POLAC

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE (PIJEMS)

VOLUME 5 NUMBER 1 JUNE 2019 ISSN 2465-7085



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE
NIGERIA POLICE ACADEMY, WUDIL
KANO STATE

Polac International Journal of Economics and Management Science (PIJEMS)

A Publication of Department of Economics and Management Science, Nigeria Police Academy, Wudil-Kano

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS

Prof. (Rev) Nkamnebe. A.D. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka*

Prof. Dandago K.I. *Bayero University, Kano*

Prof. Abimiku, C. *University of Jos*

Prof. Duru M. *Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria*

Prof. Egwikhide C.I *Nigeria Defense Academy, Kaduna*

Prof. Egwu U.E. *Ebonyi State University*

Prof. Saye, Suleiman M. *Nigeria Police Academy, Wudil-Kano*

Dr Nasiru Taura, *Southampton Solvent University, UK*

Dr. Ajegi S.O. *Benue State University, Makurdi*

Dr. Yusuf M. Muhammad. *Nigeria Police Academy, Wudil-Kano*

Dr. Jinjiri K.R. *Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria*

Dr. Ayuba Bello, *University of Abuja*

Dr. Iweama Vincent.O. *Nigeria Police Academy, Wudil-Kano*

ADVISORY EDITORS

Prof. Bill Crittendent. *Northeastern University, Boston, M.A*

Prof. Egwikhide C.I. *Nigeria Defense Academy, Kaduna*

Prof. Achumba I.C. *University of Lagos, Nigeria*

Prof. Abdullahi S. *Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria*

Prof. Aminu A. *University of Maiduguri, Nigeria*

CONTENTS

An Empirical Analysis of Oil Revenue on Macro-Economic Performance in Nigeria (1980-2016): **Oloko, Oladele Olaitan Ph.D; Chijioke Nwaozuzu, Ph.D**

Managing Difficult Officers and Informal Groups: Towards Improved Formal Policy Organizational Performance: **Yusuf Musa Muhammad, Ph.D**

Impact of Monetary Policy Shocks on Aggregate Demand in Nigeria: 1986-2017: **Egwaikhide Imoudu Christian, Ph.D; Suleiman Sa'ad, Ph.D; Saheed Zakaree, Ph.D Yunana Titus Wuyah**

Evaluation of Reverse Logistic Management on Market Sustainability: Experience from Coca-Cola Nigeria Plc: **Babatunde Bayode Olusanya Ph.D**

Does Fiscal Policy Stimulate Economic Growth through Private Investment in Nigeria: **Andohol Jerome, Ph.D; Boayally Edith Mnguhemen**

Rebranding Nigeria Police Force: Implications to Restoration of Image and Public Confidence: **Iweama, Vincent Okwudili Ph.D**

Impact of Exchange Rate Movements on International Trade and Investment in Africa: **Gbatsoron Anjande; Simeon T. Asom; Victor Ushahemba Ijirshar**

An Empirical Investigation of the Effects of Foreign Direct Investment on External Sector in Nigeria: 1981 – 2016: **Solomon Olubunmi, Ph.D**

Effects of Change on the Performance of Selected Business Organizations in Nigeria: **Aun, Isaac Iortimbir Ph.D; Abdul, Falilat Ajoke Ph.D; Oladipo, Ganiyu Taiwo Ph.D; Olota, Oluwayomi Omotayo Sanusi, Surajudeen Ishola**

Implications of Crude Oil Prices on Economic Growth in Nigeria (1986-2016): **Okoh, Abo Sunday; Apeh, Ajene Sunday, Ph.D; Onoja, John**

Financial Inclusion and Economic Growth in Nigeria: An Autoregressive Distributed Lag Approach: **Kabiru Umar Ph.D**

Income Inequality, Residential Clustering and Poverty: A Case of Jos Metropolis, Plateau State, Nigeria: **Johnson J. Zogore, Ph.D**

Agricultural Export and Economic Growth in Nigeria (1986-2018): **Asongo Simon Ternenge; Muhammad, Dahir Ahmad; Iortuleterkura Solomon**

Retention Strategies and Employee Performance: Evidence from the National Assembly, Abuja–Nigeria: **Idris Dahiru; Musa Abdullahi Bayero**

Entrepreneurship Education and Graduate Employment Creation in Nigeria: **Gbagolo, Henry M. O.; Eze, Bernard I**

Effects of Foreign Direct Investment Inflow to the Manufacturing Sector in Nigeria (1970-2014): **Adeniyan Tella; Ogunleye, A.D.** -235

