http://ojs.unimal.ac.id/index.php/jmind

MODELS AND APPROACHES TO CHANGE AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT IN MODERN ORGANISATIONS

Azuka Nwachuku[1*], Onofere Princewill Okereka[2], Akpomuvire Mukoro[3]

officialazukanwachuku@gmail.com[1], onofereonline@gmail.com[2], akpomuviremukoro@delsu.edu.ng[3]

[1,2,3] Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management Science, Delta State University Abraka, Nigeria

*Corresponding author: officialazukanwachuku@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study compares a few well-known change management models to help readers better understand change management. For this reason, this study examines the notion of change and the forces behind organizational change. The analysis demonstrates that, despite certain variations among the models discussed, they all share the division of the change of the management system into successive phases and the recognition of the role that human resources play in the process. Additionally, implications and lessons for change management in the public sector were introduced. According to the study's conclusion, companies that struggled to manage change would see a decline in employee loyalty and output. Conversely, companies that successfully handled change would gain a competitive edge that guarantees long-term success. Organizations, particularly those in the public sector, must comprehend and implement change management models in the post-COVID-19 era if they are to improve their capacity for long-term success.

Keywords: change management, change models**,** change approaches

https://doi.org/10.29103/j-mind.v8i1.14435

INTRODUCTION

In addition to a fiercely competitive business environment, a fast-paced information technology landscape, and ever-evolving customer preferences, organizations had to adapt and effectively manage changes to their internal processes, workforce competencies, organizational framework, organizational values, and other organizational sizes to meet the many challenges of the contemporary business environment. It is now necessary for organizations to undergo long-term organizational change in addition to short-term organizational change. Change management turned out to be the key to the success of a great deal of businesses, enabling them to attain sustainable growth and establish themselves as industry leaders. Change management has evolved from being a reactive strategy used by managers to handle unusual circumstances in the workplace to becoming an essential role in contemporary organizations, including those that deal with marketing, finance, human resources, and other departments. According to Senior and Swailes (2016), change management is a methodical process that enables an organization to anticipate changes in the business environment and adapt accordingly, ensuring the successful and efficient accomplishment of its objectives.

Organizational leaders who anticipate change and act responsibly and quickly adapt to the constantly shifting modern business environment. Organizational leaders who anticipate and shape the future, however, reap even greater rewards since those who design the competition are also the business leaders. Other organizations adapt to change as followers. There are still other organizations that are unable to endure. There are numerous models available for successful organizational transformation. Successors adjust to the accelerating pace and intricacy of change. They act, pick things up, and adjust quickly. People who are declining try to manage and comprehend changes in their surroundings. Organizational leaders must choose and implement a transformation model that will enable their companies to thrive into the millennium as well as afterward (Burke, 2017). The context that change management creates for adaptation efforts in organizations public or private makes it crucial. To clarify, there are three primary categories of change interventions: The foundation of top-down transformation management is the idea that change can be implemented successfully if its proponents plan ahead. The only obstacle that needs to be overcome is employee resistance, so efforts are focused on changing the organizational culture, or the "way we do things within here. Unlike top-down models, which rely on predetermined procedures, strategic change management follows a predetermined formula and tries to instill new behaviors in the workplace so that staff members can see how the organization benefits and, supported by data, absorb the change in their modalities of working (Senior & Swailes, 2016).

On the other hand, transformational leaders must lead by example, encourage others to think creatively and "beyond the box," and create a safe space for them to do so to effectively implement transformational change management strategies (Hiatt & Creasey, 2003). Depending on the circumstance, each of these methods may be useful, but it's commonly acknowledged that the first group frequently performs the worst. According to Jones and George (2015), all strategies emphasize the significance of communication, leadership, and employee involvement in the change process. As a result, adapting the model to the situation is the main challenge facing organizations. Modern managers view change as a perpetual and unchanged factor that can be used to improve internal processes, customer satisfaction, and financial performance, and acquire new perspectives within the organization. Managers use various change management models to handle the change. Some managers still struggle to effectively manage the change process, even though they understand how important it is. The main causes of this failure are either improper implementation of these models or a lack of knowledge about various change management models. The elements of several change management models that managers in contemporary organizations can use are covered in this study, along with comparisons and discussions of each.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Models of Change and Change Management

