

WOLKITEUNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES



**CHALLENGES AND PROSPECT OF KAIZEN IMPLEMENTATION IN ETHIOPIAN
HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: THE CASE OF WOLKITE UNIVERSITY**

*A SENIOR RESEARCH ESSAY SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNANCE
AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHLOR OF ARTS IN GOVERNANCE AND
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES*

**BY ZELALEM MEKONIN
TAMERAT TESFAYE
DINKNESH MANEDO**

ADVISOR; Mr. MEKONNEN MENGESHA

**WOLKITE, ETHIOPIA
JUNE, 2019**

Acknowledgement

First of all, we would like to give thanks to our almighty God the source of all knowledge and wisdom. His grace and mercy has brought us this far.

We are grateful to express our deepest appreciation and gratitude to our advisor **Mekonnen Mengesha** for his strong guidance and constructive criticism that helped us stay focused from the beginning of this work to the end.

We would also give very grateful thanks to our family for providing the financial and material assistance, which led to the implementation and finalization of this study. Without their support, this study would not have been completed on time. Finally, we would like thank all who contributed a lot in the long journey of our task.

Acronyms

CI = Continuous Improvement

EKI= Ethiopian Kaizen Institute

TQM= Total Quality Management

WKU= Wolkite University

Abstract

KAIZEN a Japans business management concept that calls for continuous improvement that promotes quality and productivity improvement as well as human resource development. It was implemented to improve organization efficiency by standardizing working procedure and eliminating wistful activities through the collective effort of its managers and staff of the organization. Kaizen was selected and implemented in Wolkite University as a working system in order to improve service delivery and standardizing the working procedure by eliminating wistful activities and reducing the long work flow. The purpose of this study is to examine current status, effectiveness and challenges of kaizen in Wolkite University. In addition, the objective is to assess the major changes brought by the kaizen implementation to study the gaps between the designed and actual application of kaizen and to analyze the major challenges encountered during kaizen implementation and to suggest good recommendation which can help effective implementation of kaizen. To achieve the above mention objectives descriptive research design is selected and used to gather primary and secondary data. The population for this study is 943 administration employees from these population 90 respondents selected by using simple random sampling. Primary data was collected through survey questionnaire and in-depth interview.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

One of the benefits of globalization is bringing the whole world to share technological equipment and other innovations to simplify the lives of human in terms of business communication like, e-learning, e-business and e-commerce (Totonchi & Kakamanshadi, 2011). In this era the world gets organized in the forms of economic unity, benchmarking the positive experience of other countries with regard to innovation. Kaizen which originated from Japan is one of the means that has been used widely; especially in Asia to improve elements associated with the effectiveness of business organization with benefits already well documented (Mureithi, 2013).

The term Kaizen is the combination of two Japanese words 'Kai' which is translated to English as Change and 'Zen' means Good and when these two words came together, they loosely translate to English as Change for Good or Better. Masaaki Imai was the first to coin the term in his book, *Kaizen: The Key to Japan's Competitive Success* (Prosic, 2011). Kaizen is a Japanese philosophy, which focuses on making small and continuous improvements.

The beginning of this philosophy dates back to the end of the Second World War with the rehabilitation of post-war Japan. American aid to help the country's reconstruction brought in experts from every discipline. The Economic and Scientific Section (ESS) group was such a group established to help improve Japanese Management skills; this group had a training film to introduce the three "J" programs. (Job Instruction, Job Methods and Job Relations) the film was titled "Improvement in 4 Steps" (Kidus, 2014). The term Kaizen actually became famous around the world through the works of Masaaki Imai. He was a Japanese organizational theorist and management consultant, known for his work on quality management, specifically on Kaizen. In 1985 he founded the Kaizen Institute Consulting Group (KICG) to help western companies introduce the concepts, systems and tools of Kaizen (Kanbanchi, 2016).

According Mullins, (2010) many scholars in relevant field of study did not agree on utilization and application of tools like, BPR because such tools focused on changes that are taken place in

big pace and hardly recognize the small improvements for the organizational change. For that purpose including Ethiopia accepted the positive contribution of Kaizen total quality management system which considers small changes and improvements as a vital key for the great organizational development.

Kaizen philosophy introduced to Ethiopia after the bilateral dialogue between Japan and Ethiopian governments undertaken in 2008. Ethiopian kaizen institute was established in 2011, and chose 30 companies for the pilot test of Kaizen project. After measuring the performance of chosen companies the institute awarded 18 companies for 3 excellent, 5 best and 10 good performer companies (EKI, 2012).

