

THE EFFECT OF CHANGE MANAGEMENT ON ORGANISATIONAL SURVIVAL

¹Lawal, Abdullazeez Abioye PhD
²Adebakin, Morufa PhD & ³Bako, Yusuf Adebola

—————¹Business Administration and Management
Lagos State Polytechnic, Ikorodu, Lagos

²Business Administration and Management
Yaba College of Technology, Yaba, Lagos

³Business Administration and Management
Federal Polytechnic Ilaro, Ogun State

Abstract

This paper focuses on the effect of change management on organizational survival. Change is always occurring in all aspect of the organization. The major objective of this study is to determine the challenges faced by organizations undergoing change. A survey of some banks quoted on the floor of the Nigeria Stock Exchange was undertaken. A six point likert scale was used in this study; Questionnaire was administered to 540 staff of 5 selected banks quoted on the Nigeria Stock Exchange. Stratified random sampling was adopted. Two hypotheses were tested using chi square test, with the aid of SPSS version 20. Findings suggest that change is a bitter pill that must be swallowed despite any form of challenges or huddles needed to be surmounted. Individual differences and the ability to accept or reject change contribute to change management. Organizational individual readiness level to change is significant to change management. Resistance to change should be expected and seen as part of changes management. However, adequate communication to all stakeholder or change agents is essential.

Keywords: *Change Management, Survival, Readiness, Communication, Resistance.*

Introduction

Research has shown that there are various factors inducing change in the organizations and such changes require management because the organization cannot but cope with change in their organizations and their environment. Organizational change has generally been affecting every aspect of the organization. However, individual employee basis for change and change resistance have not been adequately researched. The only certainty in modern organizational life is countless change which is inevitable. It is increasingly common to hear and read about rapid pace of change in the world around us. The rapid pace of change in the world has been influencing organizational functioning and their managers. Bharijoo (2005) opined that managers can no longer be successful if they are unaware of the need for adaptation and unable to bring about changes in their organizations and their method of management. An organization not being capable of adjusting with changes in time and situation is sure to go out of market or existence. To keep up the survival, each organization requires coping with dynamics of the society - organization is to work in society and changes around the society will also influence organizations.

Organizational change refers to the changes in organization-structural relationship, work/job responsibility, attitude and behavior, values and norms, rules and regulation etc. Newstrom and Davis (1996) viewed that change within an organization calls for a modification of the

relationships, responsibilities or behavior of individuals who are members of the organization. Thus, organizational change indicates adjustments, modifications and alterations needed to carry out in relation to attitude and outlooks of organizational members, work relationships and responsibility, structure and procedures and inter-personal dealings. According to Burnes (2004) change is an ever-present feature of organizational life, both at operational and strategic levels. Nature of change can be classified into two - internal change and external change. Internal change refers to the changes in management style, resource mobilization, tools equipments, machinery, methods, technology, techniques used, process and procedures and organizational structure. External change refers to the changes in economy, social structure, government policies, location, acts and regulations, science and technology, political changes and labour market etc.

Modern organizations are open systems because both internal and external factors and forces are related to its workings. Higher performance, acceptance of new technologies, cooperation and support and decreased turnover and scrap are the common objectives of organizational change. Kanter (2008) posits that organizational changes are expected to bring about changes in organizational structure and procedure to suit the prevailing environment, and in working. Frequent and often pervasive change is becoming a fact of life as organizations face increasing challenges in an ever-competitive business environment. This situation breeds frequent change requirement and change management (Dunphy et al 2003). Companies are now finding it more difficult than ever to cope with the myriad of changes necessitated by these adjustments so as to minimize employee resistance. Change management has been generally looked at from the purview of the organizations to the detriment of the individual employees. Change as been seen as a group action rather than been viewed as an individual employee issue and from individual perspective source. Change management implementers have neglected some or all of the nature of the change; the totality of other change; the process by which change is managed and the predisposition of the individuals experiencing the change. These challenges may have a great influence on change impacting on organizational survival.

