2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter would present the studies and research work that have already been done on organisational change, transformation and development. The chapter is divided into two parts; the first part presents the literature review on theoretical aspect of change and the second part highlights the literature review on empirical study related to change and transformation.

2.1 THEORETICAL ASPECT

1. According to Pettigrew, Woodman and Cameron (2001) the existing literature on organisational change remains underdeveloped regarding the six interconnected analytical issues:

   i. The examination of multiple contexts and levels of analysis in studying organisational change,

   ii. The inclusion of time, history, process, and action,

   iii. The link between change processes and organisational performance outcomes,

   iv. The investigation of international and cross-cultural comparisons in research on organisational change,

   v. The study of receptivity, customization, sequencing, pace, and episodic versus continuous change processes, and

   vi. The partnership between scholars and practitioners in studying organisational change (pp. 697-698).

Thus, the authors in this article endeavour to highlight the pitfalls or the gaps in the empirical studies that have been conducted by different scholars in the field of organisational change and have presented several challenges before the scholars who are likely to undertake study on organisational change. The article suggests:

- Commitment between social science and management research on change and innovation,
1. Perseverance to time and history.

2. The relationship between change processes and outcome should be established which depicts change as continuous processes and not just separate events.

3. In a more culturally aware, diverse and global world scholars should extend themselves beyond the boundaries of their own nations, not just to study diversity, but where they find it to reveal homogeneous patterns.

With this commitment to pluralism, organisational change research can extend the scope of its scientific base and simultaneously enhance its leverage in the ever-changing world of practice (Pettigrew et al., 2001, p. 709).

2. Organisation’s growth and changes are not always determined by the future prospects or opportunities but by past events and experiences. According to Greiner (1998) “research on organisational development has largely been empirical, and scholars have not attempted to create any model of the overall process”. Greiner has suggested an organisational growth model for new and emerging organisations which would enable the firms to detect the different phases of growth and development and enable them to determine when to alter the present practices, structure and policies in order to enter into the next phase of growth. According to Greiner (May, 1998) a growing organisation goes through five phases each of which is marked by a period of evolution which incorporates sound growth and stability and in the end, period of revolution which incorporates crisis or what is commonly called as internal turmoil or change. Greiner has taken five key dimensions that together model the development of the organisation viz., age of the organisation; size of the organisation; evolutionary stage: revolutionary stage; growth rate of industries. The five phases as explained by Greiner are: Phase I: Creativity; Phase II: Direction; Phase III: Delegation; Phase IV: Coordination; Phase V. Collaboration. This is a useful model which may enable companies to determine its rate of growth and helps in preparation for the next phase. However, the growth rate may fluctuate even within phases depending upon the prevailing market conditions.

3. According to Barnett and Carroll (1995) models of organisational change that considers both process and content of change can be used to test social science
theories as well as to evaluate programs of organisational change promulgated by consultants and practitioners. Process refers to how change occurs and content describes what actually changes in the organisation (p. 217). Accordingly there are two dimensions of change; content and process. In the first one the key aspect of change comes from comparing the organisation before and after the transformation. Major changes consist of transformations that involve many elements of structure or those that entail radical shifts in a single element of structure. A second dimension of organisational change concerns the way the transformation occurs the speed, the sequence of activities, the decision-making and communication system, the resistance encountered etc. Examining these factors involves a focus on the process of change per se (Barnett & Carroll, p. 219).

4. One of the most common barriers to change is resistance to change. Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) have recommended various approaches or techniques that could be adopted while implementing change programme to manage resistance to change.
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One of the above mentioned approaches or a combination of some or all of them can be used by the change agent depending upon the situation. According to Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) in order to implement change successfully managers must conduct an organisational analysis that identifies the current situation, problems, and the
forces that are possible causes of those problems. The analysis would automatically raises questions on who might resist the change, why, and how much; what is the position of the initiator vis-à-vis other relevant parties in terms of power, trust, normal modes of interaction, and so forth (p. 139).

Thus, the thorough analysis would lead to the choice of best strategy to be used as well provide the basis for monitoring the change process.

5. Fernandez and Rainey have made an effort to contribute to the existing body of literature on organisational change and transformation with a special focus on managing change and transformation in public-sector enterprises. According to Fernandez and Rainey (2006) the eight factors or propositions that are discussed in the following sections can influence the outcome of change initiatives at different points of the process. Moreover, researchers have generally treated these determinants of effective implementation of organisational change as having additive effects. The present analysis, in contrast, treats each determinant as potentially contributing to the successful implementation of change — or making implementation smoother — by adding to the effects of the other factors (p. 169). The factors that are treated as vital for introducing and implementing change in an organisation are:

- **Ensure the Need:** It indicates that leaders or managers must create or make everyone aware of the need for change through communication and by creating a desirable vision for the future.

