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This research was motivated by an interest in identifying the strategic change management practices in the International NGOs in Kenya. It was noted that within the large body of strategic-change literature, the research efforts have focused almost exclusively on the profit-making and Governmental organizations. The review of literature further indicates that the paradox of complexity is that it makes things exceedingly difficult: rapid change is endemic and inevitable in post-modern society; a system which self-generates complex dynamics over and over again (Fallon as cited in Val & Fuentes 2003). In this rapidly evolving environment that the INGOs in Kenya operate in, it is likely that those organizations that are not willing or able to change to meet such challenges may risk failure or close down. Thus, the question of how INGOs might change in this 21st century has become a key issue for those involved in delivering and managing them. INGOs can no longer afford to sit back and react to, still less ignore external influences; they will need to re-think and re-shape if they are to improve, develop and compete within the changing environment.

For INGOs, this study has several important implications. First, it suggests that strategic change process is seen through the change in emphasis and content of INGOs’ visions, missions, strategies and objectives that now so readily appear on their websites, in their marketing campaigns and in their strategic plans submitted to the funding agencies. Secondly, the results of this study identified that the four main forces that trigger strategic change in INGOs are the economic situation (e.g. recession), donor agencies’ requirements, availability or scarcity of resources and leadership. Therefore, INGOs will be able to respond proactively to these forces.

As discussed by Burns (2004), organizations approach strategic change process as a continuous, open-minded and unpredictable process of aligning & realigning the organization to its changing environment; the results of this study agree with that. Moreover, the change necessitates the training of employees that build their capacity to achieve the set goals. The research also found that in carrying out strategic change process, there is need to communicate to all employees about change done mainly during staff meetings. The basic premise is that in INGOs, changes along dimensions of strategy are reflective of a process of trial and error learning, whereby the CEO do not expect the external environment to organize itself to meet their needs.

The two main sources of individual resistance to strategic change in INGOs are the threats to power and influence, and the fear of unknown. The behavioral resistance to change is expected in INGOs, thus, the change team mandated the responsibility to oversee change execution must deal with the resistance and be proactive in minimizing the resistance through education, communication, participation, support and facilitation. The top management in INGOs being the key change initiator is obliged to prepare the employees and other stakeholders for change by checking for the readiness for change achieved by ensuring there is high dissatisfaction with current situation and low perceived personal risk from change. Strategic change must become part of business as usual for INGOs, that is done routinely and a having a culture that expects change.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The Concept of Strategic Change

The world today is a place of constant change, with stories of corporate mergers, layoffs, bankruptcy, redesigning, turnaround and restructuring hitting the news every day. No wonder recently, strategic change has become an increasing focus for management attention. By definition, strategic change is an empirical observation in an organizational entity of variations in shape, quality or state over time after the deliberate introduction of new ways of thinking, acting and operating (Van & Poole, 1995). The general aim of strategic change is an adaptation to the environment or an improvement in performance (Boeker, 1997; Leana & Barry, 2000 and Keck & Tushman, 1993). Contributing to this, Ragsdell (2000) commented that the intention of any organizational change is to move the organization from its current state to a more desirable and improved state. This means there is a "before" and an "after" state.

21st century review of strategic change by (Weick & Quinn, 1999) showed a detailed comparison of 2 different models of strategic change, namely: - (a) change that is episodic, discontinuous and intermittent; (b) change that is continuous, evolving and incremental. The two forms clustered by the tempo of change understood as the ‘characteristic rate, rhythm or pattern of work or activity’. The tempo distinguishes the kind of innovation pursued and its implementation process. Different kinds of innovation are characterized by their radicalism in terms of level of risk & novelty of innovation (King & Anderson, 1995). Further contribution by (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985) suggests that radical innovations occur during period of discontinuous change. This is in contrast to incremental innovations, which occur in adaptable periods.

Barker (1993) observes that whatever the perception of strategic change, it means entering new territory and playing the game by new rules. A paradigm shift is called for and, whether it is welcomed or resisted, the paradigm shift needs to be managed.
1.1.2 Strategic Change Management Practices

Strategic change management is yet to develop to a distinct discipline with clear-cut concepts, theories/arguments and practice. Its current theories and practice borrow heavily from social science schools of thought that form the foundation for change management, which include: individual behaviour, group dynamics and open systems (Maalu, 2007). Moran and Brightman (2001) define strategic change management as 'the process of continually renewing an organization’s direction, structure, and capabilities to serve the ever-changing needs of external and internal customers'.

Change is an ever-present feature of organizational life, both at an operational and strategic level. Therefore, there should be no doubt regarding the importance to any organization of its ability to identify where it needs to be in the future, and how to manage the changes required getting there (Burnes, 2004). For survival and success of any organization in a highly competitive, complex and continuous evolving environment, strategic change management is inevitable. Thus, its management is becoming a highly required managerial skill (Senior, 2002 & Graetz, 2000). Senior (2002) goes as far as suggesting that against a backdrop of increasing globalization, deregulation and the rapid pace of technological innovation; few would dispute that the primary task for management today is the leadership of organizational change.

A recent report indicated a failure rate of around 70 per cent of all change programmes initiated (Balogun & Hope 2004 and Okumus & Hemmington, 1998). Burnes (2004) suggested that this poor success rate indicates a fundamental lack of a valid framework of how to implement and manage organizational change. What is currently available to academics and practitioners is a wide range of contradictory and confusing theories and approaches (Burnes, 2004). Apparently, it is difficult to identify any consensus regarding a framework for organizational change management but there is an agreement on two important issues. Firstly, it is agreed that the pace of change has never been greater than in the current business environment. Secondly, there is a consensus that change being triggered by internal or external factors comes in all shapes, forms and sizes, therefore, affects all organizations in all industries (Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2004., Burnes, 2004; Carnall, 2003 and Kotter, 1995).
Senior (as cited in Todnem, 2005) identified three categories of change as a structure with which to link other main theories and approaches to strategic change management. These three categories have been identified as change characterized (i) by the rate of occurrence; (ii) by how it comes about, and (iii) by scale. An approach to change characterized by the rate of occurrence is a situation where organisations and their people continually monitor, sense and respond to the external and internal environment in small steps as an ongoing process (Luecke as cited in Todnem, 2005). In the case where change is characterized by how it comes about, there are several different approaches; however, the literature is dominated by planned change initiated in 1946 by Lewin and emergent change (Bamford and Forrester, 2003).

According to Lewin (as cited in Eldrod II & Tippett, 2002) a successful change project must, therefore, involve the three steps of unfreezing the present level, moving to the new level and refreezing this new level. The emergent approach to change emphasizes that change should not be perceived as a series of linear events within a given period of time, but as a continuous, open-ended process of adaptation to changing circumstances and conditions (Burnes, 1996, 2004; Dawson, 1994). Criticism to the two approaches is the work of Dunphy and Stace (1993) who argues that managers and consultants need a model of change that is essentially a situational or contingency model. This model indicates how to vary change strategies to achieve optimum fit with the changing environment. The third category, that is, change characterized by scale, there is less confusion as there seems to be some wider agreement. Dunphy and Stace (1993) noted that change identified by scale can be divided into four different characteristics: fine-tuning, incremental adjustment, modular transformation, and corporate transformation.

1.1.3 International Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Kenya

In recent past, there has been immense growth of NGOs in Kenya, from 500 in 1992 to 2500 in 2002 in NGOs Bureau Annual Records; and the amount of resources they control has increased tremendously. One of the reasons is the oft-quoted comparative advantage or the ability of NGOs to deliver development services cost-effectively to those most in need (Onyando, n.d.). Kameri (2002) noted that given the plethora of legal instruments governing NGOs in Kenya prior to the promulgation of the NGO Coordination Act, there was no definition for NGO. An NGO is
defined to mean a private voluntary grouping of individuals or associations not operated for profit or other commercial purposes but which have organized themselves nationally or internationally for the benefit of the public at large and for promotion of social welfare development, charity or research in the areas inclusive but not restricted to health relief, agricultural, education, industry and supply of amenities and services (NGO Coordination Act 1990).

NGO Coordination Board establishes a government agency and a self-regulatory agency to govern NGOs and their operations in Kenya. The Government agency is the NGO Coordination Board consisting of about 20 government appointees. The functions of the Board include coordinating and facilitating the work of NGOs, maintaining the register of NGOs, receiving and discussing reports for NGOs, advising the government on the activities and role of NGOs, providing policy guidelines to NGOs, approving reports of the NGO council and approval of the NGO code prepared by the NGO Council. The self-regulatory agency is the Kenya National Council of NGOs which is given powers to adopt its own structure rules and proceedings. It is mandated to ensure self-regulation of NGOs via a code of conduct and other regulation on such matters as activities, funding, foreign affiliations, national security, training and institutional building. Consequently, the council has established, in-ter alia, an executive committee, a board of trustees and the general assembly as the administrative structure.

The NGO Coordination Board reports indicates that by mid-2008, it has cumulatively registered over 5,000 NGOs, out of which 1500 are INGOs. The board adds that the impact of globalization and the opening up of democratic space in Kenya has further contributed to an expansion in NGO sector activities in the country. The past two years have witnessed growth in the number of INGOs seeking registration. According to Kameri (2002) World Bank 1999 estimates NGOs in Kenya have annual development expenditure of $150-$200 million. These figures showing the volume of funds in the hands of NGOs at a time of global financial crisis and dwindling aid levels illustrate their growing importance in development. Further estimates show that the NGO sector contributes up to Kenya Shillings (Kshs) 80 billion to the country’s economy and is responsible for over 100,000 employment opportunities. The NGOs are spread
all over the country and vary from small organisations operating locally to international ones with regional programmes. They range from those run by small teams of volunteers to mega organisations with hundreds of fully paid professional staff and sophisticated systems and processes. For the purpose of this study, we will focus on the NGOs organized internationally for social-economic development of Kenya.