It is difficult to ascertain the type of change that could help in dimensioning different changes that influences individual responses. There has been general neglect of individual differences or personality characteristics. Therefore, the impact of individual differences on what has change and how that change has been managed will be difficult to measure (Luecke 2003). Many change attempts have been resisted irrespective of the positive impact it may make. Resistance is seen as a barrier but research has shown that it is more of the first things to be observed and understood to implement a change. Various type of change are influencing organisations at a particular time, these may require different reactions or preparation towards change and by extension may have an impact on the way management of change are carried out. Perception, Personality, Culture and individual differences may have an impact on employees change adaptability. Various scholars have come to agree that most change effort suffer some setbacks because of lack of readiness on the part of the individuals and the organisation at large. Weiner (2009) therefore concluded that change readiness may affect the possibility of success of the change effort immensely. There have

been several challenges militating against organisations. These challenges influence the rate of change and its acceptability within the organisation. Organisations in Nigeria are faced with an array of challenges as they try to implement or adapt to change. Today change is constant and organisational leaders who anticipate change and react rapidly and responsibly are successful. However, the readiness level of organisation and particularly its employees to change has become an issue of concern to many organisations. Some organisations are not just prepared for the sudden shock that some sources of change bring up.

In many studies of change efforts, the issue of change resistance has always been included as part of notorious impediments throughout the change stages (Okunnus and Hermmington 1998; Lueke, 2003; Burnes, 2004 etc). Though some studies reveal that, due to a strong desire to remain the status quo, employees attempt not to change from what they are currently doing, the hindsight of change resistance is still under studied. People may have reason to resist change; Schermerhorn Jr, Hunt and Osborn (2003) identify fear of the unknown, insecurity, lack of felt need for change, threat to vested interests, contrasting interpretations, habit and lack of resources among other things. However, from these arrays of issues, the particular one causing resistance in particular scenario differs.

Contrast change in task, technology and structure in organization may constitute a problem to organization (Jick, 2003). These changes that can be internally or externally caused could require a change in the knowledge required, skill and behaviour of employees. Increasing knowledge, skill and improving or putting up required behaviour to measure up with the change required might be a herculean task (Wischnevsky, 2004). Change in tasks and technology usually require alterations in structures, including changes in the patterns authority and communications as well as in the roles of workers. These technology and structural changes can in turn, necessitate changes in the knowledge, skills, and behaviours of the members of the organisation (Nadler, 1987). There may be a need to alter the perception, personality, culture and individual differences during change. Communication is essential during change; however, adequate communication seems to be cordial to some extent in some organization thereby encouraging some resistance and poor implementation of change (Metre, 2009). In the same vein, the abilities of leaders to communicate effectively may hinder the success of change management.

Objectives of the study

The general objective is to identify challenges faced by organisations undergoing change and understand how to manage such challenges. Similarly, to ascertain the readiness level of organisations to change and to examine why change has been resisted are specific objectives this study limits itself to.

Hypotheses

H₀ There is no significant relationship between the change readiness level of an organisation and change management.

H₀ Resistance to change has no significant relationship with change management

Conceptual Framework

Change is the alteration of something that already exists. Transformation refers to a bona fide metamorphosis. It is not, like change, improving on what is, but creating something that does not exist. The analogy of a caterpillar transforming into a butterfly is commonly used to explain the difference: "The butterfly is not more caterpillar, or a better or improved caterpillar, or even a changed caterpillar – it is a new and entirely distinct being" (Applebaum and Wohl, 2000). Change is therefore about movement, indicating direction. We live in an era where change is seen as essential if organizations and, indeed, the human race are to survive (Dunphy et al., 2003; Kanter, 2008; Sackmann et al., 2009).

The organizations of today operate under increasing demands for change. The market has radically changed due to globalization, strong competition, technical development and a customer-driven market. (Härenstam et al., 2004) This high pace of change means that the organization must change behaviour and manage to rapidly adapt to shifts in the market (Norrgren et al., 1996 in Nonås, 2005).

Change Management

Change management has been defined as 'the process of continually renewing an organization's direction, structure, and capabilities to serve the ever-changing needs of external and internal customers (Hughes 2011). According to Burnes (2004), change is an ever-present feature of organisational life, both at an operational and strategic level. Therefore, there should be no doubt regarding the importance to any organisation of its ability to identify here it needs to be in the future, and how to manage the changes required getting there. Consequently, organisational change cannot be separated from organisational strategy, or vice versa (Burnes, 2004; Rieley and Clarkson, 2001). Due to the importance of organisational change, its management is becoming a highly required managerial skill (Senior, 2002). Graetz (2000) goes as far as suggesting 'Against a backdrop of increasing globalisation, deregulation, the rapid pace of technological innovation, a growing knowledge workforce, and shifting social and demographic trends, few would dispute that the primary task for management today is the leadership of organisational change. Since the need for change often is unpredictable, it tends to be reactive, discontinuous, ad hoc and often triggered by a situation of organisational crisis (Burnes, 2004; Luecke, 2003). Although the successful management of change is accepted as a necessity in order to survive and succeed in today's highly competitive and continuously evolving environment (Luecke, 2003).

