CHAPTER 0

INTRODUCTION
A quick glance over the world scenario reveals that rapid and radical changes are taking place in almost all spheres of life but they are more pronounced in case of economic aspects. The economics have become more competitive due to which the organization have to incorporate structural and functional changes. Kolasa (1969) contends that change makes its course in the evolution of human efforts. Change may take place so slowly that it may not be immediately perceptible or it may be so rapid that, "we are left somewhat breathless in the wakes of waves" (Kolasa, 1969). It is easy to infer that change is inevitable.

If we go by dictionary meaning, then change means substitution of one thing with another or replacement of one with the other. Change has attracted the attention of philosophers, thinkers, sociologists, dramatists, novelists and scientists etc. alike at all times, and it has been a topic of interest and debate among them.

Industrial organization have faced diversities and were forced to bring change. Coch & French (1948) pointed out that one of the most famous studies on organizational change took place in the 1940s at a plant of Harwood Manufacturing company of U.S.A. The changes were introduced for the benefit of the workers as well as the organization. The strategy, later on, was adopted by other organizations (Marrow, Bowers and Seashore, 1967). First of all Lewin initiated experiment on leadership, consumer behaviour and
group dynamics (Marrow, 1969).

PLANNED CHANGE:

Changes were treated as an accidental occurrence by some organizations but now a days change activities are productive and purposeful. Organizational Psychologists emphasize planned change. Robbins (1991) advocates that there are two goals of planned change. First it seeks to improve the ability of the organization to adapt to changes in its environment. Second, it seeks to change employees behaviour. If an organization is to survive, it must respond to changes in its environment. Since an organization’s success or failure is essentially due to employees behaviour, planned change also is concerned with changing the behaviour of individuals and groups within the organizations. Thus, planned change is defined as change in activities that are intentional and goal oriented.

Recently Boyd, Luetje and Eckert (1992) have suggested that Lewin’s (1951) field theory provides the frame work to conceptualize, plan and implement organizational change. The first phase of change was implemented through a planned top-to-bottom training process that served to “unfreeze” the organization in a dramatic way and allow change to occur. High morale, change in staff behaviour, and improved communication were observed. Kilmann (1985) presented a complete programme for organizational success. The programme was organized in terms of a 5 - stage process of
planned change: 1. Initiating the programme, 2. diagnosing the problem, 3. Scheduling the track, 4. implementing the track, and, 5. evaluating the results. It is suggested that the five stages be approached as a collaborative effort among managers, members and external consultants. Hill (1987) presents guidelines for targetting planned change in organizations by providing a model of planned organizational change that emphasizes the need to understand causes of behaviour and organizational development systems techniques. Strategic human resource planning is viewed as one critical tool, organizational behaviour is seen as a result of the interactions of organizational arrangements and task, individual and informal organizational components.

It has been observed that contemplated change often leads to resistance. Organizational change may be a product of the forces that motivate to bring about change. But the forces must be strong enough to counteract the resistance to change (Klein and Ritti, 1984).

COMPONENTS OF CHANGE & RESISTANCE TO CHANGE:

One of the most well documented findings from studies of individual and organizational behaviour is that organizations and their members resist change. Resistance provides a degree of stability and predictability to behaviour. Robbins (1991) opines that resistance can be overt, implicit, immediate, or deferred. It is easiest for management to deal with resistance when it is overt and
immediate than managing resistance that is implicit or deferred. Implicit resistance efforts are more subtle -- loss of loyalty to the organisation, loss of motivation to work, increased error or mistakes, increased absenteeism due to ‘sickness’ -- and hence more difficult to recognize.

There are many factors responsible for resistance to change. Degree and force of resistance depends upon how people feel about change. Sources of resistance may be individual as well as organizational (Robbins, 1991). Individual sources of resistance to change reside in basic human characteristics such as perceptions, personalities and need. Six major sources of organizational resistance have been identified as -- inertia, limited focus of change, group intertia, threat to expertise, threat to established power relationship, and threat to established resource allocations (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

Resistance to change is a natural phenomenon in which we all indulge. Each time a force for change arises, a defense against the change appears as well. Lewin (1951) suggested that this situation could best be represented as a "free field", with forces pushing for acceptance of change and other forces pushing against its acceptance.

Group contact, participation, and group dynamics are suggested as strategies for overcoming resistance to change (Cartwright, 1951). Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) have suggested six tactics dealing with resistance to change --
education and communication, participation, facilitation and support, negotiation, manipulation and cooptation, and coercion.