The literature contains a wide range of theories and models for bringing about change in organizations in the public and private sectors. The problem of strategies to change is related to change models. Four change models are presented in this discussion to illustrate the basic strategies that support comprehension of the nuances of change procedures and provide the framework for effective change implementation. "The use of the term "model" refers to an array of presumptions and convictions which together symbolize reality" states Hussain, Lei, Akram, Haider, Hussai, and Ali (2018: 124). Several important conventional approaches to change are discussed, which flow from this definition. The meanings of "models of change" and "strategies of change" are not entirely clear, according to the literature (Mintzberg, 1979;

Aldrich, 1979; Johnson & Scholes, 1993; Prediscan & Roiban, 2014). According to Sadler (1996), an organization's adopted strategy serves as a means of achieving the focal objective that the organization has set for itself. Stated differently, it refers to the methods selected to accomplish the goal. It consists mainly of a mission statement, a vision statement, a strategic position, particular goals, objectives, and core values; strategy; operational and long-term proposals; and strategy (Harper, 2001). On the other hand, any model of change refers to assumptions and ideologies that, when put together methodically, cause an organization to change in some way (Galli, 2018). Change models serve as the foundations for developing and implementing strategies.

Organisational Change Models
Kurt Lewin's Model of Change

Kurt Lewin (1951) developed a strategic approach to organizational change through his work on collaborative decision-making, execution, and social transformation. Group behavior constituted a major concern for Lewin (1958). He noticed that people behaved differently in different groups. He was able to contend that although individuals may join a group for quite different reasons, they are more inclined to work together to accomplish a shared goal to explain the consistency of some groups' behavior against that of others. Lewin's research produced a model that breaks down change into three steps. This three-step model is linked to deliberate organizational change, and those wishing to bring about the change may do so by employing a variety of tactics (Talmaciu, 2014). The three steps are unfreezing, starting the change (moving), and refreezing, according to Harper (2001: 9).

To put it another way, workers depart from the status quo during the unfreezing phase. Employees in organizations need to adopt new work practices quickly for change to be effective. Employees are either forced or encouraged to leave their comfort zones to adjust to new work practices to accomplish this, even in situations where their future is uncertain. Harper (2001) contended that companies putting change management into practice ought to motivate staff members to follow a plan that permits the "sloughing of yesterday" since "it will force thinking and action... make readily accessible men and money for new things... create a willingness to act". Nevertheless, there are disadvantages to this process, such as anxiety and the potential for uncertainty to cause employees to behave in an unproductive manner as opposed to a productive one. Palmer, Donford, and Buchanan (2016) have identified these patterns of behavior, noting that employees often experience anxiety when completing new tasks because they are unsure of the change's potential consequences if it hasn't been started yet.

Employees recognize and implement new methods of doing things or take up fresh endeavors to effect change in step two, or "initiating the change." In this regard, Harper (2001) suggested that for change to be effective, management needs to make sure that all pertinent parties have the chance to participate in cooperative problem-solving and decision-making. Although management was primarily responsible for the latter, employees who get involved are thought to have a higher likelihood of accepting change and becoming dedicated to seeing it through to completion. Change recipients may respond to change with little to no resistance if they have a greater awareness of the requirements and advantages of the change. The emphasis in the last and third phases (refreezing) is on the employer reinforcing new procedures and tasks within the organization. As compensation is a crucial factor, employees must be recognized for this phase to be successful. To modify behavior, rewards are essential (Schech-Storz, 2013). In public sector administration, Lewin's model of organizational change can therefore be implemented in three ways:

1. Directly altering the interpersonal style or organizational climate, such as how frequently people interact with one another, how conflict is resolved, or how decisions are made.
2. Changing the people who work in the corporation (their skills, values, attitudes, and eventually behavior) with an eye towards instrumental organizational change.
3. Changing various organizational frameworks and procedures, such as incentives, hierarchy, and work plans.

The mutual dependence and directing elements in a relationship were the main focus of Lewin's model. Within the framework of the organizational structure, this indicated a process of interdependence between the various departments and divisions.