- **Provide a Plan:** It involves developing a plan or strategy for reaching to the newly created vision or state.

- **Build Internal Support for Change and Overcome Resistance:** “Managerial leaders must build internal support for change and reduce resistance to it through widespread participation in the change process and other means” (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006, p.170). Individuals in organisations resist change for a variety of reasons Vries and Balazs (1999) — for example, some ideas for change are simply ill conceived, unjustified, or pose harmful consequences for members of the organisation. Even assuming a well-justified and well-planned change initiative, however, leaders must build internal support and overcome resistance.
• **Ensure Top Management Support and Commitment:** Top management support plays a significant role in effective implementation of the change programme. Especially in public sector enterprises cooperation of top-level career civil servants in addition to politically appointed executives where “many significant changes in government need to be — and have been — led by career civil servants” (Holzer & Callahan, 1998).

• **Build External Support:** According to Fernandez and Rainey (2006) “Managerial leaders must develop support from political overseers and key external stakeholders. Organisational change in the public sector also depends on the degree of support from political overseers and other key external stakeholders” (p. 171).

• **Provide Resources:** Adequate resources must be available for initiative.

• **Institutionalize Change:** Managers and employees must effectively institutionalize and embed changes. To make change enduring, members of the organisation must incorporate the new policies or innovations into their daily routines (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006, p. 172).

• **Pursue Comprehensive Change:** Managerial leaders must develop an integrative, comprehensive approach to change that achieves subsystem congruence. Many researchers stress that in order for fundamental change in behavior to occur, leaders must make systemic changes to the subsystems of their organisation. These must be aligned with the desired end state (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006, p.173).

6. According to Agocs (1997) The lack of attention to institutionalized resistance undermines the credibility of OD (Organisational Development) as a practical guide to managing change, especially change that does not originate with top management or reflect the short term interests of those in power. Institutionalized resistance has been defined as the pattern of organisational behaviour that decision makers in organisations employ to actively deny, reject, refuse to implement, repress or even dismantle change proposals and initiatives (p. 918). In essence institutionalized resistance is ingrained in the system by those in power and are
against the change effort, yet they do not express resistance directly. Instead it has been expressed in the one or the other forms that has been summarised below:

- “Denial of the legitimacy of the case for change,
- Refusal to recognize responsibility to address the change issue,
- Refusal to implement a change initiative that has been adopted by the organisation, and
- The reversal or dismantling of a change initiative once implementation has begun” (Agocs, 1997, p.920).

Agocs (1997) has recommended the following six strategies for advocates of change to bring about fundamental change in the face of institutionalized resistance.

i. **Resist:** Refusal to be co-opt and withdrawal of support, compliance and complicity are choices that individuals and groups may make for ethical or strategic reasons. Unfortunately, however, this kind of resistance will not in itself lead to positive change.

ii. **Create Allies:** Cooperate with, help and support other change advocates and seek common ground and joint action wherever possible. Protect individuals from having to deal alone with attacks, repression and marginalization.

iii. **Make the Case for Change:** From inside and outside the organisation, continue to present sound evidence and arguments and seek to unmask ideological claims made by authorities about the legitimacy of their resistance to change. Engage in constructive criticism of change arguments and evidence to ensure they are as effective as possible.

iv. **Make Effective Use of Existing Resources:** Work within the organisation to convince authorities that change is in their interest, and if possible, attain positions from which to influence decision making. Make full use of the change-making possibilities of existing legislation, regulations, and organisational policies and practices.
v. **Mobilize Politically:** Effect change from outside the organisation by seeking improved legislation and regulation, support from other institutions, and public understanding and support.

vi. **Create Values:** Build new parallel organisations that represent the values that change advocates are working toward, and seek to establish the effectiveness and legitimacy of these new alternatives. (p. 929)

