THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: A CASE OF TELKOM KENYA LIMITED

BY

PRISCA KARIMA MURIGU

A MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

NOVEMBER, 2010

DECLARATION

This management research project is my original work and has not been presented for examination in any other university.

Signed.................................. Date....13|11|2010.......

PRISCA KARIMA MURIGU

D61/73044/2009

This management research project has been submitted for examination with my approval as university supervisor.

Signed.................................. Date.......13|11|2010.......

FLORENCE MUINDI
School of Business
University of Nairobi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to acknowledge the following persons whose contributions facilitated the completion of this project.

First, I thank the Almighty God for the gift of life and for giving me the skills, knowledge and energy to be able to complete this paper and the postgraduate degree of Master of Business Administration.

Second, I give special thanks to my supervisor Ms. Muindi, for providing unlimited, invaluable and active guidance throughout the study. Her immense command and knowledge of the subject matter enabled me to shape this research project to the product it is now.

Third, I thank the management of Telkom Kenya Limited for allowing me to collect data from the organisation.

Finally, I owe my gratitude to Dad, Mum, Muringo, Emma, Mobisa and a great pool of people who in one way or another contributed towards completion of this project. To all of you, I say a big THANK YOU!

DEDICATION

To the men and women of integrity and to those who believe that leadership can be

nurtured. I dedicate this work to you.

ABSTRACT

Leadership, among other issues, is one of the important factors in change management. There have been a lot of changes that have taken place at Telkom Kenya Limited. With the privatization and the subsequent change in the management structure to be in line with France-Telkom, leadership has been seen as instrumental in managing the change process in the organisation. A search of literature on change management did not reveal any study on Telkom Kenya Limited. The objective of this study was to establish the influence of leadership behavior on organizational change at Telkom Kenya Limited.

This was a cross-sectional survey. A sample of 200 respondents was selected from the population of 2100 management staff. Primary data was collected in this study. The data was collected through structured questionnaires. The data was analyzed using both descriptive analysis and Pearson correlation analysis.

The study found that the most dominant behavior was autocratic leadership behavior followed by democratic leadership behavior. The least behavior exhibited was laissez-fair. The revealed that change management process was moderately practiced in the organisation. The Pearson correlation showed that leadership behaviour had significant positive influence on organisational change. The study therefore concludes that leadership behavior significantly influences organisational change. It is recommended that managers of various organisations seeking to see the successful implementation of change management need to focus on exhibiting better leadership behaviours especially in terms of motivation and communication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background of the Study

The subject of leadership, managing and organisations is possibly one of the most widely covered topics found in social and psychological journals today. One reason for this is because the leadership role is pivotal in the success of both individual and organizational process, becoming especially crucial when organizations' processes change direction, such as during transition and business re-engineering initiatives. Competent management is one source of sustainable competitive advantage in contemporary, rapidly changing organizations (Nohria, Joyce, and Roberson, 2003). The behaviors of organizational leaders directly influence actions in the work environment that enable change (Gilley, 2005). Leaders and managers are responsible for change strategy, implementation, and monitoring, thus they function as change agents (Kanter, Stein, and Jick, 1992). As a result, the challenge of managing change is one of the most fundamental and enduring roles of leaders (Ahn, Adamson, and Dornbusch, 2004), whereas the rapidly accelerating pace of organizational change has made effective leadership imperative. Despite the proliferation of numerous theories, models, and multistep approaches, leaders continue to lack a clear understanding of change, its antecedents, effective processes, or the ability to successfully engage organizational members in change initiatives (Armenakis and Harris, 2002).

1.1.1   Leadership Behavior

Leadership behavior refers to the characteristics of leaders that endear them to be effective leaders (Armenakis and Harris, 2002). Many definitions of leadership exist. The many facets of leadership become clear in the description of Bass (1990): leadership has been conceived as the focus of group processes, as a matter of personality, as a matter of

inducing compliance, as the exercise of influence, as particular behaviors, as a form of persuasion, as a power relation, an instrument to achieve goals, as an effect of interaction, as a differentiated role, as initiation of structure and as many combinations of these definitions.

Bolman and Deal (1991) suggest that leaders display leadership behaviors in one of four types of frameworks: Structural, Human Resource, Political, or Symbolic. In the structural Framework the leadership behaviour portrayed by the leader is that of analysis and design, focusing on structure, strategy, environment, implementation, experimentation, and adaptation. In the Human Resource Framework, the leadership behaviour is that of supporting, advocating, and empowerment in the organization. The leadership behaviour in the Political Framework is that of coalition building with stakeholders by use of persuasion, negotiation or coercion. In the Symbolic Framework, the leader is viewed as a prophet whose leadership style is that of inspiration. This model suggests that leaders can be put into one of these four categories and there are times when one approach is appropriate and times when it would not be. That is, any leadership behavior in any of the four frameworks can be effective or ineffective, depending upon the situation. Relying on only one of these approaches would be inadequate, thus we should strive to be conscious of all four approaches, and not just depend on one or two.

Leadership behaviour is characterized by the ability of the leader to influence the activities of a group, by initiating structures (such as goal setting), which enable the group to successfully overcome mutual problems and to achieve their group goals. The leadership behaviour exhibited by leaders may or may not reflect their personalities. In this study leadership behaviour will be discussed in terms of how the leader enacts the task and maintains functions as illustrated in the Leadership questionnaire adapted from

Gilley, A., Gilley, J.W., AND McMillan, H.S.(2009). An autocratic leader makes decisions without consultation, issues orders or gives direction, and controls the members of the group through the use of rewards or punishments. A participative leader functions in a more democratic fashion, seeking inputs from group members and giving them an active role in decision-making. A free-rein leader leaves members free to decide what to do, how to do it, and when to do it. If you were working in an organisation, you would probably say you "worked for" an autocratic leader, "worked with" a participative leader, and "worked in spite of" a free-rein leader.

1.1.2   Organizational Change

There has been an increasing emphasis on change as a critical driver of organizational success (Friedman, 2005). Research, in turn, has explored change as a variable in creating organizational competitive advantage (Florida, 2005; Friedman, 2005). Understanding organizational change involves examining types of change within firms. Miles (2001) asserts that no matter its size, any change has a ripple effect on a firm. At the corporate or macro level, frequent organizational changes focus on strategy and business models, structure, processes, culture, technology, products, and services, often involving multiple leaders or reporting lines, incorporation of new technologies, acquisitions or expansion, or downsizing (Lewis, 1994). Consequently, managing the complexities of change challenges leaders at all levels of an organization (Biech, 2007). Weick and Quinn (1999) perceived organizational change as either episodic or continuous. Episodic change is infrequent and sometimes radical, while continuous change may be incremental, emergent, and without end. Whether continuous or radical, researchers agree that the pace of change is increasing (Quinn, 2004; Weick and Sutcliffe, 2001).

In this study change will be defined when viewed from an evolutionary perspective as transitional, transformational, or developmental. Transitional change, the most common, improves the current state through minor, gradual changes in people, structure, procedures, or technology. These management-driven changes may be department or division specific, or organization-wide, in their attempt to enable the organization to get better at what it does.

Transformational change efforts represent a fundamental, radical shift that rejects current paradigms or questions underlying assumptions and mind-sets (Kuhn, 1970). Transformational change represents leadership-driven modifications of culture, formulation of drastically different strategy, or demands for conformity due to a merger or acquisition by a dominant company. Although transformational change is disruptive in nature, its successful execution has been identified as leading to increased competitiveness, to the extent that an organization can clearly differentiate itself in the market (Denning, 2005). Unfortunately, corporate results, anecdotes, and research highlight the rarity with which organizations achieve transformational change (Cope, 2003).

Developmental change stems from an overall philosophy of growth and development that creates a culture of building competitive advantage through continuous dynamic yet manageable change. Developmental change avoids infrequent radical, large-scale change by continually scanning internal and external environments, creating motivational work environments, and rewarding individual innovation, growth, and development (Gilley and Maycunich, 2000). Disconnect between a firm's intentions to implement change and the

ability of its leaders to execute transformational or developmental change warrants further investigation.

1.1.3 Telkom Kenya Ltd

Telkom Kenya was established as a telecommunications operator under the Companies Act in April 1999. The company provides integrated communications solutions in Kenya with the widest range of voice and data services as well as network facilities for residential and business customers. The company currently has a customer base of about 500,000 customers on both fixed and Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) wireless with a country-wide presence (Telkom Kenya, 2010). The company's mission statement reads: "We will connect every Kenyan through integrated communication solutions that simplify and enrich their lives. We are a social and business catalyst, liberating and inspiring people with ideas and services to connect, collaborate, and co-create in new and exciting ways".

