

EFFECT OF DEMOGRAPHICS ON CHANGE READINESS OF EXECUTIVES WORKING IN INDIAN MOBILE SERVICE SECTOR

Shivinder Phoolka

*Assistant Professor, Punjabi University Regional Centre for IT and Management, Mohali, Punjab, India.
Email: shiviphoolka@gmail.com*

Abstract *The Indian Telecom Sector has undergone a sea change, especially after the liberalization process. Entry of foreign players, acquisitions, shift from fixed landline to mobile usage, huge surge in the number of subscribers, policy changes introduced by Department of Telecommunication (DoT) and TRAI, privatization, technological changes like introduction of 3G and then 4G, cut-throat competition between operators, collaborations between operators, mobile number portability, falling average revenue per user, etc., are few changes that can be named. Whenever an organizational change occurs, employees are the first to feel the impact. The role of human resources in change implementation and the consequences of the employee behaviour and attitude towards organizational change are important topics of research. Organizational change readiness of the employees is the precursor for the successful implementation of change programmes. It is essential to determine the levels of employees' change readiness which is an analysis of attitudes of employees towards various change events that occur in organizations. Measuring the change readiness of the employees can help the HR practitioners to find the extent to which employees are cognitively inclined to accept, embrace, adopt, and support organizational change plans to purposefully alter the status quo. This study tries to gauge the change readiness of the executives working in the telecom sector for the various changes which have taken place or the changes which will occur in the near future in the telecom industry. The HR implication of this can be used to develop programmes to improve their change readiness as the Indian Telecom Sector is still in the transforming stage.*

Keywords: *Mobile Number Portability, Organizational Change Readiness, Privatization*

INTRODUCTION

The Indian Telecom Sector

“Many people see technology as the problem behind the so called digital divide. Others see it as the solution. Technology is neither. It must operate in conjunction with business, economical, political and social system.”

— Carly Fiorina

Telecommunications has been one of the fastest growing industries in India. The telecom services have been recognized the world-over as an important tool for socioeconomic development for a nation and, hence, telecom infrastructure is treated as a crucial factor to realize the socioeconomic objectives in India too. The Indian Telecom sector has come a long way since liberalization starting with New Telecom Policy (1999). Telecom sector has witnessed exponential growth especially in the wireless segment in the last few years. Telecom has evolved as a basic infrastructure like electricity, roads, water, etc., and emerged as one of the

critical components of economic growth required for overall socioeconomic development of the country (Department of Telecom). Cellular telephony has emerged as the fastest growing segment in the Indian telecom industry. According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, there is a direct correlation between the growth in mobile teledensity and the growth in GDP per capita in developing countries, which tend to have a high percentage of rural population. The fixed-line segment has actually seen a decline in the subscriber base. It stands at 24.15 million subscribers in May 2017. The decline was mainly due to substitution of landlines with mobile phones. Mobile phones are popular due to their personal, portable, and digital nature, enabling people to always stay connected. There are increasing innovations, especially development of mobile applications. The low cost of handsets in India and the innovative budget telecom network have lowered the barrier to entry of consumers to the market (TRAI, 2010). The Indian telecom industry is presently the second largest globally by subscriber base after China. Telecom contributed approximately 1.94% to India's GDP in 2014-15. The number

of telephone subscribers in India stands at 947.48 million at the end of June 2017. The share of urban subscribers was 60.71%; whereas, the share of rural subscribers was 39.29% in the month of April 2013. The overall teledensity in India is 93.61 at the end of May 2017. The direct economic benefits of growth in the telecom sector are increase in GDP and government revenue, and generation of employment in the country. The indirect economic benefits include increased productivity of business due to voice and data services, better access to information, healthcare and educational services, etc. Other intangible benefits are integrating a country with large diversity, providing an altogether different mode of business, the only technology to reach the poor too.

The Indian Telecom Sector has undergone a sea change, especially after the liberalization process. Entry of foreign players, mergers and acquisitions, shift from fixed landline to mobile usage, huge surge in the number of subscribers, policy changes introduced by DOT and TRAI, privatization, technological changes like introduction of 3G and 4G, cut throat competition between operators, collaborations between operators, mobile number portability, falling average revenue per users (ARPU), etc., are few changes that can be named. Whenever, organizational change occurs, employees are the first to feel the impact. The role of human resources in change implementation and the consequences of the employee behaviour and attitude towards organizational change are important topics of research. Organizational change readiness of the employees is the precursor for the successful implementation of change programmes. It is essential to determine the levels of employees' change readiness which is an analysis of attitudes of employees towards various change events that occur in organizations. Measuring the change readiness of the employees can help the HR practitioners to find the extent to which employees are cognitively inclined to accept, embrace, adopt, and support organizational change plans to purposefully alter the status quo. This study tries to gauge the change readiness of the executives working in the telecom sector for the various changes that have taken place or the changes that will occur in the near future in the telecom industry. Also, this study tries to see if there is any effect of the various demographics on the change readiness of the executives. The HR implication of this can be to develop programmes to improve their change readiness as the Indian Telecom Sector is still in the transforming stage.

Organizational Change and Individual Change Readiness

People who change, after the change, "Survive"
People who change with the change, "Live"
People who bring the change, "Lead"

— Anonymous

It is said that if anything is permanent, it is change. Organizations have no other option than to change in this dynamic environment. The world has become a global village and markets have become hyper-competitive. To exist in such conditions, organizations are required to bring the needed change. Organizational change can be defined as a change that has impact on the way work is done in the organization and that has significant impact on the people working in that organization. Davis & Newstrom (1989) define organizational change as any alteration which occurs in the overall work environment of an organization. Hence, any modification, alteration, translation, transformation in any of the processes of the organization can be defined as organizational change. If organizations do not change, they will perish. Whenever the organization has to increase its efficiency or effectiveness, it has to change. The various areas of organizational change are mission and strategy, organizational structure (which may or may not result from mergers and acquisitions), culture, policies, processes, legal agreements, technology, products, markets, etc. Being active in today's sensitive environment is not sufficient. Organizations need to be proactive so that they can sense what change will be required in the future and they can start planning for it at the right time. But organizational change cannot be brought abruptly without the knowledge of its members. No doubt that organizational change is inevitable, but what is even more important is the way or manner in which organizational change is introduced. Managers may become successful or fail in bringing the required change depending upon their methods of bringing the change. Schein (1990) has addressed the failure of organizational change programmes by arguing that the reason so many change efforts run into resistance or outright failure is traceable to the organization's inability to effectively unfreeze and create readiness for change before attempting a change induction. The reason for this is that organizations often move directly into change implementation before the individual or the group to be changed is psychologically ready. Readiness takes its roots in early research on organizational change (Schein & Bennis, 1965). Beer and Walton (1987) have stated that the failure to analyse and deal with readiness issues can lead to abortive organization development efforts. Beckard & Harris (1987) have discussed the link between reshaping capabilities and readiness for change in their research on organizational transitions. They argued that it is essential to determine levels of readiness for change, which is essentially an analysis of employees' attitudes towards the change event. However, in addition to the attitudes of those employees involved, they argued that the capability of the organization to effectively manage the changes should also be examined. Whereas readiness for change involves the motivation and willingness of the employees, reshaping capabilities involves the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the organization as a