Implications of Human Capital Development on Economic Development in Nigeria (1981-2016): **Akpan, James Essien; Abang, Stanley Eno; Kpanabah, Uduak Brown** -245

Effect of Shared Knowledge on the Efficiency Performance of Manufacturing Firms in Nigeria: **Babarinde, Solomon Adejare Ph.D; Adewumi, Adedigba Pete** - 261

Influence of Entrepreneur Skill on Green Entrepreneurial Practices Among SMEs in Malaysia And Nigeria: **Abdullahi Hassan Gorondutse; Aminu Yusuf; Magaji Abubakar Muhammad; Umar Haladu Utai; Zainab Bello** -277

Stock Prices and Firm Earning Per Share in Nigeria: A Study of some Selected Quoted Firms in Nigeria Stock Exchange: **Garba Ado Ph.D** -294

Psychological Construct of Economic Reform Agenda on Productivity of Public Servants in Nigeria: 2015 To 2019: **Bala Ibrahim Sambo, Ph.D; Yusuf Musa Muhammad, Ph.D** -302

An Economic Analysis of Growth, Unemployment and Poverty in Nigeria (1985 – 2017): **Adeyi Emmanuel Ola Ph.D; Miapwap Kangrot Dorcas** -316

Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) and Economic Growth Nigeria: 1999-2017: **Bature, Nakahbitrus Ph.D; Dickson Vonke Juliana; Bitrus, Mavenke Nakak** -331

Effects of Internal Communication to Market Information on Brand Citizenship Behaviour: A Study of Employees of Mall–Based Retail Industry in Kano, Nigeria: **Sulaiman, Agboola Ibrahim; Ahmad Audu Maiyaki Ph.D** -347

Staff Mentoring as a Tool for Facilitating Effective Health Services Delivery in Nigeria: **Irinoye, A.I; Okunola, O.A; Olasanmi, S.O.H; Irinoye, A.M** -364

Challenges and Options of Funding Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Plateau State, Nigeria: **Dorathy Pius Ndangra; Vahyala Adamu Tari; Kanadi Charles** - 373

EFFECTS OF CHANGE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF SELECTED BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS IN NIGERIA

[1]AUN, ISAAC IORTIMBIR, Ph.D [2]ABDUL, FALILAT AJOKE, Ph.D
[3]OLADIPO, GANIYU TAIWO, Ph.D [4]OLOTA, OLUWAYOMI OMOTAYO
[5]SANUSI, SURAJUDEEN ISHOLA
[1,2,3,4&5]Department of Business Administration,
University of Ilorin- Nigeria
Email: [1]isaacaun@gmail.com [2]falilatabdul@gmail.com [3]ganiyu_taiwo@yahoo.com
[4]olota.oo@unilorin.edu.ng [5]iyiolasanusi@gmail.com

Abstract
The study examined the effect of change on the performance of selected business organizations in Nigeria with reference to 7-Up Ltd, and Nigeria bottling company Plc. The specific objectives were to; determine the extent to which leadership change affects employee satisfaction, evaluate change in organizational structure as it affects employee commitment and examine the effects of change in technology on productivity. The study adopted survey research design, the population consist of staff of 7-Up Ltd and Nigerian bottling company Plc which were 2,631, using Taro Yamane formula, *a sample size of 335 was obtained. The data was collected with the help of three research assistants. The hypotheses were tested using Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression method at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The result of the study reveal that there is a positive effect of change on the performance of selected business organizations in Nigeria. This implies that effective change management in terms of leadership change, change in organizational structure and change in technology positively impacts organizational performance in terms of employee satisfaction, employee commitment and productivity. The study recommended that sound communication techniques are key to effectively transmit the change to all employees at work to give requisite information to avoid undue surprises that sometimes informs resistance to change and also that the adverse effect of every change program should be discussed so as to prepare workers who are directly affected by the change for easy adaptation.*

Keywords: Change, Employee satisfaction, Employee commitment, Organisation, Performance.

Introduction

Change is seen as the process of transitioning individuals, groups, and firms from a current operating level to a much desired future state. Environmental uncertainties, fierce competition, mergers and acquisitions, dynamism, hostile takeovers, technological developments and government interventions/regulations are factors that mandate an organization to introduce new ways of working.

Huang, (2001) asserted that effective change practice systematically drive managers to influence employees' behavior in a way that lead firms to achieve its goals. Moullin, (2002) opined that organizational change emanates from two main sources, internal and external. The external source is found in improved technology, pressure from interest group external to the firm e.g government, competition and so on. Internal source is in individuals within the firm such as management, employees, stakeholders etc. Regardless of the source, anytime change is

necessary, the management is always forced with the questions of how to respond to it: Do we modify the objectives and goals? Is it the methods? Is it the structure or the human resource we need to check?

