



LEADERSHIP, CHANGE MANAGEMENT AND INNOVATION APPRAISAL A PANACEA TO ORGANISATIONAL SUCCESS IN A VUCA ENVIRONMENT: A SURVEY OF ZIMBABWE LAW MAKING INSTITUTIONS (2015-2020)

Cosmas Samson Nkomo and Judith Mwenje

Graduate School of Business, Bindura University of Science Education, Zimbabwe.

Abstract: The main objective of this research study was to unravel the relevance of Change Management on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions in a VUCA (Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous) environment. In the context of this research study, Change Management had three dimensions namely Leadership, Process Innovation and Innovative Culture. To achieve the set objective, primary data was collected and analysed because this research study needed pure details of the situation obtaining in Zimbabwean law making institutions. Data for this research study was sourced from Zimbabwean law making institutions' personnel through self-administered questionnaires. With regards to data analysis techniques, this research study used inferential and descriptive statistics to analyse the relevance of leadership, process innovation and innovative culture in change management on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions in a VUCA environment. Results wise, it was revealed that Leadership in Change Management has relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions and this finding was backed by the point that it was statistically proved that the Zimbabwean law making institutions effectively engage their internal stakeholders in identifying the need for change and also develop effective plans and good monitoring/reviewing practices. Secondly, it was revealed that process innovation in change management has relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions and this finding was backed by the point that it was statistically proved that the development of new information distribution platforms for administrative purposes is a continuous process in Zimbabwean law making institutions and that Zimbabwean law making institutions deal with customers' views, comments and complaints urgently and with extreme care. Thirdly, it was revealed that innovative culture in change management has relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions and this finding was backed by the point that it was statistically proved that innovation driven proposals or ideas are welcome in Zimbabwean law making institutions. Lastly, it was revealed that Change Management has relevance on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions. This research study therefore concluded that Change Management has a bearing on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions. It also concluded that Leadership, Process Innovation and Innovative Culture in Change Management have a bearing on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions. This research study recommended that Zimbabwean law making institutions have to adopt the Transformational leadership Style and standardise the roles of employees in Change Management to foster peer relationships.

Keywords: Change Management, Leadership, Innovation, VUCA



1. INTRODUCTION

Change Management is “a comprehensive, cyclic, and structured approach for transitioning individuals, groups, and organizations from a current state to a future state with intended business benefits” (PMI 2013, p7). The study of change management in relation to organizational success has been at the centre of many studies and the results from those studies indicate that the various factors that fall under Change Management include Leadership (Ibrahim and Daniel 2019; Meraku 2017; Jabbar and Hussein 2017), Communication (Ahmad et al 2018; Shonubi and Akintaro 2016; Makumbe 2016), Employee commitment (Makumbe 2016), Employee Engagement (Makumbe 2016) and Innovation (Tuan et al 2016; Ionescu and Dumitru 2015; Ashraf and Khan 2013; Tohidi and Jabbari 2012). This research study zeroes in on the effect of three change management dimensions namely Leadership, Process Innovation and Innovative Culture on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions. Leadership is “a social influence process in which the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates in an effort to reach organization goals” (Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy 2014, p1) whereas innovation refers to “a new or innovative idea which is applied to initiating or enhancing a product, service or process” (Pellissier 2008, p69). Ashraf and Khan (2013) concluded that there exists a strong association between innovation and the effectiveness of firms from a Pakistan perspective. Ionescu and Dumitru (2015) and Tuan et al (2016) are also among the many authors who have found a positive relationship between innovation and positive organizational performance. With respect to leadership, Khator (2012) observed that leadership in state companies must be the of the same standard as that of non-state owned companies for them to grow and be rated competitively like private sector firms. Hadrawi (2018) and Novo et al (2017) have also shown that leadership is positively related to the success of the firm. What is interesting to note about these studies is that their findings tend to shadow each other as they mostly reveal a positive relationship between change

management factors and organizational success. It is also interesting to note that none of the studies focused on change management in a Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous (VUCA) environment particularly from a Zimbabwean law making institutions perspective. Hence it is against this background that this research study scrutinized the relevance of change management on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions in a VUCA environment for the period 2015 to 2020.

