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**Introduction**

In today´s markets, characterized by globalization and technology innovation, organizations must respond to new opportunities and threats faster than its competitors to survive and prosper. Therefore, the purpose of the essay is to look into why change is need and how to manage organizational changes in view to improve business performance. In other words, it means that leading strategy change is about changing the strategic courses of business to nail down a competitive advantage. Actually, leading change is the most critical leadership competences. In fact, leading strategy change requires identifying the need for, direction, motivation, communication, action, consolidations of gains by developing a change plan that maximizes commitment and minimizes resistance with view to a successful strategic change.

Indeed, it is worth highlight that managing organizational change requires, in first place, to identify the need for change, through continuous environment scanning and diagnose change problems. Secondly, it is critical to managing change that organization´s leaders be able to build an effective and proactive plan for strategic change, supported by a complete understanding of the external environment (markets and competition), because changes need to be tailored to a specific context and to also enlist the key organizational change teams. Thirdly, in developing a successful strategic change management, it is vital that organization´s leadership have a competence to create a compelling strategy, through which change initiatives will benefit from a strong vision, backed by a strong, highly aligned core change team, committed to implement a shared new vision, strategies and initiatives that will be rolled out to the entire organization. Fourth, the approach taken in leading successful implementation of strategic change, in first place, involves examining a combination of the extent of change and the nature of change to get the appropriate type of change in a given situation and the correspondent style of leadership as well as obtain an alignment of the organizational systems, organizational structure and processes with the new vision and the design of strategic change.

In effect, in aligning systems and structures with the new vision and strategy with the view to ensure successful execution, the key systems to be considered are the recruitment systems, the training systems and the performance appraisal and reward systems. In turn, in aligning structures, the key target includes selecting strong, executed oriented, individuals to key positions, maximize people commitment to change and minimize inertia and resistance to organizational change and take in account integrated changes initiatives that begin with new visions and strategy. In simple, the theme of leading strategy change approaches the importance of leadership roles, styles and emphasize the means for leading changes according to the context in which change actually occurs.

**Description:**

In view of leading strategy change in organizations, it is of value to recognize that most successful changes rely on various key elements such as: Leadership roles, styles and understanding the need for strategic change; Managerial awareness of the organizational context in which strategic change occurs; Levers or multiple means for leading strategic change; Leading types of strategy change aligned with the goals, objectives, the outcome of change in organizational structure and, organizational control systems,.

That said, it is worth to delve deeper into each of the key elements just mentioned with the view of leading different types of strategy change. To begin with, it is of essence to examine the leadership role and styles in design new strategies and managing organizational change. Actually, leadership is about managing strategic change. In effect, strategic leadership has a central role in inspiring people inside organization to realize their personal and combined potential in order of meeting the challenges of strategic change.

However, today, leadership is associated with the involvement of managers at different levels in an organization, whatever their position within the organizational hierarchical structure. That is to say, that leadership occurs at different levels and can be manifested in many different forms to contribute to strategic change. Indeed, leadership role is of utmost importance as it brings to the organization the quality, the motivation, the vision and the ability to getting along with other people in a supportive and emphatic manner, but always taking in consideration the specific context the organization are in.

That said, in addressing the theme of leading strategic change, it is of value to start with the top managers levels. Indeed, in most organizations, leading strategic change is commonly related with top management responsibilities. Thereby, the three key roles for top managers are specifically, conceiving future strategy; aligning the entire organization to deliver the new intended strategy; personify change or being and expression of change.

Thereof, to be specific, conceiving future strategy is associated with the role of top managers to ensure the development a clear and persuasive vision of the future and communicate it, in such a way as to allow easy and accurate perception or interpretation of a strategy to achieve, both internally and to external stakeholders. Actually, in practice, although strategic change may be initiated by top managers, however it is necessary that key internal and external stakeholders must share in the development of strong vision and strategy.