7. According to Beer and Nohria (2000) a change program is initiated to accomplish two types of goals i.e., near term economic improvement and an improvement in organisational capabilities. Based on these goals the new research indicates two different approaches to change viz., Theory E: An economic approach and Theory O: Organisational capabilities approach is introduced (133-141). “The explicit goal of theory E is to dramatically and rapidly increase shareholders value, as measured by improved cash flow and share price. Financial crisis is normally considered the trigger for this approach to change” ("Managing Change and Transition”, 2003, p.10). Strategies such as downsizing, layoff and restructuring are usually adopted to remain competitive and increase short-term cash flow. In contrast, the goal of theory O is to develop an organisational culture that supports learning and a high-performance employee base. It strives to foster employee participation, flatter organisation structure, employee commitment in order to implement change that values people assets above all others. According to Beer and Nohria “to thrive and adapt in the new economy, companies must simultaneously build up their corporate cultures and enhance shareholders value, the O and E theories of business change must be in perfect step (p. 140). In essence one should follow both the approaches to change simultaneously to produce successful results.

8. Whenever organisations goes through changing phase of its life, people at higher positions or those who assume responsibility for change or transformation are often at stake. Particularly a change program that is adaptive in nature which challenges the old habits, culture, status quo etc. Heifetz and Linsky (2002) has recommended “survival guide” to protect the change initiator or the leaders from those who try to push them aside thereby avoiding the perils of leadership. The following tactics have been described hereunder:
• **Operate in and above the Fray:** Leadership is creative art which is guided by a clear vision, values and a strategic plan. But what actions to be taken from at one moment or the next cannot be pre-decided. It has to be operated as the events unfold. One has to be constantly alert and objectively observe things as well as his own actions.

• **Court the Uncommitted:** “It’s tempting to go it alone when leading a change initiative. There’s no one to dilute your ideas or share the glory, and it’s often just plain exciting” (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 67). But it is not the right way to lead one must recruit more people or partners to manage more effectively thereby act as proponents of change initiative. On the other hand the people who are most crucial for the success of the change program are those who are in the middle and do not want to change i.e., the uncommitted. The leader must endeavour to identify them and shows that the intentions to change are serious.

• **Cook the Conflict:** According to Heifetz and Linsky (2002) “Managing conflict is one of the greatest challenges a leader of organisational change faces. The conflict may involve resistance to change, or it may involve cashing viewpoints about how the change should be carried out” (p. 69). “Keep the heat high enough to motivate, but low enough to prevent explosions. Raise the temperature to make people confront hidden conflicts and other tough issues. Then lower the heat to reduce destructive turmoil. Slow the pace of change. Deliver humour, breaks and images of a brighter future” (HBR’s 10 must Reads on Change Management, 2011, p. 102).

• **Place the Work where it belongs:** In order to make the real change happen the leader should stop doing everything on its own rather he should transfer the work and responsibility belonging to others. The reason behind this is to enable everyone across the organisation to adapt themselves to the changing scenario as well as sharing responsibility if any turmoil results.

• **The Dangers Within:** To remain in the race and position one practices different tactics that have been described so far. But the intellectual, physical, and emotional challenges of leadership are fierce. So, in addition to getting on the
balcony, you need to regularly step into the inner chamber of your being and assess the tolls those challenges are taking.

- **Manage your Hungers:** According to Heifetz and Linsky (2002) “the two of the most dangerous hungers which could disrupt the capacity of the leader to act wisely or purposefully and lead to vulnerable situation are desire for control and desire for importance” (p. 71). The leader should manage these two desires which would lead to the long term survival of the leader as well as enable the members of the organisation to make trade-offs with the real situation and contribute independently in taking the organisation to another level of success.

- **Anchor Yourself:** According to Heifetz and Linsky (2002) In order to survive the turbulent seas of change initiative, the leader must find ways to steady and stabilize (p.72-73). It necessitates separating personal self from the role that is being performed by the leader. The leader must understand that the criticism, personal attacks that are made are on his role and on his personal self. To remain focused and maintain the cool and calm one “must establish a safe harbor where each day you can reflect on the previous day’s journey, repair the psychological damage you have incurred, renew your stores of emotional resources, and recalibrate your moral compass” (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 73).

