International Journal of Business and Management Study – IJBMS
Volume 2 : Issue 1 [ISSN : 2372-3955]
Publication Date: 30 April, 2015

Change Leadership (Cl) And Organisational Stability (Os)

Abstract: Structural adjustment with changes in management is a feature of most organisations in a dynamic and competitive business environment. Institutions have to cope with such myriads of socio-economic disposition so as to maximise performance and returns. Hence, this study aimed at determining the empirical relationship between change leadership and organisational stability as a variable of performance of firms as a panacea for documentation. Descriptive survey research design was adopted. Based on predetermined criteria, MTN Nigeria, Airtel Nigeria and Starcomms were used for secondary data analysis. Published financial statements of the firms from 2008 – 2012 were reviewed. Data collected on change leadership (CL) and organisational stability (OS) were subjected to regression analysis via least square techniques. The findings revealed relationship between CL and OS was not significant (R^2=0.142, p-value=0.166 > 0.05); depicting a very weak relationship. In conclusion change leadership does not significantly determined organisational stability. A major implication of the findings for the industry was it has provided an insight into some of the implications of CL on OS in the Nigerian telecommunication industry. The CL was important but may not play a significant role on FP.

Keywords—*change, change management, change leadership, organisational stability, firms' performance*

I. INTRODUCTION

Kotter (1990) argues that there is marked difference in the orientation between management and leadership. Both involve deciding what needs to be done, developing the capacity to do it, and ensuring that it is done. However, while management is concerned with order and consistency, leadership is concerned with change. Chandler (1994) suggests that sometimes this does not happen. One reason for this is that leaders become so committed to a project or belief that they only attend information that supports their own position and fail to recognize signals that point to, for example, changes in customer requirements or the availability of resources. A history of past success can contribute to this condition. This encourages the leader to plough ahead without giving sufficient consideration to the needs or concerns raised by others. Carnali (1990) provides example of the inventor with a pet idea who succeeds in acquiring sufficient resources to initiate a venture that eventually fails to meet the market's needs, and the CEO who is motivated to accelerate the realization of a vision after early successes.

A related problem is that leaders, even become aware that their vision is flawed, refuse to change. Canarli (1990) suggests that this can be explained by cognitive dissonance. Leaders continue to pursue past commitments because a failure to do so would damage their favourable perceptions of themselves.

The leader's relationships with others can also lead to circumstances where a clearly flawed vision goes unchallenged. Subordinates may fear repercussion if they challenge the leader's view or they become too dependent on and trusting in the leader's judgment. Some writers argue that charismatic leaders who have dominant personalities can promote this kind of unquestioning dependence. This lack of challenge can also develop in those circumstances where the leadership team becomes so committed to a single ideology known as "groupthink".

Managerial work in times of change is increasingly a leadership task. While management and leadership are distinct activities, they are complementary and both are necessary for success in a changing business environment.Colins and Rainwaterk (2005) argues that it can be confusing to think about managers and leaders as though they are different, and to a large extent incompatible people. For example, some talk about leaders as dynamic, charismatic individuals with the ability to inspire others, and managers as uninspiring bureaucrats who just focus on the task in hand. Colins and Rainwaterk (2005) asserts that such a view does not coincide well with the experience of being a manager. People are generally recruited into 'Managerial', rather than 'leadership', positions and are expected to complete a multitude of tasks ranging from day-to-day planning and implementation, to longer-term strategic thinking. None of these are done in isolation.

Kotter (1999) argues that managers are the people who, typically, are in the best position to provide the leadership required to ensure that a change will be successful. However, if they are to provide this leadership, they need to recognize that their role involves a dual responsibility, for management – keeping the system operating effectively – and for leadership – revitalizing and renewing the system to ensure that it will remain effective over the longer term.

It is obvious that not only is the pace of change increasing, but that there is also a shift in emphasis towards managing discontinuous or transformational change. An implication of this shift is that leadership and the provision of a sense of direction are becoming more important parts of managerial work. A lot of attention has been paid to what leaders do (the behavioural view) and how circumstances affect what they do (situational view). During change leaders are expected to recognise the need for change, identify change goals, communicate a sense of direction, formulate a change strategy, motivate people, provide support and create an organizational context conducive to change.

