

The  
Management  
University  
of Africa



Sponsored by the Kenya Institute of Management

**POST GRADUATE UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS**  
**SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP**  
**DEGREE OF MASTER OF MANAGEMENT AND**  
**LEADERSHIP**

**MML 5101: LEADING AND MANAGING CHANGE**

**DATE: 30<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2026**

**DURATION: 3 HOURS**

**MAXIMUM MARKS: 60**

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

1. Write your registration number on the answer booklet.
2. **DO NOT** write on this question paper.
3. This paper contains **FOUR (4)** questions.
4. Question **ONE is compulsory.**
5. Answer any other **TWO** questions.
6. Question **ONE** carries **30 MARKS** and the rest carry **15 MARKS** each.
7. **Write all your answers in the Examination answer booklet provided**

## **QUESTION ONE**

**Read the case study and answer question a), b), c) and (d).**

### **CASE STUDY: LEADING CHANGE AT THE KENYA URBAN ROADS AUTHORITY (KURA)**

The Kenya Urban Roads Authority (KURA) is a state corporation mandated to manage, develop, and maintain urban road networks across Kenya. By 2022, KURA was under increasing pressure from the national government, development partners, and the public to improve project delivery timelines, transparency, and service quality. Rapid urbanization, rising traffic congestion, and citizen demand for accountability had exposed deep inefficiencies in the Authority's traditional bureaucratic operating model.

Internally, KURA faced several structural challenges. Decision-making was highly centralized, project approvals were slow, and departments operated in silos. Many senior managers had risen through technical ranks and were uncomfortable with participatory leadership styles. Employee morale was low, with younger professionals expressing frustration over rigid procedures and limited career growth. Externally, the Authority had to align with national reforms such as the Public Finance Management Act and digitization initiatives under Kenya's Vision 2030.

In response, the newly appointed Director General initiated an organizational change program aimed at transforming KURA into a performance-driven, customer-focused agency. The change agenda included restructuring departments, introducing digital project management systems, decentralizing decision-making, and embedding a results-based performance culture. The Director General emphasized that leadership behavior, not just systems, would determine whether the change succeeded.

However, resistance quickly emerged. Some long-serving managers perceived the reforms as a threat to their authority and status. Others questioned the relevance of private-sector-style change models in a public institution. Trade unions raised concerns about job security, while middle managers struggled to translate the change vision into day-to-day operational practices. Communication gaps fueled rumors and mistrust among staff.

To manage resistance, the leadership team adopted multiple change management approaches. They organized stakeholder forums, leadership retreats, and staff training sessions to build awareness and buy-in. The Director General applied elements of transformational leadership by articulating a compelling vision and modeling openness to feedback. At the same time, incremental change techniques were used to pilot digital systems in selected regions before full rollout. Despite these efforts, implementation remained uneven. Some regions embraced the reforms and reported improved project turnaround times, while others reverted to old practices once senior oversight reduced. These exposed weaknesses in change ownership, leadership alignment, and institutional culture. The leadership team realized that sustaining change required deeper cultural transformation, not just structural reforms.

By 2024, KURA stood at a crossroads. While tangible improvements were visible, the long-term success of the change initiative depended on leadership consistency, employee engagement, and the Authority's ability to institutionalize new ways of working. The case highlights the complexity of leading and managing change in a public-sector organization operating within political, social, and institutional constraints.

**Required:**

a) Based on the case study, analyze the key drivers of change at KURA.

**(10 marks)**

b) With reference to the case study, evaluate the leadership approach adopted by the Director General in managing the change process.

**(10 marks)**

c) Discuss the main barriers to change encountered during implementation at KURA.

**(5 marks)**

d) Using change management theory, assess why some regions succeeded while others struggled to sustain the reforms.

**(5 marks)**

## QUESTION TWO

a) “The only thing that is constant in organizations is change”, discuss the concept of organizational change in the context of public-sector institutions.

**(10  
marks)**

b) From a manufacturing industry perspective, explain how change initiative reflects the definition in section (a) above.

**(5 marks)**

## QUESTION THREE

a) As a leadership and change management expert, differentiate between planned change and emergent change.

**(10 marks)**

b) With reference to a service industry that you are familiar with its operations and structure, explain using examples the differences discussed in section (a) above.

**(5 marks)**

**QUESTION FOUR**

**a)** As a trainer of trainers (TOT) for a medium sized organization, discuss the role of organizational culture in sustaining change.

**(10 marks)**

**b)** As a manager in a local FinTech firm that has recently been established, describe how culture can influence the outcomes of its change program.

**(5  
marks)**