Peterson (2012) posited that business environment the world over has become increasingly competitive and continuously changing in the last decades. In modern businesses, organizations are face rapid change like never before; Modernization and constant innovation of technology result in a constantly evolving business environment. Phenomena such as social media have revolutionized businesses and the effects of this are an ever increasing need for change. With the business environment going through much change, organizations must then learn to become comfortable with change as well. Therefore, the ability to manage and adapt to organizational change is an essential ability required at work today. Development of technology in modern organizational change apparently informed the external innovations as oppose internal moves. When these developments emerge, the organizations that can adapt quickly create a niche for themselves while those that refuse to change get beaten by fierce competition which can result in drastic profit and/or market share loss.

Burnes (2004) argued that there is no universal formula for managing change and thereby, recommends that change programs should be planned against a set of objectives, strategies and a clear process and that the use of frameworks or models help managers to address issues in a logical order. Manufacturing companies are assuming a new change in terms of the ways they carry out their activities and in terms of the overall structure of the functions of different industries. The management, therefore, must devise appropriate change management approaches to confront the current trend in the market.

Any time change is introduced in an firm, there is the general believe among workers that the outcomes will be favourable to them (Kimaku, 2010). Behaviour determines a large part of the expected result of change. Limitations in change are related with the management perceptions of the need for change, the opportunity to change and the way to change, (Hoffman and Woody 2008). Change agents, usually managers and change recipients, usually employees need to work harmony to drive change, though, this is not always easy to achieve as change recipients are known to create unnecessary obstacles or barriers that bring about resistance to change. This assumption portrays change recipients as a weak link, hence easily blamed for failures, (Gakere, 2012).

Statement of the Problem

Inadequate management commitment to driving change programs and conflicts that often set in between the employees included in and those excluded from change programs, had overtime affected the efficiency of change program. The rate of growth and development in the food and beverages sector continuously necessitates dynamic changes in organizational activities and managers have constantly been on each others' toes trying to outwit themselves by devising new ways of improving organizational performance and at the same time reducing the cost of change execution.

Olajide {2014), pointed out that the poor survival rate of firms indicate a fundamental lack of valid framework of how to manage organizational change and that if change is not properly managed, there is the expectation that it adversely affects performance which may result in total

winding up of firms as it happened for instance, to Femstar Nigeria Ltd makers of Limca, Goldspot and Parle Soda in 2015 when the Nigerian bottling company Plc eventually acquired it.

Meanwhile, the gap created by the very scanty research work on the effect of change on the performance of selected business organizations in Nigeria with particular reference to the firms of focus will be bridged by this study. This study attempts to bridge this gap by studying the situation of business organizations in Nigeria and provide more empirical evidence on the effects of organizational change on selected firms' performance.

Research Questions

The study tries to raise the following questions:

i. To what extent can change in leadership affect employee satisfaction?
ii. What is the extent to which change in organizational structure affects employee commitment?

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to examine the effect of change management on the performance of business organizations in Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study are to:

i. determine the extent to which change in leadership affects employee satisfaction;
ii. evaluate change in organizational structure as it affects employee commitment;

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for the study:

H_{o1}: Change in leadership has no significant effect on employee satisfaction.

H_{o2}: Change in organizational structure has no significant effect on employee commitment.

Literature Review

Conceptual Clarifications

Korir and Kimeli (2012), defined change as the effective management of business change such that executive leaders, managers and frontline employees work in harmony to successfully implement the necessary process, technology or organizational changes. While Moran and Brighton (2011), defined change as the process of constantly renewing an organization's direction, structure and capabilities to serve the ever changing needs of external and internal customers. Burnes (2004), like many other scholars defined change as an ever present feature of organizational life, both at the operational and strategic levels. Due to its importance, change is becoming essential and needs appropriate managerial skills and strategies. For firm to survive, succeed and remain competitive in today's highly competitive and continuously evolving business environment, it must be able to successfully manage the change which is as a matter of fact a necessity.

Claver (2011) ,argued that change is an approach to transitioning individuals, teams and firms from current state to a desired future state. He stated further that change is inevitable and mastering change is, therefore, fundamental to the success of any business. In fact, the challenge of change initiator is to encourage their organizations to anticipate change, understand the nature of the change and to manage the change.