The average person has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if they can. Due to this dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate efforts towards the achievement of organizational objectives. The average person prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition and, above all, wants security. Managers who hold these assumptions adopt a more directive and controlling leadership style. Theory X shares many of the assumptions that underpin economic change strategy, which focuses on the drive for economic value through tough, top-down, results-driven action.

However, the assumptions underpinning McGregor's theory Y are completely different.

The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort towards organizational objectives. People will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which they are committed. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. The average person learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, and not narrowly, distributed in the population.

Managers who see other organizational members in this way are inclined to adopt a leadership style that promotes employee commitment to the change agenda and invests effort in developing their capacity to contribute to the achievement of change goals. This commitment maximization approach assumes that commitment is generated when people are trusted and allowed to work autonomously. It is an approach that shares many of the assumptions that underpin (Beer, Eisentat and Spencer,'s 1990) organizational development strategy for change, as it involves creating the capabilities that organizational members require in order to deliver high performance and secure competitive advantage over the long term.

A. *Statement of the Problem*

How leadership facilitates the process of change and the change management to ensure organizational stability has called for a great concern. Overtime, from various studies scholars have been able to submit that managers have been able to identify variables of change but do not have the capacity to manage change. Jones (2010) among others opines that lack of adequate skills; knowledge, experience and capabilities in top level managers facing change contribute to poor performance of an organization in a competitive environment. There is a wide acceptance that that they are sensitive to the needs and priorities of key stakeholders. Cialdini (1993) suggests that sometimes this does not happen. One reason for this is that leaders become so committed to a project or belief that they only attend to information that supports their own position and fail to recognize signals that point to, for example, changes in customer requirements or the availability of resources. The leader's relationships with others can also lead to circumstances where a clearly flawed a strong vision can make a valuable contribution to the success of change initiatives, but sometimes too little attention is given to the consequences of leaders developing a vision that is not fit for purpose (Hayes, 2010). It is essential that those exercising leadership make a realist assessment of the opportunities and constraints facing the organization and vision goes unchallenged. Some writers argue that charismatic leaders who have dominant personalities can promote this kind of unquestioning dependence. Leader's lack of ability to provide good plans, organize well, coordinate activities and implement change may affect change management and firms' performance.

B. *Objective of the study*

The general objective of this study is to determine the effect of change leadership on firms'performance. The specific objective is to provide a clear understanding of how leadership facilitates the change management process to ensure organizational stability.

This research is significant to all change agents at all levels of the organization as well as all stakeholders to the organization. This study is useful to investors who are interested in investing in the telecommunication industry as the findings would guide them in their investment port folio analysis. The empirical findings of this study would guide the board of directors and the shareholders on when to make necessary change in management.

This study would guide the entire management staff in the industry on the necessity to make appropriate corporate and strategic plans that would help them to achieve their corporate objectives, and achieve the main objective of shareholders of maximizing their wealth. The telecommunication industry in Nigeria directly benefit from this study.

Scholars sand researchers will also benefit from the entire study because it adds to the body of knowledge in this field and provides sources of data for further research work.

C. *Research Questions*

This research is guided by the following research question:

How does change leadership facilitate the change management process to ensure organizational stability?

D. *Hypothesis*

H0 There is no significant relationship between change leadership that facilitates change management and organizational stability.

II. Literature Review

A. *Conceptual and empirical framework*

Our world is constantly changing at a fast pace. In defining organization change, most authors refer to it as a process of transition from one state to another. Veldsman (2002) describes organization change as "the difference in the state of an organization at two separate locations in time and/or in space." The earlier location refers to the "what is" state of the organization and the latter location to its "what should/must be" state. "State" refers to the mode of existence and functioning of the organization. The change process encompasses the conversion of the "what is" state into the "what should/must be" state. Schalk, Campbell and French (2004) describe change as "the deliberate introduction of novel ways of thinking, acting and operating within an organization as a way of surviving or accomplishing certain organization goals". In this sense, "novel" refers to new, different or unique, and as such implicates doing or thinking differently. Both Mink (1998) describe change in terms of systems theory. There need to be a balance or equilibrium between related factors. Change disrupts this equilibrium and the system will take steps to regain its balance.

