

Change Management Strategies and Service Delivery in the Judiciary: A Case of Milimani High Court in Nairobi County, Kenya

Ochieng Lavenda Awuor¹ Dr. Njeri Njuguna²

1. Department of Business Administration, School of Business, Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 30041-00100, Nairobi, Kenya
 2. Department of Business Administration, School of Business, Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100, Nairobi, Kenya
-

Abstract

Developed and developing countries have been putting efforts to enhance service delivery in their public sector institutions. As a result, they have been implementing changes in their public sector institutions. In Kenya, various changes have been undertaken in the public service in pursuit for effective and efficient service delivery. In Kenya's Judiciary in particular, substantial reforms have been undertaken since 2011 targeting to enhance service delivery by reducing case backlogs and corruption, and solving administrative challenges hindering citizen's accessibility to justice. However, notwithstanding various reforms instituted within the Judiciary over the last decade under the various reforms agenda, service delivery in the Judiciary remains a focus agenda as evidenced by complaints on service delivery and target to improve confidence levels in the Judiciary in the change management documents. This study therefore sought to interrogate the change management strategies applied in the Judiciary and how they are affecting service delivery. The research applied descriptive survey design targeting a total of 90 staffs in the Judiciary comprising of Judges, Judicial Officers and Judicial Staffs based in the Milimani High Court in Nairobi. Data was collected using a questionnaire and analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics. Findings indicated that planning strategy and communication strategy in change management had a significant influence on service delivery in the Judiciary while leadership strategy and stakeholders' engagement strategy had insignificant relationship with service delivery. The study recommends among other measures, that to improve planning in change management strategy, the government through the Treasury should increase the amount of money allocated to the Judiciary in national budgets.

Keywords: *Change management strategies, planning strategy, communication strategy, leadership strategy, stakeholders' engagement strategy, service delivery*

Date of Submission: 25-10-2022

Date of Acceptance: 06-11-2022

I. Introduction

Change management has become a fundamental aspect in most organizations as improvement of service delivery continues to take a central stage both in developed and developing countries. By definition, Woodcock (2017) views change management as moving from a current situation to a new desired situation which has a higher competitiveness with a proposition of a sequence of determining the need to change, determining obstacles to address, actualizing the change as well as its evaluation. Service delivery on the other hand according to Kazmi (2012), encompasses all the processes involved in the interaction between service provider and clients. Elaborating further on service delivery, Martins and Ledimo (2015) articulated that it involves the how, when, and where the customer receives the service.

Effective service delivery in any institution largely depends on proper management of strategic change. Consequently, strategic management is being embraced by organizations as a way of reinventing themselves towards achieving efficiency and effectiveness. Strategic change arises out of the need of organizations to enhance their service delivery by exploiting existing or emerging opportunities and dealing with threats in the market (Woodcock, 2017). Strategies for managing change entail the various mechanisms put in place to ensure that staffs, teams and systems are modified to ensure smooth and effective management of resources, processes and activities culminating into adoption and implementation of change (Kurgat, 2019).

Developed and developing countries have been putting efforts towards enhancing service delivery in their public sector institutions. As a result, they have been implementing changes in their public sector institutions. This is because various government ministries, institutions and agencies have a core responsibility of ensuring essential public goods and services are availed to meet the basic wellbeing of all (Ramakrishnan,

2013). In this regard, institutions in the public sector worldwide in their bid to enhance service delivery often have had to undertake changes to confront diverse shocks triggered by various factors including natural disasters, financial crises among others. However, despite the various changes in different public institutions to enhance service delivery, Gafar (2017) indicated that service delivery in public institutions especially in most post-independence African countries has been failing. It is therefore necessary to interrogate change management strategies in these institutions.