Dunphy and Stacy's Model of Change:

Building on Lewin's three-step model, Dunphy and Stacy (1993) examined change from the standpoint of organizational transformation. According to Dunphy and Stace (1993), organizations required a change model that was essentially a "situational" or "contingency model." This model ought to guide how to adjust change tactics to attain "optimal fit" in the evolving surroundings. The theory that the choice of suitable change types rests solely on an analysis of the strategy of the circumstances is supported by Dunphy and Stace's (1993) more situational model of change (Okolie, & Memeh, 2022). Additionally, these writers insisted that change can sometimes happen abruptly rather than always in small steps. Additionally, they proposed that transformative change is coercive in nature in addition to consultative.

Kotter's Model of Change

The planned model of change was criticized, and in response to an unexpected model of change was created. This strategy has gone by several names, including organizational learning and perpetual enhancement (Burnes, 1996). The model emphasizes that change is an ongoing, flexible process of adaptation to shifting conditions and circumstances and sees change as coming from the bottom up as opposed to the top down. According to the approach, change will occur so quickly that senior change initiators won't be able to efficiently recognize, plan, and carry out the organizational changes that are required (Calegari, Sibley & Turner, 2015). As a result, accountability for organizational change needs to be distributed more and more. According to Dawson (1994), an emergent method to change is more than just a strategy for altering organizational structures and procedures; it is also linked to learning processes. Therefore, the effectiveness or collapse of the change management program may also be influenced by an organization's capacity for learning and adaptation. Additionally, several supporters of the emergent approach, like Kotter (1996), proposed a series of steps that organizations can take because there are no predetermined guidelines for implementing and overseeing change. Eight steps are recommended by Kotter's model for the change process: generating short-term wins, integrating develops and providing more change, creating a sense of urgency, building the guiding coalition, developing a strategy and a vision, communicating the change vision, and establishing novel methods in the public sector administration culture (Hussain, 2018).

Mintzberg and Quinn's Model of Change

Four general situational headings, according to Mintzberg and Quinn (1991), are crucial in determining how much change an organization can execute. These include the organization's age and size, its technological systems, its location, and the types of controls that are applied both internally and externally to it. First off, an organization's age and size are crucial markers of its capacity to embrace and execute change.

Based on the outcomes of Mintzberg and Quinn (1991), an organization's ability to

execute change can be influenced by four major situational headings. They consist of the organization's age and size, its technological systems, the setting in which it operates, and the types of controls that are applied both internally and externally to it from different sources. First of all, an organization's size and age are crucial markers of its adaptability to change.

Anderson and Anderson's Model of Change

The broad Anderson and Anderson model of change is intended to handle all types of organizational change and also accounts for the cyclical nature of such change (Anderson & Anderson, 2001). This model is divided into three sections: people (the mindset, behavioral, and cultural shifts needed to deliver the recommended change); process (actions needed to prepare, create, and carry out the recommended change); as well as content (organizational structure and technical components that need change). It is necessary to execute all three procedures in a cohesive and integrated manner. The model, which has nine phases which are as follows: 1.) Prepare to Lead the Change; 2.) Create Organisational Vision, Commitment, and Capability; 3.) Assess the Situation to Determine Design Requirements; 4.) Design the Desired State; 5.) Analyze the Impact; 6.) Plan and Organize for Implementation; 7.) Implement the Change Plan; 8.) Celebrate and Integrate the New State; 9.) Learn and Course Correct.

The Mckinsey 7-S Model

In 1978, Tom Peters and Robert Waterman, who were employed at McKinsey & Company, developed the McKinsey 7-S Model, a change model that also included input from Richard Pascale and Anthony Athos. This model is a comprehensive approach to organizations that draws upon seven key elements upon which an organization ought to build its change management procedure. Shared values, tactics, framework, mechanisms, design, workers, and skill constitute the seven factors. The core of this change model is shared value, which is defined as an organization's values and beliefs, such as its mission and vision (Burke, 2017). These models look at the organizational internal and external environments, expectations for change, the effects of particular changes, the acceptance of new behavior strategies, and the significance of prompt communications in the process of change. A thorough analysis of the models addressed reveals that an integrated set of managerial techniques is needed for transformational change to be successful. These approaches include analyzing the need for change, developing a vision, instilling a sense of urgency, identifying the leadership or guiding team, developing an implementation plan, building structures that facilitate the change, communicating effectively, and reinforcing or institutionalizing the change processes (Palmer, 2016). The five stages common to the models of change are:

The creation of clear goals: Palmer (2016) underlined the necessity for organizations to formulate and express a precise statement of their future direction. They call this method "managing from the future." Here, the future is pictured and explained so that workers in the public sector can see the big picture. Therefore, understanding the desired change and setting clear goals for it is essential to the successful implementation of change.

