



## AN IMPACT ANALYSIS OF CHANGE IN EMPLOYEES' BEHAVIOUR WITH CHANGE IN WORK ENVIRONMENT

Dr. Arindam Ghosh<sup>1</sup> and Mr. Agradoot Bhaduri<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate professor & Head, Dept. Of Commerce, Panihati Mahavidyalaya. Visiting professor, Rabindra Bharati University, DE & Jaipur National University, DDE.

<sup>2</sup>Vice Principal, Central Public School, Matarangi. Visiting lecturer, Jaipur National University, DDE. Research Scholar, Satya Sai University Of Medical Science & Technology, Sehore.

### ABSTRACT :

*Managing organisational change is always difficult. It is harder for organisation and managers as well as change agents, to prepare for and manage the changes in ways to satisfy the demands of both the organisation and employees. Over the years, behavioural, attitudinal or motivational change of workers during change in work environment has attracted increasing attention from researchers, and the stakeholders. A great deal of research has focused on understanding 'how do organisations go about making' 'structured' and 'unstructured' decisions concerning how to cope with resistance to change, so that the organisations achieve their goals of organisational change effort easily. Concept of organisational change (e.g; Meyer, 1982; Nadler; 1998) refers to an effort or a series of efforts designed to modify certain aspects or configuration of an organisation. Employees who are confronted with changes in their organisation face an inevitable choice: either they should support or resist such changes in order to achieve their personal or collective goals or objectives. Though many normative literature discuss on techniques for managing change, models for implementing change by Judson (1991), Kotter (1995), Galpin (1996) and Kotter and Cohen(2002), but empirical studies or their application seem to be too sparse to indicate convincingly and conclusively whether the techniques presented in those model have had significant influences on employees' behaviour change in managing organisational change.*

**KEYWORDS :** Employees Behaviour, Environment work.

### INTRODUCTION

In this article, we are particularly concerned with the role of perceptions, attitudes and motivation and how these might constitute determinants of employees' behavioural reactions to change. These perceptions, attitudes and motivation about change (e.g., perceived need for change, perceived change in power, and job security) are theorized to be factors leading to subsequent conscious or unconscious



decisions and/or behaviours in response to changes in organizations, which may significantly impact the change implementation and firm performance. In particular, this article will attempt to answer following research questions:  
What perceptions, attitudes and motivation influence employees' resistance to change?  
What perceptions, attitudes and motivation influence employees' support for change?

Thus, we need to fill a gap in current empirical research by empirically examining relationships between

several perceptions, attitudes and motivation that affects employees' behaviour to manage organisational change.

### **OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES :**

**From the before mentioned research questions, this article has three major objectives:**

- In order to provide foundations for developing a theoretical framework, the first objective is to review prior research on perceptions, attitudes, motivation, decision-making, theories of change, and employees' reactions to change.
- The second objective is to conceptualize a theoretical framework representing the link between various perceptions, motivations and attitudes on the one hand, and resistance to change and support for change, on the other hand. Here we propose to bring several theoretical perspectives together, creating a more realistic model of employees' behavioural reactions by combining different conceptions of human rationality. The main aim is to find the impact of which perceptions, motivations and attitudes are associated with resistance to change and/or support for change for the employees' during organisational change.
- The final objective is to empirically test the hypothesized relationships presented in the research model by gathering and analyzing relevant empirical data in a systematic way to analyse the impact of change in employees' behaviour in changing work environment.

**Accordingly, the following hypotheses (H) are formulated:**

H1a: Employees' perceived organizational support will be negatively related to their resistance to change.

H1b: Employees' perceived organizational support will be positively related to their support for change.

H2a: Employees' perceived participation in decision-making processes regarding organizational change will be negatively related to their resistance to change.

H2b: Employees' perceived participation in decision-making processes regarding organizational change will be positively related to their support for change.

H3a: Employees' perceived need for change will be negatively related to their resistance to change.

H3b: Employees' perceived need for a change will be positively related to their support for change.

H4a: Employees' attitude towards organizational change will be negatively related to their resistance to change.

H4b: Employees' attitude towards organizational change will be positively related to their support for change.