In Kenya, Jerono (2016) noted that various changes have been undertaken in the public service in pursuit for effective and efficient service delivery including structural adjustment programs, institutionalizing result-based management, employees' rationalization among others. In Kenya's Judiciary in particular, substantial reforms have been undertaken since 2011 targeting to enhance service delivery by reducing case backlogs and corruption, and solving administrative challenges hindering citizen's accessibility to justice. Notable reforms include the Judiciary transformation framework (JTF) whose implementation was from 2012 to 2016 been anchored on four pillars: people-centered justice delivery; transformative leadership, organizational culture and professional and motivated staff; adequate physical structure and financial resources; and enhancing technology application to facilitate justice (UNDP, 2016). Implementation of the most recent reforms is under the blue print – sustaining Judiciary transformation: a service delivery agenda (SJT) 2017-2021.

The changes in Kenya's Judiciary under the SJT agenda 2017-2021 is primarily targeted at improving service delivery anchoring on five pillars: improved access to justice; case backlog clearance; integrity and fight against anticorruption, Judiciary digital strategy; and institutional leadership and governance (The Judiciary of Kenya, 2019). However, notwithstanding various reforms instituted within the Judiciary over the last decade under the various reforms agenda, service delivery in the Judiciary remains an area of inquiry. This is evidenced by complaints about service delivery in the Judiciary been on the rise despite the reforms. In the year 2017/2018 for instance, 3,515 complaints were received in the office of the Judiciary ombudsman (OJO) – an office that receives complaints from the public on their dissatisfaction with service delivery at the Judiciary. This reflects a 16.9% increase from 3,005 complaints in 2016/2017. The most prevalent complaints included: slow service, missing files, corruption, delayed rulings, delayed orders among others (The Judiciary of Kenya, 2019). This makes the change management strategies in the Judiciary questionable since the changes been implemented do not seem to accomplish their aim of enhancing service delivery. The fundamental question is, what change management strategies are being applied in the Judiciary and how are they affecting its service delivery? This has been seldom researched in past studies hence the focus of this study on the question. In particular, the study investigated the influence of planning strategy, communication strategy, leadership strategy, and stakeholders' engagement strategy on service delivery in the Judiciary in Nairobi County.

II. Theoretical Review

Theoretical base of the research comprised of the Kotter's Eight Step Change Model and the SERVQUAL Model.

2.1 Kotter's Eight Step Change Model

This model was developed by Kotter (1996). It provides eight steps which inform change management strategies to ensure a desired change is successfully implemented in an organization. According to the model, the organization must follow eight (8) stages in the following sequence to ensure effective change. Stage one is to institute a sense of urgency which involves creating a scenario that demonstrates the urgency to have the change implemented. Stage two is to establish a strong guiding coalition which entails mobilizing a team especially consisting of influential employees to lead in advocating for the change. The third stage is to formulate the vision which involves developing and formalizing the purpose of the change with a clear picture of the future targeted. The fourth stage involves communicating the vision.

The fifth stage is employees' empowerment for action while the sixth stage entails generating short-term wins and these are accomplished through proper planning for the change implementation. Stage seven involves consolidating the gains and producing more change. This is where the short gains are used as the beginning for further improvements by engaging key stakeholders to bring in insights for continuous improvement to the desired state. The eighth and last stage is all about anchoring new culture to support the change. This model provided insights to interrogate the four change management strategies which constitute the independent variables in this study including: planning strategy, communication strategy, leadership strategy and stakeholder's engagement strategy.

2.2 The SERVQUAL Model

The model was conceptualized by Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1985). They coined the term SERVQUAL as an acronym for 'Service Quality' model. The model presents a set of attributes that indicates high quality service delivery. According to the model, there are five (5) aspects that should characterize high

quality service delivery including: tangibles, reliability, assurance, responsiveness and empathy (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988). The five attributes are measured on a likert type scale. This is done by assessing the difference between the expectation and perception of the particular service investigated. In other words, the assessment is “confirmation or disconfirmation” of the expectations on the service. Where perception meets or exceeds the expectation, service delivery is of high quality and vice versa (Desta, 2019).

The SERVQUAL model was applied in this study to assess the dependent variable, that is, service delivery in the Judiciary of Kenya. The model provided the insights to interrogate the quality of service delivery in the institution and helped assess the extent that service delivery meets public expectation.

III. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research applied descriptive survey design. This enabled direct interpretation of the finding as they are without manipulation by the researcher as it involves the population perspectives. The design was preferred as it has been successfully used by others studies like Kimari, Gathenya and Kihoro (2018) to interrogated service delivery in the Judiciary.

