STRATEGIC CHANGE MANAGEMENT
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

By
KIPTOO ISAAC KIROP

**A Management Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Business Administration of the
School of Business, University of Nairobi**

October, 2008

DECLARATION

This Research Project is my original work and has not been submitted for award of a degree at the University of Nairobi or any other University.

Signed .... Date...... 1ST DECEMBER, 2008

Kiptoo Isaac Kirop

This Research Project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the University Supervisor.

Signed .... Date.... 1/12/2008

Prof. Aosa Evans
Department of Business Administration
School of Business
University of Nairobi

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my beloved wife Monica and children Cynthia, Derrick and Adrian whose support and encouragement was insurmountable and who missed out precious family time when I was undertaking the study. The study is posthumously dedicated to my late Mum Mrs. Elizabeth Kirop who passed on when I had just started my research work. Her encouragement, support and inspiration will be remembered forever.

Special thanks go to my brothers Jonathan Kiplagat and John Kiprop for their selfless sacrifice that saw my education through and always being there for me. Without their support this study would have been an exercise in futility. I am also indebted to my father Mr. Isaiah Kirop for his support and encouragement throughout the programme.

I wish to thank the Almighty God for His Abundant Grace, Mercy and Blessings that have seen me through this programme. I give thanks to Him for giving me the strength and knowledge to accomplish this study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Organizations whether in public or private sector are affected by changes taking place in the environment in which they operate. It is imperative therefore for organizations to formulate strategies on how to tackle these challenges. This is through planning and effective implantation of change programmes. Successful organizations have developed systems of managing change. Kaplan and Norton (2008) argue that companies using formal systems of change management outperform their peers. Management spends a great deal of time managing change in order to ensure that the organization continue to add value to resources as external world changes (Bobby and Parton, 1998). Pettigrew and Whipp (1993) points out that since change usually require some significant modification in behavior, generating action in a new direction is usually difficult than maintaining present levels. Change may challenge the interest of some stakeholders leading to resistance. Management must therefore be skillfully in handling change management.

Change is usually presented as aligning the organization with external demands. McLoughlin and Clark, (1994) argues that most managers accept the need for change, but many were anxious about the outcome of the change and the way it had been carried out. Various models for planned change have been put forward for managing change. These include Lewin's (1951) Three-step model of change and Force Field Analysis model, Kotter's (1995) Eight-step model, Kanter *et al* (1992)'s model of change management, and Bullock and Battern (1985) integrated Four-phase model of planned change, and Beer *et al* (1990) Ten-step change process model.

The study explored how strategic change management approaches were employed at the University of Nairobi. The objectives of the study were to establish how strategic change was managed at the University of Nairobi and to determine the challenges management faced in implementation of change programmes. The findings indicated that the need for change at the University of Nairobi was necessitated by the need to set a new strategic direction that was to propel the institution to higher levels of effectiveness, efficiency and relevance which was in line with its revised vision of being *"A world class university with scholarly excellence"*.

This research was conducted through a case study of the University of Nairobi. The research design entailed utilization of qualitative research techniques for data collection to better understand how strategic change management at the University of Nairobi was undertaken. The design was appropriate as it provided insights into the research problem by describing the variables of interest in details. Primary data was collected by conducting personal interviews of the top university administrators with the help of an interview guide. The data collected was summarized according to the study themes being the approaches for change management and challenges encountered in implementation of change programmes. Data was then analyzed using content analysis.

The study established that the institution embraces change management practices. It was clear from the findings that the university managed the change process by first, setting the vision, mission and values of the institution. This was followed by undertaking strategic analysis through evaluating past performance and conducting a SWOT analysis. This was followed by developing strategic objectives which highlighted what the university desired to achieve. Each strategic objective had its corresponding strategies on how it was to be accomplished. Then the institution developed an implementation framework of how strategic plans were to be cascaded to lower units of the university, the appropriate structures for implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This was followed by an action plan and finally the actual change programme.

The researcher identified a number of challenges to the change process. This included resistance to change, inadequate resources, Competition, bureaucratic process in the University, inability of the university to attract and retain staff, trade unionism and inability of some staff to concentrate on meeting their set targets and responsibilities. The respondents noted that the university had to address these challenges by developing strategies on how to counter them. In addition, the findings noted that the leadership of the institution played a critical role in the change process.

Following the findings of this study, it recommends that a proper framework should be developed that links the various strategy implementation together. This is through creation of new comprehensive management system that the institution can use to sustain world class strategy execution. This is by clarifying the organization's goals and through conducting strategic analysis, planning organization's strategy by selecting theme based measures, targets, and initiatives, along with accountability for performance, aligning the organizational units and employees to the strategy, planning operations, through priority setting and resource allocation, monitoring and learning from operations and strategy, and testing and adopting the strategy.

It further recommends that the university should strengthen monitoring system to continuously monitor and evaluate the change outcome. This will ensure the gains achieved are not eroded and business as usual returns in the institution. The university should also do more to mobilize resources to facilitate implementation of reforms and come up with ways of dealing with resistance to change especially among the academic staff. To oversee all these processes, the researcher recommends creation of *Office of strategy Management*. This office will serve as a kind of championing team – coordinating activities across functions and departmental units and keeping everyone synchronized over time. This will enable the institution to quickly and reliably execute its strategic changes.

The study further gives limitations and suggestion for further research. Various limitation identified by the researcher included in availability of some of the respondents, the study only focused on one university and some changes were still in the process of being implemented. It is recommended that an evaluation of the change process be conducted in future for comparability since the strategic changes at the university were ongoing. A cross-sectional study in other public, private and foreign universities in Kenya should also be carried out to establish their experience on strategic change management.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Organizations worldwide are confronting more turbulent markets, more demanding shareholders, and more discerning customers, and many are restructuring to meet such challenges. Their success in making the changes required depends much on the quality of their leadership; not only at the top of the organization but also among all managers responsible for operating results. We know that leadership can make a great difference, and we know that its importance for organizational success is intensifying. Yet we still know too little about the qualities and practice of effective organizational leadership and change management (Ansoff, 1987).

Many organizations both in public and private sectors face an increasing pressure to adapt to their rapidly changing competitive or institutional environments. In order to survive and prosper they frequently enter into processes of strategic reorientation. As these processes are typically complex and intrusive however, organizations run a severe risk of deteriorating their operational performance as a consequence of the change process. Organizations engaging in strategic reorientation thus face a crucial managerial challenge of changing their long-term strategic focus while avoiding disruptions of ongoing operations, as these disruptions may in turn negatively affect intended strategic outcomes (Johnson and Scholes, 2002). Pettigrew and Whipp (1993) notes that change process should start with awareness of the need for change. An analysis of this situation and the factors that have created it leads to its diagnosis of their distinctive characteristics and indication of the direction in which action needs to be taken. Possible causes of action can be identified and evaluated and choice made of the preferred action.

If organizations have to move towards their strategic vision by means of many small scale, localized incremental changes, managers must ensure that those concerned, which could potentially be the entire workforce, have access to and are able to act on all the available information. This could be achieved through encouraging a collective pooling of knowledge and information which will lead to a better understanding of the pressures and possibilities for

implementing change successfully. These in turn enable managers to improve the quality of strategic decisions (Buchanan and Boddy, 1993; Quinn, 1993).

With each new change initiative, people have to spend time learning new tasks, implementing new systems and procedures, developing new knowledge, using new skills and behaviours, and all of this, typically, under severe time pressure because the organization cannot stop functioning while this happens (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001). Change may threaten to move us out of our 'comfort zone', away from those things, which we prefer and enjoy. We develop vested interests in the perpetuation of organization structures and accompanying technologies. Change can mean loss of power, prestige, respect, approval, status and security (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001). Wilson (1992) argues that to effect change successfully, organizations needed to continuously and proactively move forward incrementally. Large scale change and more formal and integrated approaches to change lose their sense of purpose and relevance for organizations operating in dynamic and uncertain environments.

According Kotter (1996), change management is the process, tools and techniques to manage the people-side of change processes, to achieve the required outcomes, and to realize the change effectively within the individual change agent, the inner team, and the wider system. Change management is tightly connected to the concept of learning organizations. Only if organizations and individuals within organizations learn, they will be able to master a positive change. In other words, change is the result from an organizational learning process that centers around the questions: "In order to sustain and grow as an organization and as individuals within; what are the procedures, what is the know-how we need to maintain and where do we need to change?", and "How can we manage a change, that is in harmony with the values we hold as individuals and as organizations?"

1.1.1 Overview of Strategic Change Management

Change is both inevitable and necessary in any business and so it is important for managers to sharpen their skills in change management. Managers have to judge when change is needed and

also adapt to changes outside of their organization (Kaplan and Norton, 2008). The globalization of world economies has resulted in high environmental volatility coming in unpredictable ways. Environmental changes such as technological innovation, competition, globalization, regulation and de-regulation and consumer behaviour have affected many organizations. These organizations have been forced to enhance their business processes in order to survive in an environment, which has become increasingly competitive (Ansoff, 1987). Throughout most of modern business history, corporations have attempted to unlock value by matching their structures to the strategies (Kaplan, 2002). Organizations are therefore undertaking strategic changes in order to align their business strategies to the environment thereby matching the resources and activities of an organization to that environment (Johnson and Scholes, 2002).

In order to cope with the external and internal pressures, organizations have been forced to become more innovative in ways of doing their things faster to meet more customer demand and have more products that cut a profitable market niche. Organizations have to be constantly on the alert to anticipate change and implement it to the end (Mintzberg, 1987). The capacity to anticipate change and manage adaptation to it in a timely and acceptable way is one of the key success factors for competitiveness and wealth creation of organizations and economies as a whole. For organizations to remain truly competitive over time as the environment changes, Hayes (2002) argues that they have to learn, adapt and reorient them to the changing environment. The process they argue has to be deliberate and co-coordinated leading to gradual or radical systemic realignments between the environment and a firms' strategic orientation that results in improvement in performance and effectiveness.

Attitudes towards change result from a complex interplay of emotions and cognitive processes. Because of this complexity, individuals react to change differently. On the positive side, change is seen as a kin to opportunity, rejuvenation, progress, innovation and growth. On the other hand, change can also be seen as a kin to instability, upheaval, unpredictability, threat, and disorientation. Whether an employee perceive change with fear, anxiety and demoralization, or with excitement and confidence, or somewhat in between, depends partially on the individuals

psychological makeup, partially on managements action and partially on the specific nature of the change (Worren *et al*, 1999).

Comstock (2006) recommends that before effecting change process, first an organization must be ready for change before any implementation. The top management should keep employees informed about the need and the process of change. This is because the employee's perception or interpretations of a change can increase or reduce resistance to change. Other author's (Lawrence, 1954; Maurer, 1996; Strebel 1994; and Sanyal and Martin, 1998) stress that the reason for the failure of many change initiatives are as a result of resistance to change which eventually increases operation costs and delays into the change process that are difficult to anticipate. Bear and Eisenstat (1996) argues that resistance is a source of information which is useful in developing future successful change process. De Jager (2001) points out that employee resist change because they have to learn something new; this is mainly due to fear of the unknown future and ability to adapt to it. This eventually leads to resistance to change.

