

Sustaining Change in Beulah Heights University 1918-2017

Grace N Gatungo

Beulah Heights University

Abstract

Sustaining change, Beulah Bible Instituted had first to saw the need for change and planned for change and put it in place and maintain it now for about one century. The institute founded in 1918 and located in the beautiful city of Atlanta, Georgia and nested in the historic Grant Park area of metropolitan Atlanta and reaches another world. Beulah Heights Bible institute grew to become Beulah Heights University (BHU). BHU aims to offer higher education founded in the Protestant Christian tradition. Beulah Heights University heritage training students interested in learning ethical leadership for the ministry and the marketplace. BHU curriculum centered on its core values of Biblical Inerrancy, Integrity. The curriculum includes business, humanities, sciences, practical communication skills, Doctorate of Ministry, and Ph.D. in Leadership in ministry and marketplace, and other professional studies.

Keywords: context, change, plan, hindrance, management, sustenance, opportunity.

Sustaining Change in Beulah Heights University 1918-2017

It is so amazing how human beings acquire imaginal vision to changing not only the place where they are living but to changing the rest of the world.

This paper explores how BHU has sustained the change for about one century.

This author is an alumnus of BHU spring 2016.

Questions: Who is BHU? How does BHU sustain change? Who were the drivers of change? What are the hindrances to change? Does BHU have opportunity for change?

Context

Dr. Hattie M. Barth and Mrs. Elizabeth A. Sexton envisioned of changing the world and set out to do it. The driving force was the fire they received from attending one of the Azusa revival conferences in Los Angeles, and as a result, that light, Beulah Heights Bible Institute started under the leadership of the late Reverend Paul T. Barth and his wife, Dr. Hattie M. Barth in 1918. The force behind bringing the school into existence was Mrs. Elizabeth A. Sexton, Mrs. Barth's mother, known as "Mother Sexton," who communicated to others her vision of a Pentecostal Bible School in Atlanta, Georgia (<https://www.beulah.edu/history>) and kept the fire burning far and beyond the US.

Sustaining change

The sustaining change is a process involving several stages, the need for change, the rational for change, the readiness for change, planning for change, implementing change, managing the difference, and finally sustaining change. Also, maintaining change require the knowledge of the world's demands and demographic shift, climate change, etc.

The founders of Beulah Bible institute, their drivers for change were the spiritual welfare and a moral world then. Other demand arose as the institution grew that involved a continuous

change based on the internal and external environment related to global needs. The first significant move Beulah Heights Bible Institute of Atlanta made was to merge with Southeastern Bible Institute of New Brockton, Alabama in 1940-1946 and become Beulah Heights-Southeastern Bible Institute in Atlanta, Georgia (<https://www.beulah.edu/history>). The partnership ended in 1946.

The board of trustee and the leadership working hand in hand with supports of any suggested idea of change that seemed to benefit the institution, BHU moved from a Bible institute to a University, accredited by TRACS, and trains global leaders for ministry and marketplace. To sustain change, BHU expands campus away from the central school. Planting teaching centers in many places in and outside the US, starting the online classes, increasing the academic programs of study. Also, the admissions of international students, opening the door for Asian group students and their professors in the University. Acquiring of the federal financial aid, creating of the “Discovery Day,” seeking the churches near and far for monetary support. And welcoming and encouraging the member of the church visited to join BHU for education. Reaching educational information to the community around the BHU as a tool to sustain change by them spreading farther the message about the existence of the school. BHU location gives it the opportunity for change here at home and to compete in another world. To sustain change, BHU developed the capability for change by maximizing the contributions from the human efforts of people within BHU in US (<https://www.beulah.edu/history>) and outside in another world.

Phases of growth

Beulah Heights University has undergone many phases of change in the past ninety-nine years. The drivers of change include the desire for growth from a bible college into a regular

University. First worked with local students until 1928 and later reaching to the other world, and also expanding buildings. The several phases of BHU, in 1962 was named Beulah Heights College, the Seminary and Institute became a four-year Bible college. In September 1963 it was chartered by the State of Georgia as a degree-granting institution. In the same year recognized by Southern Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges. In 1966, the board of trustee named the organization “Beulah Height College” and in January 1972 amended the name to be “Beulah Heights Bible College.” The program majors included Leadership and Administration and Community and International Economic Development. The Board of Trustees in October 2006 approved a change of name for the school to become “Beulah Heights University.” (<https://www.beulah.edu/history>). The name approved by the State of Georgia on December 4, 2006.