whole to carry out the necessary requirements for successful change implementation. Readiness for change is the crux to any change management strategy (Armenakis, Harris and Mossholder, 1993). They also suggested readiness to be the cognitive precursor to the behaviours of either resistance to, or support for, a change effort. Change readiness is the most prevalent positive attitude towards change that has been studied in the organizational change literature. Armenakis et al. (1993) noted that readiness for change is similar to Lewin's (1951) concept of unfreezing—the process by which organization members' beliefs and attitudes about a pending change are altered so that the employees perceive change as both necessary and likely to be successful. Eby et al. (2000) defined change readiness as “an individual's perception of a specific facet of his or her work environment—the extent to which the organization is perceived to be ready for change.” They concluded that this definition of readiness for change suggests that individuals have preconceived notions about the extent to which organization is ready for change. These perceptions are likely to evolve overtime as individuals develop a history within the organization. Cunningham et al. (2002) said individual-level readiness involves “a demonstrable need for change, a sense of one's ability to successfully accomplish change (self-efficacy) and an opportunity to participate in the change process.” Jones et al. (2005) defined readiness as “the extent to which employees hold positive views about the need for organizational change (i.e., change acceptance), as well as the extent to which employees believe that such changes are likely to have positive implications for themselves and the wider organization.” Armenakis et al. (2007) define change readiness as “the extent to which an individual or individuals are cognitively and emotionally inclined to accept, embrace, and adopt a particular plan to purposefully alter the status quo.” The definition for readiness includes “the preparation of a gun for immediate aim and firing” or “armed and ready,” but perhaps being “at peace and ready” is a more productive stance when confronting change (Walinga, 2008). Indeed, in a review of the literature, Bouckenoghe (2010) concluded that over 90% of conceptual work on change attitudes has been conducted on either change readiness or resistance to change.

First-Order Change vs. Second-Order Change

First-order change involves adjustments in systems, processes, procedures, methods or structures, but it does not involve fundamental change in strategy, core values, or corporate identity of the organization. It is carrying on with the past activities with focus on improving what was already being done. First-order change can be reversible. First-order changes presume the utility of established organizational

frames, and serve to tacitly reinforce present understandings, including the status quo configuration of interests and interest groups (Bartunek and Moch, 1987). It maintains the organization as it is by making adaptive changes for the better working of the organization. It requires individual initiative at local level. The other names for first-order change are transactional, evolutionary, incremental, adaptive, and continuous change. According to Burke & Litwin (1992), changes in management practices, policies and procedures, work unit climate, task requirement, location, personnel, skill, team membership, conditions of service, etc., are the transactional changes which can bring first-order change.

The second-order change alters the fundamental nature of the organization to survive in a dynamic and hypercompetitive environment. It is irreversible in nature and requires behavioural changes. It is difficult for most organizations to achieve (Weick & Quinn, 1999). It is the complex change that goes beyond existing paradigms and requires new knowledge and skills. Second-order changes go beyond augmenting or streamlining existing frames and processes, and involve shifting to radically different assumptions and mode of operation, with the shift reflecting a discontinuity and a replacement of the status quo (Gash & Orlikowski, 1991). The other names for second-order change are transformational, revolutionary, radical, disruptive, and discontinuous change. Reger et al. (1994) has defined downsizing, restructuring, and reengineering as transformational changes, because they fundamentally alter the basic nature of the organization. Palmer et al. (2009) says downsizing, implementation of new technology, mergers, and acquisitions are second-order changes. Taking insights from studies of Whittington et al. (1999), Palmer and co-researchers describe delayering, decentralization, HR practices, downscoping, outsourcing, alliances as second-order, transformational changes, which are needed to produce a fundamental reorientation of an organization.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Marrewijk (1999) studied the reaction of a Dutch public telecom operator to the restructuring of the telecom market and concentrates in particular on the strategy of internationalization. It was found that the employees could no longer depend on lifetime employment and automatic promotion but have instead to be flexible and, under the threat of possible layoffs, look for new possibilities of employment within the organization. For many of the employees, these changes involved a lot of stress and fear. Work could no longer be done according to routine. New demands from the organization required a more dynamic and commercial attitude of the employees. These new demands were taxing

and sometimes drawing in excess upon the resources of the employees. The change of cultural environment also created feelings of tension, insecurity, and fear in the expatriates. From the coping strategies, it can be concluded there were three primary major groups of employees using different strategies to cope with cross-cultural differences in the international activities of the firm. The first group of employees (almost 80%) identified themselves with their own organizational and national culture and distanced themselves from the host country cultural. The second group of employees identified themselves with the local cultural context and avoided the expatriate culture (almost 5-10%). The third group of employees identified themselves with both their own national as well as the host country culture and had networks in both cultures (almost 10-15%).

Kwun & Cho (2001) studied the change processes of a Korean public telecom company. Until the 1990s, the telecom industry had been highly regulated in Korea, as was the case in most countries. Deregulation happened around 1991 and by 1996 around 20 companies had government permission to enter the telecommunications industry. Technological innovation had also marked the industry. Korea Telecom made major structural changes in 1987 and 1996 and adopted a new HRM system in 1996 which was the first major change in the company's history. The change aimed at improving the flexibility of human resources by replacing the seniority-based bureaucratic system with one based more on competency and performance. Internal and external pressure (like, competition, substitution by the mobile services, government pressure, and unfavourable public opinion) were the major reasons for structural changes. Highly bureaucratic culture and deep-rooted inertia avoided organizational change and innovation. There were coordination and communication problems because of highly specialized functional structure. But top management strongly supported the change in the organizational structure which resulted in successful completion of this change process. The case also suggested that people resist change when they see it critically as hurting their interests. Structural changes affect their tasks and roles whereas HRM changes not only affect their tasks and roles, but also their interests and well-being. In sum, the inertia forces in the HRM change process were much stronger as compared to inertia changes in the structural change process.