1.1.2 Public Universities in Kenya

According to Commission of Higher Education (CHE), there are seven public universities and seventeen private universities that have university charters and six that have interim letters of authority. The public universities are University of Nairobi, Kenyatta University, Egerton University, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Moi University, Maseno University and Maside Muliro University. The universities have been established mainly to respond to the growing need for higher education so as to respond to current and future manpower needs. The Master Plan for Education and Training (MPET), 1997-2010 notes that there has been remarkable growth of Education and Training (E&T) since 1963. The report notes that the growth has been manifested in the growth of teaching/learning institutions and emoluments.

Oketch (2004) argues that in spite of the rapid growth, public universities in Kenya have enrollment beyond their capacity to plan and finance, fiscal challenges beyond control, a decline

in quality beyond their anticipation and weak management practices beyond their level of training. To help alleveviate some of these problems, private universities have increasingly emerged and gained ground in the country as alternative route to provision of higher education (Sanyal and Martin, 1998). Otieno (2004) notes that in effort to fulfill their role, Kenyan universities are facing numerous challenges namely; the changing relationship between public universities and the government, inadequate funding, poor infrastructure, maintaining quality and standards, increasing societal expectations, a growth in demand for higher education, shifting demographics and stiff competition.

According to Oketch (2004), Kenya public universities are facing diminished public confidence due to introduction of direct tuition charges to students under cost sharing programme, the deteriorating physical facilities, rigid course programmes that are not responsive to the labour market, students unrest which lead to long closures and the expiry of the initial public universities mission which closely linked universities degree to automatic jobs. Abagi (1999), notes that deficit between capital expenditure is also a major challenge facing public universities. Public universities have responded to increased demand of higher education by mounting self sponsored degree programmes (module II programmes).

In the report by the Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR) on, *Radical Reform for Kenya's Education Sector: Implementing Policies Responsive to vision 2030*, Kenya's education system is in a crisis and in a verge of collapse unless radical reforms were implemented fast. According to the report the crisis is as a result of challenges in access, equity, curriculum relevance and quality the education system has suffered over the years. This report partly attributes the failure to the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology failure to invest efforts and resources to develop and deploy the desired reforms. The report also calls for revising education Act and various universities' Acts that had been overtaken by events as the internal and external efficiency of education management systems cannot resolve the effects of the crisis (*The standard newspaper*, 8th September 2008:p1).

1.1.3 The University of Nairobi

The idea of an institution for higher learning in Kenya goes back to 1947 when the then Kenyan government drew up a plan for the establishment of a technical and commercial institute in Nairobi. By 1949, this plan had grown into an East African concept, aimed at providing higher technical education for all the territories of East Africa. By 1949, this plan had grown into an East African concept, aimed at providing higher technical education for all the territories of East Africa. In September 1951, this concept received a royal charter, under the name, Royal Technical College of East Africa with a grant from the Colonial Development and Welfare funds. The University of Nairobi (UON) which came into being after these developments is the largest university in Kenya. Although its history as an educational institution goes back to 1956, it did not become an independent university until 1970 when the University of East Africa was split into three independent universities: Makerere University in Uganda, the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania, and the University of Nairobi in Kenya (University of Nairobi Calendar 2006/2007; University of Nairobi web site: www.unobi.ac.ke).

Weidman (1995), points out that the first step towards the introduction and development of University education in Kenya was taken in 1961, when the then Royal College, Nairobi, was evaluated to University College status under special arrangement with the University of London, which enabled it to prepare students for the degrees of the University of London. However it was not until 1970 that the university college of Nairobi attained university status. With establishment the University of East Africa in 1963, the Royal College became the University College, Nairobi with Enrollment of just 571 students (Weidman, 1995). The university of East Africa continued operating until 1970 when the University College of Nairobi attained university status.

The university launched several policy frameworks including introduction self sponsored degree programmes to cope with the demand of higher education in Kenya. It made ties with the University of Rome La Sapienza and Vrije University Brussels in Belgium mainly for collaboration in Research and Development (R&D). In view of the rapid expansion and complexities in administration, the university underwent a major restructuring in 1983 resulting

in decentralization of the administration through the creation of six campus colleges headed by principals. These are the College of Education and External Studies, (CEES), the College of Architecture and Engineering (CAE), the College of Biological and Physical Sciences (CBPS), the College of Health Sciences (CHS), the College of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences (CAVS) and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHSS). The University was also structured under seven campuses: The Main Campus, The Chiromo Campus, The Upper Kabete Campus, The Lower Kabete Campus, The Kikuyu Campus, The Kenyatta National Hospital Campus, The parklands Campus, and The Institute of African Studies (University of Nairobi Calendar 2006/2007; University of Nairobi: *Strategic Plan 2008-2013*; University of Nairobi web site: www.unobi.ac.ke).

Some of the fundamental changes that took place in the recent past included the introduction of performance contracts to improve accountability, merging campuses to form schools with the aim of enhancing management and creating a corrupt free environment to ensure that the stakeholders get services without using unfair means. All these changes have transformed the University to the extent of being recognized internationally hence its *International Standards Organization* (ISO) certification on 7th August, 2008. With opportunities such as increased demand for higher education, University's strategic location and a move towards knowledge based economies, the University needed to reposition itself to cope up with changes in both external and internal environments (*Daily Nation newspaper*, 7th August, 2008; Ichangi, 2006).

Kenyan environment is not exempt from what the global scenes are experiencing. Organizations being environment dependent have to constantly adapt their activities and internal configurations to reflect the new external realities and failure to do this may put the future success of an organization in jeopardy (Aosa, 1998). The University of Nairobi faced challenges which included inadequate resources, the question of relevance and quality of the education offered, the rapid technological changes, the need to keep tuition fees affordable, inability to cope with the increasing demand for higher, trade unionism , perception that introduction of self sponsored degree programmes has compromised quality and competition from both public, private and foreign universities (University of Nairobi: Strategic Plan 2008-2013; *Daily Nation newspaper*,

30th August,2008: pp44; *Daily Nation newspaper*, 25th August 2008:pp6-7; *The Standard newspaper:* 20th August, 2008:pp8; The *standard newspaper*, August 2008:pp27-28).

1.2 Statement of Research Problem

The biggest challenge to managers today is the issue of how organizations can cope with the dynamic environment in which they operate given the constraints, challenges and threats they face. Organizations are therefore operating with uncertainty of change which varies from company to company, industry to industry and country to country. Unprecedented changes could be due to economic, political, technological, cultural or social factors (Burnes, 2003; Boddy and Parton, 1998). Organization have therefore introduced change management through use of systematic methods to ensure that change in organizations can be guided in the planned direction, conducted in cost effective manner and completed within the targeted time frame and with the desire result in response to environmental changes. The change could be in strategy, culture, structure, technology and attitude and skills of the people (Kaplan and Norton, 2008).

Various approaches or techniques have been put forward for effective and efficient implementations of the change. This includes planned change approach which views organization change as a process of moving from one fixed state to another through a series of preplanned steps. Emergent approach view change as continuous, open ended and unpredictable process of aligning and realigning the organization to its changing environments. It recognizes the need for organizations to align their internal practices to the external conditions (Burnes, 2003). In addition, various theoretical models of change have also been put forward with each attempting to describe the process through which an organization can successfully implement change and at the same time minimize resistance. This include Lewin's (1947) Three step model of change and Force Field Analysis model, Kotter's (1995) Eight step model, Kanter *et al* (1992)'s model of change management, and Bullock and Battern (1985) integrated Four-Phase model of planned change, and Beer *et al* (1990) Ten step change process model.

The forces for change at the University of Nairobi were necessitated by pressure from both the internal and external environments. This included inadequate resources, rapid technological changes, trade unionism, increased demand for higher education, growing pressure on public universities to provide greater access to their programmes, government requiring public universities to expand and sustain programmes they mount, employers demand for more skilled personnel with increased technical expertise and practical skills, negative perception that the quality of education offered at the university had gone down, increased competition, ineffective management styles, and the question of relevance of education offered (Oketch, 2004; University of Nairobi: Strategic Plan 2008-2013).

Change management is a subject studied extensively in Kenya. Most studies in this area have focused on the process of change management. Mbogo (2003) studied strategic change management process in Kenya Commercial Bank. He concluded that the main factors that adversely affected the change effort were non-supportive organization culture. Ogwora (2003) studied on strategic change management at the National Cereals and Produce Board. He concluded that change management has tremendously improved the efficiency of service delivery in the company. Rukunga (2003), on his part looked at Strategic Change Management at the Nairobi Bottlers Ltd and concluded that Nairobi Bottlers Ltd has successfully embraced change management as a strategy and that it has affected the operations in a positive way. Ichangi (2006) looked at managing resistance to change in public universities in Kenya. She concluded that resistance to change was a major impediment in implementing change at the public universities in Kenya.

Finally Ongaro (2004) carried out a study on strategic change management practices in Kenyatta National Hospital (KNH), he documented that service industries too need change management and KNH had taken the lead in a successful implementation of reforms. These studies show that the researchers focused on management of change in general and none had looked at strategic change management at the University of Nairobi, therefore there was a compelling need for this

research to be undertaken to establish and document the strategic change management in an academic institution in Kenya.

The study was to answer the following questions; what strategic change management approaches were adopted by the University of Nairobi? What were the challenges that the University of Nairobi management faced when managing change?

1.3 Research Objectives

i) To establish how strategic change was managed at the University of Nairobi.
ii) To determine the challenges management face in implementation of change programmes at University of Nairobi.

1.4 Importance of the Study

The study was significant for several reasons. First, the research findings were to be of value to the industry players who will have available information on the institution as a whole. In addition, the findings were to help individual learning institutions to formulate change strategies once they knew how the industry was performing.

Secondly, scholars in the field of strategic management were to use the information to understand the state of the institutions better. They will also use the information as a reference point to research on strategic change management in other academic institutions.

Finally, the Government was to benefit from the information in diagnosing the challenges facing the institutions of higher learning and coming up with solutions to reverse the situation.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Change Management

One meaning of "managing change" refers to the making of changes in a planned and managed or systematic fashion. The aim is to effectively implement new methods and systems in an ongoing organization. The changes to be managed lie within and are controlled by the organization. However, these internal changes might have been triggered by events originating outside the organization, in what is usually termed "the environment." Hence, the second meaning of managing change, namely, the response to changes over which the organization exercises little or no control e.g., legislation, social and political upheaval, the actions of competitors, shifting economic tides and currents. Researchers and practitioners alike typically distinguish between a knee-jerk or reactive response and an anticipative or proactive response (Dawson, 1994).

Change management can also be said to be an area of professional practice. There are dozens, if not hundreds, of independent consultants who will quickly and proudly proclaim that they are engaged in planned change, that they are change agents, that they manage change for their clients, and that their practices are change management practices. There are numerous small consulting firms whose principals would make these same statements about their firms. Most of the major management consulting firms have a change management practice area. Some of these change management experts claim to help clients manage the changes they face. Others claim to help clients make changes. Still others offer to help by taking on the task of managing changes that must be made. In almost all cases, the process of change is treated separately from the specifics of the situation. It is expertise in this task of managing the general process of change that is laid claim to by professional change agents (Dawson, 1994).