3.2 Target Population and Sampling Design

The study population included Judges, Judicial Officers and Judicial Staffs based in Milimani High Court in Nairobi. These included Judges, Registrar, Deputy Registrars, Legal Researchers, Court Administrators, officers in the Directorate of planning and Organizational Performance and customer service center in the Milimani High Court in Nairobi. These were a total of 90 respondents profiled as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Target population

Level	Number	Percentage
Judges	29	32.2%
Registrar	1	1.1%
Deputy registrars	21	23.3%
Legal Researchers	12	13.3%
Court administrators	14	15.6%
Directorate of Planning and Organizational Performance	8	8.9%
Customer service center	5	5.6%
Total	90	100

Since the target population was small, a census approach was used. The census approach involves covering the entire units or subjects in the target population as opposed to selecting a sample of the population. Thus, the study targeted 90 respondents. The approach is advantageous in that all the respondents are given an equal opportunity to take part in the study which reduces bias in the data (Parker, 2011).

3.3 Data Collection

Data was collected using a questionnaire which according to Pavan and Kulkarni (2014) is highly economical in saving time and costs. To ensure validity and reliability of the questionnaire before the actual data collection, a pilot test was done at the Milimani Law Courts using 10% of the sample size fraction which is approximately 9 respondents. This allowed for modification of the questionnaire before the main data collection to enable identification of questions that were not clear to participants or any other problem with the questionnaire that could lead to biased answers. In the actual data collection, an introduction letter was used to brief respondents on the objective of the survey and pledge confidentiality of the participants. Upon their consent, the questionnaire was administered to all the respondents via the drop-and-pick technique. Subsequently, a follow up was made to collect the questionnaire and where a participant faced tussles, the respondents were facilitated to complete the questionnaire. This helped to improve the response rate for the study achieving approximately 83%.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data was entered into SPSS for analysis. Quantitative data was first analyzed using the mean, frequency and percentage. Inferential statistics were then applied including regression and correlation analysis. Linear regression analysis was applied where the regression model was:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + e$$

Y = service delivery, X₁= planning strategy, X₂= communication strategy, X₃= leadership strategy, X₄= stakeholders' engagement strategy; β_0 is the regression constant; β_1 , β_2 , β_3 and β_4 are regression coefficients for planning strategy, communication strategy, leadership strategy and stakeholders' engagement strategy respectively while e is the error term.

IV. Research Findings and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

The various parameters used to assess each variable were analyzed based on percentage, mean, as well as standard deviation (Std. dev). For each of the variables, the parameters were measured on a scale of 1 to 4 where 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree, and 4= strongly agree. Based on this scale, respondents indicated their agreement/disagreement with the statement on each of the parameters.

4.1.1 Planning strategy in change management

Table 2: Planning strategy in change management

Statement	1	2	3	4	Mean	Std. dev
There is a vision for any change that is instituted in the Judiciary	-	11.9	61.2	26.9	3.1	0.6
The goals and objectives of change are clearly set out	1.5	16.4	67.2	14.9	3.0	0.6
A plan is developed before any change is instituted	-	25.4	56.7	17.9	2.9	0.7
There is adequate budgetary allocation for implementation of change in the Judiciary	35.8	47.8	13.4	3.0	1.8	0.8
The Judiciary employees align their targets to the institutional goals	3.0	35.8	53.7	7.5	2.7	0.7
Average					2.7	0.7

The overall mean score for planning strategy was 2.7 indicating that respondents agreed with most of the statements, with a standard deviation of 0.7 implying that there were negligible variations of the scores from the mean. Respondents concurred that there is a vision for any change that is instituted in the Judiciary (mean= 3.1) and that the goals and objectives of the change are clearly set out (mean= 3.0). Moreover, they asserted that a plan is developed before any change is instituted (mean= 2.9). The respondents however disagreed that there is adequate budgetary allocation for implementation of change in the Judiciary (mean= 1.8). The findings implies that while planning strategy is well executed in the Judiciary, financial resources is a major constraint due to the inadequate budgetary allocation.

