



**THE INFLUENCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND EMPLOYEE
TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGE IN
SELECTED PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING IN KENYA**

¹ **Whycliffe Cliffe's Ogaga**

*The School of Business and Human Resource Development,
Rongo University College, P.O Box 103-40404.Rongo, Kenya.
ogagacliffes@yahoo.com*

² **Agili John Nyangueso**

*Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, Board of Postgraduate Studies,
P.O Box 210-40601, Bondo, Kenya
agilinj@yahoo.com*

Abstract

Considering the constantly growing need for change in today's environment, handling changes within organizations has turn out to be extra important than ever before. This study purposed to investigate the extent to which organizational structure and employee training and development influence the implementation of change in selected public institutions of higher learning in Kenya. The Study focused on two public Universities; Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science & Technology (JOOUST) and Kisii University (KSIU) from University colleges, thus finding themselves at the very centre of the need to persistently initiate changes as a coping strategy to a hastily dynamic academic industry. Three dominant change theories/models; Kurt Lewin's Freezing- change –refreezing, John Kotter's 8 step change management model and Prosci's ADKAR change models formed the basis for the study. A descriptive survey research design was adopted with a sample of 170 respondents drawn from a target population of 1,425 formed of the University management Boards (UMBs), Deans/Directors/Heads of Departments/Sections, Teaching and Non teaching staff and Student Association's leaders. Interview schedules and questionnaires were used to collect data, SPSS was used to produce descriptive statistics. The study found that majority of employees, top management and other change stakeholders in public universities consider organizational structure and employee training and development to have great and very great extent of influence on change implementation process. The study recommends among others that public universities need to put emphasis on employee change competence during change implementation process and adopt flexible organizational structures that permit the kind of responsiveness demanded by change driven environments.

Keywords: *Influence, Implementation, Change, Organizational structure, Employee training and development*

Introduction

The phrase that goes; “There is nothing permanent except change” has most likely been said and heard by many people. Why then is it so hard to create change in organizations? It is indeed a riddling question. Hannan and Freeman's (1977, 1984) structural inertia theory states that organizations are relatively inflexible and it is difficult and hazardous to impose change on them. Latest research, however, indicates that there are approaches which can help organizations go through change without failing. Scheid (2010) carried out a survey in 248 companies and identified factors for successful change management in Organizations which include effective and strong executive sponsorship, buy-in from front line managers and employees, putting up exceptional teams, continuous and targeted communication and planned and organized approach. Olive (2009) had also concluded that the success of change depends on the organization’s ability to make all their employees participate in the change process in one way or the other. The executive team should participate actively and visibly throughout the change project, build a coalition of sponsorship, manage resistance and communicate directly with employees.

The dynamic business environment today requires frequent changes both in the way organizations operate and in the organizational structure. Turner (1999) and Abrahamson (2000) note that change is endemic and has become an essential determinant in maintaining a company’s competitive edge. In their opinion, the old bureaucratic style of management is incompetent of meeting the challenges of the changing environment.

Given the political, social and economic climate of today, some form of change is inevitable and has become a common event for organizations and their stakeholders (Akin & Palmer, 2000; Burke, 2002, Heracleous & Barrett, 2001; Piderit, 2000). But what is change? “Change means the new state of things is different from the old state of things” (French and Bell 1999). Organizational change thus means the new state of things in the organization is different from the old state of things in the organization. In simple terms, change is understood as alteration of status quo.

The world has changed and will continue to change. Senior and Fleming (2006) provided a picture of the future and how it will affect people and their willingness to change within organizations. They predict there will be a structural change with less layers of management and a reduction of the numbers of people working together. There will be a stronger pressure for individuals to work harder and longer. The working pattern is also assumed to change. It will be normal to have more than one place of employment and a greater number of people will work from home. The workforce characteristics will also change with the rate of birth decreasing and

the number of old people increasing, leading to a rise in the average age of people working. The workforce skills will change with a higher requirement for workers to learn new skills during their career due to changing technologies and a more competitive environment. The workers will also have more employment choices, with an increasing rate of self-employment and working abilities in small organizations. Due to an ageing population, pension schemes will also be necessary (Senior & Fleming, 2006).

Today's organizations 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 behavior and manage to rapidly adapt to shifts in the market (Nonas, 2005). According to Burnes (2004) change is an ever-present feature of organizational life, both at an operational and strategic level. Therefore, there should be no doubt regarding the importance to any organization of its ability to identify where it needs to be in the future, and how to manage the changes required in getting there. From a practical point of view, there is a clear need for an integrated and holistic framework to help top management think about how to formulate, implement and sustain a fundamental change in complex organizations like Universities.