Stemming from the view of change management as an area of professional practice there arises yet a third definition of change management: the content or subject matter of change

management. This consists chiefly of the models, methods and techniques, tools, skills and other forms of knowledge that go into making up any practice (Boddy and Parton, 1998:563). The content or subject matter of change management is drawn from psychology, sociology, business administration, economics, industrial engineering, systems engineering and the study of human and organizational behavior. Clarke (1994) argues that change management has also to be seen in the light of the discussion on knowledge management, which took several turns during the nineties.

2.2 Approach to Organizational Change

The planned approach to change has dominated the theory and practice of change management for the past 50 years. Based on the pioneering work of Lewin (1939), this approach views organizational change as essentially a process of moving from one fixed state to another through a series of predictable and pre-planned steps. The emergent approach, which come to the fore in the 1980s, start from the assumption that change is a continuous, open ended and unpredictable process of aligning and realigning an organization to its changing environment. Advocates of emergent change argue that it is more suitable to the turbulent environment in which modern firms now operate because, unlike the planned approach, it recognizes the need for organizations to align their internal practices, processes and behaviour with changing external conditions.

Scott (1987) argues that neither strategy nor change management would be considered particularly important if products and markets were stable and organizational change was rare. However that is not the case, nor has it ever has been so. Change is an ever present feature of organizational life, though many would argue that the pace and magnitude of change have increased significantly in recent years. Undoubtedly, the way such changes are managed and the appropriateness of the approach adopted have major implications for the way people experience change and their perception of the income.

Dawson (1994) and Wilson (1992) both challenged the appropriateness of planned change in a

business environment that is increasingly dynamic and uncertain. They argue that those who believe that organizational change can successfully be achieved through a preplanned and centrally directed process of 'unfreezing', 'moving' and 'refreezing' ignore the complex and dynamic nature of environmental and change processes, and do not address crucial issues such as the continuous need for employee flexibility and structural adaptation. Wilson (1992) also believes that the planned approach, by attempting to lay down timetables, objectives and methods in advance, is too heavily reliant on the role of managers, and assumes (perhaps rashly) that they can have a full understanding of the consequences of their actions and that their plans will be understood, accepted and can be implemented.

2.3 The Change Process

The process of change has been characterized as having three basic stages: unfreezing, changing, and re-freezing. This view draws heavily on Lewin's (1951) adoption of the systems concept of homeostasis or dynamic stability. What is not useful about this framework is that it does not allow for change efforts that begin with the organization in extremis (i.e., already "unfrozen"), nor does it allow for organizations faced with the prospect of having to "hang loose" for extended periods of time (i.e. staying "unfrozen"). In other words, the beginning and ending point of the unfreeze-change-refreeze model is stability which, for some people and some organizations, is a luxury. For others, internal stability spells disaster.

To cope with this complexity, Pettigrew and Whipp (1993) proposed a model of strategic and operational change which involves five interrelated activities: environmental assessment, leading change, coherence, linking strategic and operational change, and developing human resources. By undertaking these activities, organizations can cope with uncertainty by becoming open learning systems, with strategy development and change emerging from the way the company, a whole acquires interprets and processes information about its environment. Clarke (1994) took a similar view, arguing that an organization's survival and growth depends on identifying environmental and market change quickly, and responding opportunistically. However, as Benjamin and Mabey (1993:181) pointed out:

- 13 -

....While the primary stimulus for change remains those forces in the external environment, the primary motivator for how change is accomplished resides with the people within the organization.

Changes in the external environment, therefore, require appropriate responses within organizations. It is a response, the supporters of the emergent approach state, that should promote extensive and deep understanding of strategy, structure, systems, people, style, and culture and how these can function either as sources of inertia that can block change, or alternatively, as levers to encourage an effective change process (Dawson, 1994; Pettigrew and Whipp, 1993; Wilson 1992). A major development in this respect is the move to adopt a 'bottom up' rather than 'top down' approach to initiating and implementing change. The case in favour of this move is based on the view that the pace of environmental change is so rapid and complex that it is impossible for a small number of senior managers effectively to identify, plan and implement the necessary organizational responses. The responsibility for organizational change is therefore of necessity becoming more devolved.

A bottom-up approach requires a major change in the role of senior managers. Instead of directing and controlling change, their role becomes one of ensuring the organization's members are receptive to, and have the necessary skills and motivation to take charge of, the change process Wilson (1992) believed that to achieve this, senior managers must not only change the way they perceive and interpret the world, but achieve a similar transformation among everyone else in the organization as well. Pettigrew and Whipp (1993) contend that the degree to which organizations can achieve such a difficult task, and create receptive to change, is dependent on four conditioning factors; the extent to which key players in the organization are prepared to champion environmental assessment techniques that increase openness, the degree to which assessment occurs and how effectively it is integrated with central business operations, the extent to which environmental pressures are recognized and the structural and cultural characteristics of the organization.

Pettigrew and Whipp (1993:6) conclude that there are no universal rules with regard to leading change; rather it involves 'linking action by people at all levels of the businesses. Nevertheless, though the concepts of universally applicable rules for change are rejected, supporters of the emergent approach do tend to stress, features of organizations that either promote or obstruct success these are structures and cultures.

2.4 Drivers of Change Management

2.4.1 Organizational Structure

This is seen as playing a crucial role in defining how people relate to each other and in influencing the momentum for change (Clarke 1994: Dawson, 1994). Therefore an appropriate organization structure can be an important lever for achieving change, but its effectiveness is regarded as dependent upon the recognition of its informal as well as its formal aspects. Those favouring an emergent approach to change point out that the 1990s witnessed a move to create flatter organizational structures in order to increase responsiveness by devolving authority and responsibility. An aspect of this is the move to create customer centered organizations with structures that reflects, and is responsive to, different markets rather than different functions. Customer responsiveness places greater emphasis on effective horizontal processes and embodies the concept that everyone is someone else's customer (Kaplan, 2002).

One result of attempts to respond rapidly to changing conditions by breaking down in internal barriers, disseminating knowledge and developing synergy across functions is the creation of network organizations, or to use Handy's (1989) term, federal organizations. Snow et al (1993) suggested that the semi-autonomous nature of each part of a network reduces the need for and erodes the power of centrally managed bureaucracies, which in turn leads to change and adaptation being driven from the bottom up rather than from the top down. They further argue that the specialization and flexibility required coping with globalization, intense competition and

rapid technological change can only be achieved by loosening the central ties and controls that have characterized organizations in the past.

2.4.2 Organizational Culture

Burnes (2003) suggested that the strategic management of change is 'essentially a culture and cognitive phenomenon' rather than an analytical, rational exercise. Clarke (1994) stated that the essence of sustainable change is to understand the culture of the organization that is to be changed. If proposed changes contradict cultural biases and traditions, it is inevitable that they will be difficult to embed in the organization.

In a similar vein, Dawson (1994) suggested that attempts to realign internal behaviour with eternal conditions require change strategies that are culturally sensitive. Organizations, he points out, must be aware that the process is lengthy, potentially dangerous, and demands considerable reinforcement if culture change is to be sustained against the inevitable tendency to regress to old patterns of behaviour. Clarke (1994) also stressed that change can be slow, especially where mechanisms and promotion structures, continue unchallenged. In addition, if these reinforcement and promotion structures, continue unchallenged. In addition, if these reinforcement mechanisms are completed by managerial behaviors that promote risk aversion and fear of failure, it is unlikely to create a climate where people are willing to propose or undertake change. Accordingly, as Clarke (1994:94) suggested, 'creating a culture for change means that change has to be part of the way we do things around here, it cannot be bolted on as an extra'.

Therefore, for many proponents of the emergent approach to change, the presence of development of an appropriate organizational culture is essential. However, not all its proponents take this view; Beer et al (1993) suggested that the most effective way to promote change is not by directly attempting to influence organizational behaviors or culture. Instead, they advocate restructuring organizations in order to place people in a new organizational context that imposes new roles, relationships and responsibilities upon them. Therefore, for many proponents of

change, one essential factor in successful change is for organizations to possess or to be able to develop an appropriate organizational culture.

2.4.3 Organizational Learning

For advocates of the emergent approach, learning plays a key role in preparing people for, and allowing them to cope with, change (Bechtold, 1997; Senge, 2000). Put simply, learning means '...the capacity of members of an organization to detect and correct errors and to seek new insights that would enable them to make choices that better produce outcomes that they seek' (Martin, 2000: 463). A willingness to change often only stems from the feeling that there is no other option (Argyris, 1999; Pettigrew and Whipp, 1993). Therefore, as Wilson (1992) suggest, change can be precipitated by encouraging dissatisfaction with current systems and procedures are making impending crises real to everyone in the organization. Kotter (1996) advocates engineering a crisis in order to build the momentum for change.

Whatever the spur for change, however, staff are unlikely to recognize the need for change unless managers create mechanisms which allow them to become familiar with the company's performance, market place, customers, competitors, legal requirements, etc. (Fiol and Lyles, 1985; Probst and Buchel, 1997; Pettigrew and Shipp (1993:18) also contended that collective learning is one of the main preconditions for sustainable change. They argue that 'collective learning' ensures that the full implications of an organization's view of its environment can then inform subsequent actions over the long term and, in turn, the way in which future shifts in the environment are tackled.

Clarke (1994) and Nadler (1993) suggested that individual and organizational learning stem from effective top down communication and the promotion of self development and confidence. In turn, this encourages the commitment to, and shared ownership of, the origination's vision, actions and decisions that are necessary to respond to the external environment and take advantage of the opportunities it offers. Additionally, a Pugh (1993) points out, in order to

generate the need and climate for change, people within originations need to be involved in the diagnosis of problems and the development of solutions.

Therefore, a new open management style such as performance contracting can result in staff putting pressure on managers to address fundamental questions about the purpose and direction of the organization which previously they might have preferred to avoid. Consequently, Tsang (1997) suggest, organizational learning is neither an easy nor an uncontinuous option for organizations. There is also a great diversity of opinion as to what it is and how it can be promoted, which makes organizational learning a more difficult concept to apply than many of its supporters acknowledge (Burnes, 2003).

2.4.4 Managerial Behaviour

To be effective in this new role, managers require knowledge of an expertise in strategy formulation, human resource management marketing/sales and negotiation/conflict resolution, and much more (Beer and Nohria, 2000; Clarke, 1994; Hayes, 2002). But the key to success, the decisive factor in creating a focused agenda for organizational change is, according to many observers, managers' own behaviour (Graetz *et al*, 2002; Kanter, 1984; Kotter, 1999; Pfeffer, 1996). If managers are to gain the commitment of others to change, they must first be prepared to challenge their own assumptions, attitudes and mindsets so that they develop an understanding of the emotional and intellectual processes involved (Buchanan and Boddy, 1992; Burnes, 1998; Harrison, 2002; Sosik and Megerian, 1999).

For supporters of the Emergent approach, the essence of change is the move from the familiar to the unknown, from the certain to the uncertain (Jones *et al* 2004). In this situation, it is essential for managers to be able to tolerate risk and cope with paradox and ambiguity (Weick, 2000; Stacey *et al*, 2002). Pugh (1993) took the view that, in a dynamic environment, open and active communication with those participating in the change process is the key to pricing with risk and ambiguity. This very much follows the view expressed by many that top down, unilaterally-imposed change does not work and that bottom up change, based on devolved responsibility

and genuine empowerment, is the way forward (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1997; Clarke 1999; Harung *et al*, 1999; Styhre, 2002). This in turn requires managers to facilitate open, organization wide communication via groups, individuals, and formal and informal channels (Hayes, 2002; Kanter *et al*, 1992; senior, 2002).

