Article can be accessed online at http://www.publishingindia.com

SUPPLY CHAIN MEMBERS HEADSHIP STYLES: AN OVERVIEW OF SMALL SCALE INDUSTRIES MANAGERS PORTRAYING CUSTOMERS CONCENTRATION

Vipul Chalotra*, Taruna Dubey**

Abstract: *The present research encompasses the headship styles of supply chain members of small scale manufacturing firms operating in Udhampur district of Jammu & Kashmir (J&K) state. The data for the study were collected from 44 small scale units operating under DIC (District Industries Centre) Udhampur in Jammu & Kashmir state. The main headship styles contoured for the study were "Straightforward", "Risk taking", "Planner", and "Knowledge oriented". Overall, the variable "Straightforward" was ranked first amongst all the four variables. "Risk taking" attained rank second. Third rank was achieved by "Knowledge oriented" showing that the supply chain members are knowledge oriented and rank four fetched by "Planner".*

Keywords: *Headship Styles, Small Scale Industries (SSIs), Supply Chain*

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Supply chain in the contemporary world had been recognised as of paramount importance as its proper functioning ensures the business success or failure. It is as association of parties directed for the flow of goods and services to the markets as gathering response from the market in order to reconcile with the market variations. The flow of goods and services actually initiates from the suppliers who supplies the raw materials to the manufacturer that is required to be converted into finished goods by the manufacturer and then further supplied to the wholesalers and retailers in order to ensure its delivery to the ultimate customers. So, one can see that supply chain comprises number of persons/parties/members/patrons/helping hands (manufacturers-wholesalers-retailers-customers) to ensure the flow or supply of goods to the target customers.

Cigolini, Cozzi, and Perona (2004) describe supply chain management as activities oriented approach related to sourcing, producing, delivering goods and services to the ultimate consumers. It ensures coordination and collaboration of various actors belonging to the same supply chain (Harland, 1996). It is believed that coordination and collaboration leads to the development of cooperation in supply chain which ultimately overlays way to competitive advantage (Christopher & Juttner, 2000).

McMillan (1996) inferred that the companies/business firms should recognise to enhance their ability in planning the supply chains besides the intact material flow from the upper level members (suppliers) to the lower level members (customers). The supply chain process should be considered as an integrated process rather than as a series of detached functions. Berry and Towill (1992) conducted research in UK industries and concluded that there is considerable diminution in demand qualms that could be best possible approved by reengineering the companies supply chain to enhance demand by catering to the needs of the society.

The numerous empirical substantiation in American companies have reported that supply chain management applications imparted have abundantly enriched customer service, abridged costs, supply chain members headship styles, better return on assets, and amplified revenues (Kim, 1999). The supply chain network and its management depend upon the headship image of the members to enhance supply chain cooperation and collaboration besides its adopters developing specific capabilities (Chandra & Kumar, 2000). These headship styles encompasses scheming supple organisation, looking for totality in supply chain alliance, budding a credulous relationship with suppliers, outsource

* Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, University of Jammu, Udhampur Campus, Jammu & Kashmir, India.
Email: vipulchalotra@gmail.com

** Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Jammu, Udhampur Campus, Jammu & Kashmir, India.
Email: tarunadubey@gmail.com

non-core competencies, enhancing communiqué in order to decrease ambiguity, ensuring apt inventory levels all the times, executing build-to-order manufacturing, and lessening inventory and trim down costs. Whipple, Frankel, and Daugherty (2002) concluded that supply chain members headship styles ensures competitive advantage as it makes easy availability of market information and strengthen the supply chain network by adding sharing of information between partners and disseminating them properly.

The study incorporate the varied headship styles that supply chain members should possess in order to enhance the supply chain productivity and efficiency. The following headship styles are identified for present research:

Straightforward headship style means directly expressing what one has in their heart without giving importance to consequences. Straightforward person/leader directly approaches with the things and solution to the problems. There is no midway solution. Supply chain members should be straightforward in the way that they should directly approach the customer for the quest into the change in their needs, wants, tastes, habits, likings, dislikings. The straightforward character of supply chain members towards the higher hierarchy provides the path to manufacture the required quantity and the justified products only.

Risk taking encompasses risk which means 50% chance of success and equal 50% chance of failure. Supply chain members are connoted as risk takers as they take the risk of introducing new product into the market and takes pain and headache to market the product of the supply chain profitable and socially. Risk-taking behaviours have been the subject of much speculation as risky behaviour encompasses activities only a handful of courageous.

