

Re-positioning Human Resource Practitioners for Effective Change Management in Times of Severe Austerity: A Policy Framework for Service Delivery in Nigeria Public Sector

Chinyere, Ndukwe¹ (Ph.D) Chinyere Elom² (PhD) Ikechukwu Ogeze Ukeje³
Davidson Oliver Anigbata¹

1. Department of Public Administration, Ebonyi State University, P.M.B. 053, Abakaliki, Nigeria.
2. Department of Psychology, Federal University Ndufu Alike Ikwo, Ebonyi State, Nigeria.
3. Department of Political Science, Federal University Ndufu Alike Ikwo, Ebonyi State, Nigeria.

Abstract

In view of the current emerging environmental and climatic factors that has induced economic challenges, political instability, infrastructural defects, increasing security threats and severe austerity with significant financial pressures on all areas of organizational service delivery, it is vital that HR practitioners clarifies its aims and objectives for its staff. These need to be identified within an overall workforce strategy which is aligned to the organization's priorities and objectives. This strategy describes the high level objectives for the workforce, identifies performance measures by which progress can be judged and puts forward a range of priorities which will provide a programme of future activity with regards to workforce development. This paper argues that organizations are operating in a volatile, uncertain and unpredictable environment where the only constant is reduced resources and increased demands on service delivery. This paper therefore argues the need for a HR policy framework that addresses adaptation in public organisations and a systematic acquisition of innovative human resource professionals with requisite competence and skill capable of leading teams through periods of severe changes arising from bad government policy decisions and technology and to foster a culture of continuous improvement through reforms in other to sustain its service delivery and achieve competitive advantage in the organization.

Keywords: Change Management, workforce, austerity, Public organization, managing workforce.

1. Introduction

In recent times and in every contemporary organization world over, managers are faced with the challenge of leading their workforce during times of constant change. HRMs need to think innovatively, creatively and strategically to be able to design or re- design services to maximize efficiency and effectiveness. Change, as it is often said, is the only thing that remains constant in organization (Armstrong, 2009). The circumstances of an ever-changing market and ever changing products are capable of breaking any organization if that organization is unprepared for change. Change cannot just be allowed to happen. It needs to be managed (Armstrong, 2009). Conceptually, the change process starts with an awareness of the need for change. Possible courses of action can then be identified and evaluated and a choice of preferred action taken. Managing change during this transition state is a critical phase in the change processes (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1991); they further posit that:

The capacity of the firm to identify and understand the competitive forces in play and how they change overtime, linked to the competence of a business to mobilize and manage the resources necessary for the chosen competitive response through time.

The only thing that is permanent in every organization and the world is change. This means that change is a continuous event in the world. Everything in this globe virtually changes. In the organization, there are inevitable changes that do occur. Take for instance in the demographic profiles of the workforce. If you cast your mind in various organizations today, you will see that a lot of changes had taken place in people's demographic profiles. Many of the workforce who were single then are now married with children. Some who had little or no qualifications in terms of formal education are now probably Degree, Diploma, First School Leaving Certificate holders. Those who previously held some strategic posts in the past had either retired, resigned, dismissed or transferred to other places which paved way to others in the lower carders to assume the vacated positions. As these changes are taking place, age is also counting on them.

Furthermore, the organization in itself is also undergoing various mutations to meet the need of the modern and contemporary workforce. Legislations, public policies and judicial pronouncements also shape the day-to-day running of the organization and management must take cognizance of these realities as they unfold and face them head on. Workers' salaries must be reviewed to reflect the economic realities or circumstances and other prevailing situations in the environment of the organization. Employees' demands through their labour unions and other labour associations should also be given priority; if there will be industrial harmony (Ukeje;

Abraham, and Ndukwe, 2015). Introduction of modern techniques in organizational management also goes with training of staff who should handle such gadgets and technologies effectively. Organization should also keep in touch with globalization and computerization in order to be recognized in the comity of organizations in this 21st century. While studying these changes and effecting them as they unfold, organization should not loose sight of its goals and objectives that it sought to realize against all odds. It is on the basis of the foregoing that the need for change management in organizations becomes imperative.