Change may also be a response to the desire to achieve such equilibrium, if one or other party is not content with the status quo. Mink (1998) viewed change as a process and not an event. For him the goal of organization change is renewal towards becoming an open system. According to Applebaum and Wohl (2000), there is a difference between change and transformation. 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. They use the analogy of a caterpillar transforming into a butterfly 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, as referred to in this research, is about improvement and not transformation. Change is 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 (Kanter, 2008; Dumphy, Griffiths and Benn 2007). Such is the importance now given to change that it is seen as the prime responsibility of those who lead organizations, as the rise of the transformational leader shows (Yukl, 2010).

A global survey by McKinsey & Company (2008) concluded that only by changing constantly could organizations hope to survive. There is nothing remarkable in this finding it echoes what most writers and commentators have been saying for the past two decades (Stacey, 2007, Beer and Nohria, 2000). However, the McKinsey survey also claimed that some two thirds of all change initiatives failed, which may account for why so many people appear to have a negative perception of change. Whilst two – thirds seems to be a staggeringly high rate of failure, it is not out of line with the majority of the change literature which regularly quotes failure rates of between 60% and 90% (Burnes, 2011). For example, the general failure rate is 70% but that it rises to 90% for culture – change initiatives. In a survey of the change literature, Smith (2002), found similar failure rates. In the 1990s, Hammer and Champy (1993) claimed that 70% of all change initiatives failed. In the 1980s, the failure rate for the introduction of computer – based technologies was estimated at around 60% and in the 1970s; Crosby (1979) claimed that 90% of quality – improvement initiatives failed.

Organizational change is a demand of the day, and needed for organizations to survive. Organizations nowadays, well understand the importance of the matter, and are serious to prepare themselves not only for the current, but also for the future trends to get the level of sustainable success. Along with all of its implications and importance the process of organizational change is also a very complex and challenging.

Today change is constant and organizational leaders who anticipate change and react rapidly and responsibly are successful. However, the organizational leaders who anticipate and invent the future are even more successful because those who invent the game are the leaders in their industry. Other organizations are followers that adapt to change. Still others are the organizations that do not survive. There are many models that can be used for successful organizational change. Winners respond to the pace and complexity of change. They adapt, learn and act quickly. Losers try to control and master change in the environment. It is important for organizational leaders to identify and use a model for transformation that will help their organizations survive and flourish.

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. This high pace of change means that the organization must change its behaviour and rapidly adapt to shifts in the market (Newcomb, 2005). At the same time, Beer and Nohria (2000) have shown that currently, many change projects and development programs produce unsatisfactory results. To increase the ability to change, the change competence must increase. Change competence is described as the ability to manage change in the environment and to be able to form a continuous renewal of this process. Change competence is also about choosing a change strategy that matches the organization and its member's experience of change processes (Newcomb, 2005).

Kotter (1990) argues that there is marked difference in the orientation between management and leadership. Both involve deciding what needs to be done, developing the capacity to do it, and ensuring that it is done. However, while management is concerned with order and consistency, leadership is concerned with change. Chandler (1994) suggests that sometimes this does not happen. One reason for this is that leaders become so committed to a project or belief that they only attend information that supports their own position and fail to recognize signals that point to, for example, changes in customer requirements or the availability of resources. A history of past success can contribute to this condition. This encourages the leader to plough ahead without giving sufficient consideration to the needs or concerns raised by others. Carnali (1990) provides example of the inventor with a pet idea who succeeds in acquiring sufficient resources to initiate a venture that eventually fails to meet the market's needs, and the CEO who is motivated to accelerate the realization of a vision after early successes.

A related problem is that leaders, even become aware that their vision is flawed, refuse to change. Canarli (1990) suggests that this can be explained by cognitive dissonance. Leaders continue to pursue past commitments because a failure to do so would damage their favorable perceptions of themselves.

The leader's relationships with others can also lead to circumstances where a clearly flawed vision goes unchallenged. Subordinates may fear repercussion if they challenge the leader's view or they become too dependent on and trusting in the leader's judgment. Some writers argue that charismatic leaders who have dominant personalities can promote this kind of unquestioning dependence. This lack of challenge can also develop in those circumstances where the leadership team becomes so committed to a single ideology known as "groupthink".

