Chapter One

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

Organizational Change

A change has been a topic of interest and debates of philosophers, thinkers, sociologist, dramatists, scientists, etc. In other words it has attracted the attention of all ages at all times. For centuries, Philosophers struggled with the definitions of change though obviously not with the business organizations.

Change represents a challenge to all societies at all times. Nearly 2500 years ago, the Greek philosopher Heraclitus wrote that, "you cannot dip your toes into the same river twice" because river continuously flows and changes. Change has always been a part of human conditions.

In today's business world, any organization that isn't continually developing, acquiring or adapting to new changes will likely to be out of business in few years. Because, change rather than stability is the norm today. To survive and expand, organizations must quickly adapt to changes in their environment. If organizations do not change, they lose their ability to compete. When the environment changes and the position originally filled by the organization either becomes unimportant or is superseded, the organization must change or die. Over the past few decades, organizations throughout the world have faced the need to make radical changes in strategy, structure and management process to adapt to new competitive demands.

Change is quite inevitable due to tremendous foreseen internal and external environmental pressure. It compares the organization before and after the situation in order to stop one thing and start a new thing. In order to know the correct meaning of change we must define it, by dictionary meaning change means, "substitution of one
thing with the other or replacement of one with the other”.

According to the Chambers dictionary- Change means to “alter, or to make different, to make or to pass from one state to another, to exchange”.

Richard Beckhard (1969) defined organizational change as “an effort planned organization-wide and managed from top to increase organizational effectiveness and health through planned interventions in the organization, using behavioural science knowledge”.

Gordon Lippit (1969) conceived organizational change as the "strengthening of those human processes in organizations which improve the functioning of its objectiveness".

Warner Burke and Harvey A.Hornstein (1972) defined organizational change as “a process of planned change of an organization which avoids an examination of social process”.

Chattopadhyay and Pareek (1982) described organizational change as “a relatively enduring alteration of the present state of an organization on its components and functions in totality and partially in order to obtain greater viability in the context of the present and anticipated future environment”.

Huber, et.al. (1993) defined organizational change as "Change that involves differences in how an organization functions, who its members and leaders are, what form it takes, and how it allocates resources".

Stephen P. Robbins (1994) said that the need for organizational change is created by “the changing nature of the work force, technology, economic shocks, the new world politics and the changing nature of competition".
Van de Ven Poole (1995) defined change as a “difference in organizational form, quality, or state”.

Daft (1995) opined that organizational change is “the adaptation of a new idea or a behaviour by an organization”.

Barnett and Carroll (1995) defined organizational change as “transformation of an organization between two points in time”.

Organizational change can be defined “as any structural, strategic, cultural, human or technological transformation, capable of generating impact in an organization”. (Wood, 2000)

Greenberg and Baron (2002) said that “any planned or unplanned transformation in the structure, technology, or people of an organization is termed as organizational change”.

Change is concerned with “shifting from one stage to another or breaks down existing structures and create new one”. (Chonko, 2004).

The concept of organizational change overlaps with a few other concepts which also aim to improve the performance and effectiveness of organization such as organizational growth, organizational development and organizational renewal.

Beckard (1969) defined organizational development as “an effort planned, organization-wide and managed from the top to increase organizational effectiveness and health through planned interventions in the organization, using behavioural science knowledge”.

Peter Vail (1989) believes that the genius of organizational development is its
focus on organizational process. He views organizational development as "a process for improving organizational processes".

Porras and Roberston (1992) said that organizational development is a set of behavioural science based theories, values, strategies and techniques aimed at the planned change of organizational work setting for the purpose of enhancing individual development and improving organization's performance through the alteration of organizational members on the job behaviours.

Burke (1994) defined organizational development as "a planned process of change in an organization's culture through the utilization of behavioural science technologies, research and theory".

Wendell L. French (1998) defined organizational development as "organizational development is a process in the sense that a process is an identifiable flow of interrelated events moving over time towards some goal or end".

Whereas organizational growth is a concept that describes organization as complex organisms having a life cycle with stages of development, commencing with birth and progressing through survival to later stages of maturity.