2. Conceptual Clarification Change Management

Armstrong (2009) in his study on human resource management practice defined change management as the process of achieving the smooth implementation of change by planning and introducing it systematically, taking into account the likelihood of it being resisted. He developed three types of change in organizational management viz: Strategic, Operational and Transformational. Strategic change in the words of Armstrong is concerned with broad, long-term and organization-wide issues involving change. It is about moving to a future state that has been defined generally in terms of strategic vision and scope. It covers the purpose and mission of the organization, its corporate philosophy on such matters like: growth, quality, innovation and values concerning employees and customers, competitive positioning and strategic goals for achieving and maintaining competitive advantage and for product-market development. Operational change relates to new systems, procedures, structures or technology that will have an immediate effect on working arrangements within a part of the organization. But its impact on people can be more significant than broader strategic change and it has to be handled very carefully (Armstrong, 2009, Onah, 2010).

Transformational change takes place when there are fundamental and comprehensive changes in structures, processes and behaviour that have a dramatic effect on the ways in which the organization functions. In the words of (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1991) it is the process by which strategic organizational decisions are made through neat, successive stages of analyses, choice implementation by strategically (Ukeje and Anigbata, 2015) developing an innovative HR practitioners that are dynamic, proactive and capable of leading teams through periods of significant changes and austerity in severe economy arising from government measures to reduce public expenditure (Duru, 2009). Managing workforce or workforce management is an integrated set of processes that an institution uses to optimize the productivity of its employees on the individual, department, and entity wide levels (Thurley, 1979). These employees consist of people engaged in or available for work either in a country or area or in a particular firm or industry (Onwe, Ibeogu, and Anigbata, 2015).

As we have earlier on discussed, change is inevitable in organization. Human resource practitioners should brace up for it. In the life of any organization, there will be a time when it will experience low income due to low business patronage or severe cash flow. This will also affect the expenditure profile of the organization. In this development, what should a strategic manager do to see the organization through the time of this quagmire? Remember that salaries of workers must be paid; taxes also must be paid and other procurements made by the organization from the suppliers or contractors must be settled. It takes a seasoned and a well-trained manager to handle this situation effectively without jeopardizing any of the components of the organization. Namely: the employees, government, contractors, and suppliers. The first thing to do as a strategic human resource manager is to strengthen the revenue base of the organization and tighten the expenditure profiles. All expenses that are not necessary for the production of goods or services or for the effective running of the organization should be saved and ploughed back to the revenue base. Management should also close every loopholes that encourage prodigality and profligacy. Only those expenditure or expenses that are necessary for the running of the organization should be honoured.

Furthermore, allowances and other fringe benefits may be reduced during the austerity times as shock absorbers. Those monies that are generated from the cut allowances and some fringe packages should be adequately utilized or kept for further unforeseen circumstances. However before this should be done, management should notify the employees of any decision that they want to take and the workers should ventilate their inputs and participate in the decision that will affect their welfare. In this way, the manager must have solved the problems that would result in pay cut and other austerity measures that he may have taken. If the situation goes further after the manager must have applied all the necessary strategies and means of handle it, the next step to take is reduction of the number of workers (workforce). This is the extreme decision that requires skills, dexterity and knowledge of labour management relations. Most organisations find it difficult to dismiss an employee who has put a number of years in the organization. Even when a worker is accused of gross misconducts, they find it difficult to disengage him/her because of the number of years, sentiments and connections such an individual has, let alone disengaging committed workers who have put in their best for the upliftment of the organization. The question now remains, who should be disengaged and on what bases or criteria? A lot of companies and business organisations are facing legal battles for taking decisions related to this development while some have paid damages and arrears of salaries that the workers did not perform. The job of

a strategic manager in the recent times is very challenging and highly technical. Any decision taken recklessly will draw the entire organization to their draining boards. Because of this reason, organizations are mandated to employ only those managers who will stand the test of times in their managerial capacities.

Yes, the workforce must be reduced if the organization wants to remain solvent in business. Noteworthy is that it must make wide consultations with the: employees, trade unions or Associations and indeed the government if it is privately owned organization and intimate them about the planned action and the reasons. After these consultations and gathering of facts and input, then the manager will use the wealth of his experience to know which worker should go and which should remain and why. There should be fair play in this decision remember that the workers did not commit any crime for working in the organization and that they have laboured for the organization for many years before the unfortunate incident came in due to short fall in business. Some organizations when taking these decisions do compensate the affected workforce and promise to recall them when things come to normalcy. Others may help the affected employees to secure jobs in other firms as a way of pacifying them in order to reduce the trauma that is often associated with this phenomenon.