The success of law making institutions and other businesses alike has been under immense negative pressure particularly in the modern day VUCA business environment. The foundation of the VUCA concept can be traced back to the late 1990s when it was used in preparation of the unknown by the Army War College in Pennsylvania, United States of America (Stiehm 2002). The concept has since then been extrapolated to businesses of all kinds mostly in relation to leadership’s capabilities. Johansen (2009; 2012) posits that a competent leadership team must be visionary and agile such that it adapts quicker to any changes in the business environment and in some instances turn VUCA induced dangers into business opportunities. VUCA factors of the 21st century are more than plenty but the major ones include unprecedented erratic weather patterns on account of climate change, volatile financial markets, acts of terror/war, unemployment, underemployment, poverty, political instability and virus-related pandemics such as the covid-19 pandemic of 2020. The dynamism of the 21st century business environment has reshaped the modus operandi of modern organisations and has placed change and change management at the core of ensuring organisational success. Modern day business leaders have to reformulate business strategies and policies on the regular in order to cope with the volatile business environment which threatens the overall lifespan of corporate strategies (Musinde 2017).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This research study was anchored on the relevance of Change Management on Zimbabwean law making



institutions' success in a VUCA environment as perceived via the theory of reasoned action (TRA). The TRA (Fishbein and Ajzen 1969) is predominantly concerned with the intentional behaviours and predicting behaviour where intention is defined as "the extent to which someone is ready to engage in a certain behaviour or the likelihood that someone will engage in a particular behaviour" (Fishbein and Ajzen 1980). Theoretical literature was reviewed to give this study a strong theory base. Theories pertaining to leadership and innovation in change management and organizational success have never been in short supply such that all of them could not be covered by this empirical study. Hence this study focused on four theories namely the Achievement Motivation Theory (McClelland 1961), Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor 1960), Management Grid theory (Blake and Mouton 1964) and Kotter Eight Step Model of Change (Kotter 1995).

The relevance of leadership on organizational success has been studied empirically for many years and just like in the theoretical literature, most empirical research studies tend to support the presumption of positive relationships between organizational success and pro-inclusive leadership styles (e.g. Mathur et al 2010), and negative relationships between organizational success and pro-oppressive leadership styles (e.g. Mendez et al 2013). Mathur et al (2010) empirically studied the effect of leadership on the effectiveness of higher learning institutions from a Gwalior perspective. The survey research strategy was used with the target population being all the institutes of higher learning and the judgmental sampling technique was applied. Mathur et al (2010) concluded that there exists a high degree of positive correlation between leadership and organizational effectiveness. Other studies that support the existence of a positive relationship between good leadership and organizational success include Khator (2012), Sunday et al (2014), Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy (2014), Hao and Yazdanifard (2015), Madanchian et al (2016), Ansar (2016), Kitonga et al

(2016), Shoraj, and Memetaj (2017), Hadrawi (2018) and Ibrahim and Daniel (2019).

Ibrahim and Daniel (2019) who from a Nigerian perspective. The case study was used as the research strategy with the Coca Cola Company, Abuja, as the case. The questionnaire was used as the research instrument and the Pearson product moment coefficient and regression analysis were used to test their study's presumptions. Ibrahim and Daniel (2019) concluded that achievement of company objectives depends exclusively on the predominant leadership style in an organization and that democratic and/or participative leadership styles are the best when compared to pro-autocratic styles. Another instance where a negative relationship between leadership and organizational success was noted was in the Mendez et al (2013) who examined the effect of leadership styles on organizational effectiveness in small construction companies from a Mexican perspective. Mendez et al (2013) also documented that the existence of a positive and significant correlation between the firm's effectiveness and pro-democratic and liberal leadership styles.

The effect of innovation on organizational success has also been studied empirically for many years and most empirical research studies tend to support the presumption of positive relationships between organizational success and the ability to innovate (e.g. Walker et al 2010). Walker et al (2010) examined the effect of management innovation and organizational performance and concluded that management innovation and performance management have a positive relationship with organizational performance. A more extensive study concerning innovation was done by Acar and Acar (2012) who studied the effects of a firm's culture and innovativeness on corporate performance from a Turkish healthcare industry perspective. The study focused on three main cultures namely hierarchy, Clan and Adhocracy and concluded that the most dominant culture was the hierarchy culture followed by Clan and Adhocracy in that order. With regards to innovation, the most prevalent type of



innovation was found to be product innovation followed by behavioural, and marketing innovation in that order. This study is particularly concerned by the results pertaining to behavioural innovation since it was looking at process and cultural innovativeness.