2.4.5 Organizational Power and Politics

The importance of power and politics in organizational life, especially change situations. Though the advocates of emergent change tend to view power and politics from differing perspectives, they recognize their importance and that they have to be managed if change is to be effective. Dawson (1994: 176), for example, concluded that 'The central argument is that it is important to try and gain the support of senior management, local management, supervisors, trade unions and workplace employees.' According to Weick (2000:236) gaining support requires 'considerable linguistic skills to capture and label the flow of events (and) re-sequence and re-label that sequence'. Pettigrew *et al* (1992:293) take a similar view, stating that 'The significance of political language at the front end of change processes needs emphasizing. Closures can be labeled as redevelopments.

Kanter *et al* (1992: 508) argue that problems can be re-coded into opportunities with '... broad positive visions being articulated to build early coalitions ...' The first step to implementing change is coalition building: '... involve those whose involvement really matters... specifically, seek support from two general groups: power sources and stakeholders'. In a similar vein, Nadler (1993) advocates the need to shape and political dynamics of change so that power centers develop that support the change rather than blocking it.

2.5 Models of Change Management

Planned change is an interactive, cyclical, process involving diagnosis, action and evaluation, and further action and evaluation. It is an approach which recognizes that once change has taken place, it must be self-sustaining (i.e. safe from regression). The purpose of planned change is to

improve effectiveness of the human side of the organization. Central to planned change is the stress placed on the collaborative nature of the change effort: the organization, both managers and recipients of change, and the consultant jointly diagnose the organization's problem and jointly plan and design the specific changes (Burnes, 2003).

Planned approach to change has been widely explored and various scholars have in the process developed a number of models for managing change in organizations. Key among them include Lewin's (1947) Three-step model of change and Force Field Analysis model, Kotter's (1995) Eight-step model, Kanter *et al* (1992)'s model of change management, and Bullock and Battern (1985) integrated Four-phase model of planned change and Beer *et al* (1990) Ten-step change process model. A brief description of each of these models is presented below.

2.5.1 Lewin's Three–Step Model of Change

Lewin (1947) offered a three-step model that proposes going through the steps of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing Unfreezing involves removing those forces maintaining the organization's behaviour at its present level. Moving involves acting on the results of unfreezing i.e. take action to move to the desirable state of affairs. Refreezing seeks to stabilize the organization at the new set of equilibrium. A feature of this model is that it recognizes, and takes into account, the important fact that, with many change programmes, things may revert back to what they were, unless permanence of the new level is included in the objective.

Managers wanting to introduce change should recognize that change occurs slowly and moves through a series of stages. In the first instance, the need for change must be recognized. Then it is necessary to define where the organization stands relative to the problem, where it wants to be, and how it is going to get there. With respect to the way the change process needs to be managed, Lewin's (1947) three-step model can be expanded to show that the following sequential set of activities needs to take place: recognizing the need for change, defining the problems, identifying where the company is relative to the problem, searching for alternatives, defining goals (identifying where the company wants to be after the change), preparing for

change, unfreezing (loosening the organization so that it can change), moving (consciously managing the process of change), arriving (realizing when the goals have been met), and refreezing (stabilizing and reinforcing the change).

2.5.2 Force Field Analysis Model

Force Field analysis is a general-purpose diagnostic and problem solving technique. Lewin (1947) proposed that changes result from the impact of a set of driving forces upon restraining forces. In any situation, there are forces that push (drive) for change as well as forces (restraining) that hinder change. If the forces offset one another completely, there is equilibrium and status quo. The driving force may be external and internal and are likely to have economic aspects like to increase sales, improve profitability, improve production efficiencies, or generate new forms of competitive advantage. On the other hand, restraining forces may be existing strategies, existing people who are loyal to the status quo among others, all of which may be subjective depending on how one looks at them.

This model assumes that most problems or situations have multiple causes, most problems or situations are held in equilibrium between driving and restraining forces, there is a likelihood of accomplishing change if these forces are identified, and that it is frequently easier to make changes by reducing restraining forces. In applying this model in managing change, some managers may have tendency to increase the driving forces in order to attain change. This may however, result in instability of the system and may lead to negative consequences. Some managers increase driving forces in the short run while reducing the restraining forces in the long run to ensure stability. It is useful to analyze the driving and restraining forces in order to fully understand the change situation.

2.5.3 The Kotter's Eight Stage Change Model

In developing this model, Kotter (1996) contends that often, creating value requires significant change concluded that there are eight reasons why many change processes do not succeed. This

includes allowing too much complexity, failing to build a substantial coalition, not understanding the need for a clear vision, failing to clearly communicate the vision, permitting roadblocks against the vision, not planning for short term results and not realizing them, declaring victory too soon and failure to anchor changes in corporate culture.

To prevent making these mistakes, Kotter (1996) created the following eight change phase model consisting also of eight steps: Establishing a sense of urgency; Creating a coalition; Developing a clear vision; Sharing the vision; Empowering people to clear obstacles; Securing short term wins; Consolidating and keep moving; and Anchoring the change. According to Kotter (1996), it is crucial to follow the eight phases of change in the above exact sequence. A description of the eight stages in the model follows.

The first stage involves establishing a sense of urgency which is crucial to gaining the needed co-operation. With low urgency, it is difficult to bring together a group with enough power and credibility to guide the effort or to convince key individuals to spend necessary time to create and communicate a change vision. By examining the market and competitive realities, identifying and discussing key issues, crises or opportunities establishes urgency. The next stage is creation of a guiding coalition, this is because no one individual is able to develop the right vision and communicate it effectively to large numbers of people, eliminate key obstacles and get the change going on. A strong coalition composed of the right members with high level of trust and having a shared objective and vision is needed. The coalition should be able to work as a team with enough responsibility and authority. Position power, expertise, credibility and leadership should be the key characteristics to be considered when forming the group or team.

Developing a vision and strategy is the third stage, this is necessary to help direct the change effort for effective and successful implementation of the change. An effective vision should be imaginable, desirable, feasible, focused, flexible, and communicable. The firm should also develop strategies for achieving the vision, which should be clear and well understood by all members of the organization. The vision should be grounded on a clear and rational understanding of the organization, its market environment and competitive trends. Strategy

provides the logic and a first level of detail of how the vision can be accomplished. Fourthly there is need to communicating the change vision; all means possible should be used to communicate the new vision and strategies. Such means include employee bulletins, staff meetings, memos, and newspapers, formal or informal interactions. The team leading the change should be role models to the employees with exceptional behaviour. Communication of change vision can be undermined by behaviour on part of key team members who seem to be inconsistent with the vision. The senior management behaviour is carefully monitored so as to identify and address inconsistencies between words and actions.

The next stage of empowering employees comes next which involves getting rid of obstacles, changing systems or structures that undermine the change vision and encouraging risk taking and no traditional ideas, activities and actions. To fully empower employees, the following could be done: confront supervisors who undercut/sabotage needed change, provide the training employees need, make structures to be compatible with the vision, have and communicate a clear and sensible vision, and align information and personnel systems to the vision. Generating short term wins comes next, this is basically running a transformation without serious attention to short term wins is extremely risky. One should plan for visible improvements in performance or wins and also create those wins. In addition, the people who make the wins should be visibly rewarded and recognized.

The other stage in this model is consolidating gains and producing more change: This involves changing all systems, Structures and policies that do not fit in the transformation vision. Hire and promote people who can implement the change vision. The system is reinvigorated with new projects, themes, and change agents. Lastly anchoring new approaches in the culture is also important; this include creating better performance through better Customer and productivity-oriented behaviour, more and better leadership, and more effective management. Articulate the connections between the new behaviors and organizational success. Also, develop means to ensure leadership development and succession. Kotter (1996) says that the change process takes time and goes through several different phases in a successful change effort and that a mistake made during any phase of the change effort can have a negative impact on the organization.

2.5.4 Kanter *et al* Model of Change Management

Kanter *et al* (1992)'s model of change management focuses on managing the political context by providing information, resources and support for the change effort. The main theme is that for organizational change to be successful, it needs to be holistic and systematic, addressing individual, social and organizational factors. The model suggests a number of actions that should be taken during change management: building coalitions by seeking support from power sources and stakeholders; articulate a shared vision of the mission, goals and desired results; define the structure and process that will guide the change, including clear reporting relationships, coordination between activities and teams and accountability for outcomes; ensure communication to keep people informed, education and training to increase their capacities; institute policy and systems review in order to align the strategy with resource allocations; operations, systems and staffing. The phases of planned change model developed by Bullock and Batten (1985) have four stages. These are exploration, planning, action and implementation.

The first stage is exploration phase which involves becoming aware of the need of the need for change, searching for outside assistance/ agent and establishing a contract with the consultant, which defines each party's responsibilities. Here an organization has to explore and decide whether it wants to make specific changes in its operations and if so commit resources to planning the changes. The second stage is the planning phase in which the process of understanding the organization's problem or concern begins. This phase involves the change process of collecting information in order to establish a correct diagnosis of the problem; establishing change goals and designing appropriate actions to achieve the goals; and getting key decisions makers to approve and support proposed changes.

Action phase come third whereby change implementation and evaluation of results in order to make adjustment as necessary is done. It is at this phase where the change process and designed to move an organization from its current state to a desired future state, and include gaining support for the action to be taken. The last phase is the Integration phase; this phase is concerned

with consolidating and stabilizing the changes so that they become part of an organization's normal, everyday operation. The phase involves reinforcing new behaviors, gradually decreasing reliance on consultant, diffusing successful aspects of the change in the organization and training staff to monitor the changes constantly and seek to improve upon them.

2.5.5 Beer *et al* Ten-Step Change Process Model

Beer *et al* (1990) gives a more practicable ten step approach to change management. This process first starts with establishing a sense of urgency. Once the members of the organization have been sensitized on the need to change, the management proceeds to the second step of mobilizing commitment through joint diagnosis of problems. Having established a sense of urgency, leaders then create one or more task forces to diagnose the problems facing the company. Such teams can produce a shared understanding of what they can and must improve, and therefore mobilize the commitment of those who must actually implement the change. The third step involves creating a guiding coalition. No one can really implement such changes alone. Most companies create a guiding coalition of influential people, who work together as a team to act as missionaries and implementers.

Development of a shared vision is the fourth step. Organizational renewal requires a new leadership vision, "a general statement of the organizations intended direction that evokes emotional feelings in organization members." The fifth step involves communicating the vision. Beer *et al* (1990) asserts that the real power of a vision is unleashed only when most of those involved in an enterprise or activity have a common understanding of its goals and direction. To do this, the management has to communicate the vision. The key elements in doing so include: Keeping it simple by eliminating all jargon and wasted words, use of multiple forums which entails using every channel possible-big meetings and small, memos and newspapers, formal and informal interaction-to spread the word, use of repetition again is necessary to ensure that ideas sink in deeply only after employees have heard them many times. Lastly managers need to lead by example by "walking their talk", always making sure their behaviors and decisions are consistent with the vision they expose.