Besides, it is top manager’s role to align the entire organization, especially the core change team, to overcome challenges and deliver the new intended strategy, benefiting from a strong vision. In fact, the process of developing a strategy backed by highly aligned core change team, usually a time-consuming, because it involves a rigorous process of information sharing and dialogue amongst key stakeholders is crucial in leading strategic change.

Moreover, the need for top managers to become and expression of change means that it is equally important for them to be seen within the organization and also by external stakeholders as individuals who embody future strategy and a strategy change plan. In truth, strong planning practice is critical to strategic change process. Afterwards, the top managers, should meet the fundamental qualities of good leaders, in particular, to show the ability to energize their audience through enthusiasm, and confidence in success; to have an ability to generate and communicate compelling visions; to have the ability to interact with people to provide encouragement or emotional help and showing an ability to understand and share the feelings of others in the organization.

On the other hand, in practice, middle managers have multiple roles, in the process of leading and management strategy change. Indeed, middles manager’s approaches to managing organization strategic change encompasses critical competences to ensure that resources are allocated and controlled properly in order to monitor the performance and behavior of the organization workforce, with the view to implement top management strategic change plans.

In this sense, it worth to emphasize that middle manager roles in the context of managing strategic change. Thus, for instance, because middle managers usually are better positioned to be aware of market and technology changes, they are able to readily identify the need for change and likely blockage to change. As such, they are well placed to advise more senior managers on the need for change within the organization and subsequently to build proactive plans rather than reactive ones.

Besides, middle managers have a crucial role of understanding and feel an ownership of top management intended strategy direction to be able to properly convey and disseminate to all members of the organization at lower levels. Consequently, this way allows strategic change plans to be supported by employees who are key actors within organization relations.

In addition to, it should be point out that usually the need for reinterpretation and adjustment of strategic responses comes from the external environment. That said, bearing in mind that middle managers are in day-to-day, scanning the external environments, in terms of relationship with suppliers, customers, markets and competition and also by collecting information from employees across the organization through interviews, surveys, formal assessment, and so on, they are well qualified to reinterpret and build an effective adjustment of strategic responses as events show up.

In brief, it means that in accordance with reality, middle managers, at a local level, exercise the roles of aligning and personifying to a more bottom-up view of change, just like more senior managers do at top-down perspectives.

In the meantime, it should be noted that the approach to leadership involved in a strategic change focuses attention on the functions which will lead to effective performance by any workforce engaged in such strategic change. Accordingly, the functions of leadership while carrying out strategic changes is associated with leader´s behaviors in terms of how the leader´s behavior exert influence on building and maintaining the morale, team spirit, relationship among workforce, standards, discipline, communication and training within a working unit and regarding to what leaders do to define specific work tasks, organize the work, responsibilities, duties, satisfy the needs of the individual in the organization, with view to involve and persuade the workforce to undertake the strategic change by adjusting the leadership style as needed.

In truth, the best results of strategic changes are related to the ability of leaders to actively stimulate the work force on the high morale, a spirit of involvement and cooperation and willingness to accomplish defined tasks. Above all, this gives rise to the importance of the leader style while leading strategic change. In order to understand, it is of value to refer to the book written by Mullins, Laurie J., Christy, Gill, Management & Organizational Behavior (2013), page 375, Tenth Edition. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited *who* defines Leadership Style *as “the way in which the functions of leadership are carried out, the way in which the manager typically behaves towards members of the group”.*

In fact, the workforce in organization is more likely to work effectively for leaders who adopt a determined styles of leadership in detriment to others. Indeed, there are a broad framework of leadership styles to influence the behavior and actions of people at work, in terms of persuasion, a power relationship, as an instrument of goal achievement.

Moving along the strategic leadership style, the leader may be characterized according to the way of to carry out strategic change in terms of his behavior in motivating influence of the workforce; the extent to which leadership gives directions of actions of workforce, establish goals for them and set their roles and provides guidance to carry out tasks to smooth the path to the attainment of goals and the extent to which leader involves in two-way communication with workforces in view of helping and encouraging.

