



EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE: ACRITIQUE SHOWING WAYFOWARD

DR CHARLES WAFULA WASWA-A STUDENT OF MASTERS IN BUSSINES ADMINISTRATION,
SCHOOL OF BUSSINESS, ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES.TAITA TAVETA UNIVERSITY.

ABSTRACT

There is an emerging knowledge base on the effectiveness of strategies to close the knowledge practice gap. However, less is known about how attributes of an innovation and other contextual and situational factors facilitates and impedes an innovation adoption. adoption innovation is the act of creating and then popularizing new financial Instruments in an organization and markets. The ability to provide a specified volume and quality of service with the lowest level of resources capable of meeting that specification, performance measures and or indicators is required.

Strategic management helps to develop ability to analyze complex challenges in the technology and innovation in organizations. Development of market and emerging advancement in technology embraces innovation from a wide angles ranging from technological advancement and transformation of existing processes within the organization.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this paper to my parents Fred Waswa Mtama and Mary Nafula, my family and my siblings who encouraged and supported me through the writing, I sincerely appreciate your moral support and prayers that have contributed to the completion of this critiquing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to God for the health and in seeing me through this critiquing process. Without good health, knowledge and the strength, it would have been difficult to complete this critiquing process.

My special gratitude goes to my supervisor Dr Karim omido who tirelessly through his efforts and initiative guided me through the whole process of critiquing.

I would like to thank the writers of the journals that I used in critiquing; Jake Stum from Regent University for his good journal '**emerging leadership journey**', Ritta Smeds from Helsinki university of Technology for his good journal '**managing change towards lean enterprises**', and wenty K Smith, Michael L Tushman from Havard University for their journal '**managing strategic contradictions**'. May the Lord God bless you so much.

To my classmates and those who helped me in one way or another, thank you and God bless you.

Adaptive innovation theory

Adaptive innovation theory was developed by Dr. Kirton (1976) in order to explain cognitive tendencies, cognitive styles and to identify adaptors and innovators on a continuum scale and problem solving styles. Adaption innovation is a comprehensive text written for the purpose of dealing with problem solving, creativity, team dynamics and thinking styles. It explores and describes human preferred individual differences in the way they solve



problems. The theory aims to increase collaboration and reduce conflict within groups, increase teambuilding and personnel management.

Concept of the theory

In the background of management of diversity and change, Dr. Kirton outlines the central concepts of the theory, including the processes of problem solving, making decisions, and creativity and paradox of structure; the distinction between how teams collaborate on the common task, coping behavior and how teams manage their own differences. Dr. Kirton focuses on the positive side of managing a wide diversity within groups that has the ability to lead to the high ranks of solving problems, creativity and effective management of change.

Theory Description Assumptions

The theory's assumption is that all people solve problems are creative, this theory is concerned with style, how people solve problems. Both potential capacity and learned levels are completely independent characteristics and assessed by other measure, this means that both innovators and adaptor can be found at every kind of levels, highest to the lowest level.

The terms 'more adaptive' or 'more innovative' are more precise than 'adaptors' and 'innovators', for the theory describes a normally distributed continuous range and not just two types. The more adaptive prefer their problems to be associated with more structure, and with more of this structure objective agreed, than those who are more innovative. The more innovative are more tolerant, at least while in the pursuit of a solution, to looser guiding structure. For those working with diverse problem solving techniques the book appeal to a broad range of people from such as human resource managers, psychologists, business consultants and group trainers, management, sociology, education and politics

Innovation

Innovation consists of the creation of new ideas and its implementation into a new product, process or service leading to the dynamic growth of the national economy and the increase of employment and profit for the innovative business enterprise. Innovation concern radical or incremental. Incremental innovation bring about improvement of the old products or process within existing structure and strategy, while radical innovations give raise to new business possibilities, new strategies and structure and organizational culture too changes.