Change management is the systematic approach and application of knowledge, tools and resources to leverage the benefit of change, managing an as-is process or function moving towards a better or more efficient process or function in hopes to positively impact performance. In order to achieve desirable utility change must be effective, successful and most importantly sustainable. Change management entails thoughtful planning, sensitive implementation, and consultation with, and involvement of, the people affected by a specific change. Increasingly, change management is seen as a permanent business function to improve productivity and profits by

keeping organizations adaptable to the competitive marketplace. Change must be realistic, achievable and measurable.

Globalization, competition and accelerated technological innovation are creating conditions under which change itself is changing; change is becoming more complex and omnipresent, requiring enterprises to develop focused capabilities for change management. Expectations have shifted from seeing change as an extraordinary it as a permanent condition of business life. Similarly, change management is increasingly perceived as an ongoing business function rather than a focused response to an occasional need for reorganization. Change management is becoming institutionalized in various ways, having a dedicated change management function within an organization (typically within HR), dedication and commitment to developing tools for planning and implementation, focused communication efforts directed at facilitation of change, reorientation of corporate culture toward flexibility and agility with regard to change.

Different authors employ different terminology when describing the same change approach. While Burnes (2004) differentiates between incremental and continuous change, Grundy (1993) and Senior (2002) distinguish between smooth and bumpy incremental change. Grundy (1993) defines discontinuous change as 'change which is marked by rapid shifts in strategy, structure or culture, or in all three'. This sort of rapid change can be triggered by major internal problems or by considerable external shock (Senior, 2002). According to Luecke (2003) discontinuous change is onetime events that take place through large, separated initiatives, which are followed up by long periods of consolidation and stillness and describes it as 'single, abrupt shift from the past' (Luecke, 2003).

Organizational Survival

Organizational survival and growth are implicit organizational goals requiring the investment of energy and resources (Jones & Bartlet, 2008). Organization that does not have survival as a primary objective or goal should have re-think (Gross, 1968). The goal of organizational survival underpins all other goals (Gross, 1968). Paying attention to this goal contributes to the satisfaction and execution of other organizational goals. Gross (1968) argued that the concept of survival is an unwritten law of every organization. This suggests that every organization should see survival as an absolute prerequisite for its serving any interest whatsoever. In opposite direction, organization is assessed in phases of growth and development rather than in chronological years. The phases are linked up in subtle and unpronounced manner, but it is essential noting that not every organization displays the features of each phase as it progresses. Organizations attempt to maintain the existing state of affairs, but essentially the larger part of the survival.

With respect to change management, it is worthwhile mentioning that any transformation process is of vital importance for the survival of an organization in the environment in which it functions. However, for a change to be successful its management must be of a high quality and it must include the commitment of the top management level. This includes certain planning activities

introduced by agents of change and or leaders (French and Bell, 1995). These activities, according to the model suggested by Cummings and Worley (French and Bell, 1995) can be defined as: motivation towards change, the creation of a vision, the development of political support, management of the transition and the maintenance of the impetus. The agent of change must lead the process in such a manner as to promote and generate actions and sustain change within the organization that assures organisational survival

Theoretical Framework of change management

Researchers have developed various theories and models of change management. Some of the well-known models are summarised in the table below.

Action research Model/Theory Collier,1945 Lewin, 1946, French,1969 Schein, 1980		Kotter' Model (1996)	Jick's model (2003)	Mento/Jones/ Dirmodofer's Model(2002)	Shield's Model(1999)
Identify Problem(s)	Lewin-Step 1 Unfreezing	Establish a sense of urgency	Analyze the organizational need for change concept	Define the desired results and change plans
Consult with Behavioural science (OD) Expert	Schein-Stage 1 Need for Change; People must be dissatisfied with the present.	Form a powerful guiding coalition	Create a shared vision and common direction	Define the change initiative	Create capability and capability to change
Gather Data & Begin Preliminary Diagonose	Lewin-Step 2 Moving/ Changing	Create a vision	Separate from the past	Evaluate the climate for change	Design innovation solutions
Provide Feedback to Client	Schein-Step 2 Cognitive Restructuring	Communicate the vision	Create a sense of urgency	Develop a change plan	Select and deploy solutions
OD expert & client members diagnose problems	Lewin-Step 3 Refreezing change to make permanent.	Empower others to act on the vision	Support a strong leader role	Find and cultivate a sponsor	Reinforce & sustain business benefits

