Journal of Strategic Management

Change Management and Innovation: A Case of Safaricom PLC and Yahoo Inc. Limited

Christine Namenya Egessa

ISSN: 2616-8472

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Strategic Management
Volume 8||Issue 2||Page 18-33||April||2024|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8472

Change Management and Innovation: A Case of Safaricom PLC and Yahoo Inc. Limited

Christine Namenya Egessa

PhD Student, Pan Africa Christian University

Email: cegessa@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Egessa, N., C. (2024). Change Management and Innovation: A Case of Safaricom PLC and Yahoo Inc. Limited. Journal of Strategic Management, 8(2), 18-33. https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t30145

Abstract

For organizations operating in today's ever-changing business environment, change is not only inevitable and unstoppable, but it is also one of the most critical success factors for any organization. Several factors influence change within organizations. These include fierce competition, innovation, unprecedented global crises, changing consumer trends, globalization, technological advancements, changes in internal and external laws and policies, and operational changes within the organization, among others. Faced with the urgency of change in their daily operations, organizations that can't adapt and seize growth opportunities are likely to be surpassed by agile competitors, hence they may incur losses or even fall completely if they cannot keep up with the competition. In light of this, organizational change can bring both negative and positive impacts on the performance of organizations, hence the need to manage it effectively. Managing change effectively is still a big challenge for many organizations today. For this reason, preparing for change effectively should be a top priority for all organizational managers as it plays a critical role in the performance of an organization. It can either elevate it or lead it to its downfall. This paper, therefore, undertakes a critical evaluation of the change management concept, including an understanding of what the concept entails in terms of its definition, and the core principles and models that constitute the subject matter and its relation to innovation. The paper further explores the success factors for change management as well as the critical factors that may contribute to its poor implementation. Lastly, drawing from both global and local examples, the paper analyzes some real-life success and failure stories of enterprises that attempted the change management process.

Keywords: *Change Management, Innovation, Safaricom PLC, Yahoo Inc.*

1.0 Introduction

Change management is a critical process that enables organizations to effectively introduce and implement change. It is driven by innovation and involves strategies such as systems theory, participation, and empowerment, as well as the application of robust theories and cases (Sriboonnark, 2018; Krimi, 2022). Innovation, defined as the introduction of something new, necessitates effective change management for successful implementation (Euchner, 2013; Tandoğan, 2018). Leadership and management play a pivotal role in driving change and innovation, and organizations need to develop robust change management capabilities to thrive (Miller & Proctor, 2016). The concept of change management has garnered increasing attention in both scholarly and practitioner domains as organizations strive to navigate the complexities of adapting to dynamic changes (Stouten et al., 2018). Change management encompasses the processes, tools, and techniques employed by organizations to facilitate the transition from the current state to a desired future state (Asikhia et al., 2021). This often involves addressing the human and organizational aspects of change, such as employee resistance, communication, and the alignment of organizational systems and structures (Baran & Woznyj, 2020). The ability to manage change effectively is closely linked to an organization's capacity for innovation (Jaskyte, 2018). Innovation, which can manifest as process improvements, product development, or technological advancements, is often a driving force behind organizational change (Tidd & Bessant, 2020). Moreover, the successful implementation of innovative initiatives can be heavily influenced by the organization's change management capabilities (Imran et al., 2016).

Therefore, understanding the relationship between change management and innovation is crucial for organizations seeking to navigate the complex and dynamic business environment and achieve sustained competitive advantage. In the public sector, for instance, innovation in public administration involves introducing new processes, technologies, products, and values (Rocha & Zavale, 2021). The adoption of new management technologies and innovation is a key aspect of change management (Upadhyay, 2020). Change management is particularly important in innovation projects, helping to minimize resistance and solve problems (Amaral et al., 2020). Ultimately, effective change management can lead to increased job satisfaction and a sustainable competitive advantage (Helmold & Helmold, 2021). This paper undertakes a critical evaluation of the change management concept, including an understanding of what the concept entails in terms of its definition, and the core principles and models that constitute the subject matter and its relation to innovation (Cameron & Green, 2019). The paper further explores the success factors for change management as well as the critical factors that may contribute to its poor implementation. Lastly, drawing from both global and local examples, the paper analyzes some real-life success and failure stories of enterprises that attempted the change management process. The conclusions drawn from the lessons learned from these case studies provide a deeper and better understanding of the subject matter.

1.1 Organizational Change and Change Management in Organizations

In today's rapidly evolving business environment, organizations must undergo changes or transitions at various points in their operations to remain scalable and viable. These changes can range from merging with another organization, introducing innovative ideas or products, onboarding new employees, or exploring new markets. The impact of change on the trajectory of organizations is significant, making the effective management of change a top priority for all organizational managers (Krimi, 2022). Organizational change, as defined by Armstrong and

Taylor (2020), involves any alterations in structure, management, employees, processes, and other related activities within an organization. Lwakatare et al. (2019) view organizational change as the actions in which a company or business modifies a major component of its organization, such as its culture, the underlying technologies or infrastructure it uses to operate, or its internal processes. In contrast, Shivappa (2015) asserts that change doesn't always have to be drastic. It can also be adaptive, involving small, incremental changes that organizations adopt to address evolving needs. These changes are typically minor modifications and adjustments that managers fine-tune and implement to execute business strategies. An example of adaptive change in organizations can be updating the organization's computer operating systems to new versions. This change, while not drastic or major, helps improve the operations of the organization.

