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ABSTRACT: Banks contribute significantly to the economic growth of a nation, but their survival is being hampered by competition in the business environment, therefore there is the need to change strategically in order to survive. The objective of this study was to examine if strategic change can influence firms’ survival in the banking industry. Three theories were discussed while relevant literatures were reviewed. Four hypotheses were formulated based on the conceptual framework. Structured questionnaire was administered on 138 employees of the banks using the random sampling, the method of data analysis used in testing the hypotheses was the regression analysis and the results revealed that strategic change have a significant effect on firm’s survival. The study concluded that strategic change is a very strong predictor of firm’s survival because it can turn the position of a firm around and make it survive in a competitive environment. Therefore recommended that banks should adapt strategic change in a competitive environment if they want to survive, and should invest more in technology and innovation if they want to compete globally.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Banks contribute significantly to the economic growth of a nation but their survivals have been a concern to managers and researchers because of the turbulent, competitive and uncertain nature of the business environment. Most banks have undergone drastic transformation in order to survive in the industry. There is a global change in business, change in customer service and taste, innovations, changing nature of workforce, government legislations and regulations. Mullins (2010) asserted that factors such as uncertain economic and political conditions, change in social attitudes, fierce competition, take over, acquisitions, technological developments and governmental interventions or policies create an increasingly volatile environment for the banks.

Change in modern business has been caused by a world characterized by fierce competition and uncertainty and thus it is imperative for firms to change in order to remain competitive (Guidroz et al., 2010). According to (Kinicki and Williams, 2008) there are two types of change that are reactive and proactive changes. Reactive change is responding to unanticipated change while proactive change or planned change involves making careful thought-out changes in anticipation of possible or expected problems or opportunities. Organizational change can have many dimensions and unexpected consequences which mean that whoever seeks to initiate major changes needs to group the scale of what they are planning in order to carry out a cost benefit analysis (Rees and Porter, 2008).

Firms in Nigeria are facing a lot of challenges caused by external and internal environmental factors. The banking industry is one of the integral segments of the service sector where competition is very high; there is change in customer service and taste, change in products. In past decades, the Nigerian government has tried to ensure sanity in the industry through policies and legislation. Before 2004, there were 89 commercial banks in Nigeria, with the consolidation policy of the central bank of Nigeria that all commercial banks must have 25billion naira capital base, only 25 banks made it and today 22 banks are operating in the market. Government has intervened policy wise in order to revolutionize the banking sector to meet up the global standards but yet most of the banks in Nigeria cannot compete with its foreign counterparts.
Throughout the previous decades of environmental stability, the interest of scholars and businessmen was dominated by a focus on the potential explanatory factors of organizational success and growth (Peters and Waterman, 1982; Starbuck, 1965). However, environmental conditions have changed substantially since the past two decades. As a result of these drastic environmental changes, the main challenge which is currently faced by scholars and managers is trying to identify those factors associated with firm’s survival (Sutton, 1997; Whetten, 1987). Furthermore, in these highly turbulent environments, traditionally in organizational literature, it has frequently been argued that an organization’s survival depends increasingly on devising new competitive strategic responses. (Hambrick and D’Aveni, 1988; Porter, 1991; Weitzel and Jonsson, 1989). The Nigerian banking industry is faced with a turbulent, competitive and uncertain environment; scholars have not discussed much on strategic change for the firm’s survival in this context. Hence, the study of this nature is relevant and timely.

The paper is organized into sections starting with the brief overview of the research study followed by the theoretical framework, review of literature and hypotheses development, methodology, results and discussions, conclusions and lastly suggested areas for further research.

1.1. Theoretical Foundation

For investigating the effects of strategic change on firm’s survival, the study adopted the Lewin three step change theory and Lippitt, Watson and Westley theory of planned change.