The sixth step involves helping the employees to make the change. It is futile to communicate your vision and to have employees want to make it a reality, if they haven't the wherewithal to do so. Perhaps lack of skills stands in the way; or policies, procedures, and the organization chart make it difficult to act; or some bosses may actually discourage employees from acting. This will be followed by the seventh step which involves generating short-term wins. Changes such as redesigning a firms control system, or launching a new division may take time, but the teams working on them need some intermediate reinforcement. The eighth step involves consolidating the gains to produce more change. Such short-term wins can generate the credibility to move ahead such as to change all the systems, structures, and policies that don't fit well with the companies' new vision. Leaders continue to produce more change by hiring and promoting new people; by identifying selected employees to champion the continuing change; and by providing additional opportunities for short term wins by employees. The ninths step is to anchor the new ways of doing things in the company's culture. Organizational changes usually require a corresponding change in culture and values. A ''team-based ,quality–oriented, adaptable organization" is not going to happen if the values employees share still emphasize selfishness, mediocrity, and values bureaucratic behavior. Leaders thus take steps to role–model and communicate the new values. This is followed by monitoring progress and adjusting the vision as required. Finally, continuous monitoring and evaluation is undertaken corrective measures put in place.

2.6 Resistance to Change

Resistance to change is defined variously. Zander (1950) in Dent and Goldberg (1999) defined resistance as "behavior which is intended to protect an individual from the effects of reach or imagined change." They further argue that individuals may not be resisting the loss of status, loss of pay, or loss of comfort. Ansoff (1999) sums up resistance to mean a multifaceted phenomenon which introduces unanticipated delays; costs, and instabilities in the process of a strategic change. People in an organization may resist when implications of the change are not well understood or merely left out during the change formulation. Bolognese (2002) argues that resistance is inevitable in an organization is response to any major change. It is therefore

important for management to understand, accept and make an effort to work with resistance because resistance can undermine the most well intentioned and well conceived change efforts.

Johnson and Scholes (2004), points out that knowing or envisaging change does not in itself mean that people will make it happen. The challenges may be attributed to either systematic or behavioural attributes of an organization. Systematic resistance usually occurs from the organization mainly featuring its incompetence in managerial capacity, people's knowledge and skills, while behavioural is within the employee at individual or team level. Folger and Skalicki (1999) claim that "organization change can generate skepticism and resistance in employees, making it sometimes difficult or impossible to implement organizational improvements." Other author's (Lawrence, 1954; Maurer, 1996; and Strebel, 1994) stress that the reason for the failure of many change initiatives as a result of resistance to change which eventually increases operation costs and cause delays into the change process that are difficult to anticipate. Beer *et al* (1993) argues resistance is a source of information which is useful in developing future successful change process.

Attitudes towards change result from a complex interplay of emotions and cognitive processes. Because of this complexity, individuals react to change differently. On the positive side, change is seen as a kin to opportunity, rejuvenation, progress, innovation and growth. On the other hand, change can also be seen as a kin to instability, upheaval, unpredictability, threat, and disorientation. Whether an employee perceive change with fear, anxiety and demoralization, or with excitement and confidence, or somewhat in between, depends partially on the individuals psychological makeup, partially on managements action and partially on the specific nature of the change (Worren *et al*, 1999).

A critical point is whether management's enquiry into the business's problems and opportunities is directed at changing the culture or at changing behavior. Beer *et al* (1990) have argued that change programmes which are centrally directed, and which focus initially on attitudes or cultural change, usually fail. Instead, they propose that change efforts should focus explicitly on

creating new roles, responsibilities and relationships, which in turn lead to new attitude and behaviour, which can then be reinforced by the reward system.

Zalman and Duncan (1977) gives four categories of barriers to strategic change as cultural, social, organizational and psychological barriers which can occur at both systemic and behavioral levels. The systemic resistance is as a result of lack appropriate knowledge, information, skills and managerial capacity while behavioral resistance to change is a combination of individual reaction to frustration with strong group induced force. Comstock, (2006) recommends that before effecting change process, first an organization must be ready for change before it can be implemented. The top management should keep employees informed about the need and the process of change. This is because the employee's perception or interpretations of a change can increase or reduce resistance to change. De Jager (2001) argues that employees resist change because they have to learn something new; this is mainly due to fear of the unknown future and ability to adapt to it. This eventually leads to resistance to change.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The research was undertaken via a case study. The research design entailed utilization of qualitative research techniques for data collection to better understand how strategic change management at the University of Nairobi was undertaken. Kothari (2004) asserts that a case study research designs are appropriate where a detailed analysis of a single unit is desired as they provide a focused and valuable insight into the phenomenon that may otherwise be wrongly and vaguely known.

The design was appropriate as it provided insights into the research problem by describing the variables of interest in details. By using case studies, researchers are able to collect data and explain phenomena more deeply and exhaustively (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). Kothari (2004:113) says that "case study is a form of qualitative analysis where a careful and complete observation of an individual or situation or an institution is done; efforts are made to study each and every aspect of the concerning unit in minute details and then from case data, generalizations and inferences are drawn".

3.2 Data Collection

The main source of data collected was primary. The researcher conducted in-depth personal interviews guided by open ended questions (as per the interview guide - Appendix II) of respondents that were picked from top University administrators. These top administrators control the University's resources, make policies and therefore were directly involve in making strategic changes. Those interviewed included the Deputy Vice-chancellor (administration and finance), the principal college of Humanities and social sciences and Administration Registrar. Data was collected within one month.

The researcher used open ended questions to avoid subjectivity that could result from limiting the interviewee's answers to the questions. Cooper and Schindler (2003) points out that open-ended question help measure sensitivity or disapproval of behavior, discover silence, or encourage natural modes of expression.

3.3 Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using content analysis. The data collected was summarized according to the study themes being the approaches for change management and challenges encountered when implementing change programmes. The data was then evaluated and analyzed to determine its adequacy, credibility, usefulness and consistency. Cooper and Schindler (2003) points out that content analysis measures the semantic content or the 'what' aspect of the message. Its breadth makes it flexible and wide-ranging tool that may be used as a methodology or as a problem-specific technique. He further points out that content analysis guards against selective perception of content, provides for rigorous application of reliability and validity criteria.

The researcher used content analysis by determining the presence of key words or concepts within texts. Nachmias and Nachmias (1991), define content analysis as a technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specific characteristics of messages and then relating the themes. This tool was appropriate as it helped the researcher to quantify and analyze the presence, meanings and relationships of such words and concepts and make inferences about the messages. This method further enabled the researcher to include large amounts information and systematically identify its properties. The approach has previously been used by Ichangi (2006) and Muturi (2006).

CHAPTER 4: THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Introductions

This chapter discusses the findings of the study based on the analysis and interpretation of primary data collected from the top university management interviewed. The findings of the study focused on the themes; forces of change, approach to change management, content of change and overall achievement of change management.

4.2 Driving Forces for Change

The researcher identified that the need for change at the University of Nairobi was necessitated by the need to set a new strategic direction that was to propel the institution to higher levels of effectiveness, efficiency and relevance which was in line with its revised vision of being *"a world class university with scholarly excellence"*. The researcher noted that the need to accelerate overall performance was main driving force necessitating the change.

The pressure and direction for change came from both external and internal environments. This included inadequate resources, rapid technological changes, trade unionism, increased demand for higher education, growing pressure on public universities to provide greater access to their programmes, government requiring public universities to expand and sustain programmes they mount, employers demand for more skilled personnel with increased technical expertise and practical skills, negative perception that the quality of education offered at the university had gone down, increased competition, ineffective management styles, and the question of relevance of education offer.

The researcher established that the change process started with evaluation of past strategic changes (strategic analysis). This was through evaluation of past performance along with external competitive, economic, and environmental analyses which were summarized into statement of institution's Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT analysis).

The respondents highlighted that the assessment identified gaps and strong points in the change programmes that the institution had to tackle systematically. This was through re-examining itself and recommending appropriate paradigm shift that was to bring in a new strategic direction if the university was to fulfill its mandate effectively.

The researcher noted that some of the fundamental changes that took place in the recent past included creation of the University Enterprise and Services Limited, the introduction of performance contracts to improve accountability, restructuring of the university which led to merging campuses to form schools with the aim of enhancing management, creation of Information and Communication Technology departments, wearing of name budges, and creating a corrupt free environment to ensure that the stakeholders get services without using unfair means.

The changes were initiated at the top and cascaded downwards to colleges, schools/institutes and to other lower operating units such as the departments. In addition, the researcher established that the change initiatives were aimed at improving the implementation structures in order to enhance efficiency and effectiveness. To ensure successful implementation, monitoring and evaluation, teams were identified to champion the change process. These were mainly drawn from heads of various departments such as heads of departments, deans, principals, directors and deputy vice-chancellors. The researcher further established that the top University administrators such as the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, College principles, Administration Registrar and other administrators played a pivotal role as change agents in their respective units as well as working as a team. This was through facilitating the changes and ensuring successful implementation of the same.

4.3 Establishing Vision and Strategic Intent

The respondents identified themselves with the change process and were clear on the vision for change. The university rolled out more pragmatic vision and mission which was geared towards positioning itself in a global context. The vision was to be *"A world class university with scholarly excellence"* and its mission statement was *"to be a leading centre for creation, preservation, transmission and utilization of knowledge as an embodiment of the aspirations of Kenyan people and global community"*. The respondents pointed out that the vision and the mission statements were developed after taking into account the achievements of the first two years of the first strategic plan (2005-2010). The respondent pointed out that the vision statement provided a target and high-level description of how the institution intended to create a value for the future and an integrating tool for the diverse units scattered throughout the institution.

The researcher noted that, the strategy development started with the tools for strategy such as the vision, mission and values. This begun by the institution's top management addressing three fundamental questions: First *"What business is the university in, and why?"* This lead to clarification of vision (aspiration for future results), mission (affirmation of the organization's purpose) and core values (the internal compass that guides its action). The respondents pointed out that these statements helped in establishing guidelines for formulating and executing strategic changes. The second question was *"what are the key issues?"* this lead the university conduct its strategic analysis by reviewing their situation in their competitive and operating environments, especially major changes that had occurred since they last grafted their first strategic plan. This led to update of changes in both the external and internal environments. The third question was, *"How can we best compete?"* This lead to formulation of strategic changes with special focus on the desired outcome of the strategy.

The researcher noted that vision for change was to align the University with the changes in operating environment. The respondents pointed out that the environmental changes brought in new opportunities, challenges and obligations. The respondents pointed out that creating a sense of urgency and communicating the need for change were critical roles for the leadership through

what they termed as *strategic change agenda* which was to provide the motivation for necessity for transformation change.

To ensure that all share in the vision of change, the researcher noted that the employees held regular meetings within their departments to share the vision and progress of change. In the meetings, the need for change was explained and the expected changes outlined. To create a sense of urgency, the management immediately set up a structure committee whose mandate was to develop action plan for the expected changes. The employees were also requested to discuss the expected changes and recommend the best course of action.

4.4   Approaches to Change Management

The respondents were in agreement that planned approach to change management was dominant in the initial stages. The top-bottom approach, in which change programmes are decided at the top, in this case, the university council, and then passed down for implementation was adopted. The change decisions and activities were passed down from top management to the various organs of the university. However, as the reform process progressed, and especially after changes from external environment or internal environment, emergent approach started to take root.