Telkom Kenya is the sole provider of landline phone services in Kenya. It was previously a part of the Kenya Posts and Telecommunications Corporation (KPTC) which was the sole provider of both postal and telecommunication services. In 1999 KPTC was split into the Communication Commission of Kenya (CCK), the Postal Corporation of Kenya (CCK) and Telkom Kenya (Wikipedia, 2010). The company operates and maintains the infrastructure over which Kenya's various internet service providers operate. After its privatization in 2007, France Telecom now holds 51% of Telkom Kenya's shares. The company has a board of directors made up of 9 members.

The privatization process has led to several changes taking place. The changes have included changes in management structure, culture of the organisation as well as strategic orientation. For instance, in July 2010, Telkom Kenya reorganized its local management structure to align it with France Telecom-Orange global strategic directions (Capitalfm, 2010). The CEO, Mr. Mickael Ghossein, affirmed that the reorganized structure would 'enable Telkom Kenya focus more closely on its people, by empowering them; its networks, as the source of its growth; and its customers by conquering trust and providing innovation such as the 3G technology and quality service offering' (Capitalfm, 2010).

1.2   Statement of the Problem

To effectively adapt to change, most established organizations have a daunting task ahead of them in a variety of operational and procedural areas. Business processes must be redefined and redesigned and adapted to specific geographical and cultural settings. The workforce needs to be retrained to be ready for changes in how work is done, what skills and knowledge is needed, and how to relate to global collaborators and customers. The very culture of an organization needs to be reshaped to properly support the new processes introduced. Structures, reward systems, appraisal measurements and roles need redefinition (Bainbridge, 1996). Leadership styles and management procedures must shift and adapt, and ways of relating with customers, suppliers, and other stakeholders need refining. Technological advances and capabilities must be introduced, and preparation of the workforce to work with the new Information Technological structures is needed. Despite the existence of theories and models on change management, organizations still face difficulties in effectively implementing change process. Leadership, among other issues, is one of the important factors in change management. Change is now a key

6

concern of most business organizations, but the management of change appears weak (Gilley et al., 2009).

There have been a lot of changes that have taken place at Telkom Kenya Limited. The company changed from being a public company to a private company. With the privatization and the subsequent change in the management structure to be in line with France-Telkom, leadership has been seen as instrumental in managing the change process in the organisation. It has been observed that the change process at Telkom Kenya Limited has not been well effected as the culture has not changed completely. The reasons for this might emanate from the leadership behavior in the organization (Telkom Kenya, 2010).

There are a number of studies that have been carried out on the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational change. For instance, Gilley et al., (2009) carried out a study in order to explore the behaviors associated with leadership effectiveness in driving change. The results confirmed previous research that identify change effectiveness skills, while isolating the specific leader behaviors deemed most valuable to implementing change: motivation and communication. Kavanagh and Ashkanasy (2006) examined the impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger. The results revealed that Leaders need to be competent and trained in the process of transforming organizations to ensure that individuals within the organization accept the changes prompted by a merger. Graetz (2000) examined the role of leadership in managing the challenge of deliberate large-scale change and whether it is possible to pinpoint factors that are critical to leading change effectively. The study also investigated the view that effective change leadership

involves instrumental and charismatic roles, integrating operational know-how with strong interpersonal skills. The cross-case analysis indicated that effective change leaders recognize the importance of blending the charismatic and instrumental dimensions of change leadership. The ability to conciliate and balance the two roles depended primarily on whether a leader possessed certain qualities and attributes required for effective change leadership. Strong interpersonal skills permeated these key change leadership qualities and attributes and provided the nexus between the charismatic and instrumental roles. The closest study to the present one, so far, was done by Kerama (2006) on the application of Kotter's model of strategic change management in the insurance industry.

A search of literature on change management did not reveal any study on Telkom Kenya Limited. No study in Kenya has attempted to establish the role of leadership behavior in organizational change. There is, therefore, a gap in literature that the present study seeks to bridge. This study seeks to answer the following research questions: what is the nature of leadership behavior of managers at Telkom Kenya Limited? How has leadership behavior influenced organizational change at Telkom Kenya Limited?

1.3   Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study is to establish the influence of leadership behavior on organizational change at Telkom Kenya Limited.

1.4   Importance of the Study

This study will add on to the growing body knowledge management by extending the view on the influence of leadership on change management in organisations. The results will also be invaluable to a number of stakeholders.

8

The management of Telkom Kenya Limited will find this study invaluable. This is because the findings will show the kind of leadership behavior prevalent in the organisation as well as whether the behavior has significantly influence change management process in the company. The recommendations will guide the management in coming up with better ways of enhancing change management in the organisation.

Other companies that are in the process of effecting change management practices will also find this study an invaluable source of information. The results and the recommendations thereof will help them in understanding the crucial link between leadership behavior and performance of change management strategies in place. Thus, they shall devise strategies to help them effect changes better.

Researchers, students and academicians will also find this study useful. Those interested in the area of change management and leadership will use the study as a guide for debates on the same as well as for future studies in the same area.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   Leadership Behavior

Theories of leadership encompass frameworks such as trait, behavioral, and contemporary theories. Leadership trait theory represents an effort to identify a set of psychological traits that all successful leaders possess (Ilies, Scott, and Judge, 2006). More than 300 trait studies have failed to generate a conclusive list of agreed-on traits inherent in effective leaders (Bass, 1990), although certain traits such as supervisory ability, the need for achievement, intelligence, decisiveness, self-assurance, and initiative are deemed significant (Ghiselli, 1971). Behavioral theorists posit distinctive styles used by effective leaders, such as McGregor's (1966) theory X and Y, and behaviors that were autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire (Lussier and Achua, 2007). Contemporary perspectives of leadership view leaders as being charismatic, transformational, transactional, servant, or developmental (Gilley and Maycunich, 2000). The skill sets discussed next frame the behaviors that have been found to have a positive influence on organizational success rates and have been incorporated into numerous change models (Gilley, 2005; Kotter, 1996; Ulrich, 1998).

Coaching has been defined as a process of improving performance by developing synergistic relationships with employees through training, counseling, confronting, and mentoring (Gilley and Boughton, 1996). Coaching is based on feedback and communications (Mintzberg, 2004) designed to maximize employee strengths and minimize weaknesses (Hill, 2004), resulting in improved performance due to greater awareness (Whitmore, 1997).

10

Leading change requires the use of a diverse set of communication techniques to deliver appropriate messages, solicit feedback, create readiness for change along with a sense of urgency, and motivate recipients to act. Leaders are responsible for communicating to the organization the risks in clinging to the status quo and the potential rewards of embracing a radically different future (Denning, 2005). Leadership ambivalence weakens claims of legitimacy for change and enables recipients to cling to reasons for resistance (Larson and Tompkins, 2005). Consequently, communications should be frequent and enthusiastic (Lewis, et al., 2006), while leaders simultaneously curb their bias toward unrealistic optimism (Lovallo and Kahneman, 2003).

Employee involvement (EI) increases workers' input into decisions that affect their well-being and organizational performance (Glew, O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Van Fleet, 1995). Lawler, Mohrman, and Ledford's (1982) long-term study of Fortune 1000 firms revealed positive trends in use of employee involvement programs within these firms, along with a growing number of employee participation in EI programs.

Motivation is the influence or drive that causes us to behave in a specific manner and has been described as consisting of energy, direction, and sustainability (Kroth, 2007). In an organizational context, a leader's ability to persuade and influence others to work in a common direction reflects his or her talent to motivate. A leader's ability to influence is based partly on his or her skill and partly on the motivation level of the individual employee. Motivation theories explore the multiple approaches to meeting individuals' needs, including expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), need theory (Maslow, 1954), reinforcement theory (Skinner, 1971), and the widely used goal theory (Karoly, 1993). It has been shown that predictors of motivation include job satisfaction, perceived equity,

11

and organizational commitment (Schnake, 2007). In other words, motivation is either positively or negatively affected by the experience an employee has within a given work environment and with his or her leaders. Leaders plan, organize, and execute work processes in complex organizations. The complexity reflects continuous changes in technology, shifts in workforce demographics, and the need for faster decision making, and developing the capability to continuously adapt and change. It is within this organizational context that leaders must create a work environment that elicits employee motivation.

LeBoeuf (1985) suggested that leaders secure desired results through a compensation and reward philosophy that recognizes employees for the right performance. Rewarding change efforts demonstrates the importance of and need for change, along with leaders' understanding that "the things that get rewarded get done". Conversely, unsatisfactory outcomes are the result of rewarding recipients for doing "what [organizations] don't want them to do" (Buford and Jelinek, 2006, p. 450) or failing to reward the right behaviors.