1.2. Lewin Three-Step Change Theory

Lewin’s change theory attempts to analyze the forces (driving or restraining) that impact change. At organizational level where it is undergoing automation program, the first thing is to unfreeze the mindset of managers by creating dissatisfaction about the existing system file work or manual work discomfort amongst members of organization about lower level of productivity, creating sense of urgency and instilling fear of lagging behind in competition enlisting perceived benefits for motivating various techniques. The second step which is the change movement is that once the decision is taken for automation leads to multiple problems of learning, training, jobs and position displacements, hiring of computer technologist, budgetary allocations etc. Finally in the refreeze step, people get accustomed to the newer system as learners and performances are rewarded. Newer behaviors and work ethics are internalized. Therefore this theory fits into the study since people hardly adapt to change so it should be a gradual process.

1.3. Lippitt, Watson and Westley Seven-Step Theory

Lippitt’s is an extension of Lewin’s three-step theory. Its focus is on the change agents rather than the change itself. This model is bringing about planned change in organizations developed by Lippitt, Watson and Westley. The model is based on the principle that information must be freely and openly shared between the organizations and the change agents. This must be translated into action. The model extended Lewin’s three step theory which created a seven step theory that focuses more on the role and responsibility of the change agent than on the evolution of the change itself. The first step is to diagnose the problem. The second step is to assess the motivation capacity for change. Third step involves assessing the resources and motivation of the change agent which includes the change agents’ commitment to change, power and stamina. Fourth step is to choose progressive change objects. In the fifth step the role of the change agents should be selected and clearly understood by all parties so that expectations are clear. The sixth step is maintaining change through communication, feedback and group coordination. The final step is to gradually withdraw the change agent from their roles (Armstrong, 2006). Lippitt theory underpinned the structural changes within the organizations where the change agents need to get information about the change that is about to take place in the organization.

1.4. Quinn Logical Incrimination Theory

According to Quinn, the approach to strategic change is characterized as a process of artfully blending formal analysis, behavioral technique and power politics to bring about cohesive step-by-step movement towards ends which were initially conceived, but which are constantly refined and reshaped as new information appears. Quinn emphasizes that it is necessary to create awareness and commitment incrementally, broaden political support, manage coalitions and empower champions. Leadership change can adopt Quinn’s theory through defining a vision or goal.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Concept of Strategic Change

Given the wealth of research on strategic change, it is no surprise that different definitions exist. These definitions emphasize various aspects of strategic change, such as purpose (e.g., alignment with the external environment), its boundaries e.g., (a radical organizational change or the actors involved e.g. top managers for the purpose of this work, the researcher followed (Fiss and Zajac, 2006; Mantere et al., 2012) defined strategic change as an undertaking that involves “either a redefinition of organizational mission or a substantial shift in overall priorities and goals to reflect new emphasis or direction” organization, such as structure, identity and the workforce, while strategic change is a narrower concept that includes only organizational changes that are strategic (Ginsberg, 1988; Nadler and Tushman, 1989; Rajagopalan and Spreitzer, 1997).

Strategic change is concerned with organizational transformation that deals with broad, long-term and organization wide issues and it’s about moving to a future state, which has been defined generally in terms of strategic vision and scope, (Armstrong, 2006). Strategic change covers the purpose and mission of the organization, its corporate philosophy on such matters as growth, quality, innovation, and values concerning people, the customer needs served and the technologies employed. This leads to specifications of competitive positioning and strategic goals for achieving and maintaining competitive advantage and for product-market development (Armstrong, 2006).

2.2. Firm’s Survival

Firm’s survival refers to those firms that have not closed their operations temporarily or permanently (Cefis and Marsili, 2012). They further state that the present economic crisis facing many countries has led to increasing companies closed in recent years. Therefore, the academic literature recognizes the need to study further factors that may favour the probability of survival of firms (Ejermo and Xiao, 2014). Several empirical studies have evaluated the determinants that influence the likelihood of that happening. These factors can be classified into different levels.