H5a: Employees' fear of known consequences of a change will be positively related to their resistance to change.

H5b: Employees' fear of known consequences of a change will be negatively related to their support for change.

H6a: An employee's perceived rise or fall in status resulting from a change will be negatively related to their resistance to change.

H6b: An employee's perceived rise or fall in status resulting from a change will be positively related their support for change.

H7a: Employees' job satisfaction will be negatively related to their resistance to change.

H7b: Employees' job satisfaction will be positively related to their support for change.

H8a: Employees' job security will be negatively related to their resistance to change.

H8b: Employees' job security will be positively related to their support for change.

H9a: Employees' job motivation will be negatively related to their resistance to change.

H9b: Employees' job motivation will be positively related to their support for change.

H10a: Employees' perceived employability will be positively related to their resistance to change,

H10b: Employees' perceived employability will be negatively related to their support for change.

---

**LITERATURE REVIEW:**

In addition to the greater level of exposure of employees to organizational change, managers within most organizations are also experiencing greater internal and external pressures to initiate change within their organization in order to maintain or improve firm performance. These pressures include, for example, increased competitive pressures (Meyer, Brooks and Goes, 1990), new government regulations (Meyer et al., 1990; Haveman, 1992; Fox-Wolfgramm, Boal and Hunt, 1998), technological change (Haveman, 1992), or declining firm performance (Bibeault, 1982).

Given the above-mentioned environments, research on organizational change has been enriched by both empirical and theoretical studies investigating many aspects of organizational change such as change strategies, change processes, or antecedents and outcomes of different forms of change. To search for conditions that promote successful change in organizations, it is crucial to know the implications of organizational change for employees, and more importantly, the reactions employees will have. Much of the past research on employees' reactions to change seems to have been implicitly based on a rational choice theory about employees' behaviours, thereby giving little attention to the potential effects of perceptions, attitudes, motivation or social influence on decisions and behaviours.

Indeed, rational choice theories have long dominated the research in organization theory, which encompasses research on organizational change and development. Rational choice theories would assert that when organizational change efforts are understood to be beneficial to a firm, employees in this firm should support such changes.

This raises the question of whether all employees do in fact share the same view on this change. What are the implications for their decisions if they do not share the same view?

Within the large body of research on decision-making in the literature on strategic management or management science, several concepts and underlying assumptions—for example, cost-benefit analysis and human rationality—seem to have conditioned both the theoretical and empirical research in organizational change and employees' reactions to change. This view is consistent with that of Rumelt, Schendel, and Teece (1991), who have suggested that the logic of economics has dominated the field of strategic management. Only recently have researchers become aware of the limitations of decision-making models in economics, and thus have applied a cognitive paradigm in their research on strategic decision-making (e.g., Schwenk, 1984, 1995; Tversky and Kahneman, 1974). Ideas of organisational learning (e.g; Argyris, 1990; Foil and Lyles, 1985; Crossan and Berdrow, 2003) or strategic flexibility (e.g; Raynor and Bower, 2001) that emphasize the extent to which a firm is capable of learning and adapting itself to the changing environments and the outcomes of organisational change.

Researchers and practitioners alike posit that employees' reactions to change have critical implications for change implementation and firm performance (e.g., Kotter, 1995; Kotter and Cohen, 2002). For instance, the issue of intra organizational conflict as a serious challenge for managers in making strategic decisions has been highlighted (Amit and Schoemaker, 1993). The question of how firms, managers or consultants can minimize employees' resistance to change is a subject of debate and further research. There are a number of theoretical and practical questions, some of which lie more in the area of philosophy than in the area of change management or social science.

In response to seemingly limited empirical evidence on the effectiveness of most change management models, well-understood effects of perceptions and attitudes on reactions to change narrow the domain of potentially key factors influencing employees' reactions to change to which an organization should pay attention. In addition, these research questions are consistent with contemporary research on the role of psychological factors in predicting employees' behaviours in response to various types of decisions of organizations, but the role of several psychological factors require empirical verification.

Despite evidence that certain change management practices during organizational change are related to employees' resistance to and/or support for change rates (i.e., a percentage of the total number of employees who support or resist a change to the total number of employees) at the organizational level,

it would be a fallacy to then assume that such practices are similarly and/or directly related to employees' resistance to and/or support for change decisions at the individual level.