The Ethiopian kaizen institute described kaizen as it is "continuous improvement " it is using a common sense and it has a scientific method using statically quality control and adaptive framework of the organization. And a philosophy of never stop with a completion of one work means it is sustainable processes (JICA, 2016). On September 15, 2017 the Ethiopian kaizen institution announced after the implementation of kaizen philosophy in the country it was able to prevent above 2 billions birrs from unwanted wastage or extravagance over past five years ago (ENA, 2017).

1.2. Statement of the problem

Different countries in the world which applied kaizen management technique have various types of practice and encountered multi-dimensional challenges. Among other challenges Garcia-Sabater & Marin Garcia (2011) identified common challenges to Kaizen such as resistance to change especially among mature workers, and confusion on the concepts of continuous improvement.

As the kaizen system is new for Ethiopia it encountered challenges. Kaizen development sector deputy director general of the Ethiopian kaizen institute Seblewongel Haregeweine explained that "the management instability or work transfer, change resistance, employee turnover were the major challenges facing to the organization" (Ethiopian Herald, 2017).

Proper understanding of policy instrument, methods, culture's, principles and application technique of kaizen philosophy would be one essential steps towards addressing and solving currently existing problem and challenge (Tiwari, 2017; Ohno et al., 2009; Eden, 2017). So far there have been limited and inclusive studies conducted on implementation of kaizen in

governmental organizations at different level in Ethiopia, like BirhanuTadesse (2014) conducted a study on practice and challenges of kaizen implementation in case of woreda three enterprise of Gulele sub city in Addis Ababa city administration. Despite many researches were conducted on the issue of challenges and practice of kaizen implementation the relevance of Kaizen application in higher education is not investigated thus, the researchers would try to fill the gap by investigating the challenges and prospect of Kaizen in Wolkite University in Gurage zone. Based on the review made by the team of researchers, the practices of Kaizen in higher educational institutions are not assessed. In this study an attempt was made to assess basic issue that related with the implementation, prospect and challenges of kaizen in Wolkite University and then demonstrate the degree of prospect and its challenges that influence the implementation of kaizen in the targeted higher education al institution.

1.3 Research Questions

- How does kaizen practiced in the university?
- Does the implementation of kaizen system bring a change?
- To what extent has a kaizen improved the performance of Wolkite University?
- What were the major challenges encountered in implementation of kaizen in the university?

1.4 General objective of the study

The general objective of the study is focused on the challenges and prospect of Kaizen implementation in Wolkite University.

1.5 Significance of the study

In the first place, the findings of the study have a significant importance to understand the prospect of kaizen, and its obstacles for effective implementation in Wolkite University. Specifically this study also has the following contributions:

- ✓ The finding of the study would help to fill an information gap among managers, kaizen officer and employees.
- ✓ The finding of the study would provide a rich description of the kaizen application at WKU by clarifying challenges associated with its implementation to all interested institutions.
- ✓ It would help kaizen officers to improve or revise the practice of kaizen training.

Moreover, the study result would be served as input for the future researches in this area and it also be an addition to the existing literature.

1.6 Scope of the study

The study was delimited to Wolkite University and furthermore it is limited in the administration of the university because kaizen is implementing in the administration offices of the university. The research is focused on the challenges and prospects of kaizen implementation on administration staffs of Wolkite University.

1.7 Organization of the study

This research consisted five chapters. The first chapter dealt about introductory part. The second chapter focused on the review of related literature. The third chapter is about the research methodology and design. The fourth chapter concerned on the analysis and interpretation of the data and the last chapter contained conclusion and recommendation of the study.

1.8 Limitation of the study

In the process of conducting this study, the researchers had faced some obstacles which have their own negative impact on the well investigation of the study. These challenges occurred mainly because of lack of time, financial shortage and unwillingness of some informants to give appropriate data. Even though the researchers had faced the above mentioned problems, they have been used their maximum effort to make the study effective.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Definitions and Conceptual Overview of Kaizen

Kaizen culture is an organizational culture based on the three super ordinate principles namely process and results, systemic thinking, nonjudgmental and non-blaming (Mullins, 2010). The word indicates a process of continuous improvement of the standard way of work. It is a compound word involving two concepts: Kai (mean change) and Zen (mean for the better). The term also comes from 'Gemba Kaizen' meaning 'continuous improvement' (CI) (Mullins, 2010). Continuous Improvement is one of the main strategies for excellence in production, and is considered vital in today's competitive environment (Robinson, 1991).