The academic programs increased to include a Master of Arts, Leadership Studies fall 2007, A Master of Divinity degree program in 2008, a Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree in 2010 for the marketplace. Also approved by the State of Georgia, Department of Education on June 25, 2010, by TRACS in April 2009. In fall of 2012, a Doctor of Ministry (D Min) started, and January 2015 Ph.D. program began. Any students wishing to study in BHU willingly sign the statement of faith as tabulated by the institution and according to the biblical teaching and core moral values (<https://www.beulah.edu/history>) instituted by the funders

BHU by holding to its core values was able to sustain its ongoing change within about one-hundred years next year. The starting campuses in the state of Georgia and other countries and outside the US, the opening of the online classes, increasing the academic programs of study. In addition to the study of Bible, credited by southern association, becoming allied with many relationships, acquired financial aid from the federal government. Admitting the international

student from all over the world, hiring several doctoral professors, and setting the “Discovery Day” week for the outsiders to come and sit in a class and have a feel of being a potential student and experience with the professors and students and listen to lectures. Discovery Day week is a way of influencing the guests to make future decision of joining the school as new students; it is a form of increasing the students’ population to the university and also as a way of continuous sustaining of the change in the growth of the University.

Recognize the need for change

Hodges and Gill (2015) suggest that the first thing the leaders and managers of organization do is to recognize the need for change, the drivers of change, and the potential for change. Based first, on the analysis of the external environmental factors such as globalization, thus, the global economy, climate change, demographic shift, technology, and innovation. The political and social environment, the competition and the knowledge economy (p. 113). Crane and Matten (2007) in Hodges and Gill (2015) describe globalization as a “ongoing process that is triggered by several factors:” technology as communication media interconnect the global trade, Political changes make many things in business altered, emerging of social-cultures have different lifestyles, global risks such as environmental hazard and global warming, etc. (Hodges & Gill, 2015,116).

Global economy imbalance of one country affect another country, for example, an interior village in Kenya, women selling green vegetables raised prices with the argument that the prices were high because of Saddam Hussein and the war in Iraq that had raised gas price. The traveling cost rose, climate change bring drought to arid countries making other countries subsidize for foods and other commodities.

Hodges and Gill (2015), according to national Intelligence Council (2012) the demographic shift related to economy, politics, and war make people move out from their countries to other countries for security and inflating the population of the place they go (2015, p. 121). In present time “innovation and technology facilitate change, innovation create new opportunities and generate values by exploiting new and improved technology, techniques, and services, overcoming cultural and process barriers” (2015, p. 122).

Brinkley (2006) says technology promotes the knowledge economy from the secure computer and well-educated mind that “create wealth” (2006, p. 3). Hodges and Gill (2015) point out that the competition of the major companies such as Google, telco, and others are the drivers of change (p. 125). BHU had the opportunity of joining into the competition of expanding the classes through on the online courses and use of technology listening to the recorded messages from the dynamic chapel invited speakers whenever one is in the US or another world.

Second, the assessments of the internal organization identify the drivers of change that could be related to people wanting to change the ways they do things, developing new and better ways to do things. And solve problems, improving operational efficiency, cost reduction, and improving the quality of the products and service as well as processes (p. 129).

The information from the internal and external factors analysis the best tools to help the leaders and managers of the organization recognize the dynamics they will face for the intended change from all areas from the internal environment.

The analysis of external implications can be government registration, humanitarian need, and crisis arise that leaders and managers should be ready to respond and view them as “opportunity as well as challenge” (P. 134).

Readiness for change

The leaders and managers, once they have gathered the knowledge of external and internal factors lead them to the next move for change, that is, to identify the readiness for change. Hameed and colleagues (2013) prerequisite to change include the employees and the organization bonding. Rousseau (1998) and Cherim (2002) views for promoting the readiness for change and have effective change happen, the leaders and manager should: developing strong attachment of employees to the organization. Use adequate communication, avoid ambiguities, remove uncertainty, avert imposing decisions on the employees, build the organization reputation, and increase the level of the employees' recognition by the organization to improve.

To assess the readiness for change, Judge and Douglas (2009) have best approach to identifying the eight dimensions related to preparedness for change:

1. Trustworthy leadership with ability of senior leaders to earn the trust and credibility of others
2. Trusting follower with ability of stakeholders to willingly support the change
3. The capable champions with ability of the organization to attract and retain competent champions,
4. Involved middle man with ability of the middle managers to efficiently link the change proposed by leaders with rest of the organization
5. The innovative culture with the strength of the team to establish norms of innovation and encourage creative activity.
6. Accountable culture with ability of the team to carefully steward resources and successfully meet predetermined deadlines
7. Effective communication- the strength of the organization to efficiently communicate vertically, horizontally and with customers

8. Systems thinking- the ability of the team to focus on causes and recognize interdependencies within and outside the organization's boundaries

The leaders and managers confirm the readiness for change before beginning the next step of the planning for change. It is important to note that the short lived merger that lasted for few years between Heights Bible Institute of Atlanta and Southeastern Bible Institute of New Brockton, Alabama in 1940-1946 become Beulah Heights-Southeastern Bible Institute in Atlanta, Georgia (<https://www.beulah.edu/history>) seems that both may have not been ready for change.

