

# Actualizing Roles as A Road Map to Attain Corporate Leadership: A Research Experience during HRD Workshop of Senior Managers in an Indian Public Sector Organization



**Tulika Saxena**

Principal and Associate Professor,  
Deptt.of Managment,  
STEP-HBTI,  
Kanpur

## Abstract

The liberalization of Indian economy, privatization and globalization are forcing management to search for better alternatives for survival and success of the organizations. Corporate leadership is perceived in various ways. Some explain success in terms of profit, productivity, and capacity utilization; others relate it to the market share, sales-growth, turnover and yet others to human satisfaction. The concept of Role-Efficacy purports to generate a feeling of pleasantness in performing one's role and meeting the demands of the role. Perhaps, endeavor of this study is to examine relationship of role efficacy with leadership practiced by executives /senior managers. Difference in philosophies of various organizations put a limit on the person being a good manager or a good leader, or both. The primary data was collected via structured questionnaire canvassed among the sample drawn for the purpose, which comprised of 31 respondents holding senior managerial cadre, out of which 16 respondents on the first day and 15 managers on the second day participated in the HRD workshop belonging to public sector, Indian organization of repute. Data has been statistically treated and complemented by correlation-analysis. Conclusion drawn from the study gives an impression and hint towards the existing state of affairs in the organization and poses a question about the organizational culture and prevailing practices, which perhaps may not be conducive to appreciate the new ideas of corporate transformation. Finally the paper concludes by emphasizing that role efficacy of senior managers must be enhanced by promoting the practice of corporate leadership, both transactional and transformational by them.

**Keywords:** organizations, Leadership, Role-Efficacy

## Introduction

Today's competitive environment calls for systematic and rational policies and practices to manage employees in any organization. The direction of the policies ought to be planned in a scientific manner to execute them effectively and enhance the effectiveness of the roles. This research paper discusses the importance of a role perspective and how leadership practices of managers /executives focused on enhancing its efficacy would facilitate individual self (role) efficacy, which leads to organizational productivity.

The central theme of this work has been the study of style and value profile of managers/ leaders, which builds the organization. The two forms of leadership styles (transactional and transformational) are not entirely mutually exclusive; leaders are not necessarily one or the other, but both. The transformational leaders perceive their capability in terms of managing human beings through empowering attitude, team building and evoking a sense of confidence, visioning, modeling/inspiring, setting standards and boundary management etc. These transformational functions should be appropriately coupled with transactional functions through entrepreneurial risk- taking, not losing balance, clarity of organizational goals and capability to plan for the future, policy making, developing systems, monitoring performances, coordinating, rewarding ,coaching, synergizing, developing talent/mentoring and building culture and climate.

Success depends directly upon the style and role efficacy of the executives. Perhaps in the context of great challenges being faced by the organizations, the concept of role- efficacy has got potential to bring about a change in the employee's potential and effectiveness .The performance of a person working in an organization depends on his own potential effectiveness as a person, his technical competence, his managerial experience, etc., as well as the way the role which he performs in the organization is designed. It is the integration of the two.

#### **Review of Literature**

The concept of role-efficacy in the Indian context has been pioneered by Prof. Pareek (1974, 1975,1976,1978, 1980a, 1980b, 1984, 1986, 1987, and 1993). Pareek's earlier expositions of role efficacy and also his recent work are based on a deep understanding of role perceptions derived from empirical and action researches, laying emphasis on the normative and development aspects of role which he believes one significant building blocks for integrating individual in an organization (Argyris, 1964; Graen, 1976). Following him, a number of researchers have endeavored to unfold the relationship of the role-efficacy with personal and organizational variables. Pareek (1987, 1993) suggested that in the interest of growth and development and for enhancing HRD orientation of the company, organizations need to carry out role efficacy audits in various job-settings and embark upon appropriate strategies to bring about a change in various segments of such perception through performance counseling and utility analysis. According to (Pareek, 2001), organizations have to assist individuals to define their roles and in the process individuals are to be willing to share their concerns for organization through appropriate strategies for organizational development. The primary role of transformational leadership is to multiply power in the organization, build the organization as a learning organization and develop an appropriate culture, ethos and climate. Characteristics of a transformational leader: Behling and McFillen (1960) built a model There is contribution of a constructive learning environment to academic self-efficacy in higher education. Dorit Alt (2015). The moderating role of specific role/ self-efficacy is the impact of positive mood on cognitive performance, motivation and emotion, Tomasz Niemiec, Kinga Lachowicz-Tabaczek (2015).