The researcher noted that the emergent approach emphasized among other things the change management structure, culture, organizational learning and managerial behavior. This was aimed at preparing the organization to be ready for change. This was done through identifying areas that required reform on continuous basis in line with the university's change programme.

4.5 Models of Change

According to the respondents interviewed, they proposed a number of change management steps corresponding to the models of change. Critically looking at models, they seem to share common features that change management must entail. The researcher could pick out Kotter's (1996)

transformational process model for change management used especially in cases of major change. Each step is fundamental in managing change. The Kotter's (1996) first four steps aimed at getting change moving by tackling in-built resistance and inertia. Steps five to seven combine participative and political practices to secure and maintain support. The final stage matches Lewin's (1947) in Burnes (2004) where emphasis is on embedding the change in the continuing culture of the organization. Kotter's (1996) transformational process model comprises of the following eight steps: establishing a sense of agency, creating the guiding coalition, developing a vision and strategy, communicating the change vision, empowering broad based action, generating the short wins, consolidating gains and producing more change and anchoring new approaches in the culture.

Though Kotter's (1996) proposed eight action steps in managing change, the following was evident and respondents concurred with the increase urgency of undertaking reforms if the university was to continue providing leadership in provision of higher education and becoming truly a world class university. There was urgency to undertake reforms to make a positive contribution to the overall performance. The researcher further noted that the senior management of the university such as the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, College principles, Administration Registrar and other administrators were the guiding team for reforms. They engaged in various meetings to articulate the reforms and align on how best the university will be restructured to fit in the organizations change programme. In view of the proposed corporate recommendations and action steps required, communication strategy and within what time frame was developed.

The respondents also pointed out that, once the management was clear on the change programmes, they then engaged the employees in initial organization communication meetings, followed by departmental and in some cases one-on-one meeting with employees to explain the need for the reforms and how they were going to affect the organization as well as the employees as individuals. This was an ongoing process as the reforms progressed throughout the institution. In addition, there were continuous updates to employees through circulars and meetings.

- 35 -

4.6 Implementing Change through teams

The respondents were all emphatic that there were a number of drivers to the change process. These included the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, College principals, Administration Registrar and other administrators. The researcher noted that they were responsible of setting the change initiatives into a motion along a trajectory of successful strategy implementation. They communicated regularly and firmly on the need for change. The researcher noted that once strategic programmes were approved by the University Council, they were then cascaded downwards.

The top leadership ensured that effective members were co-opted from various colleges. Also critical to the change process were various departmental teams which were in operationalization and aligning their operations with the organizational objectives and cascaded them downwards. The researcher also noted that various teams were in place to develop a common approach of getting projects done. For instance, the University Management Board appointed a team to look into income generating activities of the university which led to establishment of University of Nairobi Enterprise Services (UNES) Limited.

The respondent pointed out that the teams' tasks were to identify and define the problem clearly, analyze and generate possible solutions. The teams were also responsible for implementation and monitoring as well as being mutually and collectively accountable for the results arising from the change programmes. The teams were chosen based on their technical, functional or professional skills relevant to tasks that the group was to undertake.

4.7 Management of Change Process, Structure, Systems and Procedures

According to the respondents, the areas that required change included processes, procedures, systems and organization structure. Restructuring was done which lead to harmonization of structures into a leaner one. The respondents pointed out that the university was mainly

restructured in order to support the strategic plan. Restructuring led to introduction of schools which led to creation of new departments, merging others, while others were scrapped altogether.

The researcher also noted that advances in ICT have changed the way the university was delivering its services. The respondents agreed that there was expansion and use of ICTs. For instance, most of the University activities such as student registration were done on line. Both intranets and extranets technologies were in use at the university. This simplified processing and retrieval of information.

4.8 Changes in Human Resources

The respondents were in agreement that managing people was one of the difficult tasks that the management encountered. The same employees were critical for the organization's success or failure. They noted that some academic staff including professors who were expected to show leadership failed to take strategic reforms seriously thereby becoming impediment to implementation of reforms.

The researcher noted that introducing changes especially which affected the academic staff was done with utmost care. Ultimately, the employees were the ones responsible in improving the processes and running the projects, programmes, and initiatives required by the strategic change. The researcher further established that consultations were done before any changes took place.

4.9 Communicating Change

The respondents were in agreement that they were well informed in advance of expected change programmes before any implementation was done. This was through circulars, meetings, briefings and discussions on continuous basis and thereafter the information was then communicated to other levels. The researcher noted that communication of vision, mission and core values was the first step in creating motivation among the employees. This was done by

informing the employees how the institution intended to create long-term value and how each one of them was to contribute to realize this objective. The respondents also pointed out that communication was also critical in shaping up the culture as it highlighted what the institution intended to be.

The researcher noted that the university has its formal communication channels. The channels in place were downward, upward and horizontal in direction. Management used downward communication when sending messages to people below the hierarchy. In upward communication, the employees passed their views and ideas to the management while horizontal communication was used when passing information across department or functional boundaries. The use of information technology at the institution radically changed many aspects of communication in the institution. For instance, the use of intranets enabled people within the organization to share information quickly, especially when information is changing rapidly.

4.10 Effects of the Stakeholders to Change Management

The researcher noted that the genesis of restructuring was necessitated by the government requirement that all parastatals including public universities needed to be restructured in order to improve their performance. Thus the University of Nairobi worked in conjunction with the government (ministry of education) and also in consultation with other public universities.

It had also linkages and collaboration with international institutions. The respondents were in agreement that this was to ensure that changes introduced were consistent with national goals of education and at the same time met the global strategic directions. For instance on issues of funding, the university consulted with the ministry of education. They collaborated with international universities on Research and Development (R&D).

4.11 Management of Resistance to Change

The researcher established that one of the greatest challenges that faced the institution to implement change reforms was resistance to change. Implementation of strategies did not automatically follow strategy formulation. The institution faced resistance wherever there was departure from historical behavior, culture and power structure. The researcher noted that both forms of systemic and behavioral resistance were present. The findings established that the institutions culture was not supportive for change. Whenever changes were made, a number of staff viewed it with suspicion and uncertainty. Others took considerable length of time before accepting the change. It was noted that those who initially objected to the change process for their self interest contributed adequately to push forward the change process and introducing instabilities into the change process. They respondents also pointed out that employee saw the changes differently from the management especially in terms of costs than benefits resulting from the change. This was evidenced by poor performance by the staff or the department's failure to meet deadlines.

The respondents pointed out that the source of resistance were inform of people resistance attributed to their personalities, attitudes, values, preferences, skills and interests. Design resistance was attributed to the design of the change such as whether the new systems or procedures will be easy to use and whether the benefits to them will be worth the effort. Process resistance was noted to have arisen due to the manner in which the change was introduced and managed. The respondents also pointed out that there was some resistance in restructuring of the institution due to fear of losing power.

To manage the resistance to change, the management instituted participatory process of change management so that the concerned persons will own the change. This participatory process enabled the staff to raise any objections and clarifications were made so that the group took charge of the change. This diffused or minimized any form of resistance. The top management in some cases took decisive action to deal with any form of resistance. This was through being firm, and consistent in decision making.

In planning for change, the respondents highlighted that various measures were taken. This included taking time to market the change rather than imposing it to the employees. This was done through publishing the benefits and allaying fears. They too pointed out that enough time and resources at an early stage to understand the situation and what the new system needed to do. This was followed by pilot systems of change where lessons were taken into account to find out if it works. Adequate time was then allowed for the change over and in some cases for training.

In general, it was noted that resistance was best managed through participation, consultations, involving the staff in the change programme, seminars and workshops on change management and proper communication of information on the need for change.

4.12 Challenges in the Change Process

The researcher identified a number of challenges to the change process. The respondents specifically indicated that resistance to change was a major challenge facing the institution. Some of the staff members were stumbling block to change due to their negative attitude towards change. For instance, the respondents gave an example where some academic staff was not ready to sign performance contracts terming it for profit making organizations. The respondents also pointed out immense resistance when the university was restructured which lead to creation of new departments while others were merged or scrapped out. They further noted that there was great resistance by the lecturers and regular students during introduction of self sponsored degree programmes claiming that it was going to dilute the performance of the university.

Inadequate resources were pointed out as a major challenge facing the institution making it difficult to implement its change programmes. The funding for public universities from the treasury continued to dwindle which made it difficult for the university to invest efforts and resources to develop and deploy the desired reforms. This was compounded further by the country's poor economic conditions characterized by high inflationary rates. In addition,

implementation Challenge was also highlighted. This was mainly due to lack of capacity in some areas.

Competition was also highlighted as another challenge facing the institution. They noted that over the years, there has been an increase in number of both public and private universities. Globalization also made it possible for foreign universities to access the Kenyan market which made competition even stiffer. The location of University of Nairobi for a long time was considered as strategic location is no more as other universities have rented or acquired buildings near it.

Another challenge identified by the respondents was the bureaucratic process in the University. They noted that it took a long process before decisions were approved by the University Council to facilitate implementation. This caused unnecessary delays. In some cases, some of the decisions were not implemented at all. This became even worse if it required approval from ministry of education or the government.

It was also identified by the respondents that another challenge facing the institution was the inability of the university to attract and retain staff. This was due to remuneration packages offered by the university was considered to be noncompetitive. This made it difficult for the university to attract and retain the staff. This too, posed another challenge of low staff morale especially during the change process. They also pointed out that the perceived non-attractive package attracted trade unionism posing another challenge. The respondents also noted that the university lost top-notch academic staff who succumbed to HIV/ AIDS. They noted that the loss of staff slowed down the change process as human capital was critical to the success of the change programme.

The respondents pointed out that inability of some staff to concentrate on meeting their set targets and responsibilities was another challenge. This was because some of the staff especially

the academic staff concentrated their effort in part time jobs elsewhere as well as their private consultancy services. This made it difficult to achieve the desired reforms.

The respondents noted that the university had to address these challenges facing the institution by developing strategies on how to counter them. For instance, for the university to remain competitive it had to invest efforts and resources in programmes that gave it a competitive edge. The respondents pointed out that this was to be done through offering quality teaching with the use of modern delivery methods, use of ICT, improving infrastructure, and improving library services. This was also through provision of good facilities, amenities, and living conditions for the students. This was to go hand in hand with engaging more resources on Research and Development (R&D) to enable the researchers contribute to the body of knowledge hence improving its global ranking. The researcher noted that the university had linkages and collaboration with international institution mainly on R&D and funding.

The researcher noted that the university has responded to financial challenge by being prudent and adopting a more business-like approach in its operations. This was through cutting down wastages and coming up with alternative sources of funding such as alumni contributions, endowment fund, Module II (self sponsored students) fees and enhancing income generating projects. This was through strengthening leadership with focus on performance based management.

4.13 Discussion of the Results

From the findings, it was clear that change management practices concur with literature available on how to manage strategic change. The findings indicated that change management at the institution was participatory and the top university administrators played a facilitative role. The researcher observed that staff involvement, consultations and regular communication of information was critical to the progress of strategic formulation as well as implementation.