INGOs are involved virtually in all spheres of life including health, education, governance, environment, human rights, HIV/AIDS, micro finance and poverty eradication among many others. To understand the INGOs operating in Kenya, drawing from the NGOs Co-ordination Board, INGOs have specific characteristics, which distinguish them from government organizations, profit-making firms or other registered private groupings. Thus, the term INGOs will be applied to organizations which possess characteristics which include: coordination - an established or permanent institution with a degree of organizational structure, such as regular meetings, and rules of procedures; international presence - an NGO operates in two countries or more, that is, the home country and other countries; voluntary - formed freely, willingly, spontaneously by individuals, groups or organizations with an element of voluntary participation; self-governing and self-regulating - have their own internal procedures for governance but nonetheless operate within accepted norms of society as a whole; not for profit sharing - not profit making organizations, but where profits are accrued, they are ploughed back to the community through the organization.

1.2 The Research Problem

There are forces that affect the way INGOs operate in Kenya, thus depicting dependency on the environment that is perceived as a threat to the INGOs autonomy and accountability to the public. This puts pressure on the management of INGOs in Kenya to respond to meet the challenge, thus, the need for strategic change management practices to adapt to the dynamic environment for their survival and success. The forces that operate in the context of the INGOs in Kenya include: demand to comply with home or host country’s legislation or international governance; state-of-art technology (such as a database management systems in the countries of operation); competing for human resources with profit-making organizations especially for
competent staff with high pay and benefits; matching up to the benchmarked NGOs beyond the border and high-level accountability demanded by funders. INGOs depend on the external environment that act as input interface (where they get the resources such as donor funding, raw materials and even the needy target groups' e.g. street children or HIV & AIDS victims). Besides the input interface, INGOs depend on output interface to accept the products or services produced in the projects. Kameri (2002) observed that in 1988, approximately 10% of the external aid used by Kenyan NGOs was through direct funding; the rest about 90% was through Northern NGOs.

Contributions on strategic change management practices (Balogun & Hope, 2004., Burnes, 2004., Graetz, 2000. and Moran & Brightman, 2001) as earlier noted show the significance of strategic change management practices in the field of strategic management. On the other hand, research on NGOs (Kameri, 2002. and Onyando, n.d.) observed that NGOs are essential for Kenya's development. The forces that operate in the context noted above, call for a strategic change management response in order for the INGOs to grow and achieve the overall objective of improving the livelihood of Kenyans. Yet there are significant gaps in understanding the strategic change management process in the INGOs. Thus, developing strategic change management practices in the INGOs will help remove the perception that change can be handled in an ad hoc basis. NGOs must undertake strategic change management and managing change should become part of business as usual. How change happens or should be introduced and also how it is strategically managed will be the focus of this research.

1.3 The Research Objective
To identify the strategic change management practices in the INGOs in Kenya

1.4 Importance of the Study
This research will be beneficial to various stakeholders. Firstly, the management of INGOs will get insight into strategic change management in order to anticipate the changes and create an internal environment that responds to the changes. Secondly, the study will underscore the need for strategic change management practices' knowledge in the management of INGOs for their
sustainability and success. Thirdly, the INGOs that are going through strategic changes can be
guided to successfully manage them by the findings of this study. Fourthly, the study will
contribute to the young and growing field of strategic change management; researchers can
explore the findings of this study for further research in the comprehension and responding to
strategic change management in the contemporary world. Finally, the policy makers for INGOs
will gain immensely in the formulation of strategic change management practices.
2.1 Strategic Change

Strategy is what an organization does; how it actually positions itself commercially and conducts the ‘competitive battle’ (Koch & Koch, 2000). Contributing to the definition, Johnson and Whittington (2005) define strategy as the direction and scope of an organisation over the long-term. This helps achieve an advantage for the organisation through its configuration of resources within a challenging environment, to meet the needs of markets and to fulfil stakeholder expectations. Thus, strategic direction is the overall long-term plan that describes the state of where an organization wants to be and how to get there. In other words, strategy is about: where is the business trying to get to in the long-term - direction? Which markets should a business compete in and what kinds of activities are involved in such markets - markets; scope? How can the business perform better than the competition in those markets - advantage? What resources-skills, assets, finance, relationships, technical competence, and facilities are required in order to be able to compete-resources? What external, environmental factors affect the businesses' ability to compete- environment? What are the values and expectations of those who have power in and around the business –stakeholders? (Strategy London, 2008).

In its broadest sense, strategic management is about taking strategic decisions - decisions that answer the questions above. In practice, a thorough strategic management process has three main components, namely, strategic analysis, strategic choice and strategy implementation. Strategic analysis is all about the analyzing the strength of businesses' position and understanding the important external factors that may influence that position. Strategic choice process involves understanding the nature of stakeholder expectations - the ground rules, identifying strategic options, and then evaluating and selecting strategic options. Strategy implementation is often the hardest part. When a strategy has been analysed and selected, the task is then to translate it into organizational action.

Tichy (1983) observed that organizations today face major, discontinuous change that makes strategic management more difficult and more complex than ever. That explains why in this contemporary world, strategic change has become an increasing focus for management attention. By definition, strategic change is an empirical observation in an organizational entity of
variations in shape, quality or state over time after the deliberate introduction of new ways of
thinking, acting and operating (Van & Poole, 1995). Therefore, strategic change is one that
involves fundamental changes in the business of the organization and its future direction. The
general aim of strategic change is an adaptation to the environment (Barr, Stimpert & Huff,
(Boeker, 1997; Keck & Tushman, 1993). This will help to build and maintain sustainable
competitive advantage and to maximize shareholders’ worth.

Change can be defined along a continuum starting in low-scope or evolutionary changes to high-
scope or strategic ones but always keeping in mind that real change is not a pure type but a
mixture. First, we have the evolutionary incremental also referred to as first order changes.
Nadler and Tushman (as cited in Val & Fuentes, 2003) highlighted that these small changes that
alter certain small aspects and looking for an improvement in the present situation but keeping
the general working framework. The second types of changes are strategic, transformational,
and revolutionary or second order ones. They are radical transformations, where the
organization totally changes its essential framework (Bluementhal & Haspeslagh as cited in Val
& Fuentes, 2003). The organization looks generally for competitive advantage and aspects that
affect the basic capabilities of the organization (Hutt, Walker & Frankwick, 1995).

Hyde (2008) observed that when preparing for strategic change, one needs to ask how ready the
organization is in proceeding with a strategic change. These include: - sponsorship of the
change- that is, to what extent are the leaders and managers in the organization in support of the
change effort? Are they willing to change their own behaviours in order to make this change
happen? Resistance - are the various stakeholders indicating a reluctance to support the change?
Are powerful individuals able to prevent the change from occurring? Culture- is the culture of
the organization threatened by the change? Do individuals in the organization understand the
need to change the corporate culture? Business Capacity- does the organization have the
required resources and tools necessary to make change happen? Specifically, do they have time
in addition to their daily tasks; do they have the necessary project management skills or the
know-how necessary to implement the change?
Framing change—how should an organization approach change? One way is to look at the change from multiple perspectives simultaneously. This is called reframing and involves looking at a particular situation from four different angles: the structural frame; the human resource frame; the political frame and the symbolic frame as elaborated in the diagram below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Frame: Processes, new technologies, organizational design involved in Change</th>
<th>Human Resource Frame: “What’s In It For Me?” How will the change impact the lives of individuals involved? How can you mobilize and empower for change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame: What are the sources of power and how can they be used to realize the results of the Change? Who can prevent the change from occurring? How will the change affect the balance of power?</td>
<td>Symbolic Frame: What is the impact to the organization’s culture? What symbols can be used to facilitate the change? What cultural icons are lost as a result of the change?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Hyde (2008) further says that change is about people; and people hate change. He adds that what most organizations forget is that the benefits of a new system and a new approach to the business are not realized until people change their behaviour. A change in behavior cannot be realized until after the initiative has been implemented. In other words, change begins with an ending. Paradoxical as this might seem, every change involves giving up something and taking a leap of faith into the unknown. The time between the change and the realization of the results of that change is what is called the neutral-zone also referred to as the realization gap. The realization gap is the time between the implementation and the realization of the benefits of the change. Most initiatives are given up because organizations don’t see the gap for what it is; the transition between the old world and the new.
2.2 Strategic Change Management Practices

Strategic change management is still a growing field in the strategic management; thus, it is yet to develop to a distinct discipline with clear-cut concepts, theories or arguments and practice. Maalu (2007) noted that the current theories and practice borrow heavily from social science schools of thought that form the foundation for change management. These schools of thought include: individual behaviour, group dynamics and open systems. Individual behaviour—behaviour is learned and the learning takes place through some external stimulus like reward, punishment and reinforcement. Psychologists add that individual's behaviour is influenced by use of reason to interpret these external stimuli. Regarding the group dynamics school of thought; individuals are members of groups and the individuals' behaviour is a function of the group environment. Individuals behave in a way to conform to group pressures where groups have norms, roles and values. From open systems school of thought, organizations are composed of a number of interconnected subsystems. A change in one subsystem impacts on the other subsystems. These subsystems are in constant interaction with the environment hence open. The main subsystems are: goals and values subsystem; technical subsystem; psychosocial subsystem; and managerial subsystem.

An in-depth analysis of strategic change management by Higgins and Vincze (as cited in Davidson, 1999) identified a typology of meanings for the term change management. The meanings include: accelerating rates of change; increasing competition; globalization of business; technical change; changing nature of the workforce; transition from industrial to knowledge society; unstable market conditions; increasing demands of constituents; and complexity of strategic management environment.

In the wake of the discontinuous, large-scale changes facing the world, for instance, the 2008 economic recession that has hit the world starting with the United Stated of America; organizations are required to undergo major strategic reorientations. These reorientations involve changes in products, services, markets, organization structure and human resource systems (Tichy, 1983). Accelerating rate of change is producing a business world in which customary managerial habits and organizations are increasingly inadequate. Experience was an
adequate guide when changes could be made in small increments. But intuitive and experience-based management philosophies are grossly inadequate when decisions are strategic and have major irreversible consequences (Henderson & Bruce, 1979).

Further contribution by Tichy (1983) highlighted that when faced with conditions of strategic organizational changes, managers often focus on small components of the overall change problem. This can lead to a fixation on tactical concerns which includes: should we change from functional structure to a matrix structure? Should we centralize or decentralize? These concerns are tactical if they do not fit within an overall framework for change. Change within such a framework has profound effect in the overall reshaping of the organization. All too often, fad and fashion or personal productivity guide decisions about change rather than hard-nosed systematic analysis of the organization and managerial conditions that require a response.