#### **Statement of the Problem**

Exploring a employees (manager in this case) role and operating leadership style in an organization gives an understanding of organizational dynamics, its culture, its structure, its various systems, interlinkages, hierarchical levels and associated processes .As far as role efficacy is concerned, it is the most basic and elementary concept in understanding success of an organization as it determines individual efficiency in the organizational context. It is through role that an individual gets linked with the organizational system. The involvement and integration of individual with the role creates joy in the work he does, and builds a

strong sense of commitment and citizenship to the organization, which is lacking to certain extent in Indian corporate context. There is an argument that applicability of management principles may be limited to a particular situation or culture.

#### **Objectives of the Study**

1. To make an audit of role efficacy as related to corporate leadership among senior managers serving in Indian public sector organization.
2. To find out inter-correlation between 14 functions of corporate leadership and 10 dimensions of role efficacy.

#### **Methodology**

The interactive HRD workshop was conducted on thirty one participants. On the first day numbers of participants were sixteen and on the second day it was fifteen. The timings of the workshop were from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. with a lunch break of an hour.

#### **Design of the Study**

The first session comprised of administration of the questionnaire to the managers while they were on the job and collection of filled in questionnaires and personal meeting programmes with the subjects. To determine the functional factors of role -efficacy contributing to effective leadership, it was felt appropriate to address the questionnaire to managerial cadre alone. The questionnaire has 2 parts; first part deals with role efficacy scale and second part deals with senior managers function schedule. Respondents were requested to go through the instructions given on the questionnaire and put their queries before filling out, during the workshop. The respondents were assured that this was an academic exercise and their responses would be kept confidential and will be used for research purpose only. This assurance was further stated in the questionnaire. In the second phase, the subjects gave their reactions about the relevance of the items in the tools with their day-to-day functions. The third phase comprised of action phase. In this session the results of the responses to the questionnaire were correlated and discussed with the participants to arrive at conclusions and suggestions.

#### **Sample**

The study has covered 31 senior managers serving in a public sector organization as respondents; composed of a comparatively small group of executives, i.e. top and the middle management and is responsible for the overall management of the organization. The respondents ranged in the age group of 32- 55 years with a work experience of 12-33 years. Among 31 participants 12 were females and 19 were males. They had degrees of B.Sc/B.A ,B.E, MBA and M.Tech( few) to their credit.

#### **Tools/Instruments Used**

For the purpose of data collection an extensive structured questionnaire of Role Efficacy, Corporate Leadership developed by Prof. Udai Pareek was used.

#### **Role Efficacy Scale**

Role –Efficacy Scale (RES) has 10 dimensions as following,

**Self-Role Integration**

The dimension measures the perception of the integration between self and role (vs. role distance). The integration of the person and the role comes about when the individual is able to contribute to the evolution of the role.

**Proactivity**

The dimension measures the perception of taking initiative (vs. reacting). A person who occupies a role responds to the various expectations that people in the organization have from that role, while this certainly gives him satisfaction; it also satisfies others in the organization

**Creativity**

This dimension measures the perception that something new or innovative is being done by the individual i.e. experimenting and trying new ideas and strategies (vs. routine).

**Confrontation**

This dimension measures the perception about the capacity of the individual to face the problems to attempt their relevant solution (vs. avoidance).