Singh (2005) studied the FDI pattern in India from 1991 to 2005 in the telecom sector. FDI in this sector was possible because of the National Telecom Policy of 1994 and New Telecom Policy of 1999. Problems like low teledensity, slow growth of telecom infrastructure, restricted investment, and obsolete technology were the push factors for reforms in the sector. It was in 1991 when expansion and upgradation

of the country's telecom network started. The reforms included complete freedom for manufacturing of telecom equipment, privatization of services, foreign investment and import of technology. Simultaneously, the Department of Telecommunications (DoT) was restructured to remove its monopoly status as the service provider. The 1994 policy did not prove to be sufficient due to some political reasons to make these changes; therefore, the New Telecom Policy 1999 (NTP99) was introduced. The political environment at this time was supportive which played a major role in the liberalization of the Indian telecom sector. As a result, a large number of private operators were allowed to operate in the basic mobile telephony and internet domains. The result of the reforms was increase in teledensity, mobile telephony took the forefront, large subscriber base, number of internet users has seen a steep growth, and larger bandwidth is available for IT-enabled services, and reduction in tariffs for national and international calls.

Rizvi (2010) studied the roles of HR during acquisition of Hutchison by Vodafone in India. He found that in the pre-acquisition phase, an informal taskforce was created comprising of business heads and HR heads. In the post-acquisition period, HR played three roles: employee advocacy role, functional expertise role, and human capital development role. In the employee advocacy role, HR countered the negative feelings of uncertainty, anxiety, loss of faith, and career doubt, communication was used as an effective tool. In the functional expertise role, it was maintained that not a single employee was laid off. And in the human capital development role, training workshops and OD interventions were used as methods of facilitating change. Orientation programme was conducted to change from the Hutch model to the Vodafone model. The values of Vodafone were linked with the values of Hutch through workshops in order to have a cultural fit. Hutch employees disliked the colour red as it was the colour used in Airtel logo, the competitor. Red was thought of as the colour of the enemy. HR changed the perception and linked the colour red with restlessness about sales and passion to perform. Two training programmes were conducted. In first, learning was imparted in leadership skills, case laws, telecom space, people sensitization, and handling worry and anxiety. The group trained went back to their respective positions and helped diffuse the culture into the whole organisation. Thus, a parallel learning system was created. The second training programme was held to communicate the values of Vodafone. These values were linked with the values of Hutch. Assessment centres assessed employees and promotions were offered to the performing employees.

S. Singh, D.K. Singh, M.K. Singh & S.K. Singh (2010) conducted a study to forecast 3G market in India. The focus

of this study was to examine the factors affecting the adoption of 3G services among Indian customers. The results of the study were that perceived usefulness is the most important factor which influences attitude towards using 3G services; intrinsic motivation is significantly influencing intention to use; perceived service quality is significantly influencing attitude towards using; apprehensiveness and individual characteristics are the other factors that influence attitude towards using. But they have less significance. Even though perceived ease of use directly influences attitude towards using, the indirect influence through perceived usefulness is even greater. Cost of adoption and perceived risk are the other two important factors which significantly influence (in negative) the attitude towards using. Subjective norms and lack of knowledge has no significant influence on attitude towards using. The result shows that there is a promising future for 3G services in India.

Jain (2011) said that India has become one of the fastest growing telecom markets in the world because of its large population, low penetration of telephony, a rise in customers' disposable income and spending power owing to economic growth. In November 2007, the Telecom Ministry decided to introduce mobile number portability (MNP) in stages, beginning with metros. She says that MNP would increase the competition in the mobile telephony market in India as customers will have the option to switch operators, if they are not satisfied with their current operator. International experience proves that there is substantial improvement in the quality of services after introduction of number portability but Indian mobile operators are not very keen to implement it fearing customer churn. The implementation of MNP will hit the operating margins of service providers and only those with deeper pockets would be able to cope up with this change. The pan-India implementation of MNP will result in churn of customers and lower the ARPU's of the operators. The operators would need to offer service quality, low tariff plans, and strong network coverage to retain the customers. Differentiating services like 3G can also pull customers towards a particular operator.

Chutima, Morgan & Griego (1998) studied the relationships between readiness for change and demographic variables of employees of a manufacturing company and found that the demographic variables like the department in which the employee worked, position of the employee, and the experience of the employee were related to readiness for change. It was also found that employees in managerial positions had higher change readiness as compared to employees in non-managerial positions.

Tredway (2004) studied the relationship between change readiness scores and learning of individuals in an organization undergoing a complex change like, merger and acquisition. The change readiness scores in the organization were lower

before acquisition. The scores improved after the change process with the help of learning interventions. The change readiness scores of the managers above 45 years of age were more than those in the age range, under 25 and 25-45.

Rafferty and Simons (2006) investigated readiness of employees for two types of organizational changes, corporate transformation changes and fine-tuning changes, and explored the antecedents of readiness for these changes in a number of public sector organizations. Respondents that had been in their organization for a minimum of 2 years were selected for inclusion in the study as there was a need for employees to have experienced a variety of organizational changes in order to be able to respond to the survey. Readiness for fine-tuning changes was higher (mean = 3.95) than readiness for corporate transformation changes (mean = 3.45). Participation was uniquely positively associated with readiness for fine-tuning changes. However, participation was not uniquely positively associated with readiness for corporate transformation changes. Self-efficacy for change displayed a unique positive relationship with readiness for both types of organizational changes. It was supported that trust in senior leaders displayed a significant unique relationship with readiness for corporate transformation changes as well as for fine-tuning changes. Trust in peers was uniquely positive associated with readiness for fine-tuning changes. Trust in peers did not display a significant unique relationship with readiness for corporate transformation changes. Perceived organizational support was uniquely positively associated with readiness for corporate transformation changes. However, perceived organizational support was not significantly uniquely associated with readiness for fine-tuning changes. Flexible policies and procedures were significantly uniquely associated with readiness for corporate transformation changes, but not uniquely associated with readiness for fine-tuning changes. In contrast, logistics and systems support was uniquely positively associated with readiness for fine-tuning changes but was not uniquely associated with readiness for corporate transformation changes.