Collaboration and respect: Kotter (1996) asserts that an organization's vision is usually formulated by a single individual, the head of the organization. For the head of the organization to successfully implement change, other staff members must cooperate. Put another way, a cross-functional group that collaborates with all stakeholders can execute revolutionary changes in change processes. Any change process that is implemented without

cooperation will inevitably fail or fail to produce the desired results. According to Galli (2018), for change to be successful, all members of the organization must respect one another.

Developing and executing an implementation plan: The creation of the execution plan is the responsibility of the steering coalition or team. First and foremost, the change must be covered in every way by the implementation plan. Additionally, it needs to be distributed equally among all organization stakeholders. The plan's execution will only involve stakeholders and other important leaders. According to Kotter (1996), the implementation strategy has to include quick wins so that workers can see the value of the change and be inspired to work towards the established goal.

The importance of communication throughout the change: Incorporating communication into the change process is essential. Within an organization, communication can take many different forms, such as written, spoken, and observed behaviors. Changes that are already in motion can be strengthened through such media, and also through presentations, one-on-one conversations, and organizational newsletters. Kitchen and Daly (2002) also reaffirm the significance of communication as a catalyst for change. These authors contend that all-important leaders should communicate consistently, that communication must be of high quality, and that communication must occur frequently and clearly.

Reinforcing and institutionalizing the change: The process of initiating change entails a forward-looking progress that calls for ongoing reinforcement of the intended change. In this sense, organizational policies and structures are altered to bring about institutionalization. Furthermore, Kotter (1996) stated that the ongoing expression of new behaviors and how they complement the mission and succession strategy formulated and carried out by the change agents are additional actions that reinforce change within the organization. Within the framework of this conversation, the leading coalition that is, the top echelon of executives within an organization may be characterized as the change agents.

Major Types of Organisational Changes

According to Schech-Storz (2013), "organizational change" refers to a big change that occurs within the organization, like a reorganization or the addition of a significant new item or service. This contrasts with more minor adjustments, like implementing a new computer protocol. Since organizational change can appear to be such an ill-defined phenomenon, it can be useful to consider it in terms of the different dimensions that are listed below.

Radical versus Incremental Change: Modifications that affect the organization's entire system and essentially reshape what it is or alter its fundamental components, such as people, procedures, strategy, structure, and (in certain situations) core values. When dealing with more basic issues, radical change or approach is employed, particularly in certain circumstances, like following a period of flux or an unanticipated rapid change in the environment. Conversely, incremental changes don't have to be tiny; rather, they are changes that occur frequently in organizations (Senior & Swailes, 2016). Large and important changes, like those to an organization's structure, the adoption of new technology, or a substantial shift in personnel policies, typically take place within the parameters and definitions already established for the organization. According to Johnson and Christensen (2008), the gradual method of change is more typical and is frequently utilized to optimize performance in the short term. The incremental view's rationale is that, since the environment is ever-changing,

the only way to ensure the company's survival and boost organizational effectiveness is through gradual change.

Reactive versus Proactive change: Change that is implemented in reaction to an external incident or to significant functioning and leadership challenges within the organization is known as reactive change. According to Johnson and Christensen (2008), reactive change refers to modifications made to organizational policies as a result of an event occurring. The impetus for this shift comes from outside sources. Most changes are unplanned and made in reaction to a circumstance. Since management does not have time to thoroughly assess the situation and formulate a well-thought-out plan, they respond to the issue by making quick and routine changes. Responses are made fast to environmental events, threats, and opportunities. On the contrary, proactive change refers to adjustments made when a business is not currently facing any significant issues but managers foresee a desire for change to improve the business's position or address any possible issues in the future. Although taking an anticipated approach to change is usually preferred, most businesses adopt a reactive strategy, often as a result of the widely held belief that if performance is already satisfactory, change is not necessary (Prediscan & Roiban, 2014). Organizations usually have little to no control over these reactive factors, but they must act fast to make the necessary adjustments in response to these events:

1. Maintain their competitiveness,
2. Continue to provide high-quality and reliable service or products,
3. Continue to grow and be financially sustainable and profitable.