Staufer (1992) and Bloom and Sheerer (1992) propose social systems approach to promote the idea of leaders as change agents. Results showed that the training had a positive effect on Ss level of perceived competence, the quality of teaching practices in their classrooms, and the organizational climate of their centers. Additionally, case study data of 39-year-old woman, who was the acting director of a program documented the Ss feelings of increased self-confidence and self-efficacy. McElheny, Robinson & Rice (1982) state that the human resource manager should focus on the development and institutionalization of specific organizational practices of development programs that can lead to increased employee satisfaction and effectiveness, but not employee productivity.

Likert (1961) has pointed out that 'supportive environment' is much more conducive to change because employees working in such organizations believe that their personal worth and importance are maintained. Walton and Mckensie (1956) reiterated that supportive conditions lay emphasis on participation which may give impetus to change (Ginzburg, 1975, Sollenberger, 1967, Mckinsey, 1968; Dickson & Power, 1973; Lucas, 1973; 1974a; 1974b; Swanson, 1974).

Beer (1991) discussed ways in which the performance
technologists can assist in attacking organizational dysfunctions by means of employee empowerment. Manager and employee set mutual goals and the manager relinquishes measurement processes and tools to the employees. However, managers may be reluctant to give up their traditional areas of control, while employees may be unaccustomed to the additional responsibility. The performance technologists, therefore, needs to consider tactics beyond those of conventional organization development. He has emphasized on getting 'mind share' at every level, enlightening, and exploiting the power of electronic mail. Glover (1992) presented a case study of a firm's decision to use power to transform the organization into a mega corporation. The power-coercive management style selected by the firm appeared temporarily effective because sales were growing, largely due to the record economic growth experienced in key markets. Once the growth halted, the lack of a team concept, counter productive incentive plans and the skewed personality composition of the management team contributed to low morale, inferior production, ineffective marketing, and, ultimately led to financial losses. Covin and Kilman (1991) investigated the reasons why organizations initiated major planned change efforts, what they were changing, and how changes were being made. A typical large-scale change (LSC) effort was initiated in response to or in anticipation of external environmental changes. Specific goals included increased productivity and responsiveness to customers or
clients, improved product quality, increased employee participation, and decreased costs. Team building was most frequently used as change techniques.

It is suggested that due to organizational change, modifications take place and it may create conditions conducive to healthy environment. In some cases, change is introduced to rectify the financial difficulties facing the organization (Seigal and Lane, 1977). Through change it is possible to improve the technique so that better performance could be obtained and change may provide job satisfaction to the employees (Francis and Milbourn, 1980). Thus it could be visualized that organizational change is important for making the organization healthy, overcoming financial or methodological difficulties, enhancement of performance and to provide job satisfaction to employees.

Predictions about the parameters of change are very difficult because it ranges from governmental policies, political atmosphere to technological innovations. Technological change, knowledge explosion, product and service absolescence, etc., impinge upon modern organizations (Hellriegal, Solocum Jr., and Woodman, 1983). Francis and Milbourn (1980) advocate that organizational goals and principles, resources, design of jobs, leadership, communication and development of a favourable climate are the factors that initiate the process of organizational change.
Among the dominant factors "Participation" is considered important for planned change. Miles (1965) and many others (Bennis, Benne & Chin, 1961; Benne and Birnbaum, 1969; Krugar and Miller, 1976; Coch and French, 1948; Likert and Likert, 1976; Bowers 1964; Tannenbaum, 1968; McMahon and Perrit, 1973) advocate that participation minimizes resistance to change because it is viewed as a vehicle for utilizing reservoirs of untapped resources, such as skills, energies and creative abilities of individuals. Participation moreover, helps in team-building and leads to achievement of higher level of creativity (Pace, 1987).

Darcy and Brain (1991) pointed out that managing major change is essentially managing people through change. Participative management may be the most important factor in successful implementation of change. Participation is instrumental in removing the obstacles to organizational development, increased trust between managers and employees, facilitates information dissemination and decision making (Liebowitz and Menelow, 1988). It is also significant to identify and explore issues associated with the use of participation in conjunction with organizational development (OD) activities (Pasmore and Fagans, 1992). The misunderstanding of participative processes (lack of preparation for participation by managers and organization members) may cast shadow over the success of OD interventions. They suggest that practitioners pay more attention to combining individual and organization
development efforts and that they devote more energy to exploring the effects of mediating variables on participation outcomes. Discussing on the psychological bases of participation, it is suggested that ego development and higher level participation must go hand in hand. Singh (1983) used 'participatory workshops' and 'goal-setting' exercises to introduce organizational change. Significant changes were found in the chemical company, including redefinition of the plant managers role.