4.1.2 Communication Strategy in change management

Table 3: Communication strategy in change management

Statement	1	2	3	4	Mean	Std. dev
Judiciary employees are aware about the changes being employed in the institution	4.5	49.3	43.3	3.0	2.4	0.6
The Judiciary uses relevant and reliable communication channels to communicate about any change to be implemented	7.6	37.3	50.8	4.5	2.5	0.7
Adequate feedback is provided on the progress of change implementation	9.0	62.7	28.4	-	2.2	0.6
The information shared by Judiciary on changes implemented is reliable and relevant	3.0	37.3	53.7	6.0	2.6	0.6
The Judiciary communicates to all the relevant parties when implementing or intend to implement any change	6.0	44.8	40.3	9.0	2.5	0.7
Change awareness is done to demystify the planned change	11.9	47.8	35.8	4.5	2.3	0.7
There is timely communication dissemination in the Judiciary	9.0	56.7	31.3	3.0	2.3	0.7
Average					2.4	0.7

The overall mean score for communication strategy was 2.4 indicating that the respondents disagreed with most of the statements. The respondents asserted that information shared by Judiciary on changes implemented is reliable and relevant (mean= 2.6). They also concurred that the Judiciary uses relevant and reliable communication channels to communicate about any change to be implemented (mean= 2.5). The respondents however disagreed that adequate feedback is provided on the progress of change implementation (mean= 2.2). They also disagreed that change awareness is done to demystify the planned change (mean= 2.3) and that there is timely communication dissemination in the Judiciary (mean= 2.3). Moreover, the respondents denied that the Judiciary employees are aware about the changes being employed in the institution (mean= 2.4). The findings imply that the information communicated and the channels used for the communication during change management are okay but the timeliness of the communication and feedback mechanism are quite wanting.

4.1.3 Leadership strategy in change management

Table 4: Leadership strategy in change management

Statement	1	2	3	4	Mean	Std. dev
The Judiciary leadership ensures staff are motivated towards adapting to and implementing changes being instituted	9.0	53.7	37.3	-	2.3	0.6
The leadership style used in the Judiciary contributes to proper change management	10.5	41.8	44.8	3.0	2.4	0.7
The Judiciary leadership promotes capacity building of staffs and material resources towards the changes being implemented	11.9	46.3	35.8	6.0	2.4	0.8
The top leadership in the Judiciary is always committed to ensure the success of any change instituted in the Judiciary	1.5	29.9	59.7	9.0	2.8	0.6
Average					2.5	0.7

Majority expressed their concurrence that the top leadership in the Judiciary is always committed to ensure the success of any change instituted in the Judiciary (mean= 2.8). They however disagreed that the Judiciary leadership ensures staff are motivated towards adapting to and implementing changes being instituted (mean= 2.3). They further disagreed that the leadership style used in the Judiciary contributes to proper change management (mean= 2.4). Equally, they denied that the Judiciary leadership promotes capacity building of staffs and material resources towards the changes being implemented (mean= 2.4). The findings indicate that although the leaders in the Judiciary are committed to effective change management, staff motivation as well as their capacity building to embrace change is poor and the leadership style used in change management is not very suitable.

4.1.4 Stakeholders' engagement in change management

Table 5: Stakeholders' engagement in change management

Statement	1	2	3	4	Mean	Std. dev
Judiciary employees are engaged in change planning	7.5	62.7	28.4	1.5	2.2	0.6
Judiciary employees are engaged in change implementation	3.0	20.9	70.2	6.0	2.8	0.6
Where necessary, public participation is adequately undertaken before change is implemented in the Judiciary	7.5	34.3	52.2	6.0	2.6	0.7
There is adequate stakeholder engagement when instituting and implementing change in the Judiciary	7.5	7.5	46.3	38.8	3.2	0.9
The stakeholders are aware of their role in Judiciary change management	6.0	32.8	55.2	6.0	2.6	0.7
The Judiciary stakeholders are engaged in evaluation of an implemented change	9.0	38.8	49.3	3.0	2.5	0.7
Average					2.6	0.7