Knowledge-oriented headship style connotes that a leader/ supply chain member should be knowledge oriented i.e. should have reservoir of infinite knowledge and should be curious to learn and to acquire more and more fresh knowledge. All the contemporary business or marketing concepts originate from market only and these persons are the founders of these concepts. So they should possess the requisite knowledge.

The last but not the least headship style contoured in the present research is planner. This is the most magnificent and dynamic quality as it depends upon the situation how to plan, how to proceed and how to achieve laurels in this edge worth competitive world. A good planner is a good manager and a good controller also. So the supply chain members should pay obeisance to this headship style.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The research methodology adopted for the study is as follows:

Sampling and Data Collection

The present study was conducted on small scale manufacturing units operating in Udhampur district in Jammu & Kashmir region having dearth of research regarding the subject matter. The first-hand information was collected from 44 small scale manufacturing units registered under District Industries Centre (DIC), Udhampur of J&K state, out of total 49 registered units under DIC. There were five non-functional units. The 44 small manufacturing units were further categorised into similar ten lines of operations which is mentioned as: cement (8), pesticide (3), steel (3), battery/lead/alloy (5), menthol (2), guns (2), conduit pipes (2), gates/grills/varnish (5), maize/atta/dal mills (3), and miscellaneous (11). The miscellaneous (not falling in any category) category embraced 11 small scale units namely M/s Supertech Industry**,** M/s Luxmi Electronics Works**,** ShajNath Vanaspati Ltd.**,** M/s Aditiya Cables, Poles and Transformers**,** Shankar Lime Industry**,** M/s Unique Carbon Industries**,** M/s B.S Traders**,** M/s Vijay Candles**,** Everest Health Care Products**,** M/s J.K Petro Chemicals, and M/s Ajay Ice Factory**.** The data from these 44 small scale units were collected with the assistance of census method.

Research Instrument

Research instrument means the survey questionnaire used to collect data from the respective respondents. The research instrument was self-developed after rigourous review of literature and consulting eminent academicians, industrialists, surveyors, and research scholars. The research instrument comprised general information and some statements of headship styles. The data collection form questionnaire comprised ranking questions, dichotomous questions, and five-point Likert scale, where 1 stands for strongly disagree and 5 for strongly agree. In this study, ranking tables are used in order to make the study elaborative and for drawing meaningful inferences.

Data Collection

Data collection acts as the backbone of the research. The primary data for this empirical study were collected from the managers of the small scale manufacturing units who stood as respective respondents (managers). These respondents were approached duly to gather respective responses. Their time feasibility was given due care at the time of collecting the responses. All ethical considerations were followed while collecting response from respective respondents. The data were collected through surveying all the manufacturing units operating by adopting census survey method i.e. all the small manufacturing units were contacted for gathering responses. The secondary source of data was also taken

into consideration and pure information was collected by different sources: Internet, books, and empirical papers from referred journals. In the present study only ranking tables were used for eliciting consequential inferences. Just to know which headship style score which rank was the main concentration behind the research paper.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS INTERPRETATION

Table 1 lays out the mean ranking of variables that reflects the headship styles possessed by supply chain members of the small scale manufacturing units operating in Udhampur district of J&K state. In Udhampur district, DIC (District Industries Centre) is segregated into two main categories namely SIDCO & SICOP. There are 44 small manufacturing firms operating which had been mainly classified into ten lines of operations i.e. the small scale manufacturing units having analogous types of businesses are categorised into homogeneous headings namely cement (8), pesticide (3), steel (3), battery/lead/alloy (5), menthol (2), guns (2), conduit pipes (2), gates/grills/varnish (5), maize/atta/dal mills (3), and miscellaneous (11). The variables that depicts headship styles of supply chain members of these ten groups of functional SSIs are "Straightforward", "Risk taking", "Planner", and "Knowledge oriented". Overall, the variable "Straightforward" was ranked first by almost all managers of small manufacturing firms. "Risk taking" was ranked second. "Knowledge oriented" was ranked third showing that the supply chain members are knowledge oriented and "Planner" was ranked fourth. Overall mean response to the factors in descending order are 2.07 (Straightforward), 2.87 (Risk taking), 3.50 (Knowledge oriented), and 3.73 (Planner) respectively. Since the supply chain members are members of small scale units operating in Udhampur district, headship styles are even visible in this small area.