Kaizen involve everyone in the organization from top management to operational workers. In Japan, the concept of Kaizen is so deeply engraved in the minds of both managers and workers that they often do not even realize they are thinking Kaizen as a customer-driven strategy for improvement rather they assume it as their own way of life that they believe their working, social and home life deserves to be constantly improved (Thessaloniki, 2006).

The Kaizen philosophy assumes that every aspect of our life should focus on constant-improvement efforts. The most effective way to achieve Kaizen is for worker themselves to be highly motivated to implement and to improve production methods and products. Suggestion systems, Quality circle and self-management are typical methods to motivate workers to achieve Kaizen (EK I, 2012).

From above definitions and explanations of kaizen it is possible to argue thatkaizen is an on-going improvement that based on incremental change. It starts from individual level in whichit requires the consent and motivation of every individual for change because its success is relied on the internalization of the concept.

2.2. Historical Overview of Kaizen

The inception of Kaizen dates back to the end of the Second World War after the defeat of the axis powers (Japan, Italy and Germany) (Kidus, 2014) it brought by the US assistance group and after taking a lesson Japan adopted and implemented it successfully this success was made because of Japan's strong hardworking culture. Its success in Japan even surpassed the performance of the US which brought to Japan. This incident makes multiple governments and business organizations to recognize and incorporate Kaizen (Ohno et al., 2009).

One of the pioneers in Kaizen innovative process was Sakichi Toyoda, the founder of Toyota Industries Co. Ltd. He developed widely recognized 'Toyota Production System'. The success of Toyota Production System led many other Japanese companies to adopt a similar technique of small, continual change in their process (Workspirited, 2018).

According to Ohno et al., (2009) the development and diffusion of Kaizen philosophy in Japan and the rest of the world has four phases. The first phase was Japan's impression in the American style quality management it's just after the Second World War. In this phase a national movement for quality and productivity improvement emerged, supported by the Union of Japanese Scientists and Engineers (JUSE), established in 1946, and the Japan Productivity Center (JPC), established in 1955. In the second phase kaizen defused throughout the Japanese companies including small and medium sized ones during 1970's and 1980's. Regional spreading of kaizen was the third phase in Kaizen history. The appreciation of the Japanese currency (Yen) in 1985 prompted Japanese manufacturing companies to shift their production bases to East Asia where production costs were lower. This incident paves a way to transfer Kaizen in East Asia. Japanese firms committed to duplicate the quality management system in their factories abroad and they assisted to local partners to learn Kaizen philosophy and practice. The fourth phase, which is recent, has witnessed growing interest in East Asia's industrial experience in other developing regions including Africa.

2.2. The Kaizen Philosophy

Improvement has become an integral part of theories and models of change and cycles of organizational changes because in order to be competitive organizations have no alternative except improve their performance for their survival. Kaizen is a philosophy that emphasized continuous improvement for great result (Titu, Oprean & Grecu, 2010). Kaizen never being

satisfied with what was accomplished last week or last year (Thessaloniki, 2006), rather it strives for endless improvement and modification.

Kaizen help companies to control cost, minimize workers motion, focus on zero defects and, more fundamentally, improve workers' skills by creating a cooperative atmosphere where everyone becomes fully aware of the key goals, each step of the kaizen process needs to be mapped out and measured to ensure economic value to its customers (Asayehgn et al, 2014).

Kaizen can be understood as having a spirit of improvement founded on a spirit of cooperation of the people. Suggesting the importance of teams as a fundamental design in this approach the researchers summarized the Kaizen methodology as (1) one that involves all the employees of the firm; (2) improving the methods or processes of work; (3) improvement are small and incremental in their nature, and (4) using teams as the vehicle for achieving these incremental changes.

2.2.1 The Objectives of Kaizen

The main aim of Kaizen is identifying the existed problem and working to get rid of it. If there are no problems, there is no room for improvement and it's obvious that identification of problem and making effort to eliminate or decrease the identified problem leads to more improvement in the standard and performance of the given organization (Eden, 2017).

In the Kaizen philosophy maintaining and improving standards is the core priority of the management because if we do not maintain and improve the standard, the desired output is bound to slip back, giving it the "two steps forward, one step back" effect. Thus, long last improvement is realized only when people work to higher standards. For this reason, maintenance and improvement are said to be the two sides of one coin (Prosic, 2011).