In an attempt to influence workforces’ perception, motivation and smooth the path to achieve successful strategic change, there are different types of styles of leading change, commonly identified as persuasive leadership styles; collaboration style; participation style, directive style.

Therefore, at this point, it is worth to delve deeper into each of leadership styles. At first, the persuasive style is related to the ways to convince the workforce in charge to undertake strategic change and making sure they understood the need for change and that it is of vital importance to enact the change. In turn, the collaborative style refers to the involvement of all those employees especially influenced by strategic change in configuring the agenda to change. On the other hand, under participation style, leadership hold the coordination of strategic change process by monitoring its development and make sure it achieves the desired aim. Finally, the directive style approach calls for the use of personal authority to establish clarity on strategic vision and communicate to the workforce how change will take place to workforce who are assigned with executing strategy change.

However, despite of the many types of leadership styles, in leading strategic change development, there is no single style appropriate to all contexts the organization face, that suit different interests of group of people.

Therefore, it should be noted that in leading strategic change, leadership style can vary at different times according to various situational factors such as the personal characteristics of the workforce and the nature of tasks and the context of change. In other words, the strategic change leaders are the ones who have the ability to practice different types of leadership style by adjusting them to the context of change the organization may face. Indeed, in this regard the book written by Johnson, Gerry and Whittington and Scholes, Kevan and Angwin, Duncan and Regnér, Patrick, Exploring Strategy (2014), page 468. Tenth Edition. United Kingdom. Pearson Education Limited, pointed out that “*successful strategic leaders adjust their leadership styles to the context they face”.*

That is to say, in practice the actions of leaders while undertaking strategic change can always be adjust to cope with organization situation or context, either organization requires a transformational change or transactional change instead.

In practice, transformational organizational change, focus on leadership approach to build a clear vision on what are the key challenges the organization actually face, identify and keep collective organization values to assist in attaining that vision and stimulate the workforce to achieve it. In true, usually, transformational change is needed when the workforce and management understand that organization faces uncertainties, which requires leaders to impact the workforces’ motivation and wider organization performance.

That said, if leading change is to be effective, it is required in first instance to diagnosis the contextual features in which changes happens, in order to adopt the appropriate approach to leading change. Actually, depending upon the organizational contexts in which changes happen. Accordingly, styles of leading change may differ in different contexts to help the change process. Therefore, in designing change programs it is required to identify the contextual features, which may give light to identify the more appropriate leading style. In fact, diagnosing the change context helps to design the strategic change program and therefore, it facilitates to identify the leading style required in different circumstances.

Moreover, styles of change leadership to be adopted in a given circumstances can be adopted by examining the following circumstantial aspects:

* how much time is available for change, either immediate or years away;
* regarding the wideness and depth, to what extent the organization change is required in terms of people contribution throughout the organization and culture;
* what organizational expertise, motivation and other resources need to be preserved; how diverse is the organization in terms of experiences, opinions and views;
* what are the available resources and management time for change; who should assume the power to implement change;
* how capable is the organization to execute changes if rely on management past experience to lead changes or based on the willingness the workforce to change;
* how employees feel the need for change throughout the organization and what abilities willingness employees have to undertake change.

Consequently, appropriate leadership style should be adopted according to a particular context feature. For example, if there is a need for rapid change or drive the change agenda, to meet external stakeholders, like in the case the organization business front on imminent decline in profits from quick changes in its market, a directive leadership style may be more appropriate. While this may be true, in a different context where management of the organization have time to plan change thoroughly, a more persuasive or supportive leadership style, which involves training, education and coaching can be adopted.

Meanwhile, in a context where there is high level of managerial and employee’s capability to carry on change make sense to adopted a collaboration or supportive leadership style. Conversely, in a context where both management capability and workforce readiness is low, then time availability is of essence in order to build capability and readiness for change, then it is worth to choose to take up a directive style, if change requires immediate action or attention.

However, in circumstances characterized by high managerial capability and low workforce readiness to execute strategic change it may be of value to embrace a participation style, in which strategic leader retain overall responsibility for change and at same time involves member of the organization in the change.