Developmental change: A developmental change is an enhancement made to the previous method to produce more or better results. An organization updating its policies, practices, and processes that are no longer relevant to its current actions is an example of this. Problem-solving, technical expertise training, communication improvement, and process improvement are examples of developmental activities (Kanter & Peter, 2009).

Convergent change: Kanter and Peter (2009) classified convergent change as developmental change since it consists of a series of minor changes. They argue that the key elements of convergent change are small-scale modifications to environmental creativity and constant enhancement that maximizes an organization's attack within its immediate surroundings. Essentially, organizations that adopt convergent change are better equipped to maintain outstanding operations and conquer outside threats because it is strategically planned and proactive.

Transitional change: Transitional change happens when there is a decision to begin an event new and alter what is already in place. It is the application of a known state, like reorganizing or disassembling antiquated operational procedures. All members of the organization must exercise patience as this kind of change typically takes place over a predetermined amount of time. Examples include the introduction of new technology, digitization of the management database, and the launch of new product lines (Schech-Storz, 2013).

Organization-Wide – Wide Versus Subsystem Change: Examples of systemic change within an organization include significant limitations, teamwork, or "rightsizing." To transition from one stage of their life cycle to another, such as from an extremely reactive,

creative organization to one with stability and strategic growth, organizations typically need to implement organizational-wide change. According to experts, a culture shift is necessary for organizational change to be successful; this is just one more example of an organization-wide change. A subsystem may change if an item or service is added or removed, a department is reorganized, or a new process for delivering goods or services is put in place (Schech-Storz, 2013).

Transformational Versus Incremental Change: Changing an organization's structure and culture from the conventional top-down, hierarchical structure to a large number of self-directing teams is an example of a paradigm shift (or radical, fundamental) change. Another example would be business process re-engineering, which aims to disassemble the main components and processes of the organization and then reassemble them more efficiently—at least initially, on paper. Quantum change is another name for transformational change. Implementing a fresh IT infrastructure to increase efficiency or using perpetual enhancement as an approach to quality management are two examples of incremental change. Many times, organizations experience incremental change and their leaders do not recognize the change as such (Schech-Storz, 2013).

Remedial Versus Developmental Change: Change can be implemented to address existing issues, such as addressing significant budget deficits, reducing workplace burnout, improving the subpar performance of a service or the organization as a whole, or helping the organization become significantly more proactive and less reactive. Because remedial projects address a pressing issue, they frequently appear more focused and urgent; because it is often simpler to assess whether these projects are successful because the issue has been resolved or not. Additionally, change can be developmental in nature. For instance, it can be used to double the number of satisfied clients or produce more of a hit product or service. The perceived generality and vagueness of developmental projects can differ from remedial projects, contingent on the specificity of the goals and the significance of achieving those goals for the organization's members. Different people may have different ideas about what constitutes a developmental change versus a remedial change. They may realize that corrective adjustments will be required if changes to development are not made quickly. Additionally, organizations may identify remedial issues that need to be addressed now and then create a developmental vision to do so. Projects in those circumstances are still remedial since their main goal was to address present problems (Calegari et al., 2015).

Unplanned versus Planned Change: Unplanned change typically happens when an organization experiences a significant, unexpected shock, to which its members react in an extremely reactive and disorganized way. Unplanned change can happen when the organization's CEO abruptly quits, serious PR issues emerge, subpar product performance leads to a rapid loss of clients, or other unsettling circumstances come up. Planned change happens when organizational leaders identify a significant change that needs to happen and proactively put together a plan to make it happen. The successful execution of a plan of action, reorganization plan, or other change of this size results in a planned change or executed plan. As opposed to what participants may have anticipated, planned change frequently happens in a more disorganized and disruptive way (Calegari et al., 2015).

Because an organization can implement so many different kinds of changes, it is crucial that before making any changes, they carefully consider the nature, scope, and nature of the changes that will be required. Galli (2018) presents an additional perspective on change. They contend that organizations that resist change need to be able to maintain a consistent brand and meet their operational objectives. Organizations must promote strong leadership, effective coordination, and transparent communication to be able to fully utilize and cultivate their resources for change to be successful. Organizations must recognize that relationships are dynamic, living structures with innate dynamic features and constant processes of change if they are to grow into these kinds of relationships. Change is considered "profound" according to Dervitsiotis (2003) when organizations "build capacity for ongoing change" by addressing the "heart of issues" and focusing primarily on the ideas underlying the change processes rather than those that favor fundamental and tactical modifications. The above authors contend that to effectively implement change, all parties involved in the process must have their values, fears, behaviors, and aspirations taken into account. According to Okolie and Memeh (2022), change is an easy process. It's easy to describe, at least. It happens every time we swap out the old for the new. Transitioning from the past to the brand-new involves letting go of the old and embracing the new. However, putting change into practice is very challenging. Most people find it difficult to part with what they know. We are all wary of the unknown; we naturally worry about how we will transition from the familiar to the unfamiliar, particularly if it means taking a chance at failure by learning something new.