Acar and Acar (2012) also found no direct relationship between hierarchy culture and business performance.

Tohidi and Jabbari (2012) examined innovation as a key success factor for organizations. Their study was a literature review and they concluded that innovation is the success key for organizations. A year later, Iqbal et al (2013) examine the empirical role of innovation on organizational growth from a Pakistani perspective and also proved the existence of a positive relationship between innovation and success. Ashraf and Khan (2013), Kenfac et al (2013) and Tuan et al (2016) also proved the existence of a positive relationship between innovation and success. What differs from these studies is their methods and geographical areas covered. Iqbal et al (2013) used correlation coefficient to analyse the data which was collected via questionnaires whereas Ashraf and Khan (2013) used correlations, means, standard deviations and multiple regression analysis from a Pakistani perspective as well. Kenfac et al (2013) carried out a qualitative study from a Swedish perspective whereas Tuan et al (2016) used regression analysis and exploratory factor analysis from a Vietnam perspective. A more recent study on the effect of innovation on organizational success was done by Sheeba and Christopher (2020) whose conceptual paper explored how non-routine cognitive jobs are done effectively through innovative work behaviour. They concluded that training and development plays a vital role in improving the performance of the employees through inculcating the innovative work behaviour which helps in accomplishing non-routine cognitive jobs effectively and innovatively.

H₀ Change management has no relevance on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions in a VUCA environment.

H₁ Change management has relevance on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions in a VUCA environment.

H₀ Leadership in change management has no relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions.

H₁ Leadership in change management has relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions.

H₀ Process innovation in change management has no relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions.

H₀ Process innovation in change management has relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions.

H₀ Innovative culture in change management has no relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions.

H₁ Innovative culture in change management has no relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology of this study encompassed research philosophy, research approach, research strategy, research design, target population, sampling techniques, research instruments, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations. This research study sought to examine the relevance of change management on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions in a VUCA environment for the period 2017 to 2020. Hence the positivist research philosophy was adopted to untangle the research hypothesis in line with the study's ontological, epistemological and axiological standpoints. This study believed that data and phenomena which is observed and measured objectively, in a value-free way, is the only source for credible statistical inferences. In line with the aforementioned philosophy, this research study adopted the inductive research approach which best suits hypothesis testing. From a strategy perspective, this research study adopted the census survey strategy. With regards to design, this research study utilized an



explanatory, mono method quantitative research design with the questionnaire as the sole data collection instrument. With regards to population, this research study targeted employees of all the law making institutions of Zimbabwe. There is only one law making institution in Zimbabwe namely the parliament of Zimbabwe hence this study was effectively targeting the 198 Parliament of Zimbabwe's employees. The adoption of the census survey strategy meant that this research study did not need any sampling technique be it probability based or nonprobability based.

However, there was need to systematically determine the actual sample size that would suffice for the study. The actual sample size of this research study calculated using reverse calculations and the 95% confidence level z-value was 198 individuals. In order to calculate this actual sample size, this research study adopted the Saunders et al (2009) 'actual sample size' formula. Baruch (1999) and Saunders et al (2009) posits that a 35% response rate for academic research studies involving top management or businesses' representatives is rational but this study depended on empirical response rates obtained from the studies reviewed in chapter 2. Specifically, this study adopted 71.3% as the proportion belonging to the specified category and the likely response rate because it was the least response rate of all the empirical studies reviewed by this study.

3.1 Research instrument

This research study used one primary method of data collection because it needed pure details of the situation obtaining in the law making business hence primary data was used. The data for this research study was sourced from Parliament of Zimbabwe personnel through self-administered questionnaires. A self-administered questionnaire is a "data collection technique in which each respondent reads and answers the same set of questions in a predetermined order without an interviewer being present" (Saunders et al 2009, p600). The usage of the questionnaire helps researchers to collect quantitative data and to report quantitatively results as well. This research study

enjoyed this advantage because the questionnaire facilitated the collection of quantitative data which enabled the study to achieve its reporting objective of quantifying the relevance of leadership, process innovation and innovative culture on the success of law making institutions in a VUCA environment from a Zimbabwean perspective.