**Centrality**

This dimension measures the perception of importance of the role i.e. if a person is feeling his role is important or central in a system his role efficacy is likely to be high (vs. peripherality).

**Influence**

A relative concept is that of influence or power (vs. powerlessness). This dimension measures the perception of the individuals towards one's own capacity in making an impact on others.

**Growth**

This dimension measures the perception about occupying a role the level of opportunities to learn new things for personal growth and development (vs. stagnation).

**Inter-Role Linkage**

This dimension measures the perception of inter dependence with others role i.e. linkage of one's roles with other's role (vs. isolation)

**Helping Relationship**

This dimension measures the perception/feeling of a person with regard to helping other and taking help from others (vs. hostility).

**Superordination**

This dimension measures the perception that something beyond the regular call of duty is being contributed to larger society and the nation i.e. linkage of one's role with larger entity/cause (vs. deprivation).

**Senior Managerial Functions Schedule**

Senior Managerial Function Schedule (SMFS) developed by Udai Pareek was used for the study. SMFS consists of a list of fourteen functions (seven are transactional and seven are transformational) as follows:

**Transactional Functions**

Leaders have an obligation to get things done, and ensure maximum efficiency and effectiveness of an organization. Transactional function includes following dimensions:

**Policy Making**

The leader arranges to set priorities and directions for organizational work, and create linkages among several aspects of the organization.

**Planning**

Planning involves working out detailed action steps, the needed resources, and contingency arrangements if a proposed action does not get done.

**Developing Systems**

Systems economize energy and lead to faster action like through management information system, budgetary system, human resource development system, reward system etc .

**Monitoring Performance**

Here monitoring is done against the accepted standards and agreed plans.

**Coordinating**

When individuals and groups work in synergy, duplication is avoided and mutual support is ensured.

**Rewarding**

Senior managers reward good performance of exemplary behavior of individuals and teams.

**Coaching**

This includes helping them to know their own strengths and weaknesses, and improve their performance in future.

**Transformational Functions**

Transformational functions go beyond the immediate task and build individuals and groups to enable them to achieve targets that the organization or individual would never have expected. These functions increase power in the organization by empowering various groups and individuals. The following functions fall in this category:

**Visioning**

Vision is the dream, which inspires people and makes them proud of working in the organization.

**Modeling**

It is a way to inspire people to set a personal example of a desirable style and behavior as, behavior speaks louder than words.

**Setting Standards**

High standards and norms inspire individual employees to follow them in their own work

**Building Culture and Climate**

Senior managers pay major attention to building climate of excellence, commitment, mutual support, etc.

**Boundary Management**

This can be done by ensuring continuous availability of resources, supports from outside and from major customers.

**Synergizing**

The strength of an organization depends on the strength of its teams.

**Searching and Nurturing Talent**

Senior managers pay attention to serve as mentor for the organizational employees.

**Data Analysis and Results****Values of Intercorrelations**

\*\*\* Denotes that coefficient of correlation (r) is significant at 0.001 level of significance p<0.001,\*\*

Denotes that coefficient of correlation ( $r$ ) is significant at 0.01 level of significance  $p < 0.01$ , \* Denotes that coefficient of correlation ( $r$ ) is significant at 0.05 level of significance  $p < 0.05$ , NS Denotes that  $p > 0.05$  meaning not significant.