Also, Novick et al., (2002) point out that the change cannot happen by the administrator announcing it to the staff and the institution that change starting now or at such and such date without first studying the culture of the organization. The leader and the manager should review the staff terms for readiness since people are used to routines and deeply grounded in their habits. The preparation for change needs a degree of relationship with staff, their trust, their commitment to the proposed change. The clear vision and direction of what is this said change, who would be the beneficiary who would lose the job, who to promoted etc. Figure 2.1 guides the leaders and managers in the understanding of the institution's culture and its readiness for change through a questionnaire and the outcomes data would guide the leader to plan for change:

Figure 2.1. Readiness for Change (Novick et al., 2002)

Would you consider your school to be more...

Autocratic	————OR————	Democratic
------------	------------	------------

Is the normal pattern of action to...

Follow routine	————OR————	Take risks
----------------	------------	------------

When matters require some review and study, is the emphasis on a process that is...

On time and fast	————OR————	Deliberate
------------------	------------	------------

Do staff members perceive themselves to be most valued when they...

Work as individuals	————OR————	Work as part of a team
---------------------	------------	------------------------

Is there a sense that the best staff members are those who usually...

Follow procedures	————OR————	Strive for excellence
-------------------	------------	-----------------------

Does the functioning of the school tend to reflect a view that...

Each task or activity is independent	————OR————	All tasks and activities are related to each other and to school goals
--------------------------------------	------------	--

Items in the right-hand column represent readiness trends that may be more conducive to bringing about change in your organization.

Meaney and Pung (2008) in Hodges and Gill (2015) say that improper strategies for readiness for change reduce organizational effectiveness, waste limited resources and extreme cases bring organizational decline and collapse (2015, p. 144).

Planning for change

Hodges and Gill (2015) four linear models with four stages guide leaders and managers in planning for change: first stage: to define the need for change and “develop a vision which involve identifying a performance gap between what the organization is currently doing and

should be doing” (p. 176), and it would guide in defining what changes need to take place and therefore define the vision for change. Building support for the need for change based on the communication and the involvement of stakeholder groups in the decision-making process (P.178). The second stage, initiate change based on the previously adopted solutions or create new and innovative solutions governed by the magnitude and the level and focus for change required. Also, leaders should build the team to support them build commitment to change (P. 178). Stage three, implement the change by putting into practice the vision and specific goals that address the need for change.

Stage four, institutionalizing the change and make it norm, thus, business as usual and no longer initiative, program or a project but the way things going in the organization” (p. 178). In stage four people stabilize and work and behave usual way supposed. It becomes part of their daily routine and can sustain change and the change continues, and benefits monitored and measured. and cost and manage the risk (p. 178).

Methodology

Selznick (1957) in Hodges and Gill (2015) model, SWOT (strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat) examines internal and external factors simultaneously to identify the aspects of the organization that need the change where the inner include strength and weakness and outer involve the opportunity and threats frameworks. First, identify the strength and weakness and then the opportunity and threats (p. 157). The leaders and managers should find out the consequences of strength and weakness that would hinder achievement of the change intended and the cause of power or the inclination. Also, check the impact the opportunity and threats would have on the organization whether it would be help or hindrance to reaching the goal and purpose. Know what to respond to the occasion and the threats (p. 157).

The linear models' first phase: gathered data from stakeholders analyze and give feedback to client “with recommendations for an intervention to address issues” (p. 182). The second phase determines expected benefits, cost, and risks. The third phase communicates the proposed change to the whole or the relevant parts of the organization. Minimize the disruption to daily business during the first and second phases. Select a few employees from their normal duties to work alongside the consultants of change and meet in a location well secured outside usual business (p. 182).

As the project moves from the second phase to the third phase communicate the “urgent necessity for change and the impossibility of carrying on as usual (p. 182). Present the predesigned changes to the employees and invite their feedback. Lack of commitment to change programme indicates lack of commitment to the future success change in the organization (p. 182). The final phase, the transition the change in place and the consultants leave the company to continue implementing the change (p. 183).

Implementing change

To sustain change, the leaders and managers should create the implementing plan with the best idea as described by Gupta and Wendler (2005) as lay the process down as follows: give clear, realistic and adequate resources, simple plan free of confusion. Also remove frustration, specify activities, rethinking with an eye toward simplicity and coherence; create the strategists in all levels who reflect the realities of the business and what the organization can accomplish. Also, the implantation plan structure be achievable, and in manageable portions, the plan specifies the role and responsibilities of the involved staff. It should be flexible and a “living” document open to revision. In sustaining change, Wardrop-White (2001) advises the leaders and managers check the gap that may have occurred during the change planning and level it out

before hinders the change implementation, Identify the difference on time and deal with it before too late. Ensure that people do not say something and they are not doing what they are saying.