Managerial work in times of change is increasingly a leadership task. While management and leadership are distinct activities, they are complementary and both are necessary for success in a changing business environment.Colins and Rainwaterk (2005) argues that it can be confusing to think about managers and leaders as though they are different, and to a large extent incompatible people. For example, some talk about leaders as dynamic, charismatic individuals with the ability to inspire others, and managers as uninspiring bureaucrats who just focus on the task in hand. Colins and Rainwaterk (2005) asserts that such a view does not coincide well with the experience of being a manager. People are generally recruited into 'Managerial', rather than 'leadership', positions and are expected to complete a multitude of tasks ranging from day-to-day planning and implementation, to longer-term strategic thinking. None of these are done in isolation.

Kotter (1999) argues that managers are the people who, typically, are in the best position to provide the leadership required to ensure that a change will be successful. However, if they are to provide this leadership, they need to recognize that their role involves a dual responsibility, for management – keeping the system operating effectively – and for leadership – revitalizing and renewing the system to ensure that it will remain effective over the longer term.

It is obvious that not only is the pace of change increasing, but that there is also a shift in emphasis towards managing discontinuous or transformational change. An implication of this shift is that leadership and the provision of a sense of direction are becoming more important parts of managerial work. A lot of attention has been paid to what leaders do (the behavioural view) and how circumstances affect what they do (situational view). During change leaders are expected to recognise the need for change, identify change goals, communicate a sense of direction, formulate a change strategy, motivate people, provide support and create an organizational context conducive to change.

The average person has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if they can. Due to this dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate efforts towards the achievement of organizational objectives. The average person prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition and, above all, wants security. Managers who hold these assumptions adopt a more directive and controlling leadership style. Theory X shares many of the assumptions that underpin economic change strategy, which focuses on the drive for economic value through tough, top-down, results-driven action.

However, the assumptions underpinning McGregor's theory Y are completely different.

The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort towards organizational objectives. People will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which they are committed. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. The average person learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, and not narrowly, distributed in the population.

Managers who see other organizational members in this way are inclined to adopt a leadership style that promotes employee commitment to the change agenda and invests effort in developing their capacity to contribute to the achievement of change goals. This commitment maximization approach assumes that commitment is generated when people are trusted and allowed to work autonomously. It is an approach that shares many of the assumptions that underpin (Beer, Eisentat and Spencer,'s 1990) organizational development strategy for change, as it involves creating the capabilities that organizational members require in order to deliver high performance and secure competitive advantage over the long term.

III. Methodology

The study adopted descriptive research method, the research instrument used to measure change leadership was the structured questionnaire while the published financial statement of some communication company ranging from 2008-2012 was reviewed to measure organisational stability. The study covered the change leadership variables. This study is done in Lagos state Nigeria where the head offices of the telecommunication companies were situated. Based on predetermined criteria, MTN Nigeria, Airtel Nigeria and Starcomms were used for secondary data analysis. Data collected on change leadership (CL) and organisational stability (OS) were subjected to regression analysis via least square techniques

A. *Descriptive Statistics of Change Leadership*

TABLE I. CHANGE LEADERSHIP

QUESTIONS	MEAN	MODE	STD. DEV.	VAR	SUM	N
Your executive group clearly articulate why the change is occurring and what the future will look like	4.83	5	1.225	1.502	6933	1435
Employee appreciate the differences between where you are now to where you want to be	5.02	5	0.908	0.824	7175	1428
Processes are in place to consult with the different stakeholder groups	4.87	5	0.911	0.830	6984	1435
Your stakeholder know how they can contribute	4.93	5	0.806	0.650	7044	1428
Employees know how decisions will be made	4.73	5	0.981	0.962	6710	1420
Are employees prepared to assume responsibility for the successful direction and execution of change	4.78	5	0.839	0.704	6827	1429
There is an approach defined or human resource principles that have been adopted for the change	4.76	5	0.951	0.904	6821	1434
A range of employee supports and learning opportunities have been made easily available	4.72	5	1.004	1.009	6756	1430
Managers been equipped to effectively manage the individual within their team during the change	4.79	5	1.003	1.006	6863	1434
There is a clear map of governance arrangement for the change	4.88	5	0.925	0.856	6961	1425
There is an effective procedure in place for monitoring the change	4.79	5	1.032	1.064	6880	1435
Executive and manangers lead by example	4.76	5	0.965	0.930	6729	1414
Your executive and managers are repeating the key messages throughout the day	4.85	5	0.846	0.716	6800	1403
Mechanisms are in place to ensure the changed state becomes the normal way of working	4.85	5	0.994	0.988	6949	1433
Leaders working as facilitators helping others on their team to learn how to lead	4.85	5	1.004	1.008	6957	1435