Human capital has been considered as an important intangible asset for new firm survival because it affects the performance (Boden and Nucci, 2000). This factor is typically measured by the entrepreneurs, firm’s founders or owners’ level of education and training (Pena, 2002), prior experience in management positions, industry-specific experience and previous startup experiences (Bruderl et al., 1992). In this order of idea, the literature recognizes that education, work and life experience are fundamental to firm survival (Coleman et al., 2013). Theoretical models of firm and industry dynamics lead to failure rates that vary with firm age (Cressy, 2006) some authors argued that exit rates are expected to decrease as firm’s age because the learning process may take several years.

About size, large firms endure better survival prospects (Esteve-Pérez and Mañez-Castillejo, 2008). Jovanovic (1982) provides a theory of selection with information consistent with finding that smaller firms grow faster and are more likely to fail than large firms. Gémar et al. (2016). Supported this idea and concluded in their studies that larger firms are more likely to survive than smaller firms in the example of the hotel industry in Spanish economy from 1997 to 2009.

According to resource based theory, the ability of firms to develop distinct capabilities largely determines their survival prospects. The generation of these firm- specific assets highly depends on the firm's R&D activities (Barney, 1991). In this way, survival performance of firms that make R&D is better than that of firms that neither make nor buy R&D independently of the innovation intensity of the industry (Kimura and Fujii, 2003). Also firms with substantial innovation are less likely to fail (Fontana and Nesta, 2009; Wagner S. and Cockburn, 2010).

2.3. Structural Changes

The structure of an organization can be regarded as a framework for getting things done in an organization and consists of units, functions, divisions, departments and formally constituted work teams into which activities related to particular processes: projects, prominent, market, customers, geographical areas or professional disciplines are grouped together (Armstrong, 2006). David (2006) indicates structure may be seen as a statement from senior management as to how they wish the firm to work. In essence the structure of the firm should reflect the activities of the firm. As trends towards teamwork; empowerment, total quality management etc. gather pace, structure needs to facilitate these initiatives. The structure indicates who is accountable for directing, coordinating and carrying out these activities and defines
management hierarchies, the “claim of command” thus spelling out, broadly, who is responsible to whom for what are each level the organization Armstrong (2006).

An organization structure is seen by many as a powerful tool in mobilizing resources in both an efficient and effective manner. The desire for change is clearly present but whether a positive outcome with a result is another matter. Organization structure is the formal presentation of the system of positions and relationships within the firm. It should be an operational statement of the firms’ goals. It specifies formal communication channels of who does what, and who is responsible for whom/what (Burton et al., 2006). Armstrong (2006) further notes that structures incorporate a network of roles and relationships and are there to help in the process of ensuring that collective effort is explicitly organized to achieve specified ends. Factors affecting structure emanate from internal or external stimuli. The changes may be real or cosmetic, short or long-term, reactive responses or amplifications of strategic readiness for the future. Internal triggers often include the managing director’s desire to improve the structure rationalization of positions and the need for better or quicker communications. It may be a current problem that gives rise to change or a more proactive intervention by senior management. External triggers are commonly changes in the environment or changes in technology. Restructuring is perceived by many as an opportunity to change and to bring about improvements (Armstrong, 2006). Rees and Porter (2008) added that the impact of globalization and technology has led to the development of more flexible organization structures. An employee’s position in the organizational hierarchy is an important structural variable which influences a range of organizational attitudes and behaviors. Based on the literature review, the study therefore set down the hypotheses as thus:

H1. Structural change significantly influence firm’s survival

2.4. Technological Changes

Technological change emphasizes automation and other capital – intensive production devices. Such technological change transforms the nature of human interaction with work (Krell, 2006). Further, a major factor causing change or being used as a change agent is change in technology (Rees and Porter, 2008). Technological forces, especially computer based information systems and the internet, continue to revolutionaries how customers are served, employees communicate and network with each other and external stakeholders (Solocum and Hullriegel, 2007). Further the introduction of new technology may result in considerable changes to systems and processes. Different skills are required and new methods of working are developed (Armstrong, 2006). Technological change transforms the nature of the marketplace by changing the relative cost, features and availability of products (Krell, 2006). The result of technological changes may be an extension of the skills base of the organization and its employees, including multi-skilling; however it could result in downsizing (Armstrong, 2006). Technology change may be considered as neutral because it can have both positive and negative effects or a combination of the two and sometimes the technical advantages of the systems may outweigh the social advantages. Sometimes it is possible to take into account social and psychological needs by recognizing the social dimensions of technological changes (Rees and Porter, 2008). New technology can present a considerable threat to employees as the world of work has changed in many ways and knowledge workers are employed in largely computerized offices and laboratories and technicians work in computer integrated manufacturing systems. They may have to be managed differently from the clerks or machine operators they displaced. Baron and Spulber (2017) states that the survival of firms depends on the continued and expanded use of technology vintage that was new at the time when the firm was created. The service industries have become predominant and manufacturing is in decline (Armstrong, 2006). The study therefore set down the hypotheses as thus:

H1. Technological change significantly influence firm’s survival

2.5. Leadership Change

Worldwide, leadership has become the most widely researched aspect of organizational behaviour and a number of theories have emerged focusing on the strategies, traits, styles and the situational approach to leadership. Since it is the duty of leaders to get things done through the coordinated efforts of others, it is assumed therefore that leadership strategies will translate into the subordinates’ performance and the success by the firm. Strategies here represent the actions that are taken by the leader to achieve objectives (Horner, 2002).
Leadership is a process by which an individual influences the thoughts, attitudes, and behaviours of others. The Leaders set a way for the firm; they help see what lies ahead; they envisage what they might achieve and how to accomplish it; they inspire and motivate the subordinates (Quinn, 2005). Leadership is therefore very important to the survival and effectiveness of organizations. As organizations grow, the expectations about their performances increase and demand for good leadership tends to multiply. Leadership ability is a valuable skill and those who possess it reap high rewards. Therefore, from every indication, there is the need to find out whether leadership has any link with survival of organizations. However, most leaders tend to learn more from failure than from success, notwithstanding failure and success of the firm are two sides of the same coin. The issue is that leaders so often ask the question “why do we fail” than to ask for “why the success they experience occurred”. They take for granted the effect of today’s success on the future survival of the firm. The basic problem in leadership of the corporate organization is that leaders do quickly ask why the failure, than to ask why the successes. However, today’s success could bring about tomorrow’s failure, if the firm refused to learn from success as they would have learnt from failure.

Cole (2005) defines Leadership as a personal hero. He states that the leader is an individual hero; a leader is a strong-willed and charismatic chief executive who personifies an organization and its success. Margie (2012) agrees that there is an increasing demand for excellent leaders. With globalization, the improvements in technology, a changing workforce and the changing expectations and values of workers, come more challenging contexts in which to lead agreed and without good leadership, organizations move too slowly, stagnate and lose their way (Margie, 2012) The study therefore set down the hypotheses as thus:

Hypothesis 3: Leadership change significantly influence firm’s survival

2.6. Product Innovation for Firm’s Survival

Literature of innovation shows that any firm needs innovation to succeed and survive (Damanpour, 1996; Jimenez and Sanz-Valle, 2011) and gain sustainable competitive advantage (Standing and Kiniti, 2011). The fact remains that there are a large number of definitions of innovation in the literature, however, the exact definition of the term was described globally (Amara and Landry, 2005). In its broadest sense, the term comes from the Latin–innovare– meaning ‘to make something new’. UK Department of Trade and Industry (2007) assumes that innovation is a process of turning opportunity into new ideas and of putting these into widely used practice. Furthermore, innovation was firstly described by the German economist and political scientist- Schumpeter (1934) defined it as “the driving force for development”. Five manifestations of innovation were proposed in his definition.