When an organization introduces a change to the organization, it is at the end of the day going to be impacting one or more of the following four parts of how the organization operates: processes, systems, organizational structure and job roles. Ultimately, the goal of change is to improve the organization by altering how work is done. While the notion of 'becoming more competitive' or 'becoming closer to the customer' or 'becoming more efficient' can be the motivation to change, at some point these goals must be transformed into the specific impacts on progressive alterations in processes, systems, organizational structures or job roles (Prosci, 2007).

With the management environment experiencing so much change, organizations must then learn to become comfortable with change as well. Therefore, the ability to adapt to organizational change is an essential ability required in the workplace today. Yet, major and rapid organizational change is profoundly difficult because the structure, culture, and routines of organizations often reflect a persistent and difficult-to-remove "imprint" of past periods, which are resistant to radical change even as the current environment of the organization changes rapidly (Dean, Christina 2009). Due to the growth of technology, modern organizational change is largely motivated by exterior innovations rather than internal moves. When these

developments occur, the organizations that adapt quickest create a competitive advantage for themselves, while those that refuse to change get left behind (Marshak, Robert J. 2005).

In the early 1980s, a survey of management consultants summarized that fewer than 10 percent of well and clearly formulated new strategies were successfully implemented (Kaplan and Norton, 2001). Kotter (1996) begins his book with highlighting the fact that most of the transformation efforts undertaken in firms end up with a failure, producing only disappointment, frustration, burned-out and scared employees, and waste of resources. Beer and Nohria (2000) have also shown that currently, many change projects and development programs produce unsatisfactory results. A 2006 study by Harvard Business Review further found that 66% of change initiatives fail to achieve their desired business outcomes.

Kotter (1996), is, however, quick to point out that a significant amount of the waste and failures could be avoided, if only more energy and attention was put into avoiding the most common and biggest problems transformation efforts are typically facing. Change competence, therefore, must increase for an organization to increase its ability to change. 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 members' experience of change processes.

In Rwanda, barriers between departments, not enough support from senior management, resistance of middle management to change, focus too much on technological aspects and too less on people, scope of change not well defined, project is oversized, resistance of users to change, not enough resources available, budget needed higher than expected, organization and procedures are not adapted to the new situation (technological and organizational integration on different levels), no transparent goals/objectives, time for implementation needed longer than expected, goals too aggressive and organization is not capable to cope, technological limitations (performance/missing functionality), barriers from external stakeholders (customers/supplier) and intercultural problems are rated as the most important problems facing change initiatives in public universities (Kamugisha, 2013).

There should be frequent organizational changes to be able to cope with the ever turbulent environment in which Universities operate. Helping workers deal with change is one of the greatest challenges Universities in Rwanda are facing today. This is because change is quite a

complex and often an emotional process. Understanding how people deal with change will help an organization manage a successful transition (Kamugisha, 2013).

According to Hodge, Anthony and Gales (1996), not all change is initiated at the same pace. Change can be either slow and deliberate or quick and radical. This study focused entirely on formally planned change. But change may also emerge through an unplanned and unforeseen process.

Organizations as such do not just roam without direction, but they change and respond to events in their environment. But perhaps the greatest challenge facing modern organizations is the need to identify appropriate areas to change and to successfully implement those changes in various aspects of the organization. Choosing the right point is not an easy task, and there is no one single right answer for all organizations. Such factors as the nature of the organization's financial muscle, the people in the organization, the existing culture, leadership, policies, structures to name but a few, have differential impact on how much change an organization needs and on how an organization successfully implements the change. Very often the inability to successfully implement change is a result of the failure to produce shared understanding or meaning among organizational members involved in the change (Lewis, 1996).

The above described situation and future, is also a reality for public Universities in Kenya. The game has changed. For them to survive, compete and prosper, changes in policies, members, products, systems, structures and processes must occur over time. These variables have dramatically come together to alter both the purposes higher education is asked to serve and the resources available to it. Higher education is now faced with a new set of social roles and responsibilities, an increasingly diverse student population, new and changing demands from both students and society, limited or declining resources, and escalating costs. Together these changes comprise a fundamentally new set of challenges to the higher education system in Kenya.

It even becomes more worrisome for these Universities when their current increased number scrambling for the ever scarce government resources is considered. There are currently 31 public Universities in Kenya according to Commission for University Education, all depending on the already over burdened government account. More are expected to come in still and the number of students is expected to rapidly multiply with the otherwise successful implementation of the Free Primary Education programme in the country. Indeed, the political leadership in Kenya has been quoted in the recent past of its intentions to increase student intake to public universities through a double intake. This meant that each public university will take higher number of

students above the admissions of previous years. This academic year (2011/2012), universities will be admitting 32, 611 students. This number is 8,000 more than the 24,000 students admitted the previous year (Daily Nation June 21, 2011).