An effective compensation and reward philosophy takes into account the dynamic nature of the organization's change initiatives (Flannery, Hofrichter, and Platten, 1996) while allowing the firm to establish and navigate its ultimate course (Condrey, McCoy, and Fleury, 2006). Consequently, effective compensation and rewards are fluid, dynamic, and constantly changing.

The synergistic benefits of teamwork enable members working cooperatively with one another to achieve more than by working independently (Trent, 2004). Recent studies

have reported an ever-increasing number of firms using teams to accomplish organizational tasks in response to serious challenges posed by a dynamic global economy (Oh, Chung, & Labiance, 2004). Effectively managing teams and structuring work groups in ways that support collaboration are two leadership abilities necessary for achieving organizational goals.

2.3   Leadership Behavior Theories

There are three leadership theories presented in this section. These are: Ohio State and University of Michigan studies, University of Iowa studies, and Theory X and Y. These theories have been picked for the study as they are the most relevant for explaining the leadership behavior and most researchers have used them in studying leadership (Schnake, 2007).

2.3.1   Ohio State and University of Michigan

Studies conducted at the Ohio State University and the University of Michigan identified two leadership styles and two types of leader behaviours (Schnake, 2007). The Ohio State studies utilized the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), administering it to samples of individuals in the military, manufacturing companies, college administrators, and student leaders. Answers to the questionnaire were factor-analyzed to determine if common leader behaviors emerged across samples. The conclusion was that there were two distinct aspects of leadership that describe how leaders carry out their role. Two factors, termed consideration and initiating structure, consistently appeared. Initiating structure, sometimes called task-oriented behavior, involves planning, organizing, and coordinating the work of subordinates. Consideration involves showing

concern for subordinates, being supportive, recognizing subordinates' accomplishments, and providing for subordinates' welfare.

The Michigan leadership studies took place at about the same time as those at Ohio State. Under the general direction of Rensis Likert, the focus of the Michigan studies was to determine the principles and methods of leadership that led to productivity and job satisfaction. The studies resulted in two general leadership behaviors or orientations: an employee orientation and a production orientation. Leaders with an employee orientation showed genuine concern for interpersonal relations. Those with a production orientation focused on the task or technical aspects of the job. The conclusion of the Michigan studies was that an employee orientation instead of close supervision yielded better results (Ilies, et al., 2006).

2.3.2 University of Iowa

Back in the 1930s, Kurt Lewin and associates at the University of Iowa conducted studies focused on the leadership style of the manager (Ilies, et al, 2006). Work at the University of Iowa identified democratic (participation and delegation), autocratic (dictating and centralized) and laissez-faire styles (group freedom in decision making) (Lussier and Achua, 2007). In autocratic Leadership Style the leader that exhibits this behavior makes the decisions, gives orders to employees, and is constantly supervising his subordinates. In Democratic Leadership Style, the leader that exhibits this behavior promotes shared decisions, team work, and does not supervise his subordinates closely. In Laissez-faire leadership style the leader lets followers make all decisions and followers do what they think is best.

14

Autocratic leadership entails centralising authority and dictating how work is to be done. Autocratic leaders limit subordinates' participation and make unilateral decisions. On the other hand, a democratic leader allows subordinates to participate in decision making and work methods. The leader delegates authority and makes use of feedback to coach subordinates. Laissez-faire leadership gives subordinates freedom to make decisions and carry out a task in a way they see fit (Lussier and Achua, 2007).

The studies involved adults trained in the use of the styles leading groups of young boys from local clubs. Observations from the studies concluded that laissez-faire was an ineffective style. The autocratic and democratic styles produced results from subordinates, however quality of results and levels of satisfaction among subordinates were higher in groups that were led by democratic leaders (Robbins and Coulter, 1996).

2.3.3 Theory X and Y

McGregor's theory X and theory Y gives the reader a view of how successful management depends upon the ability to predict and control human behaviour, and how motivation of employees are influenced in relation to the management's practice (Lussier and Achua, 2007). Characteristics for key employees are that they are motivated in their work. They are loyal to the company; they are driven, and have a desire to learn new tasks, open to new ideas, and not afraid of changes.

The concept of key employees separates them from other employees in terms of their conviction and desire to personal development. Key employees can be distinguished from other employees in the sense of fit to the company, and understanding of working tasks and organizational values. A key employee can differ depending on a certain company.

15

The employee's education in the field should match with the working tasks (Ilies, et al., 2006).

Today the theories are seldom used explicitly, largely because the insights they provided have influenced and been incorporated by further generations of management theorists and practitioners. More commonly, workplaces are described as "hard" versus "soft." Taken too literally any such dichotomy including Theory X and Y seem to represent unrealistic extremes (Lussier and Achua, 2007).

Most employees (and managers) fall somewhere in between these poles. Naturally, McGregor was well aware of the heuristic as opposed to literal way in which such distinctions are useful. Theory X and Theory Y are still important terms in the field of management and motivation. Recent studies have questioned the rigidity of the model, but McGregor's X-Y Theory remains a guiding principle of positive approaches to management, to organizational development, and to improving organizational culture (Ilies, et al., 2006).

2.4   Organizational Change

Models of change attempt to help leaders and managers understand change and guide their organizations through the process. The literature reveals numerous models designed to clarify phases of change, individual acceptance rates, and steps for implementation. Rogers (2003), for example, describes how individuals accept rates of change in different ways and at varying rates in his research on adoption of innovations. An innovation represents any change, large or small—including an idea, practice, procedure, or objects—perceived as new by an individual. The recipient's reaction to change depends

on his or perception of the degree of newness. Communication methods and systems influence how and when the change is adopted.

Acceptance of change occurs in stages, which Rogers (2003) describes as awareness of the change, interest in the change, trial, the decision to continue or quit, and adoption of the change into one's life. Five categories of individuals have been identified on the basis of their general acceptance of change: innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards. Innovators thrive on change; early adopters seek challenges and generally like change; the early majority prefer to observe the impact of change on innovators and early adopters prior to making a deliberate decision to change; the late majority are skeptical, sometimes suspicious, and occasionally change only as a last resort; and laggards are traditional, steadfast resisters who often reject change completely.

Early models of change management followed a relatively simple three step process that included evaluating and preparing a firm for change, engaging in change, and solidifying the change into the fabric of employees' daily lives. Lewin's (1951) classic model, for example, consists of unfreezing, movement, and refreezing. Unfreezing entails assessment of the current state and readying individuals and organizations for change. Movement occurs when individuals engage in the change process. Refreezing anchors new ways and behaviors into the daily routine and culture of the firm. More extensive, multistep frameworks have evolved that include leadership, employee involvement, rewards, communication, and more. Models by Kotter (1996) and Ulrich (1998), for example, suggest the importance of leadership and vision, forming guiding coalitions, communicating, motivating and empowering others, and anchoring new approaches in the firm's culture. The three change models are shown in Table 1.

17

Table 1: **Change Models**

Lewin's Model	Ulrich 7-Step Model	Kotter's 8-Step Model
Unfreeze	Lead change	Establish a sense of urgency
Movement	Create a shared need	For a guiding coalition
Refreeze	Shape vision	Create vision
	Mobilize commitment	Communicate the vision
	Change systems and structures	Empower others to act
	Monitor progress	Plan for and create short-term wins
	Make change last	Consolidate improvements and create more change
		Institutionalize new approaches

Source: Gilley, A. (2005). *The manager as change leader*, Westport, CT: Praeger, pp. 137

Critics of these models cite failure to recognize the complexity of change, simplistic assumptions of success should one follow the rigid steps in order, failure to recognize the human factor, and lack of preparedness for resistance, to name a few (Gilley, 2005). Nadler (1998) stated, "the reality of change in the organizational trenches defies rigid academic models as well as superficial management fads." Hence, the importance of the leader's role in driving change is clear.

2.5   Influence of Leadership Behavior on Organizational Change

Possessing skills in change management has been linked to bringing about successful organizational change. Lack of understanding of change implementation techniques and the inability to modify one's management style or organizational functions are cited as barriers to success (Bossidy and Charan, 2002; Gilley, 2005). Other barriers revealed by research include the inability to motivate others to change, poor communications skills, and failure of management to reward or recognize individuals who make the effort to change (Kotter, 1996; Ulrich, 1998). Leaders' thoughts and skills are manifested in actions, structures, and processes that enhance or impede change, further strengthening the linkage between their behaviors and effectiveness in implementing change.