It was evident from the findings that the university managed the change process by first, setting the vision, mission and values of the institution. This was followed by undertaking strategic analysis through evaluating past performance and conducting a SWOT analysis. This was followed by developing strategic objectives which highlighted what the university desired to achieve. Each strategic objective had its corresponding strategies on how it was to be accomplished. Then the institution developed an implementation framework of how strategic plans were to be cascaded to lower units of the university, the appropriate structures for implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This was followed by an action plan and finally the actual change programme.

The researcher noted that the University of Nairobi needed to strengthen and diversify sources of funding in order to accelerate implementation process. They too needed to enhance participation and involvement to minimize resistance. This should go hand in hand with developing and strengthening of appropriate structures for monitoring and evaluation of the change programmes. The findings were consistent with findings by Ichangi (2006) that resistance was a stumbling block to the change process at public universities in Kenya. It further reaffirms the findings by Ongaro (2004) that service industries too need change management and its successful implementation will affect the firm in a positive way.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the summery of the study findings, challenges encountered and conclusions and recommendations arising. The chapter concludes with the limitation to the study and suggestions for further study.

5.2 Summary

5.2.1 Change Management

One of the objectives of the study was to establish how change was implemented at University of Nairobi. In order to achieve the objective of the study, the researcher interviewed the top university administrators. The main aspects of strategic change management investigated include the forces of change, approaches to change, stakeholder analysis, structure, leadership, dimensions of change, resistance and teamwork.

The research findings indicated that change process at University of Nairobi was done in a participatory process. There were adequate consultations with the staff through meetings where negotiations and consultations were conducted either at individual level or through representatives. This facilitated change process and minimized cases of resistance which was major challenge to implementation of change programmes. The findings were consistent with findings by Ichangi (2006) that resistance was a stumbling block to the change process at public universities in Kenya. It further reaffirms the findings by Ongaro (2004) that service industries too need change management and its successful implementation will affect the firm in a positive way.

The researcher also established that the colleges/ departments were critical in the change process as they acted as drivers of change. The facilitative change management style adopted and consultations with most of the staff provided environment conducive for all to participate in the

change process. Members who had grievances or complaints had a clear procedure to forward them or argued their case out during consultation meetings. The researcher further noted that the management team had a clear vision of where the institution was headed for. This made it possible for the change programme to be implemented successfully. The entire management worked as a team which made it possible to champion the change programme. In some cases, to respond to changing situations, they came up with emergent strategies.

5.2.2 Challenges

The research findings established that the management of the change programme faced many challenges. The major challenge came mainly from the staff that resisted change. This was through overt and public resistance. The reluctance to accept change included refusal to use new system or procedures, making no effort to learn, using older system whenever possible, not attending meetings to discuss issues, excessive fault-finding and criticism, deliberate misuse saying it has been tried before and did not work, protracted discussion and requests for more information, linking the issues with pay or other industrial relation matters and not ready for training. Other challenges encountered included limited resources to facilitate the change process which in some cases lead to delays in implementation of change programmes.

5.3 Conclusion

From the findings above, the study concurs with literature available on how to manage strategic change. It is critical for management to identify parameters for success and sustainability of the change process. To ensure that all employees have positively participated and to 'own' the change, team work is encouraged. This minimizes cases of resistance.

It was evident from the findings that strategic changes were on going. The change process at formulation level was largely a success but the biggest challenge mainly was on implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Despite the various challenges facing the institution such as lack of adequate resources, the university has succeeded in implementation of some its change

programmes. This was encouraging especially considering the challenges brought about by globalization. The future is bright for this university as it embraces strategic change.

5.4 Limitations

First, the study data was gathered from the top management who were mainly involved in change programmes. Not all top management was available for the interview due to their busy schedules. This was a big limitation in that if all top management were interviewed, probably it would have given a wider view of the big picture.

This case study involved one public university. The study cannot be generalized to represent public universities in Kenya. This is because the university is operating its different strategic programmes in a unique operating environment. The researcher recommends the need to carryout studies of other public and private universities to give a better picture and comparison on strategic change management.

The study depended largely on the interviews and discussions with respondents who were in top management. It will be important to validate the findings with sources from interviews with employees of middle and lower level management, academic staff, support staff and the students to get their perspective. In addition, the study looked at strategic change management in the last five years. Some changes were still being implemented. It would be important to validate the findings with the result of the ongoing changes.

5.5 Recommendations

The University should also set up and strengthen an effective monitoring system to continuously monitor and evaluate the change outcome to ensure the gains achieved are not eroded and business as usual returns in the organization. It should be noted that managing change process is different from managing operations. Both are vital and need to be integrated. This is through establishing new accountability structures for executing change programmes drawn across the

institution. To oversee all these processes, the researcher recommends creation of *Office of Strategy Management.* This office will integrate and coordinating activities that align strategy and operations across functions and departmental units. The office will synchronize the various planning and control processes, which operate at different frequencies, and run the multiple linked processes of strategy execution system. In addition, the office will ensure that all the planning, execution, and feedback components are in place and that they are linked together. This office too, will guide the diverse range of existing processes, including financial management, strategy communication, human resource planning, performance management and ICT planning. This will enable the institution to quickly and reliably execute its strategic changes. The office can be run by an individual or a department.

The university should do more on managing resistance to change especially among the academic staff. This is by using various approaches including 'marketing' the change rather than 'selling' it. It is important to ensure that the benefits obtained especially the unquantifiable ones, are documented and made known. The management should also take care to allay fears over jobs, status and career prospects. The leadership should ensure that enough time and resources are spent at early stage to understand the situation and what the new systems needs to do. This can be followed by pilots of the change to verify if it works. Adequate time should be allowed for changeover and for training. In order to develop a sense of ownership of the change process, it is important to involve users during formulation of system design and implementation. This should be complimented with setting up effective communication systems to ensure that people get information from a reliable source and which will aid in ensuring that they understand and accept the need to change. People whose authority may be eroded in the change process should be isolated, or given new things to do if necessary. Equally important in managing change is identification of 'opinion leaders' in a group, who pay special attention to gaining their acceptance and support.

For change managers in organizations, they should have a clear vision and develop roadmap on how to manage people through change process. Preparing people for change is critical if success is to be realized. Also be prepared for emerging issues and come up with strategies to tackle new

challenges. As Kaplan and Norton (2008) points out, successful organizations (industry leaders) have systematic processes in place to reduce risk, prevent oversight, and assure best chance of delivering results. This is through developing formal systems to implement and manage their important processes consistently. A proper framework should be developed that links the various strategy implementation together. This is through creation of new comprehensive management system that the organization can use to sustain world class strategy execution. This is by developing strategy by clarifying the organization's goals and through conducting strategic analysis, planning organization's strategy by selecting theme based measures, targets, and initiatives, along with accountability for performance, aligning the organizational units and employees to the strategy, planning operations, through priority setting and resource allocation, monitoring and learning from operations and strategy, and testing and adopting the strategy. Equally important is the development of comprehensive framework to integrate all change programmes so that they are properly aligned and synchronized.

5.6 Suggestion for further Research

The strategic changes at the University of Nairobi were ongoing. It is recommended that an evaluation of the change process be conducted in future for comparability. It is recommended further that a study be carried out to establish how the changes at University of Nairobi have improved performance and the extent to which these changes have improved service delivery. It will also be interesting to carry out a cross- sectional study in other public and private universities to establish their experience on strategic change management.

References

Abagi, O.K., (1999), *"Revitalizing financing of Higher Education in Kenya: Resource Utilization in Public Universities"*, Nairobi IPAR policy Briefs Education Sector: No. 1

Ansoff, H.I., (1987), *Corporate Strategy,* McGraw – New York, Hill-USA

Ansoff, H.I. (1999), *Corporate Strategy (revised version)*, McGraw –Hill: New York, USA

Aosa, E., *"The Leadership Challenge Facing Kenyan Organisations"*, *The Accountant*, January-March

Argyris, C. (1999), *Organizational Learning (2nd Edition),* Blackwell: Oxford-USA

Batten, J.D. and Swab, J.L., (1985), *How to crake down on company politics*, *Personnel*, 42, 8-20

Bechtold, B.L., (1997), *Chaos theory as a model for strategy development*, *Empowerment in organizations*, 5(4), 193-201

Beer, M., Eisenstat, R.A and Spector, B., (1993), *'Why Change Programme Don't Produce Change'* Harvard Business school press, Boston, MA, USA, In Mabey, C. and Mayon B., (1993), *Managing Strategic Change*, (2nd Edition), London, The Open University/Paul Chapman Publishers

Beer, M., Eisenstat, R.A and Spector, B. (1990), *'Why Change Programme Don't Produce Change'*, Harvard Business Review, November-December, pp 158-166

Beer, M., and Nohria (2000), *'Breaking the code of Change'* , Boston, *Harvard Business school press*

Benjamin, G. and Mabey, C. (1993), *'Facilitating Radical Change'*,The Open University/Paul Chapman Publishers, In Mabey, C. and Mayon B., (1993), *Managing Strategic Change*, (2nd Edition), London, The Open University/Paul Chapman Publishers

Boddy, D.B., and Paton, R., (1998), *Management*, London, Ashford Colours Press Ltd

Bolognese A.F., (2002), ***Employee Resistance to Organizational Change***, *www.newfoundation.com/orgTheory/Bolognese721.html*

Brown, S.L and Eisenhardt, K.M. (1997), ***The art of continuous change***: *linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations*, Administrative Science Quarterly, 42, March, 1-34

Bullock, R.J and Batten (1985), ***It's just a phase we're going through***: *a review and synthesis of OD phase analysis*. *Group and organization studies*, 10, December, 383-412

Buchanan, D.A. and Boddy, D., (1993), ***The expertise of the Change Agent***, Prentice Hall: London

Burnes, B. (2004), ***Managing change: A strategic approach to organization Dynamics,*** (4th edition), Pitman publishing

Burnes, B. (2003), ***Managing change and changing managers***: from ABC to XYZ, Journal *of Management Development*, 22(7), 627-42

Burnes, B. (1998), ***Managing change: A strategic approach to organization Dynamics,*** (2nd edition), Pitman publishing

Burke, W.W. (1997), *The new agenda for organization development; **Organizational Dynamics***, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 7-21

Clarke, L. (1999), ***The Essence of Change.*** Prentice-Hall: London.