From the above definition and discussion it is clear that organizational development is planned change in an organization context. The development of models of planned change facilitated the development of organizational development. The theme of planned change began to take form in the late 40's and 50's as several scholars argued that the fundamental problem of organizational change per se. Kurt Lewin is credited with introducing this theme with a powerful model of unfreezing, changing and refreezing, which would be discussed later in this chapter.
In the history of organizational development, change has been thought of as an important and dominant factor in the development of organization. Change happens too frequently today, that it seems that one change is not complete before another is being launched. Change is everywhere, change will be the one of the few constants during the end of this century and into the next, the pace of change has primarily been increased with the increasing challenges such as competition, development, general instability, mergers and reengineering of work process. Such challenges emerged rapidly during the emergence of global economy in the late 1980’s and 1990’s, and advancement of technology and communication networking system (Bernerth, 2004).

Ralph Kilman, Covin (1988) and others have identified ten features of organizational transformation.

1. It is a response to environmental and technological change.

2. It provides a new model of organization for the future by creating a new vision.

3. It is based on dissatisfaction with the old and belief in the new.

4. It is qualitatively different way of perceiving, thinking and behaving.

5. It represents system-wide or organization-wide change.

6. It requires the top management leadership.

7. It is ongoing forever.

8. It is orchestrated by internal and external experts.

9. It represents the leading edge of knowledge about organizational change.

10. It generates more open communication and feedback throughout the organization.
**Forces for Change**

The organizational environment is constantly changing, and an organization must adapt to these changes in order to survive (C. Argyris et. al, 1985). There are many forces in the environment that have an impact on the organization and that recognizing the nature of these forces is one of a manager's most important task (R.M. Kanter, 1984). If managers are slow to respond to competitive, economic, political, global, and other forces, the organization will lag behind its competitors and its effectiveness will be compromised.

Listed below are the most important forces for change that confront an organization and its managers:

1. **Competitive forces** - Organizations are constantly striving to achieve a competitive advantage. Competition is a force for change because unless an organization matches or surpasses its competitors in efficiency, quality or its capability to innovate new or improved goods or services it will not survive.

2. **Economic, Political and Global forces** - These forces continually affect organizations and compel them to change how and where they produce goods and services. Economic and Political unions among countries are becoming increasingly important forces for change (C.W.L.Hill, 1994).

3. **Demographic and Social forces** – Managing a diverse work force is one of the biggest challenges to confront organizations in 2000 and beyond (D Jamieoson & J.O'Mara, 1991). Changes in the composition of the workforce and the increasing diversity of employees have presented organizations with many challenges and opportunities. Increasingly, changes in the demographic characteristic of the work
force have led managers to change their styles of managing employees and to learn how to understand, supervise and motivate diverse members effectively.

4. **Ethical Forces** – It is also important for an organization to take steps to promote ethical behaviour in the face of increasing government, political and social demands for more responsible and honest corporate behaviour (W.H. Shaw & V. Barry, 1995). Many organizations need to make changes to allow managers and workers at all levels to report unethical behaviour so that an organization can move quickly to eliminate such behavior and protect the general interests of its members and customers.

**Responses to Change**

The responses to change depend upon the employees’ perception about the change, different individuals differ in their attitudes and hence, the perceptions towards change. Therefore, one important task of the management of an organization is to understand and create a positive attitude among employees regarding change. According to Elizure and Guttman (1976), attitudes towards change in general consist of a person’s cognition about change, affective reactions to change, and behavioural tendency to change. Researchers have, identified various employees’ responses to an organizational change ranging from strong positive attitudes (i.e. “this change is essential for the organization to succeed”) to strong negative attitudes (i.e. “this change could ruin the company”).

Therefore change can be received with excitement and happiness or anger and fear while employees’ response to it may range from positive intentions to support the change, to negative intentions to oppose it. Positive attitudes to change were found to be vital in achieving organizational goals and in succeeding in change programmes (Eby et al., 2000).
Employees' attitudes toward change can impact their morale, productivity and turnover intentions (Lacovini, 1993). Many studies suggested that organizational change efforts can be very stressful experiences for individuals (Elrod and Tippett, 2002; Grant, 1996). More specifically, they noted that there are many emotional states that a person can experience during change processes, which are equilibrium, denial, anger, bargaining, depression, resignation, openness, readiness and re-emergence (Perlman and Takacs, 1990).

Schabracq and Cooper (1998) believe that due to change in organization employees' positions and technical skills are changed or altered, and when employees fail to make necessary technical adjustments, a sense of uncertainty arises about the future, which, in turn, creates stress. This uncertainty can affect employees' work commitment and job satisfaction. McHugh (1993), Change will be a stressful experience. Stress caused by organizational change will result in creating negative attitudes toward change, and therefore stress will become an inhibitor to change.