In brief, diagnosing the change context indicates that changes have to be managed in stages. Indeed, in order to succeed with change initiatives, leading strategic change occurs by adopting different leadership styles, according to a particular context the organization is in.

**General Analysis**

The challenges most leaders face while leading strategic change is to translate change initiatives into reality through building their workforce. In fact, converting most strategic change into desired outcomes, generally rely on multiple methods for leading change. Accordingly, it is essential that leadership knows how important is to adopt distinct styles of leadership in line with the different context, the need to satisfy of all stakeholder’s interests. Beyond that, it equally important that leadership knows what are the levers for strategic change and how they might be recognized.

Actually, some important means for leading change depend on a clear vision of what winning in the way it is desired, looks like. Indeed, with a simple and clear vision of what successful change looks like, owned by management, the workforce within the organization is usually motivated to deal with pain of doing something hard to relentlessly achieve great execution. It is equally important the outcome of change in organizational structure and control systems.

However, there are others levers that can be of use in giving a view of forces at work in an organization that act to refrain or promote change. Those forces acting to block or facilitate change initiatives is known as forcefield. Actually, forcefield allow to identify the current forces promoting strategic changes or against them. For this purpose, it is of value to proceed with forcefield analysis. That is, in examining forcefield, there are key questions that need to analyzed in order to develop strategic decisions. Such questions generally are:

* What particular feature of the current circumstances would obstruct or prevent change, and how can these be overcome?
* What particular characteristic of the present situation might support change in the wanted directions, and how might these be strengthened?
* What need to be put in place or build up to help change?

Thereof, can be helpful in leading strategy change to answer these key questions. At first, in addition of identifying the contextual features to be considered in designing the strategic change program, is also of value to map activity systems which provides the underlying support, underpinned on organization past success, in order to determine which future change might be edified. Secondly, stakeholder mapping can inform the power of distinct stakeholders to encourage change or to prevent changes. Thirly, to diagnosis the organizational culture in order of understanding the rooted culture such symbols, routines, structures, systems that can be employed for change or can turn out to be resistant to change. Last, but not least important is to examine others elements of an organization’s design such as purpose, mission, vision, objectives, style of leadership, staff, skills in a mutually support fashion.

Actually, leading strategy change is about to present compelling case for change, challenging the taken for grant, the need to change operational processes, routines and symbolic changes, as well as, to take in account the importance of power and political systems and the specifics tactics of change, being considered in terms of the particular context change or according to specific organization need for change.

That is to say, the adoption of a case for change that cope with leadership and management´s awareness through its feeling on how to meet shareholders expectations or overcome competition and on how to have a strong effect on employees´ personal well-being, customers, particular area or neighborhood working team and on society in general. In this respect, the book written by Johnson, Gerry and Whittington and Scholes, Kevan and Angwin, Duncan and Regnér, Patrick, Exploring Strategy (2014). Page 477. Tenth Edition. United Kingdom. Pearson Education Limited quote McKinsey & Co., the consultants in the following terms: *argue that too often the case for change is made in terms of top management´s perception of what is important: for example, meeting expectations of shareholders or beating competition.*

Additionally, it is worth to highlight that it is imperative that beyond the need to have a convinced case for change, which should be understandable for all stakeholders, leading to change means that beyond of the compelling case for change, it is crucial that leadership be able to put the convincing case in action in order to deliver the desired strategic change. In effect, the process of carrying through the desired strategic change, often require a need to challenge the embedded taken-for grant culture that can act against change. In short, a long-standing mindset may lead to a very opposition to change. In contrast, there are some cases, where significant strategic change occurred on the basis of encouraging people within the organization to challenge each other, as a way to overcome people mindset and cultural taken-for grant assumption.

On the other hand, it important to take in consideration the need to change operational processes, routines and the advantages of symbolic changes while leading change. Indeed, strategic changes may happen through a formalized planning operational change, changing routines and take advantages of the role of symbols surrounding people within the organization, in assisting to reshape their beliefs and expectations in change process.