The adoption of the self-administered questionnaire as the sole research instrument was beneficial to this research study because it was in line with its research philosophy. The ontological standpoint of this research study was such that objectivism was at play hence the distribution of the questionnaire ensured that the researcher had minimum influence on the data collection process. Questionnaires were sent to the respondents for them to fill in the absence of the researcher, on their own time and at their own pace. The axiological standpoint of this research study was such that a value-free way approach was adopted in the quest to obtain credible statistical inferences. Another advantage of using questionnaires is that they enable researchers to create a standardised and hence objective way of collecting data. This research study enjoyed this advantage because all the respondents received the same questionnaire written in the same language (English) which enhanced uniformity of responses. Uniformity of responses was also facilitated by the fact that the questionnaire had close ended questions only. With regards to the questionnaire's structure, it was divided into eight distinct sections such that it captured;

- Age and gender;
- Highest level of education and number of years in the organisation;
- Position in the organisation and years of experience;
- Leadership style predominant in the organization;
- Leadership questions;
- Process innovation questions;
- Innovation culture questions and;
- Overall assessment of all factors.



In order to pre-test the questionnaire, the main survey was preceded by a pilot study, otherwise known as a pilot test, whereby 7.57% (15 individuals) of the target population was involved. The participants of the pilot study did not reveal any area that needed correction hence the main study adopted the initial questionnaire.

3.2 Data reliability testing

Data reliability, otherwise known as data validity, refers to “the extent to which data collection technique or techniques will yield consistent findings, similar observations would be made or conclusions reached by other researchers or there is transparency in how sense was made from the raw data” (Saunders et al 2009, p600). Prior to data analysis, this research study utilised Cronbach’s alpha (1951) because it sought to determine the internal consistency of the research instrument. The Cronbach’s alpha for the data was 72.4% which is slightly above the 70% minimum acceptable level of reliability.

4. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Leadership styles, process innovation and innovative culture tend to change rapidly particularly in a VUCA environment which makes it difficult to conduct controlled experiments in an isolated setting and this is the major problem associated with social science studies as opposed to natural sciences studies. The conditions of social science studies cannot be reproduced in the real world which leads to the problem of artificiality and due to this, the observations made with regards to a certain geographical region may not be applicable to the next thus several regions must be studied over a period of time to draw concrete conclusions. Some cited cases of fear to give information and fear of victimisation and name calling were noted amongst respondents. However the researcher had to strongly emphasise that the information was for academic use and it was confidential.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

With regards to data analysis, the data that was collected was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16 and the research

study made use of inferential and descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to show the respondents’ views and demographic details and to directly address both the main and specific objectives and hypothesis of this research study via the eighth section of the questionnaire. All computations in this research study were made at 5% significance level with a 4% margin of error hence where descriptive statistics indicate that x% of the respondents are in a certain category, this research study concludes with 95% certainty that the number of individuals in the stated category lies within the range x% minus 4% to x% plus 4%. The descriptive statistics were displayed in tabular form and crosstabs. Secondly, Kendall Tau-b’s correlation coefficient was used to unravel the consistencies in respondents’ views by analysing the correlation between the views of the respondents regarding their perceived relevance of leadership, process innovation, innovative culture and change management (section 8 of the questionnaire) on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions. Thirdly, cross tabulations were used to unravel the relationship between leadership styles (section 4 of the questionnaire) and the respondents’ perception about the relevance of leadership, process innovation, innovative culture and change management (section 8 of the questionnaire) on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions.

Correlational analysis helped examine the direction and degree of the relationship between the respondents’ perception about the change management factors that were under study. In the context of this study, a degree of one on the Kendall correlation coefficient shows perfect correlation whereas a degree of zero on the Kendall correlation coefficient shows no correlation between variables. A degree between zero and 0.3 exclusive on the Kendall correlation coefficient shows a weak correlation whereas a degree of 0.3 and above but below 0.8 shows strong correlation. Finally, a degree of 0.8 and above shows a very strong correlation. On the other hand, the direction of the relationship was indicated by the sign on the Kendall correlation



coefficient. A negative sign infers an inverse relationship whereas a positive sign infers a direct relationship.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization

Table 1: Overall assessment question 1 [OA1]

OA1

leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid DISAGREE	1	.6	.6	.6
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	62	35.8	35.8	36.4
AGREE	95	54.9	54.9	91.3
STRONGLY AGREE	15	8.7	8.7	100.0
Total	173	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author’s own calculations in SPSS

Table 1 shows that 0.6% of the respondents disagreed to the assertion whereas 35.8%, 54.9% and 8.7% neither agreed nor disagreed, agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Hence this research study is 95% certain that the number of employees in the law making industry who disagree to that assertion lies within the

range 0% to 4.6% of the total number of employees in the law making industry whereas the number of employees who neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree lies within the ranges 31.8% to 39.8%, 50.9% to 58.9% and 4.7% to 12.7% respectively.