Literature reveals that change is a source of feeling of threats, anxiety, uncertainty, frustration and alienation (Ashford, 1988). Change in an organization will produce some uncertainty, frustration, and anxiety among employees that will have long-term effects on employees' attitude and psychology. Hui and Lee (2000) found that the expectation of changes led employees to experience psychological uncertainty about the potential loss of current position, unemployment, role pressure, and reduction of available resources. Employees may also lose trust in the organization as a whole. Thus it is imperative to know the employees perception regarding the change before initiating change process. Many researchers like Eby et al., (2000) focused on employee's attitudes and behaviours to effective change programs. In this regards, Desplaces (2005) advocated that extent of certain individual and workplace
characteristics may lead to develop positive attitudes and behaviours for change readiness. These factors are associated with personal, social, environmental, cultural and organizational services. In this regards, change management agents are solely concerned with the issues how to deal with the employees so that they can actively accept and involve in the change process.

Furthermore, change that contributes to a “better life” for members of the work unit may lead individuals to conclude that organizations hold values and goals consistent with their own and is acting in their best interest in making the change. Therefore, changes whose outcomes are generally favorable to the unit’s members should be positively related to individual’s commitment to both the change and to the organization.

DIMENSIONS OF CHANGE

Change is a dynamic process and with change in any one dimensions results in compensatory change in other dimensions. Dimensions of organizational change were given by Flood in 1995 which was further supported and described by Cao et al in 2000 according to which organizational change has been classified into four dimensions:

1. Changes in Organizational Process:

The key issue of change management is to deal with change in organizational processes and control over these processes. Organizational process transforms certain inputs into outputs of value to customers. It often involves material flow from raw material to finished products, cash flow from investments to profits, and human resource input. According to Peter in 1994 process change involve operational sub-
processes improvement, intra-process improvement, inter-process relationship improvement, process redesign, total process re-conception and technological implementation.

2. Changes in organizational functions, their organization, co-ordination and control (Structural Change):

Organizational structure is a formal system of task and authority, relationship that control how people co-ordinate their actions and use resources to achieve organizational goals. For any organization an appropriate structure is one that facilitates effective responses to problems of coordination and motivation. Structural strategies attempt to change an organization's design by modifying the lines of authority, span of control and arrangement of work functions. When there is change in organizational functions then there may be changes in horizontal and vertical structures; changes in decision systems and policy, change in resource allocation mechanism; and change in the criteria used for recruitment, appraisal, compensation and career development. In today's developing societies it is found that organizations are changing from rational bureaucratic structures to flexible structures, characterized by a flat authority structure.

3. Changes in Organizational Culture (Changes in Values):

Change in culture means changes in values, beliefs and human behavior in terms of relationships to social rules and practices. An organization's culture is shaped by the people inside the organization, by the employment rights given to employees and by the type of structure used by the organization. Organization culture shapes and controls behavior of the people within the organization. It is believed that “multicultural organization” should be created, thereby encouraging more creativity.
better problem-solving and flexible adaptation to change, and keeping the company ahead of the competition through mutual learning among organizational members. Reed (1992) argues that organizational culture is shaped by organizational politics and will direct long-term structural development. The cultures of organizations that provide essentially the same goods and services can be very different for example: Coca-Cola and PepsiCo are the two largest and most successful companies in the soft drink industry. They sell similar products and face similar environment but they have different culture. Coca-Cola takes pride in its long term commitment to employees: its loyal managers, many of whom spends their entire career with the organization whereas PepsiCo has a highly competitive and political culture in which conflicts over decision making causes frequent disputes, and often turnover among top managers.

4. Changes in power distribution and the way organizational issues are influenced:

This view sees organizations as union of interest group in tension or a particular balance of forces, continually subject to modifications. McHugh (2001) suggest that it is important to understand where power comes from and how these sources of power can be developed.