Barrera (2011) examined the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, demographic variables, and readiness for change of the employees of a public service utility. It was found that there were significant correlations between readiness for change organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and demographic variables.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study titled, "Effect of Demographics on the Change Readiness of Executives Working in Indian Mobile Service Sector," exploratory research has been done first and then followed the descriptive research for the latter to be more

effective. The latter organizes the data and hypotheses found during the exploratory process. This study has been restricted to the mobile service sector in the states of Punjab, Haryana, and Union Territory of Chandigarh. The study covers Network Service Provider Companies and Vendor Companies. The former are business-to-customer companies and the latter are business-to-business companies. For the purpose of this study, an executive in the telecom sector is one who by virtue of his position is responsible for taking some decisions which are necessary for the accomplishment of his role and duties. There were approximately 5400 employees starting from the level of an executive to that of a senior manager in the telecom sector in Punjab, Haryana, and Chandigarh. The implications of this study are of material importance for them. In this study, the two types of companies, i.e., Network Service Provider companies and Vendor companies are considered as two strata for this study. From each stratum, seven companies were selected randomly. Further, from each company, 30 executives were selected randomly. That makes a total sample size of 420 (the sample size is 7.8% of the population). But not all the questionnaires were received back. A total of 401 questionnaires were complete in all respects, and received. The scale which consists of 25 questions measures the Change Readiness of the executives. These statements represent different change situations in the telecom sector. These statements are categorized into two groups. Group one consists of 12 statements which represent First-order changes. The second group consists of 13 statements which represent Second-order changes. This categorization has been done according to the categorization and the definitions of first-order organizational change and second-order organizational change provided by Burke and Litwin (1992), Palmer and Dunford (1997), Whittington et al. (1999), and other researchers.

OBJECTIVES

- To examine the effect of various demographics on the Change Readiness of executives, if any:

The demographics of the executives, namely, age, experience, gender, qualifications, marital status, department, designation shall be studied vis-à-vis their Change Readiness to see if these demographics have any effect on their readiness for organizational change.

HYPOTHESES

- H₁: There will be significant differences in the mean scores of Total Change Readiness, Change Readiness for first-order changes and Change readiness for second-order changes for executives of Network Service Provider and Vendor Companies.
- H₂: There will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of the executives in different age categories.
- H₃: There will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of the executives in different experience categories.
- H₄: There will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of male and female executives.
- H₅: There will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of graduate and post-graduate executives.
- H₆: There will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of married and single executives.
- H₇: There will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of the executives from different departments.
- H₈: There will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of the executives with different designations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and F Value for Change Readiness vs. Company Type

	Company Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F (Between Groups)	Sig.
Change Readiness for 1 st Order Changes	NSP	201	46.4826	5.61524	.39607	.057	.812
	VC	200	46.3600	4.66575	.32992		
	Total	401	46.4214	5.15746	.25755		
Change Readiness for 2 nd Order Changes	NSP	201	47.1343	7.17543	.50612	2.861	.092
	VC	200	46.0350	5.75931	.40724		
	Total	401	46.5860	6.52290	.32574		
Total Change Readiness	NSP	201	93.6169	11.83924	.83508	1.320	.251
	VC	200	92.3950	9.29792	.65746		
	Total	401	93.0075	10.65211	.53194		

It can be seen from Table 1 though employees working in Network Service Provider (NSP) Companies showed more Total Change Readiness ($M = 93.62$, $SD = 11.84$) as compared to their counterparts working in Vendor Companies (VC) ($M = 92.40$, $SD = 9.30$), but that difference did not come out to be statistically significant $\{F(1,399) = 1.32$, $p > 0.05$, Table 1}. Similarly, no significant difference has been found between the Change Readiness for first-order changes for executives of two company types. Same results have been found out for the Change Readiness for

second-order changes. This shows executives from Vendor Companies and Network Service Provider companies are similarly prepared for first-order changes as well as second-order changes. The reason for this can be that similar kind of change is sweeping in both types of companies in the telecom sector. Hence, the hypothesis, H_1 that there will be significant differences among the mean scores of Network Service Provider and Vendor Companies executives' Total Change Readiness, Change Readiness for first-order changes and Change Readiness for second-order changes is rejected.

Table 2: Correlation Table for Age, Experience, and Change Readiness of Executives

		Change Readiness for 1 st Order Changes	Change Readiness for 2 nd Order Changes	Total Change Readiness
Age	Pearson Correlation	.201**	.282**	.270**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	401	401	401
Experience	Pearson Correlation	.143**	.198**	.191**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.000	.000
	N	401	401	401

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Change Readiness vs. Age of Executives

	Age Category	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F (Between Groups)	Sig.
Change Readiness for 1 st Order Changes	21-30	277	45.7256	5.20422	.31269	8.465**	.000
	31-40	116	47.9914	4.74662	.44071		
	41-50	8	47.7500	4.46414	1.57831		
	Total	401	46.4214	5.15746	.25755		
Change Readiness for 2 nd Order Changes	21-30	277	45.4368	6.55969	.39413	14.880**	.000
	31-40	116	49.1293	5.78383	.53702		
	41-50	8	49.5000	4.00000	1.41421		
	Total	401	46.5860	6.52290	.32574		
Total Change Readiness	21-30	277	91.1625	10.70177	.64301	14.334**	.000
	31-40	116	97.1207	9.44748	.87718		
	41-50	8	97.2500	8.13722	2.87694		
	Total	401	93.0075	10.65211	.53194		

1. Age vs. Change Readiness

Age has been found to be significantly related to Total Change Readiness ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$, Table 2). Individuals in the age range of 41–50 years scored more ($M = 97.25$, $SD = 8.13$, Table 3) on Total Change Readiness as compared to

individuals in the age range of 31–40 years ($M = 97.12$, $SD = 9.44$) and those in 21–30 years ($M = 91.16$, $SD = 10.70$). Significant differences have been observed on Total Change Readiness between these three levels of age $\{F(2,398) = 14.334$, $p < 0.01$, Table 3}. Thus, the hypothesis, H_2 that there will be significant difference in the Total Change

Readiness of the executives in different age categories has been accepted. Similar results have been supported by Tredway (2004) and Barrera (2011) though Chutima (1997), Weber & Weber (2001), Barber (2010) and Shah & Shah (2010) found that there is no significant association between age and Change Readiness of employees.

Similarly, age of the executives has been found out to be significantly related to their Change Readiness for first-order changes ($r = .201$, $p < 0.01$, Table 2) as well as to their Change Readiness for second-order changes ($r = .282$, $p < 0.01$, Table 2). Similarly, the executives in the age range 31–40 have highest mean score ($M = 47.9$, $SD = 4.74$, Table 3) for Change Readiness for first-order changes and the executives in the age range 41–50 have the highest mean

score ($M = 49.5$, $Sd = 4.0$, Table 3) for Change Readiness for second-order changes. Age has been found out to be more significantly related to Change Readiness for second-order changes which means the senior executives are more ready for second-order changes as compared to their younger counterparts $\{F(2,398) = 8.46$, $p < 0.01$ & $F(2,398) = 14.88$, $p < 0.01$, Table 3}. The reason for this can be that senior executives understand the importance of second-order changes better than their younger counterparts because of their mental maturity and past similar experiences in the organization. The implication is that the senior employees have been found to be more ready for organizational changes and their readiness for second-order changes is higher too; therefore, they should be used by organizations as change agents, initiators, and mentors for change processes.