The Fionnphort model is helpful in recognizing whether the change and implementation working the way anticipated. The model identifies three areas where the implementation of reform can have a gap, direction, leadership, and energy.

In the direction during the implementation of change focus on making the path clear, let affected people know the course, the method to measure the direction, known and understood each other in the organization. The vision core theme, vision as the direction providing a mental image of the current status of association and the intended future place where the organization is going and want to be.

Wardrop-White (2001) the leadership is vital to ensure the sustaining of the organization, the leaders and managers of implementing change have the required behaviors and make successes. Ensure the different actions needed for implementing change available in every stage of the implementation, the response appropriate in every particular phase. Ensure leaders and managers coached on what they need to continue to do differently and that they have the skills of the implementers of change. It was mentioned earlier on in this writing that the leaders and managers who implement change have differing skills from the skills of the leaders and managers who envisioned and planned for reform.

To sustain change, ensure there is sufficient energy to meet the purposed activities during the change implementation. The leaders and managers should have appropriate skills to measure the current amount of the power and desire to change exist in the organization in terms of resources and amount of energy needed to carry on the activities of the change implementation. The leaders and managers should have the right knowledge of the effect of the reactions that

follow change from the previous experiences gathered elsewhere the change had occurred. It will help them be ready and use right tactics to the results of the change implementation. Leaders and managers should ensure that the people understand the benefit of change. They also know what to do differently, “if anything, to increase the amount of available energy and resources for implementing the change.” It is essential for leaders and managers that they remove away any hindrances for change, implementing and sustenance.

Hindrances for change

Hodges and Gill (2015) provide information on hindrances for sustaining the change that include change as a power dynamic, organizational politics, change conflict and change as a phenomenon-involving many people (p. 333).

Yulkl (2006) describes “power as a dynamic that changes as conditions change.” Kanter (1979) says that the traditional power can be negative or positive, in essence, it is about forcing the people to do what they do not want to do and against their will. The forcing power changes the behavior of the person who is doing something unwillingly mostly toward unhappy mode. The negative influence has dominance and control over others. The change and sustenance in organization face these two faces of power that would hinder the process of change and its sustenance.

McClelland et al., (1976) says power can be confident when the person in control uses it to motivate people and it also right to note that people can be driven to support change and to sustain it or against it this evidence that power has two faces a positive and a negative one. Some leaders and managers who choose to be liked more than others can use negative energy to oppress others to gain positions.

Ashforth (1994) found that power tends to corrupt, that absolute power corrupts absolutely. The leaders and managers holding power are likely to distort themselves and others and both them and employees end up having similar attitudes and behaviors. When the employees subjected to managerial control instead to subordinate may end up questioning the character of the leader or manager when they are not constrained within the same rules set by the organization for all the workers. Under such conditions within the team, the sustenance of change can be hard.

The politics inside and outside the organization are hindrance to sustaining change since some people will be committed to change and others will refuse. Buchanan and Badham (2009) find that the power has two different perspectives on organizational politics.” One views politics as negative and inhibiting efficient running of the organization and the other one take politics as more positive light, concludes that by engaging in politics the integrity is sacrificed and the party involved likely to become manipulative. Buchanan and Lawler (1998) argue that politics creates energy for change during the conflict of interests and to remove the politics in the organization is to remove that power that brings change. The point here is one that the energy that brings change is the same energy that hurt that change sustainability.

Schon (1963) found that political behavior during change causes threats to the change it brings and pushes some “individuals out of their comfort zones and also jeopardize the existing practices and routines, status hierarchies, information flows, resources allocation and power bases.” Sustaining change can be hindered by the conflict in the organization. Hodges and Gill (2015) point out that what one person calls a change another one may call it a bargaining. Robins (2005) defines “conflict as a process that begins when one party perceives that another party has negatively affected, or is about to affect negatively, something that the first party cares about.”

Mullins (2007) sees conflict as an obstructive behavior to the intended achievement goals, Tosi and colleagues (1994) see conflict as a disagreement, tension or problems between two people or parties. The persons in conflict frustrate each other or about to frustrate the need or goals of each other. The two parties in conflict realize they are, one party in opposition when interaction is taking place during the change. Conflict disrupts the normal and desired states of stability and harmony within an organization. Martin (2005) feels that conflict should be avoid or eliminated if possible, but the conflict is likely inevitable where humans interaction occurs especially during the process of change in an organization. The conflict disrupt the sustenance of change too.

Robbins et al., (2010) say that destructive conflict consequences increase in number while constructive conflict will help improve the quality of decisions. Destructive conflict the staff unsatisfied while the constrictive strife stimulates the creativity and innovation, the inevitable conflict increase in inefficiencies between teams when the constructive brings about a medium through which the problems can solve. The destructive conflict rises grievances and constructive fosters an environment of the self-evaluation and change.