Lewin and Seibold (2008), saw change management as a process involving unfreezing, moving, and refreezing values, practices, and procedures within

organizations. Unfreezing refers to the creation of a perceived discrepancy between the existing and ideal state of an organization that generates a desire for change and lowers people's resistance to change. Moving refers to the various processes such as training, education, and restructuring that lead to the development of new behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs. Refreezing refers to reestablishing a new state of equilibrium within the organization by stabilizing the new patterns through a variety of support mechanisms.

Even though there has not been an agreement as to the framework for organizational change, there seem to be an alignment on two salient issues. One, there is the understanding that change, being triggered by internal or external factors, comes in all shapes, forms and sizes (Balogun and Hailey 2004; Burnes 2004, Carnall, 2003; Luecke 2003) and second, It was found that the introduction of change was greater in the past, than in the current business environment (Balogun & Hailey 2004, Burnes 2004; Carnall 2003; Luecke 2003; Senior 2002; Moran & Brighton 2011).

Variants of organizational change includes but not limited to the following;
Change in leadership, Change in organizational structure, Change in technology, Cultural change, but for the purpose of this work, leadership change and change in organizational structure are discussed below:

Leadership Change
Leadership is one of the key driving forces for improving firm performance. Leaders, as key decision-makers, determine the acquisition, development, and deployment of organizational resources, the conversion of these resources into valuable products and services, and delivery of value to organizational stakeholders.

Change in Organizational Structure
McLagan (2002), claimed that organizational structure enables an organization to have common views and mission. Well functioning organizational structure is important for an organization going through change, because if there are flaws in the structure it will affect communication flow. With unclear roles, conflicts and misunderstandings occur that lowers motivation and work morale. It can also drift different departments apart from common organizational goal, where decision making processes become slow and employee effectiveness disappears.

Duggan (2004), posited that organization structure can inhibit or promote performance, and this may depend on how effectively the supervisory relationships and workflow influence productivity. He further elaborates that organizational structure affects how performance is measured in an organization.

Levels of Change

Robbins (2007), opined that change can be at individual, group or organizational levels.

Individual Level of Change
At the individual level, change is considered in such areas as change in work assignment, physical movement to a new facility, or the change in skills of a worker which manifests over time. It is believed that changes at this level will rarely have a major implication on the entire organization. This may not be true because a significant change at the individual level will have its repercussions on the group which, in turn, might influence the entire organization.

Group Level of Change

Most organizational changes have their major effects on the group level which may either be departments or work groups; this is due to the fact that most activities in organizations are structured. Change at this level can affect work flow, job design, social interactions, and communication pattern. Managers must consider group factors when implementing change where informal groups can pose resistance because of the inherent influence they possess, also formal groups can resist change, as exemplified by the resistance demonstrated by unions to the changes proposed by management. Due to the powerful influence that groups can have on individuals, effective implementation of change at the group level can frequently overcome resistance at the individual level.

Organizational Level of Change

Change at this level involves strategic activities that affect both individuals and the groups. Decisions regarding changes here are generally made by senior management are rarely implemented by a single manager. They frequently occur over long periods of time and require considerable planning for execution. Example of these changes would be reorganization of the organizational structure and responsibilities, improving employee remuneration system, or major shift in an organization's direction. Change at this level is usually referred to as organizational development.

Types of Change

There are different types of change that an organization might undertake or be forced to undertake because of internal and external factors.

Smith (2013), posited that internal factors of change include reorganization and restructuring to meet the challenges of the future and also to act proactively to initiate change as a means of staying ahead of the competition. While he saw external factors as including change that is forced upon the organization because of falling revenues, changing market conditions and the need to adapt to the ever changing business landscape.

Radical Change

Nadler and Tushman (2000), posited that radical change is a change that have an impact on the whole system of the organization and fundamentally redefine what the organization is or change its basic framework, including strategy, structure, people, processes and in some cases, core values. Radical change or approach is used to address more fundamental problems especially in some situations, such as after a period of flux or unexpected rapid change in the environment (Johnson and Scholes, 2007).

Incremental Change

Incremental change is referred to as changes that happen all the time in organizations, and they need not to be small. Such things as changes in organization structure, the introduction of new technology and significant modifications of personnel practices are all large and significant changes, but usually occur within the existing definition and frame of reference of the organization. Johnson (2008) claimed that the incremental approach to change is more common and this type of change is commonly used to maximize short term performance. The logic behind the incremental view is that the environment is constantly changing and incremental change being a continuous process is the only way to secure the future of the company and improve organizational performance.

Reactive Change

Reactive change is characterized as that change implemented in response to some external event and or serious internal operational and managerial problems. Bennis and Thomas (2002), sees reactive change as a change in the organizational policies which is implemented in reaction to the occurrence of an event. This change is initiated due to pressures of external forces. Changes are made in response to a situation and primarily unplanned in nature. Management makes changes to deal with the problem in a quick and routine manner since they do not have time to analyze the situation and prepare a well-conceived plan. The environmental events, various threats and opportunities are reacted to immediately.