O'Reilly et al. (2019) suggest that organizational change is the movement of an organization from one state of affairs to another. It can take many forms, including changes in a company's structure, strategy, policies, procedures, technology, or culture. The change may be planned years in advance or may be forced upon an organization because of a shift in the environment. Organizational change can be radical, altering the way an organization operates, or it may be incremental, slowly changing the way things are done. Regardless of the type, change involves letting go of the old ways in which work is done and adjusting to the new ways (Samal & Chatterjee, 2020). Change management in an organizational context is defined as the systematic approach and application of knowledge, tools, and resources to deal with organizational change (Usman et al., 2023). According to Daniel (2019), it involves defining and adopting corporate strategies, structures, procedures, and technologies to handle changes in external conditions and the business environment. Effective change management goes beyond project management and technical tasks undertaken to enact organizational changes and involves leading the "people side" of major change within an organization. The primary goal of change management is to successfully implement new processes, products, and business strategies while minimizing negative outcomes. Bagga et al. (2023) similarly suggest that change management is the systematic approach that includes dealing with the transition or transformation of organizational goals, core values, processes, or technologies. Henne (2019) sees change management as the art of leading an organization during a change process, to achieve the desired change, without harming the human dimension of the employees in the organization. Blokland and Reniers (2021) state that alignment is crucial for the successful implementation of change and for the achievement of the desired outcomes.

According to Stouten et al. (2018), change management is a systematic approach to dealing with change from both the organization's and the individual's perspectives. It involves preparing, supporting, and assisting individuals, teams, and organizations in making organizational changes. The primary focus of change management is on managing the process of change, not the content of the change. It employs tools and techniques to manage the people side of change to achieve the required business outcomes. Change management incorporates organizational tools that can be utilized to help individuals make successful personal transitions, resulting in the adoption and realization of change (Prosci, 2018). On the other hand, innovation refers to the process of creating and implementing a new idea, method, or device. It involves translating an idea or invention into a good or service that creates value or for which customers will pay. Innovation involves the deliberate application of information, imagination, and initiative in deriving greater or different values from resources and includes all processes by which new ideas are generated and converted into useful products (Juliana et al., 2021). The key difference between the two lies in their goals and processes. Change management is about managing change in a way that minimizes disruption

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Strategic Management
Volume 8||Issue 2||Page 18-33||April||2024|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8472

and resistance and maximizes acceptance and efficiency. It’s about transitioning from one state to another. Innovation, on the other hand, is about creating something new and different that adds value. It’s about breaking new ground. However, these two concepts are interconnected. Effective change management can facilitate innovation by creating an environment that is receptive to change and encourages creativity and risk-taking. Conversely, innovation often requires change management to ensure that new ideas are implemented effectively and that the organization can adapt to new ways of doing things (Harrington, 2018).

1.2 Innovation and Change Management

Innovation can take many forms, including process and product improvement, new product development, technological advancements, and sustainability, among others. Olubitan (2023) asserts that innovation is "the outcome of a set of activities that use knowledge to create new value for those benefiting from its use." Innovation can also be defined as "Any new idea that has an effective and efficient implementation, to effect a change of a system's process or device or product that can be applied for an improved result than previously applied" (Zidan et al., 2018). According to Edwards-Schachter (2018), innovation in a broad sense involves "developing new processes, new products, or new organizational improvements for the industry. It can take many forms, but in every form, it tends to reduce unit costs and/or helps to expand market demand. On the other hand, change management in relation to innovation is "the systematic approach to deal with change, both from the perspective of an organization and on the individual level, proactively addressing adapting to change, controlling change, and effecting change" (Cabrilo et al., 2018). Cabrilo et al. (2018) further add that "the word 'innovation' does not only mean technological progress, but it includes the renewal of business models as well. One of the important elements of innovation is the creation of some kind of new knowledge and wisdom through the fusion of different ones, as new fusion meaning that in innovation, knowledge, and wisdom exist in intangible assets.

Innovation itself cannot be viewed as a competitive organizational strategy, but once well-articulated and analyzed, it can help organizations achieve a competitive edge over their rivals. Innovation can help employees generate new ideas for new services and products and enhance the day-to-day running of operations. Ideally, the significant role of innovation is to help an organization achieve a competitive advantage in the market by consistently introducing new products and services while simultaneously helping with incremental improvements of existing products and services. Through this, an organization gains the ability to compete effectively in the market by having a dominant position. Change management also helps an organization deal with the risks and uncertainties that come with innovation by evaluating the risks and making informed decisions about them. Gam (2015) argues "that innovation is inherently risky and always involves making big bets on unproven concepts. But most of the risks can be reduced by systematically testing the key questions about a new opportunity using focused experiments in the marketplace and managing the change needed to give an organization the competitive edge over its market rivals.