2.1 Managing changes in environments of organization

Environments are those forces that condition or influence the operation of organization. Human resource managers are operating in an incongruous environment. This means that organizations are operating within uncertain environmental factors which are unforeseen and exigent. In the words of Heady, in Onah (2008):

“Like living organisms, formal organizations and indeed other bureaucracies are conditioned by their environments, and the conditioning is naturally mutual. Bureaucracies as well as other political and administrative institutions can be better understood if the surrounding conditions, influences and forces that shape and modify them are identified and ranked to the extent possible in order of relative importance and if reciprocal impacts of these institutions on their environment are explored”.

Organization’s environments are divided into two categories: (1) controllable and (2) uncontrollable environments. The controllable environments are: workforce, suppliers, decisions, policies, productions, services etc. They are controllable because an organization can control them easily due to the fact that they are within the reach of the organization. The uncontrollable environments are: legislations, competitors, trade unionism, inflation, austerity and government policies etc. These factors cannot be controlled by any organization without making necessary and strategic adjustments. These factors are beyond the control of any organization. Take for instance legislation and unionism. If government legislates against any organizational policy or decision, the organization has no options but to obey what the law says without making any hesitation about it. The only option it has is to make adjustment and change its previous policy or decision it wants to embark on. Similarly, an organization cannot compel a trade union to obey its policies. It is either that it obeys the decision of the trade union or seek for dialogue or this is to show that trade unions are an uncontrollable environment of an organization.

Therefore, change management in environment presupposes that managers should know beforehand what and what constitutes their external and internal environments (uncontrollable and controllable) and brace up for the challenges that may come from them at any particular point in time. Managing human beings in this 21st century coupled with workforce diversity is a very big challenge which needs to be handled effectively. Human resources managers should adopt situation or contingent approach to management in handling the environments of business or organization. Situational or contingent manager takes decision based on the situations on ground and does not resort to empirical methods. This means that organizational management of environment is situated to situations and not necessary on precedents. Hence a manager knows that there are uncontrollable forces in business and these forces are unforeseen, he should not wait for the exigent time to come before he begins to adjust. Adjustments should already be in the plans and also a part of his managerial techniques in handling and managing changes in organization especially, environmental changes. Changes are inevitable and managers must learn how to handle them as they emerge and unfold.

2.2 Theoretical framework of Analysis

It is apt to state that before commencement of any scholastic endeavour of this nature, one first of all needs to establish the conceptual and theoretical foundations upon which an understanding of the work is to be premised. It is on this note that the study adopts situational theory: This theory was propounded by Fielder, (1960). The theory states that what managers do at any point in time in organizational management is situated to situations. Since there is no best way to manage, organizational managers do resort to use of discretion in times of new organizational circumstantial dispositions and exigencies. It equally opines that the ‘art of managing’ takes precedence over ‘the science of managing.’ That the kind of leadership or management style that any manager adopts depends on the: situation on ground; type of organization, the nature of dynamic and undynamic

environment and the implications of the outcomes of any decision that will be taken.

3. Approaches and models to managing change

There are many approaches to change management in organization. However, the Thurley (1979), Lewin (1951), Beckard (1969), Nadler and Tusham (1985), Stace and Dumphy (1994), Schein (1985), and Tichy and Devanna (1986) approaches will be adopted in this study.

Thurley's model

1. Directive – The imposition of change in crisis situations or when other methods have failed. This is done by the exercise of managerial power without consultation.
2. Bargained- This approach recognizes that power is shared between the employer and the employed and change here requires negotiation, compromise and agreement before being implemented.
3. Analytical – a theoretical approach to the change process using models of change such as described above.
4. Hearts and mind- An all-embracing thrust to change the attitudes, values and beliefs of the whole workforce.
5. Action based- This recognizes that the way managers behave in practice bears little resemblance to the analytical, theoretical model. The distinction between managerial thought and managerial action blurs in practice to the point of invisibility.

Lewin's model

The basic mechanisms for managing change according to Lewin are:

1. Unfreezing –altering the present stable equilibrium that supports existing behaviours and attitudes. This process must take account of the inherent threats change presents to people and need to motivate those affected to attain the natural state of equilibrium by accepting change.
2. Changing- Developing new responses based on new information
3. Refreezing-Stabilizing the change by introducing the new response into the personalities of those concerned.

Lewin also suggested a methodology for analyzing change that he called 'field force analysis which contains the following items.