5.2 The relevance of process innovation in change management

Table 2: Overall assessment question 2 [OA2]

OA2

process innovation is relevant in explaining the success of the organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid DISAGREE	3	1.7	1.7	1.7
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	6	3.5	3.5	5.2
AGREE	38	22.0	22.0	27.2
STRONGLY AGREE	126	72.8	72.8	100.0
Total	173	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author’s own calculations in SPSS

Table 2 shows that 1.7% of the respondents disagreed to the assertion whereas 3.5%, 22% and 72.8% neither

agreed nor disagreed, agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Hence this research study is 95% certain



that the number of employees in the law making industry who disagree to that assertion lies within the range 0% to 5.7% of the total number of employees in the law making industry whereas the number of

employees who neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree lies within the ranges 0% to 7.5%, 18% to 26% and 68.8% to 76.8% respectively.

5.3 The relevance of innovative culture in change management

Table 3: Overall assessment question 3 [OA3]

OA3

innovative culture is relevant in explaining the success of the organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid DISAGREE	4	2.3	2.3	2.3
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	43	24.9	24.9	27.2
AGREE	113	65.3	65.3	92.5
STRONGLY AGREE	13	7.5	7.5	100.0
Total	173	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's own calculations in SPSS

Table 3 shows that 2.3% of the respondents disagreed to the assertion whereas 24.9%, 65.3% and 7.5% neither agreed nor disagreed, agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Hence this research study is 95% certain that the number of employees in the law making industry who disagree to that assertion lies within the

range 0% to 6.3% of the total number of employees in the law making industry whereas the number of employees who neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree lies within the ranges 20.9% to 28.9%, 61.3% to 69.3% and 3.5% to 11.5% respectively.

5.4 The relevance of change management

Table 4: Overall assessment question 4 [OA4]

OA4

change management is relevant in explaining the success of the organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid STRONGLY DISAGREE	1	.6	.6	.6
DISAGREE	2	1.2	1.2	1.7
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	53	30.6	30.6	32.4
AGREE	100	57.8	57.8	90.2
STRONGLY AGREE	17	9.8	9.8	100.0
Total	173	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's own calculations in SPSS



Table 4 shows that 0.6% of the respondents strongly disagreed to the assertion whereas 1.2%, 30.6%, 57.8% and 9.8% disagreed, neither agreed nor disagreed, agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Hence this research study is 95% certain that the number of employees in the law making industry who strongly disagree to that assertion lies within the range 0% to 4.6% of the total number of employees in the law making industry whereas the number of employees who disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree lies within the ranges 0% to 5.2%, 26.6% to

34.6%, 53.8% to 61.8% and 5.8% to 13.8% respectively.

Correlational analysis

An evaluation of the correlation matrix based on Kendall Tau-b’s correlation coefficient also done such that this research study was able to unravel the nature of the relationship between the views of the respondents regarding their perceived effect of change management and its dimensions on the success of law making institutions in Zimbabwe. The following table shows the results obtained;

Table 5: Correlation matrix

Correlations

			OA1	OA2	OA3	OA4
Kendall's tau_b	OA1	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.080	.118	.254**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.266	.097	.000
		N	173	173	173	173
	OA2	Correlation Coefficient	-.080	1.000	.057	.106
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.266	.	.427	.139
		N	173	173	173	173
	OA3	Correlation Coefficient	.118	.057	1.000	.198**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.097	.427	.	.005
		N	173	173	173	173
	OA4	Correlation Coefficient	.254**	.106	.198**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.139	.005	.
		N	173	173	173	173

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Author’s own calculations in SPSS