Many experts believe that 'influence' is an important ingredient of organizational change. An individual or a group of individuals may persuade their colleagues to adopt change (Likert, 1961; Judson, 1966; Lewin, 1947; Blake, Mouton, Barnes & Greinder, 1964). It is also reported that 'shared influence' or the 'power equalization' approach is an effective method for implementing change (Greiner, 1967; Agnew & Hus, 1960; Tannenbaum, 1968; Georgopoulas and Tannenbaum, 1957; McMahon, 1976). Anderson & Terborg (1988) suggest that researchers and practitioners need to be sensitive to employees fears and concerns about the negative consequences of work redesign interventions. Olson & Tetrick (1988) indicate that organizational level moderated the impact of organizational restructuring on satisfaction with the supervision and security. The effect for satisfaction with the security was found only for supervisors. Griffin (1991) investigated the long-term effects of a work redesign on a number of perceptual, attitudinal, and behavioural
variables in 526 bank tellers over intervals of 6, 24 and 48 months. Findings show that Ss evidently perceived the changes in their jobs in the predicted and desired directions, and these perceptions did not diminish over the 48 months period. Attitudes (satisfaction and commitment) increased quickly but then diminished back to their initial levels. Performance did not increase initially, but did increase significantly by the end of the study period.

It is often argued that the tendency of employees is to dislike change unless it is accompanied by rewards and recognition (Kruger & Miller, 1976; Mumford, 1969; Lucas, 1975a; Ein-dor & Segev, 1978; Grindlay & Cummer, 1973; Dickson & Simons, 1970). Gaertner (1989) examined 147 managers interpretations to large-scale organizational change that resulted in a new business unit strategy for their firm. There were configurations of attitudes that predicted support for the strategy, depending on whether the employees gained (winners) or lost (losers) power and opportunity as a result of the change. Among winners, the strongest predictors of support for the new strategy were positive career expectations and current career satisfaction; among losers, the strongest predictor of support was the belief that people had been treated fairly during the change process. Guthrie, Grimm & Smith (1991) hypothesized that background characteristics of managers (such as tenure and level of education) significantly influence change process.

Kumari and Dwivedi (1988) investigated the effect of
organizational climate and attitude towards change. Results show that the organizational climate was a significant predictor of acceptance of change. Kozolowski & Hults (1987) assessed the efficacy of the concept of updating climate provided a useful framework for understanding factors that facilitate technical competences and performance.

STRATEGIES FOR CHANGE:

Organizational decline could be retarded by periodic monitoring of management practices and the work group environment. Such an exercise stimulates concerted effort toward change (Fox, Ellison and Keith, 1988). Four streams of human resource management (HRM) activity are proposed for strategic change: The management of culture; the development of skills; productivity improvements; and improving the quality (Sparrow and Pettigrew, 1988). Similar views have been expressed by Harris and Harris (1983) regarding characteristics of information workers where their motivation and involvement, education and competencies, attitudes toward work and leisure, and concerns for self-fulfillment are discussed. Also the components of organizational culture are outlined in terms of identity and purposes, process and activities, interpersonal relations, recognition and rewards.