9. Managing or introducing change in an organisation can be accomplished in two ways one is structural-functionalist view by Burrell and Morgan (1979) (as cited in Ford, 1999) in which the job of change agents is to align, fit, or adapt organisations, through interventions, to an objective reality that exists “out there”. “Successful change, therefore, ultimately depends on the ability to accurately mirror or represent reality and to choose and implement interventions appropriate to that reality” (Ford, 1999, p. 480). Another way is socially constructive in which “we consider organisations as socially constructed realities in which the reality we know is interpreted, constructed, enacted, and maintained through discourse” (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Holzner, 1972; Searle, 1995; Watzlawick, 1984a; Weick, 1979) as cited in Ford, (p.480). Here knowledge and analytical skills plays a vital role in understanding and discovering the reality which is created or constructed or reconstructed through awareness and understanding. This one is not blindly working to reach the underlying reality that is already known but by
finding, analysing and testing the truth. According to Ford “two constructed realities together make a meaningful conversation which includes first order and second order realities. First-order, presented realities refer to the physically demonstrable and publicly discernible characteristics, qualities, or attributes of a thing, event, or situation” (p. 481). Second- order realities has been portrayed as the one which is an analysis or interpretation of the first order reality. The result may differ from person-to-person while discovering the second order reality. Realities are considered as a by-product of conversations and organisations are understood as networks of conversations, which are interconnected such as planning, budgeting, hiring, firing, promoting, managing, rewarding etc. (Ford, p.485). According to Ford, producing change through social constructive view requires managing change through “conversations to generate, sustain, and complete conversations in order to bring about a new network of conversations (i.e. first- and second-order realities) that result in the accomplishment of specific commitments” (p. 486). In essence the change agents or the managers are required to bring change in the design or embroidery of conventional language representations to bring and produce change.

Thus, conversations are the target, medium, and product of organisational change as well as a tool to overcome resistance by interpreting it as a second order reality (Ford, 1999). “Indeed, in a network of conversations, an organisational change is itself a series of sequential and concurrent conversational episodes held together by a theme” (Czarniawaska, 1997) as cited in Ford.

10. Change agents or managers lays too much emphasis on the soft elements or issues of change management while taking big initiatives such as transformation thereby neglecting crucial or the hard factors which is a big reason for transformation program failure. Soft factors such as motivation, visionary leadership, communication, culture etc., are equally important but if the four key factors as identified by the authors as duration, integrity, commitment and the extra effort required to adopt new processes are neglected then it may lead to failure of transformation programme before soft elements come into play. According to Sirkin, Keenan and Jackson (2005) “Executives must study the four DICE (Duration, Integrity, Commitment, Effort) factors carefully to figure out if their change programs will fly - or die” (p.110).
• **Duration:** It implies the time required to complete the project or transformation initiative and the review of the performance at specific intervals. Success of a change initiative does not depend on the life span of the project but on the frequent reviews or evaluation of the project.

• **Integrity:** Successful change programs are generally accomplished by highly reliable and qualitative teams. Therefore “companies must free up the best staff while making sure that day-to-day operations don’t falter” (Sirkin et al., 2005, p.111).

• **Commitment:** Top management support or commitment is imperative in bringing dedication and commitment across the organisation. If the leaders do not endorse the change initiative as much as they can then people won’t change. Moreover communicating the need for change is also crucial for bringing commitment.

• **Effort:** Implementation of change program entails extra effort on employees and if it exceeds too much, employees would resist. Change agents must calculate the amount of extra work to be done by the employees and it must not exceed more than 10% beyond their present workload. Moreover if possible, unnecessary work should be removed so that the employees performing key role in the transformation initiative could pay more attention to crucial tasks.

11. The major reason behind the organisation’s failure to respond effectively in meeting the challenge of disruptive change is the lack of ability to identify its own capabilities and weaknesses. “To succeed consistently, good managers need to be skilled not just in assessing people but also in assessing the abilities and disabilities of their organisation as a whole” (Christensen & Overdorf, 2000, p.68). There are three factors that determines the capabilities of an organisation viz.,

• **Resources:** It refers to an asset or stock that can be taken out by a person or an organisation to function effectively. “It includes tangible ones like people, equipment, technologies, and cash, and the less tangible ones like product designs, information, brands, and relationships with suppliers, distributors, and customers. Without doubt, access to abundant, high-quality resources increases an
organisation's chances of coping with change” (Christensen & Overdorf, 2000, p. 68).

- **Processes:** It refers to the established ways of performing tasks, patterns of interaction, communication and decision making etc. that supports smooth functioning of organisation.

- **Values:** According to Christensen and Overdorf (2000) values are the standards by which employees set priorities that enable them to judge whether an order is attractive or unattractive, whether a customer is more important or less important, whether an idea for a new product is attractive or marginal, and so on at every level (p.69).