OD expert & client jointly plan actions	Schein-Step 3 Refreezing involves self and others.	Plan for and create short term wins	Line up political sponsorship	Prepare target audience, the recipient of change	NA
Take action	Schein - To be permanent, change becomes a part of self, relations with others, & system in which people exist.	Consolidate improvements producing more change	Craft an implementation plan	Create the cultural fit-making the change last	NA
Gather data after Action	*Lippitt, Watson, Westley expand Lewin's Model	Institutionalize new approaches	Develop enabling structures	Develop and choose a change leader team	NA
Measure & Evaluate results	*After Step 1, add Establish a change relationship	NA	Communicate, involve people and be honest	Create small wins for motivation	NA
Feedback results	*After Refreezing, add Achieve a terminal relationship	NA	Reinforce and institutionalize the change	Constantly and strategically communicate the change	NA
Re-diagnose	*Lippitt, et al Five Phase Change Model (1958)	NA	NA	Measure progress of the change effort	NA
New action if Necessary		NA	NA	Integrate Lessons learned	NA

Source: Adapted from M.G. Pryor, S. Taneja, J. Humphreys, D. Anderson, and L. Singleton (2008) Challenges facing change management theories and research Delhi Business Review X Vol. 9, No. 1

The change management models and theories have similar characteristics which are observed in various steps of the models. Most of the models identified a process to establish a reason and a need for change. This step has to start with the leaders or the change agent of the organization. An organisation's challenge is to select the right organizational leaders who can create an atmosphere where people are inspired to go beyond the minimum expectations and improve the situation. People dislike change unless there is a reason to change.

Research has shown that certain circumstances tend to increase the likelihood that leaders will engage in major organizational change initiatives. These circumstances include top management changes, environmental shifts and a decline in performance. All of the models encourage the development of a vision or desired business result and movement from the status quo to a future state. Visioning is one of the most essential steps of a change process. A good vision helps people in the organization know their direction. Many organizations have written visions that are published, distributed to employees and hung prominently on the walls. Having a published vision is not enough to direct people to a future state or assist them in getting there. The leaders have to communicate the vision to the people within the organization and they have to lead by example to make the vision a reality. When there is a difference in what leaders say and what leaders do, this leads to a loss of trust and faith among the leaders and their people.

Some of the models address the concept of changing processes to empower people in the organization to change. This step includes evaluating the current systems, processes and capabilities to facilitate change. According to Farrell, Flood, Curtain, Hannigan, Dawson and West (2005), Organizational learning and the ability of a company to create and exploit knowledge and information leads to successful organizational performance. According to Herrick (2005), leaders should be involved in stewardship transformational process of involving others in solutions and actions. Leaders need to create an enabling work environment to provide the framework for a positive and professional practice environment. Pryor, Taneja, Humphreys, Anderson and Singleton (2008) opined that World class organizations are known for their workplaces which are customer-focused and which empower people to change.

All of the models incorporate the idea of reinforcing and creating small improvements to encourage additional change. Most organizations have a model for improvement. One of the most common according to Pryor et al (2008) is the Shewhart (or Deming) Cycle, also known as the Plan-Do-Check/Study-Act Cycle (Deming, 1986). Employees need to understand that every process can be improved and when leadership focuses on continuous improvement and reinforces the small successes, it encourages people to seek more opportunities for improvement (Pryor, White and Toombs, 1998).

People respond differently to change. Some people find it exciting and enjoy change some are indifferent and do not act, while others dislike and resist it. Resistance is a normal reaction to change and should be expected. This is especially true during the development (early) stages of

groups undergoing change of any dimension. Leaders need to expect and understand this reaction and support the individuals, teams and units as they go through these phases of change. Transformational organizations recognize normal resistance and plan strategies to enable people to work through their resistance (Kohles, Baker and Donaho, 1995). There are some significant differences in the models as well. All change models, except Shields (1999), identified a step where the support for the change is created as well as developing the capabilities of the team which will make the changes. The change plan should not be created in some high level office and then forced upon the staff who will implement the changes. Instead, the planning should involve both vertical and horizontal levels of an organization. When a plan is viewed as everyone's plan, it can be embraced by everyone. It is empowering when people are involved in the planning and change management process (Collins, 2001, Hughes 2011).