In all conditions, conflict hinders the process of sustaining change. Robbins et al., (2010) points out that communication can be the source of conflict in the organization where there are different culture speaking same office language yet the words have the different meaning in different cultures. If the structure of the staff responsivities ambiguous during the change the conflict likely happens. Again, the private variable occurs where there is human interaction and involves personality, emotions, and values of those people that feel they have authority over the others most likely cause conflict when they inflict their feelings on others who have no power. BHU has the right hand of being a multicultural organization where everyone has the opportunity to experience with other many cultures from different part of the world.

Sustaining Change

Thomas and Kilmann (1974) suggest that during the process of stabilizing and sustaining the change the leaders and managers should help the staff handle hindrances such conflict the others through competing, collaborating, avoiding, accommodating, and compromising. When things are trivial avoiding (uncooperative and passive) postpones the problem to a better time to address it even though better time takes away valuable time for the commitment toward sustaining change. The competing (assertive and uncooperative) help resolve conflict diplomatically if emergency aiming at winning or overcoming the situation going on. In accommodating (cooperative and passive) the leaders and managers yield and listen to the person with more power to ease the situation and bring peace if the issue at hand is more significant or essential sustaining change since the sustaining the change is the critical issue. By collaborating (assertive and cooperative), the leaders and managers work together to resolve the conflict and put the agenda at hand in place and understand the plan is sustaining change. In compromising by two people of equal power can agree temporarily current deal and achieve the need at hand necessary to promote the sustenance of change. The human interaction like to create conflict where the parties involved are responsible for observing respect for each other and the ethical values essential during the transaction.

The organization has power over the employees and during the change, and whatever is going to take place during this time the ethical part of the situation observed. Mckendall (1993) says that “most organizational change efforts serve to increase the power of leaders relative to others in the organization.” If the ethics not preserved there is the likelihood of leaders to introduce change according to their desire and what benefits the company without considering the benefits toward workers, something that employees may question, something that would

interfere with implementing and sustaining of change. The strategies to sustain change, according Hodges and Gill (2015):

1. To maintain change hold on to it
2. Put sustenance of change in initial planning change
3. Monitor, review the implementation
4. Delay victory declaration of Change
5. Strategies to turn around failed change (p. 373).

According to this author's "week eight discussion board" (2017, December 06) response from Hodges and Gill (2015), this author discussed the four linear models: Beer model (1990), Kanter and colleagues (1992), Kotter (1996), and Luecke (2003). Their models used mostly but almost have similar information (p. 178). These four models' approaches consist four stages; the first phase define need for change, and development of vision, the second step initiates the move, the third stage implement the change, the fourth stage institutionalized the amendment (pp. 178-179)

The linear models service consistent structure for planning and implementing change and also, they "reduce the risk that some key part of the change process might miss" (p. 183) and that quickly understood. The only problem these models have, they do not provide the information how to sustain the change in the organization for the benefits realized (183). At the time of planning for change and implementation, the planners give much attention to gains, and they forget that if the difference is implemented and fails after a while the benefits will not be realized and the tremendous amount of money used already that would cause the organization suffers costs.

Hodges and Gill (2015) state that it is proper to include ways and means to sustain change in the initial planning of change such as “measuring, monitoring, and reviewing of key objectives, benefits, and risks” (333). Also, suggest that to review the implementation for change to identify areas that need adjustment and adaptation to ensure that change efficiently implemented and that the intended benefits achieved before turning to another project thinking that the shift instilled and the goal accomplished and is even time for jubilation that the ball touched down. Sustaining change can be difficult evidenced by separation of Beulah Heights Bible Institute of Atlanta and Southeastern Bible Institute of New Brockton, Alabama in 1940-1946 (<https://www.beulah.edu/history>). The relation may have gradually failed while the leaders and managers for change were in celebration mood of their joining together the success.

Despite hard work, BHU definitely may have had experienced some hindrances to change all the years gradually advanced in changing evidenced by the separation of Beulah Heights Bible Institute of Atlanta and Southeastern Bible Institute of New Brockton, Alabama in 1940-1946 (<https://www.beulah.edu/history>) and Southeastern Bible Institute went its separate way. Senior (2002) says that some hindrances to change include need for experience and skills. Hodges and Gill (2015) view the stoppages to change is due to the shift of the whole world to a network, digital marketplace and the organizations driven by the competing ecosystems. Howieson and Hodges (2014) suggest that the leaders should have the ability to recognize the drivers of change and develop the ability to cope with them. Graetz acknowledges that these drivers of change the external environment has no regulation has “rapid pace of technological innovation, the growing knowledge workforce, and shifting social and demographic trends” (Graetz, 2000, p.550). BHU has the highest opportunity for change as she is situated in the heart of the greatest city of Atlanta and within the prime metro Atlanta. BHU is a multicultural

institution, and benefits from many cultures that contrite diverse creativities and activities. Therefore, BHU has great opening to attract many people from the US and another world to join. For example, there is a huge number of Asian community who joined the school and they learn in their language and have their Asian professors speaking the students' language.