Accordingly during the start up stage organisations attribute much of its success to its resources especially people. But at times laying emphasis only on the resources to confront major change initiatives is not the solution. Companies must recognize and built its capabilities by making its values and processes stronger which together forms the culture of the organisation. “Hence, the factors that define an organisation's capabilities and disabilities evolve over time-they start in resources; then move to visible, articulated processes and values,- and migrate finally to culture” (Christensen & Overdorf, 2000, p.71). In order to tackle with disruptive innovations or change identifying capabilities is just not adequate, organisations must endeavour to build new capabilities to outperform and remain in the race.

12. Kegan and Lahey (2001) unveil the real reasons that prevent people from accepting or undertaking change. “Sometimes it's easy to see why the employee fears a shift in power, the need to learn new skills, the stress of having to join a new team. In other cases, such resistance is far more puzzling. An employee has the skills and smarts to make a change with ease, has shown a deep commitment to the company genuinely supports the change-and yet, inexplicably, does nothing” (p.85). Thus, it has been discovered that the employees become reluctant to change due to the unrecognized competing or hidden commitments that thwart them from initiating a new project, career advancements etc. Kegan and Lahey (2001) have described the ways to diagnose immunity to change through:
• **Uncovering Employee’s Competing Commitments**: It involves asking a series of questions in group where other employees voluntarily discuss their own stories and how they overcome their own competing commitments which make employees feel more comfortable in discussing the truth behind their actions.

• **Unearthing their Big Assumptions**: “People rarely realize they hold big assumptions because, quite simply, they accept them as reality”. For example “I assume that if I develop unambivalent relationships with my white coworkers, I will sacrifice my racial identity and alienate my own community” (Kegan and Lahey, 2001, p.88). Thus, uncovering big assumptions that people hold inform why they are behaving in a contradictory manner and also enable them to recognize whether the assumption they hold is actually correct or not.

### 2.2 EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

1. Introducing proactive change in an organisation entails a visionary approach, openness to learning by doing and appropriate strategy at the right time. As seen in case of GE which adopted delayering of organisation structure, changing organisational culture and values, incorporating six sigma approaches, following best practices i.e., leading by example and boundarylessness as cornerstone for company’s strategy for 1990’s (Garvin, 1993; Koontz & Weihrich, 2012).

2. The leading reasons behind the transformation of public sector undertakings in India range from bureaucratic rule, short time-span of top level executives, absence of autonomy to intolerable interference of ministers in day-to-day functioning of these enterprises who considered these companies as their private property (Singh & Pant, 1982).

3. According to the report developed by (KPMG & ASSOCHAM, 2011). After the liberalisation of the Indian economy, public sector enterprises were exposed to fierce competition with the domestic and international organisations and therefore a change in vision of the public enterprises was necessitated. Thus, government has taken several measures to fight back the tough competition that include divestment of sick units, disinvestment in non-profitable areas, operational and financial autonomy to profitable enterprises, ESOS (Employee stock option scheme). In addition to this DPE (Department of Public Enterprises) has
categorized central public enterprises into several ‘Ratnas’ on the basis of their profitability and thereby granting special privileges and powers to them which allowed free flow of services.

4. One cannot implement change or replicate best management style or model in India that worked well in other country without addressing various issues and accordingly determine which management practice is best suited for a particular organisation. This means that the Indian culture, values, beliefs, traditions, sentiments needs to be addressed accordingly while implementing any change programme (Gupta, 1991).

5. There is widespread change in the business practices after liberalisation of the Indian economy which resulted in decreasing the gap between the lower level employees and higher level management as well as a shift in culture of the organisation that welcomes openness, innovation, learning, involvement that has become the cornerstone in today’s era of globalisation and liberalisation. To quote (Robbins, Judge & Sanghi, 2010) “Sasken Communication reflects an atmosphere of complete trust and equality. Sasken believes that lack of monitoring leads to transparency and freedom from fear. Thus it has no attendance system and no limit on sick leave that an employee can avail.” While travelling everyone along with the CEO fly in economy class and stays in similar hotel. Intel Technologies India looks at innovation as one of its seven core values and believes that the only way to innovate is by questioning the status quo. (p. 278).