From the above discussion it is clear that change in any one dimension will probably result in compensatory change in other dimension. These dimensions are interconnected and interacting. For example shifts in the large culture influence individuals, who influence organizational culture, which in turn affects organizational structure (DeLisi, 1990).
Barnett and Carroll (1995) identified two major dimensions relevant to organizational change:

1) The **content of change**, which relates to differences in the content of a state A organization relative to the content associated with a state B firm. State A is the current organizational form that a firm occupies, and state B represents an alternative organizational form that the firm aspires to be. Both states can be described on the basis of their organizational content, namely, their structures, relationships, information and production technologies, operational processes and routines etc.

2) The **process of change**, which focuses on how change occurs, including the speed of change, the necessary sequence of activities, supporting internal changes, and obstacles confronted.

**Models of Change**

Models and theories depict the important features of some phenomenon, describe those features as variables, and specify the relationship among variables. Planned change theories are rudimentary as far as explaining relationships among variables, but pretty good for identifying the important variables involved.

Kurt Lewin, a pioneer in the field of social psychology and group dynamics identified, change a three phase model Unfreezing, changing/moving, refreezing. Kurt Lewin (1951) has applied his theory of force field analysis to study the process of bringing about effective change.

Lewin’s model assumes two obstacles which generally affect the change process:
(1) Generally individuals experience obstacles to change as they are unable or unwilling to alter long established attitude or behaviour for various reasons.

(2) They may try to do things differently but may have the tendency to return to traditional ways after a short time. To overcome this problem, Lewin proposed a three step sequential model of change process.
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**Fig 1.1. Image of change**

According to Lewin, there is a current state (A) and a desired future state (B) and through planned interventions, one moves from state A to the most desirable state B.

The first step of change is to **unfreeze** the present or old behaviour (or situation) by creating a perceived need for something new. It is facilitated by environmental pressure such as increased competition, declining productivity and performance, felt need to improve the style of work, etc.

The second step, **changing or moving** involves making the actual changes that will move the organization to another level of response- learn new skills, practices, changes in reporting relationships, reward systems, etc. This stage involves a shift in behaviour of organizations by modifying system, process, technology and people.
The final stage of the change process, **refreezing**, involves stabilizing and integrating change by reinforcing new behaviours and integrating them into formal and interpersonal relationships and in one’s personality.

Lewin’s model provides a general framework for understanding the organizational change. At the later stage, the model has been modified by Lippitt et al. (1958), they expanded the three stage model into a seven stage model of planned change. Their seven stages are as follows:

1. Developing a need for change. This is similar to Lewin’s unfreezing phase,
2. Establishing a change relationship.
3. Clarifying or diagnosing the client system’s problem.
4. Examining alternative routes and goals.
5. Transforming intentions into actual change efforts.
6. Generalizing and stabilizing change.
7. Achieving a terminal relationship that is, terminating the client-consultant relationship.

The first three steps represent the unfreezing step, the fourth and fifth steps represent the moving stage, sixth and seventh step represent the refreezing stage.

Tichy and Devanna (1986) described change as three act drama:

**Act I - Awakening organizations to the need for change.** The goal is to arouse emotional energy of the entire organization. The process destroys what is familiar.

**Act II - Mobilizing organization to create a blue print for the future,** as old ways are swept away and people begin to recognize the need for something new. Leader articulates a vision and communication becomes critical.
Act III – Reinforcing concerns for creation of structures to institutionalize the organization vision. New practices are created to embody the new ideas and over a period of time, these practices influence the way employees think and behave.

According to Nicklos (2004) to manage change effectively, the following sets of skills are required: political skills, analytical skills, people skills, system skills, business skills.

The past few decades have been seen increasingly rapid advances in the field of change management and mainly focused on the issues of effective and successful implementation of changes (Madeson et al., 2005). Indeed, change requires proper handling the situation because of human involvement that can develop uncertainties and ambiguities due to diverting situation from known to unknown and individual difference in their life. Organizational change programs cannot be assumed or become automatic but requires proper attention (Smith, 2005).

In summary, organizational change should be seen as a dynamic process concerned with the management of diversity of approaches to continually changing problem contexts. Gluskinos (1987) suggests that management of strategic change in organizations requires diagnosis of three sub-systems: The technical, political, culture. In his study he demonstrates the impact of introducing common management techniques such as M.B.O (Management By Objectives), Performance Appraisal and reward systems on the political and cultural sub-systems of the organizations.
Work Commitment

Work commitment is one of the widely researched areas among researchers, psychologists and human resource management practitioners. In the present modern world the major concern of management is to utilize the maximum human resource to enhance quality of skills, quality of life and subsequently organizational commitment and other work related attitude and behavior. In this modern era work commitment is being viewed as an important aspect for determining employees' productivity, efficiency because perception of work commitment has been regarded as an important construct in understanding the work behavior of employees. Various researches identify multiple factors affecting organizational commitment among employees. Work commitment has been defined and measured in several different ways and it has been related with many job related variables.