Graetz (2000) suggests that evaluated change since it is likely to have the joy of change and turn to other business and forget to maintain the instilled change and in the end, find out that everything reverted to status quo. Hayes and Hyde (2008) provide "change management indicator (CMI) as a structured means of receiving feedback" (www.peterhyde.co.uk). Hayes (2014) also, suggests that the survey usable diagnostic instrument to identify major areas of concern and a barometer indicating the whether the trend is in the desired direction; to compare the situation in different departments, functions, locations and local issues. Also, the survey used as an "intervention to get people thinking about the issues and to promote dialogue" (Hayes, 2014).

Hodges and Gill (2015) say "failure to measure and review the way change implemented and managed affect the achievement of the objectives and timescale for implementing the change. It can also undermine staff commitment to the organization, cause reputational damage and increase the resources unintended for use and finally affect the sustaining of the change.

BHU opportunity for change

BHU, has gone through change many a time in about one century and managed and sustained it. It is time to ready to face the challenges by the global megatrends 2030 and megatrend 2040 that will bring different change and be maintaining for evolution different from that of the many years past (p. 397).

BHU currently is operating in time the world is transforming and involves “climate, rapid population growth, and resource scarcity, the resurgence in ideology, rapid technological development and innovation, and the shift in global power from west to east” (397). Climate change today alarming because of the global warming that affects many countries today evidenced by droughts and flooding destruction of the resources and humans.

The directors or players of the global change are required to observe ethics by preserving the earth, humankind and the organizations. BHU, to have the opportunity for change as it appears should build up the capacity and capability to meet these oncoming challenges of the new megatrends change and sustaining of the new switch.

The United States’ Intelligence Council (2012) in Hodges and Gill (2015) defines megatrends as “game-changers that will determine what kind of transformed world we will inhabit in the future” (p. 398). “These game-changers include the global economy, national and global governance, the nature of the conflict, regional spillover, advancing technologies, and the United States’ role in the international arena” (p. 398). All the changes “can sow the seeds of global disruption or huge advance” (p. 398) that will affect the current organizations such as BHU. BHU should engage before is late and plan for new change and new sustaining of the new change that will have to affect it next thirty-five years to come and harness harms the move will bring before it overwhelms BHU.

The term sustainability is new in business for leaders and managers as familiar terms in business have been planning change, implementing change and manage it but never included sustenance of change in the planning of change. Bonin and colleagues in Hodges and Gill (2015) say that sustainability of change “encompasses the process of surviving in a hostile environment” when the “global economy is in bad shape” (p. 399). According to management consultants,

McKinsey and others in Hodges and Gill (2015) say sustainability of change “will be a defining force in the future” (p. 400). BHU should be clear how to carry out the change to meet the sustainability expected for the organization to continue its business (Miller, 2012) in (Hodges & Gill, 2015, p. 400).

Stubbings and Ceasar in Hodges and Gill (2015) model guides the organization to define its identity “about ‘who we are’ and the image we want to portray of our values, culture and strategic intent” for the era of sustainability (p. 400). Their guiding model of change comprises of four E’s:

First, Expressing-articulating the external value-proposition through products, physical artifacts or service

Second, Engaging –with stakeholders’ feedback on their impressions of the organization’s activities about its vision, purpose, values, strategy and employee and management competency, relationship, and loyalty

Third, Encoding-through redesigning system and process

Fourth, Enacting-aligning cultural practices through creating new meaning and discourse on vision, purpose, values, strategy, and identity (Hodges& Gill, 2015, p. 400).

The four Es serve the leaders and managers in ways to sustain change efficiently, to build a culture committed to maintaining, at the senior level be able to define sustainability of change, establish an integrated culture aligned with sustainability with business purposes, and driving sustainability priorities through the organization. At the functional level, Es guide the managers in the way to “translate organizational sustainability goals into tools and programmes for facilities, suppliers, and employees. At the individual level, the managers reduce the fragment

influences from the different culture in the staff and create a working environment in long-term plan (p. 401) to guard the reputation of the organization.

Sustaining the organization's reputation safeguards the organization's product and service to influence the customers to do business with the company and the ethics counts here. Hodges and Gill (2015) say business ethics essential for the megatrends multiple-stakeholder groups and it necessary to create an ethical orientation covering all the groups involved to guide every business how to react to the moral actions when they happen, what measures to take and who would respond to what. For example, the accidental spilling of the oil in the ocean and polluting the water killing many creatures that depend on the ocean water in 2010 (<https://www.livescience.com> › Planet Earth) President Obama reacted to the situation and stopped more drilling of oil from oceans.