6. Design of an organisation should be such that it allows efficiency in performing day-to-day activities as well as flexibility in transforming itself in response to the fundamental shifts in the environment. Generally employees may be prompted to specialize and refine their skills through learning by doing to enhance efficiencies (Argote, 1999). Yet, too much specialization generates competency traps (Levitt & March, 1988; Lant & Mezias, 1990). Consequently, when organisations optimize their technologies to perform well in a given context, they may also diminish their flexibility to evolve over time (Schumpeter, 1975). Moreover, organisations may be reluctant to make upfront investments required to build flexibility into their technologies (Baldwin & Clark, 2000). This is because they employ discounted cash flows and net present value, financial techniques that do
not recognize the real options value of building employees, and the organisation itself, may become maladaptive, especially when a competency-destroying change occurs (Tushman & Anderson, 1986). One of the several companies that have transformed itself in response to changing environments even as it has served existing clients well is Infosys which recognises that investment in the four elements viz., People, technology, process and purpose (governance) is a key to success (Garud, Kumarswamy & Sambamurthy, March-April, 2006).

- **People:** Infosys's founders recruited only the top students from India's best engineering schools. Among the recruiting criteria, one struck us as unique? "learnability," i.e., "an individual's ability to derive generic lessons from specific situations and apply those lessons to unstructured problems." ((Garud, Kumarswamy & Sambamurthy, March-April, 2006, p. 279).

- **Governance:** The employees of Infosys believes in decentralization, sharing, teaching and empowering one another which led to the “creation of an asking culture driven by an unwritten rule” (Garud, Kumarswamy & Sambamurthy, March-April, 2006b, p. 280).

- **Processes:** Department of Quality Control and Assurance was set up to achieve performance excellence. In addition to this adoption of Capability Maturity Model (CMM) that evaluates the maturity level of a company's software development processes and rates them from Level 1 to Level 5 (Jalote, 1999).

- **Technologies:** Investment in technologies leads to better communication among the employees as well as facilitates coordination and creation of harmonious culture in the organisation. Infosys implemented a company wide information intranet in 1996. Named Sparsh, meaning "in touch,"this intranet supported e-mail, official electronic bulletin boards, and more informal technical and personal discussions. Sparsh extended the reach of Infosys's "asking" culture.

7. To manage an organisation well requires a visionary approach; freedom from obsolete rules, strong HRD, investment in technology, infrastructure, training; openness; innovative ideas, following best practices, implementation of various OD interventions that are suitable in a given context and at the heart of it customer focused services all of which were lacking in case of a government owned public
sector enterprise erstwhile DVB (Delhi Vidyut Board). Saini (2005) DVB was running into losses, its AT&C (Aggregate Technical and Commercial) losses had reached 53 per cent and there were widespread corruption from line man to top officials all of which led to the transformation of DVB into Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL) and BSES on PPP (Public-Private-Partnership) basis. TPDDL has improved its functioning on several operational parameters. The AT&C losses were reduced from 53 per cent in July 2002 to 33.16 per cent on 30 September 2005, which meant reduction of about 20 per cent in a period of 38 months from the takeover (p. 276). Moreover TPDDL has taken several initiatives that include introduction of VRS (Voluntary retirement scheme), peer-exchange program, renovation of buildings, quick response to customer complaints, opening up of bill collection centres, technological advancements. On the HR front it takes the various measures that include participation of employees in management decision through formation of JIF (Joint Interaction Forum), salary disbursement through electronic bank transfer, implementation of SAARTHI for grievance redressal, Widow’s fund scheme etc. Today the company has reached at a point where one can look up to it as a role model for implementing transformational change.

8. There is a need to contribute a lot in the existing body of knowledge on organisational change, development and acknowledging the strategic role of HR in the Indian context emphasizing its crucial contribution to the field of OC (Bhatnagar, Budhwar, Srivastava & Saini, 2010, p. 492). In the present environment, HRM issues have become more important, with the firms’ adoption of strategies of expansion, diversification, turnaround, and internationalization. The human resources (HR) function is under severe pressure to bring about large-scale structural changes in order to cope with these challenges. In such conditions, the core focus of the Indian HR function has been on the development of their human resources in order to implement major OCs (Budhwar & Sparrow, 1997; Sparrow & Budhwar, 1997; Saini & Budhwar, 2004; Budhwar & Bhatnagar, 2009). Researchers highlight that the role of economy, the position of the state, the ways of doing business, and the national culture have an impact on the effectiveness of OC interventions in different settings (Child, 1981; Golembiewski, 2000). An analysis of the relevant literature highlights that OD
interventions have been practiced in a diversity of Indian organisations over the past few decades. Second, a number of different OC interventions have been adopted in the Indian context and there is a scarcity of research relating to transformational OC. Third, there is a scarcity of OC research in the new Indian economic environment, particularly as regards public-private-partnerships (which are a strong emerging phenomenon in the new economic environment) and the key issue of how to manage OC in these partnerships. The empirical evidence on organisational change is lacking and therefore an in depth analysis of the case of a utility company in India has been studied to understand the dynamics of managing a massive change i.e., transformation of a public utility DVB into Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. on PPP basis (Public-Private-Partnership). The change has been managed in such a peaceful and successful manner that it has taken the organisation to an entirely new phase of success as compared to the erstwhile DVB which has lend itself into a complete troubled situation.