#### NOTEWORTHY CONTRIBUTIONS IN THIS FIELD:

There are several relevant questions concerning change. What is it? Why do firms need to change? Under which conditions will firms initiate changes in their organization? What kinds of outcome will a change bring to firms? Certainly, these questions already suffice to show that there is need for research on organizational change. The wide range of past research on organizational change has focused on four main categories. One category has to do with content issues, and it mainly focuses on factors related to successful or unsuccessful change attempts (e.g., Hofer 1980; Bibeault, 1982; Hambrick and Schechter, 1983; Barker and Duhaime, 1997). Another category concerns process issues, mainly focusing on steps, phases, or actions undertaken during the implementation of an intended change (e.g., Judson, 1991; Kotter, 1995; Galpin, 1996). An additional category deals with context issues, focusing on internal or environmental forces or conditions affecting a change in an organization (e.g., Schendel and Patton, 1976; Slatter, 1984; Robbins and Peace, 1992). The final category concerns reaction issues, and it focuses on employees' responses to organizational change (e.g., Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996; DeWitt, Trevino, and Mollica, 1998; Patterson and Cary, 2002).

The literature suggests several internal and external factors that lead a firm to commence a change. Examples of these factors include: (1) increased competitive pressure (Meyer, Brooks and Goes, 1990); (2) new government regulation (Meyer et al., 1990; Haveman, 1992; Fox-Wolfgramm, Boal and Hunt, 1998); (3) technological change (Haveman, 1992); and (4) management team change (Castrogiovanni, Baliga and Kidwell, 1992). Firms that undertake change, any change, in their organization often aim to improve their performance in terms of, for example, higher profits, better responsiveness to the market, and long-term competitive advantage. For example, past studies on corporate turnaround (e.g., Hofer 1980; Bibeault, 1982; Hambrick and Schechter, 1983; Barker and Duhaime, 1997) have found several actions or strategies that can revive the troubled firms through corporate turnaround. We can thus conclude that the real value of organizational change rests on its ability to alter an organization's identity, strategy, structure, operation or human resources as a means to enhance firm performance.

Now let us consider the characteristics of change. Change is defined as a movement away from a current state toward a future state (George and Jones, 1995). In the organizational change literature, at the abstract level, there are two distinct modes of change: first- and second-order change. The phrase "first-order change" is used to describe organizational changes that occur within a relatively stable system that remains mostly unchanged; and for a system to remain stable or unchanged, it requires frequent first-order changes (Weick and Quinn, 1999). On the contrary, second-order change or so-called episodic change modifies or transforms fundamental structures or properties of the system (Weick and Quinn, 1999). The concept of first- and second-order change is very popular and powerful, and its fruits have been many. To give but a brief sample of some of the works that have benefited from this concept, it has advanced several theoretical models such as Argyris and Schon's (1979, 1996) single- and double-loop learning by individuals, Miller and Friesen's (1984) adaptation vs. metamorphosis by organizations, and Tushman and Anderson's (1986) competence-enhancing vs. competence-destroying changes in technology. In summary, there are several patterns or types of change (Miller, 1980; Johnson-Cramer, Cross and Yan, 2003): small or large (Ledford et al., 1989), planned or emergent in nature (Johnson-Cramer et al., 2003), radical or incremental (Weick and Quinn, 1999).

Another aspect of change is that it can occur at differing organizational levels. First, change can occur within a population of organizations. For example, changes occurring at an industry level (e.g., changes in customers' demands and preferences) have implications for most, if not all, companies within the industry. Similarly, changes occurring at a country level have implications for most, if not all, organizations within the country. In addition, changes can occur in a single organization, having implications for the whole organization or for specific parts of the organization. Even, changes can occur at the level of individuals

within an organization—that is, at the level of employees or managers. The important point for us to observe is that changes at differing levels may share some common characteristics but may also possess certain unique characteristics.

One of the central issues of organizational change concerns the ability of the organization to enact change. The ability may be partly limited by organizational inertia; that is, the organization may not be inclined to search for new solutions (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Zucker, 1987). This raises the question of whether organizations can change themselves. That is a difficult question, and no single answer will adequately answer it.