Tichy (1983) added that in the past, and in simpler organizations with less turbulent and stressful environments, there was more room for trial-and-error approaches to these concerns. But we have now moved into the era of discontinuous change brought about by energy problems, finite resource limits, competition cleavage between developed and underdeveloped nations and a world of economy that does not function effectively and efficiently. Organizations, now facing these complex and hostile environments need to be more systematic and have informed means of making major strategic changes required for organizational survival and viability. Contemporary change management practice is limited because managers and consultants tend to focus attention on a restricted set of organizational change levers. That is, regardless of the nature of the problem, they tend to employ the same change levers. Some always restructure the organization; others try to improve communication while others replace people. What narrows the focus?

Managers and practitioners tend to view the change process from only one perspective, to the exclusion of others. That is, some view change solely as a technical problem while others see it as solely a political problem. Still others see it as solely a cultural problem. The traditional technical perspective regarding organizations and change prescribes change strategies based on empiricism and enlightened self-interest. This solely engineering or technical problem leads to
problems. An example was the General Motors, Ohio plant that was built to produce the Vega automobile in the early 1970s (Tichy, 1983). The plant was billed by GM as the most modern and technically efficient auto assembly plant in the world. Actual performance, however, fell far below the expectations of management, there was high absenteeism and low quality control with low productivity below the target and eventually strike resulted. The other tradition views organizations as political entities that can only be changed by the exercise of power by the dominant groups over those with less power or by bargaining among powerful groups. This view is likely to be dysfunctional, it can lead to low levels of trust, cynicism and a view that all interactions are win/lose bargaining situations. Finally, the tradition that views organization as cultural systems of values with shared symbols and shared cognitive schemes that tie people together and form a common organizational culture. Change comes about by altering the norms and cognitive schemes of the members of the organization. Many organizations’ overreliance on purely cultural orientation has limited their use of other change approaches, especially those derived from the organization design and management fields.

According to Tichy (1983) it is the tendency to subscribe to one dominant mode of change strategy that is a major reason for little that is known about how to manage change. He proposed a more comprehensive view that acknowledges all the three approaches continuously in order to resolve the three change dilemmas. The technical, political and cultural problems are portrayed as three interrelated strands of a rope called the strategic rope. Strategic management is the task of keeping the rope from becoming unraveled in the face the technical, political and cultural problems. Strategic change is the realignment of the three strands.

In order to strategically manage change, the following change levers must be equally available for use. Firstly, the external interface: as the environment becomes more complex and turbulent, the task of identifying and predicting measures becomes more difficult to understand. It is also more difficult to map environmental pressures. The development of new environmental scanning and information processing capabilities is often required. Other change levers include: mission-in times of relative environmental stability and surplus resources, it is possible for organizations to function quite effectively with nebulous shifting goals and priorities. But as the economic,
political, social pressures mount, so does the need for clear statements of organizational mission to guide the organization in strategic decisions. Strategy— the development of a strategic plan with operational objectives at multiple levels in the organization is a vital requirement. As planning and decision making become more complex, it is necessary to develop more sophisticated processes that realistically engage the relevant interest groups (Tichy, 1983).

A shift in strategy may entail the introduction of new tasks and technologies in the organization. This requirement may result in the introduction of new professionals into the organization or the training and development of existing staff. Prescribed networks— adjustments are required in the networks of communication and authority to deal with new tasks and/or technologies. The introduction of new tasks requires management to plan and prescribe the necessary network of communication. This includes specifications of who works with whom to accomplish what tasks as well as who reports to whom. People— any organizational change entails altering individual behaviour. Thus, an explicit focus on motivating people becomes part of the managed change process. Emergent networks— a major part of an organizational change process is to manage the informal communication and influence networks that exist throughout the organization. Coalitions and cliques in these networks can facilitate or hinder the change effort and thus need explicit attention. The eight change levers represent the agenda of strategic change management.

ADKAR is a useful framework for change management teams in the planning and execution of their work (Prosci, 1998). The framework developed after research with more than 300 companies undergoing major change projects. To use the framework effectively, one needs to understand the underlying change initiatives. In the diagram below, change happens on two dimensions: the business dimension (vertical axis) and the people dimension (horizontal axis). Successful change happens when both dimensions of change occur simultaneously.
The business dimension of change includes the typical project elements, namely: - business need or opportunity is identified; project is defined (scope and objectives); business solution is designed (new processes, systems and organizational structure); new processes and systems are developed; and the solution is implemented into the organization. On the people dimension of change, research shows that problems with the people dimension of change is the most commonly cited reason for project failures. In a study with 248 companies, effective change management with employees was listed as one of the top-three overall success factors for the project. Helping managers be effective sponsors of change was considered the most critical success factor overall. Effective management of the people dimension of change requires managing five key goals that form the basis of the ADKAR model. The key goals are: awareness of the need to change; desire to participate and support the change; knowledge of how to change (and what the change looks like); ability to implement the change on a day-to-day basis; and the reinforcement to keep the change in place.
2.3 Models of Managing Strategic Change

There is an ever-growing generic literature emphasizing the importance of change and suggesting ways to approach it, yet very little empirical evidence has been provided in support of the different theories and approaches suggested (Guimaraes & Armstrong, 1998). Senior’s (2002) identified three categories of change as a structure with which to link other main theories and approaches. These three categories have been identified as change characterized by the rate of occurrence; by scale; and by how it comes about. For this discussion, the emphasis is on the look into the change that is characterized by how it comes about. When change is characterized by how it comes about, there are several different approaches; however, the literature is dominated by planned and emergent change (Bamford & Forrester, 2003). Planned change views organization change as a process of moving form one fixed state to another through a series of pre-planned steps. Emergent change approach emerged in the 1980s. Emergent change approach views change as a continuous, open ended and unpredictable process of aligning and realigning the organization to its changing environment. There are a number of theoretical models of change that explains the two major forms of change.

2.3.1 Models of Planned Change

Kurt Lewin first coined the term ‘action research’ in about 1944 and it appears in his 1946 paper action research and minority problems (Action Research Boston, 2008). In the paper, he described action research as a comparative research on the conditions and effects of various forms of social action and research leading to social action that uses a spiral of steps. Each of the steps is composed of a circle of planning, action and fact-finding about the result of the action. It refers to programs and interventions designed to solve a problem or improve a condition. The action research process involves the perception of the problem by some key individuals, that is, consultation with experts. Then systematic data gathering about the system relative to some goal; taking action by altering selected variables within the system; evaluating the results by collecting more data and taking action again.

The second model is further work by Lewin. According to Lewin (as cited in Eldrod II & Tippett, 2002) a successful change project must, therefore, involve the three steps of unfreezing
the present level, moving to the new level and refreezing this new level. This model of change recognizes the need to discard old behaviour, structures, processes and culture before successfully adopting new approaches (Bamford and Forrester, 2003). Even though this three-step model was adopted as a general framework for understanding the process of organisational change, it is rather broad (Eldrod II and Tippett, 2002). Several authors have, therefore, developed Lewin's work in an attempt to make it more practical (Bamford and Forrester, 2003). By reviewing more than 30 models of planned change, Bullock and Batten (1985) developed a four-phase model of planned change that splits the process into exploration, planning, action and integration. Exploration phase involves awareness of need for change and searching for solutions. Planning phase involves understanding the problem, collecting information, setting change goals and designing action plans. Action phase involving arrangements for managing change and feedback processes. Finally the Integration phase involving consolidating and stabilizing change and reinforcing new behaviours. According to Burnes (2004) this is a highly applicable model for most change situations.

Other models include the work of Kotter (1995) where he outlined an eight step process with suggestions to help organizations transform. Increase urgency where one examines market and competitive realities, identify and discuss crisis, potential crisis, or major opportunities and provide evidence from outside the organization that change is necessary. Build the guiding team by assembling a group with enough power to lead the change effort, attract key change leaders by showing enthusiasm and commitment and encourage the group to work together as a team. Get the vision right by creating a vision to help direct the change effort and developing strategies for achieving that vision. Communicate for buy-in using every vehicle possible to communicate the new vision and strategies, keep communication simple and heartfelt and then teach new behaviours by the example of the guiding coalition. Empowering action by getting rid of obstacles to the change, change systems or structures that seriously undermine the vision, encourage risk-taking, non-traditional ideas, activities and actions. Create short term wins where one plans for visible performance improvements, create those improvements and recognize and reward personnel involved in the improvements. Do not let up by planning for visible performance improvements, create those improvements and recognize and reward personnel
involved in the improvements. Finally, make change stick by articulating the connections between the new behaviours and corporate success and developing the means to ensure leadership development and succession.

Beckhard and Harris's (1987) formulated the fifth model that is a change formula identified as a mathematical representation of the change process. The Change model formula (change equation) is: $D \times V \times F > R$; in words, Dissatisfaction x Vision x First Steps > Resistance to Change. The basic notion is that, for change to occur, the costs of change ($R$) must be outweighed by dissatisfaction with the status quo ($D$), the desirability of the proposed change ($V$), and the practicality of the change ($F$). It is important to note that the three components must all be present to overcome the resistance to change in an organization. In other words, dissatisfaction with the present situation, a vision of what is possible in the future, and achievable first steps towards reaching this vision.

Even though the planned approach to change is long established and held to be highly effective (Bamford & Forrester, 2003. and Burnes, 2004) it has come under increasing criticism since the early 1980s (Kanter, Stein & Jick, 1992. and Burnes, 1996). Firstly, it is suggested that the approach's emphasis is on small-scale and incremental change, and it is, therefore, not applicable to situations that require rapid and transformational change (Burnes, 1996, 2004. and Senior, 2002). Secondly, the planned approach is based on the assumptions that organisations operate under constant conditions, and that they can move in a pre-planned manner from one stable state to another (Bamford & Forrester, 2003). Moreover, it is suggested that organizational change is more an open-ended and continuous process than a set of pre-identified set of discrete and self-contained events (Burnes, 1996, 2004). By attempting to lay down timetables, objectives and methods in advance it is suggested that the process of change becomes too dependent on senior managers. Wilson (as cited in Todnem, 2005) noted that the managers in many instances do not have a full understanding of the consequences of their actions.