● Creation of new products or qualitative improvements in existing products
● Use of a new industrial process
● New market openings
● Development of new raw-material sources or other new inputs
● New forms of industrial organizations

According to Oslo Manual, innovation is defined as the “implementation of a new or significantly improved product (goods or service), process, a new marketing technique or a new organizational method in business practices, workplace organization or external relations”. (OECD and Eurostat, 2005) also classified innovation into four different types which are product innovation, process innovation, marketing innovation and organizational innovation. Most studies of firm survival states that innovation is the essence of firm survival since only those firms that are able to successfully innovate are able to establish and maintain a competitive advantage in the market (Bruderl et al., 1992; Wagner J., 1999).

Although there is an element of truth in this line of argument, it only tells one side of the story since it ignores the fact that innovation, especially new-to-the-world innovation, is subject to fundamental uncertainty. Consequently, studies of firm survival using measures of innovation based on “successful” innovation erroneously infer a positive causal relationship between innovation and firm survival. The study therefore set down the hypotheses as thus:

Hypothesis 4: Product innovation significantly influence firm’s survival
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study used a descriptive survey and inferential design. The purpose of using these was to collect detailed and factual information. Data was collected based on the concepts defined in the research model and hypotheses tested. The study is a descriptive survey and inferential because it adopted the use of questionnaires and hypotheses tested which was aimed at examining the effect of strategic change on firm’s survival.

3.2. Population of the Study

The target population of study was the entire employees of the various banks in plateau state which was estimated to be 210.

3.3. Sample and Sampling Techniques

The sample size for the study was 138 employees of banks in Jos Metropolis. Taro Yamane formula was used to determine the sample size, the researcher used a simple random sampling method to collect data from the target population. This involves dividing the target population into subgroups in order to get equal representation of staff of the banks in the metropolis.

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \]

Where:
- \( n \) = sample size required
- \( N \) = number of people in the population
- \( e \) = allowable error (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/NO</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zenith</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>First bank</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FCMB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Polaris bank Ltd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GTB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UBA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unity bank</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sterling bank</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey 2018
3.4. Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire because questionnaires are extremely flexible and could be used to gather information concerning almost any topic from a large or small number of people (Olatokun, 2009). The questionnaire was specifically designed to accomplish the objectives of the study. The questionnaires were divided into two A and B sections. A comprise of basic demographic information regarding the respondent such as gender, age, academic qualification and working experience. Section B comprise of the questions which the respondent is expected to answer. Sections A consist of closed-ended questions. Section B used a structured 4-points modified Likert scale where strongly agree (SA) 4, agree (A) 3, Disagree (DA) 2, strongly agree (SA) 1.

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree/disagree with the various statements.

3.5. Validity of the Instrument

Validity of the instrument was ascertained by experts to ascertain its content before its use. The researchers carried out a pilot test before the commitment of time, work and money to the actual data collected in the research study which makes the instrument reliable.

3.6. Method of Data Analysis

On receipt of the questionnaires from the field, the data collected was edited, coded and classified based on similarities and the tabulated. Content analysis was employed for data pertaining to the profile of the respondents while data pertaining to the objectives of the study was analyzed by employing descriptive statistics. The researchers employed a regression analysis method to test the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

4. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

One hundred and thirty eight (138) copies of the questionnaires were administered to the staff of the selected banks using a research assistant and only 97 copies were duly completed and returned representing 70% of questionnaires distributed. Results from the analyses of the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents indicated that majority of the respondents are males. Moreover, the respondents are concentrated within the age bracket of 26 to 45 years. Most of the respondent’s qualifications were persons with HND, B.Sc and Master Degrees. This implies that most of the staff will not have much problem in adopting change.