2. Experience vs. Change Readiness

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics and F Value for Change Readiness vs. Experience of Executives

	Experience Category	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F (Between Groups)	Sig.
Change Readiness for 1 st Order Changes	< = 5 yrs	225	46.0844	4.84003	.32267	3.643*	.013
	> 5-10 yrs	140	46.3071	5.59791	.47311		
	> 10-15 yrs	30	49.3333	4.77301	.87143		
	> 15-20 yrs	6	47.1667	4.26224	1.74005		
	Total	401	46.4214	5.15746	.25755		
Change Readiness for 2 nd Order Changes	< = 5 yrs	225	45.9289	6.07059	.40471	7.280**	.000
	> 5-10 yrs	140	46.4500	6.84602	.57859		
	> 10-15 yrs	30	51.5000	6.58499	1.20225		
	> 15-20 yrs	6	49.8333	4.57894	1.86934		
	Total	401	46.5860	6.52290	.32574		
Total Change Readiness	< = 5 yrs	225	92.0133	9.94964	.66331	6.626**	.000
	> 5-10 yrs	140	92.7571	11.23578	.94960		
	> 10-15 yrs	30	100.8333	10.35602	1.89074		
	> 15-20 yrs	6	97.0000	8.83176	3.60555		
	Total	401	93.0075	10.65211	.53194		

It can be seen in Table 2 that significant positive association has been found between length of experience and Change Readiness ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$). Employees with more experience showed more readiness to change as compared to employee with less job experience. As shown, employee with 10 or more years of experience scored more on Change Readiness than the others. As can be seen in Table

4, significant differences have been observed between employees with different experience $\{F(3,397) = 6.63$, $p < 0.01\}$. The reason for this can be that the executives with longer experience in the sector have seen similar changes before and understand that these changes are inevitable and necessary for the growth of the organization. The implication here is that executives with more experience in the sector

should involve the executives with lesser experience in the change processes and can share their rich experience of dealing with such kind of changes with them. The newer employees always look upon experienced ones for valuable information they can provide which can be beneficial for them to prepare themselves for such change situations. Thus, the proposed hypotheses, H_3 that there will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of executives in different experience categories holds good. Barrera (2011) also found similar results between the experience and Change Readiness of employees of a public service utility. Chutima et al. (1997) too found that readiness for change is significantly related to length of employment. Whereas, Weber and Weber (2001) found no relationship exists between the two. Barber (2010) found that there is no significant relationship between

experience and Change Readiness of employees of a not-for-profit nursing home.

There is significant difference in the Change Readiness for first-order changes of executives in different age categories $\{F(3,397) = 3.64, p < 0.05, \text{Table 4}\}$. Similarly, there is significant difference in the Change Readiness for second-order changes of executives in different age categories $\{F(3,397) = 7.28, p < 0.01, \text{Table 4}\}$. This shows that the executives with more experience understand the need and importance of organizational changes better. Another intriguing result is that the Change Readiness for first-order changes as well as for second-order changes decreases slightly for experience category 15-20 years (Table 4).

3. Gender vs. Change Readiness

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and F Value for Change Readiness vs. Gender of Executives

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F (Between Groups)	Sig.
Change Readiness for 1 st Order Changes	Male	338	46.3254	5.21929	.28389	.745	.389
	Female	63	46.9365	4.81889	.60712		
	Total	401	46.4214	5.15746	.25755		
Change Readiness for 2 nd Order Changes	Male	338	46.3669	6.58487	.35817	2.438	.119
	Female	63	47.7619	6.09525	.76793		
	Total	401	46.5860	6.52290	.32574		
Total Change Readiness	Male	338	92.6923	10.69041	.58148	1.888	.170
	Female	63	94.6984	10.36376	1.30571		
	Total	401	93.0075	10.65211	.53194		

Table 5 depicts mean values on Change Readiness for male and female executives.

Female executives showed more Total Change Readiness ($M = 94.70, SD = 10.36, \text{Table 5}$) as compared to their counterpart male executives ($M = 92.70, SD = 10.70, \text{Table 5}$), but that difference was not found to be statistically significant $\{F(1,399) = 1.88, p > 0.05\}$. Thus, the hypothesis H_4 that there will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of male and female executives has been rejected. Chutima (1997) and Tredway (2004) too supported this in their respective studies. Barber (2010) too found that there is no significant relationship between gender and Change Readiness of employees of a not-for-profit nursing home. Shah (2010) also stated that there is no positive and significant relationship between the gender and Change

Readiness of employees of a public sector organization. But Barrear (2011) found significant correlation between gender and Change Readiness of employees. Also, the mean value of Change Readiness for first-order changes has been found out to be almost equal for men and women. The mean value for Change Readiness for second-order changes for women has been found to be slightly more than men but this difference is not significant. This shows, men and women are equally prepared for the changes taking place in the telecom organizations. The reason for this might be the professional attitude of the women once they enter the organizations. They understand their roles, responsibilities, and contributions which are expected of them. The implication is females should be given equal opportunities and their participation should be sought in the change programmes as they are equally prepared for such changes.

4. Qualifications vs. Change Readiness

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics and F Value for Change Readiness vs. Qualifications of Executives

	Qualifications	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F (Between Groups)	Sig.
Change Readiness for 1 st Order Changes	Graduate	276	46.1051	4.84972	.29192	3.351	.068
	Post Graduate	125	47.1200	5.73838	.51326		
	Total	401	46.4214	5.15746	.25755		
Change Readiness for 2 nd Order Changes	Graduate	276	45.9964	6.36896	.38337	7.350**	.007
	Post Graduate	125	47.8880	6.69402	.59873		
	Total	401	46.5860	6.52290	.32574		
Total Change Readiness	Graduate	276	92.1014	10.13207	.60988	6.494**	.011
	Post Graduate	125	95.0080	11.51051	1.02953		
	Total	401	93.0075	10.65211	.53194		

Qualifications of the executives have also been studied to find their effect on Adversity Quotient and Change Readiness. Qualifications of the executives have been found to be associated significantly with Total Change Readiness. As shown in Table 6, executives having post-graduate degree showed more Change Readiness ($M = 95.00$, $SD = 11$) as compared to the executives having graduate degree only ($M = 92.10$, $SD = 10.13$). The difference between these two groups was able to reach to the significance level $\{F(1,399) = 6.50, p < 0.01\}$. Therefore, the hypothesis H_5 that there will be significant difference in the Change Readiness

of graduate and post-graduate executives is accepted. Also, there is significant difference in the Change Readiness for second-order changes, for graduate and post-graduate executives $\{F(1,399) = 7.35, p < 0.01\}$. This is not so for Change Readiness for first-order changes. This shows that the executives with higher education understand the importance of second-order organizational changes better. But Chutima (1997) and Weber & Weber (2001) in their respective studies found that there is no association between readiness for change and education of the employees.