In brief, the way in which planning operational change; challenging organizational process and day-to-day operational routines assumptions; lowest organization level-up approach changes to routines are connected have relevant impact on strategic change. Furthermore, leading strategy change, involves understanding the political context an organization is in and external factors in which an organization operate.

Thus, it is fundamental to take in account the importance of power and political systems in and throughout an organization, together with the specifics tactics of change to be employed to make possible the process of change. In practice, there are established process connected with leading and managing change from a political perspective or through the use of symbols, rituals and language to motivate the entire organization to make changes inevitable. In respect to the political perspective, it encompasses the following actions:

* Controlling or acquiring significant resources areas or areas of expertise to be used to overcome resistance, persuading others to accept change or to build readiness for change;
* Association with powerful stakeholders or seniors’ executives to aid to prevent opposition to change, because in some cases may be necessary to withdraw groups or individuals who pose resistance to change;
* Bring up alliances and networks of contracts and sympathizers to change using the stakeholder mapping to identify bases of alliance and more powerful resistant groups or less sympathetic to change, in view to attempt to overcome them and facilitates the acceptance of whole organization to change.

While this may be true, it should be noted that leading to change means that it is also particularly essential to consider at least two themes on the specifics tactics of change to be employed to facilitate the process of change. In truth, the themes on the specifics tactics of change relates to choosing the right time to tactically stimulate change. Indeed. For instance, if an organization experience periods of downturns or loss of profit, competitive treats or risk of takeover then, it may be the right time for change leaders to promote change. Also, in general there is always windows of opportunity in change process at the time the owner of organization or shareholders feel that there is an opportunity for improvement. For example, if organization´s owner feel there is a need to introduce a new chief executive to run the business, it is time to take as an opportunity to make more significant change. Likewise, the introduction of a new product or the incoming of a major competitive threat on the scene may give rise a window of opportunities to take over the change. Additionally, it is important for change leaders ensure that messages about change are adequately synchronized with change whether it is required rapid change or instead long-time horizons change.

In respect to the theme related to encouraging effect of visible quick wins, while strategic change program execution is underway. In this regard, it is worth to highlight that the identification of “low-hanging fruit” changes or quick payoff can be helpful, as they may constitute a visible indicator to demonstrate wins in the market, which can be used to galvanize the whole organization commitment to pursue with the intended strategy approach.

In fact, celebrating the achievement of realistic short-term objectives or new ways of doing things, help to maintain momentum and use them to set up the next more difficult round of executing change. Therefore, it is clear that being wise means to be prudent to not celebrate quick wins as absolute victories.

**Actualization**

In recent years renewed attention has been given to change management process. in fact, there is general recognition that leading strategic change becomes today one of the most critical management competencies in achieving organization competitive advantage. In truth, because competitive advantage is dependent on the speed at which the entire organization adapt to change. On the other hand, it should be noted that change management is about people.

Indeed, it is a change leaders’ task to help people quickly get rid of old attitudes, values and beliefs and through motivating influence towards new attitudes, values and beliefs within the organization and to draw attention to adapt, if necessary, the organizational systems, structures and processes, in order of achieving a successful strategy implementation.

To that effect, change leaders can practice different types of leadership styles at different times in varying circumstances. Thus, by practicing weather, the persuasive leadership styles, collaboration style, participation style or a directive style at distinct circumstances and at different times, change leader usually attempts to influence workforces´ perceptions and motivation, and smooth the way to their goals.

While this may be true, it is worth to note that in leading different types of strategic change, it is required an organizational diagnosis and an analysis on how the external environment may affect the design of strategic change. Such exercise, aims at having a complete understanding of organizational environment with view to anticipated change by keeping a vigilant external-focus and identify the need for change and build an effective strategy change.

Actually, the need for change usually comes from the external environment. Thus, in leading strategy change, it is crucial to bear in mind that the external environment is the permanently changing collection of forces external to the organization that constrain and influence the organization and delineate key opportunities for change.