Finally, the critics argue that the planned approach to change presumes that all stakeholders in a change project are willing and interested in implementing it and that a common agreement can
be reached (Bamford & Forrester, 2003). This presumption clearly ignores organizational politics and conflict, and assumes these can be easily identified and resolved (Burnes, 1996, 2004). In response to this criticism of the planned approach to organizational change, the emergent approach has gained ground. Rather than seeing change to be top-down driven, the emergent approach tends to see change driven from the bottom up (Bamford & Forrester, 2003, and Burnes, 2004).

2.3.2 The Models of Emergent Change

The emergent approach suggests change to be so rapid that it is impossible for senior managers effectively to identify, plan and implement the necessary organizational responses (Kanter, Stein & Jick, 1992). The emergent approach to change emphasizes that change should not be perceived as a series of linear events within a given period of time, but as a continuous, open-ended process of adaptation to changing circumstances and conditions (Burnes, 1996, 2004; Dawson, 1994). Apart from only being a method of changing organizational practices and structures, change is also perceived as a process of learning (Davidson & De, 1999, and Dunphy & Stace, 1993).

Although Pettigrew and Whipp (1993) argue there are no universal rules when it comes to leading and managing change, several advocates of the emergent approach have suggested several models of emergent change. University of Ulster (2007) noted the processual model, an approach that seeks to understand change as it happens. Change is a complex, unpredictable and continual process and organisations are characterised by conflict, power struggles and politics hence the need to fully understand the context and substance of change. Therefore, temporal aspects of change are used as a means of breaking down the complex process of organizational change into manageable portions and then have organizational transition with new work practices.

The second emergent change model is the logical incrementalism developed by Quinn (as cited in Maalu, 2007). He claimed that strategic management involves guiding actions and events towards a conscious strategy in a step-by-step process. Managers nurture and promote strategies
that are themselves changing. The patterns of change come through creating awareness and commitment incrementally, amplify understanding and awareness. There is also changing symbols that involve building credibility; legitimizing new viewpoints; making tactful shifts and partial solution. After which the management broadens the political support to overcome opposition, structure flexibility, systematic trial and waiting. It is followed by solidifying the progress incrementally by creating pockets of commitment. Finally, the integration of processes through an incremental process not piecemeal and rewarding key thrust.

Senge (1990) learning organization model is the third model of emergent change. This is whereby organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire. The new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, collective aspiration is set free and where people are continually learning to learn together. A learning organization does not suddenly adopt strategic change, but is perpetually seeking it. A learning organization uses learning, experimentation and communication to renew itself constantly; are adaptive to their external environment; continually enhance their capability to change; develop collective as well as individual learning and uses the results of learning to achieve better results.

There are other authors who offer more practical guidance to organisations and managers as models of emergent change. Three of these authors are Kanter’s (Kanter, Stein & Jick, 1992); Ten Commandments for executing change, Kotter’s (1996) eight-stage process for successful organizational transformation, and Luecke (as cited in Todnem, 2005) suggested seven steps in order to identify similarities and differences between these models. As the emergent approach to change is relatively new compared to the planned approach, it is argued that it still lacks coherence and a diversity of techniques (Bamford & Forrester, 2003. and Wilson, 1992). Another criticism of the emergent approach is that it consists of a rather disparate group of models and approaches that tend to be more united in their skepticism to the planned approach to change than to an agreed alternative (Bamford & Forrester, 2003. and Dawson, 1994). More so, not all organisations are operating in a constantly changing environment. The approach dismisses idea of stages, but still talks in terms of transition, scratch any account of creating and managing change and the idea that change is a three-stage process which necessarily begins with
a process of unfreezing will not be far below the surface (Hendry as cited in Coram and Burnes, 2001).

However, according to Burnes (1996) the general applicability and validity of the emergent approach to organizational change depends on whether or not one believes that all organisations operate in dynamic and unpredictable environments to which they constantly have to adapt. If so, Burnes (1996) argues the emergent model is suitable for all organizations, all situations and at all times. Dunphy and Stace (1993) do not agree with Burnes (1996) argument of 'one best way for all'; they view and argue managers and consultants need a model of change that is essentially a 'situational' or contingency model. A model that indicates how to vary change strategies to achieve optimum fit with the changing environment (Dunphy & Stace, 1993). They advocate an approach that reflects not only that organisations are operating in ever-changing environments, but also that there is a range of approaches to change. Furthermore, it is argued that the planned and emergent approaches to change should not be seen as the entire spectrum of change events.

An approach of contingency to change that supports a ‘one best way for each’ organisation approach rather than a ‘one best way for all’ approach is therefore suggested. The contingency approach to change is founded on the theory that the structure and the performance of an organisation are dependent on the situational variables that it faces (Dunphy and Stace, 1993). No two organisations are alike, and will not necessarily face the same variables. Therefore, their operations and structures may be different. However, contingency theory in general has been criticized for the difficulty of relating structure to performance and that the theory assumes that organisations and managers do not have any significant influence and choice over situational variables and structure (Burnes, 1996). An organisation does not necessarily have to adapt to the external environment. Burnes (1996) advocates an approach of choice by suggesting that there is certainly evidence that organizations wishing to maintain or promote a particular managerial style can choose to influence situational variables to achieve this. The point is that rather than having little choice or rather than being forced to change their internal practices to fit in with external variables, organizations can exercise some choice over these issues.
2.3.3 Beyond Planned and Emergent Change

Successful change in organizations depends on the change agency and the organizational change competency (Maalu, 2007). Irrespective of the nature or form of change, change has to be managed. Someone has to take responsibility for ensuring that change takes place (change agent) who could be a team leader, facilitator, a coach, or a dictator. There is need to identify specialist skills that will be necessary to manage the different types of changes whether this is being done by a manager or a specialist. Then the change competency where an organization has a wide capability to apply change management practices successfully and routinely. It is the presence of a business culture that expects and reacts to change with the understanding, perspectives, tools and techniques to make change seamless and effortless. This is where an organization that faces constant demands to change uses effective change management over and over with each new initiative making change a part of ‘business as usual’. It is a fundamental shift in operations, positioning the organization to be able to embrace change. It requires new attitude and approach where all individuals in such an organization define their jobs in relation to change – value ability to change as one of their primary responsibilities. It must penetrate every facet and level of the organization.

2.4 Challenges of Strategic Change Management

Bruch, Gerber and Vogel (2005) in recent dialogue concerning organizational change says that there has been broad consensus that increasing environmental instability and uncertainty are forcing companies to change continuously. However, change itself is a risky, and often haphazard and improvised, process reaching unsatisfactory results in many companies, sometimes even leaving them worse off than before. Val and Fuentes (2003) observed the more radical and transformational strategic change is, the more powerful resistance to change is. This echoes the words of Fallon (as cited in Val & Fuentes, 2003) that the paradox of complexity is that it makes things exceedingly difficult and that rapid change is endemic and inevitable in post-modern society. It is a system which self-generates complex dynamics over and over again.

Several authors (Lawrence., Strebel., Waddell & Sohal as cited in Val & Fuentes, 2003 and Maurer, 1996) stress that the reasons for failure of many strategic initiatives can be found in
Resistance to change is a phenomenon that affects the change process, delaying or slowing its beginning, obstructing or hindering its implementation and increasing its costs (Ansoff, 1990). Zander (as cited in Bolognese, 2002) an early researcher on the subject, defined resistance to change as behaviour which is intended to protect an individual from the effects of real or imagined change. Zaltman and Duncan (as cited in Bolognese, 2002) define resistance as any conduct that serves to maintain the status quo in the face of pressure to alter the status quo. In the view of Folger & Skarlicki (1999) resistance is defined as employee behaviour that seeks to challenge, disrupt, or invert prevailing assumptions, discourses, and power relations.

On the other hand, resistance is any conduct that tries to keep the status quo, that is to say, resistance is equivalent to inertia, as the persistence to avoid change (Maurer, 1996, Rumelt, 1995, and Zaltman & Duncan, 1977). Thus, resistance is not a negative concept but rather challenge to effective strategic change management (Val & Fuentes, 2003). There are 2 main types of resistance to change: systemic or organizational resistance and behavioural resistance (Maalu, 2007). Systemic resistance may take the form of organization design, organizational culture, resource limitations, fixed investments and inter-organizational agreements. This is where there is passive incompetence of the organization proportional to the difference between the capacity required for new strategic work and the capacity to handle it. It occurs whenever the development of capacity lags behind strategy development. Minimizing it require provision of dedicated capacity by planning and budgeting for it. It also involves integration of management into the change process and stretch the duration of change to assure timely response to environmental challenges.

Behavioural resistance arises from individuals, that is, employees and managers in other departments apart from change initiating department; group resistance to include managers who share common tasks and coalitions and power centres within the organization. Bolognese (2002) noted that employees resist change because they have to learn something new. In many case there is not a disagreement with the benefits of the new process, but rather a fear of the unknown future and about their ability to adapt to it. De (2001) argues that most people are
reluctant to leave the familiar behind. People are suspicious about the unfamiliar and are naturally concerned about how they will get from the old to the new, especially if it involves learning something new and risking failure. Low tolerance for change is another challenged to strategic change management posed by employees. Low tolerance is defined as the fear that one will not be able to develop new skills and behaviours that are required in a new work setting (Bolognese, 2002). If an employee has a low tolerance for change, the increased ambiguity that results as a result of having to perform their job differently would likely cause a resistance to the new way of doing things. An employee may understand that a change is needed, but may be emotionally unable to make the transition and resist for reasons they may not consciously understand.

Strebel (as cited in Val & Fuentes, 2003) attributes resistance as a violation of personal compacts any management has with its employees. Personal compacts are the essence of the relationship between employees and organizations defined by reciprocal obligations and mutual commitments that are both stated and implied. Any change initiatives proposed by the organization would alter their current terms. He points out that when these personal compacts are disrupted it upsets the balance and increases the likelihood of resistance. He suggests that management view how change looks from the employees’ perspective and to examine the terms of the personal compacts currently in place. Unless manages define new terms and persuade employees to accept them, it is unrealistic for managers to expect employees to fully buy into changes that alter the status quo.