Prior to these events, there were only 7 public universities in the country, the number of students getting entry in them hardly went beyond 10,000. When they required money for development or offsetting recurrent expenditure etc., the Kenyan state often invested what was necessary. This gave the Universities a protected situation where initiative and innovation were unnecessary and the possibilities of failure did not exist. Today Kenya Government is pursuing Vision 2030, the country's new development blueprint covering the period 2008 to 2030. It aims to transform Kenya into a newly industrializing, "middle-income country providing a high quality life to all its citizens by the year 2030" (Republic of Kenya, 2007).

Critical players in achieving Kenya Vision 2030 are the universities. This is because education and training at university level, according to the Government (Republic of Kenya, 1999), is expected to achieve the following: imparting hands-on skills and capacity to perform multiple and specific national and international tasks, creation of dependable and sustainable workforce in form of human resource capital for national growth and development, creation of entrepreneurial capacity for empowering individuals to create self -employment and employment for others, offering opportunities for advancement of learning beyond basic education with strong leaning towards scholarship and research, bridging the gap between theory and practice in various disciplines of education and training among others.

Sifuna (2012), while investigating leadership in Kenyan public universities and the challenges of Autonomy and academic freedom found out that there are numerous challenges facing public universities in Kenya today that require innovation and continuous change in order to cope effectively. Gudo, Olel and Oanda (2011) also in their study on University expansion in Kenya and issues of quality, although focusing on challenges and opportunities, came up with similar findings. Since these changes are inevitable, it is important to study the change process in order to better understand it and determine the extent of influence certain key organizational factors have on its successful implementation within public Universities.

A study regarding how the environment affects organizational structure showed that organizations have different structures depending on whether they operated in a stable environment or a more dynamic, changeable environment. The study identified two different main types of structure, mechanistic structure which is suitable for stable environments and organic structure which suits a more unpredictable environment (Burns 2004). In a study of the

London Insurance Market in 2001, Heracleous and Barrett as cited in Burns (2004) suggest that deep structures, persistent and stable processes and patterns that influence action in organizations shape the change process. Managers or change agents with extended knowledge of these deep structures are necessary in the enactment of change in organizations of this type.

Armstrong (2006) identified lack of the necessary skills and competency fears as part of the reasons why people resist change in organizations. Jacobs & Russ (2002) explain that employees are often introduced to a planned organizational change initiative through a change-related training event. The writers further report that some Human Resource Development scholars have noted that change-related training may actually have a significant role in shaping employees' perceptions and attitudes toward the change because training is often the employees' first significant exposure to the organizational change. During a training event, employees will naturally have affective and cognitive reactions which will contribute to the formation of attitudes regarding the change (Ajzen, 2001).

When organizational members lack the confidence that they can successfully change, they ought to be provided with education and training suitable for that change (Dennis, 2005). Armenekis et al (2007) while developing their change readiness assessment tool, identified Efficacy as one of the major domains of assessment. They explained that Efficacy represents the capacity of the organization to implement the proposed change. It is the possession of confidence by an individual that the individual or the organization has the capacity and ability to implement the desired changes successfully. This capacity and confidence can be achieved through training the employees.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the extent of influence of organizational structure and employee training and development on implementation of change in selected public Universities in Kenyan.

Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives;

- i. To establish the extent of influence of organizational structure on implementation of change in public institutions of higher learning in Kenya.

- ii. To examine the extent of influence of employee training and development on implementation of change in public institutions of higher learning in Kenya.

Research Questions

- i. To what extent does organizational structure influence the implementation of change in public institutions of higher learning in Kenya?
- ii. To what extent does employee training and development influence implementation of change in public institutions of higher learning in Kenya?

Research Methodology

The study employed a descriptive survey design in two purposively sampled public universities awarded charters to acquire full fledged university status in the same period; Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology (JOOUST) in Siaya County and Kisii University (KSIU) in Kisii County. The institutions are currently under pressure to initiate and implement change projects that are meant to enable them meet the requirements of their new university statuses and cope with the rapid dynamics experienced in Kenyan academic industry. The target population of the study was stratified in to Universities Management Boards, Deans/Directors/Heads of Departments and Sections, Teaching and None teaching Staff and Students’ Association Leaders from each university. From a total population of 1,425 a sample of 170 respondents was used in the study selected through purposive and random sampling techniques.