The main driving forces behind most of the changes witnessed over the past two centuries are attributed to innovation and new technologies. Therefore, identifying the need for change requires not only a detailed understanding of the organization's current operating environment but also a clear picture of how things should be and could be before deciding on an innovative idea. Understanding the business environment and the potential for future innovation requires consistent

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Strategic Management
Volume 8||Issue 2||Page 18-33||April||2024|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8472

and focused individuals regarding business intelligence acquisition activity. To make these changes, organizational leaders must consider several different factors (Gartner & Folkedal, 2018). The purpose of innovation in companies is to help them develop. Organizations that are creative demonstrate their resilience and flexibility to change, which is critical for their survival in today's marketplaces. The growth of innovation models utilized in businesses today can be traced back to this demand for adaptability and flexibility. Change drivers such as technological advancement, strong competition, and globalization demanded that organization leaders develop new concepts and ideas to meet ever-increasing customer and market expectations in ever-changing marketplaces (Stager, 2021).

1.3 Models of Innovation

Innovation models were created to describe the innovation processes in organizations because they give the structures for enabling and detecting the need for change in organizations by providing values that aid in the long-term growth and development of companies. The models of innovation state that each business's innovation process is unique, based on the demands of the organization, and those innovation models are never unidirectional. Because of the diversity of demands and the uniqueness of each business, no single innovation model fits all, and the model chosen is typically dictated by the organization's innovation goals (Rogers, 2017). Due to the requirement to accommodate the demands of many customers, processes, and stakeholders, innovation models have evolved from generation to generation. They have progressed from simple to complicated models that cater to the various demands of corporations and their shareholders over time. This part of the paper will focus on the six-generation innovation models identified by Roy Rothwell in 1994, who argued that the integration and complexity of innovation models have expanded with each generation as they help to clearly show the importance of effective change management for organizations as they move from one generation to another and adopt themselves to deal with the needs of each generation. According to Rothwell (1994), the difficulties and complexity of innovation models were caused by the development of new practices that pushed businesses to adapt to numerous shifting settings while also coping with the flaws of past generations. Rothwell went on to say that the evolution of each model did not imply a replacement of previous models, but rather a coexistence of models that borrowed and shared aspects to build models that could be adopted by organizations to meet various settings.

1.3.1 Technology Push Model (First Generation)

According to Barrett (2024) the first-generation model was the technology push model, which assumed that the formation of new industries as a result of technological advancements forced established sectors to innovate and adopt new machinery to enhance productivity. The regeneration provided greater employment, increased consumption of products and services, and prosperity to the industries as a result of the technology push. Electronics and vehicles were adopted as industries attempted to fulfill the expectations of their customers by replacing outdated technology with new ones. One of the model's assumptions is that many of our society's problems can be handled via scientific progress and that a crucial indication of corporate success is a company's capacity to innovate to fulfill customer expectations. To effectively manage inventive change, the first-generation innovation model argued that by investing in significant research and development, firms boosted their chances of successfully developing new goods that suit the demands of their present markets (Fang, 2023).

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Strategic Management
Volume 8||Issue 2||Page 18-33||April||2024|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8472

1.3.2 Market Pull Model (Second Generation)

The Market Pull model, also known as the second-generation innovation paradigm, proposes that innovation is driven by customer demand and should be led by market demands. Companies may utilize R&D data to determine customer demands and align their innovation aims with those needs. Simply defined, the introduction of a new product or service should be based on the demands of the customers for such products or services. The Market Pull innovation model shares some similarities with the Technological Push model. Both models believe that innovation occurs in a linear progression and to manage it effectively organizations can use research and development to assess the risk, needs, and wants of the market (Trott, 2017).

1.3.3 Coupling or Chain Linking Model (Third Generation)

The third-generation model otherwise known as the coupling, linking, or interactive model asserts that to manage organizational change brought on by innovation effectively, there is a need to acknowledge the complexities of innovation. Adding to the assumptions of the previous first and second-generation models, the coupling model further argues that both technology and market demands necessitated the need for organizations to innovate hence they were both crucial factors to be considered for successful innovation (Rothwell, 1994).

1.3.4 System Models (The fourth generation)

The system model posits that effective organizational innovation is the result of several systems functioning together as a single entity. It goes on to say that enterprises who can't afford to innovate in-house might gain from collaborations with other businesses. The system concept has several advantages, including collective learning for all members, combining expertise to address innovation difficulties, decreased innovation costs and time, and networking benefits for small businesses.

1.3.5 Evolutionary Models (The fifth generation)

The evolution model asserts that for innovation to occur, technical flaws must drive the demand for change and that innovation is influenced by numerous variables other than its price. The model elucidates the decision-making process that occurs during the development of new products. The external and internal environment, as well as government rules and standards, all have an impact on the decision-making process for innovation to emerge. The model's originality comes from the fact that it recognizes the emergence of new ideas that lead to improved productivity and variety in organizations. It also contends that businesses must change to survive and adapt to keep their competitive advantage. According to Massaro et al., (2015), the model also contends that businesses must change to survive and adapt to keep their competitive advantage. It also pushes businesses to do studies into the flaws in the external environment and come up with creative solutions to these problems as part of their successful innovation processes.