Research has been done on organizational inertia, which examines the role and impact of organizational inertia on organizational structure and design. In the organizational inertia literature, it is argued that various factors generate several forms of inertia in the organization (e.g., strategic, structural, or cultural inertia). Organizational change may be limited by internal factors such as an organization's investments in plant, equipment, and specialized personnel (Hannan and Freeman, 1989). It is also possible that top managers or decision makers may receive limited or insufficient information to the extent that they may fail to make a decision on organizational change or adaptation. If internal politics exist in an organization, they may also contribute to organizational inertia; that is, political disequilibrium in an organization may lead to resistance towards certain proposed changes.

Indeed, most organizational changes are designed to benefit the organization as a whole; and these benefits are likely to take time to be realized; however, any political resistance within the organization generates short-run political costs that may either exceed the potential benefits or be high enough that top executives may decide against the intended change (Hannan and Freeman, 1989). Likewise, external factors such as the dynamics of political coalitions, costly or limited information with regard to relevant environments, and legal and other barriers to entry or exit from the market may also restrict the nature and degree of organizational change or adaptation in organizations (Hannan and Freeman, 1984).

Research on organizational change has led to various views and perspectives. However, there are at least three most prominent views on organizational change. The first view, based on population ecology theory, argues that most of the variations in organizational structures occur through the creation of new organizations and organizational forms, and the demise of old ones (Hannan and Freeman, 1977, 1989; Freeman and Hannan, 1983). According to Hannan and Freeman (1989), this perspective, which may be called "selection theory," argues that existing organizations, particularly the largest and most powerful ones, seldom change their strategy and structure quickly enough to keep up with the demands of uncertain and changing environments. The second view, based on random transformation theory, proposes that endogenous processes induce structural changes in the organizations, but the changes are loosely associated with the goals of the organization and the demands of the uncertain and changing environments (March and Olsen, 1976; Weick, 1976). The third view, based on the rational adaptation theory developed by March and Simon (1958), argues that organizational variability generates changes in strategy and structure of organizations in response to threats, opportunities, and environmental changes. Strategic contingency theories focus on structural changes that match organizational structures (Thompson 1967), whereas resource dependence theories focus on structural changes that neutralize sources of environmental uncertainty (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978).

In summary, as the review of the literature has shown, organizational change, regardless of its form, will have implications for the organization as well as its employees. Simon (1991: 32) noted that "employees, especially but not exclusively at managerial and executive levels, are responsible not only for evaluating alternatives and choosing among them but also for recognizing the need for decisions." Accordingly, it is useful to understand how employees view and react to organizational change. In support of this view, the main focus of this article is on the implications of organizational change for employees' rather than for organizations and, specifically, on how employees respond to organizational change.



## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY :

The overall objective of the work is to examine how employee's behaviour changes in managing organisational changes i.e. how perceptions, attitudes or motivation effects employees' reactions to organisational change. To achieve this objective, this work seeks to test the hypothesized relationships between perceptions, attitudes and motivation on the one hand and employees' resistance to change and support for change on the other hand. To understand the implications of employees' perceptions , attitudes and motivation for their reactions to change, and if one postulates a direct relationship between perceptions, attitudes, motivation and reactions to change, then two important consequences will follow. First, the understanding of different research methodologies that have been used in social science in general and management science in particular was required. Second, a research strategy that is capable of providing answers to the research questions in this proposed thesis has to be determined.

We know that empirical research has many variants. Three of which are the most prominent: (1) empirical experimental research; (2) empirical statistical research; and (3) empirical case study (Wacker, 1998). According to Wacker (1998), each type of research strategies seeks to address different research objectives: for the empirical experimental research, the focus is on examining the relationships between variables by manipulating controlled treatments to determine the exact effect on specific dependent variables; the purpose of the empirical statistic research is to empirically validate the assumed relationships between variables in a large sample from actual environments; and the purpose of the empirical case study is to develop insightful relationships within smaller or limited samples.