As mentioned earlier, Hodges and Gill (2015) say organizational capacity for change is vital and "can be conceptualized as the overall capability of an organization to either effectively prepare or respond to an increasingly unpredictable and volatile environmental context" (p. 407). According to Judge (2011) in Hodges and Gill (2015) the overall capability is multidimensional that includes three ingredients (a) individual skill set and resources; (b) formal system procedures; and organizational culture, values, and norms. Also, Judge (2011) describes organizational capability for change as "a dynamic, multidimensional capability that enables an organization to upgrade or revise existing organizational competencies, while cultivating new competencies that enable the organization to survive and prosper" (Hodges & Gill, 2015, p. 407)

Hodges and Gill (2015) say a (2012) survey by Moorhouse Consulting in the UK's "financial services sector found that staff did not have capacity and capability to deliver change and that front-line staff could not cope with the volume of change" (407). Ashkenas (2013) in

Hodges and Gill (2015) “supports the survey’s new view that there is a problem with the under-development of capacity to implement change.” And recommends three things: first, a common framework, language definition, approaches and set of tools for managing change, second, plans for reform that integrated with other projects as part and parcel of overall business strategy, and third, clear accountability in the organization for change (pp.407-408).

In addition, Judge (2011) in Hodges and Gill (2015) guidelines to distil the concept of organizational capacity for change based on eight separate steps with distinct dimensions:

1. The real leaders with the ability to lead and best interest of the organization as the priority.
2. Trusted staff with the level of trust.
3. Capable champions, a leader often sponsored by senior management, with influence for others, adopt change proposed change, with formal authority, with the capability to build formal and informal coalitions to make a difference and get the thing done, with the knowledge to directly or indirectly handle political opposition.
4. Involved middle management who are pivotal figures in shaping an organization’s response to potential change and initiatives for change.
5. Systems thinking look at the more significant number of interactions within the team and between the agencies as a whole.
6. Communication systems designed efficiently and delivered communication up, down and across the organization.
7. Accountable cultures monitor the outcomes of the results produced and to know what helped or hindered successful change.
8. Innovative cultures that create a culture to explore new ideas and to develop the best plans for new ventures.

Further, Judge (2011) in Hodges and Gill (2015) suggests two way to assess capacity for change first by qualitatively interviewing individuals at different levels in the organization and check the date against eight dimensions. Second, quantitatively by administering a survey and use Judge (2011) OCC tool to measure the outcomes against the eight dimensions (pp.408-409).

Hodges and Gill (2015) say that “megatrends will influence current and future change and transformation in organizations in the global business environment” (p. 416) and these will be practical implications for managers and leaders. BHU opportunity to change is made possible through the provisions of so many guidelines available in the literature.

Conclusion

Hodges and Gill (2015) state that the world is changing and the organization in the world continue changing making it necessary to learn about change sustenance as the vital element for change. Otherwise, the many companies cannot thrive if they cannot manage change that happens and affect the organizations (p. 435). Hodges and Gill say that the “business success requires a strong commitment to sustainability and, in particular, sustainable change” (p. 420).

Buchanan et al., (2005) and Farjoun, (2010) Judge and Douglas (2009) say that to sustaining “change in the organization is crucial to the development, growth, success, and survival of any organization operating within an ever-changing environment.” Hodges and Gill (2015) say that if change sustained the company lowers the huge cost used to carry out the change that eventually fails and the employees go back to the same old way of working. Hodges and Gill further say that there is the normal method to manage change as the success of sustaining it depends on the individual company’s context and content as what works for one organization may not work for another one.

Nadler (1988) suggests that to be able to sustain change, it should be incorporated initially in the planning for change and include the plan for sustaining change once implemented. Change, Nadler says sustaining change should be integral part of the business “bloodstream” and should not be labelled as separate part from the usual daily business activities. The employees should not feel the change as different from working, but they should work general way.