1.3.6 The Innovative Milieu (The sixth generation)

This model is the sixth-generation model of innovation, and its fundamental assumptions are that innovation does not happen in a vacuum, but rather requires resources that are customized to certain areas' demands. Knowing about certain areas and their customer demands leads to the creation of unique concepts that are tailored to fulfill those needs. To effectively manage organizational change in the sixth generation, Trott, (2017) highlighted that "The actions influencing innovative milieu are not based on market demand but the movement and exchange of

https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t30145

goods, services, and information, among other ideas. Factors like productive work environments have influenced the capacity of innovative firms. Organizations now realize the power of a location in the innovative process. The natural characteristics of a location, climate, air quality, and quality of life directly impact the creative process. According to the model, the physical environment plays a role in an individual's innovativeness. Different localities give birth to innovative firms due to their different patterns, knowledge paths, and technology development. Therefore, firms have a greater chance of effectively innovating through networking and information sharing within a specific locality." (p. 34).

1.4 Why Innovation Fails

Due to the benefits it provides, particularly in terms of providing organizations with a competitive edge, innovation has become a buzzword for every organization, large or small, in developed or emerging markets. In today's technologically driven and fast-paced business environment, all organization leaders face two tough choices: innovate or fade into obscurity. Despite the dire consequences' organizations face if they fail to innovate, most fail to innovate because of the challenges that come with innovation. This section will discuss the reasons why innovations fail in organizations despite the planning that goes into them.

1.4.1 Thinking Short-term instead of Long-Term

One reason why innovation fails in many organizations is that most organizations tend to think short-term rather than long-term. This has dire consequences for organizations because, in the process of achieving their short-term goals, organizations tend to allocate too many resources, leaving less towards innovation and R&D, which is key to successful innovation in organizations (Trott, 2017).

1.4.2 Excessive Focus on Innovation Costs

An organization may fail to appreciate the importance of innovation by focusing too much on the cost of innovation rather than the benefits. Innovation can be expensive and time-consuming, and these two factors of cost implication and time implication can cause some organizations to shy away from the process of innovation by abandoning new products and services that may be beneficial to their success in the long run (Daft, 2014).

1.4.3 Lack of Strategic Alignment

Another potential threat to successful innovation would be the lack of strategic alignment, which makes it difficult to establish the level of change management necessary for achieving the change goals. According to Revenio (2016), "If all relevant parties involved are aligned around the business goals, they are more likely to be aligned with the components of innovation resulting in measurable business benefits."

1.4.4 Lack of Support by Management

The lack of executive buy-in will most certainly fail successful innovation. Having established that executives may often remain indifferent toward the importance of change management, it becomes even worse when they show indifference toward the innovation initiative itself (Quirke, 2017). "Even though they may sign off on the project, they may not be fully supportive of it and depict minimal involvement in the strategic project decisions. This most certainly fails as employees tend to emulate executives' attitudes and actions. To curb this, it is vital that the executive clearly describe the need for change to the employees, articulate the expected results, explain the costs

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Strategic Management
Volume 8||Issue 2||Page 18-33||April||2024|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8472

and consequences of delayed change, and lastly demonstrate the relationship between the proposed changes and the expected benefits. This ultimately becomes the most substantial step towards change, and it all hinges on effective and timely communication" (Fortunato et al., 2018).

1.4.5 Lack of Coordination and Cooperation

This is another problem area associated with innovation failure. Lack of proper communication with relevant employees can bring organizational fragmentation and conflicts between employees of different departments who are key to making a particular innovation successful. Deshler (2017) asserts that "it remains essential to identify the full breadth of the employees and how they will be affected when implementing any new processes or technology, and often, this goes deeper than upper-level managers. At the onset of any innovative initiative, there remains a strong likelihood that the changes will have an impact on employees across the organization. Having a robust change framework will allow an organization to map out these impacts with detail and clarity. This will then allow the development of a targeted communication plan that will equip and empower the employees with the tools and knowledge they need to confidently embrace the new normal at the organization and help them cooperate and coordinate to successfully effect the innovation."

1.4.6 Organization Culture

According to Desher (2018), innovations may sometimes fail not because of a lack of buy-in or strategy, but rather because the innovation is not aligned with the organization's culture. "When an organization allows culture and innovation to fall out of alignment, its company's entire foundation could be in jeopardy. Not only could this confuse and disorient employees, but an organization's public image could also take a hit, along with its turnover rate. Before the start of any business transformation or innovation, it is important to ensure that it corresponds with the brand image an organization projects and it is in line with the plans and the in-house culture cultivated within the organization. If it does not correspond, two choices remain: either the organization reconsiders the innovation or changes the culture at the organization.