Table 1: Target Population of the Study per University

Target Population	JOOUST	KSIU	Total
Management Board	10	6	16
Deans/Dir./HoDs/Sect.	49	33	82
Teaching & Non Teaching Staff	369	950	1319
Students Association Leaders	4	4	8
Total	432	993	1425

Source: Universities Record (2014)

Kodhari (2009), Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) and Bryman criteria for sample determination were used to select the total sample of 170 respondents. Kodhari (2009) was used for teaching and none teaching staff while Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) was used for

Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections. Proportionate sampling method of determining sample size was then used to determine the proportions to be selected from each University in order to ensure University representation. Systematic random sampling was there after used to come up with the sample interval for each stratum along which respondents to participate in the study were picked from registers of employees.

According to the Universities records (2014), there are a total of 16 members of the Universities Management Boards(UMB), 82 Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections, 1319 members of teaching and non teaching staff and 8 senior student leaders. Using 30% the desired sample of UMB is 5, Deans/Dir/HoDs/Sect. was 25, while teaching and non teaching staff was 132 using 10%. Student leaders was 8 using saturated sampling. To get University representation, proportionate sampling criteria was used;

Stratum was University and Position defined;

UMB

Population =16

JOOUST - $10/16 \times 5 = 3.152 = 3$ respondents

KSIU - $6/16 \times 5 = 1.875 = 2$ respondents

Deans/Dir/HoDs/Sect.

Population =82

JOOUST - $49/82 \times 25 = 14.93 = 15$ respondents

KSIU - $33/82 \times 25 = 10.060 = 10$ respondents

Teaching and non teaching staff

Population =1319

JOOUST - $369/1319 \times 132 = 36.92 = 37$ respondents

KSIU - $950/1319 \times 132 = 95.07 = 95$ respondents

Systematic random sampling was then used to calculate the interval **K=size of population/desired sample size of every stratum**. On UMB, the population of JOOUST is 10/3, K=3 while in KSIU, K=6/2=3. On Deans/Dir./HoDs/Sect., In JOOUST, K will be 49/15=3.26=3 while in KSIU, K will be 33/10=3.3=3. On teaching and non teaching staff, in JOOUST, K will be 369/37=9.97=10 and in KSIU, K will be 950/95=10.

Simple random sampling was then used to pick the first respondent from each stratum. After picking the first respondent from among the target population sizes in each stratum, the

researcher systematically picked every **Kth** individual member of the population until the required size of the sample was met.

Table 2: Sample size of the Study

Strata	JOOUST		KSIU		Total Sample
	Total PPn	Sample	Total PPn	Sample	
Management Board	10	3	6	2	5
Deans/Dir./HoDs/Sections	49	15	33	10	25
Teaching & None Teaching Staff	369	37	950	95	132
Students Assoc. Leaders	4	4	4	4	8
Total					170

Source: Universities Records (2014)

Data collection:

To successfully conduct the study, the researcher, used both open ended and closed questionnaires and interview schedules as the instruments to collect the necessary data required for the study. Questionnaires, personally administered by the researcher were used for Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections and teaching and none teaching staff. Interview schedules were used for university management boards (UMBs) and students' association leaders. To ensure validity, the researcher ensured that the instruments were sufficiently formatted and the contents capable of measuring what they purported to measure with regard to set objectives of the study in addition to seeking advice from the supervisors on the validity of the instruments. Their views together with results of piloting among 17 none sampled respondents were used in revising the instruments. Cronbach's Alpha Test registered Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.888 on questionnaire for Teaching and None teaching staff while the questionnaire for Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections registered Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.789. The rule of thumb is that alpha values of at least 0.7 are considered optimal (Kulter, 2007). The instruments were therefore found to be reliable for the study.

Data analysis and Presentation

The responses were classified into themes and sub themes for ease of analysis using both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Raw data were grouped into themes and sub themes as per the study objectives. Quantitative data was coded and analyzed through the use of Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) in order to describe and interpret data based on research objectives. Presentation of the analyzed data was done in form of frequencies, tables, percentages and explanatory notes.

Empirical Results and discussions:

The extent of influence of organizational structure on implementation of change in public universities in Kenya was assessed through five organizational structural aspects and the study found out that majority of employees believe that organizational structure influences behavior towards and ability to successfully implement change. 69% (majority) of the respondents reported their behavior towards change to be influenced by one or more of the organizational structural aspects under test. 31% of the respondents on the other hand said their behavior towards change is not influenced by any of the structural aspects.