Reflect on our research questions: what perceptions, attitudes and motivations influence employees' behaviour in managing organisational change i.e employees' resistance to change employees or support for change? We think Quantitative research will be a better option to address these research questions than qualitative research. One main reason to lend strong support for the use of quantitative research in this proposed work is that quantitative research is better suited than qualitative research where the purpose of the study is to investigate relationships as pairs of variables. In particular, quantitative research provides an opportunity to generalize the results statistically to the population.

To address the research questions, as Schwaninger (2004) has described, focuses on facts, adopts an objectivist worldview, and relies on quantification. Another issue has to be considered during research design choices which imply trade-offs between three dimensions: (1) generalization to the population that supports the external validity; (2) precision in measurement and control of the behavioral variables that affect internal and external validity; and (3) realism of context.

**Population of Study:** SSI employees' who face organisational changes.

**Sample size:** 200 persons (as planned) from different SSI organizations.

**Sampling procedure :** Convenience sampling.

**Data Collection –** Primary data collection through multiple item survey during working hours to a random sampling procedure. A questionnaire was designed for the purpose.

**Data Analysis :** A specific multinomial regression model is used as a tool for estimation in this context because (1) it takes the existence of a ranking into account, (2) it assumes that the difference between any two adjacent levels is not known, and (3) it does not assume the independence of irrelevant alternative property. To test hypotheses, we are therefore preferred to conduct the the particular multinomial ordered regression model, which does not violate the independence of irrelevant alternative property.

## CONCLUSION:

It is critical to explain the relationship between any type of change management practices and analyse its impact like resistance to and/or support for change at the individual level. Rather than answering the question of the effect of change management practices on employees' reactions to change directly, empirical evidence of the role of perceptions and/or attitudes and motivation in predicting employees' reactions to change may promote a better understanding of psychological factors influencing employees'

reactions to change. Obviously, the field of organizational change and its scientific investigation is manifold. For instance, archetypes of a firm's organizational change can be neatly classified into five groups or dimensions: (1) identity; (2) strategy; (3) business processes; (4) structure; and (5) human resources. Each of these dimensions has different implications for an organization as well as its employees. In view of the fact that organizational change can take on many forms, in this proposed work I shall focus on analyzing changes of employee's behaviour in managing change in work environment.

Here our aim is to develop a model which suggests relationships between perceptions and attitudes and motivation on the one hand and resistance to and support for change on the other hand, and to empirically test it by using data gathered from employees of SSI units who currently facing change in organizational environment.

The focus of this article will strictly limit to the examination of the relationships between perceptions, attitudes and motivation on the one hand and reactions to change on the other hand at the given moment in time rather than during different points in time. Thus, it shall not be a longitudinal study.

This implies that these studies will not investigate feedback-loops or a so-called dynamic mode that addresses: (1) the effects of employees' resistance to and support for change on the change efforts (e.g., the change goals and processes); and (2) the perceptions of the modifications in organizational change efforts at time  $t_1$  as a consequence of employees' reactions at time  $t_0$  on their reactions to such modifications at time  $t_1$ . Main reason for not including the feedback-loops model concerns the casual link between perceptions, attitudes or motivation, and reactions to change. If we were to find such a relationship at one moment in time, then we might expect to find that relationship at another moment in time. Another reason concerns the practical aspect of developing and validating the feedback-loops model using data from the questionnaire surveys: this will require not only comparing results of different surveys but also gathering data from the same respondents at different times, which will be too problematic or beyond the scope of this study.

It is important to note that the nature and magnitude of the impact analysis of change in employee's behaviour depends on, among other things, the type of change and the way in which the change is introduced. For example, changes can be initiated either from top management (a so-called top-down approach) or from employees (a so-called bottom-up approach). Because we assume that the strength of the impact of the change is inherently expresses in the perceptions of the employees, it is not necessary to separately explore the effects of the change on the employees.

However, because the changes we have studied entailed organization-specific (SSI Units), location specific(Kolkata region), situation-specific, time-specific, and relationship-specific contexts, the extent to which the findings can be generalized to other contexts is limited. It is also useful to note that the implications of cultural differences on reactions to change are not within the scope of this article.