Majority of the respondents agreed that there is adequate stakeholders' engagement when instituting and implementing change in the Judiciary (mean= 3.2). They concurred that Judiciary employees are engaged in change implementation (mean= 2.8) and that the stakeholders are aware of their role in Judiciary change management (mean= 2.6). They affirmed that where necessary, public participation is adequately undertaken before change is implemented in the Judiciary (mean= 2.6). Nonetheless, they denied that Judiciary employees are engaged in change planning (mean= 2.2). The findings imply that stakeholders' engagement strategy is well executed in change management in the Judiciary except that the Judiciary employees are not effectively engaged in planning the change.

4.1.5 Service Delivery

Table 6: Service delivery in the Judiciary

Statement	1	2	3	4	Mean	Std. dev
There is reduction in case backlog	1.5	1.5	65.7	31.3	3.3	0.6
There is improvement in case clearance rate	-	1.5	71.6	26.9	3.3	0.5
Services are delivered in a timely manner	-	22.4	62.7	14.9	2.9	0.6
There is integrity in service delivery	-	9.0	79.1	11.9	3.0	0.5

Change Management Strategies and Service Delivery in the Judiciary: A Case of Milimani ..

Complaints by clients against those serving in the Judiciary has reduced	-	11.9	71.6	16.4	3.0	0.5
Complaints against services rendered has reduced	-	16.4	74.6	9.0	2.9	0.5
The Judiciary is focused on service delivery	-	7.5	65.7	26.9	3.2	0.6
The Judiciary employees are aware of their role in service delivery	1.5	13.4	62.7	22.3	3.1	0.7
Average					3.1	0.5

Service delivery in the Judiciary rated at an aggregated mean of 3.1 at a negligible Std. dev of 0.5. A vast majority of the respondents concurred with the statements as reflected by the high mean score range of 2.9 – 3.3. They confirmed that there is improvement in case clearance rate (mean= 3.3) and that there is reduction in case backlog (mean= 3.3). It was further established that the Judiciary is focused on service delivery (mean= 3.2) and its employees are aware of their role in service delivery (mean= 3.1). The respondents indicated that there is integrity in service delivery (mean= 3.0), while asserting that complaints by clients against those serving in the Judiciary has reduced (mean= 3.0). Moreover, they attested that complaints against services rendered has reduced (mean= 2.9) noting that services are delivered in a timely manner (mean= 2.9).

4.2 Inferential Statistics

These were applied to analyze the influence of change management strategies on service delivery in the Judiciary. In this regard, correlation and regression analyses were done.

4.2.1 Correlation Analysis

Table 7: Correlation analysis

Correlations		Planning strategy	Communication strategy	Leadership strategy	Stakeholder engagement	Service delivery
Planning strategy	Pearson Correlation	1	.556**	.058	.299*	.621**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.639	.014	.000
	N	67	67	67	67	67
Communication strategy	Pearson Correlation	.556**	1	-.144	.290*	.501**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.246	.017	.000
	N	67	67	67	67	67
Leadership strategy	Pearson Correlation	.058	-.144	1	.127	-.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.639	.246		.308	.910
	N	67	67	67	67	67
Stakeholders engagement	Pearson Correlation	.299*	.290*	.127	1	.219
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.017	.308		.075
	N	67	67	67	67	67
Service delivery	Pearson Correlation	.621**	.501**	-.014	.219	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.910	.075	
	N	67	67	67	67	67

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Planning strategy in change management had a correlation of 0.621 with service delivery. The correlation is significant because its p-value (Sig. = 0.000) is less than 0.05. This is an indication that planning strategy in change management significantly influences service delivery in the Judiciary in a positive way. The findings concur with the findings by Daniel (2019) who found planning significantly and positively affected how a firm performed.

Similarly, a significant positive correlation was found between communication strategy in change management and service delivery (r= 0.501, p= 0.000). This indicates that communication strategy in change management has a significant positive influence on service delivery in the Judiciary. The findings are congruent to Hasanaj and Manxhari (2017) whose findings revealed that in a change process, communication had a significant role in contributing significantly to successful change implementation and enhancing productivity of the employees.