- (a) Analyse the restraining or driving force which will affect the transition to the future state.
- (b) Assess which of the driving or restraining forces are critical
- (c) Take steps both to increase the critical driving force and to decrease the critical restraining forces.

Beckhard's approach

According to Beckhard 1969, a change programme should incorporate the following processes:

- * Set goals and define the future state or organizational conditions desired after the change.
- * Diagnose the present condition in relation to these goals.
- * Define the transition state activities and commitments required to meet the future state.
- * Develop strategies and action plans for managing this transition in the light of an analysis of the factors likely to affect the introduction of change.

Tichy and Devanna (1986) model

Their model begins with:

Act 1: recognizing the need for revitalization. During this stage, organization leaders must recognize that change is needed, and then create dissatisfaction with the status quo, sufficient to induce an organization-wide desire for transition.

Act 2: creating a new vision where a new strategic focus is sought, towards which the organization can steer and realign.

Act 3: institutionalizing change, as with Lewin's refreezing any transformation must be looked in, during this stage. New realities, actions, and practices must be shared so that changes become institutionalized.

Schein (1985) model

This model looks similar to Lewin's in that it includes building a desire for change and developing an anxiety gap between the present and the desired state. It also proposes an additional element which is to an environment of psychological safety identified with the target state to induce willingness for individuals to make the journey.

Dunphy and Stace (1994) model

Dunphy and Stace extended their hypothesis in 1988 to a model of 1994. They studied 20 organizations and split the two existing intensity of change categories into four, introducing fine tuning and splitting transformative into modular transformation and cooperate transformation. Fine tuning they saw as nothing more than a maintenance function, and found it generally to be a non-viable change strategy. The difference between modular and corporate transformation is the breath of change, where modular is partial, progressive change, and corporate is incomplete, holistic change. Below is a tabular representation of the above model:

Stace & Dunphy (1994)	Finetuning	Incremental	Modular Transformation	Corporate Transformation
Collaborative				
Consultative	Taylorism	Developmental Transformations (constant change)		Charismatic Transformation (Inspirational change)
Directive	Avoiding Change	Task-focused Transition (constant change)		Turn arounds (frame breaking change)
Coercive				

Source: Change model-Stace and Dunphy (1994)

Explanation of the table contents:

Explanation of Transitions: (constant change): A Company is able to use this approach when they are able to maintain their strategic alignment with the environment.

Task-Focused Transition: (constant change): This style of change is directed from the top unit managers are consultative interface between top management and workers, and thus they are given autonomy for change, but are held accountable for results. This type of change has the potential to the implementation may lose focus from intent.

Charismatic Transformation: (Inspirational change): This is a revolutionary change useful when a company is out of fit with its environment, and when time limits the amount of participation in the process. For example, a leader will take a charismatic approach to change, engaging the intellectual, emotional and behavioural characteristics of people to steer them towards change.

Turnarounds (frame breaking change): A firm facing a turnaround will be in a similar environment to companies contemplating transformation; poor fit and limited time. However, the critical differences are the dire need for change, which will be driven by a desire for survival and clear lack of employee support.

Nadler and Tushman (1989-95) model

Tadler and Tushman combine incremental and discontinuous with anticipatory and reactive dimensions to produce a matrix similar to Dunphy and Stace's. See the matrix below:

Nadler and Tushman (1989-95)	Incremental	Discontinuous
Anticipatory	Tuning	Reorientation
Reactive	Adaptation	Re-creation

Source: Nadler and Tushman change model (1989-95)

Explanation of the contents in the table above:

Tuning: A company that adopts a 'tuning' approach will perform continuous or incremental changes in anticipation of environmental demands.

Adaptation: Where tuning was changed through anticipation of external events, adaptation, is change triggered in reaction to external events.

Reorientation: Change which is commended in anticipation of external drivers, but which is discontinued. It usually involves changing the core elements of the company, including identity, values, culture, strategy and structure.

Re-creation: Business leaders who have foresight and skills required to succeed with reorientation are a rarity. Generally, the need for change is not recognized until crisis is imminent or actual. Recreations occur in reaction to a desperate situation, where time and resources are strained.

4. Guidelines for Change Management

"The change process will take place more smoothly with the help of credible change against- internal or external. These people who facilitate change by providing advice and support on its introduction and management. This is often the role of HR specialists but the use of line managers adds extra value" (Tushman, 1980).