Most models except one addresses the importance of communication in order to gain support for the change and to encourage adoptability and adaptability. Successful organizations have to acquire, integrate and use new knowledge to be successful. They have to be able to combine and exchange information in order to enhance their processes to guard against failure. Understanding where an organization is and where they should be is part of this process. This has to be discussed, explored and communicated (Farrell, Flood, MacCurtain, Hannigan, Dawson and West, 2005). Mento's model is the only one which includes a step for monitoring and measuring change as it is implemented. Successful implementation of change involves discipline. Collins (2001) asserts that the most successful organizations should have disciplined people, disciplined thought and disciplined actions. People should be held accountable for their actions and this cannot occur unless measurements are in place. Newcomb (2005) suggests that leaders have to be accountable to the organization for the results of their plans and the outcomes of the organization. Accountability requires a master plan which can be segmented into smaller projects, assigned to teams and monitored by team leaders. This plan can be tracked with target dates for completion and evaluation (Newcomb, 2005). Jick's (2003) and Mento's (2002) models include a step that addresses leadership behaviour and supporting strong leadership characteristics. Kotter (1996) and Shields (1999) focus more on the cultivation of the team members implementing the change.

The article by Mark Hughes (2011) examined a number of claims that the failure rate for change is 70%. He reviews five separate published instances identifying a 70% failure rate. In each instance, the review highlights the absence of valid and reliable empirical evidence in support of the espoused 70% rate. Hughes goes on to question the utility of inherent rates of failure and stresses the need to take account of that context within which change takes place and the different views of participants as to whether change has been successful. Provocatively, he also raises the issue of whether it is even appropriate to seek to prove or disprove an inherent failure rate, given the disparity between types of change between, and within, organisations. McClellan (2011) argues that change fails because those who manage it often suppress the emergence of conflicting organizational meanings, rather than seeing them as a method of allowing participants to constitute new organizing discourses.

Various articles reflect diverse research into the topic of organizational change. Some of these studies look at organizational change from several perspectives. For example, in their review of theoretical and empirical change literature over a nine-year period, Armenakis and Bedeian (1999) identify four research themes or issues common to all change efforts (1) content issues which focus on the substance of contemporary organizational changes; (2) contextual issues, which primarily deal with forces in an organization's external and internal environments; (3) process issues, which address actions undertaken during the enactment of an intended change and (4) criterion issues, which focus on outcomes commonly assessed in organizational change efforts.

Regardless of which forces cause organizations to see the need for change, organizational leaders continue to struggle to maintain or increase their companies competitive advantage as rapid changes occur both in the external and internal environments. Conclusions drawn by these researchers are that the driving forces for organizational change are the result of the need to constantly improve productivity and efficiency (Arnetz, 2005). Once organizational leaders realize the need for change, they also face challenges in terms of successfully implementing initiatives that will lead to change. Raelin and Cataldo (2011) concludes that when an organization is going through change, it is time for management to exercise leadership. They should become the role models for the rest of the staff and exhibit behaviours that demonstrate what is expected from employees in relation to the change. This would be consistent with social learning theory and the concept that people learn through observation of others. Also during a time of organizational change, management needs to send positive messages about the change itself. On one level, positive verbal reinforcement from management that the organizational change is desirable and beneficial will expedite employees' willingness to learn the change.

Buchanan (2012) opined that to lead change successfully one must analyze situational factors. Determine how much and what kind of resistance to expect. Assess your own power relative to potential resisters. Identify who has the most accurate information to design the change initiative. Decide how urgently the company must change. Determine the optimal speed of change is another crucial factor. One must proceed with; caution if you anticipate intense resistance, have less power than resisters or need information from others to design and implement the change (Cameron 2008). Downs (2012) concludes from his research that resistance should be treated as a document of change rather than something to be squashed. What appears is portrayal of resistance to organisation change as a result of threats to identified status quo. Rather defining resistance as always bad i.e. negative, it is contended that responses to change are rarely consistently all negative or all positive.

