

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology  
of Egypt / Egyptology

Readiness for Change among Executives of Japanese MNCs Indian Workspaces- An  
Exploration

*Ms. Chandibai Postsangbam*  
Research Scholar  
Department of Business Administration,  
Assam University, Silchar-788011  
&  
*Prof. Arup Barman*  
Department of Business Administration,  
Assam University, Silchar-788011  
Email: abgeet@gmail.com

**Ms. Chandibai Postsangbam, Prof. Arup Barman, Readiness for Change among Executives of Japanese MNCs Indian Workspaces- An Exploration- - Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(9). ISSN 1567-214x.**

**ABSTRACT**

*Readiness for change* is a developmental point of an individual or person within an organisation, or system which has the competence and willingness to engage in a particular activity.<sup>1</sup> In present research as well as in referring advice on change readiness, tends to view only in two primary points of view, i.e., (1) readiness is measured by the organization's financial, material, human and informational resources that can be applied to the change, and (2) readiness is determined by the psychological willingness of affected people to cooperate in bringing the change for fruition<sup>2</sup>. As both the points are not commonly brought together, in this paper we focus, in particularly to resolve and bring beneficial at different levelsthe second point that an individual's perception of the benefits of change is an initiator of readiness for change<sup>3</sup> is the purpose of this paper. The issues of readiness for change among employees have become much significant, hence to figure out the willingness among each employee need to explore and know-how for further research is questionable for the employees mainly working in Japanese firms in Indian workspace.

**Introduction- The Concept**

Readiness to change, by definition, organizational members' shared resolve to implement a change (change commitment) and shared belief in their collective capability to do so (change efficacy).<sup>4</sup>It is commonly accepted that an individual's perception of the benefits of change is an initiator of readiness for change (Cunningham et al.2002)<sup>5</sup> which it is belief that change benefits more to an individual who are more willing to participate in that change. With the current scenario of Indian workforce, organizational readiness to change may be more aptly understood as a formative scale, the constituent pieces (items or subscales) are the determinants and the latent variable organizational readiness to change is the intermediate outcome<sup>6</sup>, bringing an assessment among various levels of employees among themselves, company-wise as well as area i.e., cities of India. Gleick (1987) stated that it is a chaotic situation for organizational change from history onwards<sup>7</sup>and even more dramatic for both the employees and the organization (Abrahamson, 2000)<sup>8</sup>. For innovative change of the same organization (or working unit), both the participant as well as no-

participant group, meaning group climate can be used to evaluate readiness<sup>9</sup>. In the process of managing change employee involvement and self-determinant<sup>10</sup> is also believed to increase the outcome change. Lastly, in the context both the psychological capital and psychological empowerment have positive and significant influence on individual readiness for change.<sup>11</sup>In fact, many organizations today including mainly Japanese firms situated in India have to change and adjust themselves with the changing external environment. Readiness for change, today have become a major issue affecting all the individuals in various organization and industrial sectors. The only factor that plays an immense important role in organizational change is the individual itself within the organization.

## 2. Connection of change readiness with adaptive performance

In today's time, there is no organization exists in a stable environment<sup>12</sup>, instead focussing on traditional way on resistance to change it is more important too understanding the conditions encouraging to individual readiness<sup>13</sup>. AA Armenakis, SG Harris (2002) crafted a change message to develop and expand the employee base readiness stability<sup>14</sup>, and expanding the understanding of the change message<sup>15</sup>J Bernerth (2004) continue to investigate what makes change efforts successful among employees. With the ever-changing work environment, the success of change occurs only when the employees take personal responsibility through effective adaptation to changing conditions and proactive anticipation of new challenges<sup>16</sup>. The aspects of individual readiness to change<sup>17</sup>, adaptive performance is useful for the accomplishment of task performance<sup>18</sup> among employees. An illustration by Randell and Coakley (2007) states that the greater potential for successful change initiatives presented by the adaptive leadership model<sup>19</sup>.

In the journal of change management, Caldwell S.D (2013) states that change readiness and adaptive performance go simultaneously, in which, considering the changing external environment and with the individual employee performance adaptive of the participation demands<sup>20</sup>. Being able to change or adapt<sup>21</sup>, management performance, increasingly recognised as necessitating flexibility and readiness to adapt to change<sup>22</sup>. In 1993 Journals of Human relations,readiness to change is created and exercises to teach adaptive style individuals properly<sup>23</sup>, adaptation and realignment, trends in human-resource management and the implications of managing change are also discussed<sup>24</sup>to improve organizational effectiveness and employee wellbeing.

### 1. Objectives of the paper is

- (a) To estimate levels of “readiness to change” among the executives groups working in the Japanese MNCs in select cities of India.
- (b) To examine concordances of readiness to change among the different groups employees .