- The achievement of sustainable change requires strong commitment and visionary leadership from the top.
- Understanding is necessary of the culture of the organization and the lever for change that are most likely to be effective in that culture.
- Those concerned with managing change at all levels should have the temperament and leadership skills

- appropriate to the circumstances of the organization and its change strategies.
- Change is more likely to be successful if there is a 'burning platform' to justify it, i.e a powerful and convincing reason for change.
 - People support what they help to create. Commitment to change is improved if those affected by change are allowed to participate as fully as possible in planning and implementing it.
 - The reward system should encourage innovation and recognize success in achieving change.
 - Change will always involve failure as well as success. The failure must be expected from.
 - Resistance to change is inevitable if the individuals concerned feel that they are going to be worse off-implicitly or explicitly. The inept management of change will produce that reaction.
 - In an age of global competition, technological innovation, turbulence, discontinuity, even chaos change is inevitable and necessary.

5. The Role of Human Resource Management (HRM) in Managing Change in Organizations

“Organization which successfully manage change are those which have integrated their human resources management policies with their strategies and the strategic change processes” Johnson and Scholes (1997).

If human resource managers as they should be –in playing a major role in the achievement of continuous improvement in organizational capability and individual performance, and in the HR processes that support improvement, then it will need to be involved in facilitating change (Ulrich, 1997). Strategic HRM is as much if not more about managing change during the process of implementation as it is about producing long term plans Purcell (1999) believes that “we should be much more sensitive to processes of organizational change and avoid being trapped in the logic of rational choice.” HR practitioners may be involved a stabilizing initiating change but they can also act as a stabilizing force in situations where change would be damaging (Mohman and Lawler, 1998). The HR function can help the organization develop the capability to whether the changes that will continue to be part of the organizational landscape. It can help the organization develop a new psychological contract and ways to give employees a stake in the changes that are occurring in the performance of the organization.

Ulrich (1998) argues that HR professionals are not fully comfortable or compatible in the role of change agents, and their task is therefore not to carryout change but to get change done. But HR practitioners are in a good position to understand possible points of resistance to change and they can help to facilitate the information flow and understanding that will help to overcome that resistance.

In the words of Gratton (2000) HRM should understand the state of the company/organization/institution, the extent of the embedding of processes and structures throughout the organization and the behaviour or attitudes of individual employees. She believes that “the challenge is to implement the ideas and the solution is to build a guiding coalition by involving line managers which means creating issue based, cross-functional action teams that will initially make recommendations and later move into action. This approach builds ‘capacity to change’. The contribution of HRM to change management will often take the form of implementing right structures, processes and systems to support change in line with the view of Beer et al (1990). Change often requires adopting new behaviours and acquiring different skills and HRM can organize the learning and development programmes required to do this.

5.1 Ways of handling Organizational Circumstantial Dispositions and Exigencies in Times of Radical Changes

Many ways and approaches abound in handling organizations policies and principles in times of radical changes. They include the following ways:

- Organizational Transformation: This is defined by Cummins and Worley (2005) as a process of radically altering the organization’s strategic direction, including fundamental changes in structure, processes, and behaviours. Transformation involves what they called ‘second orders’ or ‘gamma’ change involving discontinuous shift in strategy, structure, processes or culture. Transformation is required when:
 - Significant changes occur in the competitive, technological, social and legal environment;
 - Major changes takes place to the product life cycle requiring different product development and marketing strategies;
 - Major changes take place in top management;
 - A financial crisis or Large down turn occurs;
 - An acquisition or merger takes place.
- Transformational Strategies: Is described as strategies that are usually driven by senior management

and line managers with support of HRM. Organization's transformation strategic plans may involve radical changes to the structures, culture, and implementing significant and far reaching developments in corporate structures and organization- wide processes. The changes is neither incremental (bit by bit) nor transactional (alteration of ways in which organization does business), for instance:

- A charge in what drives the organization
- A fundamental change in the relationships between or among organizational parts.
- A major change in the ways of doing work.
- A basic cultural change in norms, values or research system (Beckard, 1989).
- Transformation through Leadership: Transformation programme are led from top within the organization. They do not rely on an external 'change agents' (Burns, 1978). The prerequisite for a successful programme is the presence of transformational leaders who, as defined by Burns motivates others to strive for higher-order goals rather than merely short-term interest. Transformational leaders go beyond dealing with day to day management problems they commit people to action and focus on the development of new level of awareness of where the future lies, and commitment to achieving that future. There is difference between transformational leaders and transactional leaders. The latter are good at dealing with here and now problems but they will not provide the vision required to transform the future while the former operate by building up a network of interpersonal transactions in a stable situation.
- Managing the Transition: Strategies need to be developed for managing the transition from where the organization is to where the organisation wants to be in the future. This, according to Kotler (1995) is critical part of a transformation programme. It is during the transition period of getting from here to there that change takes place. Transition management starts from a definition of the future state and a diagnosis of the present state. (Anigbata and Duru, 20015). This means deciding on the new processes, systems, procedures, products and markets to be developed. The strategic plans for managing the transition should include provisions for involving people in the process and for communicating to them about what is happening why it is happening and how it will affect them (Ukeje and Anigbata, 2015).
- Transformation Capability: the development and implementation of transformation strategies requires special capabilities. As Gratton (1999) rightly observed "transformation capability depends in part on the ability to CREATE AND EMBED PROCESSES which link business strategy to the behaviours and performance of individuals and teams. These clusters of processes link vertically (to create alignment with short term business needs), horizontally (to create cohesion) and temporally (to transform and meet future business needs). To achieve these, Kotler (1995) outlined 8 steps which includes:
 - Establishing a sense of urgency;
 - Forming a powerful guiding coalition;
 - Creating clear vision;
 - Communicating the vision;
 - Empowering others to act on the vision;
 - Planning for and creating short-term wins;
 - Consolidating the improvements and producing still more changes;
 - Institutionalizing new approaches.
- Diversity Management: a policy on managing diversity recognizes that there are differences among employees and that these diversities if properly managed will enable work to be done more effectively and efficiently. According to Kandola and Fullerton (1994) the concept of managing diversity is founded on the premises that harnessing these differences will create a productive environment in which anyone will feel valued, where their talents are fully utilized, etc. Managing diversity as a way of change management recognizes the benefits to be gained from differences. This according to Mulbolland et al (2005):

"Diversity management goes beyond the equal opportunities management considerations as described by law and promises to make a positive and strategic contributions to the successful operation of business".

• **Redundancy Policies**

The redundancy policy should state that the aim of the organization is to provide for employment security. It is the organizations intention to use its best endeavours to avoid redundancy through redeployment and training programmes. However, if the situation is unavoidable, those affected should be given fair and equitable treatment, and every help that can be provided to obtain suitable alternative employment.

6. "Frame Bending" and "Frame Breaking" as a Strategy for Handling Change

In its everyday operation, an organization functions within a set of predefined parameters, these include its values, culture, belief, policies, principles, strategies and operational plans. These parameters can be known as operational frame work or frame. The changes an organization undergoes can be within this frame as in the case

of incremental change where the frame work or parameters maintain a close congruence with their pre-change position, or they can move beyond the frame, as these parameters undergo major transformations.

Tushman (1985) identifies reorientations as ‘frame bending’ where the ‘frame of the organization is changed, modified and reshaped, but hopefully not broken.’ Frame Breaking’ occurs during recreation type changes, where the more sudden and desperate nature of the change creates stress of such intensity that many of the elements of the existing system are broken, discarded and replaced.

Frame Bending and Frame Breaking

Researcher(s)	Year	Major findings
Konter	1983	Problem definition Identify problem Gather information Identify stakeholders Justify the solutions Coalition building Gaining approval Building support Transacting Enlist executives Mobilization Handling oppositions Blocking interferences Continuously motivating Secondary design Communicating
Vandermerwe & Birley	1997	Key roles of effective change Motivating Networking Communicating Risk taking Influencing
Kouzes & Posner	1987	Leadership practice of exemplary leaders Challenge process Inspired a shared vision Enable others to act Model the way Encourage the heart
Kotter	1990	Requirement for effective leadership Industry and organizational knowledge Relationships in the firm /industry Reputation and track records Abilities and skills Personal values Motivation

Source: Michael Jones’ Frame Bending and Frame Breaking Analysis (2010).

7. Conclusion

This paper has examined the challenges of managing workforce in times of severe austerity and the imperative for change management. HR managers of contemporary organization are faced with many challenges in organizational management. Knowing that there is no best way to manage organization, the options that are left for HR practitioners are to adopt effective management styles and techniques that can best suit the circumstances on ground. Therefore, managers should avail themselves of the opportunities that are abound in order to be developed and trained so that they will assume the positions of strategic importance that their jobs demand. Opportunities like: workshops, conferences, symposia, seminars etc; attending any of these where related organization’s challenges are treated or discussed will be a milestone in the organizational management.