Wursten (2008) submits in his work Culture and change management, that preparation and implementation of change is highly culturally sensitive. When introducing a change plan, make sure you allow for different approaches in different countries. In a complex world, this might sometimes be seen as delay, however diligence can save cost, reduce frustration and increase the

likelihood for success. Whether one likes it or not, organizational change plays a significant role in our lives. In our own organizations, it affects the nature of our jobs, or even if we have no job. In our everyday life, it impacts on the cost, quality, and availability of the services and goods we rely upon.

Methodology

The study utilized a descriptive survey research design which involved describing the staff feelings and responses to change management in the Nigeria commercial banking industry. The research instrument used was a structured questionnaire which was designed after the initial qualitative research activities. The design of the questionnaire benefitted from extant literature dealing with change challenges, culture, change adaptability, change resistance and change communication. The questionnaire was divided into 2 major sections. Section A focused on the personal information and in the other section of the research instrument the respondents were provided with questions of a six point Likert scale type response ranging from 'strongly agree' (6) to 'strongly disagree' (1). In all these options, the respondent was not given the option of undecided because such as option according to Allen et al (2005) would have created difficult research meanings.

The entire questionnaire was subjected to expert opinion validity from both the academics and selected professionals. Specifically, content validity was established by conducting a comprehensive review of relevant literature, in addition to the opinions of experienced researchers, academics, and organizational managers. Before the administration of the research instrument a pre-test of the instrument with a small group of respondents who were part of the final group of respondent was undertaken to improve the quality of the research instrument. Following the pre-test, a few changes were made and the revised research instrument/questionnaire was then used for the main research study. This study used the stratified random sampling technique. In all, 605 copies of the research instrument were administered through the stratified random sampling of respondents in 5 selected quoted commercial banks on the Nigeria stock exchange representing the commercial banking industry. Only 540 copies of the research instrument were reasonably and adequately completed, resulting in an 89.2 % response rate. Chi square test was adopted in this study at $\alpha=0.05$ to test the hypotheses because data collected is a categorical data.

Reliability of the instrument used was tested using Cronbach's Alpha which give the value of 0.768, this shows moderate reliability. That is, the extent to which the result are consistent over time and an accurate representation of the total population. The analysis of the data gathered from completed copies of the research instrument utilized the SPSS version 20 software.

Findings and Discussion

The chi square value for the first hypothesis is 1851.5926 with degree of freedom of 20; also the p-value gives 0.0000 which is less than the significant value of 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected for this hypothesis and we then conclude that the readiness level of an organisation must

be high. Change readiness is highly necessary for change management can be well achieved. The change leader or change agent must be able to create the need for the change in the minds of its people and get them ready to make or implement the change. Communication of change will go a long way in sensitising the people and prepare them for the required movement in status quo. Readiness is an important precursor of resistance to change and the adoption of employees. Scenario assessment is proposed, to determine just how ready for change employees are, before organizational changes are implemented. Armenakis et al. (1999) stress the importance of adapting methodology appropriately to capture the dynamic environment often associated with change.

The chi square value for the second hypothesis is 1439.2816 with degree of freedom of 15; also the p-value gives 0.0000 which is less than the significant value of 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected for this hypothesis and we then conclude that resistance to change has a significant relationship with change management. That is change management is greatly affected by change resistance. The process of change is ubiquitous, and employee resistance has been identified as a critically important contributor to the failure of many well-intend and well-conceived efforts to initiate change within the organization. Resistance to change is a complex mixture of context, attitudes and process. Change readiness affects the possibility of success of the change effort immensely. It can be observed from this study that adequate acceptance of change is connected to change readiness. When implementers of change are made ready by provision of enabling environments, implementation of change will largely be successful.

Due to a strong desire to remain the status quo, employees attempt not to change from what they are currently doing. Change is constantly resisted if there is no clear direction and guidelines, as such may cause disagreement between concern parties. However, change resistance can bring about suggestions and contributions that can improve the change management efforts. Change management implementers have neglected some or all of the nature of the change; the totality of other change; the process by which change is managed and the predisposition of the individuals experiencing the change. Some organisations implementing change have limited view on the nature of the change they are trying to make because they have not paid adequate attention to other changes happening at the same time in the environment on the organisation. These challenges have a great influence on organisation undergoing change and this impact on organizational survival.