Reasons for resistance by individuals can be summarized as parochial self interest through loss of something of value as a result and political camps in organizations fighting each other. Then the misunderstanding and lack of trust caused by implications not understood or distrust of those in authorities or in other departments or even resistance in order to save face – accepting may mean admitting past mistakes. There are also different assessments and different views from managers or even some may see more costs than benefits. It may be good if based on full information as it may point to some potential problem, low tolerance for change and fear of not being able to develop skills or behaviours required (Strebel as cited in Val & Fuentes, 2003).
Maalu (2007) highlighted that in dealing with behavioural resistance to change management, several tactics can be used. Firstly, education plus communication—used in situations where there is a lack of information or inaccurate information and analysis. Secondly, participation and involvement—commonly used where the initiators do not have all the information they need to design the change, and where others have considerable power to resist. Thirdly, facilitation with support—commonly used where people are resisting because of adjustment problems. Fourthly, negotiation and agreement used where someone or some group will clearly lose out in a change, and where that group has considerable power to resist. Then, there is manipulation and co-option—used in situations where other tactics will not work, or are too expensive. Lastly, explicit and implicit coercion—commonly used where speed is essential, and the change initiators possess considerable power.

Managers often perceive resistance negatively and employees who resist are viewed as disobedient and obstacles the organization must overcome in order to achieve the new goals (Bolognese, 2002). However, in certain instances, employee resistance may play a positive and useful role in organizational change. Insightful and well-intended debate, criticism, or disagreement do not necessarily equate to negative resistance, but rather may be intended to produce better understanding as well as additional options and solutions. De (2001) claimed that the idea that anyone who questions the need for change has an attitude problem is simply wrong, not only because it discounts past achievements, but also because it makes us vulnerable to indiscriminate and ill-advised change. Piderit (2000) points out that what some managers may perceive as disrespectful or unfounded resistance to change might be motivated by an individual's ethical principles or by their desire to protect what they feel is the best interests of the organization. Employee resistance may force management to rethink or re-evaluate a proposed change initiative. It also can act as a as a gateway or filter, which can help organizations select from all possible changes the one that is most appropriate to the current situation. According to De (2001) resistance is simply a very effective, very powerful, very useful survival mechanism.
Kotter (as cited in Bruch, Gerber & Vogel, 2005) noted that inappropriate set up and executions are other major challenges to the reasons why certain change processes are only marginally successful or even completely unsuccessful. So from a theoretical and practical standpoint, there is a difference between the what – what would be right – and the how – how do we do it right? Inappropriate set-up is what is referred to as systemic resistance discussed earlier. In executions, basically, it is dealing with stakeholders. Johnson & Scholes (2005) define stakeholders as those individuals or groups of individuals who depend on the organization to fulfil their own goals and on whom the organization in turn depends. Stakeholders define the political context of organizational strategy implementation. Stakeholders may include organization staff (management and non-management staff), shareholders, customers, suppliers, competitors, government and social groupings. These stakeholders have power, interests and influence. Stakeholders are looking at how the change will affect them hence will react differently for different situations as the change program progresses. More so, stakeholder positions do change as the change progresses, thus, posing a challenge in the execution of strategic change. The strategic change manager needs to build a personal relationship with the stakeholders for success.

2.5 Effective Strategic Change Management

Just as one ready their garden for planting, an organization adapts to change most successfully when the ground is well prepared in advance. Respondents on change management success, over the years, have spoken about creating a trusting and trustworthy environment in advance of the change (Change Management London, 2008). Only about fifty percent of all large-scale change interventions are successful. These facts have given management scholars and practitioners alike pause to solve the puzzle of how companies can ensure an effective strategic change management. Answers proposed by several authors, in response to this puzzle revolve around what managers can do to ensure success in a change processes are several (e.g. Senge, 1990. and Kotter, 1996). Lengnick-Hall and Lengnick-Hall (as cited in Bruch, Gerber & Vogel, 2005) noted that decisions prior to the rollout of a change program – that is, those related to clarifying the change itself, have received surprisingly little attention. Nevertheless, strategic change is not merely a matter of defining steps that will ensure its successful implementation; part of change
management also embodies taking a firm grasp on a seminal change idea or purpose, which must then be thought through and clarified before the enactment of the change.

Bruch, Gerbal and Vogel (2005) in a case study of German aviation Group Deutsche Lufthansa found that top executives must systematically make two decisions. First, they need to decide what the right change is for their company and second, they need to decide how to implement the change correctly. As Kotter (1996) points out, there is a difference between leading change and managing change. If leading change revolves around conceiving a clear goal as well as logic for how to achieve it, managing change deals with the actual realization of that logic in a controllable process. It is important that senior management steered by a strategic change manager define and communicate the change process in order to provide both leadership and support for all those involved in the implementation of change. Three pertinent things must be done, namely: communicate the vision; establish a sense of urgency; and be proactive (Change Management London, 2008).

Communicating the vision involves more than just sending out policy letters or communiqués to publicize the new vision. If in fact a new vision is being established, the organization is undergoing a strategic change process which requires an adjustment of its culture and subsequent values. Establish a sense of urgency, without a doubt, as an organization moves to execute a new vision. Resistance will take many forms from outright defiance to various delaying actions to procrastination. Steps must be taken to activate the buy-in of the people in the organization in order to make them understand that the longer they resist the change efforts, the more drastic the changes will be. This of course is predicated on the fact that the strategic planning process has validated a need for these actions and that change for change's sake is not occurring. In essence, this sense of urgency needs to be tied to a credible reality. Being proactive where the emphasis is not doing something but rather doing the appropriate thing. Efficient change management must be a proactive. When carried out in a planned and systematic fashion it is instrumental in implementing new methods and systems within an organization. The changes can be controlled and managed and all staff can be positively involved in the process. When no proper procedures
for managing change are present, the process becomes simply reactive. Change occurs in an unplanned way, without all implications being fully considered.

Bruch, Gerber and Vogel (2005) observed that even before organizations can even broach the subject of implementation, companies must clarify in a straightforward, systematic way what change would be right for their company. All too often, when a change program is underway, questions emerge, such as does the change make sense? Is it the right thing for the company? Is it happening at the right time? Such questions and misgivings rob a company of its energy, weaken the process and hinder long-term implementation (Bruch, Gerber & Vogel, 2005). The feeling that change is right for a company and the necessary sense of urgency to secure its realization will only occur if it is clear that the change has been tailored to the company and its particular business situation. Change is only possible when it is contextualized against the backdrop of a company’s particular past and present (Pettigrew & Whipp, 1987). Then there is focusing the change agenda (Bruch, Gerber & Vogel, 2005). Change processes are by nature complex, but they must have clear priorities in order to be manageable. Excessive complexity and an inconsistent focus are deadly to a program’s excitability, especially to a company-wide program. So as they ask themselves what the right change would be, companies must systematically define what the focal points are.

Simons (as cited in Bruch, Gerber & Vogel, 2005) emphasized that doing only what one can really commit to is another critical factor for the success of a change process. So the change management design the change, a company’s top management must ask what they can credibly implement. What change they can really commit to? What type of change will fit their style so that they will be able to support it authentically and wholeheartedly later? Change processes that lack a credible patron are as unsuccessful as those which lack visible, convincing support from the top management (Kotter, 1996).

Doing what is right for the company’s culture and strategic change processes are only successful if they fit a company’s current culture (Bruch, Gerber & Vogel, 2005). Traditions, norms and shared values within a company must be included in the deliberations regarding the selection of a
change program (Heracleous, 2001). Certain change processes cannot be executed in more
bureaucratic cultures, while other types of processes simply are not compatible with team-
oriented or innovative/dynamic organizations (Bruch, Gerber & Vogel, 2005). Management
decisions, that is, doing change right is crucial. Once the question of which change program is
right for a company at a particular point in time has been answered, the management must also
systematically make decisions that will ensure that the change will be implemented successfully
and have a permanent impact. Acceptance, attention, effective change agents as well as
momentum and sustainability are all important in this regard. Without these factors, change
processes will not be put in motion, make headway only with great difficulty or have a fleeting
or even negligible impact (Weick & Quinn, 1999).

Successful change management practitioners spoke about change working best in organizations
that traditionally value each employee and respect their potential contribution. Change
management and change described as easier in organizations that have a norm of frequent,
honest communication (Change Management London, 2008). Change is easier when there is
widespread agreement, in the organization, about the need to change. To build this agreement
about change and institute effective change management, do the following. Assuming decisions
about needed change are made based on relevant data; an informed workforce will understand
and agree with the need for change. They may not agree on the how or what, but the change
agent is miles ahead if there is an agreement on the why and the whether. Secondly, there is the
essence to create urgency around the need to change. Projecting the workforce, what will
happen if the organization doesn’t make the needed changes? Communication of this
information honestly and using data whenever it is available. This involves spending extra time
and energy working with front line supervisory staff and line managers to ensure that they
understand, can communicate about, and support the changes. Their action and communication
are critical in moulding the opinion of the rest of the workforce.

Five steps to effective change management were identified that summarized that best way to
implement large-scale change efforts, whereby, one uses a model that enables accountabilities to
be assigned, progress measured and self-interest realized (Weiss, n.d.). He identified five key
steps to implement successful change project. First is to define the current state by being sure organizational members are confident of the current state to be changed. Second is to define the future state by creating a clear goal that is both a valid stretch but also a pragmatic reality. Third is to be careful about reach exceeding grasp or one may create an environment in which people are never successful enough. There must be small victories. Fourth is to determine key sponsors and implementers who will be responsible for exemplifying and endorsing the change and whose self-interests must be appealed to in order to successfully implement it? Finally is to adjust environment, feedback, and rewards to support desired change. Banners in the cafeteria do not change behaviour and money will change it only temporarily. It is the change agent’s job to find and appeal to the rational self-interest that will support the desired change. Review progress against metrics with management. One of the greatest weaknesses of change effort is that they are not crisply measured with isolated variables and objective indicators. It is as important to show implementers the progress as it is to show a buyer.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design
This study investigated the strategic change management practices in the INGOs in Kenya based on a survey in order to get a broader picture of strategic change management among INGOs in Kenya for comparison purposes.