In this study, the despondences have evaluated questions relating to change leadership. There are fifteen questions in all as regards change leadership. The responses are shown in the table 4.a above. The overall means of all the fifteen questions are above average, ranging from 4.74 to 5.02. Most of the respondents picked "agreed" for the fifteen questions. This shows that most of the telecommunication company staff were fully aware of change leadership procedures.

39.5% of the respondents strongly agreed, 31.5% of the respondents Agreed with the first question in the questionnaire, while 21.4% fairly agreed, 1.2% fairly disagreed,1.0% disagreed as 5.4% strongly disagreed.

49.5% and 29.8% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed that Employee appreciate the between where you are now to where you want to be, while 17% fairly agreed, 1.2% fairly disagreed, 4% disagreed and 1.7% disagreed.

To confirm whether processes are in place to consult with the different stakeholder groups, 709 agreed and 328 strongly agreed with the question representing 49.4% and 22.9% respectively. About 22.6% of the respondents fairly agreed with the question.

Also, question is asked whether the stakeholder know how they can contribute to the organisation. 20.6% of the employees strongly agreed and 57.1% agreed that the stakeholder were fully aware of how they can contribute to the organisation growth while about 21.8% of the respondents fairly agreed, disagree and strongly disagree with the question.

Employees know how decision will be made is one of the questions that the respondents were asked to say their opinion about. 61.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that Employees know how decisions will be made while 424 respondent representing 29.5% fairly agreed with the question. 73(5.1%) of the customer fairly disagreed, 23 (1.6%) of the respondents Disagreed while 15(1%) Strongly disagreed with the question whether the employees are prepared to assume responsibility for execution of change. 70.8% of the respondent strongly agrees that they are ready to assume responsibility for execution and successful direction and execution of change. 331(23.1%) fairly agreed with question. 50(3.5%) fairly disagreed, 26(1.8%) disagreed, 6(0.4%) strongly disagreed with the questions.

On whether there is a Defined or human resources principles that have been adopted for change. 682(47.5%) agreed, 283(19.7%) strongly agreed and 363(25.3%) fairly agreed with the statement. While others representing 7.4% fairly disagreed, disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The researcher also investigates through the questionnaire whether there are employee supports and learning opportunities. 604(42.1%) of the respondents agreed with the fairly disagreed, 11(0.8%) disagreed that there are several opportunity to supports employees and learning.

Managers have been equipped to effectively manage the individual within their team during the change. 1435 respondents were reach out to, in which 18(1. %) strongly disagreed, 23(1.6%) disagreed, 76(5.3%) fairly disagreed, 361(25.2%) fairly agree, 609(42.4%) agree, and 347(24.2%) of the respondent strongly agree with the statement. However, there is one out of the respondent that refused to fill the response for the question of the respondent

On order to know whether there is a clear map of governance arrangement for the change. 16(1.1%) of the respondent strongly disagree, 14(1.0%) disagree, 44(3.1%) fairly disagree, 325(22.6%) fairly agree, 671(46.8%) agree, 355(24.7%) strongly agree that there is a clear map. However there are 10(0.7%) respondents that refused to respond to the question.

On whether there is an effective procedure in place for monitoring the change. 543(37.8%) agree, 388(27%) strongly agree and 378(26.3%) fairly agree that there is an effective procedure for monitoring change, while 26(1.8%) strongly disagree, 1(0.1%) disagree and 99(6.9%) fairly disagree.

342(23.8%) strongly agree, 515(35.9%) agree and 474(33%) the respondents fairly agree that Managers and top executives lead by example, while 17(1.2%) strongly disagree 9(0.6%) disagree and 57(4.0%) fairly disagree with the statement that the top executives lead by example.