This study attempts to predict firm survival from structural change, leadership change, product innovation and technological change. The dependent variable measured as firm survival moderately correlates with structural change ($R = 0.253$), leadership change ($R = -0.293$), product innovation ($R = 0.262$) and technology change ($R = 0.459$), which is appropriate for regression analysis. Tolerance and VIF, indicators of multicollinearity are also within acceptable range indicating absence of multicollinearity, which is an appropriate condition for regression analysis. When structural change and technology change are regressed against firm survival, the regression model is significant. In order words, structural change, leadership change, product innovation and technological change are significant predictors of firm survival. Table 2 captures this: $F(4,96) = 11.301$, $p < 0.001$. The model as developed for this study therefore, explains 0.329 of the variance in the dependent variable while the multiple correlation value is 0.574. This information is shown on Table 2 by reading the $R^2$ and $R$ statistic respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>116.010</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173.010</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors Computations (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.574&quot;</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>1.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), technological change, structural change, leadership changes, product innovation
b. Dependent Variable: firm survival
Source: Authors Computations (2018)
4.1. Tests of Hypotheses

Test of hypothesis was achieved through evaluating the t-statistic with its significance value. Table 4 summarizes the regression result. From the table, $H_1$, $H_2$, $H_3$, and $H_4$ are all rejected. The regression result shows that structural change ($H_1$) is a significant predictor of firm survival with $B = 0.252$, $t = 2.644$, $p = 0.010$; technological change represented as hypothesis two is also a significant predictor of firm survival with $B = 0.344$, $t = 3.530$, $p = 0.001$; leadership change represented as hypothesis three also significantly predicts firm survival with $B = 0.471$, $t = -2.700$, $p = 0.008$ and lastly product innovation represented as hypothesis four also significantly predicts firm survival with $B = 0.388$, $t = 2.122$, $p = 0.000$.

Table 4. Test of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Change - $H_1$</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological change$H_2$</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership change-$H_3$</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product innovation-$H_4$</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.520</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.122</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors computations (2018)

4.2. Discussion of Findings

This study investigated strategic change for firm’s survival in some selected money deposit banks in Jos metropolis by looking at how the various strategic changes influence banks' survival.

The result of testing hypothesis $H_1$ has established that structural change significantly influences firm’s survival. The implication is that when there are changes within the various structures in the organization can influence the survival of the firm. This is in line with the findings of Gitonga (2014) which shows that there is a positive relationship with the firm's performance. Armstrong (2006) also sees restructuring by many as an opportunity to change and to bring improvement.

The results of hypothesis $H_2$ shows that technological change significantly influences firm’s survival which indicates that the introduction of new technology will definitely change the services of the banks which will give confidence to the stakeholders. This is also consistent with the findings of Gitonga (2014) which states that technological change positively correlates with firm’s performance. Therefore for a firm to survive in a competitive environment, it can transform the nature of the marketplace by changing the relative cost, features and availability of products (Krell, 2006).

The results of $H_3$ indicates that leadership changes have a significant influence on firm’s survival. This implies that visionary leaders and leadership style influence firm’s survival which can turn around firms for better performance. This is in line with the findings of Hurduzeu (2015) which states that transformational leaders inspire individuals within the organizations to work harder and to strive for the highest levels of performance and Danisman et al. (2015) which states that leadership has a medium level of effect on organizational performance.

The results of hypothesis $H_4$ also established that product innovation has a significant influence on firm’s survival therefore innovation is key to the survival of firms in a competitive environment which is in line with the findings of Jimenez et al that says firm’s need innovation to succeed and gain competitive advantage.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study established that firm’s survival is affected by the four strategic change variables namely; structural change, technological change leadership change and product innovation. Strategic change is a very important element for firm’s survival because of the pressure being mounted by the external environment and the expectations of stakeholders; top management needs to establish a flexible and adaptive infrastructure that should lead firms towards survival.

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the study therefore recommended that banks should adapt structural, technological change, leadership change and product innovation as strategies for survival in this kind of competitive environment if they want to continue in business.

Banks should invest more in technology and product innovation so as to compete globally; they should always be ahead of their competitors and be proactive as government policies can change at any time with customers' tests or the way they want to be served.
SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study is limited in scope as it was conducted within Jos metropolis; therefore it can be extended in Nigeria using all the money deposit banks in Nigeria because not all the banks are operating in plateau state. Other variables like human resource change, geographical change can be used to examine whether there is any significant influence on firm’s survival.
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