Gluskinos (1987) suggests that management of strategic change in organizations requires diagnosis of 3 subsystems:
the technical, political and cultural. In his study he demonstrates the impact of introducing common management techniques such as management by objectives, performance appraisal and reward systems on the political and cultural sub-systems of the organizations. In one study, Peters (1987) discusses the politics and provides a model for implementation and management of organizational change. The model consists of ideas into action, circumventing barriers, intrapreneuring, getting funding, understanding organizational politics, and using them to achieve objectives. Brown (1992) examines important implementation issues accompanying the introduction of new change programme in the National Health Service (NHS) in the U.K: The Resource Management Initiative (RMI). The RMI provides clinicians and other hospital managers with the information they require to use the resources they control to maximum effect, generally by introducing new information technology. The main cause of resistance was fear (i.e. fear for financial advantage, fear of loss of status and power). These fears could have been overcome by high quality training, effective communication, participative style of change management and strong leadership. Kumar and Thibodeaux (1990) pointed out that despite of acceptance of the fact that organizational change is inextricably linked with organizational politics, organization development (OD) professionals have continued to be continuous in grappling with the political realities involved in the implementation of planned organizational
Edwards & Kleiner (1988) have concluded that the strategy for carrying out change depends on the type of corporate culture that exists within the organization, the stage in the organizational development, and the type of change desired. Bronson (1991) describes a holistic human systems approach to strategic change management (SCM). Successful implementation of a strategic change programme using this approach requires two key elements: Communication from management about the strategic significance of the change and associate (employees) involvement in the design and implementation of the change. Such communication throughout the change process ensures that the importance of the change is understood and collectively owned. Outlining the 7 step cycle for SCM he focuses first on planning and designing and then on implementation and follow-up. Pointing out the barriers to strategic changes in organizations Manikutty (1990) presents a case study of how an organization made strategic changes in response to environmental changes. It is examined from cognitive, sociological, and rational-analytical perspectives. Fundamental barriers to strategic changes are prevalence of strong and dominant values in the organization and inability to see threats from the environment when they go against the prevalent beliefs of key members. Other barriers are the past history and the social system of the organization.

To manage the change process Alva (1991) discuses
change in the corporate world, especially in India, which reflect increased international influences, an orientation toward products rather than functions, and the supremacy of the competence. Comparing the action research and organizational development research he points out the importance of learning to change and adapt. **Burke & Litwin (1992)** provide a model of organizational performance and change, at least 2 lines of theorizing need to be explored: organizational functioning and organizational change. They suggest causal linkages that hypothesize how performance is affected and how effective change occurs. Change is depicted in terms of both process and content, with emphasis on transformational vs transactional factors. Transformational change occurs as a response to the external environment and directly affect organizational mission and strategy, the organization is leadership and the culture. In turn, the transactional factors (structure, systems, management practices, and climate) are affected. These transformational and transactional factors together affect motivation, which in turn, affects performance.

**Boulden (1983)** opines that imposing change will not work unless followed by negotiated change; therefore he focuses on a combination of imposed and negotiated change. **Boulden & Lowler (1982)** argue that to be effective, change must be negotiated and should be depictive of the interrelated process of recognizing that some current behaviour is inappropriate, deciding to change it, getting
permission to change it and bringing about the change. Crystal and Deems (1983) advocate that as organizations change, new needs emerge and existing needs diminish. It is suggested that organizations can increase productivity and morale by implementing a programme of redesigning jobs. Jobs can be restructured by identifying employees most refined skills, most enjoyed skills, and most productive work environment, and by identifying changing organizational needs.

SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOUR

The supervisor is considered to play a vital role in the smooth functioning of the organization. He is the link between the management and the employees. The facets of organizational change ranging from communication to implementation of policies is invariably associated with the supervisory behaviour.

The supervisor in the organization is often called as the leader because he has to act as guide, mentor, interpreter of organizational rules, regulations and organization policies. So many things are attributed to him that sometimes it becomes difficult to properly defined the quality of leadership (Stogdill, 1974). Leadership according to Tannenbaum (1961), "is interpersonal influence exercised on the situation and directed through communication process, towards the attainments of
specialized goal or goals."

Many experts assumed that certain traits were inherent in the good leader, that he was born with these traits and he could apply them effectively in varying situations (Ghiselli, 1971; Kelly, 1974; Gowin, 1915; Bellingrath, 1930). Such an approach was critically evaluated by Byrd (1940) and Gibb (1954) and on the basis of review of Trait approach Stogdill (1948) came to the conclusion that "the qualities, characteristics, and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader." Consequently it was suggested that we should not simply examine the behaviour of leaders but we should take into the account the situation in which they have to operate leaders who were effective in one situation were not necessarily effective in another. Szilaggi & Wallace (1980) emphasize that trait approach has ignored the subordinate and his effect on leadership. Therefore, focusing on one part only of the influence relationship provides an incomplete view of the leadership process.

BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH:

During the 1950s a critical situation emerged. It was analyzed that leadership was shown by a person’s acts more than by his traits, though traits influenced acts. Investigators focussed their attention toward the specific behaviour of leaders to check if something was different in
the behaviour of successful and effective leaders. According to this point of view, successful leaders with a particular style were expected to lead persons and groups for the attainment of specific goals, which would result in high productivity and morale.