Work commitment is defined as

(1) A strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization;

(2) A willingness to exert high levels of efforts on behalf of the organization;

(3) A definite in, and acceptance of, the values and the goals of the organization.

In other words, this is an attitude reflecting employees' loyalty to their organization and is an ongoing process through which organizational participants express their concern for the organization and its continued success and wellbeing. Commitment refers to individual's attraction and attachment with the work in an organization.
Whyte (1956) a social anthropologists proposed the concept of “the organization man” a person who not only works for the organization but also has a sense of organizational belongingness. This concept received wide publicity in the field of organizational behaviour. In almost the same line Lawrence (1958) asserted “ideally we would want one sentiment to be dominant in all employees from top to bottom, namely a complete loyalty to the organization purpose”.

Organizational commitment refers to the nature of an individual’s relationship to an organization such that highly committed individual will indicate

a) A strong desire to remain a member of the organization

b) A willingness to exert high levels of efforts on behalf of the organization and

c) A definite belief in an acceptance of the values and goals of the organization (Mowday et al., 1982; Steers, 1977).

Rechiers (1986) opined organizational commitment as a process of identification with the goals of organizations multiple constituencies and these constituencies includes from top management to the public at large.

O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) contends to the fact that employees’ psychological attachment to an organization can reflect varying combination of the three psychological foundations like compliance that occurs when attitudes and behaviours are adopted not because of shared beliefs but simply to gain specific rewards, whereas identification occurs when individuals accept influence to establish or maintain satisfying relationships, that is, an individual may feel proud to be a part of group respecting its values and accomplishments without adopting them his / her own. Internalization occurs when influence is accepted because of induced attitude
and behaviour that are congruent with one’s own values, that is the values of the
group or organization are same, the impact of O'Reilly and Chatman (1986)
classification system has been found weakened as they failed in distinguishing
between identification and internalization items to form a measure of what they called
normative commitment.

According to Meyer & Allen (1991) organizational commitment can take three
distinct forms, namely affective, continuance and normative commitment.

1) **Affective commitment** refers to identification with, involvement in, and emotional
attachment to the organization, in the sense that employees with strong affective
commitment remain with the organization because they want to do so. Porter et al.
(1974) categorize the affective commitment in the following types;

(a) Acceptance of the organization’s goal and values.

(b) A willingness to focus efforts to achieve the organization’s desired outcome.

(c) A willingness to maintain organization’s membership.

2) **Continuance commitment** refers to commitment based on employees’ recognition
of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Thus, employees with strong
continuance commitment remain with the organization because they have to do so,
either because of low perceived alternatives or because of high personal sacrifice
associated with leaving the organization.

3) **Normative commitment** refers to the commitment based on a sense of obligation
to the organization. Weiner (1982) has discussed that normative commitment is the
generalized value of loyalty and duty. Those with strong normative commitment
remain with the organization because they feel they ought to do so. It could be argued
that employees with strong affective commitment would be more willing to accept change, provided that such a change is not altering the basic values and goals of the organization, and is seen as beneficial to the organization, since organizational commitment reflects a belief in the values and goals of the organization.

Sharma and Singh (1991) describes that organizational commitment is the product of two independent sets of factors viz., personal and organizational which simultaneously operate in every organization.

Brown (1996) studied popular concepts and types of organizational commitment in the light of the definition of commitment and common factors that pertain to all types of commitment. Commitment is best conceptualized as a single, fundamental construct that may vary according to differences in focus, terms, and time specific-evaluation. The commitment development process not only affects focus and terms of commitment, but also has strong implication for the evaluation process. Analysis of affective commitment measures indicates that certain measures contain more than one constraints to the basic meaning of commitment. Recommendation for evaluation of organizational commitment, include the argument that commitment measures should address one set of terms and avoid evaluative phraseology.