Types of innovation and cognitive biases

A firm's innovation stream is made-up of continued incremental innovation in the extant product, as well as at least one non-incremental innovation. For example, in 1969 Goodyear began to develop a radial tire even as it continued to produce its existing bias-ply tire. Successfully building an innovation stream is challenging because exploring and exploiting are contradictory to one another. Exploitative innovation is associated with efficiency, focus, convergent thinking, and reducing variance; while exploratory innovation is associated with experimentation, flexibility, divergent thinking, and increasing variance. Cognitive biases define how managers understand a situation, seek information, and make decisions. Managers' understanding and processing of tensions and contradictions has an impact on whether they embrace the tensions and benefit from them or are halted by the inconsistencies.

Paradoxical frames create a foundation for cognitive processes that can handle inconsistencies. Based on the assumption that both the existing product and innovation must succeed, managers can confront the relationship between these two products both



their differences and their similarities. Effectively managing these contradictions is associated with two distinct cognitive processes differentiating and integrating. Whereas differentiating involves recognizing and articulating distinctions, integrating involves shifting levels of analysis to identify potential linkages. Differentiating helps overcome inertia by both reinforcing the needs of each product and being vigilant that the innovation is not crowded out by commitments to existing strategies and processes.

Differentiating involves clarifying distinctions between the existing product and innovation. (i.e., tasks, people, formal organization, and culture). Each product is associated with an internally consistent organizational architecture and associated logics; even as these architectures and logics are themselves fundamentally, different Differentiating involves recognizing and reinforcing the differences in these organizing logics. But it limits inertia by dampening cognitive commitments to the existing product.

Cognitive differentiating encourages managers to explore new markets, new skills, and new opportunities for the innovation, unburdened by the context of the existing product. This cognitive differentiation allowed these managers to build firms that excelled both in print and online. In contrast, those less successful teams saw online as a threat and, in turn, focused quickly on leveraging their existing competencies, and in turn restricting the innovation's growth. Embracing, rather than deciding between, contradictory styles and structures provides an important direction for organizational scholarship. As top management teams are at the juncture of internal forces for stability and external forces for change, the systematic study of the conditions under which the senior team attend to and deal with strategic contradiction deserves to be more at the center of our scholarship.

Understanding how organizations effectively manage contradictions is extremely important question for organizational specialists. The challenge issued by Thompson (1967) and Barnard (1968) decades ago still rings true. While there is a growing literature on the importance of exploration and exploitation, exceptional skillful designs, and dynamic managerial capabilities, there is limited literature on the characteristics of the senior team that can manage these complex strategies as associated complex organizational forms.

Change in structure

Change in structure and in the coordination of activities in the business chain raise new strategies in an enterprise. Specifically, it is argued that the change of manufacturing according to lean principles can trigger a radical techno-organizational change towards a "lean enterprise", with a new structure, strategy and culture. Innovation is illustrated by product life cycle concept and it shows that it changes as the industry matures. The life cycle of a product begins with the introduction of a series of radical product innovations. In the next evolutionary stage, growth in sales is pursued through major process innovations that affect price, quality and market segmentation.

In the maturity phase, only incremental innovations in both product and process innovations are possible, since the product and its associated processes are so intertwined. The maturity phase turns into decline when the market reaches saturation. Some external shock in the market, or in technology, can trigger a new wave of product innovations and the introductory phase of the new substituting product begins.

Lean enterprise structure

Lean manufacturing seems is a radical process innovation that is not restricted to its origin, and has wide applicability across the globe. The lean manufacturing system and emerging



lean enterprise structures develop towards the simple co-ordination of the basic business processes in the chain from the suppliers to the customers, the driving force behind lean manufacturing follows the general direction of self-organization: towards the “simplicity of the original structure” Management’s important task is to support and manage this innovative.

Umbrella strategy and factors affecting

Enterprise’s evolution towards a lean enterprise cannot be managed with a top-down development strategy. Instead, an emergent strategy is needed. An emergent strategy can however be guided by an overall umbrella strategy, where management sets out the vision and the broad guidelines for a strategy, and leaves the specifics to emerge. It gives the vision and guidelines for the formation of strategies.