In this article we shall attempt to contribute to the research on impact on analysing employees' behaviour in relation with change in work environment on in three ways , First, we examines a variety of actions that employees may choose in response to a change in the organization. Drawing upon prior research, it try to identify types of employees' reactions to change: resistance to change and support for change. These will further divided into: active and passive resistance, and active and passive support.

Second, using perception-based logic, we examines a number of perceptions, attitudes and motivations that may influence employees' choice (conscious or unconscious) to support or resist change, thus shedding light on whether perceptions, attitudes and motivation impel, impede or exert any effect on employees' behaviour and decisions. Although the organizational change literature is rich, there seems to be a surprising gap in the literature concerning the role and nature of change of employees' perception, attitude and motivation in managing organizational changes. In particular, this work aims to contribute in this area by examining the link between various perceptions, attitudes and motivation on the one hand and resistance to change and support for change on the other hand.

Third, based on the expected findings, we have tried to develop a tool for predicting employees' reactions to change in work environment. More importantly, understanding the ways in which employees

establish certain reactions to change will provide a potential avenue for developing a range of change management strategies that may bring employees' behaviour in alignment with those desired, thereby strengthening the degree to which employees support organizational change. The expected outcome of this work will also be informative for managers, consultants, as a way to improve the current change management practices in dealing with employees' resistance to change. Understanding employees' perceptions, attitudes and motivation before, during, and after the change in work environment may prove to be valuable to firms, managers, consultants and other stakeholders.

#### REFERENCES:

- Agocs, C. 1997. Institutionalized resistance to organizational change: Denial, inaction and repression. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16: 917-931.
- Alderfer, C. P. 1986. An intergroup perspective on group dynamics. In J. W. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior*: 190-222. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. 2003. The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29(1): 99-118.
- Argyris, C. 1999. *On organizational learning*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. 1993. Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46: 681-703.
- Bandura, A. 1977. *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bartunek, J. M., Lacey, C. A., & Wood, D. R. 1992. Social cognition in organizational change: An insider-outsider approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 28: 204-223.
- Bovey, W. H., & Hede, A. 2001. Resistance to organisational change: The role of defence mechanisms. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(7): 534-548.
- Burke, W., & Litwin, G. 1992. A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management*, 18: 523-545.
- Coghlan, D. 1993. A person-centred approach to dealing with resistance to change. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 14(4): 10-14.
- Crossan, M. M., & Berddrow, I. 2003. Organizational learning and strategic renewal. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 1087-1105.
- Dent, E. B., & Goldberg, S. G. 1999. Challenging 'resistance to change'. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35(1): 25-41.
- Dubrin, A. A., & Ireland, R. D. 1993. *Management & Organization*. 2nd ed. Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern College Publishing Company.
- Dulebohn, J. H., & Martocchio, J. J. 1998. Employee perceptions of the fairness of work group incentive pay plans. *Journal of Management*, 24(4): 469-488.
- Einhorn, H. J., & Hogarth, R. M. 1981. Behavioral decision theory: Processes of judgment and choice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32: 53-88.
- Farrell, D. 1983. Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: a multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4): 596-607.
- Fiske, S. T., & Tayler, S. E. 1991. *Social cognition*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Spiker, B. K., & Lesser, E. 1995. We have met the enemy. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 16(2), 17-21.
- Steinburg, C. 1992. Taking charge of change. *Training and Development*, 46(3): 26-32.
- Susanne, C., & Harackiewicz, J. M. 2000. *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Taber, T. D., & Alliger, G. M. 1995. A task-level assessment of job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2): 101-121.
- Terry, D. J., & Hogg, M. A. (Eds.) 2000. *Attitudes, behaviors, and social context: The role of norms and group membership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.



- Trader-Leigh, K. E. 2002. Case study: Identifying resistance in managing change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15(2): 138-155.
- Von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. 1980 *Theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton University Press.
- Vroom, V. H. 1964. *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. 1999 Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50: 361-386.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:**

1. National Library, Kolkata
2. Indian Institute of Management Library, Kolkata.
3. American Center Library, Kolkata.

**Dr. Arindam Ghosh**

Associate professor & Head, Dept.Of Commerce, Panihati Mahavidyalaya.Visiting professor, Rabindra Bharati University, DE & Jaipur National University, DDE.