### 3. Methodology of Study

- i. **Design of Study and Analysis-** This study adopts the partly empirical and partly descriptive research design. Data was collected with the help of questionnaire in the context of Japanese firms located in India.
- ii. **Development of Hypothesis- two hypotheses were formulated for pursuing the objective in this study-**
  - (a)  $H_{01}$ = *The level of readiness to change among the different categories of employees are not different;*
  - (b)  $H_{02}$ = *There are no agreement of opinion on the component of readiness to change among the different categories of employees in the context of Japanese firms.*
- iii. **Tools for measurement:** The assessment scales were framed which demands reliability test. The testing of reliability is to check were done whether the assessment in the context of the employees working in the Japanese firms illuminates reliable or not, with the constructs and 30 scale items adapted for assessing the “readiness to change”.

iv. **Test of Reliability and Validity of Change Readiness Scales-Items:** The test of reliability on change readiness among 112 numbers of employees was measure and recorded with the help of 30 numbers of self-reporting statements. From the result, the test indicated the Cronbach’s Alpha value of Bengaluru city (N=53) is 0.867 with significance (P= 0.000), mean value (150.57). Along with this Bhubaneswar (N= 20) resulted with Alpha value 0.962 with significance (P= 0.000), mean value= 143.75. Lastly, Hyderabad (N= 38) having significance (P= 0.000) with Alpha value 0.934 and mean value 144.61 respectively.

v. Table-II Reliability Statistics of Change Readiness of the three metro-cities in India

Branch	Valid(V)	N	Cronbach’s Alpha	Cronbach’s Alpha Based on Standardized Items	Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	Sig.
<b>Bengaluru</b>	53	30	0.867	0.870	150.57	236.443	15.377	0.000
<b>Bhubaneswar</b>	20	30	0.962	0.965	143.75	680.197	26.081	0.000
<b>Hyderabad</b>	38	30	0.934	0.922	144.61	325.975	18.055	0.000

**Universe of Study:** The study was conducted among various Japanese firms located in Indian cities. But, the constraints limits us to select the sample respondents from the firms located and operated by Japanese firms in the Bangalore, Bhubaneswar, Delhi and Hyderabad cities.

**Profile of Sample and Respondents:** We have selected some Japanese companies in which the employees working in the firms are the respondents. We distributed the questionnaire among the employees engaged in different companies recorded and analyzed of the concerned work units as stated in the table-1 and in table-2.

**Table-1**

Cities	Sample
Bangalore	53
Chennai	65
Delhi	63
Hyderabad	37

**Table-2: Japanese MNCs under consideration**

Company	Cities							
	Hyderabad		Bengaluru		Delhi		Chennai	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Nissan Motors	7	18.42	7	13.20	7	11.29	-	-
Mitsu	13	34.21	-	-	12	19.35	13	20
Taiyo India Pvt	11	28.94	-	-	11	17.74	11	16.92
Honda	7	18.42	8	15.09	7	11.29	7	10.76
Novexo tech	-	-	7	13.20	-	-	-	-
JeckSw M co ltd	-	-	12	22.64	-	-	-	-
REBI	-	-	11	20.75	-	-	-	-
Morpheushcon	-	-	8	15.09	-	-	-	-
Cannon India Pvt ltd	-	-	-	-	25	40.32	-	-
Indo Japan Apparel Pvt ltd	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	10.76
Japan Mannequin	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	29.23
Nihon Tech	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	12.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>		<b>53</b>		<b>62</b>		<b>65</b>	

*Note: f=Frequency & % = Percentage*

**viii. Constructs under Measurement Tools-** The tool for change readiness was adopted from the scale adopted by Jernney T.J.<sup>1</sup> for work. In this scale for change readiness measurement, the constructs were- (a) Resourcefulness (b) Optimism (c) Adventurousness (d) Passion Drive (e) Adaptability (f) Confidence and (g) Tolerance for Ambiguity. Each of the construct described by 5 itemed (self statement), thus, this scale had almost 35 items. The 35 itemed questionnaire was administered in among 210 total responded questionnaire were collected from the survey.

**Measurement of Levels of Readiness for Change**

The change readiness during covid-19 pandemic situation among executive of any company have had been an essential attribute for accepting the challenges of business continuity. To examine the readiness to change among the executives the collected responses were classified according to the cadre of executives and work units location in the studied cities (Table-3) in India.

Executives Cadres	Hyderabad		Bengaluru		Delhi		Chennai	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Ex-3	5	13.15	7	13.20	9	14.28	8	12.30
Ex-4	10	26.31	17	32.07	14	22.22	19	29.23
Ex-5	6	15.78	8	15.09	10	15.87	11	16.92
Ex-6	10	26.31	12	22.64	18	28.57	15	23.07
Ex-7	6	15.78	8	15.09	10	15.87	10	15.38
Ex-8	1	2.63	1	1.88	2	3.17	2	3.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>		<b>53</b>		<b>62</b>		<b>65</b>	

*Note: f=Frequency & % = Percentage*

The assessment of levels of change readiness we calculated eliminating the calculations for executives' in MNCs in different cities. So we calculated mean level of Levels of components of readiness to change in the table-4 in appendix. The mean values from the table-4 for each category of respondent executives are presented in the table-5. The mean values for resourcefulness among the different executives groups locate within 22 to 23. As the overall score 30 classified by itemised scores plotted in 6 levels; explaining scores for all groups of executive within the range high level of resourcefulness attributes.