Kaizen aims for improvements in productivity, effectiveness, safety, and waste reduction. Those who follow the approach often find a lot more in return. There are various benefits of improvements in which the following are some of them. Those who follow the approach often find a whole lot more in return: Less waste – inventory is used more efficiently based on employee skills; Workers are more satisfied – they have a direct impact on the way things are done; Employees are more committed to do a better job– team members have more of a stake (a share or interest in business) in their job and are more inclined to commit to doing a good job; Improved retention – satisfied and engaged people are more likely to stay; Competitiveness increased – increases in efficiency tend to contribute to lower costs and higher quality products;

Improvement in consumer satisfaction – coming from higher quality products with fewer faults; Improved problem solving and looking at processes from a solutions perspective allows employees to solve problem in the work place (Mark & Jenkins, 2015).

Kaizen is generally said to be an endless improvement that always strives for detecting the problem in the work process and made an effort to eliminate or decrease the detected constraint in which it led the work process more standardized.

2.2.2. Kaizen Application and Implementation

Kaizen implementation is not a one-time activity rather it is continuous and a day today activity and it expressed by the rate of the workers involvement in terms of providing important suggestion for their organization (Prosic, 2011). It is based on making little changes on a regular basis namely, always improving productivity, safety and effectiveness while reducing waste. Suggestions are not limited to a specific area such as production or marketing rather they are needed everywhere in the organization. Kaizen is generally based on making changes anywhere that improvements can be made (Thessaloniki, 2006).The companies that implement a Kaizen philosophy place an emphasis on the processes on the 'how' of achieving the required results. A process emphasis goes beyond designing effective processes; it requires the teams to understand why a process works, whether it can be modified or replicated somewhere else in the company

Conventional Approach	Process-emphasis approach
Employees are the problem	The process is the problem
Doing my job	Helping to get things done
Understanding my job	Knowing how my job fits in the process
Measuring individuals	Measuring performance
Change the person	Change the process
Correct errors	Reduce variation
Who made the error?	What allowed tile error to occur?

and how it can be improved.

Table 2.1: improvements through kaizen: a process focus (Source Thessaloniki, 2006)

Table2.1, illustrates some of the major differences between a conventional and a process-emphasis approach. The conventional approach is subjective in which it point a finger on people for the committed problems and believes changing weak employees by strong and competitive

persons bring change whereas, the process-emphasis approach blames the process for being pervasive so in order to make improvements the pervasive process should be replaced by improved process.

2.2.3. Preconditions Necessary to Implement Kaizen Training

The Stage of human capital development is crucial since the Kaizen advocates life-long learning (Kokeb, 2018). To conduct effective management leadership should use professional development, self-development, excellence model, assessing organizational performance and effectiveness like benchmarking, gap analysis among other to become competitive, to improve the skill, to sustain the effectiveness and performance of management leaders.

The most effective forms of development activity are those connected directly to managers' experiences in the workplace. The belief that 'leaders are born and not made' has finally been eclipsed by the implementation of job experience. The ability to facilitate organizational learning and to lead through ethical/ value-based behavior is identified as priority areas. Management development should be seen as continuous process including the preparation and responsibility of a new job, and subsequent career progression. In recent years greater recognition has been given to the significance of lifelong learning and to continuing professional development (CPD). Regarding CPD as vital to a successful career and requires all members to make a commitment to their own professional development (Mullins, 2010).

Therefore, human capital development is the very important thing to evolved and create skilled individual who lived without job to become long last employment. The conception of human capital development underlies most training programs and its ultimate aim is creating long-run employment and non-employment. By achieving human capital development, we can assure social welfare and peaceful living for the people or we can reduce criminals due to employment. In order to achieve the outcome of the human capital development the organization should confirm lifelong learning and try to identify the human resource skill and knowledge gap to fix and fit into dynamic economy and world of work. There is a wide range of interrelated individual, group, organizational and environmental influences on behavior in work organizations. If possible, it is better to use developed nation mostly used Excellency model in under professional development (Mullins, 2010).

2.3. Best Practices of Kaizen

2.3.1. Total Quality Management (TQM)

Quality is becoming one of the important aspects of company adaptation to environmental changes, and quality management is one of the most important tasks of company management (Janjic, Todorovic&Domanović, 2018). Total Quality Management is a management approach which introduced in business world in 1957 by Armand Feigebaum and has steadily become more popular since the early 1980's (Whitelaw, 2012). It is an approach for an organization, centered on quality, based on the participation of all its members and aiming at long-term success through customer satisfaction, and benefits to all members of the organization and to society. It is a set of management practices throughout the organization geared to ensure the organization consistently meets or exceed customer requirements (Arikkok, 2017). TQM also generally expressed in terms of a way of life for an organization as a whole, committed to total customer satisfaction through a continuous process of improvement and the contribution and involvement of people (Mullins, 2010).