Clarke, L. (1994), ***The Essence of Change,*** Prentice-Hall: London

Comstock, B. (2006), ***Managing Organizational Change***, Revision no.3, Southeastern Louisiana University

Cooper, D.R. and Schindler, P.M., (2003), **Business Research Method**, New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing, company Ltd

Daily Nation newspaper, *published by Nation Media group*, Nairobi-Kenya

Dawson, P., (1994), **Organizational Change**: *A Processual Approach*, Paul Chapman Publishing: London

Desler, G., (2004), **Human Resource Management**, (9th edn), New Delhi; Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd publishers

De Jakar, P., (2001), **Resistance to Change:** *A new view of an old problem*, The Futurist, 24-27

Dent, E., and Goldberg, S. (1999), *Challenging Resistance to Change*, **Journal of applied Behavioral sciences**, 25-41

Graetz, F. Rimmer, M. Lawrence, A and Smith, A (2002), **Managing Organizational Change**, Wiley: Milton, Queensland, Australia

Greenhouse, S., (1999), "**Labour Revitalized with New Recruiting,** New York Times, October, 9: p A10

Fiol, M.C., and Lyles, M.A., (1985), *Organizational learning,* **Academy of Management Review**, 10(4), 803-13

Folger, R., and Skarlicks, D., (1999), *Unfairness and Resistance*: **Hardship as Mistreatment**, **Journal of Organizational Change Management**, 12(1)

Handy, C. (1989), **Understanding Organizations**, Penquin: Harmondsworth

Harrison, M. (2002), *Lord Simson speaks out for the first time since leaving Marconi*, **Independent**, 28 November, 24

Harung, H.S. Heaton, D.P, and Alexander, CN (1999), *Evolution of Organizations in the new millennium*, **Leadership and Organizational Development Journal**, 20(4), 198-207

Hayes, J. (2002), **The Theory and Practice of Change Management**, Palgrave: Basingstoke

Hope, K.R. (2002), '*The New Public Management: Context and Practice in Africa'*, **International Public Management Journal,** Vol. 4, No. 2

Huczyynski, A. and Buchanan, D. (2001), **Organizational Behaviour** (4[h] edition), FT/Prentice Hall: Harlow

Ichangi, M.N., (2006), **Managing Resistance to Change in Strategy Implementation in Public Universities in Kenya**, Unpublished MBA Research Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi

Jenero and Lyons (2002), *"Employee Participation Programmes: The case for Company Unions"*, **Labour history 41**, no.3 August: pp539

Jones, J., Staub, C., and Power, E., (2004), *Four Antidotes to Change Resistance*, **Strategy and Business,** Spring 2004

Johnson, G., and Scholes, K., (2004), **Exploring Corporate Strategy.** Prentice Hall: London

Johnson, G., and Scholes, K., (2002), **Exploring Corporate Strategy.** Prentice Hall: London

Kanter, R.M, Stein, B.A., and Jick T.D., (1992), **The Challenges of organizational Change**, Free press, New York, USA

Kanter, R.M., (1984), **The Change Masters**; *Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the article corporation*, Sinon & Scholster, New York

Kaplan, R.S., and Norton D.P., (2008), **Execution Premium: Linking to Operations for Competitive Advantage,** Boston, Harvard Business School Publishing Co., USA

Kaplan, P.J., (2002), *F'd Companies: Spectacular Dot-com Flameouts.* Simon & Schuster: New York, USA

Kothari, C.R., (2004), *Research Methodology: Methods and Technuques* (2nd edn), New Delhi, New International (P) Ltd Publishers

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

Kotter, J.P., (1999), *Why Transformation Effort Fail: Harvard Business review*

Lawrence, P.R., (1954), *How to deal with Resistance to Change, Harvard Business Review*, 32(3) 49-57

Lewin, G.W. (1948), (ed): *Resolving Social Conflict*, London, Harper & Row, In Burnes, B. (2004), *Managing change: A strategic approach to organization Dynamics, (*4th edition), Pitman publishing

Lewin, K. (1947), *Group Decisions and Social change*, New York, Harper & Row, In Burnes, B. (2004), *Managing change: A strategic approach to organization Dynamics, (*4th edition), Pitman publishing

Lewin, K., (1939), *When facing danger*, New York, Harper & Row, In Burnes, B. (2004), *Managing change: A strategic approach to organization Dynamics, (*4th edition), Pitman publishing

Mabey, C. and Mayon B., (1993), *Managing Strategic Change*, (2nd Edition), London, The Open University/Paul Chapman Publishers

Martin, R. (2000), *Breaking the code of change: observations and critique*, McMillan, New York, In Beer, M., and Nohria (2000), *'Breaking the code of Change.'* Harvard Business school press, Boston, MA, USA

Master plan for Education and Training (MPET) for Kenya, 1997-2010

Maurer, R., (1996), *Using resistance to Build Support for Change*, **The Journal for Quality and Participation**, 19(3):56-66

Mbogo, M., (2003), **A study of Strategic Change Management Process in Hybrid Private-Public organizations: The Case of Kenya Commercial Bank,** Unpublished MBA Research Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi

McLoughlin, I. and Clark, J. (1994), **Technological Change at Work,** (2nd edn), Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Mintzberg, H., Ahstrand, B., and Lampel, J., (1998), **Strategy Safari**, London, Prentice Hall

Mintzberg, H. (1987), *Grafting Strategy*, **Harvard Business Review**, 19(2), 66-75

Mintzberg, H., and Waters J.A., (1985), *Of Strategies, Deliberate and Emergent*, **Strategic Management Journal,** pp 257-72

Mogambi, H., (2004*), "Education: Why parallel Causes Are the Way Forward"*, **Business Custom Wire**, August

Mugenda, A.O. and Mugenda, A.G., (2003), **Research Methods**: *Quantitative & Qualitative Approaches*, (Revised Edition), African Centre for Technology Press, Nairobi, Kenya

Muturi, S.N., (2006), **Management of Strategic Change at Plan International Inc-Kenya**, Unpublished MBA Research Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi

Nadler, D.A, (1993), **Concepts for the management of the strategic change,** Ballinger, New York, In Mabey, C. and Mayon B., (1993), **Managing Strategic Change**, (2nd Edition), London, The Open University/Paul Chapman Publishers

Nachmias, V.F. and Nachmias, D., (1991), **Research Methodology in Social Sciences**, 5th edition, New York, Worth Publishers

Ogwora E.M., (2003), *Strategic Change Management at the National Cereals and Produce Board,* Unpublished MBA Research Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi

Oketch, M.O., (2004), *"The Emergence of Private Universities in Kenya: Trends, Prospects and Challenges"*, *international Development of Education Development* 24; 119-136

Ongaro K. (2004), *Strategic Change Management in Kenya*, The Case of Nairobi Bottlers Ltd, Unpublished MBA Research Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi

Otieno, W., (2004), *"The Privatisation of Kenya Public Universities", International Higher Education:* Summer 111

Pettigrew, A. Whipp, R. (1993), '*Understanding the Environment'*, In Mabey, C. and Mayon B., (1993), *Managing Strategic Change*, (2nd Edition), London, The Open University/Paul Chapman Publishers

Pfeffer, J. (1996), *Competitive Advantage Through People: Unleashing the power of the Work Force*, Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA

Probst, G., and Buchel, B., (1997), *Organizational Learning*, Prentice Hall: London

Pugh, D.S., (1993), *Understanding and managing organizational change,* In Mabey, C. and Mayon B., (1993), *Managing Strategic Change*, (2nd Edition), London, The Open University/Paul Chapman Publishers

Quinn, J.P., (1993), *Managing Strategic Change*, Irwin, Homewood-III, In Mabey, C., and Mayon – White, B., (eds): *Managing Change (2nd edn),* The Open University/Paul Chapman Publishing: London

Rukunga J.K, (2003), *Strategic Change Management Practices in Kenyatta National Hospital,* Unpublished MBA Research Project, School of Business, University of Nairobi

Sanyal, B., and Martin, M., (1998), *Management of Higher Education with Special Reference to Financial Management in African Countries*, Paris, IIEp

Senior, B., (2002), *Organizational Change*, London: Pitman

Scott, W.R., (1987), **Organizations**: *Rational, Natural, and Open Systems,* Prentice Hall: Eaglewood Cliff, NJ, USA

Senge, P.M. (2000), ***The puzzles and paradoxes of how living companies create wealth:*** *why single-valued objective functions are not quite enough*, In Beer and Nohria (2000), ***'Breaking the code of Change',*** Harvard Business school press, Boston, MA, USA

Snow, C. Miles, R. and Coleman, H. (1993), ***'Managing 21st Century Network Organizations',*** In Mabey, C. and Mayon B., (1993), **Managing Strategic Change**, (2nd Edition), London, The Open University/Paul Chapman Publishers

Sosik, J.J. and Megerian, L.E., (1999), ***Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance***: the role of self- other agreement inn transformational leadership perceptions, *Group and Organizational Management*, 24(3), 367-90

Stacey, R.D, Griffin, D. and Shaw, P., (2002), ***Complexity and Management***: *Fad or Radical Challenges to Systems Thinking,* Rutledge: London

Standard newspaper, *published at I&M Bank Towers by The Standard group*, Nairobi-Kenya

Strebel, P., (1994), *Choosing the Right Change Path*, ***California Management Review,*** 36 (2): 29-51

Styhre, A., (2002), *Non-linear change in organizations: organization change management informed by complexity theory*, **Leadership and Organization Development Journal**, 23(6), 343 – 51

Tsang, E.W.K., (1997), *Organizational learning and the learning organization: a dichotomy between descriptive and prescriptive research.* **Human Relations**, 50(1), 73-89

University of Nairobi Calendar: 2006/2007

University of Nairobi: *Strategic Plan 2008-2013*

University of Nairobi web site: www.unobi.ac.ke

Wilson, D.C., (1992). *A Strategy of Change*, Rutledge: London

Weick, K.E. (2000), *Emergent change as a universal in organization,* In Beer and Nohria (2000), *'Breaking the code of Change'* Harvard Business school press, Boston, MA, USA

Weidman, J., (1995), *Diversifying Finance of Higher Education Systems in the Third* world: the case for Kenya and Mongolia; available at *http://lapaa.asu.edu/epaa/v3n.htm*

Worren, N.A.M., Ruddle, K. and Morore (1999), *"From Organizational Development to Change Management: The emergence of a New Profession," The Journal of applied Behavioural Science*, 35(3):273-286

Zalman and Duncan (1997), *Strategies for planned Change Model: Harvard Business review*

APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

August 2008

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am an MBA student from School of Business, University of Nairobi. I am conducting a management research on **"Strategic Change Management at the University of Nairobi".**

In order to undertake the research, you have been selected to form part of the study. This letter is therefore to request your assistance in collecting information to enable me carry out the research. The information you give will be treated with strict confidentiality and is needed purely for academic purposes.

A copy of the final report will be available to you upon request. Your assistance and cooperation will be highly appreciated.

Yours Sincerely,

KIPTOO ISAAC   **PROF. AOSA EVANS**
MBA Student   **Department of Business**
                                                         Administration,
                                                         School of Business,
                                                         University of Nairobi.

APPENDIX II   INTERVIEW GUIDE

<u>**PART ONE**</u>

1   Describe the process used to develop the strategic change management objectives.

2   Explain how the vision and change strategies were shared with all the stakeholders.

3   Were there teams formed with the responsibility to implement the change process?

4   What forces necessitated the change?

5   Describe how the planning of change was done.

6   How was the change programme initiated and managed?

7   Was there a monitoring system during and after the change programme implementation?

8   How the top management did supported the change process?

9   What resources were allocated to the change programme?

10 In your view explain how the following factors influenced the change outcome;

  - Culture
  - Structure
  - Power and politics
  - Stake holder's behaviour
  - Resources
  - Top management

11 Did the change process develop any record system or improve the terms of service? Please give details

12 What steps have been taken to ensure achievements of the change process are not eroded and business is not disrupted due to negative forces of change?

PART TWO

DISCUSSION GUIDE

1 Describe the change process at the university of Nairobi
2 How were you prepared for change?
3 What were your role(s) in the implementation of the change programme
4 In your view was there adequate participation of all the stakeholders
5 Explain how changes, strategies, structures, systems, processes, policies and procedures were effected