1.5 Successful Management of Innovation Process in Organization

Many organizations undergo changes related to innovations at varying complexities, magnitudes, and degrees. Billions are invested annually to ensure successful innovation processes, as failure can have catastrophic impacts. Successful management of the innovation process is crucial for improving outcomes and helping organizations optimize opportunities from innovation. Managing innovation successfully entails understanding the success factors that affect outcomes. While their presence does not guarantee success, their absence contributes to failure (Miller & Miller, 2020). These success factors form a framework describing an organizational environment vital for innovative initiatives' success while providing a mechanism for improvement. The degree to which these practices are established and embedded indicates an organization's capability and maturity to innovate successfully. To achieve strategic advantages using innovation, managers should focus on four main types of changes that provide a competitive edge in global and domestic markets (Daft, 2014). Technological changes involve an organization's production process, knowledge, and skill base that enable distinctive competence, making production more efficient or increasing volume. These include work methods, equipment, and workflow. In today's business environments, organizations must embrace continuous technological development and acquisition to avoid becoming obsolete.

https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t30145

Product changes pertain to an organization's outputs. New products include small adaptations or entirely new lines, designed to increase market share or develop new markets, customers, or clients (Daft, 2014). These changes are generated from evolving consumer trends and observed market gaps, allowing organizations to modify offerings to meet demands and gain an edge over competitors. Structural changes involve the administrative domain, including organization structure, strategic management, policies, reward systems, labor relations, coordination devices, management information and control systems, and accounting and budgeting systems. These top-down changes are usually mandated by top management (Daft, 2014). Cultural changes refer to shifts in employees' values, attitudes, expectations, beliefs, abilities, and behavior – changes in mindset rather than technology, structure, or products (Daft, 2014). A new product may require production technology changes, or a structural change may necessitate new employee skills, as organizations are interdependent systems where changing one part often impacts others.

1.6 Innovation and Change Management Bad Practice - A Case of Yahoo

One good example of how change management and innovation have taken a giant company to its grave is the story of Yahoo. Yahoo is a web services portal operated by Yahoo Inc which is currently owned by Apollo Global Management and Verizon Communications and is headquartered in Sunnyvale, California, United States. This was after Apollo Funds completed its 90% acquisition of Yahoo in May 2021 and Verizon Communications retained a 10% stake in the ownership. Yahoo, once the most popular website on the internet, offers a wide range of online services which include email, news, finance, weather, and search. Once the face and entry point of the internet, Yahoo's change and innovation management have seen the giant company fall from its highest-performing moments to the point where it has become a subsidiary company that was recently sold at a loss.

Yahoo was founded back in the year 1994 by David Filo and Jerry Yang who were electrical engineering students at Stanford University. At first, the two started with a directory of other websites on the internet and called it "Jerry and David's guide to the World Wide Web". After getting more than one million hits and seeing a huge business potential in their website, Jerry and David later renamed the website to Yahoo and incorporated Yahoo Inc in early 1995. After raising a number of venture capital, Yahoo became a public company in 1996 and raised more capital through the selling of 2.6 million shares at USD 13 each. In the late 1990s, Yahoo went through huge growth and in the process made some huge acquisitions. One of the most important acquisitions the company made was Rocket Mail which was part of Yahoo's acquisition of Four11 online communication company. Rocket Mail was then renamed Yahoo Mail which later became the leading email service provider on the internet. Yahoo Inc went on to make more and more acquisitions which expanded its business offers to news, finance, sports, weather, search, entertainment, shopping, and more. This expansion saw its share price grow to its highest ever value of USD 118.75 per share in the year 2000.

In 2001 after the dot-com bubble period, Yahoo started facing challenges. The dot-com bubble was a period between 1995 to 2000 when investors excitedly put most of their investments into internet-based startups with the hope of a higher return on investments in the future. And while many of the startups never made it past the dot-com bubble, Yahoo was among the companies that survived that period. However, after the period Yahoo's stock price went to its lowest value of USD 8.11 in 2001. In 2004 Yahoo launched its own search engine after failing to acquire Google for USD 3 billion in the year 2002. This was also after having a short-term deal with Google where

Yahoo tapped onto Google's search engine services for searches that were made on Yahoo's website. In 2008, Microsoft came in with the interest in acquiring Yahoo and offered the latter an acquisition deal of USD 44.6 billion after several failed attempts. Yahoo denied the offer. The two companies however reached a search engine partnership deal and came up with Bing search in 2009. Bing was intended to compete and beat Google search. Yahoo's failure started in the year 2012 while the company continued replacing its Chief Executive Officers and making more and more acquisitions. The implementation of strategies of change and innovation in the company became more and more intense with the hope that Yahoo would regain its popular presence on the internet. Unfortunately, mistakes such as poor corporate governance, lack of strategic focus, and over-paid and poor acquisition deals, made the company continue losing its revenue market shares to Facebook and Google.