The mean score for optimism attribute among the different categories of executives are showing observable deviations. The mean score for optimism of executive group 4, 5, 6, and 7 falls within the mean range of 20-25 which can be explained as the high level of optimism attribute among these groups of executives. The mean score for the group-3 and group-8 placed slightly higher to level of high scored groups. In other words, score for the group-3 and group-8 explains very high level of optimism attribute.

(1) Exe (S)	(2) Des Stat	(3) Res	(4) Opt	(5) Adv	(6) Passion	(7) Confi	(8) Tolerance	(9) Adapt
<b>Exe -3 (S=29)</b>	Mean	22.8276 (HL)	25.3448 (VHL)	23.4828 (HL)	23.8276 (HL)	23.7586 (HL)	21.4483 (HL)	25.3448 (VHL)
<b>Exe-4 (S=60)</b>	Mean	22.2833 (HL)	22.9000 (HL)	23.3333 (HL)	24.0167 (HL)	23.7167 (HL)	21.4833 (HL)	22.9000 (HL)
<b>Exe-5</b>	Mean	22.3429	24.5429	23.8571	25.2000	23.6571	21.9143	24.5429

<sup>1</sup> Change-Readiness Assessment in the Work of *Jenney T. J* at Purdue  
[www.tech.purdue.edu/ols/courses/ols386/crispo/changereadinesstest.doc](http://www.tech.purdue.edu/ols/courses/ols386/crispo/changereadinesstest.doc)

(S=35)		(HL)	(HL)	(HL)	(VHL)	(HL)	(HL)	(HL)
<b>Exe-6</b> (S=55)	Mean	22.6545 (HL)	23.2000 (HL)	23.9273 (HL)	24.3091 (HL)	24.0727 (HL)	21.3455 (HL)	23.2000 (HL)
<b>Exe-7</b> (S=34)	Mean	22.3529 (HL)	23.4412 (HL)	23.3824 (HL)	23.1765 (HL)	23.2353 (HL)	22.3824 (HL)	23.4412 (HL)
<b>Exe-8 (6)</b>	Mean	22.8333 (HL)	25.6667 (VHL)	22.0000 (HL)	24.5000 (HL)	24.1667 (HL)	22.8333 (HL)	25.6667 (VHL)
Abbreviations- Res= Resourcefulness; Opt= Optimism; Adv= Adventurousness; Confi= Confidence; Adpat= Adaptability; Des Stat= Descriptive Statistics, S= Sample (N); *HL = High Level; VHL= Very High Level								

The mean scores for all groups of executives exhibiting scorer range within 22 to 24. The score range explains high level of adventurousness of all groups. For the passion as an attribute among the executives group, number 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 within the range of 22 to 24.5 (in the figure-2. These groups of executives are explaining high level of passion. The executives group, number-5, revealing slightly higher score from above 25 for passion, which elucidating as this group-5 showing very high level of passion compared to the executive group- 3,4,6 ,7, and 8.

(1) Exe (S)	(2) Res	(3) Opt	(4) Adv	(5) Passion	(6) Confi	(7) Tolerance	(8) Adapt	(9) N=224
Exe -3 (S=29)	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>
Exe-4 (S=60)	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted
Exe-5 (S=35)	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>
Exe-6 (S=55)	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted
Exe-7 (S=34)	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted
Exe-8 (6)	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted
All Executive	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> Accepted	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>	H <sub>01</sub> <i>Rejected</i>
Abbreviations- Res= Resourcefulness; Opt= Optimism; Adv= Adventurousness; Confi= Confidence; Adpat= Adaptability; Des Stat= Descriptive Statistics, S= Sample (N); *HL = High Level; VHL= Very High Level								

For the attribute of confidence among all the groups of executives, the mean scores plots in the range of 22-25 denoting all groups of executives bearing high level of confidence. In the same way the all the groups of executives, the groups score located in the range of 22-25, explaining all groups showing high level of tolerance to change and ambiguity.

The executive groups 8 and 3, the mean score for amateness are slightly higher than the mean score-25 and located in the range of 25-30. The location of mean scores in the range of 25 to 30 stating that these 2 groups of executives of Japanese MNCs in India possesses a very high level (VHL) of adaptive capacity. Summarising this assessment and levelling the overall readiness to change among the different groups of executives working in Japanese MNCs in Indian work space revealing a positive picture. To explain more objectively, the different executive groups possessing a high level of change readiness attributes. Though

mean scores for all the components of change readiness are exposed by an almost similarity in levels, but, these mean score are numerically different or varying among the groups of executives.

The similarity and the revealed slightest variances of the mean scores for the components of change readiness, and the overall readiness for change among the different categories of executives logically pushes to the next of queries to explore. As the mean score revealing there are similarity of score value with slight variations therefore whether for members of executive groups are statically concordant (agreement) on each of components in readiness to change. Whether, the concordance of readiness to change will be equal or different according to the executives working work spaces of different cities incorporated for the study. Whether the concordance of opinion can be observed for executives according to organisation or in other words can organisation work as the differentiator for concordance of agreement in case readiness to change.