The paper therefore concludes on the need for a HR policy framework that addresses adaptation in public organisations and a systematic acquisition of innovative human resource professionals with requisite competence and skill capable of leading teams through periods of severe changes arising from bad government policy decisions and technology and to foster a culture of continuous improvement through reforms in other to sustain

its service delivery and achieve competitive advantage in the organization.

References

- Adams, J. (2005). Injustice in Social Exchange in (Ed) L. Berkowitz, *Advances in Experimental Psychology*.
- Armstrong, M (2000). "The name has changed but has the game remained the same? *Employee Relations*. 22 (6) 578-589.
- Armstrong, M and Brown, D. (2001) *Pay: The New Dimensions*. CIPD, London.
- Armstrong, M and Baron, A (2002). "Strategic HRM: The Route to improved Business Performance CIPD, London.
- Armstrong, M (2009) *Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. India: Replika press print
- Anigbata, D. O (2013). "The challenges of Human Resource Management in Organizational Management." Unpublished MSc Dissertation, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria.
- Barney, J (1991): Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*. 17 (7): 99-120.
- Baron, J and Kreps, D (1999). Consistent Human Resource Practices. *California Management Journal*, 4(3), 29-53.
- Bandura, A (1986). *Social Boundaries of thought and Action*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Becker, B. and Gehart, S (2006). The impact of HRM on organizational Performance: Progress and Prospects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4) 779- 801.
- Beckhard, R (1989). A model for the Executive Management of Transformational change in (Ed) Beer, G. *Human Resource Strategies*. London. Sage.
- Beer, M; Einstant, R and Spector, B. (1990) "why change programs Don't Produce change. *Harvard Business Review*. Nov-Dec. PP 158-116.
- Boxall, P. and Purcell, J. (2003). *Strategy and Human Resource Management* Palgrave: Mac Millan.
- Burus, J. (2008). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Pascale, R. (1990). *Managing on the Edge*. London: Viking.
- Beer, M and Spector, B (1985). Corporate wide transformations in HRM: Trends and challenges. *Harvard Business School Press Boston*.
- Beer, M et al (1998). *Managing Human Assets*. New York: Free Press.
- Burke, W and Spencer (1991). "Managers get a "C" in managing a change." *Training and Development Journal*. 45(5):87-92.
- Cummins, T. and Worley, L. (2005) *Organisations development and change*. Ohio: mason ltd
- Duru, E. (2009) *Personnel Management Guideline*. A Lecture Memographe (unpublished).
- Dunphy, D & Stace, A (1988). "Transformational and Coercive Strategies for Planned Organizational Change: Beyond the OD Model." *Organization Studies Journal* 9(3): 3170-334
- E-reward (2008). Survey of Grade and pay Structures, e-reward.co.uk; Stockport.
- Guest, D (1987). Human Resources Management Industry Relations. *Journal of Management Studies*. 24(5):503-521.
- Guest, D. and Conway, N. (1997). *Employee Motivation and the Psychological Contract*, IPD, London.
- Gratton, L. Hailey, V, and Truss, C (2009). *Strategic Human Resource Management* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hamel, G and Prahalad, C (1994). *Competing for the future*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- Hailey, P. Stiles, C (2000). *Strategic Human Resource Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hales, C (1993). *Managing through Organization-The management process, forms of organization and the work of managers*. London: Routledge.
- Hendry, C and Pettigrew, A (1986). Practice of Strategic HRM. *Personnel Review*, 15 (5) 3-8
- Huselid, A (1995). The impact of HRM practices on turnover, productivity and Financial performance. *Academy of Management journal* 38 (635): 672- 701.
- Huczynski, A and Buchanan, D.(2007) *Organizational Behaviour* 6th Edition. HarLow: Prentice Hall Ltd.
- Lemins, K. (1951) *Field Theory in Social Sciences*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kochan, T and Dyer, L (1993) *Managing Transformational change: The Role of Human Resource Professionals*. *International Journal of HRM*, 4 (5): 69-90
- Kotter, J. (1990). "What Leaders Really Do." *Harvard Business Review*. 60(6):156- 167
- Kouzes, J and Posner, Z (1987). *The Leadership Challenge How to get Extraordinary organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kanter, R (2004). *The Change Masters*, London: Allen & Unwin ltd.
- Lake, O (2012) *Organizational Capability: Competing from the inside out*. New York Wiley Ltd.
- Legge, K (1978). *Power, Innovation and Problem Solving in Personnel Management*. Maidenhead: Mc Grawl.
- Legge, K (1995). *Human Resource Management: Rhetoric's and Realities*. London: Mac Millan