One of the main reasons as to why Yahoo kept falling from its seat at the top of the market was poor corporate governance. Yahoo's fall was clearly visible before it even happened and its situation was possible to resolve with proper changes to their products and governance. However, Yahoo continued making poor decisions which included excessive change of CEOs, incompetent board of directors and poor decision making like higher wages at a time the company was collapsing (Mahmood, 2016). The top seat at the corporate leadership of Yahoo has been held by CEOs and interim CEOs from 1995 to date. However, the pace at which the leadership of the company has been changing has been so fast with about eight different CEOs leading the company in a ten-year period. Yahoo kept changing its leadership with the hope that new ideas would finally earn the company better market share. But this was not the case and new CEOs kept repeating the same mistakes that were in existence in the first place (Jacques et al., 2013). According to news by The Guardian, Yahoo activist investors were disappointed by the board of directors claiming the board were mishandling finances and making poor decisions which included egregious hiring processes and compensations, poor execution of management, and lack of oversight and accountability, which they claimed were the reason the company was recording poor financial performances. The shareholders of the company were demanding the entire board of directors to be fired. Yahoo's CEOs, especially Marissa Mayer, were among the top paid CEOs and this did not change even at a time the company was struggling. The compensations of the leadership and its hiring processes also received huge criticism from its shareholders who were not happy with their return on investments. But this was at the expense of the company's staff who were laid off more than once.

Yahoo's content strategy was mainly focused on providing a consolidated news platform to sell its advertisements campaigns. While this was a much-needed product at first, things started changing with the invention of social media. People stopped going to Yahoo for news and focused on their social media platforms which were easily accessed on smartphones. With time Yahoo's products started becoming irrelevant and one would quickly question its existence. And as much as this was clear, Yahoo management did not opt for adjusting its online presence to comply with the new demands, like starting social media-oriented products or similar. They kept on having more and more focus on improving their existing products. Major changes to Yahoo included improving their email applications and changing the layout of their home page. However, this was not enough (Johnson, 2016). Yahoo played to be a one stop shop for everything with products ranging from email, search, weather, news, entertainment, and so on. However, this did not play well with not having a market segment focus. And while its competitors were focusing on selected market segments, Yahoo was trying to do it all. This was another poor strategy by the company and we can argue that Yahoo did not play to win (Mahmood, 2016). Over the years Yahoo depended mostly on acquisition for its product range and little did the company give focus on developing its products from scratch. Most of these acquisitions' relevance were questionable. Yahoo made a poor decision to acquire products that were not potentially profitable and it also overpaid for the deals. Apart from poor acquisitions, Yahoo also made partnership decisions that did not fully support its market growth and goals. The partnerships did not fully address Yahoo's interests and this also led to its further downfall (McGrooran, 2016).

1.7 Innovation and Change Management Best Practice - A Case of Safaricom PLC

Safaricom PLC is Kenya's largest and most successful telecommunications company, dominating 65% of the market as of 2020. Its innovation, particularly with its revolutionary M-Pesa mobile money transfer service, has allowed it to gain a massive competitive edge. M-Pesa identified and filled "a massive hole in the market" by granting financial access to the unbanked majority of Kenyans (Business Today, 2020). Safaricom's wide range of consumer-centric products and services, tailored pricing and bundles, and reliable customer service have all contributed to its market dominance over rivals like Airtel and Telkom Kenya. A key factor behind Safaricom's success is its commitment to continuous innovation across all aspects of its business. It has integrated the UN Sustainable Development Goals into its corporate strategy to drive meaningful innovation (Safaricom, 2021). Technological innovation is viewed as central, with a focus on developing innovative digital products/services to meet evolving customer needs and stay ahead of competitors (Safaricom, 2020). Strategic partnerships, such as with banks to expand mobile banking services like M-Shwari, have spawned many successful innovations (Daily Nation, 2020). Robust governance and risk management frameworks aligned with ISO 31000 enable Safaricom to proactively identify and mitigate risks stemming from disruption and change (Safaricom, 2018).

Safaricom understands that its success hinges on its people - employees, customers, and other stakeholders. It has tailored engagement processes for each stakeholder group to incorporate their insights into decision-making (Safaricom, 2020). Innovative tools like customer satisfaction monitors guide product development to meet evolving consumer needs (Nyogesa, 2017). Safaricom also transforms lives through community initiatives under its corporate social responsibility, aligning its strategy with Kenyan culture and diversity. Employees are nurtured through training at the Digital Academy to continually upgrade their skills for the changing digital landscape (Safaricom, 2021). Another pillar of Safaricom's success is its comprehensive and innovative approach to change management. It aims to create an agile, responsive organization that can quickly adapt processes, products, services and skillsets to technological disruption and market shifts. From product naming to its workplace culture, Safaricom embeds innovation and an embrace of change throughout all facets of its business. It views change management not just as an operational necessity, but as a core driver of its competitive advantage and sustained market leadership (Nyongesa, 2017). Therefore, Safaricom's phenomenal ascent is attributed to its innovation excellence spanning products like M-Pesa, technological capabilities, stakeholder engagement, corporate strategy alignment with sustainability goals, proactive risk management, digital upskilling of employees, and a comprehensive change management approach. Its customer-centric, sustainable and continually innovating business model has cemented Safaricom as Kenya's telecommunications leader and a prime example of an African company gaining global competitive advantage through pioneering innovation (Bhadury et al., 2000; Nyongesa, 2017; Safaricom 2018, 2020, 2021).