#### 4. Assessment of agreement on Readiness for Change

Kcc is the Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance is a normalization of Friedman test and Chi Square ( $\chi^2$ ), an identical normalized value of Friedman Test. Through Kendall's W is used to interpret the coefficient of concordance and symbolized here as Kcc, is a measure of agreement among raters either for self-rating statement or rated on others. Kcc values ranges 0 (zero) to 1 (one). Near to 0 (zero) indicates raters opinion are not having agreement statistically. Value is more nearer to 1 indicates the that there higher level of agreement in opinions.

Here, for the readiness for change opinions, the each components (use used as construct variables) change readiness for each group of executives working in Japanese firms from selected cities were computed (tested) for Kendall's Coefficient (Kcc). Contextualizing the study and sample, we computed city and company wise Kcc for executives groups in Indian workspaces of Japanese MNCs. The citywide computation of co-efficient (Table-6 in appendix) of concordance we found statistical significance along with the related chi-square values for each co-efficient for each components of readiness to change.

The derived interpretable results are explained the overall executives from each city in the study. For the resourcefulness attribute among the executive of Bangalore (N=58) with co-efficient of concordance Kcc= 0.672, denoting high level of itemized score with agreement (HKcc) which is statistically significant. For the executives groups responded from Chennai city (N=65), the coefficient of concordance (Kcc=0.572) is observably above the mid value (above 0.50), explains medium level of agreement among the different categories of executive and medium level of agreement. For the executive working in Delhi (N=63) of which concordance coefficient (Kcc= 0.872) which is statistically significant. The coefficient of concordance (Kcc=0.872) states very high level of agreement symbolized as VHKcc for resourcefulness among the respondents representing different categories of executive working in Japanese MNCs in work spaces of Delhi. For executives working in Hyderabad City (N=38) with calculated statistically significant a high coefficient of concordance (Kcc= 0.772). For the overall executives groups (N=224), the co-efficient of concordance ( i.e. Kcc=0.692) implies statistically significant high level of agreement of opinion among all executives in all selected cities of India.

For optimism dimension executives responded from Bangalore (Kcc=0.620) and Delhi (Kcc= 0.620) and hyderabad (Kcc= 0.630) calculated high level coefficient concordant. For executives from Chennai (Kcc=0.520) calculated coefficient of concordance is medium level. For overall executives group for the study (N=224) the calculated coefficient of concordance (Kcc= 0.560) indicating medium level of agreement of opinion in regards to optimism dimension of change readiness.

The adventurousness dimension for change readiness among the executives of Bangalore (Kcc=0.581), Delhi (Kcc= 0.561) and Hyderabad (Kcc=0.581) computed coefficient of concordance is medium level (MKcc) and for the executives of Chennai computed coefficient of concordance (Kcc= 0.881) i.e. agreement of opinion is very high level (VHKcc). The computed coefficient of concordance (Kcc=0.681) for overall executive for 4 cities (N=224) denoted as high level (HKcc) of agreement.

For the passion and drive dimension of change readiness among executives co-efficient of concordance s were computed as Kcc= 0.780 for Bangalore, Kcc=0.710 for Chennai, Kcc=0.780; and for the overall groups of executives (N=224) coefficient of coefficient of concordance Kcc=0.720 explaining high level of agreement (HKcc). For the executives of Delhi, the computed Kcc= 0.560 revealing medium level of agreement.

For dimension of adaptability the computed Kcc= 0.601 for Bangalore, Kcc=0.711 for Chennai, Kcc= 0.781 denoting very high level (HKcc) of coefficient of concordance. The computed co-efficient for concordance for Hyderabad city (Kcc=0.101) indicating very low level of concordance in other word, a very high level of disagreement among the executives responded from workspace in Hyderabad city. For overall groups of respondents from the four cities (N=224) in the computed coefficient of concordance (Kcc= 0.601) showing moderate level of agreement (MKcc).

Computing co-efficient for the confidence dimension of change readiness among the executives, the Kcc= 0.801 in the MNCs located in Bangalore City, Kcc=0.711 for Chennai, Kcc=0.701 For Delhi City are statistically significant and interpreting as employees are opining as they possess high level of agreement. In contrast, computed coefficient of concordance (Kcc=0.601) for executives responded from the Hyderabad city interpreted with moderate level agreement. For the overall groups of executives responded for the study (N=224) the coefficient value (Kcc= 0.670) is interpreted as the high level of co-efficient of concordance among the executives groups in India.

Finally, the computed coefficient for *Tolerance and Ambiguity* Kcc= 0.480 for Bangalore revealing very low level of efficient of concordance i.e. low level of agreement among the groups of executives responded from the Bangalore. For the respondents (executives) from the Hyderabad, Kcc=0.580 can be interpreted with moderate level of coefficient of concordance, i.e. moderate agreement for tolerance for ambiguity dimension of change readiness.

The computed co-efficient of concordance for overall *Readiness for Change* for the executives groups responded from Bangalore (Kcc= 0.500) is absolute moderate agreement; for the groups of executive responded from Chennai (Kcc=0.610) is interpreted as high level of agreements; for the executive responded from Delhi (Kcc=0.588) indicating moderate level of agreement; and Kcc=0.499 for Hyderabad city found moderate level of coefficient of concordance. Co-efficient concordance Kcc=0.610 readiness for change among the overall respondents (N=224) revealing high level of co-efficient in other word high level of agreement among the different cadres of executives working in the Japanese MNCs in India workspaces.