This point of view holds that change entails a transition from the known to the unknown, and since the future is unpredictable, it could negatively impact workers' sense of worth, coping skills, and competencies. It is important to understand that most employees are resistant to change unless they are persuaded to do so by strong arguments. Therefore, among other things, vision, mission, communication, effective leadership, participation, and culture are necessary for change to be successful. To be more specific, according to Burke (2017), the culture of an organization is a common comprehension of how the organization operates and influences initiatives for change. Vision entails creating a future vision for the organization. Mission sets the stage for organizational change. Communication and effective management are essential in getting ready the organization for change as they guide it through turbulent phases. To put it another way, organizations need to adapt to change in order to stay on par in both public and private sector settings. Organizations must therefore understand the significance of adopting a holistic strategy to any change program that combines structural, technological, and behavioral approaches to promote the establishment of positive relationships.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Approaches to Change and Change Management in Public Administration

However, change is a multifaceted and multilevel phenomenon, suggesting that the frequently discussed distinctions between the two sectors may have some bearing. The literature on change management, particularly concerning the public administration

perspective, still seems to be lacking, though. Simultaneously, a broad range of instances of organizational and sectoral shifts in the public sector are documented in the literature on general management and public administration. This abundance would suggest that it would be beneficial to conduct a more thorough investigation of the literature to ascertain the type and volume of evidence that is specifically related to change in the public sector (Karp & Helgo, 2008).

It is imperative to acknowledge that a constructive and forward-thinking work environment in the public sector is one in which all aspects of employee scheduling and corporate tactics are in line with organizational goals. Machin and Bannon (2005) posit that the degree of dedication to organizational change is significantly influenced by the characteristics of the work environment. Because of this, government change agents need to decide in advance of implementing change how they will both lead their organizations via the upcoming times of change and proactively address the needs of the public sector. Based on the conversations above, it can be said that there exist a variety of distinct emphases or viewpoints that make the term "change" elusive to understand and challenging to accurately describe.

It appears that the power structure in public and private organizations differs significantly. Administrative management is another concept used to discuss authority in the public sector (Orhero, 2021). Political leadership, which relates to the leadership responsibilities carried out by the political overseers of public organizations, can be distinguished from administrative leadership (Mukoro, 2018). Some authors concentrate on the role of management in organizational change, even though the majority of the published work on the leadership of the public sector does not address organizational transformation (Trottier, Van Wart & Wang, 2008). Studies on organizational change, suggest that leadership plays a crucial role in these processes (Kotter 1996). In the public sector, leadership is also seen as a key factor in driving change (Okereka, 2016). For instance, driving successful change requires effective leadership. In a similar vein, Christensen (2005) highlights the role that consultants and political leadership play in organizational change procedures.

According to the majority of public sector workers, they have either undergone personal transformation or are closely connected to someone who has. Anecdotal evidence gathered through formal and informal conservations with a diverse range of employees within the organization, indicates that generally speaking, many had a limited understanding of the phenomenon of change. In light of this, the researcher argues that although change is necessary for any organization, it is crucial to understand how it fits into the larger scheme of organizational life. Workers must comprehend what change is and how change processes can modify current frameworks that affect an organization's efficiency. This is vital in developing a broader understanding of the change, the change process, and the changing environment.

CONCLUSION

Effective change management is becoming more and more crucial in today's fiercely competitive economy. Managers of large companies in particular must embrace change management as a successful strategy for accomplishing organisational objectives. Employers who struggled to handle change would lose the loyalty and productivity of their workforce.

Conversely, companies that successfully handled change would gain a competitive edge that guarantees long-term success. Organizations, particularly those in the public sector, must comprehend and implement change management models in the post-COVID-19 era if they are to improve their capacity for long-term success.