One of the earliest and probably the most influential attempts to delineate the dimensions of leadership behaviour was made by Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939). They distinguished two non-overlapping types: Authoritarian and Democratic (in addition to Laissezfaire styles).

It is important to note that during the Second World War many anecdotes were reported which highlighted the role of the leader in boosting the morale and sustaining the spirit of the rank and file of the Army and Airforce personnel. Immediately after the war concerted research on leadership were initiated in United States of America specially in the universities of Ohio and Michigan.

MICHIGAN AND OHIO STUDIES:

A series of investigations conducted at the Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan has been concerned with the characteristics of successful supervisors (Likert, 1961). A major finding of the Michigan studies was that supervisors of the high producing units were more often "employee-centered", while supervisors of low producing units were more often "Job-centered", (Kahn & Katz, 1953). The employee-oriented manager focuses his
attention on the ‘human aspects’ and the production-oriented managers operate on "scientific management" basis. Elaborating the Michigan continuum a model has been produced that provides ‘stages’ of production-oriented (Boss-centered) and employee-oriented (Subordinate-centered) behaviour (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1958).

Another approach to supervision was illustrated by the Ohio State leadership studies, most of which were concerned with descriptive analyses of organizational structure, executive functions, and supervisory behaviour in many different settings (Shartle, 1956). The central findings of this research was that leadership behaviour was basically concerned with two independent factors called "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration". "Initiating Structure" pertaining to the extent to which the supervisor actively plans and directs group activities oriented toward goal attainment, and "Consideration" characterised by a friendly, warm, considerate supervisory relationship, as contrasted with an impersonal and authoritarian relationship (Fleishman, 1953; Stogdill & Coons, 1957).

These two characteristics were found to be independent dimensions. Further it was found that supervisors rating low on both traits proved to be weak and ineffective leaders, who were often bypassed by their own subordinates (Fleishman, Harris & Burtt, 1955). Although the results varied somewhat with the situation, in general the most
effective leaders, were above average in both Consideration and Initiating Structure (Stodgill & Coons, 1957). Further research on the dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure indicated that the relation between these supervisory characteristics and certain indices of employee morale may be curvilinear (Fleishman & Harris, 1962).

Apart from these studies a number of studies were conducted on leadership styles in different phases. A graphical portrayal of a two-dimensional view of leadership style was developed by Blake and Mouton (1964). They proposed a managerial grid based on the styles of "Concern for people" and "Concern for production" which essentially represent the Ohio State dimensions and Michigan dimensions. Blake and Mouton (1982) pointed out that managers perform best under a 9, 9 style since there is little substantive evidence to support the conclusion that 9, 9 style is most effective in all situations (Larson, Hunt and Osborn, 1976; Nystrom, 1978).

Reddin (1970) conceptualized a three-dimensional grid, also known as 3-D management, borrowing some of the ideas from managerial grid. Three dimensional axis represent Task-orientation (TO), Relationship orientation (RO), and Effectiveness.

CONTINGENCY/SITUATIONAL APPROACH:

There has been no shortage of studies attempting to isolate critical situational factors that affect leadership
The basic tenet of contingency approach is that, for the evaluation of leadership effectiveness, not only the leader behaviour but some other variables should also be considered, because a particular style cannot be equally effective or successful in all situations.

For the first time Fiedler (1967) developed a comprehensive contingency model for leadership. This model proposes that effective group performance depends upon the proper match between the leader's style of interacting with his subordinates and the degree to which the situation gives control and influence to the leader. An individual's basic leadership style has been assessed through the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC), it is necessary to match the leader with the situation. With knowledge of an individual's LPC, the Fiedler model proposes matching them up to achieve maximum leadership effectiveness (Fiedler, Chemers, and Mahar, 1977). The studies (Graen, Alvares, Orris, and Martella, 1970; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977) have identified some serious shortcomings of this model. But Peters, Hartke & Pohlmann (1985) pointed out the conflicting results by this model. Rice 1978; Schrieshein, Banmister and Money (1979); Kennedy, Houston, Korgaard & Gallo (1987); Schein (1980) and Kabnoff (1981) have criticized this model considering its complexities.