5. Marital Status vs. Change Readiness

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics and F Value for Change Readiness vs. Marital Status of Executives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F (Between Groups)	Sig.
Change Readiness for 1 st Order Changes	Married	252	47.0317	5.42598	.34180	9.703**	.002
	Single	149	45.3893	4.50032	.36868		
	Total	401	46.4214	5.15746	.25755		
Change Readiness for 2 nd Order Changes	Married	252	47.4960	6.80081	.42841	13.616**	.000
	Single	149	45.0470	5.72375	.46891		
	Total	401	46.5860	6.52290	.32574		
Total Change Readiness	Married	252	94.5278	11.17924	.70423	14.273**	.000
	Single	149	90.4362	9.17202	.75140		
	Total	401	93.0075	10.65211	.53194		

An interesting finding has been observed in the present study that married employees are more ready to organizational change as compared to their single counterparts. Table 7 depicts means values on Total Change Readiness, in relation to the marital status of the executives. Married executives

showed more Change Readiness ($M = 94.53$, $SD = 11.17$, Table 7) as compared to their counterpart single executives ($M = 90.43$, $SD = 9.17$). The difference between married and single executives has been found to be statistically significant for Total Change Readiness $\{F(1,399) = 14.27$,

$p < 0.01$ }. Hence, the hypothesis H_6 that there will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of married and single executives is accepted. Similar results have been found for Change Readiness for first-order changes $\{F(1,399) = 9.70, p < 0.01\}$ as well as to Change Readiness for second-order changes $\{F(1,399) = 13.62, p < 0.01\}$. The

reason for this can be adjusting to changes in their married lives makes them more adaptable in general which explains their higher readiness for organizational changes. No such association between the two has been reported by Chutima (1997) and Shah (2011) in their respective studies.

6. Department vs. Change Readiness

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics and F Value for Change Readiness vs. Department of Executives

	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F (Between Groups)	Sig.
Change Readiness for 1 st Order Changes	Commercial	56	46.8393	5.26662	.70378	7.197**	.000
	Finance	58	49.2586	4.96147	.65147		
	Human Resources	58	46.7759	5.10261	.67001		
	Marketing	38	45.8421	5.14927	.83532		
	Networks	135	44.7704	4.86526	.41873		
	Sales	56	47.0714	4.64311	.62046		
	Total	401	46.4214	5.15746	.25755		
Change Readiness for 2 nd Order Changes	Commercial	56	46.1964	7.84027	1.04770	5.177**	.000
	Finance	58	49.4655	6.17924	.81137		
	Human Resources	58	48.1207	4.39728	.57739		
	Marketing	38	46.1053	6.18538	1.00340		
	Networks	135	44.8519	6.68650	.57548		
	Sales	56	46.9107	5.88767	.78677		
	Total	401	46.5860	6.52290	.32574		
Total Change Readiness	Commercial	56	93.0357	12.43889	1.66222	7.106**	.000
	Finance	58	98.7241	10.06260	1.32128		
	Human Resources	58	94.8966	8.72522	1.14568		
	Marketing	38	91.9474	9.99175	1.62088		
	Networks	135	89.6222	10.47660	.90168		
	Sales	56	93.9821	9.16414	1.22461		
	Total	401	93.0075	10.65211	.53194		

Table 8 is showing means values on Total Change Readiness, Change Readiness for first-order changes and Change Readiness for second-order changes in relation to department of the executives. Executives mainly represented six departments, i.e., Commercial, Finance, HR, Marketing, Network & Sales. Executives working in Finance department showed highest Total Change Readiness ($M = 98.72$, $SD = 10.06$) and executives working in Networks department showed lowest Total Change Readiness ($M = 89.62$, $SD = 10.47$). The difference among these six types came out to be statistically significant $\{F(5,395) = 7.10, p < 0.01\}$. Hence, the hypothesis H_7 that there will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of executives from different departments is accepted. Similar results have been found for first-order

changes and second-order changes. Significant differences have been found in Change Readiness for first-order change for executives from different departments $\{F(5,395) = 7.19, p < 0.01, \text{Table 8}\}$. For Change Readiness for second-order changes too, executives from various departments show different levels of readiness $\{F(5,395) = 5.17, p < 0.01, \text{Table 8}\}$. One peculiar finding is that the Change Readiness for second-order changes for the HR executives ($M = 48.12$, $SD = 4.39$, Table 8) is more than their Change Readiness for first-order changes ($M = 46.78$, $SD = 5.14$, Table 8). HR executives themselves have to work as change agents in an organization. The findings show that they understand the importance and role of second-order changes that are sweeping the industry. The Total Change Readiness of the

executives from the networks department is the lowest which shows the need of interventions to improve their readiness as the executives from this department are instrumental and have a direct role in implementing some of the second-order changes, such as technological changes and launch of 4G, etc. The significant differences in the Change Readiness of the executives from various departments show that they perceive these changes differently which can be due to the effect that these changes can bear on their respective functional roles. The implication here is that Change Readiness is required at organizational level, from all functional areas not only from few. Each functional area is affected by organizational change, few are affected more and others are affected less.

For example, technological changes directly have a bearing on the roles and responsibilities of executives of networks department where the Change Readiness has been found to be the lowest. The implication here is that such organizational changes which affect the roles of executives of a particular department need to be handled with care. There is a need of making them understand through communication that their role is vital and crucial in the successful implementation of these changes. Chutima et al. (1997) too found significant relation between the two. Similar results have been reported by Tredway (2004) who found significant difference in the Change Readiness of employees from different functional areas.