**Analysis of Intercorrelations between Role Efficacy Components and Corporate Leadership Components for Senior Managers (Ref. Annexure)**

A thorough probe into the values of Intercorrelations between 10 dimensions of role efficacy and 14 components of corporate leadership functions clearly indicates that dimensions of the corporate leadership and role efficacy are related positively as well as negatively, up to various degrees and significance level as follows:

1. Centrality was found positively related with Integration ( $r=0.22$ ), positively related with Proactivity ( $r=0.37$ )\*\* , positively related with Creativity ( $r=0.60$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Inter-role linkage ( $r=0.18$ ), positively related with Helping relationship ( $r=0.49$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Superordination ( $r=0.41$ )\*\* , positively related with Influence ( $r=0.40$ )\*\* , positively related with Growth ( $r=0.41$ ), positively related with Confrontation ( $r=0.05$ ), positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.66$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.66$ )\*\*\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.12$ ) , positively related with Visioning ( $r=0.09$ ) , negatively related with Planning ( $r=-0.01$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.06$ ), positively related with Setting standards ( $r=0.24$ ), positively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.01$ ), negatively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=-0.02$ ), positively related with Boundary Management ( $r=0.15$ ), negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.15$ ), negatively related with Synergising ( $r=-0.07$ ), positively related with Rewarding ( $r=0.13$ ), negatively related with Developing talent ( $r=0.08$ ), negatively related with Coaching ( $r=-0.25$ ), negatively related with Building culture & climate ( $r=-0.12$ ).
2. Integration was found positively related with Proactivity ( $r=0.35$ )\*, positively related with Creativity ( $r=0.41$ )\*\* , positively related with Inter-role linkage ( $r=0.26$ ), positively related with Helping relationship ( $r=0.24$ ), positively related with Superordination ( $r=0.45$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Influence ( $r=0.00$ ), positively related with Growth ( $r=0.10$ ), positively related with Confrontation ( $r=0.31$ )\*\* , positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.49$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.49$ )\*\*\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.16$ ) , positively related with Visioning ( $r=0.04$ ), negatively related with Planning ( $r=-0.19$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.04$ ), positively related with Setting standards ( $r=0.12$ ), positively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.19$ ), positively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=0.07$ ), negatively related with Boundary management ( $r=-0.02$ ), negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.04$ ), positively related with Synergising ( $r=0.04$ ),

negatively related with Rewarding ( $r=-0.01$ ), positively related with Developing talent ( $r=0.22$ ), positively related with Coaching ( $r=0.01$ ), negatively related with Building culture & climate ( $r=-0.13$ ).

3. Proactivity was found positively related with Creativity ( $r=0.47$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Inter-role linkage ( $r=0.25$ ), positively related with Helping relationship ( $r=0.26$ ), positively related with Superordination ( $r=0.49$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Influence ( $r=0.45$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Growth ( $r=0.47$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Confrontation ( $r=0.08$ ), positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.68$ )\*\*\* , positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.68$ )\*\*\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.10$ ), positively related with Visioning ( $r=0.08$ ), negatively related with Planning ( $r=-0.12$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.15$ ), Positively related with Setting standards ( $r=0.15$ ), negatively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.10$ ), negatively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=-0.05$ ), positively related with Boundary management ( $r=0.09$ ) Negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.29$ )\*, positively related with Synergising ( $r=0.20$ ), negatively related with Rewarding ( $r=-0.09$ ), positively related with Developing talent ( $r=0.23$ ) Positively related with Coaching ( $r=0.03$ ), negatively related with Building culture & climate ( $r=-0.19$ ).
4. Creativity was found positively related with Inter-role linkage ( $r=0.28$ )\*, positively related with Helping relationship ( $r=0.45$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Superordination ( $r=0.58$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Influence ( $r=0.37$ )\*\* , positively related with Growth ( $r=0.40$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Confrontation ( $r=0.18$ ), positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.74$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.74$ )\*\*\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.36$ )\*\* , positively related with Visioning ( $r=0.14$ ), negatively related with Planning ( $r=-0.27$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.07$ ), positively related with Setting standards ( $r=0.30$ )\*, positively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.23$ ), positively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=0.03$ ), positively related with Boundary management ( $r=0.08$ ) Negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.35$ )\*, positively related with Synergising ( $r=0.04$ ), positively related with Rewarding ( $r=0.02$ ), positively related with Developing talent ( $r=0.26$ ), negatively related with Coaching ( $r=-0.19$ ), positively related with Building culture & climate ( $r=0.06$ ).
5. Inter-Role Linkage was Found positively related with Helping relationship ( $r=0.42$ )\*\* , positively related with Superordination ( $r=0.20$ ), positively related with Influence ( $r=0.36$ )\*\* , positively related with Growth ( $r=0.35$ )\*, positively related with Confrontation ( $r=0.17$ ), positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.54$ )\*\*\*, Positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.54$ )\*\*\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.15$ ),