The ranking categorisation is done as follows:

Cements

M/s Associated Cements, Zenith Cement Industry, Shivalik Cements, M/s Continental Cement Industry, Wullar Cements, M/s Shri Nath Industry, and Uma Cement Industry were found to the prominent eight small scale firms registered under DIC (District Industries Centre). As far as mean ranking related to the variables depicting supply chain members headship styles of these firms are concerned: these small scale firms accorded rank one to "Straightforward" revealing straightforwardness of supply chain members i.e. wholesalers, retailers. "Risk taking" occupied rank two by most of the small scale units operating under DIC. "Planner" acquired rank three. "Knowledge oriented" was ranked fourth. This ranking made it clear that the variable "Straightforward" is the main variable this category had enlisted of their wholesalers and retailers.

Battery/Lead/Alloy

In the next main group (battery/lead/alloy) of small scale units was encompassed with five firms namely: Radha Industries, Pilot Batteries, Durga Batteries, Suraksha Batteries, and Avtar Batteries. The mean ranking accredited by these firms was: "Straightforward" was ranked first by all the small scale firms operating under this group. "Planner" gained rank two amongst all the variables and "Risk taking" was ranked third. Consequently, "Knowledge oriented" was ranked fourth as represented in Table 1.

Pesticides/Insecticides

M/s Dhanuva Agritech Ltd., Safex Chemicals Ltd., and M/s Modern Insecticides were the main three competitive units operating here under this category. The mean ranking portrayed by small scale industries managers regarding their supply chain members is that this category assigned rank one to "Risk taking" as it was found that their supply chain partners are risk takers in nature. Rank two was obtained by "Straightforward" as it is the straightforward nature of supply chain partners that counts much to this category. Rank three was accrued by "Planner" as supply chain members are good planners also. The last headship style is "Knowledge oriented" which portrays that supply chain members are knowledge oriented also. So the ranking categorisation of this group clarifies that the supply chain partners are more risk takers as compared to other variables.

Conduit Pipes

The two competitive small scale units operating under this category were M/s Pee Kay Products and Rukhmani. As far as mean ranking related to the variables depicting supply chain members headship styles of these firms is concerned, the variable "Straightforward" ranked first amongst all the four variables under this group. "Risk taking" entrusted with rank two by conduit pipes and "Knowledge oriented" was ranked third. "Planner" was accorded rank four. The rankings made it very clear that conduit pipes industry supply chain members headship styles is highlighted with straightforwardness.

Menthol

Two small scale units operating under this category were: M/s Harikripa Perfumes Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Mahadurga Industries. "Straightforward" headship style was ranked first by both the units operating under this group as it was

found to be the main headship styles of the supply chain partners. "Knowledge oriented" was ranked second by these small firms and "Risk taking" was ranked three. "Planner" headship style was ranked fourth.

Guns

M/s Gulab Gun Factory and M/s Hunter Gun Factory, the two edge-worth competitors assigned rank one to "Straightforward" and "Risk taking" was given rank two by both the units. "Knowledge oriented" was ranked third by both the units. "Planner" headship style was accorded rank four. The ranking is displayed in Table 1.

Steel

Three small units namely M/s MahaLuxmi Steel Fabricators, M/s Faqir Chand Sanak Raj, and M/s Gupta Furniture were found competing under this category. As far as mean ranking related to the variables depicting supply chain members headship styles of these firms is concerned: rank one was assigned to "Straightforward" as it was found to be their main variable that acts as main headship style of supply chain members, "Risk taking" ranked two, "Knowledge oriented" ranked three and "Planner" ranked four.

Gates/Grills/Varnish/Paint

This group was found to be the advanced group and is the main group of the research. M/s Balaji Industries, M/s Wazir Engineering Works, ISRO Products, Shakti Engineering Works, and M/s Everest Paints were operating under this category. As far as mean ranking related to the variables depicting supply chain members' headship styles of these firms are concerned, "Risk taking" was ranked first by this group of small firms. "Planner" was given rank two by these units, "Straightforward" was ranked third, and "Knowledge oriented" was ranked fourth.

Atta/Maize/Dal Mills

Three small units namely Shalimar Floor Mills, M/s Udhampur Dal Mills, and M/s Sharda Enterprises were the main units of this outstanding group. So far as mean ranking related to the variables depicting supply chain members headship styles of these firms are concerned, "Straightforward" was ranked first by all the units operating under this group. "Knowledge oriented" was ranked second by this industry. "Risk taking" was ranked third. "Planner" was ranked fourth. It implies that atta/maize/dal mills supply chain partners were mainly hovered with are mainly hovered with "Straightforward" headship styles as depicted in Table 1.