Today, for instance, there is a common recognition that increase competition and technological change are increasing the power of customer. Therefore, in leading strategy change it important to recognize that today customer demand more for less. As a result, nowadays, becomes crucial for change leaders to adopt a customer-focused business strategy.

In addition, by looking into the most useful way of conceiving strategy change, there are many problems and challenges in the process of leading strategic change. Actually, in examining the particular challenges intrinsic to leading strategic change, it is worth to highlight some key challenges, change leaders may face today in leading successfully strategic change, typically they are:

* The control over strategy development;
* The speed of change in business environment,
* Capability of knowledge creation and knowledge sharing and cooperation between departments or business units;
* Challenges related to organizing for international context in terms of communication across wider geography,
* Coordination more diversity and building relationship across diverse cultures, being present around the world.

**Discussion:**

A strong planning practice is of essence to change management success. Actually, planning process will help, everyone throughout the organization, to understand the need for change, the need to create a proactive plan that are supported by the involvement of key organizational players and the need for change leaders to adopt distinct styles of leading strategic change in line with different contexts, which will be instrumental in successful leading strategic change.

However, in many cases it has been observed change program failure. Thereof, in examining why change programs failed of strategy change, it is of value to avoid the main pitfalls. In practice, there are reasons why change programs fail, which can serve as a general guidance to follow. Today, the common reasons for the failure of change programs include:

* Failing to continuously scanning the external environment, that is, markets and competition leads to not readily identify the need for change.
* Despite the importance of building a strong planning to change, the emphasis should be put on delivering it. To that effect, it is crucial to avoid an excessive preoccupation and discussion on planning the change program;
* To keep away from discourse about change linked to political game -playing. Otherwise, change process could become paralyzed, if emphasis is put on analysis and approvals of each proposal and reports related to the changes;
* Because strategic change often requires ongoing number of initiatives along the years, it is necessary to draw attention to a risk that the initial strategy change program gradually leave its tracks accidentally, due to loss of focus;
* There is a risk of reinterpreting the intended strategy change according to existing culture and not focused on what customer value. The risk can be avoided if change leaders be aware of that risk to be ready for providing specific direction;
* There is a possibility that the change program may not be understood by people in low levels of the organization, as such, people may feel changes not satisfying their expectations and not connected to their reality or on other hand, people may see changes being deviated from the intended strategy change. Thus, change leaders should be aware of that fact in order to take corrective action in due time;
* Change leaders, should pay attention to the danger that people may appear to comply with strategic change program, because in reality, they may not be committed with change.;
* While implementing change, change leaders should develop the ability to recognize that critical scrutiny and resistance to the change as a basis for involving others in the change program. It should be noted that a major problem in leading change is the tendency of people to hold on to existing ways of doing things;
* While in the process of change, change manager, should always cultivate the trust and respect of the workforce, especially through avoiding inconsistences between their actions, words and deeds, in order to avoid strong resistance to change.
* Beware of the risk associated with not making great efforts to objectively appreciate business issue and double-check dangerous assumption created by organization history of success.

**General Recommendation**

In today´s markets, characterized by globalization and technologies innovations, organizations must respond to new opportunities and threats faster than its competitors, to survive and prosper. For this purpose, leading strategy change is now one of the most critical leadership and managerial competences.

Accordingly, change leaders are likely be required to consider different approach to manage different types of strategic change. Thus, different types of strategic change might be taken whether change occur putting in place a new technology, launching a new product, promoting a cultural shift, or changing business model.

In effect, there are two ways of particular importance in deciding what types of strategic change are more practicable and desirable in a given situation. Actually, these two ways, determine the type of change, which affect the change leader´s role and influence. There are the extent of change and the nature or urgency of change. In concrete, the approach on the extent of change can help change leader to decide whether, a strategic change should occur as a realignment of strategy, that is, aligned with the existing business model and within the current culture, as for example launching new product but keeping business model and culture of organization as usual or the change which require a transformation, that is, relevant change in terms of business model and on organizational culture of the organization, as for instance, the move from focus on production for a manufacturer to customer-led, which require a major change.