<b>Table-7 (b)</b>					
<b>Coefficient of Concordance</b>					
Dimension of Readiness to Change	<i>Bangalore</i> (N= 58)	<i>Chennai</i> (N=65)	<i>Delhi</i> (N=63)	<i>Hyderabad</i> (N= 38)	<i>Overall</i> (N= 224)
	<i>Kcc</i>	<i>Kcc</i>	<i>Kcc</i>	<i>Kcc</i>	<i>Kcc</i>

Resourcefulness	0.672 (HKcc)	0.572 (MKcc)	0.872 (VHKcc)	0.772 (HKcc)	0.692 (HKcc)
Optimism	0.620 (HKcc)	0.520 (MKcc)	0.620 (HKcc)	0.630 (HKcc)	0.560 (MKcc)
Adventurousness	0.581 (MKcc)	0.881 (VHKcc)	0.561 (MKcc)	0.581 (MKcc)	0.681 (HKcc)
Passion & Drive	0.780 (HKcc)	0.710 (HKcc)	0.680 (MKcc)	0.780 (HKcc)	0.720 (HKcc)
Adpatability	0.601 (HKcc)	0.641 (HKcc)	0.781 (HKcc)	0.101 (VLKcc)	0.601 (MKcc)
Confidence	0.801 (VHKcc)	0.711 (HKcc)	0.701 (HKcc)	0.601 (MKcc)	0.671 (MKcc)
Tolerance for Ambiguity	0.480 (LKcc)	0.658 (HKcc)	0.650 (HKcc)	0.580 (MKcc)	0.600 (HKcc)
Readiness for Change	0.500 (Mkcc)	0.610 (HKcc)	0.588 (Mkcc)	0.499 (MKcc)	0.610 (HKcc)

**5. Test on Concordance for Readiness to Change**

The computed coefficient of concordance for each component for readiness to change, respective groups of executive respondent from the selected cities computed chi-square and significance values together confirms the rejection of hypothesis ( $H_{02}$ ) There are no agreements of opinion on the components of readiness for change among the different categories of executives in the context of Indian workspaces of Japanese firms (Table-8). Thus, confirms the acceptance of alternative hypothesis, there are agreements of opinion on the components of readiness for change among the different categories of executives working in Indian workspaces of Japanese MNCs. Furthering confirms that there are different levels of agreement of opinion on overall readiness to change, irrespective of location and workspaces of operation in Indian cities.

**Table-8**

**$H_{02}$ : There are no agreements of opinion on the components of readiness for change among the different categories of executives in the context of Indian workspaces of Japanese firms.**

Dimensions of Readiness to Change	<i>Bangalore</i>	<i>Chennai</i>	<i>Delhi</i>	<i>Hyderabad</i>	<i>Overall</i>
	<i>(N= 58)</i>	<i>(N=65)</i>	<i>(N=63)</i>	<i>(N= 38)</i>	<i>(N= 224)</i>
	<i>For Kcc</i>	<i>For Kcc</i>	<i>For Kcc</i>	<i>For Kcc</i>	<i>For Kcc</i>
Resourcefulness	H <sub>02</sub> rejected for 4 cities. (Significant at 95% Level)				H <sub>02</sub> is rejected
Optimism	H <sub>02</sub> Rejected for 4 cities (Significant at 95% Level)				H <sub>02</sub> is rejected
Adventurousness	H <sub>02</sub> Rejected for 4 cities(Significant at 95% Level)				H <sub>02</sub> is rejected
Passion & Drive	H <sub>02</sub> Rejected for 4 cities(Significant at 95% Level)				H <sub>02</sub> is rejected
Adpatability	H <sub>02</sub> Rejected for 4 cities(Significant at 95% Level)				H <sub>02</sub> is rejected
Confidence	H <sub>02</sub> Rejected for 4 cities(Significant at 95% Level)				H <sub>02</sub> is rejected
Tolerance for Ambiguity	H <sub>02</sub> Rejected for 4 cities(Significant at 95% Level)				H <sub>02</sub> is rejected
<b>Readiness for Change</b>	<b>H<sub>02</sub> Rejected for 4 cities(Significant at 95% Level)</b>				<b>H<sub>02</sub> is rejected</b>

**6. Company wise Agreement of Opinion Analysis**

We examined the readiness of change among the different categories of executives of the selected work spaces of Japanese MNCs operating in Indian cities. According to the numbers

**Table-9 (a)**

**MNC wise Concordance (Agreement) of Change Readiness**

Dimensions	<i>KCC</i>	<i>Nissam</i>	<i>Mitsu</i>	<i>Taiyo</i>	<i>Honda</i>	<i>Cannon</i>	<i>Japan</i>
------------	------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	---------------	--------------



