture

The management of the organization should create an environment of openness by giving enough opportunities to its employees to express their views, ideas, and suggestions without fear. The management should encourage their subordinates to confront problems bravely without searching for escape routes. The employees should be given training in developing confrontation abilities and approaches for creative problem-solving. Management should improve the communication relationship between the employees to create a higher degree of trust among them.

Authenticity needs to be improved by providing fair and decent deal to all employees so that they are not tempted to manipulate and speak polite lies. The management should encourage people to anticipate problems and make arrangements for their resolutions well in advance so that necessary systematic and process changes are made without compromising quality and quantity taking in-to account both the positive and negative aspects of the issues. There is a need to develop autonomy by defining role clarity, delegation of responsibility, and giving freedom to employees to take decisions. The organization should empower employees and encourage them to make decisions for themselves without the fear of negative repercussions along with gradual enlargement of duties. The management should also promote the sense of cooperation and collaboration among the employees, so that the routine issues are resolved effectively without repetition or confusion. To promote experimentation, the organization should organize brainstorming sessions which will generate new and innovative ideas. Experimentation value should also be improved through encouraging innovative methods to solve problems, rather than relying on traditional and tested ways of dealing things.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The present study attempts to uncover the culture of the organization i.e. Rourkela Steel Plant under study. It clearly reveals that there is considerable scope for the development and implementation of appropriate HRD programmes and interventions in RSP as well as various other sectors in the country. By doing this we can ensure enhancement of employee competencies, dynamism, motivation and effectiveness in a systematic and planned way.

REFERENCES

BOOKS

1. Krishnaveni, R., (2009), "Human Resource Development – A Researcher's Perspective", Excel Books, ISBN No.: 978-81-7446-643-3, pp. (4, 10, 45).
2. Pandu, Naik, G., (2007), "Training and Development", Excel Books, ISBN No.: 978- 81-7446—565-8, pp. (5).
3. Sachar, Arun., "Organisational Climate And Managerial Effectiveness", Himalaya Publishing House, New Delhi, First Edition: 2010, pp. (15-16).
4. Rao, T. V., (2004). "Reading in Human Resource Development", Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, ISBN: 81-204-0585-4, pp. (42-44).
5. Rao, T.V., (2004). "HRD Audit", Evaluating the Human Resource Function for Business Improvement, Sage Publications, New Delhi, ISBN: 0-7619-9349-5, pp. (212-214).
6. Pareek, Udai., (2008), Training Instruments in HRD & OD, TATA McGraw-Hill, ISBN No. 13:

978-0-07-04-8324-8, New Delhi, pp. (790-799).

7. Kothari, C.R., Research Methodology, (2005). New Age International, New Delhi, pp. (184-225).
8. Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient Alpha and Internal Structure of Tests, Psychometrika, 16(3), pp. (297-333).
9. Gupta, S.C. (2011). Fundamentals of Statistics, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai, pp. (15.29, 16.26-16.33).

Article in a Journal

1. Manthangi, J., et. al. (2010). “Organizational Culture Profiling of BIMTECH”, Electronic Copy available at: <http://ssrn.com>, pp. (1-3, 8).
2. Krishna, P.M and Rao P.S., (1997), “Organizational at HRD Climate in BHEL: an Empirical Study”, the journal of public administration Vol. 43 pp. (209-216)
3. Mangraj. S., (1999). “HRD System: A Case Study of Rourkela Steel Plant”, The Business Review: 5, pp. (203-210).
4. Anu Singh Lather, et. al., (2010). “Organizational Culture: A study of selected organizations in the manufacturing sector in MCR AGRIC”. ECON. – CZECH, 56, 2010 (8): pp. 349 – 358.
5. Saraswati S. (2005), “Human Resources Development Climate: An Empirical Study”, VIKALPA, Vol-30, No.2, pp.(78-84), ISSN-2010-0248.