3.2 Population of Study
Population consisted of INGOs registered under section 10 of the NGOs Co-ordination Act, 1990, that estimated the number of INGOs in Kenya to be 1500.

3.3 Sample Design
The study interviewed 40 INGOs in Kenya using the stratified random sampling technique; 10 samples in each stratum were studied. The basis for the four strata was on annual income (Kenya Shillings): 0 to 1,000,000; 1,000,001 to 50,000,000; 50,000,001 to 100,000,000; and Over 100,000,000. Limitation to the sampling technique was that Neither the NGO Coordination Board nor the NGO Council have definite numbers for each of the strata. Thus, the researcher assumed that there was relatively equal numbers of INGOs in each of the 4 sub-groups in the population meaning the samples were proportionately allocated.

3.4 Data Collection
This research used both primary data and secondary data. The secondary data regarding the organizational history, the number of countries it has a presence and the number of projects in each of the countries was obtained from organization’s websites and publications. The primary data was obtained through a questionnaire (appendix 1) regarding the strategic change management practices in INGOs. The questionnaire was divided into 3 parts. Part A helped get the general information about respondent and organization; part B dealt with the strategic change management practices in Kenya’s INGOs while part C gathered information on other aspects of strategic change management. The questionnaire was administered to chief executive officers or managing directors, country directors, finance directors and strategic change managers since the responsibility of strategic change management in INGOs was vested on them. The questionnaire
was sent through the internet to the respondents and in some cases, the ‘drop and pick’ mode of questionnaire was used. This method was appropriate since it was simple and cost effective. The researcher administered the questionnaire.

3.5 Data Analysis

The feedback from the questionnaires formed the basis for the statistical analysis; which was computed through mean scores, frequencies and percentages. Percentages were used to summarize responses regarding strategic change management practices in the INGOs while frequencies showed the various strata of INGOs have approached change. Mean scores and rating scales were important in determining the extent to which various forces affects strategic change. Tables, graphs and charts were also used to help visualize the data collected for clarity.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
The study sought to identify the strategic change management practices in the INGOs in Kenya. The respondents were mainly country directors, program managers and finance managers in the organizations studied. It was intended to study 40 INGOs, but only 36 responded, representing ninety percent of the target. This chapter first analyses the general information about the INGOs in Kenya followed by findings on strategic change management practices.

4.2 Profile of INGOs
INGOs operating in Kenya were studied and the data as per the organizations’ websites and publications helped establish the number of countries an organization has a presence and the number of projects in each of the countries. INGOs are involved in various sectors including capacity building, social development, health (disease interventions such as HIV/AIDS, drug & substance abuse and nutrition), sports, feeding, education, gender issues, justice and political empowerment. Other sectors include family life, entrepreneurship, helping people with disabilities, environmental conservation, information technology, rehabilitation, poverty eradication, relief aid and conservation of wildlife. These INGOs may have a dual-role, acting as implementers and also as donors to locally based NGOs and CBOs. Most of the INGOs are coordinated from the headquarters with the support team that deals with proposals for funding based there.

From the studied organizations’ websites and publications, majority of the INGOs have an annual income of over Kshs. 50 million in Kenya’s operations only. 31% of the organizations studied have an annual income of over Kshs. 100 million, 36% have an annual income between Kshs. 50,000,001- 100,000,000, 25% have an annual income between Kshs. 1,000,001-50,000,000 while only 8% of the organizations have an annual income between Kshs. 0-1,000,000 as indicated in the Diagram 1 below.
Respondents were asked to state the period they had worked in their organization and most of them had worked for less than 10 years. 17% of the respondents had worked between 0-2.5 yrs while 36% had worked between 2.5- 5 years. Those who had worked between 5 to 7.5 years were 28%, 14 % had worked between 7.5 to 10 years while only 6% had worked over 10 years. This is represented in the Table 1 below.

### Table 1: Employees’ Period Worked in INGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-5 Years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7.5 Years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5-10 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research, 2010
On the INGOs existence in Kenya, it was found out that 37% of the surveyed organizations had been registered in Kenya between 1-5 years, 38% between 5-10 years, 15% between 10-15 years and 10% in over 15 years. This is represented in the Diagram 2 below.

Diagram 2: INGOs’ Duration of Existence in Kenya

Source: Research Data, 2010

4.3 Strategic Change Management Practices

4.3.1 Strategic Change Formulation

There are forces that operate to trigger change. It is important for an organization to know the forces most critical at work in order to prioritize the action points on the forces depending on the influence on the organization. No organization can respond to every single force, need to anticipate the implications of the forces to help determine change strategy. Both internal and external forces that triggered change in the studied organizations are highlighted in Table 2 below.
Table 2: Forces that Triggered Change in INGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forces</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a). External Forces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing target groups’ needs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS related cases</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing technology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic situation e.g. recession</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Agencies requirements</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b). Internal Forces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Chief Executive officer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability or scarcity of resources</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research, 2010

Findings indicated that economic situation (e.g. recession) and donor agencies requirements contributed highest in triggering change with 15% each. Leadership and availability or scarcity of resources forces’ followed in triggering change with 14% each. Changing target groups’ needs had 11% in triggering change, changing technology had 9%, new Chief Executive officer had 8%, and culture had 6% while HIV/AIDS related cases and Government each had 4%.

4.3.2 Models of Managing Strategic Change

Strategic change in organizations can either be proactive or reactive. INGOs respond to external environment partly proactively and partly reactive for survival and continuity. 89% of the respondents indicated that they react to the business environment partly proactively and partly reactively while only 11% indicated they respond reactively as indicated in Diagram 3 below.
Organizations just like individuals view strategic change process differently. The respondents were asked to identify and give details on the stated processes that best depict their view of strategic change process. 50% of the respondents view strategic change process as a continuous, open-minded and unpredictable process of aligning and realigning the organization to its changing environment with some stating that change is a dynamic process since the environment is always changing. 36% of the respondents view strategic change as part of business as usual for the organization, that is done routinely, involves continuous revision of business models, loving change since it is constant and a having a culture that expects change. Only 14% of the respondents view the process as a pre-planned step by step process moving from one fixed state to another, the distinct steps indicating that there has to be elimination of systems and culture that support current way of carrying out project work then introduction of new ways of doing things and finally making sure the new ways are consolidated. This is represented in the Diagram 4 below.
4.3.3 Principles of Change Management

Strategic change in organizations has the people dimension besides the business dimension. The findings found out that in order to achieve or encourage the desired change results, both the people and business dimensions were aligned. The findings indicated that organizational culture needed the most alignment with 31%, followed by values with 29%, attitudes with 24% while behaviour had 16% only as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Aligning People's Dimension in Change Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data, 2010
The people dimension of change is how employees experience the change process, there is need to communicate to all employees about change. The findings found out that 94% of the responded were told about change while only 6% were not informed about change, as shown in Diagram 5 below.

**Diagram 5: Employees Informed About Change**

Source: Research Data, 2010

The way change initiative was communicated to the employees was mainly through employees meetings. 39% of the respondents indicated that they were told about change in meetings, 20% through bulletins, 16% through newsletters, 18% through memos while 7% was through their supervisor as shown in Table 4 below.
Table 4: Communicating the Change Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees meetings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data, 2010

4.3.4 Strategic Change Implementation

It is one thing to have a great strategic change plan and another thing to execute the plan till completion while celebrating success at various phases in the change process. The findings sought to find out how was change carried out in the studied organizations. The respondents were to indicate how the change was done ranging from rapidly to intermittently. Of the 36 respondents, 42% indicated that they carried out change process in more than one way while 25% carried out change process continuously. 19% carried out change process gradually, 8% rapidly while intermittently was only 6%. This is shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Change Process Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapidly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradually</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittently</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of 2 or more factors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data, 2010
Employees need to know how to implement change on day to day basis, part of business as usual. People need to be enabled to act and behave as expected in the new way of doing things. 69% of the respondents noted that change necessitated the training of employees while 31% highlighted that the change did not necessitate any training of employees as highlighted in Diagram 6 below.

**Diagram 6: Change Necessitating Training of Employees**

Source: Research Data, 2010

Respondents were also asked to use a 5-point scale to indicate how often they train their employees for the purposes of adapting to change ranging from extensive to no training at all. Scale 5 indicated quite often while 1 indicated hardly any training as shown in Table 6 below.
Table 6: Employees’ Training for Change Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than average</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data, 2010

From Table 6 above, 28% of the respondents indicated that the training was done moderately often, extensive and little training had 19% each while no training at all and more than average had 17%.

Further to the issue of change implementation, the study sought to find out whether there was a specific team (s) mandated the responsibility to implement change as shown in Diagram 7 below.

Diagram 7: Existence of Team Mandated Responsibility to Implement Change

Source: Research Data, 2010
From Diagram 7 above, 67% of the respondents indicated that there was a team mandated the responsibility to implement change while 33% indicated that there was no team mandated the responsibility to implement change.