On the other hand, the type of change can also be determined by the nature of change, which depends on the speed at which changes is intended to occur, whether rapid or incremental change. Indeed, rapid change usually take place in cases where organization faces crisis or there is an urgent need to change strategy direction. In turn, if happen to be enough time to build on employee’s skills, processes, routines and beliefs within the entire organization, it preferable to undertake a gradual or incremental change. To be clear, it means that through examining the extent of change required and the nature or urgency of change needed, leads to determine the appropriate leading type of change.

Thereupon, it is possible to define different types of change. Accordingly, depending on the extent of change, the type of change could be weather a realignment of strategy or a transformational strategy. At the same time, based on the urgency change needs to take place, it is determined whether to pursue an incremental or gradual change. As a result, it gives rise to four general types of strategy change, namely the adaptation, reconstruction/turnaround, revolution and evolution type of change.

Thereby, starting from adaptation type of change, it refers to a form of change in organizations in which, it is simultaneously required a realignment of a strategy combined with a gradual change. Actually, in practice most strategic change happens linked with gradual change, underpin on or improving what the organization has been doing in past and in accordance with the present model and existing organizational culture. In effect, the adaptation type of strategy, covers changes in terms of methods or production or product design, launches of new products, including related diversification.

On the other side, in circumstances where it is required both a rapid changes, and imply a major structural changes or major cost-cutting program to deal with a decline in profits or difficult market conditions, however, not demanding change on the business culture neither the organization culture, but it could drive the organization to closure or be taken over, the most common approach to change is the reconstruction or turnaround strategy.

Indeed, the situation where it is required a realignment of organization combined with the need for a rapid change, lead to adoption of a turnaround or reconstruction strategy, because the emphasis is on fastness of change and urgent cost cutting and or income generation.

Notwithstanding, the approach to a turnaround strategy come about because of four major elements of turnaround strategy in situations of:

* Crisis stabilization requiring urgent regain of control over the deteriorating position of organization;
* Key stakeholders’ feelings, require the need to change, especially at the chairman or chief executive levels and at the marketing, sales and finance in order of bringing in new management with different approach and experience in operating the business;
* The importance of change leaders to recognize that in turnover situation, it is absolutely necessary that key stakeholders such as bank, workforce be clearly informed of any improvement in economic, business, or other activity as change are being made or any eventual downturn, in order of managing successfully the turnaround strategy.
* The vital importance of change leaders to understand that in managing a turnaround situation, it is of essence to ensure focus on revenue generation activities, on key market segments and disregard markets that are not making sufficient financial in view of maximizing revenue.
* While managing a turnaround strategy, change leaders need to ponder the need of changing current capital structure by weather rising supplemental finance or renegotiating contractual arrangement with creditors.

For all that, change leaders are likely to be required to employ a directive style approach to manage a turnaround change strategy in a such way that substantial structural or a major cost cutting and revenue generation are required, in view of the organization to survive. For this purpose, under a turnaround situation, change leaders need to be able to prioritize actions that provides rapid and relevant benefits.

On the other hand, a reconstruction type of changes, involves sudden change but, without the need for a deep structural change on organization business model nor a radical change on the organization culture.

However, it may happen to be particular circumstances, where the need for change well might happen, not only for fast change, but transformation is fundamentally based on cultural change. This is referred to as a revolution change. In concrete, change may be required by focusing on processes or products no longer considered to be important or beneficial by customer, resulting in relative decline in a market. In such circumstances, it may happen that organization may experience observable problems understood by everybody within the organization, but the workforce finds difficult to discern a way forward to overcome such situation, which imply the need for a revolution change.

In such context, the nature of leading changing is likely to be a directive style and might encompass the following requirements:

* The need of clear strategic direction and actions supported by that direction;
* The eventual need to replace top managers (CEO´s and board members), in order of introducing new ideas, initiative and a new perspective not embedded in the existing culture in order of exploring new ways of doing things;
* The adoption of a directive leading style of change need to accompanied by the use of a persuasive style to convince workforce on the need to change and the participation style which includes specific expertise to deal with some aspects of change to overcome people resistance to change;
* The need to identify aspects of culture that have to be changed and those positive aspects that can be reinforced or developed;
* The need to monitor change which is frequently related to overall financial objective.