Perception, Personality, Culture and individual differences have an impact on employees change adaptability. Change influencing organisations at a particular time, require different reactions or preparation towards change and by extension may have an impact on the way management of change is carried out. There is strong evidence to show that change in tasks and technology usually require alterations in structures, including changes in the patterns authority and communications as well as in the roles of workers. These technology and structural changes can in turn, necessitate changes in the knowledge, skills, and behaviours of the members of the organization

Communication in organization undergoing change affects change management significantly. Communication of change is often undertaken by most organisation facing change. However, lack of adequate communication may be the cause of resistance (Mclellan, 2011). Poor communication affects change readiness, resistance, implementation change management as a whole.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Successfully changing an enterprise requires wisdom, prescience, energy, persistence, communication, education, training, resources, patience, timing, and the right incentives, McCallum (1997). In the view of McCallum (1997), "Successfully leading and managing change is and will continue to be a front-burner responsibility for Executives. Prospects are grim for enterprises that either cannot or will not change. Indeed, no industry member is quite so welcome as the one that steadfastly refuses to keep up. Change can be costly, financially and otherwise, but it can also be very rewarding if it is carefully thought out and implemented. Since a great deal of financial and human resources are required to effect some process changes, quality plans are required to ensure that the new process is implemented, clogs in the wheels are promptly identified and feasible solutions are derived. It is the responsibility of top management to ensure a successful process change.

To maximize success, management must be well equipped to manage the environment (employees, customers, suppliers, competitors and other stakeholders) affected directly or indirectly by the process change. It is evident from this article that change is an ever-present element that affects all organisations. There is a clear consensus that the pace of change has never been greater than in the current continuously evolving business environment. Therefore, the successful management of change is a highly required skill for organisational survival. However, the management of organisational change in some organisations currently tends to be reactive, discontinuous and ad-hoc with a reported failure rate of around 70 per cent of all change programmes initiated (Balogun and Hope Hailey, 2004). This may indicate a basic lack of a valid framework of how to successfully implement and manage organisational change since what is currently available is a wide range of contradictory and confusing theories and approaches, which are mostly lacking empirical evidence and often based on unchallenged hypotheses regarding the nature of contemporary organisational change management.

Change is a better pill that must be swallowed despite any form of challenges or huddles needed to be surmounted. Individual differences and the ability to accept or reject change contribute to change management. Organisational individual readiness level to change is significant to change management. Resistance to change should be expected and seen as part of changes management. However, adequate communication to all stakeholder or change agents is highly essential.

References

- Applebaum, S. H and Wohl, L. (2000): "Transformation or Change: Some Prescriptions for Health Care Organizations." *Managing Service Quality*, 10, (5), 279-298.
- Arbetslivsinstitutet Sackmann, S.A., Eggenhofer-Rehart, P. M. and Friesl, M. (2009) "Sustainable change: long-term efforts toward developing a learning organization," *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 45 (4), pp. 521–549.
- Armenakis, A. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1999). "Organizational Change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s." *Journal of Management*, 25: 293-315.
- Balogun, J. and Hope Hailey, V. (2004) "Exploring Strategic Change," 2nd edn (London: Prentice Hall).
- Bateman, Thomas S., and Carl P. Zeithaml (1990) "Management: Function and Strategy." Homewood, IL: Irwin,
- Beckhard, R.D. (1969) "Organization Development: Strategies and Models, Reading," MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Beer, M (1980) "Organization Change and Development: A Systems View" Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.
- Bernstein, M. (1955). "Regulating Business by Independent Commission" (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).
- Burnes, B. (2004) "Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organisational Dynamics' 4th edn (Harlow: Prentice Hall)
- Burnes, B. (2004). "Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A re-appraisal." *Journal of Management studies*, 41, 977–1002.
- Collins, J. (2001), *Good to Great*, Harper Collins Publishers Inc, NY, pp.124-129.
- Cummings, T.G. and Worley, C.G. (2005) "Organization Development and Change" 8th edn (Mason, OH: South-Western College Publishing).
- Downs, A. (2012) "Resistance to change as a positive influencer: an introduction" :*Journal of organisation change management* Vol. 25, 6
- Dunphy, D., Griffiths, A., & Benn, S. (2003). "Organizational Change for Corporate Sustainability: A guide for leaders and change agents of the future." Routledge. Publishers
- Farrell, J.B., Flood, P.C., Mac Curtain, S.M., Hannigan, A., Dawson, J., and West, M. (2005), "CEO Leadership, Top Team Trust and the Combination and Exchange of Information" *The Irish Journal of Management*, Vol.26, pp.22-40.
- French, W.L. & Bell, C.H. (1995). "Organization development: Behavioral science interventions for organizational improvement" (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Graetz, F. (2000) "Strategic change leadership, *Management Decision*" 38(8), pp. 550–562.
- Gross, B. (1968). "Organizations and their Managing." New York: The Free Press, Jones and Bartlett Publishers Acquires Tarascon Publishing, Inc. Reuters. 2008-06-02 <http://www.reuters.com/article/pressRelease/idUS160467+02-Jun-2008+BW20080602>. Retrieved March 10, 2013.