18

According to Hudson (1999), the primary role in coaching is that of an agent of change. Hudson suggests that coaching skills enable leaders to question the status quo, approach situations from new perspectives, and allow others to make and learn from mistakes. Moreover, he believes that leaders who coach help employees improve their renewal capacity and resilience, which has a positive influence on organizational success. Coaching inspires others to be their best, remain future oriented and cautiously optimistic, and pursue useful alliances and networks that enhance cooperation and results (Hudson, 1999). Disappointing or unfavorable results due to unfulfilled or inaccurate promises and predictions undermine leadership credibility and lead to employee perceptions of injustice, misrepresentation, and violations of trust (Folger and Skarlicki, 1999; Tomlinson, Dineen, and Lewicki, 2004). Organizational justice research reveals that people who experience an injustice or betrayal report feeling resentful and a desire for retribution (Folger and Skarlicki, 1999), while those who perceive that they have been treated fairly display attitudes and behaviors associated with successful change, such as enthusiasm or commitment (Cobb, Wooten and Folger, 1995). Evidence suggests that informational justice, which is being truthful when things go wrong, a fair process, and treatment with interpersonal dignity, enables recipients to accept an undesirable outcome (Cropanzano, Bowen, and Gilliland, 2007; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997). Hence, there is a need for realistic, truthful discussions that include the scope of the change and are clear about the negative aspects of implementation (Saunders, 1999).

Leaders as change agents must provide employees with abundant, relevant information with regard to impending changes, justify the appropriateness and rationale for change, address employees' questions and concerns, and explore ways in which change might affect recipients in order to increase acceptance and participation (Green, 2004; Rousseau

and Tijoriwala, 1999). Employees' acceptance of and participation in change depend on their perception of personal benefits associated with the change (Gilley, 2005). Employees question, evaluate, and weigh arguments for and against change to determine its strengths and weaknesses; thus, well-developed rationalizations are more likely to be accepted, while weaker arguments are rejected (Knowles and Linn, 2004). Communication can be an effective tool for motivating employees involved in change (Luecke, 2003). Appropriate communications provide employees with feedback and reinforcement during the change (Peterson and Hicks, 1996), which enables them to make better decisions and prepares them for the advantages and disadvantages of change (Saunders, 1999).

A growing body of research suggests that employee involvement has a positive impact on change implementation (Sims, 2002) and productivity (Huselid, 1995). Specifically, relinquishing control and allowing employees to make decisions yields constructive results (Risher, 2003). Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) posit that those allowed to participate meaningfully in change are more committed to its success because their relevant contributions are integrated into the change plan. Lawler et al., (1982) attributed EI productivity gains to improved communication, motivation, and employee capabilities, each of which support change efforts.

Birdi's (2005) research indicates that involving employees and soliciting their feedback significantly influences the extent to which action is taken on creative ideas. Other authors provide examples of overcoming barriers to taking action and realizing success. Specifically, successful change execution requires a facilitative management style that ensures that communication (including coaching, information sharing, and appropriate

feedback) mechanisms are in place, worker involvement flourishes, and social networks (teams and collaboration) are supported (Denning, 2005).

Carlisle and Murphy (1996) contend that motivating others requires skilled managers who can organize and provide a motivating environment: communicate effectively, address employees' questions, generate creative ideas, prioritize ideas, direct personnel practices, plan employees' actions, commit employees to action, and provide follow-up to overcome motivational problems. A recent study involving highly creative technical professionals found that how these employees were managed was a significant motivating factor (Hebda, Vojak, Griffin, and Price, 2007). Specifically, 23% of respondents indicated that having freedom, flexibility, and resources was a significant motivator, while 25% indicated that the most important motivator was the time provided by their management (e.g., long stretches of time to focus on solving complex problems).

Compensation research indicates that an integrated reward philosophy supports each step of the organization's change initiative. Recipients of change react positively to rewards for incremental change, celebrations of milestones, and leaders who create win-win situations related to change (Lussier, 2006). Reward programs that help organizations achieve specific change goals such as greater creativity, innovative products, competitiveness, collaboration and teamwork, employee commitment and loyalty, long-term plans, and continual learning and application of new skills are positively related to organizational goal achievement (Ulrich, Zenger, and Smallwood, 1999).

Early management research made an empirical case for collaborative approaches to managing (Follett, 1924), while contemporary scholars have found significant influence

on change flows from teamwork and collaboration in the form of work group design (Fuqua and Kurpius, 1993; Williams, 2001). Studies suggest that work groups can be designed to enable members with diverse skills and backgrounds to communicate and interact in ways that constructively challenge each other's ideas (Williams, 2001). Furthermore, it has been evidenced that social networks have important effects on team performance and viability (Balkundi and Harrison, 2006).

Teams with a dense configuration of connections within their social network tend to attain their goals more frequently and remain intact as a group for a longer period of time (Balkundi and Harrison, 2006). Not surprisingly, the influence of interpersonal skills combines with group processes and structure to create or impede teamwork and collaboration (Fuqua and Kurpius, 1993; Nadler and Tushman, 1989). Teamwork and collaboration suffer under conditions of a hostile environment, unrealistic expectations, poor communications, lack of skills training, and coercive rather than coactive control (Follett, 1924; Longenecker and Neubert, 2000; Zhou and George, 2003). Conversely, teams thrive with open communications, shared leadership, clearly defined roles and work assignments, valued diversity of styles, and a sense of informality (Parker, 1990).

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This was a cross-sectional survey. These studies typically involve conducting a survey of a sample of population elements at one point in time (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). They are useful because they provide a quick snapshot of what's going on with the variables of interest for the research problem.

3.2 Population

The population at Telkom Kenya Limited was 2100 employees. (Source; Human Resource Department at Telkom Kenya)

3.3 Sample

The sample was drawn from the Management, Supervisor, and Team Leader staff within Telkom Kenya Limited 10 Departments. A sample of 200 Management, Supervisor and Team Leader Staff was drawn from the Population using the Proportionate Sampling Method. The Sampling Frame used is as below.

Name of Department	Total Management, Supervisor and Team Leader Staff	% of Staff to be used in the Sample	Number of Staff to be in the Sample
CEO Office	3	40%	1
HR	12	40%	5
Business Market	24	40%	10
Mass Market and Customer Care	60	40%	24
Marketing	12	40%	5
Carrier Services	6	40%	2
Information Technology and Network	309	40%	123

Corporate Communications	9	40%	4
Support Services	30	40%	12
Finance	35	40%	14
TOTAL	500		200

3.4   Data Collection

Primary data was collected in this study. The data was collected through structured questionnaires. The questionnaires had three sections named A, B and C. Section A addressed the sample demographics such as age of respondents, their gender, and marital status. Section B addressed the leadership behavior of managers in the organisation and section C addressed the issues of organizational change.

3.5   Data Analysis

Section A of the questionnaire was analyzed using descriptive analysis. This used statistics such as percentages and mean scores. The mean score showed whether the leadership behavior showed concern for People and Task. If the respondent scored very high concern for Task and low concern for People, this showed the leadership behavior exhibited was that of an autocratic leader. If the respondent showed very high concern for People and low concern for Task the leadership behavior exhibited was that of a Laissez faire leader. If the respondent showed high concern for Task and high concern for People the leadership behavior exhibited was that of a Participative leader. For section B and C, in order to determine the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational change, the specific analysis tools used were the correlation analysis and involved the use of statistics such as Pearson product moment of correlation, R, and significance test values, p-values.

The formula for R (Pearson Product Moment of Correlation) is as follows:

24

$$r = \frac{\frac{\sum XY}{N} - (\frac{\sum X}{N})(\frac{\sum Y}{N})}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2}{N} - (\frac{\sum X}{N})^2 * \frac{\sum Y^2}{N} - (\frac{\sum Y}{N})^2}}$$

Where:

N	represents the number of pairs of data
X	denotes the independent variable (Leadership Behavior)
Y	denotes the dependent variable (Organization Change)
$\sum$	denotes the summation of the items indicated
$\sum X$	denotes the sum of all X scores
$\sum X^2$	indicates that each X score should be squared and then those squares summed
$(\sum X)^2$	indicates that the X scores should be summed and the total squared. [avoid confusing $\sum X^2$ (the sum of the X squared scores) and $(\sum X)^2$ (the square of the sum of the X scores]
$\sum Y$	denotes the sum of all y-scores
$\sum Y^2$	indicates that each Y score should be squared and then those squares summed
$(\sum Y)^2$	indicates that the Y scores should be summed and the total squared
$\sum XY$	indicates that each X score should be first multiplied by its corresponding Y score and the product (XY) summed

The size of any correlation was evaluated as follows:

Correlation Value	Interpretation
≤ 0.50	Very low

0.51 to 0.79	Low
0.80 to 0.89	Moderate
≥ 0.90	High (Good)

A high (or low) negative correlation has the same interpretation as a high (or low) positive correlation. A negative correlation indicates that high scores in one variable are associated with low scores in the other variable.