Majority (88%) of the Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections agreed that the structural aspects/components influenced their School/Directorate/Departments/Section's capacity and ability to successfully implement changes initiated in their universities. 12% reported that the structural aspects did not influence their School/Directorate/ Departments/ Sections' capacity and ability to successfully implement changes initiated in their universities. Number of Layers/Levels of management hierarchy, adaptability or responsiveness of management system were reported by majority of respondents (48% and 51% respectively) as having very great and great extent of influence on behavior towards and ability to successfully implement change. (see tables 3, 4 and 5 below).

Table 3: Influence of Organizational Structural Aspects on Staff (n=129)

Influence	Yes	No	Total
Frequency	89	40	129
Percentage	69%	31%	100%

Table 4: Influence of Organizational Structural Aspects on School, Directorate, Department, Section’s Capacity and Ability to successfully implement change(n=25)

Influence	Yes	No	Total
Frequency	22	3	25
Percentage	88%	12%	100%

The teaching and none teaching staff were presented with a number of structural aspects and asked to indicate the extent to which they felt the various aspects influenced their readiness and capacity to implement changes initiated in their universities. The findings revealed that number of layers/levels of management hierarchy had the largest percentage of respondents, 48%, who felt the aspect had a very great influence on readiness and capacity to implement change. Horizontal Integration/ coordination was found to have the least number of respondents, 18%, who believed it had a very great extent of influence on staff readiness and capacity to implement change. Reporting channels had a majority of respondents who felt it had very little influence on staff readiness and capacity to implement change at 14% while adaptability/responsiveness of management systems was viewed by the least number of respondents, 2%, who said it had very little influence on staff readiness and capacity to implement change. Additionally, Horizontal integration/coordination had majority (26%) of respondents who said its extent of influence on readiness and capacity to implement change was neutral while reporting channels had the least number of respondents who felt the same at 9%.

When the Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections were asked to state the extent to which the same structural aspects influenced their areas’ capacity and ability to successfully implement changes, distribution/decentralization of authority had the highest percentage among respondents while considering the aspects to be having very great extent of influence. Horizontal coordination and reporting channels were considered by the least number of respondents to be having very great influence. Number of layers of management hierarchy was considered by majority of respondents to be having great influence on schools/directorates/department/sections’ capacity and ability to successfully implement initiated changes. Adaptability/responsiveness of a management system had the second largest number of respondents who believes its influence is great at 52%. Horizontal integration coordination was considered by majority of Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections at 32% to have a neutral extent of influence, similar to reports

from teaching and none teaching staff whose majority considered it so at 26% (see tables 5 and 6 below).

Table 5: Extent of Influence of Organizational Structural Aspects on Readiness and Capacity to Implement Change among Staff (n=89)

Structural Aspect	Total Frequency		Very great		Great		Neutral		Little		Very little	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
	No.of layers of Mgnt. Hierarchy	89	100%	43	48%	20	22%	14	16%	7	8%	5
Distrbt/decentralizatrtn of Authority	89	100%	24	27%	34	38%	11	12%	13	15%	7	8%
Horizontal Integration/coord	89	100%	16	18%	33	37%	23	26%	9	10%	8	9%
Adaptability/Responsiveness of management systems	89	100%	35	40%	45	51%	2	2%	5	5%	2	2%
Reporting Channels	89	100%	22	25%	38	43%	8	9%	8	9%	13	14%

Table 6: Extent of Influence of Organizational Structural Aspects on School, Directorate, Department/Section among Deans/Directors/HoDs (n=22)

Structural Aspect	Total Frequency		Very great		Great		Neutral		Little		Very little	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
	No.of layers of Mgnt. Hierarchy	22	100%	7	32%	12	55%	1	4%	1	4%	1
Distrbt/decentralizatrtn of Authority	22	100%	11	50%	8	36%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%
Horizontal Integration/coord	22	100%	2	9%	9	41%	7	32%	1	5%	3	13%
Adaptability/Responsiveness of management systems	22	100%	3	14%	11	52%	4	17%	3	13%	1	4%
Reporting Channels	22	100%	2	9%	9	43%	6	26%	2	9%	3	13%

When a majority of respondents view levels of management hierarchy as having a very great extent of influence on staff readiness and capacity to implement change against other aspects, it indicates that the number of layers of authority an institution establishes affects staff response towards changes in substantial way. Either, when the number of respondents reporting that adaptability/responsiveness of a management system has great and very great influence on staff readiness and capacity to implement change stands at higher percentages against other extents along the continuum, it indicates that majority of staff in these universities consider

adaptability/responsiveness of their management systems as central in change implementation process.