However, the study found a negative and insignificant correlation between leadership strategy in change management and service delivery (r= -0.014, p= 0.910). The findings indicate that leadership strategy in change management has insignificant relationship with service delivery in the Judiciary. This differs with Riggii et al. (2018) whose findings revealed that service delivery was significantly influenced by leadership strategy.

The study further revealed an insignificant positive correlation of 0.219 between stakeholders engagement strategy in change management and service delivery (p= 0.075). The finding indicates that stakeholders' engagement strategy does not have a significant relationship with service delivery in the Judiciary.

The findings disagree with Kimutai and Kwambai (2018) who indicated that stakeholders' engagement significantly affected organizational effectiveness positively.

4.2.2 Regression Analysis

Table 8: Regression model summary

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.649 ^a	.421	.384	.27061	.421	11.290	4	62	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Stakeholders engagement, Leadership strategy, Planning strategy, Communication strategy

The R Square for the regression analysis was 0.421. This means that the predictors in the model (stakeholder engagement, leadership strategy, planning strategy and communication strategy) determine 42.1% of how service delivery changes in the Judiciary. Additionally, the findings imply that various factors apart from stakeholders' engagement, leadership strategy, planning strategy and communication strategy influence approximately 58% of changes in service delivery in Judiciary.

Table 9: ANOVA analysis

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.307	4	.827	11.290	.000 ^b
	Residual	4.540	62	.073		
	Total	7.848	66			

a. Dependent Variable: Service delivery

b. Predictors: (Constant), Stakeholders engagement, Leadership strategy, Planning strategy, Communication strategy

The F-value coefficient was 11.290 with a p-value of 0.000. Since the p-value is less than 0.05, it therefore means that regression model was significant in estimating how the dependent variable is influenced by the independent variables.

Table 10: Regression coefficients

Coefficients ^a								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1.415	.482		2.938	.005		
	Planning strategy	.433	.104	.497	4.167	.000	.656	1.524
	Communication strategy	.200	.109	.221	1.823	.073	.636	1.571
	Leadership strategy	-.019	.151	-.012	-.123	.903	.929	1.076
	Stakeholders engagement	.011	.139	.008	.077	.939	.868	1.153

a. Dependent Variable: Service delivery

Based on the regression coefficients as derived in table 10, the regression model was:

$$Y = 1.415 + 0.433X_1 + 0.2X_2 - 0.019X_3 + 0.011X_4$$

Regression coefficient for planning strategy (B= 0.433, p= 0.000) indicated that when planning strategy is improved in change management in the Judiciary, it is likely to trigger a significant improvement in delivery of services (p-value is less than 0.05). The results agree with Kharroub and Mansour (2019) which revealed planning has a positive and significant correlation with the quality of service delivery.

The coefficients for communication strategy (B= 0.2, p= 0.073) indicates that communication strategy in change management positively influence service delivery. That means, when communication strategy is improved in change management in the Judiciary, service delivery is likely to improve. The findings agree with Shonubi and Akintaro (2016) which indicated that effective communication played a major role in enhancing the organizational performance.

It was found that leadership strategy had a negative regression coefficient of 0.019 where the p-value of the coefficient was 0.903. The negligible coefficient coupled with the high p-value which is greater than 0.05 indicates that leadership strategy in change management in the Judiciary has insignificant effect on service delivery. The findings differ with Kolil et al. (2019) that indicated that leadership had a significant effect on service delivery.

Stakeholders' engagement strategy had a regression coefficient of 0.011 with a p-value of 0.939. Since

the p-value is also greater than 0.05, the coefficient is insignificant. The findings therefore indicate that stakeholders' engagement in change management in the Judiciary does not significantly affect service delivery. The findings disagree with Terer, Mwangi and Gichuhi (2019) that revealed that stakeholders' involvement had a significant positive influence on change management which enhanced service delivery.