All modifications are the same because of various internal organizational environment factors; as a result, modern organizations must employ various change methods and models based on the circumstances. This study will help organizations and leaders in the public sector keep in mind that applying change approaches and models requires a bigger picture, especially before they become bogged down in the details of implementation.

Consequently, as a suggestion for future research, researchers should focus more on the importance of leadership styles in achieving organizational change effectively in the the public sector. Additionally, future research should investigate the effectiveness of different leadership styles in achieving change in different societies where employees' cultures differ, or in multinational organizations where managers deal with different cultures in the workplace.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, H. E. (1979). *Organisations and environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Anderson, D., & Anderson, L. S. (2001). *Beyond change management: Advanced strategies for today's transformational leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Burke, W. W. (2017). *Organisational change: Theory and practice* (*5th edition ed.).* New York: Sage Publications.

Burnes, B. (1996). *Managing change: A strategic approach to organisational dynamics*. London: Pitman Publishing.

Calegari, M. F., Sibley, R. E., & Turner, M. E. (2015). A road map for using Kotter's organisational change model to build faculty engagement in accreditation. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 19(3), 31 - 43.

Christensen, M. (2005). The third hand: Private sector consultants in public sector accounting change. *European Accounting Review*, 14(3), 447 - 474.

Dawson, P. (1994). *Organisational change: A processual approach*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Dunphy, D.C., & Stacy, D. A. (1992). *Under new management: Australian organisations in transition*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill.

Galli, B. J. (2018). Change management models: A comparative analysis and concerns. *Ieee Engineering Management Review*, 46(3), 125 – 132.

Harper, S. C. (2001). *The forward-focused organisation*. New York: American Management Association.

Hiatt, J., & Creasey, T. (2003). *Change management: the people side of change*. New York: Prosci Research.

Hussain, S., Lei, S., Akram, T., Haider, M., Hussai, S. H., & Ali, M. (2018). Kurt Lewin's change model: A critical review of the role of leadership and employee involvement in organisational change. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 12, 123 - 127.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Johnson, G., & Scholes, K. (1993). *Exploring corporate strategy: Text and cases*. London: Prentice Hall.

Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (2015). *Essentials of contemporary management.* New York: McGrawHill.

Karp, T., & Helgo, T. I. T. (2008). From change management to change leadership: Embracing chaotic change in public service organisations. *Journal of Change Management*, 8(1), 85 - 96.

Kitchen, P. J., & Daly, F. (2002). Internal communication during change management. *Corporate Communications*, 7(1), 46-53.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper and Row.

Machin, M. A., & Bannon, S. F. (2005). *Australian public sector employees' commitment to change to organisational change*. Australia: Australian Psychological Society.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organisations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mintzberg, H., & Quinn, J. (1991). *The strategy process: Concepts, contexts, cases*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Mukoro, A. (2018). *The burden of leadership in Nigeria*. Nigeria: International Institute for Policy Review and Development Strategies.

Okereka, O. P. (2016). Understanding leadership styles and improved staff performance in the nigerian legislature: A perspective of the delta state house of assembly. *International Journal of Management*, 6(12), 604 – 618.

Okolie, U. C., & Memeh, N. J. (2022). Influence of change management on modern organisational efficiency. *Jurnal Riset Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 15(3), 171 – 195.

Orhero, A. E. (2021). Leadership and governance failure in Nigeria's fourth republic. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 18(5), 290 – 303.

Palmer, I., Donford, R., & Buchanan, D. (2016). *Managing organisational change: A multiple perspectives approach.* London: McGraw-Hill Education.

Prediscan, M., & Roiban, R. N. (2014). The main forces driving change in the Romanian SME's. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 12(4), 236 - 245.

Schech-Storz, M. D. (2013). Organisational change success in project management: A comparative analysis of two models of change. *Pro-Quest Dissertations and Theses*, 2, 20 - 25.

Senior, B., & Swailes, S. (2016). *Organizarional change (5th edition ed.).* New York: Pearson Publishers.

Talmaciu, I. (2014). Comparative analysis of different models of organisational change. *Valahian Journal of Economic Studies*, 5(4), 78–80.

Trottier, T., Van Wart, M., & Wang, X. (2008). Examining the nature and significance of leadership in government organisations. *Public Administration Review*, 68(2), 319 - 933.