Horizontal integration/coordination having been considered by majority of respondents from both teaching and non-teaching staff and Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections as having a neutral extent of influence indicates that most employees and persons on positions of authority have not clearly determined the true impact and importance of effective coordination in a management process and so in change implementation process. It is, therefore, a reflection of lack of adequate consultations and efficient linkages between different levels of management within the universities. The small number of respondents reporting this aspect as either having little, very little or a neutral extent of influence shows the level of staff awareness of the role adaptability of a management system plays in public universities and indeed any organization. In general, the findings show that organizational structure affects most employees' readiness and capacity to implement change(s). Most responses range from very great to great against very little, little and neutral.

It was also established that the organizational structures of universities were simple and supportive to change efforts among students according to student leaders interviewed. They identified ease of communication, securing appointment with top university management and faster decision making process as some of the deliverables the current structures offer to students. This makes it possible and quick to engage with the management on the best ways to successfully implement changes initiated in the universities. This finding confirms the findings of a survey conducted in 248 companies by Schien in 2010 which found out that continuous effective and targeted communication is essential for successful implementation of change.

The University Management Board members unanimously reported that they were satisfied with currently existing organizational structures of their universities. Majority, 60% of them said that to a great extent, the currently existing structures influenced their ability to successfully implement initiated changes in their universities. 20% said their ability was being very greatly influenced with another 20% saying the structures had a moderate influence in their ability. When 20% of UMB members report that their ability to successfully implement initiated changes are only moderately influenced with their current organizational structures, it shows that it is likely that they may not support and champion any programme or project initiated within these structures as may be required and good. This scenario is likely to hamper successful implementation of such programmes, change being one of them.

The extent of influence of Training and development on implementation of change in public universities in Kenya was assessed through frequency of training to staff and increase in change competence among the respondents arising from various training areas available. Majority (91%) of the respondents reported that training for them is important in implementation of changes initiated in their universities. Only 9% of the respondents felt that training them was not important in implementation of change. When Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections were asked to state whether in their opinion training staff was important in implementation of change, all the respondents (25) answered in the affirmative translating to 100% (see tables 7 and 8 below).

Table 7: Importance of Training and Development among staff (n=129)

Training Importance	Yes	No	Total
Frequency	117	12	129
Percentage	91%	9%	100%

Table 8: Importance of Training and Development for Staff among Deans/HoDs (n=25)

Training Importance	Yes	No	Total
Frequency	25	0	25
Percentage	100%	0%	100%

The results are an indication that staff prefer to be trained during change implementation programme.

On whether they got trained every time they were asked by their university management to implement a change programme, majority (62%) of the respondents reported that they don't get trained every time they are asked to implement a change programme. 38% said however that they get trained every time they are asked to implement a change programme in their universities. 56% of the Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections, however, reported that they normally get their staff trained every time change was implemented in their areas. 44% on the other hand reported that they did not train staff every time they implemented change. When the Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections were asked whether they themselves get trained by university management every time change is implemented in the university, 51% said yes while the remaining 49% said no (see tables 9, 10 and 11 below).

Table 9: Frequency of Staff Training among Teaching and none teaching staff (n=129)

Trained every time	Yes	No	Total
Frequency	49	80	129
Percentage	38%	62%	100%

Table 10: Frequency of Staff Training among Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections (n=25)

Trained every time	Yes	No	Total
Frequency	14	11	25
Percentage	56%	44%	100%

Table 11: Frequency of Training for Deans/Directors/HoDs/Section (n=25)

Trained every time	Yes	No	Total
Frequency	13	12	25
Percentage	51%	49%	100%

The UMB members unanimously reported that they did not train their staff every time the initiated a change programme/project. They cited lack of adequate resources and the belief that employees understand the changes as the causes for this. Interestingly, 40% of the respondents disclosed that even when the trainings are done, they are normally done just to fulfill other emerging management requirements like performance contracting and not with a commitment of achieving success in change implementation process. This means that almost a half of trainings conducted by these universities even during a change implementation process are not change needs-driven. They are eclipsed under ordinary day to day activities of the university, which is likely not to generate any fruitful responses from the trained staff.

University staff were further presented with a number of training areas and asked to indicate the extent to which they felt that getting trained in the areas increased or would increase their competence to successfully implement changes initiated in their universities. The findings revealed that planning skills was viewed by majority of both teaching and none teaching staff and Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections as increasing staff competence to a very great extent at 33% each. Communication skill was rated second at 30% and 29% respectively by both sets of

respondents with coordination being rated at the same percentage, 29%, by Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections in the same consideration. Monitoring and evaluation was rated by the least number of teaching and none teaching as increasing staff competence levels to a very great at 20%. Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections rated technical know-how as such by 12%. Further, the study revealed that coordination skills is viewed by majority of respondents, 43%, as increasing staff competence to successfully implement changes to a great extent .