Table 5 shows that the correlation coefficient for OA1 and OA2 was -8% with a p-value of 26.6% which implies that there exists a statistically insignificant, weak and negative relationship between the two variables. A statistically insignificant and weak relationship was also observed between OA1 and OA3 shown by a positive correlation coefficient of 11.8% with a p-value of 9.7%. A statistically insignificant correlation of 5.7% exists between OA2 and OA3 since the corresponding p-value is 42.7%. OA2 and OA4 are insignificantly, positively but weakly related as shown

by a 10.6% correlation coefficient with a p-value of 13.9%. Statistically significant correlations were observed between OA1 and OA4, and OA3 and OA4. There exists a positive correlation of 25.4% between OA1 and OA4 with a corresponding p-value of 0% whereas there exists a positive correlation of 19.8% between OA3 and OA4 with a corresponding p-value of 0.5%.

Cross tabulations

The leadership style and OA1 crosstab sought to find out how leadership styles are related to the respondents’



views about the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization.

The following table shows the results obtained;

Table 6: Leadership style and OA1 crosstab

		Crosstab				
% within OA1		OA1				Total
		DISAGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	
LEADERSHIP STYLE USED	AUTHORITARIAN			2.1%		1.2%
	PARTICIPATIVE		8.1%	15.8%	6.7%	12.1%
	DELEGATIVE		6.5%	2.1%	20.0%	5.2%
	TRANSACTIONAL	100.0%	3.2%	3.2%	26.7%	5.8%
	TRANSFORMATIONAL		82.3%	76.8%	46.7%	75.7%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Author's own calculations in SPSS

The statistics given in table 6 are statistically significant at the 5% significance level. Table 6 shows that 2.1% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that the authoritarian leadership style is predominant. The other 15.8%, 2.1%, 3.2% and 76.8% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that participative, delegative, transactional and transformational were predominant respectively. On the other hand, 6.7% of the individuals who strongly agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in

explaining the success of the organization had cited that the participative leadership style is predominant whereas the other 20%, 26.7% and 46.7% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that delegative, transactional and transformational were predominant respectively. The following table shows the results obtained for the leadership style and OA2 crosstab which sought to find out how leadership styles are related to the respondents' views about the assertion that process innovation is relevant in explaining the success of the organization.



Table 7: Leadership style and OA2 crosstab

% within OA2		Crosstab				Total
		DISAGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	
		OA2				
LEADERSHIP STYLE USED	AUTHORITARIAN		33.3%			1.2%
	PARTICIPATIVE	33.3%		21.1%	9.5%	12.1%
	DELEGATIVE		50.0%	10.5%	1.6%	5.2%
	TRANSACTIONAL	33.3%	16.7%	2.6%	5.6%	5.8%
	TRANSFORMATIONAL	33.3%		65.8%	83.3%	75.7%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Author's own calculations in SPSS

The statistics given in table 7 are statistically significant at the 5% significance level. Table 7 shows that 21.1% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that the participative leadership style is predominant. The other 10.5%, 2.6% and 65.8% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that delegative, transactional and transformational were predominant respectively. On the other hand, 9.5% of the individuals who strongly agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of

the organization had cited that the participative leadership style is predominant whereas the other 1.6%, 5.6% and 83.3% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that delegative, transactional and transformational were predominant respectively. The following table shows the results obtained for the leadership style and OA3 crosstab which sought to find out how leadership styles are related to the respondents' views about the assertion that innovative culture is relevant in explaining the success of the organization;



Table 8: Leadership style and OA3 crosstab

		Crosstab				Total
		DISAGREE	NEITHER NOR DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	
% within OA3						
		OA3				
LEADERSHIP STYLE USED	AUTHORITARIAN		2.3%	.9%		1.2%
	PARTICIPATIVE	25.0%	9.3%	12.4%	15.4%	12.1%
	DELEGATIVE	25.0%	4.7%	3.5%	15.4%	5.2%
	TRANSACTIONAL	25.0%	2.3%	4.4%	23.1%	5.8%
	TRANSFORMATIONAL	25.0%	81.4%	78.8%	46.2%	75.7%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Author's own calculations in SPSS