The p-value is the probability of obtaining a test statistic at least as extreme as the one that was actually observed, assuming that the null hypothesis is true. The lower the p-value, the less likely the result is if the null hypothesis is true, and consequently the more "significant" the result is. In this study, p-value of 0.05 (5%) or less was used to show that the relationship is significant or not.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1   Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study. From the 200 questionnaires administered to the managers of the company, 112 were completed and used in the analysis. This shows that the response rate was 56%. Given that questionnaires normally yield lower response rates, the response rate of 56% is acceptable. Before the analysis, the data collected through the questionnaires was tested for reliability using Cronbach's alpha. The alpha was 0.836 which was high hence the data was reliable enough to be analysed and interpreted.

4.2   General Information

This section presents an analysis on the demographic characteristics of the respondents at Telkom Kenya Limited. The specific characteristics are gender, age, and length of service.

4.2.1   Gender

An analysis of the gender of respondents was performed in a bid to establish the composition of respondents according to gender. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2:   Gender

	Frequency	Percent
Male	62	55
Female	50	45
Total	112	100

The study found that 55% were male and 45% were female. These results indicate that most of the respondents were male. This closely mirrors the gender distribution of employees in the management level in the organisation.

4.2.2 Age

The ages of respondents were sought in order to establish the distribution of managers as regards their age groups. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3:   Age

	Frequency	Percent
25-30	28	25
31-40	43	38
41-50	41	37
Total	**112**	**100**

The study found that 25% were aged 25-30 years, 38% were 31-40 years while 37% were aged 41-50 years. These results indicate that the distribution of ages was even in the organisation as there was a closer march within the age groups for the managers.

4.2.3 Length of Service

The length of period with which the managers had been working in the organisation was also sought. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.

Table 4:   Length of Service

	Frequency	Percent
Less than 5	54	48
5-10	18	16
11-15	32	29
16-20	8	7
Total	**112**	**100**

28

The study noted that 48% had been in the organisation for less than 5 years, 16% for 5-10 years, 29% for 11-15 years and 7% for 16-20 years. Thus, it can be observed that majority of the employees have been with the company for less than 5 years. This can be attributed to the fact that the company recently put up change process that saw majority of old employees retrenched and new employees hired to take up positions in the company.

4.3   Leadership Behaviour

This section presents the results of the analysis on leadership behaviour in Telkom Kenya Limited. Questions on leadership are in section B of the questionnaire. The questions were meant to elicit the extent to which these behaviours were inherent in the managers of Telkom Kenya Limited. A total of 36 questions were listed. In order to bring out clearly the elicited leadership behaviour among the respondents, a descriptive analysis was performed. The questions were structured on a five-point Likert scare. The ranges were 1(never), 2(seldom), 3(occasionally), 4(frequently) and 5(always). These questions sought to establish whether the leaders were autocratic, democratic or laissez-fair. These were the behaviours these questions sought to determine. The results are shown in Table 5.

4.3.1   Autocratic Behaviour

Table 5 shows that autocratic behaviour had 15 statements that coincided with the behaviour. The study found that the respondents would urge the group to beat its previous record (4.8214), they would ask the group members to work harder (4.7857), would keep the work moving at a rapid pace (4.6071), push for increased production (4.8214) and ask group members to follow standard rules and regulations (4.5714). The study also noted that the respondents would not allow members to complete freedom in their work (2.2143); they would not tolerate postponement and uncertainty (1.2143) and would not

29

permit the group to set its own pace (2.4821). Overall, the study revealed that autocratic behaviour was exhibited by most of the managers as shown by the mean score of 3.8821. The standard deviation was 0.8146 and this shows that the variation in responses on this behaviour was low. These results show that the managers retained as much power and decision-making authority as possible. Employees are expected to obey orders without receiving any explanations.

4.3.2 Democratic Behaviour

Table 5 also shows that democratic behaviour was exhibited by some of the managers. There are 9 statements under this behaviour. The study found that most of the managers would explain their actions (2.9286), they would act by consulting the group (2.8571), and would speak as representatives of their groups (4.1071). The managers would encourage overtime (2.4107), and try their ideas in the group (4.2500). The overall mean score was 3.667 which suggest that it was the second most exhibited behaviour after autocracy. The standard deviation was 0.762 showing that the responses were less varied on this behaviour. The democratic leadership style is also called the participative style as it encourages employees to be a part of the decision making. The democratic manager keeps his or her employees informed about everything that affects their work and shares decision making and problem solving responsibilities.

Table 5: Leadership Behaviour

Autocratic behaviour	Mean	Std. Dev
I would urge the group to beat its previous record.	4.8214	.76186
I would ask the group members to work harder.	4.7857	.77609
I would keep the work moving at a rapid pace.	4.6071	.90402
I would push for increased production.	4.8214	.76186
I would ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.	4.5714	.94644
I would speak for the group if there were visitors present.	4.2857	.92443
I would encourage the use of uniform procedures.	4.1786	1.39635
I would decide what should be done and how it should be done.	4.2321	.73500
I would assign group members to particular tasks.	4.0536	.83654
I would stress being ahead of competing groups.	4.9286	.25870
Things would usually turn out as I predicted.	4.3750	.77256
I would let the members do their work the way they think best.	2.6607	.95440
I would not permit the group to set its own pace.	2.4821	.62934
I would not tolerate postponement and uncertainty	1.2143	.49189
I would not allow members complete freedom in their work.	2.2143	1.06904
Average	3.8821	0.8146
Democratic behaviour		
I would refuse to explain my actions.	2.9286	.92721
I would act without consulting the group.	2.8571	.83674
I would speak as a representative of the group.	4.1071	.62033
I would present the group at outside meetings.	4.0000	.60030
I would most likely act as the spokesman of the group.	4.1250	.82882
I would persuade others that my ideas are to their advantage.	4.4821	.78249

I would encourage overtime work.	2.4107	1.00048
I would be working hard for a promotion.	3.8393	.75401
I would try out my ideas in the group.	4.2500	.51114
Average	**3.667**	**0.762**
Laissez-fair behaviour		
I would be reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.	2.7679	.94899
I would permit the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.	3.7143	.96262
Average	**3.2411**	**0.9558**

4.3.3   Laissez-fair Behaviour

Under this behaviour, there are 2 statements. The study revealed that the managers would allow the members freedom of action (2.7679) and would permit the members to use their own judgement in solving problems (3.7143). The overall mean score was 3.2411 indicating that this was the least exhibited of the three leadership behaviours with a standard deviation of 0.9558. These statements show that the managers provide little or no direction and give employees as much freedom as possible. All authority or power is given to the employees and they must determine goals, make decisions, and resolve problems on their own.

To conclude this section, it can be noted that the two most exhibited leadership behaviour were autocratic and democratic leadership behaviours. Thus, much of the management in the organisation does not include the input of employees. The least exhibited leadership behaviour was laissez-fair.

4.4   Organisational Change

This section presents the results of the analysis on organisational change in Telkom Kenya Limited. Questions on change process are in section C of the questionnaire. The questions were meant to elicit the management of change process in the organisation. A total of 21 questions were listed. The questions were divided into the following sections: challenge the current state, harmonise and align leadership, activate commitment, nurture and formalise design, guide implementation, evaluate and institutionalise the change. The results are shown in Table 6 in terms of mean scores and standard deviations. The interpretation and presentation is also made in terms of the theories of change management. As such, the process through which change in Telkom Kenya Limited goes through is explained in terms of the sections.