In order to implement TQM effectively there must be an overall process which involves all activities of the organization and direct participation of all staff. It requires a suitable organizational culture and a demand for change in the management. TQM places emphasis on the involvement of people as the key to improved quality. It involves replacement to the existed structure with greater focus on natural work groups, multi-discipline working and team-based management (Antić & Novičević, 2012). Attention must be given to effective education and training, empowerment and the motivation to take ownership of quality, and systems of communications at all levels of the organization.

Kaizen is integral part of a total quality management approach. Kaizen and TQM are closely related concepts, but not identical. Kaizen is somehow different from conventional method of Total Quality Management (TQM) of production techniques in which in conventional TQM workers were sent back to their regular duties and told to improve the quality of their work process and there wasn't much incentive to change anything (Asayehgn et al, 2014). However, in Kaizen based TQM the management motivate employees by creating an environment where everybody may take joy in their work (Mark & Jenkins, 2015). Janjic, Todorovic & Domanović (2018) argued that basis for successful quality improvement in both concepts is the Deming cycle, as a series of related activities – plan, do, check, and act.

2.3.2. The Just- In-Time Production System

This Japanese manufacturing management method developed in 1970s. It was first adopted by Toyota manufacturing plants by Taiichi Ohno (Mahmoud, 2015). Just-in-time principles are to produce only the units in the right quantities, at the right time, and with the right resources. Just in time implemented with the aim to regulate the timeliness of the production and delivery of products while maintaining or improving the quality of products (Xu & Chen, 2016).

To realize the ideal JIT production system, a series of Kaizen activities must be carried out continuously to eliminate wastes. JIT dramatically reduces cost, delivers the product in time, and greatly enhances company profits (Coudounaris, 2017).

2.3.3. Kaizen Method

The companies that want to have a performance must keep their leader position on market by increasing the quality level of services provided, reducing costs and last but not least motivating the whole staff in order to implement the concept of performance oriented organization (Boca, 2011).

Kaizen methods for work process improvement that include making the improvements originated in the World War II Job Methods training program. It was developed by the Training within Industry (TWI) organization, a component of the U.S. War Manpower Commission during World War II. Kaizen methods that suggest improvements also originated in the work TWI. As suggestion rather than action improvement programs, Imai points out that, less well known is the fact that the suggestion system was brought to Japan by Training within Industry (TWI) (Imai, 1986).

Huntzinger, (2002) also traces Kaizen back to the Training within Industry (TWI) program. TWI was established to maximize industrial productivity from 1940 through 1945. One of the improvement tools it developed, tested, and disseminated was labeled. It taught supervisors the skill of improving work processes. This program's name was changed to "How to Improve Job Methods" (Production Board, 1945) and is most often referred to as Job Methods training (Berhanu, 2014). It taught supervisors how to uncover opportunities for improving work processes and implement improvements.

2.3.4 The Suggestion System

The *suggestion system* is a best practice of *Kaizen* and it acknowledged the morale-boosting benefits of employee participation in providing better ideas for the improvement of the

organization (Kidus, 2014). This system enhances the dedication of employees for continuous change and creates Kaizen minded and self-disciplined workers (Eden, 2017). In Japan which is the origin of Kaizen the managers encourage employees to provide suggestions no even if their suggestion is small and Japanese employees are also often motivated to share their ideas verbally with their supervisors and put the suggestion into action (Assefa, 2016).

2.3.5 Small-Group Activities

A kaizen strategy includes small-group activities- informal, voluntary, intra-company groups organized to carry out specific tasks in a workshop environment. The most popular type of small-group activity is quality circles (Kidus, 2014). These activities are designed to address issues such issues as quality, safety, cost and productivity. Quality circles have played an important role in standardizing product quality and productivity in Japan (Eden, 2017). Management place a leading role in realizing quality-in ways that include building quality assurance systems, providing employee training, establishing and deploying policies, and building cross-functional system for quality, cost, and delivery. Successful quality circles activities indicate that management plays an invisible but vital role in supporting such activities.