Others (Miscellaneous)

Eleven main competitive units were found operating in the category of Miscellaneous. The names of the units under this group were M/s Supertech Industry, M/s Luxmi Electronics Works, ShajNath Vanaspati Ltd., M/s Aditiya Cables, M/s Unique Carbon Industries, M/s B.S Traders, Poles and Transformers, M/s Vijay Candles, Everest Health Care Products, Shankar Lime Industry, M/s J.K Petro Chemicals, and M/s Ajay Ice Factory. So far as mean ranking related to the variables depicting supply chain members' headship styles of these firms are concerned, "Risk taking" was ranked firstby most of the units and "Straightforward" was given rank two by almost all the units operating, "Knowledge oriented" was ranked third, and "Planner" was ranked fourth representing the actual figure of variables that enlists supply chain members headship styles.

Overall, all the firms operating under SIDCO & SICOP represents straightforwardness as the main headship style of their supply chain members, followed by Risk taking, subsequently after that knowledge oriented and at the end by planner (Table 1).

CONCLUSION

The research presents the mean ranking of various variables that depicts the headship styles of the supply chain members. The study provides fresh knowledge and insights into the existing literature by adding up the ranks in terms of headship styles to the existing literature. The variables that portray the headship styles are "Straightforward", "Risk taking", "Planner" and "Knowledge oriented". The present research conducted on 44 small scale manufacturing firms divulged the mean ranks accorded to these four variables by the mangers of these small scale firms. The ranking were related to the headship styles possessed by their supply chain members. Overall, the variable "Straightforward" was ranked first by almost all managers of small manufacturing firms. "Risk taking" attained rank two. Third rank is acquired by "Knowledge oriented" showing that the supply chain members are knowledge oriented and rank four fetched by "Planner". Overall mean response to the factors in descending order are 2.07 (Straightforward), 2.87 (Risk taking), 3.50 (Knowledge oriented), and 3.73 (Planner) respectively.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study is conducted in one area i.e. area specific, so the results of this study cannot have universal application as there could be diversity in other areas according to the environment and other factors associated.

The results depend upon the response of the respective respondents. Although all the efforts were applied to

make the study free from any sort of bias, but the rule of subjectivity cannot be avoided.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Similar type of research could be conducted in large scale firms. Future research can also be conducted by taking into preview more than four headship styles variables. Moreover, supply chain members themselves can be contacted in future researches in order to collect response from all supply chain members.

Table 1: Mean Ranking of Variables Depicting Supply Chain Members Headship Styles

Manufacturing Units/Factors	Straightforward	Risk taking	Planner	Knowledge oriented
Cement	1.27(I)	2.3(II)	2.75(IV)	2.49(III)
Battery/Lead/Alloy	1.5(I)	2.5(III)	2.4(II)	2.7(IV)
Pesticides/Insecticides	2(II)	1.4(I)	2.2(III)	4(IV)
Conduit pipes	1(I)	2.3(II)	3.7(IV)	3(III)
Menthol	1(I)	3(III)	4(IV)	2(II)
Guns	1.5(I)	2.5(II)	3.5(IV)	2.5(III)
Steel	1.2(I)	2.8(II)	2.7(IV)	3.5(III)
Gates/Grills/Varnish/Paint	2.7(III)	1.5(I)	2.5(II)	3.2(IV)
Atta/Maize/Dal mills	2(I)	2.6(III)	3.3(IV)	2(II)
Others (Miscellaneous)	2.45(II)	2.09 (I)	2.81(IV)	2.63(III)
Mean & Rank	**2.07 (I)**	**2.87 (II)**	**3.73** (IV)	3.50 (III)

Note: Here 1 denotes "highest rank" and 4 denotes "lowest rank"

REFERENCES

Chandra, C., & Kumar, S. (2000). Supply chain management in theory and practice: A passing fad or a fundamental change? *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 100(3), 100-113.

Christopher, M., & Juttner, U. (2000). Supply chain relationships: Making the transition to closer integration. *International Journal of Logistics*, 3(1), 6-23.

Cigolini, R., Cozzi, M., & Perona, M. (2004). A new framework for supply chain management. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 24(1), 7-41.

Harland, C. M. (1996). Supply chain management: Relationships, chains, and Networks. *British Journal of Management,* 7, 63-80.

McMillan, J. (1996). *From Glamour to Grind: The globalization of casinos in gambling cultures: Studies in history and interpretation.* London, Routledge, pp. 263-283.

Berry, D., & Towill, D. R. (1992). Material flow in electronic products based supply chains. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, 3(2), 15-34.

Kim, K. (1999). On determinants of joint action in industrial distributor-Supplier relationships: Beyond economic efficiency. *Journal of Marketing*, 16, 217-236.

Whipple, J. M., Frankel, R., & Daugherty, P. (2002). Information support for Alliances: Performance implications. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 23(2), 67-82.