The situational model (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977) was
proposed to combine the Fiedler (1967) studies with previous studies of Ohio State University to construct a tri-dimensional model of leadership effectiveness. Critics pointed out that the conceptual basis of the theory is weak, because it does not provide a coherent, explicit rationale for the hypothesized relationship (Yukl, 1981). So many studies have been undertaken to empirically test its validity but most of these were not comprehensive (Hambleton & Gumpert, 1982; Graeff, 1983; Blank, Weitzel & Green, 1986; Vecchio, 1987; Goodson, McGee & Cashman, 1989).

Path-goal was another contingency model of leadership that extracted key elements from the Ohio state leadership research on ‘initiating structure’ and ‘consideration’, and the expectancy theory of motivation (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974; House, 1987). This model has gone through several refinements and extensions in recent years (House & Desslar, 1974; Stinson & Johnson, 1975). Research to validate the hypotheses of this model was encouraging (Indik, 1986; Keller, 1989).

One of the most recent additions to the contingency approach was the leader-participation model proposed by Vroom & Yetton (1973). It relates leadership behaviour and participation to decision making. Research testing the leader-participation model has been encouraging (Field, 1982; Leana, 1987; Ettling and Jago, 1988). The latest and most sophisticated revision of this model identifies twelve contingency questions rather than seven and expands
responses from two ('Yes' or 'No') to five for most questions (Vroom & Jago, 1988).

Observing all the models of leadership style we can contradict the common belief that some leadership style will always be effective regardless of the situation. It is evident that there is no one simple formula for improving supervision. As Likert (1958) has pointed out that effective supervision must be adaptive and relative. Procedures that work for one person or in one situation may be useless or harmful with another person or in a different situation. Numerous studies collectively demonstrate that, in many situations, whatever behaviours leaders exhibit are irrelevant. Certain individual, job, and organizational variables can act as subordinates for leadership or neutralize the leader's effect to influence his subordinates (Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Howell & Dorfman, 1981; Howard & Joyce, 1982; Howell, Dorfman & Kerr, 1986; Pitner, 1988).

SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOUR IN INDIAN CONTEXT

Sinha (1972) advocates that "researches on leadership and supervision in industry and government organization have been significant, and the primary question has been whether Indian researchers on the pattern of effective supervision and its impact on worker behaviour yield similar or different findings from those obtained elsewhere. While the reports show some conflicting results, there is ample evidence that they generally support the western studies on
the behavioural characteristics of effective supervisor. Jain (1971); Singh and Mishra (1973) worked on emergence of leadership, while Dayal (1975) and Sheth (1972) worked on leadership functions. It was found that while there has been much research on leadership, with some exceptions (Prakasam, 1980; Sayeed & Mathur, 1981; Singh, 1983), studies of organizational leadership using the current situational approaches were few. Effective style of leadership was found crucial and many Indian investigators tried to prove that ‘people-oriented’ leader (democratic, considerate, and participative) was effective in Indian culture (Daftuar & Krishna, 1971; Kakar, 1971; Pandey, 1976; Pestonjee, 1973; Rao, 1973; Singh & Pestonjee, 1974; Rao, 1970). Also, studies on different aspects of leadership styles have been conducted in Indian context (Sharma, 1973; Saiyadain, 1974; Sinha, 1974; Ray, 1970; Sinha, 1980; Sinha, 1973; Chattopadhyay, 1975; Sinha, 1970; De, 1974; Sinha & Sinha, 1974; Kakar, 1971; Ansari, 1981; Ansari, 1986; Ansari, 1987). Rangaswamy & Helmick (1976) pointed out that Indian managers are more ‘employee-oriented’ as compared to their American counterparts.

Some other studies analyzed the leadership behaviour taking different variables affecting leadership pattern. Elhance and Agarwal (1975) emphasized on democratic leadership style whereas Singh and Das (1977) found that bureaucratic style was most predominant followed by the benevolent autocrat, developer, and democratic in that
order. Jaggi (1978) concluded that prevailing leadership styles appear to be between benevolent autocracy and consultative type. Kaur (1993) and Panchanatham, Rajendran & Karuppiah (1993) found that executives dominantly used democratic authoritative and such other styles of leadership.

LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Change initiated by the managers at the top has greater chances of success because they have the authority and power to implement it (Gehraman, 1986). Supervisor, being the link between the organization and employees should, naturally, be associated with organizational change and development programmes. Such programmes must be addressed to individual skills and personal values as well (Pearlstein, 1991).