- negatively related with Visioning ( $r=-0.05$ ), negatively related with Planni ( $r=-0.18$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.13$ ), positively related with Setting standards ( $r=0.21$ ), positively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.02$ ), positively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=0.18$ ), negatively related with Boundary management ( $r=-0.01$ ), Negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.06$ ), negatively Rewarding ( $r=-0.08$ ), positively related with Developing talent related with Synergizing ( $r=-0.10$ ), negatively related with ( $r=0.10$ ), positively related with Coaching ( $r=0.03$ ), positively related with Building culture & climate ( $r=0.06$ ).
6. Helping relationship was found positively related with Superordination ( $r=0.42$ )\*\*, positively related with Influence ( $r=0.52$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Growth ( $r=0.41$ )\*\*, negatively related with Confrontation ( $r=-0.07$ ), positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.66$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.66$ )\*\*\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.17$ ), positively related with Visioning ( $r=0.13$ ), negatively related with Planning ( $r=-0.15$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.11$ ), positively related with Setting standards ( $r=0.34$ )\*, positively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.11$ ), negatively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=-0.13$ ), positively related with Boundary management ( $r=0.03$ ), negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.22$ ), positively related with Synergizing ( $r=0.11$ ), positively related with Rewarding ( $r=0.09$ ), positively related with Developing talent ( $r=0.10$ ), negatively related with Coaching ( $r=-0.38$ )\*\*, positively related with Building culture & climate ( $r=0.05$ ).
  7. Superordination as found positively related with Influence ( $r=0.48$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Growth ( $r=0.36$ )\*\*, positively related with Confrontation ( $r=0.31$ )\*\*, positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.76$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.76$ )\*\*\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.08$ ), positively related with Visioning ( $r=0.15$ ), negatively related with Planning ( $r=-0.06$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.04$ ), positively related with Setting standards ( $r=0.22$ ), negatively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.02$ ), negatively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=-0.04$ ), negatively related with management ( $r=-0.14$ ), negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.19$ ), positively related with Synergizing ( $r=0.19$ ), positively related with Rewarding ( $r=0.05$ ), positively related with Developing talent ( $r=0.18$ ), negatively related with Coaching ( $r=-0.18$ ), negatively related with Building culture ( $r=-0.08$ ) & climate.
  8. Influence was found positively related with Growth ( $r=0.60$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Confrontation ( $r=0.10$ ), positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.72$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.72$ )\*\*\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.12$ ), negatively related with Visioning ( $r=-0.05$ ), negatively related with Planning ( $r=-0.07$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.08$ ), positively related with Setting standards ( $r=0.25$ ), positively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.09$ ), positively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=0.11$ ), negatively related with Boundary management ( $r=-0.05$ ), negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.10$ ), negatively related with Synergizing ( $r=-0.12$ ), positively related with Rewarding ( $r=0.01$ ), positively related with Developing talent ( $r=0.18$ ), negatively related with Coaching ( $r=-0.05$ ), negatively related with Building culture & climate ( $r=-0.10$ ).
  9. Growth was found positively related with Confrontation ( $r=0.04$ ), positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.68$ )\*\*\*, positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.68$ )\*\*\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.06$ ), positively related with Visioning ( $r=0.03$ ), positively related with Planning ( $r=0.11$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.04$ ), positively related with Setting ( $r=0.27$ ), positively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.05$ ), positively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=0.03$ ), negatively related with Boundary management ( $r=-0.07$ ), negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.14$ ), negatively related with Synergizing ( $r=-0.05$ ), negatively related with Rewarding ( $r=-0.17$ ), positively related with Developing talent ( $r=0.04$ ), negatively related with Coaching ( $r=-0.05$ ), negatively related with Building culture & climate ( $r=-0.17$ ).
  10. Confrontation was found positively related with Role efficacy total ( $r=0.32$ )\*, positively related with Role efficacy index ( $r=0.32$ )\*, negatively related with Policymaking ( $r=-0.25$ ), positively related with Visioning ( $r=0.01$ ), negatively related with Planning ( $r=-0.19$ ), positively related with Modeling ( $r=0.04$ ), positively related with Setting standard ( $r=0.07$ ), positively related with Developing systems ( $r=0.09$ ), positively related with Monitoring performance ( $r=0.10$ ), positively related with Boundary management ( $r=0.12$ ), negatively related with Coordinating ( $r=-0.15$ ), negatively related with Synergizing ( $r=-0.04$ ), positively related with Rewarding ( $r=0.09$ ), Positively related with Developing talent ( $r=0.23$ ), positive related with Coaching ( $r=0.04$ ), negatively related with Building culture & climate ( $r=-0.06$ ).