Another approach to type of change is known as evolution, which combines transformation and the incremental nature of change to allow time to bring up on skills, beliefs and routines within the entire organization. Actually, evolution is a change that envisage a transformational type of change based on incremental change on business models, combined with incremental culture change but, always in line with a changing environment. In general, evolution change focus attention on building on and exploiting existing strategic capabilities while developing new strategy capabilities.

Indeed, there are two ways of drawing up evolution change in strategy that bring about transformation combined with incremental change. On way of transformation change is through structural ambidexterity. In other words, it means exploring the organization capabilities built over time and at the same time to explore new capabilities in order to achieve and sustain competitive advantage.

Additionally, evolution change approach might be possible by promoting a culture of diversity rather than conformity. Moreover, while change leaders need to make decision on the way forward to be followed by everyone throughout the organization. Also, change leader need to stimulate and value different points of view in detriment of demanding uniformity of thinking.

Another way of transformational change is in terms of stage of evolution. Actually, evolution change is a process in which an organization moves from a given strategy to a changed strategy to be developed along many years. The evolution change involves examining the change process according to the change context. In this regard, there are some guiding principles to be followed by change leaders. Indeed, they are:

* Firstly, attention should be given to stages of transition in order to identify the readiness of workforce and capacity to initiate major changes and be ready to establish the change conditions if necessary;
* Secondly, it concerns to the ability to recognize that there may happen to be no immediate irreversible change impacts as it may occur on long-run, which effect would be difficult to reverse;
* Thirdly, it is mandatory to sustain top management consistent commitment;
* Fourth, it should be recognized that being a transformational change, it is required to undertake culture change. Under transformational type change, change leaders focuses attention on the most effective use of workforce to revitalize or transform organization.

Therefore, managing change as evolution in terms of moving from one strategy to a new one requires changes leaders to use consistently the persuasion and participation styles to lead people throughout the organization to perceive the need for change both rationally and emotionally and help in achieving what that change should be.

**Conclusion**

To this end, it of value to remind that leading strategy change is about to convince people, within the organization, of the new strategy and to enable and ensure people effective performance to achieve the new intended strategy.

Accordingly, the general point to bear in mind is to approach leading strategic change by emphasizes the following: strategic change leaders need to adopt different leadership styles of leading strategic change depending on different contexts and the way in which the involvement and interest of distinct groups or stakeholders are connected. In effect, the approach to leading change is related to organizational context.

The referred approach to leading strategic change includes examining the resources and skills that need to be maintained in its original, the level of diversity or homogeneity in the organization, the strength to make change occur and the capacity, capability and being fully prepared for change. On the other hand, in leading strategic change, change leaders need carry on forcefield analyses, which is a useful means of identifying obstruction to change and potential levers for change. In concrete, levers for managing strategy change need to be taken in consideration in regard to the context of change.

In effect, these levers for managing change encompass setting up a compelling case for change, challenging the taken for grant, the need to change operational process, routines and symbols, the importance of political process, and other change tactics.

However, in practice, there are different types of strategic change, which can be defined by combination of extent of culture change required by the organization and the speed at which change need to occur, weather it is incremental over years or a rapid change. Then, according to the situation, there are different types of leading strategic change such as, adaptation, reconstruction or turnaround, revolution or evolution is likely to be required different styles of leadership of managing strategic change.

In brief, today it is particularly important that change leaders be able to.

* Identify and evaluate distinct styles of leading strategic change;
* Examine how organizational context might affect the design of strategic change;
* Carry on a forcefield analysis to identify force blocking and facilitating change;
* Assess the value of different levers for strategic change;
* Identify types of needed strategic change;
* Identify a way of dealing with change, problems, pitfalls of leading different types of strategic change.
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