	(Level)	Motors (N=99)	(N=38)	India Pvt. (N=33)	N=29	India Pvt ltd (N=25)	Mannequin (N=19)
<i>Resourcefulness</i>	Kcc	0.872 (VHcc)	0.772 (Hcc)	0.760 (Hcc)	0.772 (Hcc)	0.872 (VHcc)	0.772 (Hcc)
<i>Optimism</i>	Kcc	0.720 (Hcc)	0.870 (VHcc)	0.625 (Mcc)	0.620 (Mcc)	0.610 (Mcc)	0.620 (Mcc)
<i>Adventurousness</i>	Kcc	0.601 (Mcc)	0.681 (Hcc)	0.688 (Hcc)	0.681 (Hcc)	0.681 (Hcc)	0.681 (Hcc)
<i>Passion &amp; Drive</i>	Kcc	0.790 (Hcc)	0.530 (Mcc)	0.780 (Hcc)	0.780 (Hcc)	0.750 (Hcc)	0.680 (Hcc)
<i>Adaptability</i>	Kcc	0.841 (VHcc)	0.741 (Hcc)	0.481 (Mcc)	0.681 (Hcc)	0.681 (Hcc)	0.581 (Mcc)
<i>Confidence</i>	Kcc	0.701 (Hcc)	0.811 (VHcc)	0.621 (Hcc)	0.401 (Lcc)	0.501 (lcc)	0.401 (Lcc)
<i>Tolerance for Ambiguity</i>	Kcc	0.601 (Hcc)	0.758 (Hcc)	0.450 (Mcc)	0.310 (Lcc)	0.450 (Mcc)	0.650 (Hcc)
<i>Readiness to change</i>	Kcc	0.710 (Hcc)	0.73 (Hcc)	0.660 (Hcc)	0.56 (Mcc)	0.657 (Hcc)	0.660 (Hcc)

of response representing executives of Japanese MNCs in India, among the all respondents executives groups of the selected companies revealing high and very high level of concordance for the attributes of resourcefulness, passion & drive irrespective of the MNCs. For the optimism dimension executives respondents of Taiyu India, Honda, Cannon India, Japan Mannequin computed moderate concordance.

For the adaptability dimension of change readiness agreement among Taiyu India and Japan Mannequin computed moderate level agreement. For the confidence dimension of change readiness the computed concordance for Honda, Canon India, and Japan Mannequin. For the overall readiness for change executive of Honda in the four cities computed moderate level of agreement. All these does not mean the there are no agreement, instead there different level of agreement or the positive concordance in the work spaces of selected Japanese MNCs in Indian work spaces. Computing coefficients of concordance for overall readiness for change scale, indicated high and moderate level agreement in the context of executives irrespective of MNCs in India.

From the table-9 and the appendix table-8, the computed coefficient of concordances with chi-square values and significance for readiness to change among the different groups of executives on the selected companies for study disproves (rejects) the hypothesis "there are no agreements of opinion on the components of readiness for change among the different categories of executives in the context of Indian workspaces of Japanese firms". Finally, an alternative hypothesis "there are agreements of opinion on the components of readiness for change among the different categories of executives in the context of Indian workspaces of Japanese firms" is accepted with based on the level of association (chi-square value) and it's significant level at 95% level.

## 8. Findings, Implications, and Conclusion

The study is revealing many interesting findings. As this study was conducted in the workspace of Japanese MNCs operating in the Indian Cities, the work behaviours are no doubt governed by management policies of Japanese MNCs and the work culture, behaviour, work psychology of India worker. As Indian Japanese firms engages the Indian employees, hence the how Indian employees at executive works at Japanese enterprises operating in Indian cities as well as offices. We confirm, this study uniquely contributes

will motivate future researches to study employees behaviour in overseas branches of MNCs in India.

The readiness to change is an utmost important attribute. Many a time, this was assessed only at the time of personality development assessment program and leadership issues among executives of any corporation at the peak of competition and globalisation. But assessment and research on readiness to change in the context of Japanese MNCs in Indian business environment is a rarest of rare study. This study further posits the hypotheses that Indian executives working Indian workspaces of Japanese MNCs exhibit high level of readiness to change and through the co-efficient of concordance confirms agreements among the different group of executives, executives working in different cities of India, and working in different company or organisations operating by central administration under Japanese MNCs.

Furthermore, this study confirms many hypotheses to test for future research. The two hypotheses of this exploration tested and rejected in the context of Japanese MNCs in India workspace. Employees resourcefulness, optimism, passion and drive, adaptability, tolerance for ambiguity showing the variability of levels in the context of Japanese MNCs and in the Indian workers in Japanese firms is interesting one. At the present juncture, these attributes are most essential to adjust to the situation of crisis and continuity. How do the employees of Indian firms uses all these attributes; these can be assessed is understanding adaptability of executives or employees and for ensuring adaptive performance in Indian private and public firms.