The statistics given in table 8 are statistically significant at the 5% significance level. Table 8 shows that 0.9% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that the authoritarian leadership style is predominant. The other 12.4%, 3.5%, 4.4% and 78.8% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that participative, delegative, transactional and transformational were predominant respectively. On the other hand, 15.4% of the individuals who strongly agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant

in explaining the success of the organization had cited that the participative leadership style is predominant whereas the other 15.4%, 23.1% and 46.2% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that delegative, transactional and transformational were predominant respectively. The following table shows the results obtained for the leadership style and OA4 crosstab which sought to find out how leadership styles are related to the respondents' views about the assertion that change management is relevant in explaining the success of the organization;

Table 9: Leadership style and OA4 crosstab

		Crosstab				Total
		STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	
% within OA4						
		OA4				
LEADERSHIP STYLE USED	AUTHORITARIAN			1.9%	1.0%	1.2%
	PARTICIPATIVE			11.3%	14.0%	12.1%
	DELEGATIVE	100.0%	50.0%	1.9%	2.0%	5.2%
	TRANSACTIONAL		50.0%	3.8%	4.0%	5.8%



TRANSFORMATIONAL			81.1%	79.0%	52.9%	75.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Author's own calculations in SPSS

The statistics given in table 9 are statistically significant at the 5% significance level. Table 9 shows that 1% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that the authoritarian leadership style is predominant. The other 14%, 2%, 4% and 79% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that participative, delegative, transactional and transformational were predominant respectively. On the other hand, 5.9% of the individuals who strongly agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that the participative leadership style is predominant whereas the other 23.5%, 17.6% and 52.9% of the individuals who agreed to the assertion that leadership style is relevant in explaining the success of the organization had cited that delegative, transactional and transformational were predominant respectively.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the aforementioned findings, this research study concluded that;

Leadership in Change Management has significant relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions. Research studies that have also found leadership to be relevant on organizational success include Mathur et al (2010), Khator (2012), Kitonga et al, (2016), Madanchian et al (2016), Ansar (2016), Shoraj, and Memetaj (2017), Hadrawi (2018), Ibrahim and Daniel (2019), Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy (2014) and Hao and Yazdanifard (2015). The conclusion of this research study could be similar to that of Mathur et al (2010) on account of similar research strategies. The convergence of this research study's conclusion with that of Khator (2012) on account of the somewhat similar type of organizations that were under study. Khator (2012) studied state

owned organizations whereas this research study studied law making institutions hence one could say both studies focused on public sector organizations. The convergence of this research study's conclusion with that of Kitonga et al (2016) could have been on account of the fact that both studies focused on organizations which do not seek to make financial profit.

Process Innovation in Change Management has significant relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions. Research studies that have also found Process Innovation to be relevant on organizational success include Walker et al (2010) and Tohidi and Jabbari (2012) who found that Innovation has a positive relationship with organizational performance. The conclusion of this research study could be similar to that of Walker et al (2010) on account of similar research instruments and research approaches. Both studies used the questionnaire as the research instrument and the deductive research approach.

Innovative Culture in Change Management has significant relevance on the overall success of Zimbabwean law making institutions. Research studies that have also found Process Innovation to be relevant on organizational success include Ashraf and Khan (2013), Kenfac et al (2013), Tuan et al (2016) and Sheeba and Christopher (2020). The conclusion of this research study could be similar to that of Ashraf and Khan (2013) on account of similar data analysis techniques. Both studies used descriptive statistics and correlations to analysis data and the only difference with regards to data analysis was that Ashraf and Khan (2013) went a step further to use the multiple regression model as well. However this result needs to be extrapolated to law making institutions with caution on account of the different modus operandi of law making institutions and the different types of organizations that



were studied by Ashraf and Khan (2013), Kenfac et al (2013), Tuan et al (2016) and Sheeba and Christopher (2020).

Change Management has relevance on the success of Zimbabwean law making institutions in a VUCA environment. This conclusion is aligned to Kotter's (1995) view that a holistic approach towards Change Management is needed if sweeping organizational change and success are to be achieved.