Selby (1989) advocates that the attitude of senior executives is critical regarding acceptability of change of innovation whereas, Preston (1988) opines that unless power culture change is contemplated, organizational change may not be possible. Beatty & Lee (1992) advocate that although the importance of top managers in promoting technological innovation has been identified, the role played by middle level technical managers in implementing the changes has been largely neglected. They offer a framework for analysis of leadership roles in technological change, technology, strategy, and organizational change.
Gibbons (1992) explicates a link between the concept of leadership, followership and environment. A conceptual scheme is developed to facilitate the identification of leader-follower relationships which are best suited to specific environmental contingencies. The variables discussed include resource scarcity, environmental complexity, decision making style, task scope, and transactional and adaptive leadership styles. This typology is then used as a basis for identifying interventions that would appropriate in moving from one environmental situation to another. Ekvall (1991) points out that current thinking on leadership styles emphasizes two classical categories: task orientation and people orientation. However, in response to rapid changes in working-life conditions, business management has become more concerned with renewals, and less concerned with established and stable efficiency. A study of 130 people in a medium sized company revealed the presence of a third dimensions, change-centered leadership, characterised by employees who were strongly committed and motivated, and a climate that was full of debate and creativity.

Covin & Kilmann (1990) studied the ultimate success of large-scale change programmes. Content analysis revealed that positive-impact issues included visible management support and commitment, employee participation, and communication. Negative-impact issues included
inconsistency among key managers, managers forcing change, and poor communication. Collins, Hatcher and Ross (1993) found that participation, identity, cooperation, and expected plan support were significant for OC among no-union based organization.

When we evaluate the organizational change in context of leadership in the perspective of Indian experience, it is suggested that the chief executive sponsors the change programme and provides support and leadership for its success. Many studies have been conducted which throw light on leadership behaviour and organizational change (Sinha, 1976; Krishnamurthy, 1977; Dayal, 1969; Ansari, 1986; Maheshwary and Ganesh, 1974).

Work related variables such as age, tenure, experience, promotion earned and such other variables immensely influence behaviour in the organization. But our review of literature leads us to conclude that work related variables had not been taken into consideration to study organizational change. But we have selected such variables as promotion, salary and job tenure to study their influence on organizational change.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Extensive review of literature of organizational change (OC) leads us to conclude that innumerable factors related to political, financial, governmental policies, manager's
attitudes, organizational climate, role of the supervisors, supervisory styles, employees motivation, their participation, trust of the employees on the management, pressure group, union and management relations, potential risk and compensation risk etc. influence organizational change.

The review also reveals that the experts in the field of organizational behaviour and human resource development as well managers fully realize that organizational change is inevitable for efficient functioning. But few researchers in our country seem to have developed awareness towards organizational change and practically insignificant number of investigators have attempted to empirically study organizational change.

A few researchers who have attempted to study OC have not ventured to investigate it intensively. It was found that lack of availability of a psychometrically sound tool to measure OC was not available. This single factor might have discouraged many researchers to undertake OC studies. The second important factor is related to the general philosophy of the management that 'Old is gold'. In other words the managers believe in status quo. They are aware of the fact that change may lead to resistance and destabilize the functioning of the organization. If public sectors run in losses, it hardly bothers the people at the top. Political interference, often disregard for management principles and lack of accountability may have prevented the
organizations in initiating process of change. The most glaring example of such aspects is the closure of HEC, Ranchi for a period of 72 days. The present study was undertaken in the light of the above so as to fill up the voids in our country.

The salient feature was the development of a scale for the measurement of OC (Rahman, 1992). We have observed that supervisory behaviour, by and large, influences the various aspects of organization, such as culture, climate, motivation and job satisfaction of employees, their productivity, etc. Thus it was decided to explore the influence of supervisory behaviour on organizational change. This dimension has not been taken into consideration by Indian researchers while studying OC. In this regard the present investigation may be considered to tread unexplored factor.

Many work related variables such as salary, promotion and job tenure have been included to investigate their relation with OC. Such aspects, to the best of our knowledge, have not been investigated with regard to OC.

In short it may be visualized that the present investigation departs from the usual approach of verification researches and literally speaking, has fragrance of freshness.

The findings of the present investigation may stimulate
others to undertake researches on organizational change suited to Indian conditions. The managers and the consultants may initiate incentive programmes on the basis of the present findings. The present findings may also be helpful in initiating organizational development programmes and the development of organizational theory and practice suited to our own socio-cultural milieu.