1.8 Conclusion

Change is unavoidable and an inevitable aspect for all organizations seeking to survive in the current business environment. Change can be caused by a number of factors that exist in the internal and external environment of the organization and can have a positive and negative impact to the performance of the organization as shown by our case studies depending on how it is managed by the organizations. Therefore, effective management of change brought on innovation should be a top priority for all organization managers. As seen through the success of Safaricom PLC in the Kenyan and global markets, effective management of change provides an organization with several benefits including gaining a competitive edge against its rivals. Additionally, innovation and change help organizations respond quickly to the ever-changing market and consumer demands hence help organizations realize significance of change and the opportunities it presents organizations if managed properly.

REFERENCES

Amaral, R. E., Brito, J., Buckman, M., Drake, E., Ilatova, E., Rice, P., ... & Abraham, Y. S. (2020). Waste management and operational energy for sustainable buildings: a review. *Sustainability*, *12*(13), 5337. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135337

Amarantou, V., Kazakopoulou, S., Chatzoudes, D., & Chatzoglou, P. (2018). Resistance to change: an empirical investigation of its antecedents. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *31*(2), 426-450. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-05-2017-0196

Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.

Asikhia, O., Nneji, N., Olafenwa, A., & Owoeye, O. (2021). Change management and organisational performance: a review of literature. *International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management*, *3*, 6779.

Bagga, S. K., Gera, S., & Haque, S. N. (2023). The mediating role of organizational culture: Transformational leadership and change management in virtual teams. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, *28*(2), 120-131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2022.07.003

Baran, B. E., & Woznyj, H. M. (2020). Managing VUCA: The human dynamics of agility. *Organizational dynamics*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2020.100787

Barrett, H. (2024). *Towards a systems-based framework for understanding the diffusion of technology: A case study of a modest technological innovation in the multi-agency context of policing* (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University).

Beer, M. & Nohria, N. (2000). (Ed.), Breaking the code of change. Boston, Massachusetts. Harvard Business School Press.

Beer, M. and Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review*, May/June, pp. 133- 41.

Blokland, P., & Reniers, G. (2021). Achieving organisational alignment, safety and sustainable performance in organisations. *Sustainability*, *13*(18), 10400. https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810400

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The Social Self: On Being the Same and Different at the Same Time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*(5), 475–482. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167291175001

Burnes, B., (2009) Reflections: Ethics and Organizational Change – Time for a Return to Lewinian Values. *Journal of Change Management 9* 359-381. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010903360558

Cabrilo, S., Kianto, A., & Milic, B. (2018). The effect of IC components on innovation performance in Serbian companies. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, *48*(3), 448-466. https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-06-2016-0033

Cameron, E., & Green, M. (2019). *Making sense of change management: A complete guide to the models, tools and techniques of organizational change*. Kogan Page Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496408328821

Daniel, C. O. (2019). Effects of change management on the performance of firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Advances in Scientific Research and Engineering*, *5*(1), 59-64. https://doi.org/10.31695/IJASRE.2019.33065

Desher, A. A. (2018). Biofouling impacts on the environment and ship energy efficiency.

Deshler, R. (2017, November 7). The Dangers of a Misalignment between Culture and Strategy. *American Management Association Blog*. Retrieved from https://www.amanet.org

Dosi, G. (1999) 'Technological paradigms and technological trajectories.' Research Policy, 11: p.147-162. https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(82)90016-6

Edwards-Schachter, M. (2018). The nature and variety of innovation. *International Journal of Innovation Studies*, *2*(2), 65-79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijis.2018.08.004

Fang, Z. (2023). Assessing the impact of renewable energy investment, green technology innovation, and industrialization on sustainable development: A case study of China. *Renewable Energy*, *205*, 772-782. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2023.01.014

Fortunato, J. A., Gigliotti, R. A., & Ruben, B. D. (2018). Analysing the dynamics of crisis leadership in higher education: A study of racial incidents at the University of Missouri. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, *26*(4), 510-518. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12220

GAM, G. A. M. (2015). Innovation-Based Change Management. *Innovation*, *7*(32).

Gartner, E., & Folkedal, T. (2018). Navigating to a Successful Enterprise-Wide PMO Creation. *The Journal of Modern Project Management*, *5*(3).

Harrington, H. J. (2018). *Innovative change management (ICM): Preparing your organization for the new innovative culture*. Productivity Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351248556

Helmold, M., & Helmold, M. (2021). Change management as the trigger for new work. *New Work, Transformational and Virtual Leadership: Lessons from COVID-19 and Other Crises*, 31-43. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63315-8_3

Helmold, M., & Helmold, M. (2021). New office concepts in the post COVID-19 times. *New Work, Transformational and Virtual Leadership: Lessons from COVID-19 and Other Crises*, 79-89.

Henne, A. (2019). Analysis of the Transition from Traditional Closed Innovation Systems to Open Innovation.