- Lewins, K. (1951) *Field Theory in Social Sciences*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mathew, J. (1990) *Tools of Change*. Sydney: Pluto press.
- Marchington, M and Grugulis, I. (2000) "Best Practices". *Human Resource Management. International Journal of HRM*, 11 (6) 1104-1124
- Mc Nickel, C and Cameron, N (2003) *The Impact of Flexible Delivery of Human Resource Practices*. NCVER, Adelaide.
- Nadier, D & Tushman, L. (1989). "Organizational Frame Bending: Principle for Managing Reorientation." *Academy of Management Executive*. 3(3): 194-204
- Nadler, D & Tushman, L (1995). *Type of organizational change: from incremental Improvement to discontinuous transformation*. San Francisco: Ukel publishes ltd.
- Ndubisi (2000) *Fundamentals of Management* Enugu: Aki Press.
- Onah, F (2010). *Human Resource Management*. Enugu: John Jacobs Ltd.
- Onwe, O; Ibeogu, S and Anigbata, D. (2015). *The challenges of Managing Workforce Diversity in 21st Century organization*. *Business Management Journal* 2(2) 110-115.
- Pascale, R. (1990) *managing on the edge*. London: Viking
- Pettigrew, A. and Whipp, R. (1991) *Managing Change for competitive success*, Blackwell: Oxford
- Pettigrew, A and Whipp, R (1991). *Managing change for Competitive success*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pfeffer, J (1998). *The Human Equation: Building Profits and putting people first*. Boston: Harvard Business school Press.
- Porter, M (1985). *Competitive Advantage: Creating and sustaining superior Performance* Newyork: Free Press.
- Purcell, J. (1999). *Best Practice or Best fit: Chimera or cul-de-sac*. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 9 (3): 26-41.
- Quinn, J. (1980). *Managing Strategic changes*. *Sloane Management Reviews*. 11 (4/5) pp 3-30.
- Richardson, R and Thompson, M (1999) *The impact of people management practices on business performance. A literature review*, institute of personnel and development, London.
- Schuler, R (1996). *Strategic HRM and Industrial Relations*. *Human Relations Reviews*, 42(2) 156-184.
- Schein, E (1985). *Organizational Culture and leadership*. San Francisco. Jossey- Bass
- Seigal, W (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Siegal, W (1996) "Understanding the Management of Change: An overview of managers' perspectives and assumptions in the 1990's" *Journal of Organizational change Management*. 9 (6): 54-80.
- Sisson, K (1990). *Introducing the HRM*. *Journal of Human Resource Management*. 1(1) 1-11.
- Tichy, N (1983). *Managing Strategic Change : Technical, Political and Cultural Dynamics*. New York: Wiley Ltd
- Ukeje, I. O.; Abraham, E. A and Ndukwe, C. (2015) *Effects of Leadership Influence on Labour Management Relations: case study of Ebonyi State University, southeastern Nigeria*. *International Journal of Advancement in Research and Technology (IJOART)* Vol. 4 (7): 44-50. http://www.ijoart.org/research-paper-publishing_july-2015.shtml
- Ukeje, I. O and Anigbata, D. O. (2015). *Strategic Human Resource Management. A lecture memographe*. Unpublished.
- Ulrich, D. (1997). *Human Resource Champions*. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Ulrich, D. (1998). *A new mandate for Human Resources*. *Harvard Business Review- Jan-Feb*. pp124-134.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley ltd.
- Vandermerne, S and Birely (1997) "The corporate Entrepreneur: Leading Organizational transformation:" *Long Range Planning Journal*. 30 (3): 318-319.
- Walton, R (1985). *From Control to Commitment in the work place*. *Harvard. Business Review*, 62(2) 77-84.
- Wernerfelt, B. C (1984). *A resource-Based view of the firm*. *Strategic Management Journal* 5(2): 171-180.
- Willmott, H (1993). *Managing multi Organizational Culture in Modern times*. *Harvard Business Review*. March-April pp 77-84.
- Woodwards, J. (1968). *Resistance to change*. *Management International Review*. 8(78-93).
- Wood, S. (1999). *Human Resource Management and Performance*, *International. Journal of Management Reviews*, 1 (4) 397-413.