According to Suliman and Iles (2000a), the following are the important aspects of organizational commitment: it improves employees performance, that is, committed employees are assumed to be motivated to work hard and put in more efforts than less committed employees; it fosters better superior-subordinate relationships; it enhances organizational development, growth and survival; it negatively influences withdrawal behaviour, such as turnover, tardiness and
absenteeism: and it has a positive impact on employees’ readiness to innovate and create. Commitment is usually stronger among longer term employees, those who have experienced personal success in the organization and those working within a committed employee group. Organizationally committed employees will usually have good attendance record, demonstrate a willing adherence to company policies, and have lower turnover rates.

Meyer & Herscovitch (2001) defined commitment as follows: “commitment is a force that binds an individual to a course of action that is of relevance to a particular target”.

According to Cartwright and Cooper (2002) commitment of the employee to the organization implies expectations of the organization that its employees will do their job to the best of their ability and that they will be loyal and dedicated to the organization.

While surveying the concept of commitment, it has been noticed that commitment is multidimensional construct and this term has been defined in many ways due to the flexibility given for the use of the term. Commitment is a general term which in work context refers to either organizational commitment or work commitment where earlier concept is used in broader sense and in meaning and the later refers to specific commitment which is known as work commitment, though these two are generally interchangeably used.

It is significant to point out here that work commitment is one of the construct of organizational commitment as Morrow (1983) enumerated organizational commitment as a construct, was potentially redundant with other work commitment constructs such as job involvement (Kanungo, 1982; Lodahl & Kejner, 1965), work
ethic (Blood, 1969; Mirels & Garrett, 1971) and career commitment (Blau, 1985). Furthermore, Morrow and Mc Elory (1993) suggested that organizational commitment is the most naturally developed aspects of work commitment family of constructs. In spite of such controversies, it is important to point out here that in this large investigation work commitment is used which in itself bears the notion of organizational commitment as these two terms are so interdependent where one cannot be explained by overlooking the others. So, in this investigation work commitment combines the notion of organizational commitment.

**Outcomes of Work Commitment:**

Literature shows that employees' attachment, identification and involvement depend upon the outcomes such as pay, promotion, appraisal, and satisfaction that can refer to one's motivation to work in a chosen vocation (Judge et al., 1995). Steers (1977) proposed the model in which it was expected that commitment would lead to at least four different effectiveness related outcomes. First, employees who were truly committed to the values and goals of the organization would be more likely to exhibit high level of participation in organizational activities. It will lower the employees' absenteeism. Second, highly committed employees would have a stronger desire to remain with their organization so as to contribute to the attainment of its goals. Third, because of their increased identification with and belief in the organizational objectives. It is likely that such committed individuals will become involved in their jobs. Finally, highly committed employees would be willing to expend considerable efforts on the behalf of the organization.

Batenman and Strasser (1984) concluded that organizational commitment was an important antecedent of job satisfaction. Committed individuals showed high level
of job satisfaction. Begley and Czajka (1993) got interesting findings. They found that highly committed employees felt the effect of stress more than did the less committed employees. Authors concluded that highly committed employees take organizational problems more personal and feel deeply disturbed by them. Thus they have more negative outcomes. Meyer et al. (1993) found that organizational commitment led to low personnel turnover and low job satisfaction.

According to Weiner and Vardi (1980) a committed individual retains membership in the organization and exerts high degree of effort not because he has figured out that doing so is to his personal benefits but because he believes that “he should” behave in this way since this is the right and expected behaviour. They found that organizational commitment has been used as a criterion of organization effectiveness.

Employees with the high commitment usually go on work in time and are motivated to put more efforts but individuals having low level of commitment are least motivated. Least motivated individuals try to give excuses like illness or transportation problem but highly motivated employees cannot think of it to be late or absent from work. Individuals having high level of job involvement and commitment have fewer excuses as compared to those individuals who have low level of commitment and involvement (Blau, 1986; Blau & Boal, 1987).
Significance of the Study

The importance of any study has its utility and practicability in the life of human being. The present investigation will help to visualize various dimensions of organizational change and its impact on work commitment of employees. Now a days, organizational changes of increasing frequency and severity has become the norm. so. improving our understanding of reactions to such changes becomes increasingly important. By identifying the relationships of independent (organizational change) and dependent (work commitment) variables, the managers and the organization can better understand the process of change and find ways to enhance staff of the organization, improve employee performance and plan better policies etc. The present investigation would help the organization development specialist, H.R practioners in better understanding of the organizational change and its impact to meet the organization goals and values.