Pro-active Change

Proactive change on the other hand, is that change where the company is not currently experiencing any serious problems but managers anticipate the need for change to put the company in a better position, or current potential problems. Though this anticipatory approach to change is generally preferable, in practice most companies tend to take a reactive approach, usually as a consequence of the commonly held view that there is no need for change if current performance is satisfactory.

Organizational Performance

Blout (2013), asserted that managers are concerned with organizational performance which is the accumulated end result of all the organization's work processes and activities. Upadhaya and Mounir (2014), asserted that organizational performance comprises the actual output or result of an organization as against its intended goals. It is a complex but important concept, and managers need to understand the factors that contribute to high performance. They want their organizations, work units, or work groups to achieve a high level of organizational performance, no matter what mission, strategies, or goals are being pursued. Managers at all organizational echelons and in all work areas manage their available assets - people, information, equipment etc by making decisions that they hope will lead to high levels of performance. Because achieving high levels of organizational performance is important in both the short run and long run. Performance dimensions, among others, are as follow;

i. Employee satisfaction
ii. Employee commitment
iii. Productivity
iv. Customer service
v. Service quality

Meanwhile, two of these organizational performance variables will be discussed viz Employee satisfaction and Employee commitment.

Employee Satisfaction

Employee satisfaction sometimes referred to as job satisfaction is important for both the employees and the organization as a whole. Human capital is the strategic resource of an organization, (Jones, 2009). If employees are are satisfied and contented, their commitment levels will be high and hence, their contributions to the organization will also be high, and consequently, they tend to continue with the job and be more loyal to the organization. Lower employee turnover will further reduce recruitment and training costs for the organization, (Nagini, 2013). There are a number of factors that can influence an employee's level of job satisfaction. Some of these factors include the level of pay and other financial benefits, the perceived fairness in promotion system of the firm, the quality of working conditions, manager and sub-ordinate relationships, the job itself (i.e the variety of

tasks involved, the interests and challenges the job generate, and the clarity of job description/requirements). Muhammed (2011), stood that the happier people are with their jobs, the more satisfied they tend to become.

Employee Commitment

Akintayo (2010), defined employee commitment as the degree to which the employees feel devoted to their organizations. Meanwhile, organizations value employee commitment because it is typically assume to reduce withdrawal behavior, such as lateness, absenteeism and turnover. Hence, there is no doubt that these values appear to have a potentially serious consequences for overall organizational performance. Lo (2009), noted that employee commitment is important because workers with a high sense of commitment are less likely to engage in withdrawal behavior and more willing to accept change.

Theoretical Framework

The theories relevant to this study are discussed below. The Kurt Lewin's Theory explains the change process and how change managers can actually manage each of the stages, while the ADKAR is a result oriented tool that enables change teams to focus on the activities that will make them reach their goals.

Kurt Lewin's Change Theory

Kurt Lewin's Three Stages model or the Planned Approach to Organizational change is one of the cornerstone models which are relevant in the present scenario even. Lewin, a social scientist and a physicist, during early 1950s propounded a simple framework for understanding the process of organizational change known as the Three-Stage Theory which he referred as Unfreeze, Change (Transition) and Freeze (Refreeze). According to Lewin, Change for any individual or an organization is a complicated journey which may not be very simple and mostly involves several stages of transitions or misunderstandings before attaining the stage of equilibrium or stability. For explaining the process of organizational change, he used the analogy of how an ice block changes its shape to transform into a cone of ice through the process of unfreezing.

Stage 1 - Unfreezing: This is the first stage of transition and one of the most critical stages in the entire process of change management. It involves improving the readiness as well as the willingness of people to change by fostering a realization for moving from the existing comfort zone to a transformed situation. It involves making people aware of the need for change and improving their motivation for accepting the new ways of working for better results. During this stage, effective communication plays a vital role in getting the desired support and involvement of the people in the change process.

Stage 2 - Change: This stage can also be regarded as the stage of Transition or the stage of actual implementation of change. It involves the acceptance of the new ways of doing things. This is the stage in which the people are unfrozen, and the actual change is implemented. During this stage, careful planning, effective communication and encouraging the involvement of individuals for endorsing the change is necessary. It is believed that this stage of transition is not that easy due to the uncertainties or people are fearful of the consequences of adopting a change process.