However, it is necessary for the managers to remind the employees the key message of change. About 69.1% of the respondent affirmed that there is a repetition of the key message of change, 333(23.2%) fairly agree while 2(0.1%) strongly disagree, 14(1.0%) disagree.

Also, the researchers find out whether there is a mechanism in place to ensure that change statement becomes the normal way of working. 58% of the respondents agree, strongly agree with the statement, 314(21.9%) fairly agree with the statement. However 124(8.6%) fairly disagree, 11(0.6%) disagree, 8(0.6%) strongly disagree with the statement.

On whether leaders are working on the facilitators helping others on their team to learn how to lead. About 72.3% of the respondents agree that their leaders are helping their team to become a good leader. 254(17.7%) fairly agree, while 15(1%) strongly disagree, 19(1.3%) disagree and 110(7.7%) fairly disagree with the statement.

The descriptive statistics presented in the table 4.b covers all the sampled telecommunication companies for the five years under study.

From Fig. 4.b, the average ROCE for the three companies for the five years are: 17.4180 for MTN, 14.1540 for Starconns and 14.9320 for AIRTEL with standard deviation of 1.85445, 7.45311 and 4.82001. MTN has the least standard error for the five years with value 0.82933, and 3.33268 for STARCOMS, 2.15557 for AIRTEL. However, the minimum ROCE for the five years for MTN is 14.44 and the maximum is 19.21%. The minimum and maximum for STARCOMS are 2.78% and 21.56, while for AIRTEL, the minimum is 9.40 and maximum is 19.54%. Also, the average gearing ratio for MTN, STARCOMS and AIRTEL are, 71.6400, 32.2000 and 29.3600 with standard deviation of 4.27937, 22.57654 and 18.33434.

The average standard errors are:

1.91379 for MTN, 10.09653 for STARCOMS and 8.19937 for AIRTEL. However, for the five years, the minimum and maximum Gearing ratio for MTN are 65% and 75.9%, STARCOMS 0% and 55% and AIRTEL 15% and 50.8%.

The trend line for the five years shows the profitability for the three companies in fig. 4.1 MTN has a steady increase from 2008 to 2011 with 2011 as the peak with value of 19.21%. The ROCE now dropped in 2012. However, STARCOMS and AIRTEL were not having a stable ROCE value (profitability value) which continues to be on decline from 2008 to 2012.

The trend line for gearing ratio revealed that MTN as at 2008 is 73.3% with the peak in 2009 as in fig. 4.2. This value dropped over the years with the least value recorded in 2012. This shows that MTN was running much more on borrowed funds for the five years considered which is more risky for the company. However, STARCOMS and AIRTEL were having increase in borrowers fund from 2008 to 2012.

For STARCOMS, the reliance on borrowers fund reached its peak in 2012 while AIRTEL

reached its peak in 2011 with a sharp drop on reliance on borrowers fund in 2012.

IV. Test of Hypothesis One

TABLE II. VARIABLES ENTERED/REMOVEDA

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	BDZb	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: GEARINGOB

b. All requested variables entered.

TABLE III. MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.680a	0.462	0.420	0.1934901

a. Predictors: (Constant), BDZ

TABLE IV. ANOVAA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	0.417	1	0.417	11.151	0.005b
	Residual	0.487	13	0.037		
	Total	0.904	14			

a. Dependent Variable: GEARINGOB

b. Predictors: (Constant), BDZ

TABLE V. COEFFICIENTS[A]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-0.108	0.173		-0.626	0.542
	BDZ	0.050	0.015	0.680	3.339	0.005

a. Dependent Variable: GEARINGOB

V. Result

The first hypothesis states that, there is no significant relationship between change leadership and organisation survival. To test the hypothesis, the proxy for the dependent variable used is GEARINGOB while for the independent variable is BDZ. However, after the analysis, the estimated model obtained is:

$$GEARINGOB = -0.108 + 0.050BDZ$$

From the model summary (table III) there is a strong positive relationship between change leadership and organisation survival with r-value of 0.680 and it also shows that above 46.2% variation in organisation survival is caused by change leadership. The standard error of the estimate for the model is 0.1934901.