### Citations and References

- 
- <sup>1</sup>Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M. & Wallace, F. (2005). Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231), <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/>
- <sup>2</sup>Combe, M. (2014). Change Readiness: Focusing Change Management Where It Counts. *PMI White Paper*.
- <sup>3</sup>Shivers-Blackwell, S. L., & Charles, A. C. (2006). Ready, set, go: examining student readiness to use ERP technology. *Journal of management Development*.
- <sup>4</sup>Weiner, B. J.(2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science* : IS,4, 67. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-67>
- <sup>5</sup>Shivers-Blackwell, S. L., & Charles, A. C. (2006). Ready, set, go: examining student readiness to use ERP technology. *Journal of management Development*.
- <sup>6</sup>Helfrich, C. D., Li, Y. F., Sharp, N. D., & Sales, A. E. (2009). Organizational readiness to change assessment (ORCA): development of an instrument based on the Promoting Action on Research in Health Services (PARIHS) framework. *Implementation Science*, 4(1), 38.
- <sup>7</sup>Gleick, J., & Berry, M. (1987). Chaos-Making a New Science. *Natur*, 330, 293.
- <sup>8</sup>Abrahamson, E. (2000). Change without pain. *Harvard business review*, 78(4), 75-79.

- <sup>9</sup>Schultz, J. S., Sjøvold, E., & Andre, B. (2017). Can group climate explain innovative readiness for change?. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*. 2017, 30 (3), 440-452. 10.1108/JOCM-06-2016-0112
- <sup>10</sup>Lizar, A. A., Mangundjaya, W. L., & Rachmawan, A. (2015). The role of psychological capital and psychological empowerment on individual readiness for change. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 49(5), 343-352.
- <sup>11</sup>Lizar, A. A., Mangundjaya, W. L., & Rachmawan, A. (2015). The role of psychological capital and psychological empowerment on individual readiness for change. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 49(5), 343-352.
- <sup>12</sup>Choi, M., & Ruona, W. E. (2013). Individual readiness for organizational change. *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Leadership, Change, and Organizational Development*, 331-345.
- <sup>13</sup>Choi, M., & Ruona, W. E. (2011). Individual readiness for organizational change and its implications for human resource and organization development. *Human resource development review*, 10(1), 46-73.
- <sup>14</sup>Armenakis, A. A., & Harris, S. G. (2002). Crafting a change message to create transformational readiness. *Journal of organizational change management*. Vol. 15 Iss 2 pp. 169 - 183
- <sup>15</sup>Bernerth, J. (2004). Expanding our understanding of the change message. *Human resource development review*, 3(1), 36-52.
- <sup>16</sup>Ghitulescu, B. E. (2013). Making change happen: The impact of work context on adaptive and proactive behaviors. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 49(2), 206-245.
- <sup>17</sup>Vakola, M. (2014). What's in there for me? Individual readiness to change and the perceived impact of organizational change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. In the url [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262575144\\_What's\\_in\\_there\\_for\\_me\\_Individual\\_readiness\\_to\\_change\\_and\\_the\\_perceived\\_impact\\_of\\_organizational\\_change](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262575144_What's_in_there_for_me_Individual_readiness_to_change_and_the_perceived_impact_of_organizational_change)
- <sup>18</sup>Indrianti, Y., & Oentoroa, J. B. (2018). Does Readiness to Change Affect Engineers Performance? A Study on Indonesian Construction Companies. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 120(6), 7727-7736.
- <sup>19</sup>Randall, L. M., & Coakley, L. A. (2007). Applying adaptive leadership to successful change initiatives in academia. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. In the url [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321364648\\_Adaptive\\_Leadership\\_in\\_Academic\\_Libraries](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321364648_Adaptive_Leadership_in_Academic_Libraries)
- <sup>20</sup>Caldwell, S. D. (2013). Are change readiness strategies overrated? A commentary on boundary conditions. *Journal of Change Management*, 13(1), 19-35.

<sup>21</sup>Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American journal of community psychology, 41*(1-2), 127-150.

<sup>22</sup>Griffin, B., & Hesketh, B. (2005). Are conscientious workers adaptable?. *Australian Journal of Management, 30*(2), 245-259.

<sup>23</sup>Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human relations, 46*(6), 681-703.

<sup>24</sup>Beer, M., & Walton, A. E. (1987). *Organizational change and development*. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Annual review of psychology. Annual review of psychology, Vol. 38* (p. 339–367). Annual Reviews.