33

Table 6: **Organisational Change at Telkom Kenya Using Kotter's 8-Step Model**

		Mean	Std. dev
Challenge the current state	Identifies and discusses actual or potential crises or major opportunities	4.107	1.11789
	Examines external trends, issues and problems confronting it	3.750	1.41102
	Establishes an increased sense of urgency around needed change	2.250	0.83288
	Average	3.369	1.121
Harmonize and align leadership	Puts together a group with enough power to lead the change	4.321	0.96995
	Gets the group to work together effectively as a team	3.375	1.09975
	Creates a vision and strategy to help guide the change effort	3.785	1.18115
	Aligns policies, systems, structures and practices to fit each other and the change vision	3.696	0.86825
	Ensures that it is a shared vision and strategy	2.187	0.66483
	Average	3.473	0.957
Activate commitment	Leadership team role-model the behavior expected of employees	3.535	0.98574
	Continuously use every available vehicle to communicate the new vision and strategy	2.75	0.91533
	Average	3.143	0.951
Nurture and formalize a design	Modifies systems or structures that undermine the change vision	3.142	0.91884
	Eliminates obstacles to the planned change	3.000	1.02227
	Encourages reasonable risk-taking and non-traditional ideas and actions	2.821	1.05876
	Focuses on results rather than activities	4.053	0.99403
	Average	3.254	0.998
Guide implementation	Plans for visible short-term improvements in performance (quick wins)	4.321	0.80778
	Visibly recognizes and rewards people who make the wins possible	2.732	1.13091
	Monitors and adjusts strategies in response to problems in the change process	2.678	0.95119
	Average	3.244	0.963
Evaluate and institutionalize the change	Reinvigorates the change process through new projects, themes and change agents	3.473	0.99512
	Hires, promotes and develops people who can implement the change vision	2.892	1.08518
	Creates processes to ensure leadership development and succession	3.464	1.4822
	Articulates the connection between new behaviours and organizational success	3.446	1.10559
	Average	3.319	1.167

4.4.1 Challenging the current state

It was noted that the company identifies and discusses actual or potential crises or major opportunities (mean = 4.1071) and that the variance of responses was high on this (1.11789). The study further noted that the company examined external trends, issues and problems confronting it (mean = 3.75) and the variance was low (SD = 1.41). The company does not establish an increased sense of urgency around needed change (mean = 2.25).

Thus, the study notes that in challenging the current state, the company does not establish a sense of urgency. This is the practice that is least done. The practice that was most done is scanning for potential crises and opportunities. Examining external trends is moderately done in this step. The average mean of 3.369 suggests that Telkom Kenya Limited moderately challenged the current state of affairs in the organisation.

4.4.2 Harmonize and align leadership

The results show that the company puts together a group with enough power to lead the change (mean = 4.321). The deviation on this response was low (SD = 0.96995). It also gets the group to work together effectively as a team (3.37). The company creates vision and strategy to help guide the change effort (3.785), aligns policies, systems, structures and practices to fit each other and the change vision (3.696), but does not shares vision and strategy (2.187).

Thus, it is noted that the most practiced part of this step is empowering groups to lead the change while the least practiced was sharing of vision and strategy. Getting groups to work as a team was moderately practiced. The overall mean score of 3.473 suggests that Telkom Kenya Limited moderately harmonised and aligned leadership.

35

4.4.3 Activating Commitment

Activation of commitment for change management is important for any firm. For Telkom Kenya Limited, the leadership team has role-modelled the behaviour expected of employees (3.535) but does not continuously communicate the new vision and strategy (2.75). The study noted that the organisation moderately role modelled the behaviour expected of employees while it least used available vehicle to communicate the new vision and strategy. The overall mean score of 3.143 suggests that Telkom Kenya Limited moderately activated commitment.

4.4.4 Nurturing and Formalization of Design

It is important that companies undergoing change nurture and formalise change designs. Telkom Kenya focuses on results rather than activities (4.053), modifies systems and structures that undermine the change vision (3.142), eliminates obstacles to planned change (3.00), and does not encourage reasonable risk taking and non-traditional ideas and actions (2.821). This shows that these steps are not usually followed to their entirety as the employees are not allowed to take reasonable risks despite the important of risk taking in change management. It is important that all these activities be followed through for better nurturing and formalisation of change designs.

Thus, Telkom Kenya Limited mostly focused on results rather than on activities and least encouraged reasonable risk-taking and non-traditional ideas and actions. The company moderately eliminated obstacles to the planned change. The overall mean score of 3.254 reveals that the company moderately nurtured and formalised change design.

4.4.5   Guiding implementation

The study noted that the company plans for visible short-term improvements in performance (4.321). It does not visibly recognize and reward employees who make the wins possible (2.732) nor does it monitor and adjust strategies in response to problems in change process (2.678). These issues are important because they guide the change implementation in the organisation. The fact that the company does not practice much of these processes makes it difficult to achieve its change objectives.

The study noted that the company least monitored or adjusted strategies to respond to the problems in change process while it mostly planned for quick wins. The overall mean score of 3.244 means that the organisation moderately guided implementation.

4.4.6   Evaluating and Institutionalising the Change

The study found that Telkom Kenya Limited reinvigorates the change process (3.473), creates process to ensure leadership development and succession (3.464), articulates the connection between new behaviour and organisational success (3.446), but seldom hires, promotes or develops people who can implement the change vision (2.892). The study noted that the company least hired, promoted or developed people to implement change vision while it mostly reinvigorated the change process. The overall mean score of 3.319 suggests that the organisation moderately evaluated and institutionalised the change.

To conclude, the organisation moderately engages in change management. This is because some of the issues discussed above were least practiced. But there are formal procedures the organisation has used in addressing change by planning for quick wins, focusing on results rather than activities, empowering groups to lead change, and by identifying and discussing actual and potential crises or major opportunities. These were

37

the issues the organisation mainly addressed. The issues that were not addressed are establishment of increased sense of urgency around needed change, ensuring that the vision and strategy are shared, using available vehicle to communicate the new vision and strategy, encouraging risk taking and non-traditional ideas and actions, recognising and rewarding people, monitoring and adjusting strategies in response to problems in the change process, and hiring, promoting and developing people to implement the change vision.

4.5 The Influence of Leadership Behaviour on Organizational Change

Table 7 presents the results on the mean scores and standard deviations (descriptive statistics) on leadership behaviour as well as organisational change in the organisation.

Table 7: Leadership Behaviour and Organisational Change

	Mean score	Standard deviation
Leadership behaviour	3.6434	0.19972
Organisational change	3.3231	0.61020

The overall mean score for leadership behaviour in the organisation shown in Table 4 was 3.6 with a standard deviation of 0.2. This shows that most of the leadership behaviour espoused in the questionnaire were occasionally used by the managers. Most of the behaviour was autocratic (more concerned with completion of tasks) while very few showed concern for people (democratic or shared leadership behaviour).

Table 7 also shows that the overall mean score for organisation change was 3.3 with a standard deviation of 0.6. The mean score reveals that change management process was moderately practiced in the organisation. This is so because most of the change process has only involved the structure and the staff. There are several other dimensions of

change that have not occurred in the organisation as the company is in the process of implementing them.

This section presents the results on the influence of leadership behavior on organisational change. The analysis to test for the influence of leadership behaviour on organisational change was performed using the Pearson correlation analysis. The formula used is shown in chapter 3. The results of the correlation are shown in Table 8.

Table 8:   Pearson Correlation

		Leadership behaviour	Change management
Leadership behaviour	R	1	.302[**]
	P value		.001
Change management	R	.302[**]	1
	P value	.001	
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The Pearson correlation, R, between leadership behaviour and change management shows that leadership behaviour had a low positive influence on change management practice of the organisation (R = 0.302). The study found that the p-value was 0.001. This shows that the relationship given by the Pearson correlation was very significant at a confidence level of 99% or 0.01. This therefore means that there is a significant influence of leadership behaviour and organisational change. Thus, when good leadership behaviour is exhibited, organisation change process becomes effective. Also, when the leadership behaviour is ineffective, the change process also becomes ineffective.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Findings

This chapter presents the summary of research findings, conclusions of the study, recommendations for policy and practice and suggestions for further research. In this section, summary of major research findings based on the questionnaire and research objectives are made.

The study found that most of the respondents were male. This shows that most of the managers in the organisation were male. Most of the managers who took part in the study were aged 31-40 years. This shows that the workforce in the organisation was young and vibrant. The study also revealed that majority of the managers had less than 5 years experience in the organisation. This shows that most of the managers were new employees who had probably been poached from other firms in the industry in order to spearhead the change process.

There were a mix of leadership behaviours and the mean scores revealed that the managers occasionally practiced the said behaviours. The dominant behaviour was autocratic leadership behaviour. This means that most of the managers in the company were more autocratic in their style of management. A small number were democratic as they exhibited shared leadership while very few were laissez-fair.

The study found that change management process was moderately practiced in the organisation. Telkom Kenya Limited moderately challenged the current state of affairs in the organisation, moderately harmonised and aligned leadership, moderately activated

40

commitment, moderately nurtured and formalised change design, moderately guided implementation, and moderately evaluated and institutionalised the change.