Interestingly, while considering the training areas as having great extent of contribution in increasing staff competence, majority, 56%, of Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections of were in favour of technical knowhow followed by organization skills at 48%. Decision making and interpersonal skills were considered by the least number of teaching and none teaching staff as increasing staff competence to a great extent at 28% each. Only 1% of the teaching and none teaching staff said training them in planning skills would increase their change implementation competence to a very little extent with those viewing its extent of contribution in increasing staff competence as being little standing at 3%. Monitoring and evaluation on the other hand had the highest number of respondents, 10%, who view its extent of contribution in increasing staff competence to successfully implement change as being very little. Majority of teaching and none teaching staff, 27%, said that training them in decision making skills would to a neutral extent increase their competence to successfully implement change in their universities against all other areas of training.

Very few Deans/Directors/HoDs/Sections considered the areas of training as either having little or very little extent of contribution in increasing their competence to successfully implementing changes initiated in their universities (see tables 12, 13 and 14 below).

Table 12: Extent of Increase of Competence from Training among Staff (n=129)

Training Area	Total		Very great		Great		Neutral		Little		Very little	
	Frequency		f		f %		f %		f %		f %	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Planning skills	129	100%	43	33%	52	40%	29	23%	4	3%	1	1%
Organization skills	129	100%	36	28%	45	35%	32	25%	12	9%	4	3%
Coordination skills	129	100%	34	26%	55	43%	26	20%	10	8%	4	3%
Decision making skills	129	100%	36	28%	36	28%	35	27%	16	12%	6	5%
Communication skills	129	100%	38	30%	44	34%	30	23%	9	7%	8	6%
Technical Knowhow	129	100%	34	26%	37	29%	28	22%	26	20%	4	3%

Interpersonal skills	129	100%	32	25%	36	28%	26	20%	26	20%	9	7%
Monitoring and Evaluation skills	129	100%	26	20%	41	32%	24	19%	25	19%	13	10%

Table 13: Extent of Increase of Competence from Training among Deans, HoDs (n=25)

Training Area	Total		Very great		Great		Neutral		Little		Very little	
	Frequency		f %		f %		f %		f %		f %	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Planning skills	25	100%	8	33%	12	46%	4	17%	0	0%	1	4%
Organization skills	25	100%	7	28%	12	48%	5	20%	1	4%	0	0%
Coordination skills	25	100%	7	29%	11	42%	6	25%	1	4%	0	0%
Decision making skills	25	100%	6	24%	10	38%	3	14%	6	24%	0	0%
Communication skills	25	100%	7	29%	9	34%	7	29%	0	0%	2	8%
Technical Knowhow	25	100%	3	12%	14	56%	6	24%	2	8%	0	0%
Interpersonal skills	25	100%	6	22%	7	26%	7	30%	3	13%	2	9%
Monitoring and Evaluation skills	25	100%	5	21%	8	33%	5	21%	2	8%	4	17%

Table 14: Extent of Increase of Competence from Training on Staff for Successful (n=25)

Training Area	Total		Very great		Great		Neutral		Little		Very little	
	Frequency		f %		f %		f %		f %		f %	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Planning skills	25	100%	4	17%	15	58%	6	25%	0	0%	0	0%
Organization skills	25	100%	5	20%	15	60%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Coordination skills	25	100%	8	32%	10	41%	5	18%	2	9%	0	0%
Decision making skills	25	100%	5	20%	10	40%	6	24%	3	12%	1	4%
Communication skills	25	100%	8	30%	6	25%	6	25%	3	12%	2	8%
Technical Knowhow	25	100%	4	17%	14	54%	3	13%	3	12%	1	4%

Interpersonal skills	25	100%	4	17%	11	42%	7	29%	1	4%	2	8%
Monitoring and Evaluation skills	25	100%	5	21%	10	38%	2	7%	4	17%	4	17%

When majority report that training in planning skills increases or would increase their level of competence to successfully implement change to a very great extent and another large number saying the increase in competence is or would be to a great extent, it reflects that employees associate good planning with successful change implementation and additionally reaffirms the central position of planning in the life of institutions. The fact that only a small number of the respondents consider the contribution of planning skills in increasing change competence as being very little and as little shows that majority of employees understand and are well aware of the crucial role planning plays in operational life of organizations. Furthermore, the specific results on each of the training areas shows that in general, they are considered by a majority of employees as important in boosting change competence levels. Most responses range from very great to great against very little, little and neutral.