Stage 3 - Freeze (Refreezing): During this stage, the people move from the stage of transition (change) to a much more stable

state which we can regard as the state of equilibrium. The stage of refreezing is the ultimate stage in which people accept or internalize the new ways of working or change, accept it as a part of their life and establish new relationships. For strengthening and reinforcing the new behaviour or changes in the way of working, the employees should be rewarded, recognized and provided positive reinforcements, supporting policies or structures can help in reinforcing the transformed ways of working.

The three stages of Change can be aptly explained through the aid of an example of Femstar Nigeria Ltd (Makers of Limca, Gold Spot and Parle Soda) which went bankrupt due to the issues of high debts and dipping market share.

ADKAR Theory

ADKAR model or theory of change is a goal-oriented tool or model which makes it possible for the various change teams to focus on those steps or activities that are directly related to the goals it wants to reach. The goals, as well as the results derived and defined using this model, are cumulative and in a sequence. This means that while using this model, an individual must get each of the outcomes or results in a certain orderly fashion so that the change can be sustained and implemented. The model can be used by managers of change to find out the various holes or gaps in the process of change so that effective training can be offered to the employees. The following are some of the things for which this model can be used:

i. To provide help and support to employees to g o through the process of change or transitioning while the change is taking place.

ii. To diagnose and treat the resistance shown by employees towards change.

iii. To come up with a successful and efficient plan for the professional as well as personal improvements of employees during the change.

ADKAR is an acronym that basically stands for;

i. **Awareness** – of the need and requirement for change by informing participants that it is happening.

ii. **Desire** – to bring about change and be a participant in it. This is regarded as the most difficult stage.

iii. **Knowledge** – the skills and behavior needed to support change once it occurs. It is effective when individuals already have awareness and desire the change.

iv. **Ability** – this is where change actually occur and as such, required skills and behavior should be implemented.

v. **Reinforcement** – to keep it implemented and reinforced later on as well by applying necessary incentives and rewards that will help the change stick.

Empirical Review

Doreen {2015}, conducted a research on the effect of change management on the employees' performance in co-operative bank of Kenya Limited, adopted a survey research design by focusing on qualitative method of data analysis which allows detail analysis of data collected. The study then concluded that the turn-around of activities brought about by technological change were

successful, and also that there were technological challenges that relates to electricity disruptions and system failure which can cause interruption in service delivery of the bank.

Olajide (2014) in his work titled 'effect of change management on organizational performance of Nigerian Telecoms industry: empirical insight from Airtel Nigeria'. The study was carried out in Lagos, Nigeria using descriptive survey. The study target population was one thousand employees of Airtel Nigeria where a sample size of three hundred workers comprising middle level managers, supervisors, operating staff and customers. Questionnaire was adopted to collect data which were validated through a pilot study. The study concluded that change has now become a regular feature of business life as part of the desires for increased organizational performance and the ever important needs to satisfy stakeholders.

Stephen, (2015) in his work, on the effect of change on the performance of Government institutions in Rwanda, adopted survey research design and the target population was employees of Rwanda Revenue Authority. Data was collected using questionnaires and interviews and analyzed using SPSS and Microsoft Excel. Based on the data collected, the study concluded that all changes made in the institution in the past four years have been well planned and implemented. Most of the employees have generally embraced the changes made in the organization and at the same time resulting into overall organizational performance.

Wanza (2011), in a research titled 'Influence of change on employee performance' that was carried out in Kenya using a survey research design where the researcher adopted questionnaire and interview as data collection instruments. Data analysis was done using descriptive statistics that involved the use of frequency and percentages. The study found that change management factors such as leadership, structure and technology influenced performance at all echelons in the firm. It also revealed that structural changes are most effective when directive comes from a clear line of authority.

Wilfred (2016), in his work titled 'Change management practices and performance of selected local government in Eastern Uganda'. The study adopted a research design which involved the use of both qualitative and quantitative data to help answer research questions.

In another research conducted in London by Summers (2005), on the impact of employee participation in organizational development using secondary source of data collection. The study found that connection between employee participation during organizational change and its management depends on the degree of influence granted to employees under participation measures.

Identification of Gap from the Literature Review

Most of the literature review focus on organization change in foreign countries such as Kenya, Eastern Uganda and Rwanda. This implies that the studies were carried out in foreign countries with attendant systematic, regulatory, cultural, attitudinal and social differences with Nigeria. Meanwhile, the few ones carried out in Nigeria has its focus on telecommunication industry, whereas, this study is focused on the effects of change on the performance of selected business organizations in Nigeria with reference to food and beverages sector of the manufacturing industry.