The Pearson correlation showed that leadership behaviour had a low positive influence on organisational change and the relationship was significant (R = 0.302, p<0.01). These results reveal that the tempo of change process in the organisation was considered moderate by the managers. The results also show that the type of leadership behaviour a manager exhibits had a significant effect on the pace of change process in the organisation.

These findings are consistent with some studies on the link between leadership behaviour and change management. For instance, the study findings are consistent with those of Sims (2002) who noted that employee involvement was positively related to change implementation. This was also the same case with Birdi (2005). Thus, the results in this study can be said to be consistent with theory and empirical results hence adding on to the body knowledge on the importance of leadership in change management programs.

5.3   Conclusion

The objective of this study was to establish the influence of leadership behavior on organizational change at Telkom Kenya Limited. From the correlation analysis, the study established that there was a low positive correlation between leadership behavior and organisational change at Telkom Kenya Limited. It was also noted that the most dominant behavior was autocratic and that change process was moderate in the organisation. The study concludes that most of the managers at Telkom Kenya Limited exhibited an autocratic leadership behavior. The study also concludes that the pace of change

41

management process in the organisation was moderate. The study further concludes that leadership behavior significantly influences organisational change.

5.4   Recommendations

The study recommends that since leader behaviour has a significant influence on change management, the managers of various organisations seeking to see the successful implementation of change management need to focus on exhibiting better leadership behaviours especially in terms of motivation and communication. Motivating employees and providing effective communications are highly and significantly associated with effective implementation of change.

With nearly two-thirds of change efforts falling short of expectations, the need is clear for change agents to possess a thorough understanding of the relationship between change abilities and change effectiveness. Knowledge of which skills and abilities significantly influence change success can help leaders design and lead more effective change efforts. Furthermore, leaders at all levels are likely to need development in change implementation techniques and the behaviours associated with successful change.

5.5   Limitations of the Study

There were a number of limitations that affected the outcome of the study. For instance, data was collected from only one company, Telkom Kenya. This may limit the application of results to the entire industry.

The data was also collected only from the management staff. This might introduce some bias as the managers self-rate themselves on their leadership behaviours. They might also be biased as far as the practice of change management is concerned.

Financial resources were another limitation. The research demanded a lot of printing, bindings, typesetting, and data collection. All these activities needed money and this was a challenge to the researcher.

5.6   Suggestions for Further Research

Additional study may add to our understanding of factors that reinforce and sustain change within complex, dynamic environments. For example, relevant research would compare and contrast employees' perceptions of leadership and change with documented organizational results (e.g., revenues, productivity, customer service levels). Future study could support or refute the accuracy of employees' perceptions of their leadership and change, examine the influence of one's position on perceptions of leadership change effectiveness, and consider the scope of changes being evaluated. The same study should also be conducted in a different setting or using a survey.

REFERENCES

Ahn, M.J., Adamson, J.S.A., & Dornbusch, D. (2004). From leaders to leadership: Managing change. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 112-123.

Armenakis, A.A., & Harris, S.G. (2002). Crafting a change message to create transformational readiness. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15, 169-183.

Bainbridge, C. (1996). *Designing for change: A practical guide for business transformation,* New York: John Wiley.

Balkundi, P., & Harrison, D. A. (2006). Ties, leaders, and time in teams: Strong inference about network structure's effects on team viability and performance. *Academy of Management*, 49(1), 49–68.

Bass, B. (1990). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Biech, E. (2007). *Thriving through change: A leader's practical guide to change mastery.* Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Birdi, K. S. (2005). No idea? Evaluating the effectiveness of creativity training. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29(2), 102–111.

Bolman, L. and Deal, T. (1991). *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bossidy, L., & Charan, R. (2002). *Execution: The discipline of getting things done*. New York: Crown.

Buford, J. A., Jr., & Jelinek, S. M. (2006). Traditional pay in public organizations. In R. R. Sims (Ed.), *Human resource management: Contemporary issues, challenges, and opportunities* (pp. 441–454). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Capitalfm (2010). *Changes at Telkom Kenya*, retrieved on 12/08/2010 online from http://www.capitalfm.co.ke/business/Kenyabusiness/Changes-at-Telkom-Kenya-4427.html

Carlisle, K. E., & Murphy, S. E. (1996). *Practical motivation handbook*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Cobb, A. T., Wooten, K. C., & Folger, R. (1995). Justice in the making: Toward understanding the theory and practice of justice in organizational change and development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 8, 243–295.

Condrey, S. E.,McCoy, C. L., & Fleury, J. M. (2006). Compensation: Choosing and using the best system for your organization. In R. R. Sims (Ed.), *Human resource management: Contemporary issues, challenges, and opportunities*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Cope, M. (2003). *The seven C's of consulting* (2nd ed.). London: Financial Times/Prentice- Hall.

Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34–48.

Denning, S. (2005). Transformational innovation. *Strategy and Leadership*, 33(3), 11-16

Flannery, T. P., Hofrichter, D. A., & Platten, P. E. (1996). *People performance and pay: Dynamic compensation for changing organizations*. New York: Free Press.

Florida, R. (2005). *The flight of the creative class*. New York: Harper Business.

Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1999). Unfairness and resistance to change: Hardship as mistreatment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12(1), 35–50.

Follett, M.P. (1924). Creative experience. Retrieved September 6, 2010, from http://www.follettfoundation.org/mpf.htm

Friedman, T.L. (2005). *The world is flat*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Fuqua, D.R., and Kurpius, D. J. (1993, July-August). Conceptual models in organizational consultation. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 602–618.

Ghiselli, E. (1971). *Explorations in management talent*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.

Gilley, A. (2005). *The manager as change leader*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Gilley, A., Gilley, J.W., & McMillan, H.S. (2009). Organizational change: motivation, communication, and leadership effectiveness, *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 21(14), 75-94.

Gilley, J.W., & Boughton, N.W. (1996). *Stop managing, start coaching.* NewYork:McGraw-Hill.

Gilley, J.W., and Maycunich, A. (2000). *Beyond the learning organization: Creating a culture of continuous growth and development through state-of-the-art human resource practices*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Glew, D., O'Leary-Kelly, A., Griffin, R., & VanFleet, D. (1995). Participation in organizations: A preview of the issues and proposed framework for future analysis. *Journal of Management*, 21(3), 395–421.

Graetz, F. (2000). Strategic change leadership. *Management Decision*, 38(8), 550–562

Green, S.E. (2004). A rhetorical theory of diffusion. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 653–669.

Hebda, J.M., Vojak, B.A., Griffin, A., & Price, R.L. (2007). Motivating technical visionaries in large American companies. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 54(3), 433–444.

Hill, L.A. (2004). New manager development for the 21st century. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 121–126.

Hudson, F.M. (1999). *The handbook of coaching: A comprehensive resource guide for managers, executives, consultants, and human resource professionals*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Human Resource Department at Telkom Kenya Limited (September 2010)

Huselid, M. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 635–672.

Ilies, R., Scott, B.A., & Judge, T.A. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intra-individual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 561–575.

Judge, T.A., & Piccolo, R.F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 755-768.

Kanter, R.M., Stein, B.A., & Jick, T.D. (1992), *The challenge of organizational change: How companies experience it and leaders guide it*. New York: Free Press.

Karoly, P. (1993). Mechanisms of self-regulation: A systems view. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, 23–52.

Kavanagh, M.H. & Ashkanasy, N.M. (2006). The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger, *British Journal of Management*, 17(S1), pp. S81-S103.

Kerama, T. (2006) A survey of the application of Kotter's model of strategic change leadership in the insurance industry in Kenya. *Unpublished MBA Research Project*, University of Nairobi.

Knowles, E. S., & Linn, J. A. (2004). The importance of resistance to persuasion. In E. S. Knowles&J.A. Linn (Eds.), *Resistance and persuasion* (pp. 3–9). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kotter, J. P., & Schlesinger, L. A. (1979, March/April). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, 106–114.

Kroth, M. (2007). *The manager as motivator*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Kuhn, T.S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Larson, G.S., & Tompkins, P.K. (2005). Ambivalence and resistance: A study of management in a concertive control system. *Communication Monographs*, 72, 1–21.

Lawler, E., III, Mohrman, S. A., & Ledford, G. (1982). Productivity and the quality of work life. National Productivity Review, 2, 23–36.

LeBoeuf, M. (1985). *Getting results: The secret to motivating yourself and others*. New York: Berkeley Books.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: HarperCollins.

Lewis, R. (1994). From chaos to complexity: Implications for organizations. *Executive Development*, Vol. 7, pp.16-17.

Longenecker, C.O., & Neubert, M. (2000, September–October). Barriers and gateways to management cooperation and teamwork. *Business Horizons*, 37–44.