- Härenstam, A., M. Karlqvist, A. Rydbeck, K. Waldenström & P. Wiklund, (2004), "The Significance of Organisation for Healthy Work: Methods, study design, analysing strategies and empirical results from MOA-study" ISBN: 91-7045-729-8,
- Herrick, K.S. (2005), "The Opportunities of Stewardship," *Nurse Administration Quarterly*, Vol.29, No.2, pp.115-118.
- Hughes, M, (2011) "Do 70percent of all organisational change initiative really fail?" *Journal of change management* vol. 11, no 4, 451-464
- Jick, T. D. (2003), "Managing Change: Cases and Concepts" Second Edition, New York: Irwin Publishing
- Kanter, R.M. (2008) "Transforming giants," *Harvard Business Review*, 86 (January), pp. 43–52
- Kohles, M.K., Baker, W.G., and Donaho, B.A. (1995), "Transformational Leadership, Renewing Fundamental Values and Achieving New Relationships in Healthcare" *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, Vol.28, pp.141-146.
- Kotter, J.P. (1996). "Leading Change." Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Leifer, R. (1989) 'Understanding organizational transformation using a dissipative structural model', *Human Relations*, 42 (10), pp. 899–916.
- Lewin, K.; (1951) "Field Theory in Social Science" Harper and Row, New York, USA,
- Luecke, R. (2003). "Managing Change and Transition." Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McCallum, J.S. (1997), "The Face Behind Change." *Ivey Business Quarterly*.
- Mclellan, J. G. (2011) "Reconsidering communication and discussion politics of organisational change." *Journal of change management* vol. 11 No 4, 465-480
- Mento, A.J., Jones, R.M., and Dirndorfer, W. (2002), "A Change Management Process: Grounded in Both Theory and Practice." *Journal of Change Management*, Vol.3, No.1, pp.45-59.
- Mindy, W. T. (1998). "Paradigm Lost, Human Resource Executive Model." *Journal of Behavior Research*, (58), pg. 494-497.
- Nadler, L. (1990), "Human Resource Development." New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Newcomb, K. (2005), "Transformational Leadership: Four Keys to Help You and Your Organization Stay Focused on Continuous Improvement and Greater Value" Retrieved Feb.13, 2013 from http://www.debt3online.com/?page=article&article_id=79
- Newstrom, J. W. and Keith D. (1996), "Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work," 9th ed. Tata McGraw - Hill Edition
- Nonås, K. (2005), 'Vision Versus Reality In Organizational Change' *Arbete och hälsa*, Avhandling, Göteborg Universitet.
- Pryor M. G, Taneja S, Humphreys J, Anderson D and Singleton L. (2008). "Challenges facing change management theories and research" *Delhi Business Review* vol. 9, No 1
- Pryor, M.G., White, J.C., and Toombs, L.A. (1998), "Strategic Quality Management: A Strategic, Systems Approach to Continuous Improvement," United States: Thomson Learning.
- Raelin J. D and Cataldo C. G (2011). "Whither Middle Management: Empowering Interface and the failure of organizational change" *Journal of change management* 11, 3; 273-288

- Rieley, J. B. and Clarkson, I. (2001) "The impact of change on performance" *Journal of Change Management*, 2(2), pp. 160–172.
- Schermerhorn Jr, J. R, Hunt J. G. And Osborn R..N. (2003) "Organisation Behaviour" 8th edition. John Wiley and sons, Inc New Jersey
- Senior, B. (2002) "Organisational Change" 2nd edn. London: Prentice Hall.
- Shields, J. (1999), "Transforming Organizations, Methods for Accelerating Culture Change Processes., *Information Knowledge Systems Management*," Vol.1, No.2, (Apr.), pp.105-115.