**Appendices**

<b>Table-4</b>								
<b>Levels of Readiness to Change</b>								
Exe (S)	Des Stat	Res	Opt	Adv	Passion	Confi	Tolerance	Adapt
<b>Exe -3</b> <b>(S=29)</b>	Mean	22.8276	25.3448	23.4828	23.8276	23.7586	21.4483	25.3448
	Median	22.0000	26.0000	24.0000	23.0000	24.0000	21.0000	26.0000
	Std.	3.03632	2.71604	2.68089	2.60589	2.04686	2.95908	2.71604
<b>Exe-4</b> <b>(S=60)</b>	Mean	22.2833	22.9000	23.3333	24.0167	23.7167	21.4833	22.9000
	Median	23.0000	23.0000	23.0000	24.0000	24.0000	22.0000	23.0000
	Std.	3.27855	3.17672	3.33277	3.11090	2.66866	3.49572	3.17672
<b>Exe-5</b> <b>(S=35)</b>	Mean	22.3429	24.5429	23.8571	25.2000	23.6571	21.9143	24.5429
	Median	23.0000	24.0000	23.0000	25.0000	24.0000	23.0000	24.0000
	Std.	3.56406	2.81114	3.14496	3.04670	2.70014	3.21185	2.81114
<b>Exe-6</b> <b>(S=55)</b>	Mean	22.6545	23.2000	23.9273	24.3091	24.0727	21.3455	23.2000
	Median	23.0000	24.0000	24.0000	25.0000	24.0000	21.0000	24.0000
	Std.	2.95157	3.05141	3.06627	3.30473	2.89223	2.91369	3.05141
<b>Exe-7</b> <b>(S=34)</b>	Mean	22.3529	23.4412	23.3824	23.1765	23.2353	22.3824	23.4412
	Median	22.0000	24.0000	23.0000	23.0000	24.0000	21.0000	24.0000
	Std.	3.35643	3.50057	3.12385	3.46822	2.21645	3.73367	3.50057
<b>Exe-8</b> <b>(6)</b>	Mean	22.8333	25.6667	22.0000	24.5000	24.1667	22.8333	25.6667
	Median	23.0000	27.0000	23.0000	25.0000	24.0000	24.0000	27.0000
	Std.	3.71035	4.63321	2.00000	3.33167	1.83485	3.86868	4.63321
Abbreviations- Res= Resourcefulness; Opt= Optimism; Adv= Adventurousness; Confi= Confidence; Adpat= Adaptability; Des Stat= Descriptive Statistics, S= Sample (N)								

**Table- 7 (b)**  
**Coefficients of Concordance (Kendal W)**

Dimensions	Bangalore (N= 58)	Chennai (N=65)	Delhi (N=63)	Hyderabad (N= 38)	Overall (N= 224)
------------	----------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------	---------------------

	Kcc	$\chi^2$	Sig	Kcc	$\chi^2$	Sig	Kcc	$\chi^2$	Sig	Kcc	$\chi^2$	Sig	Kcc	$\chi^2$	Sig
<i>Resourcefulness</i>	0.672	45.02	0.002	0.572	44.02	0.001	0.872	75.02	0.000	0.772	75.02	0.001	0.672	85.02	0.012
<i>Optimism</i>	0.620	56.02	0.001	0.520	66.02	0.001	0.620	57.02	0.001	0.620	56.02	0.001	0.420	86.02	0.001
<i>Adventurousness</i>	0.581	45.23	0.000	0.881	65.23	0.000	0.581	65.23	0.001	0.581	65.23	0.000	0.481	65.23	0.000
<i>Passion &amp; Drive</i>	0.780	67.01	0.000	0.710	57.01	0.001	0.680	77.01	0.003	0.780	67.01	0.000	0.720	68.01	0.000
<i>Adaptability</i>	0.601	74.44	0.000	0.641	54.44	0.000	0.781	74.44	0.000	0.101	64.44	0.000	0.601	84.44	0.000
<i>Confidence</i>	0.801	87.01	0.000	0.711	81.01	0.000	0.701	81.01	0.004	0.601	77.01	0.000	0.501	86.01	0.000
<i>Tolerance for Ambiguity</i>	0.480	60.06	0.000	0.658	70.06	0.000	0.650	60.06	0.000	0.580	70.06	0.000	0.780	66.06	0.000

**Table- 9 (b)**  
**Coefficient of Concordance**

Dimensions		Nissam Motors (N=99)	Mitsu (N=38)	Taiyo India Pvt (N=33)	Honda N=29	Cannon India Pvt ltd (N=25)	Japan Mannequin (N=19)
<i>Resourcefulness</i>	Kcc	0.872	0.772	0.772	0.772	0.872	0.772
	$\chi^w$	75.02	64.02	65.02	85.02	75.02	55.02
	Sig	0.002	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.001	0.005
<i>Optimism</i>	Kcc	0.720	0.870	0.625	0.620	0.610	0.620
	$\chi^w$	66.02	66.02	77.02	77.02	67.02	47.02
	Sig	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001
<i>Adventurousness</i>	Kcc	0.601	0.681	0.688	0.681	0.681	0.681
	$\chi^w$	75.23	75.23	85.23	75.23	75.23	75.23
	Sig	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.003
<i>Passion &amp; Drive</i>	Kcc	0.790	0.530	0.780	0.780	0.750	0.680
	$\chi^w$	87.01	91.01	87.01	81.01	77.01	67.01
	Sig	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
<i>Adaptability</i>	Kcc	0.841	0.741	0.481	0.681	0.681	0.581
	$\chi^w$	64.44	64.44	84.44	74.44	80.44	80.44
	Sig	0.004	0.002	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.000
<i>Confidence</i>	Kcc	0.701	0.811	0.621	0.401	0.501	0.401
	$\chi^w$	77.01	75.01	44.01	80.01	70.01	74.01
	Sig	0.010	0.000	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004
<i>Tolerance for Ambiguity</i>	Kcc	0.601	0.758	0.450	0.310	0.450	0.650
	$\chi^w$	60.06	71.06	44.06	80.06	74.06	81.06
	Sig	0.003	0.004	0.000	0.002	0.010	0.002