Lovallo, D., & Kahneman, D. (2003). Delusions of success: How optimism undermines executive decisions. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(7), 56–63.

Luecke, R. (2003). *Managing change and transition*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Lussier, R.N. (2006). *Management fundamentals: Concepts, applications, skill development* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

Lussier, R.N., & Achua, C.F. (2007). *Leadership: Theory, application, and skill development* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: HarperCollins.

McFadden, C., Eakin, R., Beck-Frazer, S., & McGlone, J. (2005). Major approaches to the study of leadership. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 9(2), 71-75

Miles, R.M. (2001). Accelerating corporate transformations by rapidly engaging all employees, *Organizational Dynamics*, pp. 313-21

Mintzberg, H. (2004). Leadership and management development: An afterword. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 140–142.

Mugenda, O.M. and Mugenda, A.G. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative & Qualitative Approaches*, ACTS: Nairobi.

Nadler, D. A. (1998). *Champions of change:HowCEOs andtheircompanies are mastering the skills of radical change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1989, August). Organizational framing bending: Principles for managing reorientation. *Academy of Management Executive*. 194–203.

Norhia, N., Joyce, W., and Robertson, B. (2003). What really works. *Harvard Business Review*, 81, 43-52.

Oh, H., Chung, M.H., & Labianca, G. (2004). Group social capital and group effectiveness: The role of informal socializing ties. *Academy of Management Review*, 47, 860–875.

Parker, G.M. (1990).Team *players and teamwork: The new competitive business strategy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

49

Peterson, D.B., & Hicks, M.D. (1996). *Leader as coach: Strategies for coaching and developing others*. Minneapolis: Personnel Decisions International.

Quinn, R.E. (2004). *Building the bridge as you walk on it,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Risher, H. (2003). Tapping unused employee capabilities. *Public Manager*, 32(5), 34–38.

Robbins, S.P., and Coulter, M. (1996) *Management*. Prentice hall international.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Rousseau, D.M., & Tijoriwala, S.A. (1999, August). What's a good reason to change? Motivated reasoning and social accounts in promoting organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 514–528.

Saunders, R. (1999). Communicating change. *Harvard Management Communication Letter*, 8(1), 35–36.

Schnake, M. (2007). An integrative model of effort propensity. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 274–289.

Sims, R. R. (2002). Employee involvement is still the key to successfully managing change. In S.J. Sims & R.R. Sims (Eds.), *Changing the way we manage change* (pp. 33–54). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Skarlicki, D.P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 82, 434–443.

Skinner, B. F. (1971). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. New York: Knopf.

Telkom Kenya (2010). *About Telkom Kenya,* retrieved on 12/08/2010 online from www.telkom.co.ke

Tomlinson, E.C., Dineen, B.R., & Lewicki, R.J. (2004). The road to reconciliation: Antecedents of victim willingness to reconcile following a broken promise. *Journal of Management*, 30, 165–187.

Trent, R. J. (2004). Becoming an effective teaming organization. *Business Horizons*, 47, 33–41.

Ulrich, D. (1998). *Champions of change: How CEOs and their companies are mastering the skills of radical change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ulrich, D., Zenger, J.,& Smallwood, N. (1999). *Results-based leadership: How leaders build the business and improve the bottom line*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Weick, K.E., & Sutcliffe, K.M. (2001). *Managing the unexpected: Assuring high performance in an age of complexity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Weick, K.E., and Quinn, R.E. (1999) Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361-386.

Whitmore, J. (1997). *Coaching for performance: The new edition of the practical guide*. London: Nicholas Brealey.

Wikipedia (2010) *Telkom Kenya*, retrieved on 12/08/2010 online from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telkom_Kenya

Williams, S. (2001). Increasing employees' creativity by training their managers. *Industrial and Commercial Training*. 33(2), 63–68.

Yuki, G. (2006). *Leadership in organisations* (6th Ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall: Pearson Education.

Zhou, J., & George, J. M. (2003). Awakening employee creativity: The role of leader emotional intelligence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 545–568.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Introduction Letter

RE: REQUEST TO COLLECT DATA FOR MBA RESEARCH PROJECT

I am a student at the University of Nairobi pursuing a Masters of Business Administration program. Pursuant to the pre-requisite course work, I am conducting a research project on **The Relationship between Leadership Behavior and Organizational Change: A Case of Telkom Kenya Limited**. Your organisation has therefore been selected for the study.

I am kindly requesting you to take time and fill in the questionnaire. Your responses will be useful in fulfilling the objectives of this study. The information that will be provided will be used for academic purpose only. Your assistance is highly valued. Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

....

Prisca Murigu   Florence Muindi

MBA Student   Supervisor

52

Appendix 2: Research Questionnaire

Section A: Demographic information

1. Kindle state the following:

Your gender: Male   [   ]

                    Female   [   ]

Your age: Below 25 years   [   ]

                    25-30 years   [   ]

                    31-40 years   [   ]

                    41-50 years   [   ]

                    Over 50 years   [   ]

Years in the company: Less than 5 years [   ]

                    5-10 years   [   ]

                    11-15 years   [   ]

                    16-20 years   [   ]

                    21-25 years   [   ]

                    Over 25 years   [   ]

Section B: Leadership Behavior

2. The following items describe aspects of leadership behavior. Respond to each item according to the way you would most likely act if you were the leader of a work group. Circle whether you would most likely behave in the described way: always (5), frequently (4), occasionally (3), seldom (2), or never (1). [Adapted from Gilley, A., Gilley, J.W., and McMillan, H.S. (2009)]

		1	2	3	4	5
1	I would most likely act as the spokesman of the group.					
2	I would encourage overtime work.					
3	I would allow members complete freedom in their work.					
4	I would encourage the use of uniform procedures.					
5	I would permit the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.					
6	I would stress being ahead of competing groups.					
7	I would speak as a representative of the group.					
8	I would push members for greater effort.					
9	I would try out my ideas in the group.					
10	I would let the members do their work the way they think best.					
11	I would be working hard for a promotion.					

12	I would tolerate postponement and uncertainty					
13	I would speak for the group if there were visitors present.					
14	I would keep the work moving at a rapid pace.					
15	I would turn the members loose on a job and let them go to it.					
16	I would settle conflicts when they occur in the group.					
17	I would get swamped by details.					
18	I would present the group at outside meetings.					
20	I would be reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.					
21	I would decide what should be done and how it should be done.					
22	I would push for increased production.					
23	I would let some members have authority, which I could keep.					
24	Things would usually turn out as I predicted.					
25	I would allow the group a high degree of initiative.					
26	I would assign group members to particular tasks.					
27	I would be willing to make changes.					
28	I would ask the group members to work harder.					
30	I would trust the group members to exercise good judgment.					
31	I would schedule the work to be done.					
32	I would refuse to explain my actions.					
33	I would persuade others that my ideas are to their advantage.					
34	I would permit the group to set its own pace.					
35	I would urge the group to beat its previous record.					
36	I would act without consulting the group.					
37	I would ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.					

Section C: Change Management

3. Kindly assess the change management process in your organisation based on the key below: [Adapted from: Weick, K.E., and Quinn, R.E. (1999)]

1 means strongly disagree

2 means moderately disagree

3 means neutral

4 means moderately agree

5 means strongly agree

Telkom Kenya …………….. (Tick in the appropriate box below using the keys above)

		1	2	3	4	5
1	Examines external trends, issues and problems confronting it					
2	Identifies and discusses actual or potential crises or major opportunities					
3	Establishes an increased sense of urgency around needed change					
4	Puts together a group with enough power to lead the change					

54

5	Gets the group to work together effectively as a team					
6	Creates a vision and strategy to help guide the change effort					
7	Ensures that it is a shared vision and strategy					
8	Continuously uses every available vehicle to communicate the new vision and strategy					
9	Has the leadership team role-model the behavior expected of employees					
10	Eliminates obstacles to the planned change					
11	Modifies systems or structures that undermine the change vision					
12	Encourages reasonable risk-taking and non-traditional ideas and actions					
13	Focuses on results rather than activities					
14	Plans for visible short-term improvements in performance (quick "wins")					
15	Visibly recognizes and rewards people who make the wins possible					
16	Monitors and adjusts strategies in response to problems in the change process					
17	Aligns all policies, systems, structures and practices to fit each other and The change vision					
18	Hires, promotes and develops people who can implement the change vision					
19	Reinvigorates the change process through new projects, themes and change agents					
20	Articulates the connection between new behaviors and organizational success					
21	Creates processes to ensure leadership development and succession					