### Conclusion & Suggestions

The present study reveals that Role – efficacy was found related to Corporate Leadership of senior managers both favorably and unfavorably upto various extents / degrees. Looking at the negative correlations between 10 items of Role – Actualization and 14 components of Corporate Leadership, considered for study it can be concluded that, corporates will have to evolve a culture that motivates and equips its people to deliver quality. So CEOs (corporate leaders) must ensure that the corporate vision, mission statement, values, and targets are communicated clearly to all employees, equipping them with all the information, resources, and

counseling they need to synchronize their actions with the company, they must extract their feedback using employee satisfaction surveys, and modify organizational systems accordingly (roe efficacy).

Enough attention should be paid to the process of managerial autonomy in the organization, taking steps to make work a source of development and growth for managers rather than being treated merely as an activity for which they are paid. At the same time managers have to be extremely concerned with environmental elements, like stakeholders, government, demographic changes, socio-cultural, economic, political, natural, technological and legal factors, shareholders, employees, customers, industrial groups, competitors, suppliers, trade associations, community, social responsibility and good corporate citizenship to incorporate these in the transacting business, since they contribute to achieving business excellence.

#### **Limitations of the Study**

Scarcity of resources limits the horizon of any study, as researches have to restrict the size of the sample due to practical limitations. Corporate leadership as well as role efficacy are multidimensional and each dimension of these variables are full unit in it self. Future studies dealing with the single dimensions are desirous. It can be inferred that different organizations require different sets of skills due to the intrinsic structural procedural and environmental difference in their settings. To

further validate the findings a large number and varied organizations needed to be included into the sample. Other most obvious limitation of the research is that, the results will depend on how truly subjects respond to the questionnaires.

#### **References**

1. Wadsworth j, Walter (2001) .*The International Best Seller: The Agile Manager's Guide to Leadership*. Velocity Business Publishing Inc, USA.
2. Sayeed Bin, Omer and Pareek, Udai (2000), *Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi*.
3. Singh, Pritam and Bhandarker, Asha (2002). *Winning The Corporate Olympiad: The Renaissance Paradigm*. Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.
4. Lynton P, Rolf And Pareek, Udai (2000). *Training For Organizational Transformation*. Sage Publications India Pvt .Ltd, New Delhi.
5. Pareek, Udai (1993). *Making Organizational Roles effective*. Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd, New Delhi.
6. Pareek, Udai. Rao, Venkateswara.T (1999). *Designing And Managing Human Resource System, 2nd Ed*. Mohan Prmlani For Oxford &IBH.