4.3.5 Strategic Change and Leadership

The findings indicate that the Corporate headquarter/Parent organization, Top management, Middle level management, Low level management, other members of staff, Consultants and Donor agencies were involved in initiating change process in INGOs. Top management had the highest percentage (30%) showing that it was the team that initiated change process in most of the INGOs studied. It was closely followed by Corporate headquarter or Parent organization with 24%, Donor agencies with 19% while Middle level management had 14%. Of the INGOs studied none indicated that other members of staff initiated change while Low level management had 5% and Consultants with only 7% as highlighted in Table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate headquarter</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level Management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Members of Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor agencies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data, 2010

The study further sought to find whether there was a change leader. 90% of the respondents indicated that there was a change leader while only 10% did not have a change leader as shown in Diagram 8 below.
4.3.6 Resistance to Change

Following is an investigation of the employees’ readiness for change in terms of level of dissatisfaction with situation before change and rate of employees’ perceived personal risk from change. Respondents were asked to use a 5-point scale to indicate the extent to which each of the two stated factors had contributed to readiness for change among the employees. For the level of dissatisfaction with situation before change, 5 represented very highly dissatisfied while 1 represented not at all dissatisfied, the higher the percentage, the higher the employees’ readiness for change and vice versa. 33% indicated that the employees were moderately dissatisfied with current situation, 28% not at all dissatisfied, 20% were highly dissatisfied, 11% had low dissatisfaction while 8% were very highly dissatisfied. The results are shown in Table 8 below.
Table 8: Employees’ Dissatisfaction with the Current Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data, 2010

On the other hand, the rate of employees’ perceived personal risk from change, 5 represented very high risk while 1 represented no risk at all, the lower the percentage, the higher the employees’ readiness for change and vice versa. Of the 36 respondents, majority indicated that there was high perceived personal risk from change with over 36%, 19% indicated that they had very high perceived personal risk from change, 22% had moderate risk, 6% had low risk while only 17% indicated that there was no perceived personal risk from change as shown in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Employees’ Perceived Personal Risk from Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Personal Risk</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data, 2010
Change is normally resisted with stakeholders not sure whether it will succeed and fear they stand to lose. The human side of resistance speaks out more compared to the systemic side of it. 61% of the respondents stated that there was resistance to change from the employees while 39% stated that there was no resistance to change from the employees as shown in the Diagram 9 below.

*Diagram 9: Behavioural Resistance to Change*

![Diagram 9: Behavioural Resistance to Change](image)

Source: Research Data, 2010

The study also sought to find the source of individual resistance that offered highest resistance. Respondents were asked to rank the sources to indicate the extent to which each of them had offered resistance. 1 represented highest contributor to resistance while 7 represented the least contributor to resistance. The lower the mean score and the standard deviation, the higher the source had offered resistance and vice versa. The results are shown in table 10 below.
Table 10: Sources of Individual Resistance to Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habit</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to Power and Influence</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the Unknown</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Reasons</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data, 2010

From Table 10 above, threats to power and influence offered the highest resistance to change with mean score of 1.22, followed by fear of unknown with mean score 2.44, personality with mean score 3.44, economic reasons with mean score 4.09 and perception with a mean score of 4.11. Habit was the least source of resistance to change with a mean score of 4.12.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary, Discussions and Conclusions
The research has sought to identify the strategic change management practices in the INGOs in Kenya. From the study results, the four main forces that trigger change in INGOs are: economic situation (e.g. recession), donor agencies requirements, availability or scarcity of resources and leadership. These forces call for a strategic change management response in order for the INGOs to grow and achieve the overall objective of improving the livelihood of Kenyans. Thus, developing strategic change management practices in the INGOs will help remove the perception that change can be handled in an ad hoc basis as observed in previous research (e.g. Badebo, 2006., Nyororo, 2006., Odongo, 2006 and Toshe, 2006). INGOs must undertake strategic change management and make change part of life.

The literature reviewed focused in the broader context of strategic change management components that included management practices, models of managing change, challenges of strategic change and effective strategic change management. The strategic change enables the INGOs to understand the fundamental changes in an organization and its future direction with an aim of adapting to the external environment and an improvement in performance. The research confirms that strategic change management is practiced across the board in the INGOs in Kenya as noted by Kameri (2002). The study revealed that majority of INGOs (89%) indicated that they react to the business environment partly proactively and partly reactively which is in agreement with the work of Bamford and Forrester (2003). Whereas, none of the respondents indicated that they react to business environment proactively.

Most of the INGOs (50%) approach strategic change process as a continuous, open-minded and unpredictable process of aligning and realigning the organization to its changing environment; a model referred to as emergent change. With emergent change model, there is the alignment of internal practices to external circumstances. Minority of the INGOs (5) viewed the process as a conscious pre-planned step by step process moving from one fixed state to another, model referred to as planned change. In moving from one step to another, there is elimination of systems and culture that support current way of carrying out project work then introduction of
new ways of doing things and finally making sure the new ways are consolidated. Nonetheless, some of the INGOs (36%) studied approached strategic change beyond planned and emergent change seeing the change process as part of business as usual for the organization; just liked it was noted in Maalu (2007). This strategic change is done routinely that involves continuous revision of business models, loving change since it is constant and a having a culture that expects change. The research confirms that in order to achieve or encourage the desired change results, both the people and business dimensions need alignment of the organizational culture, values, attitudes and behaviour; view held by Prosci (1998). Of the four dimensions, organizational culture needs the most alignment (31%).

In carrying out strategic change process, there is need to communicate to all employees about change. The research shows up to 94% of the INGOs are told about change meaning the employees are informed of the fundamental changes in their organizations; this in agreement with the observations done by Kotter (1995) and Burnes (1996, 2004). The research further substantiates that the change initiatives in INGOS are communicated to the employees mainly during employees meetings (39%). Having a great strategic plan is only effective if executed to completion. The research verifies that strategic change implementation process in INGOs is carried out through a combination of two or more ways: rapidly, gradually, continuously and intermittently. It shows that in change execution, there is constant monitoring of the internal resources to meet change demands that match the external environment, thus, the process requires diverse ways in achieving the desired results. This is support of researches done by Nyalita (2006) and Mugo (2006).

In addition, the research validates that employees need to know how to implement change on day to day basis and embrace change. People need to be enabled to act and behave as expected in the new way of doing things as noted in previous work (e.g. Burnes, 2004., Davidson & De, 1999., Dunphy & Stace, 1993., Kanter, Stein & Jick, 1992. and Wilson, 1992). Majority of INGOs (69%) identifies that change necessitates the training of employees to enable the employees build their capacity to reach the set goals as they handle change; a proposition advocated by Senge (1990). The research also confirms that in the INGOs studied, training was not given priority
with only a small number of the organizations studied (19%) receiving extensive training during the change process. Leadership is the force that makes things happen, it is about finding the future and is the single most factor that distinguishes change efforts that succeed from that fail. The research shows that of the stakeholders that lead change, top management is the group that initiated strategic change in most of the INGOs (30%). Therefore, it is not surprising to note that none of the studied organizations identified ‘other members of staff’ as strategic change initiators. The research verifies that in order to successfully implement the strategic change process, it is important to assign a specific change team the responsibility to oversee the process. Up to 67% of the INGOs mandate specific team (s) the responsibility of implementing strategic change. Moreover, majority of the INGOs (90%) has a change leader who coordinates the entire change process heading the strategic change team.

The findings indicated that resistance to change may take the form of procrastination, inefficiencies and delays to slow down the change or sabotage change, making it cost more than initially intended as noted in earlier discussion (Maalu, 2007). Majority of the INGOs (up to 22) indicates that there is resistance to change from the employees. The two main sources of individual resistance to strategic change in INGOs are the threats to power and influence (mean score of 1.22) and fear of unknown (mean score of 2.44). Thus, INGOs have to be proactive in handling these sources in order to minimize the resistance. In dealing with behavioral resistance to change in INGOs, checking the readiness of the people for change is vital. Adopting Zeira and Avedisian (1989) model to check for readiness, research shows that most of the INGOs (up to 72%) are not dissatisfied with the current change and only a small portion (23%) of the INGOs have low perceived personal risk from change. This means that the INGOs hardly analyses or prepares the ground for change by ensuring that there is high level of dissatisfaction with current situation and low perceived personal risk from change.

In conclusion, a progressive International NGO must seek to identify both external and internal forces that trigger change and respond proactively in putting in place strategic change management practices that will enable the organization to survive and improve on its performance. The top management in INGOs as the key change initiator is obliged to prepare
the employees and other stakeholders for change by checking for the readiness for change achieved by ensuring there is high dissatisfaction with current situation and low perceived personal risk from change. Strategic change must become part of business as usual for INGOs, that is done routinely and a having a culture that expects change. Strategic change ought to necessitate employees' training in order to embrace change and implement the change plan. The behavioral resistance to change is expected in INGOs, thus, the change team mandated the responsibility to oversee change execution must deal with the resistance through education, communication, participation, support and facilitation.

5.2 Limitations of the Study
This study like many other studies encountered a number of practical limitations. Data collection was difficult since some of respondent INGOs were not cooperative in providing the required information. This resulted to fewer respondents for analysis that initially intended. The list of registered INGOs obtained from the NGO Coordination Board’s website was not up-to-date as most of the INGOs contacts’ information contained in it were incorrect. Some of the questionnaires sent through the internet were incomplete that shows the chief executive officers or managing directors, country directors, finance directors and strategic change managers must have delegated to their juniors that task of filling the questionnaires.

The NGO Coordination Board that facilitates the work of NGOs and maintains the register of NGOs didn’t have definite information on the number of INGOs in Kenya nor the annual financial reports for each INGO making it hard to identify strata for study. The preview of strategic change management practices was too broad and time available was short for such study. Therefore, the researcher was not able to include in detail all information on the topical issues that form the body of strategic change management.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Research
For a fact, no research is an end in itself, strategic change management being a young field of study in strategic management, can’t be said to be mastered. Thus, what this research has achieved should be supplemented by further research work. From insights gained in the course
of the investigation, the researcher offers the following suggestions which should act as a basis for further work on the subject. The research carried out sought to document strategic change management practices in INGOs. It is recommended that further research should be conducted on INGOs in other parts of Africa particularly Uganda and Tanzania where majority of INGOs based in Kenya have a presence in these countries.

A replication of this study should be done after five or more years to find out what changes will have taken place and compare with the current data. From this, a definite recommendation and conclusion should be arrived at. With the turbulent external environment at work in INGOs context, more studies should be carried out to document the effects such changes bear on strategic change management practices.

Scholars can also carry out a research on the awareness and effectiveness on strategy change management practices among various INGOS to establish their contribution towards the achievement of organization objectives. Such data may be made available to stakeholders to help improve the overall working environment of INGOs. Another study should be undertaken to look at the impact of the forces that trigger strategic change and further study on dealing with resistance to strategic change in INGOs in Kenya.