The external contingencies, the norms, standards and institutional arrangements in the society, the prevailing organizational, the rules of competition, and the existing technologies, affect the formation of the umbrella strategy and restrict also the innovation process. To develop the idea into an innovation, a hologram structure is needed, the designing of the whole into the parts. This is accomplished by creative interaction of a group of individuals with the requisite variety in knowledge and capabilities. These groups are often parallel structures to the formal organization, teams, project groups, matrix structures, new inter-functional cooperation networks, even internal ventures. Incremental improvements in everyday operations are encouraged through grouping interdependent tasks into autonomous cells that produce similar outputs.

Organization performance

Organizational performance depends on top management teams effectively. Strategic agendas are, associated with contradictory organizational architectures. Using the literature on paradox, contradictions, and conflict, we develop a model of managing strategic contradictions that is associated with paradoxical cognition senior leaders and their teams.

Thriving describes an individual’s experience of vitality and learning. The primary goal of this article is to develop a model that illuminates the social embeddedness of employees’ thriving at work. Thriving is a useful theoretical to construct, define and compare it to related constructs, including resilience, flourishing, subjective well-being, flow, and self-actualization, how work contexts facilitate argentic work behaviors, which in turn produce resources in the doing of work and serve as the engine of thriving. Thriving serves as a gauge to facilitate self-adaptation at work. Firms must build capabilities to attend to contradictions, the theoretical and empirical work on building teams and architectures to manage these tensions. However, contradictions abound. Firms are pressed to be both big and small, efficient and effective, and to operate in multiple time frames, as well as to be prospectors and analyzer.

Competitive advantage

Competitive advantage is rooted in both building existing products and in creating products that cannibalize those existing products. Where exploration is rooted in variance-increasing activities, learning by doing, and trial and error, exploitation is rooted in variance-decreasing activities and disciplined problem solving. Where exploitation builds on an organization’s past, exploration creates futures that may be quite different than the organization is past. This paper directly focuses on top management teams dealing with strategic contradictions. Exploring the mechanisms by which top management teams might successfully manage the contradictions of both exploring and exploiting.



The article assumes that inconsistent and contradictory agendas exist and can both succeed. Shifting the perspective from choosing between contradictory agendas to embracing the contradictions, the article provides an important lens through which to understand how to manage contradictions. Managing contradictions is rooted in paradoxical cognition managerial frames and processes that recognize and embrace contradiction.

CONCLUSION

Innovation, creativity, good strategies place organization on successful ground and awards it with competitive advantage, comparative advantage and more so absolute advantage. It is therefore quite sure that for effective management, you will have to embrace innovation, creativity and strategy.

REFERENCES

- Smith, W. K., & Tushman, M. L. (2010). *Managing strategic contradictions: A top management team model for simultaneously exploring and exploiting*. In *Hand book of Top Management Teams* (pp. 60-70). Palgrave Macmillan, London
- Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). *Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organiing*. *Academy of management Review*, 36(2), 381-403.
- Andriopoulos, C., & Lewis, M. W. (2009). *Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: Managing paradoxes of innovation*. *Organization science*, 20(4), 696-717.
- Easterby-Smith, M., & Lyles, M. A. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Lichtenthaler, U., & Lichtenthaler, E. (2009). *A capability-based framework for open innovation: Complementing absorptive capacity*. *Journal of management studies*, 46(8), 1315-1338.
- Jansen, J. J., Tempelaar, M. P., Van den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2009). *Structural differentiation and ambidexterity: The mediating role of integration mechanisms*. *Organization science*, 20(4), 797-811.
- Stum, J. (2009). *Kirton's adaption-innovation theory: Managing cognitive styles in times of diversity and change*. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 2(1), 66-78.
- Carnabuci, G., & Diószegi, B. (2015). *Social networks, cognitive style, and innovative performance: A contingency perspective*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(3), 881-905.
- Jablokow, K. W., Jablokow, A. G., & Seasock, C. T. (2010). *IT leadership from a problem solving perspective*. *Information Technology and Management*, 11(3), 107-122.



Smith, W. K., &Tushman, M. L. (2005). Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams. Organization science, 16(5), 522-536.

O'Reilly III, C. A., &Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. Research in organizational behavior, 28, 185-206.