7. Designation vs. Change Readiness

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Change Readiness vs. Designation of Executives

	Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F (Between Groups)	Sig.
Change Readiness for 1 st Order Changes	Executive	95	46.1368	4.79719	.49218	5.522**	.000
	Sr. Executive	39	45.5385	3.41703	.54716		
	Engineer	42	43.8810	5.15233	.79502		
	Sr. Engineer	27	45.5556	4.90160	.94331		
	Assistant Manager	73	46.0548	5.65167	.66148		
	Manager	92	47.6196	5.32430	.55510		
	Sr. Manager	33	49.6970	4.38381	.76312		
	Total	401	46.4214	5.15746	.25755		
Change Readiness for 2 nd Order Changes	Executive	95	45.9053	4.80707	.49320	5.077**	.000
	Sr. Executive	39	46.9487	4.11639	.65915		
	Engineer	42	42.8095	7.85303	1.21175		
	Sr. Engineer	27	46.0741	5.81726	1.11953		
	Assistant Manager	73	46.3836	6.15456	.72034		
	Manager	92	47.9239	7.74772	.80776		
	Sr. Manager	33	50.0606	6.57619	1.14477		
	Total	401	46.5860	6.52290	.32574		
Total Change Readiness	Executive	95	92.0421	8.30395	.85197	6.251**	.000
	Sr. Executive	39	92.4872	6.24024	.99924		
	Engineer	42	86.6905	12.22251	1.88597		
	Sr. Engineer	27	91.6296	9.63626	1.85450		
	Assistant Manager	73	92.4384	10.65623	1.24722		
	Manager	92	95.5435	12.16319	1.26810		
	Sr. Manager	33	99.7576	10.15822	1.76832		
	Total	401	93.0075	10.65211	.53194		

Designation of the executives has been found to be associated with their Change Readiness too. Employees mainly represented seven types of designations, i.e., Executive,

Senior Executive, Engineer, Senior Engineer, Assistant Manager, Manager, and Senior Manager as depicted in Table 16. Executives working as Senior Manager showed

highest Total Change Readiness ($M = 99.75$, $SD = 10.16$, Table 9) and employee working as Engineer showed lowest Total Change Readiness ($M = 86.69$, $SD = 12.22$, Table 9). The difference among these seven types came out to be statistically significant $\{F(6,394) = 6.25, p < 0.01, \text{Table } 9\}$. Hence, the hypothesis H_8 that there will be significant difference in the Change Readiness of executives with different designations has been accepted. Designation of the executives has been found out to be significantly related to Change Readiness for first-order changes $\{F(6,394) = 5.52, p < 0.01, \text{Table } 9\}$ as well to Change Readiness for second-order changes $\{F(6,394) = 5.07, p < 0.01, \text{Table } 9\}$. The higher Change Readiness of the managers and the senior managers can be because they have earlier also been part of such organizational changes and are more involved in the decision making regarding the implementation of change. And it is said that people support what they help create. They are held responsible for further dissemination of the change process. They have to practice and show what they preach. The lowest Change Readiness of the engineers can be due to the reason that they do what they are asked to and are seldom involved or asked to participate or give suggestions regarding the changes in the organization. The implication is that involvement, suggestions, and participation should be sought from executives at lower levels too. They should feel part of the change process and not feel alienated in this whole process. Chutima et al. (1997) too found that readiness for change is significantly related to position of the employee. Tredway (2004) found that the Change Readiness of managers was more than non-managers and this difference was significant. Similar results have been given by Shah & Shah (2010) who found association between present employment status and readiness for change of employees. Barrera (2011) too found significant correlation between position held by employee and his Change Readiness.

In the present study, designation of the employees is clearly affecting their Change Readiness. This may suggest that as the designation of the executive improves, he gains experience of handling different changing situations. He has had handled difficult situations in the past working experience too. So, he becomes more equipped to face difficult situations in future. Also as he goes up in the hierarchy, he has to take decisions which involve change process. His role changes from implementation to planning and he understands the need of organizational change better. This again testifies the need of a mentor-mentee kind of a relationship between the senior and the lower level executives where the former can by virtue of their rich experience in the sector prepare the latter for the changes taking place in the sector.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following can be concluded and recommended from this research piece:

- Measuring and improving the individual Change Readiness of the executives should be the precursor to introduction of change programmes. This can give an idea about how the executives view the impending change, what are the fears and apprehensions in their minds.
- Change Management Programmes should be conducted frequently and at regular intervals in the organizations to explain the need and importance of organizational change and improve the participation.
- Training programmes should be organized in which executives can gain information and knowledge regarding the change which is going to take place. This can improve the Change Readiness of the executives which will further help them to contribute more effectively to their organizations.
- In this study it was found that Change Readiness of executives was less for second-order changes. The implication is that second-order changes should be dealt with care, employees need to be fully informed and their participation should be sought. What is generally seen in organizations is that second-order changes more announced like policies and therefore create doubt, fear, and apprehension in the minds of the employees.
- The senior executives have been found to be more ready for organizational changes and their readiness for second-order changes is higher too; therefore, they should be used by organizations as change agents, initiators, and mentors for change processes. This implies that Mentoring, Counseling, and Coaching should be made integral and more formal part of HR in these organizations.
- More experienced executives have demonstrated more Change Readiness. The implication here is that executives with more experience in the sector should involve the executives with lesser experience in the change processes and can share their rich experience of dealing with such kind of changes with them. This shows a need for interactive sessions and

team building between the more experienced and the lesser experienced executives.

- Gender has not been found out to affect the Change Readiness of the executives. The implication is females should be given equal opportunities and their participation should be sought in the change programmes as they are equally prepared for such changes.
- Significant differences have been found for Change Readiness of executives from different departments. The implication here is that Change Readiness is required at organizational level, from all functional areas not only from few. The organizational changes which affect the roles of executives of a particular department need to be handled with care. There is a need of making them understand that their role is vital and crucial in the successful implementation of these changes. Wherever possible, job rotation can be used so that the executives with higher Change Readiness can disseminate such qualities in other department too where it is needed.
- The Change Readiness of managers and senior managers has been found to be higher than the executives at lower hierarchy. The implication is that involvement, suggestions and participation should be sought from executives at lower levels too. They should feel part of the change process and should not feel alienated in this whole process. This also shows that the senior executives should adopt a participative management style.
- The sample for the study was selected from fourteen telecom companies (Network Service Providers and Vendor Companies) in the states of Punjab, Haryana, and the U.T, Chandigarh. Study can be replicated in other telecom companies too across the country.
- The study can be replicated in other industries too.
- The Change Readiness of the executives can be measured in other industries too which are swept by rapid organizational change.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- The study has been restricted to the states of Punjab, Haryana, and the U.T. of Chandigarh.

- Sample of the study has been restricted only to telecom companies in the selected regions.
- The sample size of the study was small as compared to the universe.
- Biasness and resistance of the respondents due to their personal reasons could not have been mitigated altogether.
- Lack of published/unpublished literature related to the topic of the study in the country was another limitation.