Methodology

The design used in this research is exploratory survey design. The population of this study comprised of 2,631 employee of Nigeria Bottling Company Plc. Ikeja Plant, Lagos, and 7-Up Bottling Company Ltd. Oluyole Plant Ibadan all in Nigeria. Comprising of managers, supervisors and operating staff of the company. A sample size of 335 respondents were selected using Taro Yamane formula. The employees were contacted to collect data through personal-administrated questionnaires in their offices. However, 313 usable questionnaires out of the 335 copies of questionnaires administered were duly filled and returned. Which brings the response rate to 93.4%. Data collected were analysed using Ordinary Least Regression (OLS) analysis with the aid of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) software.

A 5-point Likert scale was adopted with answers ranging from 5 points strongly agreed to 1 point strongly disagreed to elicit response from the target respondents.

The following hypotheses were formulated for the study:

H_{o1}: Change in leadership has no significant effect on employee satisfaction.

H_{o2}: Change in organizational structure has no significant effect on employee commitment

Data Presentation and Analysis

Test of Research Hypotheses

Table 1: Model Summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.760[a]	.578	.551	1.37771

Predictors: (Constant), Change in Leadership

Source: SPSS Print out, 2018

The result shown in table 1 revealed that: R-square is (0.578). The R^2 value (0.578) is a measure of the strength of relationship between employee satisfaction and change in leadership thus, indicates a 57.8% of the variation in employee satisfaction are explained by change in leadership while the remaining 42.2% was due to other variables that were not accounted for in the model. The value of R indicates a strong relationship between change in leadership and employee satisfaction values of the variables.

Table 2: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	regression	262.428	1	262.428	46.419	.000[b]
	Residual	1758.236	311	5.653		
	Total	2020.665	312			

a. Dependent Variable Employee Satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Change in Leadership

Source: SPSS Print out, 2018

From the ANOVA result in table 2, p-value = 0.000 < 0.05 (sig). Since p-value < 0.05, the null hypothesis which state that leadership change has no significant effect on employee satisfaction is rejected, thus the alternative that change in leadership has significant effect on employee satisfaction is hereby, accepted.

Table 3: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	sig
1.	(Constant)	11.031	.520		21.206	.000
	Change in Leadership	.593	.087	.560	6.813	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Satisfaction

Source: SPSS Print out, 2018

Table 3 revealed that employee satisfaction = 11.031 when all other variables are held constant. Employee satisfaction would increase by 0.593 when there is an increase in change in leadership by one unit, while other variables remain constant. However, the result indicate that change in leadership has positive and significant effect (B=0.760, t-value 6.813, $p < 0.05$). This implies that when the organization adopts workable/friendly leadership styles, there will be 76.0% improvement on the way things are done. In other words, employees enjoy working with friendly leader/manager hence increasing satisfaction that brings about higher productivity.

Result of the hypothesis tested implies that there is a significant effect of change in leadership on employee satisfaction. This result supported the findings of Efi (2010), who affirmed that there is a positive relationship between effective leadership and service quality which ultimately impact organizational performance.

Test of Research Hypothesis II

Table 4: Model Summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.845[a]	.714	.698	1.07752

a. Predictors: (Constant), Change in Organizational Structure

Source: SPSS Print out, 2018

From regression analysis result shown in table 4 above, R-square was found to be (0.714). The R^2 value (0.714) measures the strength of relationship between employee commitment and structural change which means a 71.4% of the variation in employee commitment as explained by change in organizational structure while the remaining 28.6% was due to other variables that were not accounted for in the model. The value of R indicates a strong relationship between change in organizational structure and

employee commitment values of the variables.

Table 5: ANOVA[a]

Model	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	48.876	1	48.876	42.096	.000[b]
Resident	361.086	311	1.161		
Total	409.962	312			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment
b. Predictors: (Constant), Change in Organizational Structure

Source: SPSS Print out, 2018

From the ANOVA result in table 5, above, p-value = 0.000 < 0.05 (sig). Since p-value < 0.05, the null hypothesis which states that change in organizational structure has no significant effect on employee commitment is rejected, thus the alternative that change in organizational structure has significant effect on employee satisfaction is hereby, accepted.

Table 6: Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized coefficient		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. error	Beta		
1. (Constant)	4.034	.230		17.576	.000
Employment Commitment	.218	.034	.845	6.488	.000

a. Dependent Variables: Change in Organizational Structure

Source: SPSS Print out, 2018

Table 6, holds that employee commitment = 4.034 when all other variables are held constant. Employee commitment would increase by 0.218 when there is an increase in change in organizational structure by one unit, while other variables remain constant. However, the result indicates that change in organizational structure has positive and significant effect (B=0.845, t-value 6.488, p < 0.05). This implies that when the organization adopts stable organizational structure over time, there will be 84.5% improvement on the ways of working hence, employees are committed. In other words, employees enjoy working under flexible structure hence increasing commitment.