9. According to Bordia, Hobman; Jones, Gallois and Callan (2004) change causes uncertainty among employees which are interrelated viz., strategic, structural and job-related uncertainty (p. 507). According to Bordia, et al Strategic uncertainty refers to uncertainty regarding organisation-level issues, such as reasons for change, planning and future direction of the organisation, its sustainability, the nature of the business environment the organisation will face, and so forth. Structural uncertainty refers to uncertainty arising from changes to the inner workings of the organisation, such as reporting structures and functions of different work-units. Job-related uncertainty includes uncertainty regarding job security, promotion opportunities, changes to the job role, and so forth (p. 510-511). Research on public-sector undertaking which have been de-merged and re-established in a new department reveals that management communication is effective in reducing uncertainty about strategic aspects of the change. One-way communication channels may be appropriate for communicating information about upper management decisions that are typically strategic in nature. However, to reduce feelings of uncertainty regarding structural and job-related issues participative strategies, such as team meetings, are required.

10. Organisation performance, innovation capability as well as transformational efforts are greatly influenced by the type of leaders associated with the
organisation. Rooke and Torbert (2005) have conducted an extensive survey at companies such as Deutsche Bank, Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, Hewlett-Packard, NSA, Trillium Asset Management, Aviva, and Volvo found that leaders who make an effort to understand their own action logic can improve their ability to lead. But to do that, it’s important first to understand what kind of leader you already are (p. 67). The three types of leaders associated with below-average corporate performance (Opportunists, Diplomats, and Experts) accounted for 55% of the total sample. They were significantly less effective at implementing organisational strategies than the 30% of the sample who measured as Achievers. Moreover, only the final 15% of managers in the sample (Individualists, Strategists, and Alchemists) showed the consistent capacity to innovate and to successfully transform their organisations as mentioned by Rooke & Torbet (p. 68). The different kinds of leaders have been explained as follows.

- **Opportunist:** These types of leaders focus on personal wins and see the world and other people as opportunities to be exploited. They regard their bad behavior as legitimate in the cut and thrust of an eye-for-an-eye world. They reject feedback, externalize blame, and retaliate harshly. Few Opportunists remain managers for long, unless they transform to more effective action logics (Rooke & Torbet, 2005, p. 68).

- **The Diplomat:** Diplomat seeks to please higher-status colleagues while avoiding conflict. This action logic is focused on gaining control of one’s own behavior—more than on gaining control of external events or other people. In a support role or a team context, this type of executive has much to offer. Diplomats provide social glue to their colleagues and ensure that attention is paid to the needs of others, which is probably why the great majority of Diplomats work at the most junior rungs of management, in jobs such as frontline supervisor, customer service representative, or nurse practitioner (Rooke & Torbet, 2005, p. 68).

- **The Expert:** The largest category of leader is that of Experts, who account for 38% of all professionals. In contrast to Opportunists, who focus on trying to control the world around them, and Diplomats, who concentrate on controlling their own behavior, experts try to exercise control by perfecting their knowledge, both in their professional and personal lives. Experts are great individual
contributors because of their pursuit of continuous improvement, efficiency, and perfection. But as managers, they can be problematic because they are so completely sure they are right. Emotional intelligence is neither desired nor appreciated. As Sun Microsystems’ CEO Scott McNealy put it: “I don’t do feelings; I’ll leave that to Barry Manilow” (Rooke & Torbet, 2005, p. 71).

- **The Achiever**: These leaders create a positive work environment and focus their efforts on deliverables; the downside is that their style often inhibits thinking outside the box. Achievers can also reliably lead a team to implement new strategies over a one- to three-year period, balancing immediate and long-term objectives (Rooke & Torbet, 2005, p. 71).

- **The Individualist**: The Individualist action logic recognizes that neither it nor any of the other action logics are “natural”; all are constructions of oneself and the world. This seemingly abstract idea enables the 10% of Individualist leaders to contribute unique practical value to their organisations; they put personalities and ways of relating into perspective and communicate well with people who have other action logics. They tend to ignore rules they regard as irrelevant, which often makes them a source of irritation to both colleagues and bosses (Rooke & Torbet, 2005, p.71).