REFERENCES

- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K.W. (1993). Creating Readiness for Organizational Change, *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681-703. doi: 10.1177/001872679304600601
- Armenakisa, A., Harris, S. G., Cole, M. S., Fillmer, J. L., & Self, D. R. (2007). A top management team's reactions to organizational Transformation: The diagnostic benefits of five key change sentiments. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(3), 273-290. doi: 10.1080/14697010701771014
- Banunek, J., & Moch, M. (1987). First order, second order, and third order change and organization development interventions: A cognitive approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 23, 483-500.
- Barber, V. A. (2010). *A Study of Change Readiness: Factors That Influence the Readiness of Frontline Workers Towards a Nursing Home Transformational Change Initiative* (Education Doctoral). St. John Fisher College, New York.
- Beckhard, R., & Harris, R. T. (1987). *Organizational transitions: Managing complex change*. Boston: Addison Wesley.
- Beer, M., & Walton, A. E. (1987). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 339-367. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.38.020187.002011
- Bhardwaj, S. (2012). Infrastructure sharing in telecom industry: Growth of new business models & their prospective trends. *International Journal of Research and Development - A Management Review*, 2(1), 20-24.
- Bhattacharya, M. (2004). *Telecom Sector in India: Vision 2020*.
- Burke, W. W., & Litwin, G. H. (1992). A Causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management*, 18(3), 523-545.

- Cannibalism in Telecom Sector Likely to Get Worse in Long Run. (2013, Oct 24). *The Economic Times*.
- Chutima, H., Morgan, G. A., & Griego, O. V. (1998). An extension of the theory of margin: A framework for assessing readiness for change. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(4), 339-350. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.3920090405
- Cunningham, C. E., Woodward, C. A., Shannon, H. S., MacIntosh, J., Lendrum, B., Rosenbloom, D., & Brown, J. (2002). Readiness for organizational change: A longitudinal study of workplace, psychological and behavioural correlates. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 377-392.
- Davis, K., & Newstrom, J. W. (1989). *Human behaviour at work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India Private Limited, (2014). *Telecom: Enabling Growth and Serving the Masses*.
- Desai, A. (2006). *India's telecommunications industry: History, analysis, diagnosis*. Sage Publications.
- Dun & Bradstreet. (2009). *Indian telecom industry*. New Delhi.
- Eby, L. T., Adams, D. M., Russell, J. E. A., & Gaby, S. H. (2000). Perceptions of organizational readiness for change: Factors related to employees' reactions to the implementation of team-based selling. *Human Relations*, 53, 419-442.
- Gash, D. C., & Orlikowski, W. J. (1991). Changing frames: Toward an understanding of information technology and organizational change. *Academy of Management*, 189-193.
- Jain, S. (2011). Temporary protection and technology adoption: A case of mobile number portability. *International Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 2(2), 388-390. Retrieved on March 2, 2012, from <http://www.ijcst.com/vol22/2/surbhi.pdf>
- Kwun, S. K., & Cho, N. (2001). Organizational change and inertia: Korea telecom. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 7(4), 111-136. doi: 10.1080/713999119
- Mobile data in India nearly doubles in 2012. (2013, May 25). *The Financial Express*.
- Palmer, I., & Dunford, R. (1997). Organising for hyper-competition. *New Zealand Strategic Management*, 2(4), 38-45.
- Palmer, I., Dunford, R., & Akin, G. (2009). *Managing organizational change* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rafferty, A. E., & Simons, R. H. (2006). An examination of the antecedents of readiness for fine-tuning and corporate transformation changes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(3), 325-350. doi:10.1007/s10869-005-9013-2
- Reger, R. K., Mullane, J. V., Gustafson, L. T., & DeMarie, S. M. (1994). Creating earthquakes to change organizational mindsets. *Academy of Management Executive* 8(4), 31-43.
- Rizvi, Y. (2011). Human capital development role of Human Resource (HR) during mergers and acquisitions. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(2), 261-268. Retrieved on March 10, 2012, from <http://www.academicjournals.org/AJBM>
- Schein, E. H., & Bennis, W. (1965). *Personal and organizational change via group methods*. New York: John Wiley.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45, 109-119. doi: 10.1037//0003-066X.45.2.109
- Shah, N., & Shah, S. G. (2010). Relationships between employee readiness for organizational change, supervisor and peer relations and demography. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 23(5), 640-652. doi: 10.1108/17410391011083074
- Singh, K. (2005). Foreign direct investment in India: A critical analysis of FDI from 1991-2005. *Centre for Civil society, Research Internship Programme*, New Delhi.
- Singh, S., Singh, D. K., Singh, M. K., & Singh, S. K. (2010). The forecasting of 3G market in India based on revised technology acceptance model. *International Journal of Next-Generation Networks*, 2(2), 61-68.
- Telecom Hiring Slumps, Layoffs Become Common. (2011, September 22). *The Times of India*.
- Telecom Industry Cracking Under Financial Pressure. (2013, July 11). *The Hindu*.
- Telecommunications in India. (February 18, 2014). Retrieved December 20, 2013, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telecommunications_in_India
- Telecom M&A to be in place by November 1: Kapil Sibal. (2013, July 7). *Business Today*. Retrieved on December 19, 2013, from <http://businesstoday.intoday.in/story/telecom-mergers-and-acquisition-rules-to-be-in-place-by-nov/1/199608.html>
- Telecom Regulatory Authority of India. (2011). *2010 Value of Spectrum in the 1800MhzBand*. Retrieved on December 19, 2013, from <http://www.trai.gov.in/WriteReadData/Recommendation/Documents/reportmndive9feb11.pdf>

- Telecom Regulatory Authority of India. (2012). *Telecom Sector in India: A Decadal Profile*. Retrieved on December 15, 2013, from <http://www.trai.gov.in/WriteReadData/Publication/Document/201304121052403536675NCAER--Report08june12.pdf>
- Telecom Regulatory Authority of India. (2013). *Highlights of Telecom Subscription Data as on 30th April 2013* [Press release]. Retrieved on December 15, 2013, from <http://www.trai.gov.in/WriteReadData/PressRealease/Document/PR-TSD-03JULY2013.pdf>
- Tredway, R. (2004). *A Merger Case Study of Learning and Change: Exploring the Relationships Between Learning Styles and Change Orientation to Enhance Learning Interventions* (Doctoral Dissertation). North Carolina State University. Raleigh, United States.
- Walinga, J. (2008). Toward a theory of change readiness: The roles of appraisal, focus, and perceived control. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 20(10), 315-347. doi: 10.1177/0021886308318967
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361-386.
- Whittington, R., Pettigrew, A., Peck, S., Fenton, E., & Conyon, M. (1999). Change and complementarities in the new competitive landscape: A European panel study, 1992-1996. *Organization Science*, 10(5), 583-600.