Additionally, the UMB members were unanimously in agreement that their staff appreciate the usefulness of the trainings whether offered to them or not. They also unanimously rated their extent of satisfaction with their staff performance in change implementation after trainings as moderate. They said that some of their staff still demonstrated worrying trends of inability to meet expectations and fail to take the trainings seriously. This is indicative of the finding that these trainings are not change-needs driven and as such it is no surprise for UMBs to get moderate satisfaction. This is likely to continue if training programmes are not properly planned, designed, aligned and administered as per requirements. These universities are therefore faced with the danger of continued recording of dismal performance in change implementation process if this situation is left to remain.

All student leaders reported that to a great extent, trainings and education they receive in the university made them receptive to change implemented in the university. They attributed this to increased understanding and knowledge on the benefits and need for consistent transformation for increased ability to cope with changing environmental demands.

Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to determine the extent of influence of organizational factors; organizational structure and training and development on implementation of change in selected public universities in Kenya. The study established that both factors investigated were considered by majority of employees and students in the public universities to have a great to very great extent of influence on change implementation process. Thus, the study concludes that the nature of organizational structure and employee change competence (ability to successfully implement a change program) are critical in determining the success and performance of modern organizations including public Universities. Understanding of their contribution on readiness, competence and capacity to successfully embrace change by employees and students in institutions of higher learning can, therefore, not be over emphasized. It is something that managers of these institutions need to lay as a top priority if they have to realize maximum value from their change initiatives.

References

- Abrahamson, E. (2000) Change Without Pain. Harvard Business Review, July-August 2000
- Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52.
- Conner, D. R. (1992). *Managing at the speed of change: How resilient managers succeed and prosper where others fail*. New York: Villard.
- Armenakis, A.A, Bernerth, J.B., Pitts, J.P & Walker, H.J (2007). Organizational change recipients' beliefs scale: Development of an assessment instrument. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 43.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A hand book of human resource management practice* (10th Edition). London: Kogan Page.
- Beer, M., Nohria, N. (2000), *Breaking the code of change*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston Massachusetts.
- Burke, W. Warner. (2002) *Organization Change: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications .
- Burnes, B. (2004), *Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organisation Dynamics*, 4th edition, Pitman Publishing.
- Dean, Christina (2009). *Managing Successful Change*. Australia: Uniforte Pty Ltd

- Dennis, R. S. (2005). *Assessing the management of readiness: An empirical examination using a mixed method approach*. Retrieved from: http://etd.auburn.edu/bitstream/handle/10415/751/SELF_DENNIS_21.pdf
- French, W. and Bell, C. (1999) *Organization Development – Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvement*, Sixth edition. Englewood Cliffs (NJ), Prentice-Hall.
- Gudo , C., Olel M. and Oanda I,(2011) *University Expansion in Kenya and Issues of Quality Education: Challenges and Opportunities. International Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 2 No. 20; November 2011.*
- Hannan, M. T. & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49.
- Jacobs, R. L. (2002), *Institutionalizing organizational change through cascade training*, Journal of European Industrial Training.
- Kamugisha, S. (2013) *The effects of change management in an organization: a case study of National University of Rwanda*. A published PhD thesis.
- Kaplan, R. S. and Norton, D. P. (2001) *The Strategy Focused Organisation – How Balanced Scorecard Companies Thrive in the New Business Environment*. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996), *Leading Change*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston Massachusetts
- Lewis, D. (1996) *The Organizational Culture Saga – from OD to TQM; a Critical Review of the Literature*. Part 1- Concepts and Early Trends. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 1.
- Nonås, K. (2005), *Vision versus reality in organizational change*, Arbete och hälsa, Avhandling, Göteborg Universitet
- Oliver, R. (2009). *Definitions and phases in the change processes*: Retrieved from http://www.themanager.org/pdf/change_phases.pdf. Retrieved on 3-7-2014.
- Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *The Academy of Management Review*, 4.
- Prosci (2007). *Best practices in change management*. Retrieved March 10, 2014 from <http://www.brighthub.com/office/project-management/articles/29922.aspx> image=10709
- Republic of Kenya (2007). *Kenya Vision 2030: a competitive and prosperous Kenya*. Nairobi
- Scheid, J. (2010). *Best practices in change management*. Retrieved from <http://www.brighthub.com/office/project-management/articles/29922.aspx?image=10709>
- Senior, B. & Fleming, J. (2006) *Organizational change*, Pearson Education Limited, Essex

Sifuna, D (2012) , Leadership in Kenyan Public Universities and the Challenges of Autonomy
and Academic Freedom: An Overview of Trends Since Independence.
JHEA/RESA Vol. 10, No.1.

Turner, R. J. (1999) The Handbook of Project Based Management, Second edition. London,
McGraw-Hill.