5.4 Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Days of poor performance, inefficiencies in operations and handling strategic change in an ad hoc basis in INGOs are long gone. Quite a few INGOs have taken the lead in initiating strategic change management practices. INGOs ought to formulate and implement strategic change management practices that will ensure appropriate allocation of resources, build a learning organization and implement set strategies. The execution of such practices will need to be monitored and evaluated in order to correct inappropriate strategic choices already undertaken and improve on good performance to achieve overall corporate objectives. For INGOs to practice their documented strategic change effectively, it is recommended that they should align various organizational factors such as structure, organizational culture, attitudes, values and behaviours to strategies with clear parameters for measurement to attain targets.
Organizational policies in INGOs should be reviewed in light of new strategies in comparison with activities carried out by successful organizations in other countries in order to achieve and exceed the desired objectives. More techniques for local resource mobilization should be developed including forming consortiums of similar INGOs to attract corporate donations and aggressive marketing/publicity. Institutional donors seek to fund INGOs that control huge resources and reach millions of people in need, thus, the many small INGOs ought to work on partnerships or collaborations for sustained funding. This should be supplemented by developing competitive funding proposals and having skilled and competent employees. INGOs should encourage income generating activities that are locally managed adding to the donations. Donations from the developed world are normally controlled from head offices in parent organizations based outside the country delaying the decision making process on resource allocation. That means that with locally mobilised financial resources some programs can be run without delay without affecting the overall organizational budgets and plans.

INGOs should formalise the policies and procedures for strategic change management practices ensuring participation of all staff and other stakeholders in their strategic analysis, choice and implementation. The hands-on staff mainly the program officers who work in the field with target groups should be involved in strategic change formulation process making them have ownership that lead to successful implementation. Strategic change should necessitate training of employees in INGOs for effective execution of set strategies. The training and development of staff should be continuous, developing a learning organization that will ensure that handling strategic change is no longer a surprise in INGOs but rather part of business as usual for the organizations. Strategic change will be done routinely, involving continuous revision of business models and the trained staff will turn to ‘change lovers’ and not ‘change haters’. Change being constant, these staff working in INGOs will develop a culture that expects change.

Strategic change should be communicated to all stakeholders particularly the implementers in order to address the sources of individual resistance to change and effectively deal with any behavioural resistance to change. It is recommended that INGOs should be proactive when developing their change strategies and try to identify a change team to lead the execution.
Establishing a strategic change management department in an INGO as practiced in profit making organizations that have a distinct change department headed by a change leader and who is part of top management is key to success. This department should be involved in research and development for innovation in strategic change management practices.

There should be regular and specific reviews on the change process and the change strategy should be flexible such that it can be changed or adjusted to match the dynamic environment. Further to this, INGOs need to benchmark against best current strategic change management practices and adapt the lessons learnt from governmental and profit making organizations on strategic change management practices.
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APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to help the researcher collect views on the strategic change management practices in the INGOs in Kenya.

Part A:
Name of respondent: ............................................................................................................
Position: ...........................................................................................................
Name of your organization: ....................................................................................................
Period worked in the organization: ........................................................................................

Part B: Strategic Change Management Practices

1. Kindly tick the response that best describe to what extent how you react to the business environment:
   - Proactively
   - Partly proactive & partly reactive
   - Reactively

2. Describe the preparation made in the following areas before initiating strategic change?
   (a) Assessment of external environment ..............................................................................
   (b) Defining of the change goals..........................................................................................
   (c) Assessment of resources & capabilities required to carry out change ..........................
   (d) Communicating to all the stakeholders...........................................................................
   (e) Assessment of where the change will lead to .................................................................
   (f) Others, specify please ....................................................................................................

3. Of the following views of strategic change process, tick and give details on the one that best depict your view:
   (a) □ A pre-planned step by step process moving from one fixed state to another, what distinct steps
   (b) □ A continuous, open-minded and unpredictable process of aligning & realigning the organization to its changing environment, explain
   (c) □ Change as part of business as usual for the organization that is done routinely, please explain
4. Tick how was the change carried out in your organization?

- Rapidly □
- Gradually □
- Continuously □
- Intermittently □
- Combination of ...........................................

5. In order to achieve or encourage the desired change results, how did you align each of the following:
   
   (a) Organizational culture............................................................... 
   
   (b) Behaviour.................................................................................. 
   
   (c) Attitudes.................................................................................... 
   
   (d) Values....................................................................................... 
   
   (e) Others...................................................................................... 

6. Describe how the following contributed, if at all in triggering change:

   - Changing target groups’ needs.................................................. 
   
   - AIDS related cases................................................................. 
   
   - Competition............................................................................... 
   
   - New Chief Executive officer.................................................... 
   
   - Changing technology............................................................... 
   
   - Economic situation e.g. recession........................................... 
   
   - Others, please specify............................................................ 

7. Describe how the following factors have influenced the change process:

   **Internal Factors**

   - Organization structure.......................................................... 
   
   - Availability or scarcity of resources........................................ 
   
   - Culture..................................................................................... 
   
   - Leadership............................................................................... 
   
   - Teamwork............................................................................... 
   
   - Technology used................................................................. 
   
   - Politics.................................................................................... 
   
   - Others, specify.................................................................
External Factors

Donor agencies requirements.................................................................
Legal & regulatory requirements.............................................................
Government involvement...........................................................................
Others, specify..........................................................................................

8. Of the following, tick which group(s) initiated the change process?
   (i) Corporate headquarter or Parent organization
   (ii) Top management/ executive team
   (ii) Middle level management or departmental/programme heads
   (iii) Low level management or line managers or programme officers
   (iv) Other members of staff
   (v) Consultant(s)
   (vi) Funding/donor agencies
   (vii) Others, please specify.................................................................

9. (a). Was there a change leader? Yes ☐ No ☐
   (b). If yes, tick below, the person(s) who was responsible for implementing the change
       process?
       ☐ Chief Executive Officer/ Executive Director            ☐ Project Manager
       ☐ Programme head(s)                                        ☐ Programme Officer(s)
       ☐ Other member(s) of staff                                    ☐ Consultant(s)
       ☐ Others, please specify...................................................
   (c). If no, please explain...................................................................

10. What were the roles of the following in the change process?
    Board of Directors...............................................................................
    Chief Executive Officer......................................................................
    Senior Management.............................................................................
    Consultants........................................................................................
    Employees..........................................................................................
    Others, specify...................................................................................
11. (a). Were employees told about change? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b). If yes, tick below the means of communicating the change initiative:
- Bulletins ☐
- Newsletters ☐
- Employees meetings ☐
- Memos ☐
- Supervisor ☐
- Others, specify please ☐

(c). If no, please explain..............................................................................................

12. (a). Was there a specific team (s) mandated the responsibility to implement the changes?
- Yes ☐ No ☐

(b). If yes, how were the team members identified or selected? .......................................

(c). What were the roles & powers of the team (s)? ..........................................................

(d). How were the team members familiarized with the key aspects of change? ............

(e). If no to (a), please explain..........................................................................................

13. (a). Tick below the kind of resources allocated for the change process:
- Financial resources ☐
- Technical resources ☐
- Human resources ☐
- Others, please specify............................................................................................

(b). How did the change manager ensure availability of these resources? .....................

14. How did the top management indicate their support for the change programme?
.................................................................................................................................

15. What was the role of the change leader in each of the following change phases?

(a). Planning phase........................................................................................................

(b). Design phase...........................................................................................................

(c). Implementing phase..............................................................................................

16. Describe the role of experimentation, if at all allowed during the change process:
.................................................................................................................................

17. How was success celebrated at various changes process? .................................
18. (a). Did change necessitate the training of employees? Yes or No

(b). If yes, on a scale of 1-5, how often do you train your employees for the purposes of adapting to change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c). Of the following groups, rank them, in order of who you prefer to train, 1 highest preferred while 4 least preferred:

Ordinary employees □ Managers □ Supervisors □ Others, specify ...........................................

(d). If no to (a) please explain........................................................................................................

19. What role did the following participation tools played in the change process?

Task forces....................................................................................................................................

Brainstorming..............................................................................................................................

Opinion polls................................................................................................................................

Suggestion boxes..........................................................................................................................

Newsletters..................................................................................................................................

Comments via email or phone calls............................................................................................

Questions & answers...................................................................................................................

Others, please specify .................................................................................................................

20. What systems were developed for the following?

Documentation............................................................................................................................

Periodic reporting........................................................................................................................

Feedback....................................................................................................................................

Information dissemination..........................................................................................................

21. (a). Was there any resistance to change from the employees? Yes □ or No □

(b). If yes, what were the specific signs among employees of resistance to change?

(i) ..............................................................................................................................................

(ii) .............................................................................................................................................

(iii) ............................................................................................................................................

(iv) .............................................................................................................................................
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(c). Tick if any of the following sources of individual resistance to change were noted, ranking them, 1 being the one that offered highest resistance and 7 being the least:

- Perception
- Personality
- Habit
- Threats to power & influence
- Fear of the unknown
- Economic reasons
- Others, specify

(d). Describe, if at all the following sources of organizational or systemic offered any resistance to change:

(i). Organization design or structure
(ii). Organizational culture
(iii). Resource limitations
(iv). Fixed investments
(v). Funding agencies' requirements
(vi). Others, specify

Part C: Other Aspects of Strategic Change Management

22. a). How would you rate the employees' level of dissatisfaction with the situation before change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low satisfaction</th>
<th>Highly dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b). How would you rate the employees' perceived personal risk from change in terms of how negatively change will affect them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low risk</th>
<th>High risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. How was the following, if at all used in overcoming resistance to change among employees?

(a) Involvement........................................................................................................................
(b) Information sharing...........................................................................................................
(c) Listening.............................................................................................................................
(d) Threats...............................................................................................................................
(e) Ordering.............................................................................................................................
(f) Coaching/education...........................................................................................................
(g) Role modelling..................................................................................................................
(h) Counselling....................................................................................................................... 
(i) Others, specify...................................................................................................................

24. Please comment on impact the following organizational aspects influenced the change process:

(a) Targeted group focus...........................................................................................................
(b) Promotions..........................................................................................................................
(c) Customs & norms..............................................................................................................
(d) Reward & recognition........................................................................................................
(e) Ceremonies & events.........................................................................................................
(f) Innovation..........................................................................................................................
(g) Policies............................................................................................................................... 
(h) Others, give details please...................................................................................................

25. How ready after the change are the employees prepared to accept new change?

Least prepared Highly prepared

1  2  3  4  5

□  □  □  □  □