- **The Strategist**: Strategists account for just 4% of leaders. What sets them apart from Individualists is their focus on organisational constraints and perceptions, which they treat as discussable and transformable. The Strategist is also adept at creating shared visions across different action logics—visions that encourage both personal and organisational transformations. According to the Strategist’s action logic, organisational and social change is an iterative developmental process that requires awareness and close leadership attention.

Strategists deal with conflict more comfortably than do those with other action logics, and they’re better at handling people’s instinctive resistance to change. As a result, Strategists are highly effective change agents (Rooke & Torbet, 2005 pp. 71-72).

- **The Alchemist**: Alchemist has an extraordinary capacity to deal simultaneously with many situations at multiple levels whereas the strategist will move from one
engagement to another. They can talk with both kings and commoners and can deal with immediate priorities yet never lose sight of long-term goals. Alchemists constitute 1% of the sample, which indicates how rare it is to find them in business or anywhere else. Alchemists are typically charismatic and extremely aware individuals who live by high moral standards. They focus intensely on the truth. Perhaps most important, they’re able to catch unique moments in the history of their organisations, creating symbols and metaphors that speak to people’s hearts and minds (Rooke & Torbet, 2005, p. 72).

11. Public-Private-Partnership model is considered an essential approach to meet the critical service needs of citizens. According to Zeeshan and Rehman (May, 2013) Public Private Partnerships or PPPs are being promoted for implementation of infrastructure projects. PPP is often described as a private business investment where two parties comprising government as well as a private sector undertaking forming a partnership. PPPs do not mean reduced responsibility and accountability of the government (p. 174). The research is conducted with a motive to study consumer’s perception of the need to involve private partners in infrastructure projects and identification of priority sectors among Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) projects of Uttar Pradesh. The five priority sectors include Roads, Airline services, Electricity, Education and Healthcare services in which implementation of PPP model considered mandatory. According to Zeeshan and Rehman increase in the number of PPP models can only be possible if the consumers or the public are aware about the positive aspects and benefits of PPP to improve standard of living. Moreover education is required to explain to them that the services could not be provided unless a fee is charged, and then they are better offered (p. 188).

12. According to Meyerson (2001) people in various organisations may differ from the organisational status quo in some way – in values, race, gender, or sexual preference. They all see things a bit differently from the “norm”. If something is unusual they work quietly to challenge prevailing wisdom and gently provoke their organisational cultures to adapt (p. 93). Such change agents have been called tempered radical by the author as they act as an informal leader who calmly challenges the existing culture. “Peter Grant a black, manager of West Coast Bank has radically altered the face of his organisation by materializing goal of hiring
more women and racial minorities into the group to enable them to succeed” (Meyerson, 2001, p. 94). He is able to fulfill his dream and chip away organisation’s demographic base without attacking the system, advancing a bold vision, or wielding great power by following the strategies to change as described below:

- **Disruptive Self expression**
  It entails a different perspective or expression which is not in consonance or disruptive to others expectations. “Whether waged as a personal act of protest or merely as a personal demonstration of one’s values, disruptive self-expression in language, dress, office décor or behaviour can slowly change the atmosphere at work” (Meyerson, 2001, p. 95).

- **Verbal Jijutsu**
  It means taking a challenge or voice coming at your end and turning it into opportunity for change. In other words if a demeaning statement, remark, or inconsistent situation occurs then it is taken as an opportunity for change not directly but quietly (Meyerson, 2001).

- **Variable term opportunism**
  In order to bring change it must be acceptable to all therefore the next step that tempered radicals should follow is to recognize every opportunity to motivate or inspire others to get the real change.

- **Strategic Alliance Building**
  It entails working with allies than alone as this would automatically increase the influence as well as boost the pace of change. Moreover it would create gains for the individuals in terms of ease of access to resources, technical and task assistance, emotional support and advice (Meyerson, 2001, p.99).

### 2.3 CONCLUSION

The present study is an endeavour to analyse the attitude and perception of TPDDL employees post organisational transformation. This becomes more relevant as
planning commission Dy. Chairman Montek Singh Ahluwalia, “the strongest proponent of public-private-partnership (PPP) projects has admitted to the problem being faced by those organisations post organisational transformation, but he ruled out scrapping the model, instead he has started discussion on how the mechanism can be made to work better” (Dash, 2013, p. 22). The present study is a humble effort in this direction.