7. REFERENCES

- Acar, A. and Acar, P. (2012), "The effects of organizational culture and innovativeness on business performance in healthcare industry", *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, Vol. 58 (2012), pp683-692
- Ansar, S., Aziz, H., Majeed, A. and Rassol, U. (2016), "Impact of Charismatic Leadership Style on Organizational Effectiveness", *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, Vol. 7, Issue 11, November 2016
- Ashraf, F. and Khan, M. (2013), "Organizational Innovation and Organizational Effectiveness Among Employees of Cellular Companies", *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 2013, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp01-24
- Baruch, Y. (1999), "Response rates in academic studies - a comparative analysis", *Human Relations*, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp421-38.
- Cronbach (1951), "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests", *Psychometrika* v16:3
- Fishbein, M., and Ajzen, I. (1975), "Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research", Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hadrawi, K (2018), "Network analysis of the effect of strategic leadership on organizational success: evidence from Iraqi heavy industry", *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, Volume 17, Issue 4, 2018
- Ibrahim, A. and Daniel, C. (2019), Impact of leadership on organisational performance. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Research*, 06(02), 367-374.
- International Labour Organization Monitor (2020), COVID-19 and the world of work: Impact and policy responses, 1st Edition, 18 March 2020
- Ionescu, A. and Dumitru, R. (2015), The role of innovation in creating the company's competitive advantage, *Ecoforum* [Volume 4, Issue 1 (6), 2015
- Iqbal, N., Ahmad, N., Ateeq, M., and Javaid, K. (2013), Role of innovation on organizational growth: evidences from Pakistan, *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter)* Vol. 3, No.4; Nov. 2013
- Johansen, B. (2009), *Leaders make the future: Ten new leadership skills for an uncertain world*, San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler
- Johansen, B. (2012), *Leaders make the future: Ten new leadership skills for an uncertain world*, 2nd Ed, San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Khator, A. (2012), The Role of Leadership in Organizational Development, *International Journal of Business and Commerce* Vol. 1, No.11: Jul 2012[97-104]
- Kotter, J. (1995), Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail?, *Harvard Business Review* (March/April), pp59-67
- Madanchian, M., Hussein, N., Fauziah, N. And Hamed, T. (2016), Effects of Leadership on Organizational Performance, *ResearchGate*
- Makumbe, W. (2016), Predictors of effective change management: A literature review, *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 10(23), pp. 585-593, 14 December, 2016
- Management study guide (2018), <https://www.managementstudyguide.com/kotter-8-step-model-of-change.htm>



- Mathur, G., Negi, P., Vigg, S. and Gupta, V. (2010), Leadership and organizational effectiveness in higher learning institutes, *The Journal of Higher Education* · January 2010
- McClelland, D. (1961), *The achieving society*, New York, Free Press.
- McGregor, D. (1960), *The human side of enterprise*, New York, McGrawHill.
- Méndez, R., Muñoz, J. and Muñoz, M. (2013), Leadership styles and organizational effectiveness in small construction businesses in Puebla, Mexico, *global journal of business research*, volume 7:5, 2013
- Meraku, A. (2017), Role of Leadership in Organizational Effectiveness, *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, Vol. 5, No. 11, November 2017
- Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. and Swamy, D. (2014), Leadership styles, *Advances In Management*, Vol. 7(2) February (2014)
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2009), *Research Methods for Business Students*, Pearson Education Limited 2009, 5th Ed.
- Sheeba, M. and Christopher, P. (2020), Exploring the role of training and development in creating innovative work behaviours and accomplishing non-routine cognitive jobs for organizational effectiveness, *Journal of critical reviews* Vol 7, Issue 4, 2020
- Shoraj, D. and Memetaj, M. (2017), Impact of Leadership Versus Organizational Effectiveness in the Secondary Banking Sector in Albania, *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, May-August 2017 Volume 2, Issue 5
- Sunday, K., Adekunle, I., and Roseline, O. (2014), Organizational Survival: The Effects of Leadership Skill and Strategy. *Science Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 2, No. 2, 2014, pp. 44-49. doi: 10.11648/j.sjbm.20140202.11
- Tohidi, H. and Jabbari, M. (2012), Innovation as a Success Key for Organizations, *Procedia Technology* 1 (2012) 560 – 564
- Tuan, N., Nguyen, N., Giang, P. and Nguyen, N. (2016), The Effects of Innovation on Firm Performance of Supporting Industries in Hanoi – Vietnam, *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 2016 – 9(2): 413-431 – Online ISSN: 2013-0953 – Print ISSN: 2013-8423 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3926/jiem.1564>
- Walker, R., Damanpour, F. and Devece, C. (2010), Management Innovation and Organizational Performance: The Mediating Effect of Performance Management, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, March 2010