Also, the sum of the squares for the regression and residual are 0.417 and 0.487 respectively by (table IV), with mean square regression and residual being 0.417 and 0.037 respectively. The p-value for the model is 0.005 which is less than 0.05, this implies that the model is adequate and significant with this result, which fail to reject the alternative hypothesis that there is significant relationship between change leadership and organisational survival. Also, the variable BDZ is significant with p-value of 0.005 and t-value of constant and BDZ been - 0.626 and 3.339 respectively.Morelos, the standard error is 0.015 for BDZ, the t-value shows that the coefficient are not zero.

Therefore, change leadership has an influence that is significantly positive on organisational survival. That is, as the BDZ increases, the higher probability of survival of the organisation.

VI. Conclusions

The findings of this research have empirically proved that change leadership significantly affects firms' performance. Change leadership directly influence organisational stability.

VII. Recommendations

The following are recommendations from the research objectives, research hypothesis, research questions, findings and the conclusion.

This study generates recommendations which if implemented will improve firms' performance and management practice in organisations, and change management in the telecommunication industry in particular. The following recommendations are therefore proffered:

Change leaders should be proactive and posses a good strategic view of the organisation and its environment to contribute significantly to change management so as to be able to ensure organisational stability. Managers should be equipped with necessary skills for change management. Change management should be seen as one of the functions of management. There should be a clear way of governance arrangement for change management. Mechanisms to manage change must ensure the changed state becomes a normal way of working.

References

[1] S. H. Applebaum, and L. Whol, Transformation or change: Prescription for health care organisations. Managing Service Quality, 10(5), 279-298, 2000

[2] M. Beer, and N. Nohria, Breaking the code of change. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 2000

[3] M. Beer, R. A. Eisenstat, and B. Spencer, Why change programme don't produce change. Harvard Business Review, 68(6), 158 – 166, 1990

[4] B. Burnes, Why does change fail and what can we do about it? Journal of change Management , 11(4), 445 – 450, 2011.

[5] C. A. Carnali, Managing change in organization. London, UK: Prentice Hall, 1990.

[6] D. A. Chandler, The history of business change. A Road map to corporate transformation. UK: McGraw – Hill Books, 1994.

[7] R. B. Cialdini, A person–centered approach to dealing with resistance to change. Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 14 (4), 10 – 14, 1993.

[8] D. Collins, and K. Rainwater, Managing change at sears: A sideways look at a tale of corporate transformation. Journal of Organaisational Change Management, 18(1), 16 – 30, 2005.

[9] P. B. Crosby, Quality is free. New York: McGraw–Hill, 1979.

[10] D. Dunphy, A. Griffiths, and S. Benn, Organizational change for corporate sustainability (2nd ed.). London: Routledge, 2007.

[11] M. Hammer, and J. Champy, Re-engineering the corporation. London: Nicolas Brealey, 1993.

[12] T. Hayes, Total quality management and organizational change. Research Papers Dublin City: University Business School, 15, 2010.

[13] R. M. Kanter, Transforming giants. Harvard Business Review, 86,43-52, 2008.

[14] J. P. Kotter, Leading change. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1999.

[15] J. Kotter, L. Schlesinger, and V. Sathe, Organisation (2nd ed.). Homewood: Irwin, 1990.

[16] O. G. Mink, Ontology: Creating a Growth. Oriented learning environment managing Service Quality, 8 (4), 272 – 280, 1998.

[17] K. Newcomb, Transformational Leadership: four keys to help you and your organization stay focused on continuous improvement and greater value. Retrieved from http://www.debt3online.com/page=article_id=79, May, 2013

[18] R. Schalk, J. W. Campbell, and C. Freese, Change and employee behaviour. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 19(3), 157 – 163, 1988.

[19] M. E. Smith, Changing an organizations culture, correlate of success and failure. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24(5), 249 – 261, 2000.

[20] R. D. Stacey, Strategic management and organizational dynamics: The challenge of complexity. Harlow: Prentice Hall, 2007.

[21] T. H. Veldsman, Into the people effectiveness arena: navigating between chaos and order. Randburg: Knowledge Resources, 2002

[22] G. Yukl, Leadership in organizations, (7th ed.). New Jersey: Person Upper Saddler River, 2010.