Result of this hypothesis tested indicates that change in organizational structure has a significant effect on employee commitment This is consistent with the findings of Wanza (2011), who observed that change management variables such as change in leadership, change in organization structure and change in technology positively impact organizational performance and also that change in organizational structure is most affected where directive comes from a clear line of authority.

Conclusion

Organizations studied have benefited from change management through employing friendly leadership styles, workable structure and modern technology. Also, every organizational change, whether large or small, requires one or more change agents. A change agent is one who has the

skills and authority to guide and facilitate the change efforts.

The findings of the study revealed positive effect of change on the performance of selected business organizations in Nigeria. This implies that effective change in terms of leadership change and change in organizational structure positively improves organizational performance in terms of employee satisfaction and employee commitment. Thus, from the research objectives stated, the study concludes that change has a significant effect on influencing the performance of business organizations in Nigeria. That is, from the result of the analysis above, leadership change was found to positively affect employee satisfaction while change in organizational structure has positive effect on employee commitment.

Furthermore, it was shown from the regression analyses results that change in leadership was found to be the second influential variable (.760[a]) in ensuring effective organizational performance measured by employee satisfaction while change in organizational structure has greater influence (.845[a]).

Recommendations

In the light of the above findings and conclusion drawn, the study recommends that:

i. The communication of change is critical and must be provided to employees at work to give necessary information to avert undue surprises that sometimes informs resistance to change, sound communication technique is recommended.

ii. The adverse effect of every change program should be discussed to prepare workers who are directly affected by the change for easy adaptation. Also, involving the employees and getting them engaged in the discussion about needed change is key.

iii. Change implementation in organizations should be systemic and be introduced from the top management down the line in a clear and consistent manner, and efforts should be made to do away with some forms of ambiguity through communication clarity and consistency.

References

Ahls, B. (2001), 'Organizational Behaviour: A Model for Cultural Change' *Journal of Management*..43(4)..

Anderson, L. A. (2011), Change leader's roadmap: How to navigate your organization's transformation. New York, NY: Routledge.

Armstrong, M. (2009), A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice. U.S.A.

Asika, N. (2004), Research Methodology: A Process Approach. Unilag Press, Akoka, Lagos. Nigeria.

Barbaroux, P. (2011), Design-Oriented Approach to Organizational Change: Insights from Military Case Study. *Journal of Organizational Change*. 24(5): 626-639.

Beinstein, L. (2009), Management Development. First Edition, McGraw Hill Publishers. London.

Burke, W. W. (2011), Organizational change: Theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burnes, B. (2004), Managing Change: A Strategic Approach of Organizational Dynamic, 4th Edition. England. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Bwibo, A. (2000), Survey of Strategic Change Management Practices within Non-Governmental Organizations in Kenya MBA Project, University of Nairobi.

Carnall, C. (2008), Managing change in organizations. Upper saddle RIVER, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Carnall, C. A. (2007), Managing Change in Organizations, 4th Edition. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Claver, E., and Gasco, J. (2001), Strategic Process of Cultural Change to Implement Total Quality Management. 12(4).

Jick, T. (2003), Managing Change: Cases and Concepts, second Edition, New York: Irwin Publishing.

Korir, J. (2012), Change Management Effect on Hotel Performance: Journal of Social Sciences Tomorrow. 1(8).

Kotter, J. (1995), Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. Harvard Business Review. Free Press.

Lindgreen, A. (2004), Corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics.* 51(1): 31- 35.

Markiewicz, P. (2011), Change Management on the Startegy Implementation Process. Intellectual Economics, 5th Efition. 2:257-264.

Naddler, A. and Tushman, M. (1999), Beyond Charismatic Leader: Leadership and Organizational Change: *Journal of Change Management*, 32(2): 77- 79.

Robbins, S. (20030, Organizational behavior. Prentice Hall. New York.

Rollinson, D. (2008), Organizational Behaviour and Analysis. Pearson: Essex.

Sheilds, J. (1999), Transforming Organizations. Methods for Accelerating Cultural Change Processes. Information Knowledge Systems Management. 1(2): 105-115.

Stephen, T. (2010), Successfully managing change in organizations. New York, NY: Industrial

Thompson, J. (1998), Startegic management, awareness and change, London: Chapman and Hall.

Tidd, J. (2010), Managing innovation: Integrating technology, market and organizational change. New York, NY; Wiley.