Hodges and Gill (2015) say global megatrends of business will influence the company and the ethics will be vital in the process. Hodges and Gill (2015) suggest that the organizations should recruit leaders and managers with the capability and capacity to build change in the fiber of the companies to collectively accomplish what is needed for change in group to survive, thrive and sustain change, in an ethical way

References

- Ashforth, B. (1994). 'Petty tyranny in organizations.' *Human Relations*, 47(7):755-778.
- Beckhard, R. & Harris, R. (1987). *Organizational transitions: Managing complex change*. (2nd ed.) Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Beer, M. (1990). *Leading change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard School of Publishing.
- BHU (n. d.). *About bhu - history - beulah heights university*. Retrieved from <https://www.beulah.edu/history>
- Brinkley, I. (2006). *Defining the knowledge economy*. London: The Work Foundation.
- Buchanan et al., (2005). 'No going back: A review of literature on sustaining organizational change.' *International Journal of Management Review*, 7(3):189-205.
- Buchanan, D. A. & Badham, R. J. (2009). *Power, politics, and organizational change*, (2nd ed.), London: Sage
- Cherim, S. (2002). 'Influencing organizational identification during major change: A communication based perspective.' *Human Relations* 55: 1117-1137.
- Farjoun, M. (2010). 'Beyond dualism: Stability and change as a duality.' *Academy of Management Review*, 35(2): 202-225.
- Ferris, G. R. & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). 'Perception of organizational politics.' *Journal of Management*, 18(1):93-116.
- French, J.R. P., Raven, B. (1999). 'Based of social power, in d copy write (ed.), *Studies in Social Power*. University of Michigan Pres, 150-167.
- Graetz, F. (2000). 'Strategic change leadership.' *Management Decision* 38(9):550-562.

Greiner, L. E. (1972). 'Evolution and evolution as organization grow. *Harvard Business Review*, 50(4):37-46.

Gulf Oil Spill (2010). *Could spread to atlantic ocean - live science*. Retrieved from <https://www.livescience.com> › Planet Earth

Gupta, R. & Wendler, J. (2005). 'Leading change: An interview of the ceo of proctor and Gamble.' *Mckinsey Quarterly*, July.

Hameed, I., Roques, O. & Arain, G. A. (2013). 'Nonlinear moderating effect of tenure on organizational identifications (oid) and the subsequent role of old in fostering readiness for change.' *Group and Organization management*, 38(1): 101-127.

Hayes, J. & Hyde, P. (2008). 'The change management indicator.' [www.peterhyde.co.uk/document/ The Change ManagementIndicator.pdf](http://www.peterhyde.co.uk/document/The%20Change%20ManagementIndicator.pdf). Retrieved June 2012.

Hodges, J. & Gill, R. (2015). *Sustaining change in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Howieson, B. & Hodges, J. (2014). *Public and third sector leadership: Experience speaks*. London: Emerald

Hughes, M. (2006). *Change management: A Critical Perspective*. London: CIPD

Judge, W. & Douglas, T. (2009). Organizational change capacity: The systematic development of a change.' *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 22(6): 635-649.

Kanter, R. M. 1979). 'Power failure in management circuits,' *Harvard Business Review*, 57(4): 65.

Kanter, R., Stein, B. & Jick, T. (1992). *The challenge of organizational change: How companies experience it and leader guide it*. New York, NY: Free Press.

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

- Luecke, R. (2003). *Managing change and transition*. Boston, MA: Harvard School Business Press.
- Martin, J. (2005). *Organizational behavior and management* London Cengage Learning EMEA.
- McClelland, D. C. & Burnham, D. H. (1976). 'Power is the great motivator.' *Harvard Business Review*, 73(1):126-139.
- Mckendall, M. (1993). The tyranny of change: Organizational development revisited. *Journal of Business Ethics* 12(2)93-104.
- Mullins, L. J. (2007). *Management and organizational behavior*. Harlow: FT/ Prentice Hall.
- Nadler, D. A. (1988). 'Concept of the management of organizational change,' in Tushman, M.L. & Moore, W. I. (Eds.). *Reading in the management of Innovation* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Ballinger, 718-732.
- Novick, B., Kress, J. S. & Elias, M. J. (2002). *Readiness: Assess your school's potential for change*. Retrieved from www.ascd.org/.../books/.../Readiness@-Assess-Your-School's-Potential-for-Change.as
- Rick, T. (n.d.). *Awesome quotes on change management*. Retrieve from <https://www.torbenrick.eu/blog/change.../20-awesome-quotes-on-change-managemen>
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A. & Campbell, T.T. (2010). *Organizational behavior*. Harlow: PT/Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Organizational Behavior*, (11th ed.). Edgewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1998). 'Why workers still identify with organization.' *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 19: 217-233.
- Schon, D. A. (1963). Champion for radical new inventions.' *Harvard Business Review*, 41(2): 77-86.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation*. Evanston, IL:

Row Peterson.

Thomas, K. W. & Kilmann, R. H. (1974). *Thomas-kilmann conflict mode instrument*, Tuxedo,

NY: Xicom, Inc.

Tosi, H. L., Rizzo, R. J. & Carroll, S. J. (1994). *Managing the organizational behavior*. Malden,

MA/Oxford: Blackwell.

Wardrop-White, D. (2001). *The crystal bridge: A practical Manual for Internal Consultants*.

Edinburgh: PricewaterhouseCoopers.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. London: Simon & Sons Schuster Trade.