V. Conclusion

The study concluded that among the four change management strategies assessed in Kenya's Judiciary, planning strategy and communication strategy significantly influences service delivery positively. On the other hand, leadership strategy and stakeholders' engagement strategy has insignificant influence on service delivery in the Judiciary. The study recommends that to improve planning in change management strategy, the government through the Treasury must increase the amount of money allocated to the Judiciary in national budgets. The Judiciary must also ensure there is continuous sensitization on the changes being instituted and communication on the change implementation progress. The Judiciary should further engage employees in change management planning and evaluation to providing a learning curve on how to actualize change so that the change planner and implementers are working under similar dynamics. Last but not least, the top leadership in the Judiciary needs to ensure that they facilitate and promote capacity building to institutionalize planned changes and create general acceptance and involvement in the process.

References

- [1]. Daniel, C. O. (2019). Effects of change management on the performance of firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Advances in Scientific Research and Engineering*, 5(1), 59-64.
- [2]. Desta, B. K. (2019). Investigation of judicial service quality and customer satisfaction: The case of Dire Dawa city courts, Ethiopia. *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization*, 84(1), 1-17.
- [3]. Gafar, B. B. (2017). The travail of service delivery and developmental failure in post-independence Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 9(3), 26-33.
- [4]. Hasanaj, C. R. & Manxhari, M. (2017). Importance of communication during change: A case of the municipality of Vlora. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 2(1), 15-19.
- [5]. Kazmi, A. (2012). *Business policy and strategic management* (2nd ed.). Tata: McGraw Hill.
- [6]. Kharroub, A. O. & Mansour, M. M. (2019). The impact of strategic planning in Palestinian municipalities on the quality of service provided to its citizens. *International Business Research*, 12(5), 69-85.
- [7]. Kimari, M. M., Gathenya, J. & Kihoro, J. (2018). Influence of training on judicial service delivery in Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 5(1), 275-303.
- [8]. Kimutai, K. S. & Kwambai, M. (2018). Effect of stakeholder engagement on effectiveness of public universities in Kenya: Case of university of Eldoret. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, VI(2), 524-536.
- [9]. Kolil, S., Ondiek, B. A. & Manyasi, J. (2019). The effect of leadership on service delivery in county governments in North Rift, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 6(4), 443 – 451.
- [10]. Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- [11]. Kurgat, F. K. (2019). Effect of change management on organizational performance of media companies in Kenya (Unpublished master's thesis). Strathmore University, Nairobi.
- [12]. Martins, N. & Ledimo, O. (2015). The perceptions and nature of service delivery innovation among government employees: An exploratory study. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, 4(4), 575-580.
- [13]. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A. & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(Fall), 41-50.
- [14]. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A. & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, Spring (1), 12-40.
- [15]. Pavan, G. K. & Kulkarni, N. (2014). Research methodology: Review article. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 3(7), 168-173.
- [16]. Ramakrishnan, R. (2013). Delivery of public services-The way forward. A conference paper presented in the 31st SKOCH Summit on re-thinking governance, New Delhi, India (25th – 26 March).
- [17]. Rigii, G. P., Ogotu, M., Awino, Z. B. & Kitiabi, R. (2018). Strategic leadership and service delivery of county governments: The Kenyan experience. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, VI(11), 395-411.
- [18]. Shonubi, A. O. & Akintaro, A. A. (2016). The impact of effective communication on organizational performance. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*, 3(3), 1904-1914.
- [19]. Terer, L. C., Mwangi, J. & Gichuhi, D. (2019). Effect of stakeholder involvement on change management in the national police service in Nakuru County, Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, VII(10), 229-239.
- [20]. The Judiciary of Kenya (2019). *State of the Judiciary and the administration of justice: Annual report 2017-2018*. Nairobi: The Judiciary of Kenya.
- [21]. UNDP (2016). *A transparent and accountable Judiciary to deliver justice for all*. Bangkok: UNDP.
- [22]. Woodcock, J. (2017). *Management: Working the phones - Control and resistance in call centres*. London: Pluto Press.

Ochieng Lavenda Awuor, et. al. "Change Management Strategies and Service Delivery in the Judiciary: A Case of Milimani High Court in Nairobi County, Kenya." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 24(11), 2022, pp. 47-54.