Imran, M. K., Rehman, C. A., Aslam, U., & Bilal, A. R. (2016). What's organization knowledge management strategy for successful change implementation? *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *29*(7), 1097-1117. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-07-2015-0130

Jacques, D., Kepos, P., & Group., G. (2013). International directory of company histories. Volume 143 [electronic resource]. Detroit: St. James Press. [accessed 2 April 2022]

Jaskyte, K. (2018). Board attributes and processes, board effectiveness, and organizational innovation: Evidence from nonprofit organizations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *29*(5), 1098-1111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-017-9945-y

Johnson, L. (2016). Here's a Timeline of Yahoo's 22-Year History as a Digital Pioneer. Retrieved from Adweek: http://www.adweek.com/news/technology/heres -timelineyahoo-s-22-year-history-digital-pioneer-172663 [accessed 1 April 2022]. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2021.94095

Juliana, N. O., Hui, H. J., Clement, M., Solomon, E. N., & Elvis, O. K. (2021). The impact of creativity and innovation on entrepreneurship development: evidence from Nigeria. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, *9*(4), 1743-1770.

Krimi, M. (2022). Educational Reform: Change Implementation, Support and Management. https://doi.org/10.55454/rcsas.2.4.2022.001

Lwakatare, L. E., Kilamo, T., Karvonen, T., Sauvola, T., Heikkilä, V., Itkonen, J., ... & Lassenius, C. (2019). DevOps in practice: A multiple case study of five companies. *Information and Software Technology*, *114*, 217-230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2019.06.010

Mahmood, F. (2016). Yahoo's demise: The internet giant's failure is a story of missed opportunities. Retrieved from The Express Tribune: http://tribune.com.pk/story/1153035/yahoos -de mise-internet-giants-failure-storymissed-opportunities/ [accessed 31 April 2022] 587-604

Massaro Maurizio, Dumay John, Bagnoli Carlo (2015) , Where there is a will there is a way, Journal of Intellectual Capital; 2015, Vol. 16 Issue 3, p490-517, 28p, ISSN: 14691930. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-07-2014-0091

Miller, L., & Miller, A. F. (2020). Innovative work behavior through high-quality leadership. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, *12*(2), 219-236. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-04-2019-0042

O'Reilly, N. M., Robbins, P., & Scanlan, J. (2019). Dynamic capabilities and the entrepreneurial university: a perspective on the knowledge transfer capabilities of universities. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, *31*(3), 243-263. https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2018.1490510

Olubitan, J. O. (2023). Human Resources Development and Innovation Capability of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Ibadan Metropolis. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences Vol*, *24*(2b).

Quirke, B. (2017). *Making the connections: Using internal communication to turn strategy into action*. Routledge.

Revenio, J. (2016). The Impact of Change and Change Management in Achieving Corporate Goals and Objectives: Organizational Perspective. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) 5* 1233-1239

Rocha, J. O., & Zavale, G. J. (2021). Innovation and change in public administration. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, *9*(6), 285-297. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2021.96021

Rothwell, R. (1994). Towards the fifth-generation Innovation Process. International Marketing Review, 11, (1), 7-31. https://doi.org/10.1108/02651339410057491

Safaricom (2021). Annual Report. Available at https://www.safaricom.co.ke/annualreport_2021/ accessed 19/03/2022

Samal, A., & Chatterjee, D. (2020). Rethinking Organizational Change: Towards a Conceptual Framework. *South Asian Journal of Management*, *27*(2).

Shivappa, R. (2015). Change ManagementConcept, Process, Principles and Skills. Retrieved on March 29 2022, from http://www.slideshare.net/shivapparamakrishna/change -manage-dr-r-shivappa.

Sriboonnark, N. P. (2018). Innovation and change management. In *ASEAN/Asian Academic Society International Conference Proceeding Series* (pp. 756-764).

Stager, J. (2021). Testimony of Joshua Stager Deputy Director, New America's Open Technology Institute.

Stouten, J., Rousseau, D. M., & De Cremer, D. (2018). Successful organizational change: Integrating the management practice and scholarly literatures. *Academy of Management Annals*, *12*(2), 752-788. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0095

Sumita, Takayuki (2008):"Intellectual assets-based management for innovation", *Journal of Intellectual Capital, Vol. 9 Iss 2 pp. 206 – 227. https://doi.org/10.1108/14691930810870300*

Tandoğan, M. (2018). Corporation culture in businesses and innovation management. *Global Journal of Business, Economics and Management: Current Issues*, *8*(2), 49-60. https://doi.org/10.18844/gjbem.v8i2.3528

Tidd, J., & Bessant, J. R. (2020). *Managing innovation: integrating technological, market and organizational change*. John Wiley & Sons.

Trott, P (2017): Innovation Management and New Product Development, 6th Edition, Pearson

Upadhyay, N. (2020). Demystifying blockchain: A critical analysis of challenges, applications and opportunities. *International Journal of Information Management*, *54,* 102120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102120

Usman, T., Omotosho, F., & Galadima, J. (2023). Effect of Change Management On Attaining Corporate Goals And Objectives: A Critical Evaluation. *Fuoye Journal of Management, Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *2*(2).

Zidan, M. A., Strachan, J. P., & Lu, W. D. (2018). The future of electronics based on memristive systems. *Nature electronics*, *1*(1), 22-29. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41928-017-0006-8