2.3.6 5S practices (Housekeeping)

This practice is viewed as the main and principal tool for the realization of kaizen philosophy. This is because it has its own positive impact in the success of other practices. 5S is considered to be the most basic step for improving quality and productivity. According to Berhanu (2014) 5s practice is the basic strategy and it is also a prerequisite for Kaizen implementation. The word 5s brought from five Japanese words which have an equivalent meaning English as follows: 5s stands for Sort=Seiri, Set-In-Order=Seiton, Shine=Seisou, Standardize=Seiketsu, Sustain=Shitsuke. If it is installed correctly in the organization there will be sound improvements in the standardization and cost effectiveness of the organization.

2.4 Basic Components of Kaizen

2.4.1. Continuity

The implementation of kaizen philosophy is not stopping on the specific period of time rather its on-going and relied on permanent basis and it's obvious that every activity has high opportunity for becoming successful if it improved in continuous manner. Kaizen is a day to day activity in which it identified flaws on the daily work process and made an effort to solve them (Eden,

2017). Asayehgn et al., (2014:40) expressed the continuity of kaizen as follow: “The dynamic kaizen strategy is an activity of continually revolving cycles of Plan, Do, Check and Act (PDCA) which focus on customer-driven processes to improve productivity and the quality of products and services by amassing marginal improvements over time.”

2.4.2 Participation

In every improvement kaizen requires the full participation of all workers because in order to maintain a great change there should be sound integration between all workers ranging from top up to the bottom. Participatory approach enhances the employees’ moral and allows everyone to master the art of solving immediate problem from their own workshop. According to Imai (2010) kaizen is “everyday improvement by every person, everywhere” that make all stakeholders in the work process valuable (cited in Reddy & Karim, 2014). Thus, organizational achievement can be only realized as a result of the mixed efforts of each employee (Boca, 2011).

2.4.3 Small Improvements

Incremental improvement is the integral part of Kaizen philosophy. There is one quote which showed the benefit of incremental change it says “Accumulation of a small dust builds a mountain”. Kaizen philosophy believes that every big result is the collection of little improvements that are made previously. Prosic (2011) argued that Kaizen is all about attaining change by taking small steps rather than rapid and heavy-handed changes.

2.4.4 Muda (Waste) Elimination

Muda/Waste is any activity of workers/machines which consumes resources such as money, time, energy, materials, etc without adding value (Thessaloniki, 2006; Kidus, 2014). In other words; it’s anything unnecessary in operation. Eliminating muda is the very component of kaizen because eliminating wasteful activities prevents the likelihood of organizational failure and crisis (Reddy & Karim, 2014).

2.5 Challenges of Kaizen Implementation

Adoption of every philosophy from abroad requires well awareness by host country about it before the actual implementation takes place. Kaizen which nowadays apply in most parts of the world has different record of achievement in different places for example it is highly successful in east Asia countries because they are internalize the concept of kaizen philosophy

however, its success is not satisfying when one sees the experience of third world countries because they apply it before they understand it well (Ohno et al., 2009).

Eden (2017) finds out that knowledge gaps on the concept of continuous improvement and employees' impression on the traditional hierarchical work trends are challenges for kaizen implementation. Thus, lack of awareness and internalization of the concept could be the main challenge for Kaizen implementation. According to Garcia-Sabater & Marin Garcia (2011) resistance to change especially among older employees can be also mentioned as the challenge for Kaizen. The motive for change is necessary for the effective accumulation of improvement because change is a key for solving every identified flaw. If there is resistance for change in the organization the organization will be stagnant. Relatively, change resistance is more prevalent on mature workers because they can't adopt with new environment easily rather they preferred to stay where they are however, the younger workforce is eager for change and they are tended to be unsatisfied with existing situation. Lack of suitable environment for employees to create new ideas that bring improvement in the organization and lack of suitable environment for application of kaizen itself is another challenge for the realization of effective kaizen implementation (Assefa, 2016). The above mentioned challenges are some of the many possible challenges of kaizen implementation.

2.6 Prospects of Kaizen

For the realization of successful Kaizen implementation there should be suitable organizational culture that emphasizes improvement strongly and there should be improvement driven employees because if there is change resistance within the employees the chance of Kaizen success in the organization is minimal (Garcia-Sabater & Marin Garcia, 2011). Thus the motive for change and suitable environment for Kaizen are the core factors for the fruitful implementation of Kaizen.

Efficient knowledge about Kaizen increased the likelihood of Kaizen success because lack of adequate knowledge about continuous improvement usually leads to the failure of Kaizen. Eden's study (2017) finds out that lack of technical knowledge about kaizen is the main cause for failure to bring a change in the organization.

The incentive system will pave the way for the successful attainment of kaizen and it should deserve high emphasis (Kidus, 2014). In kaizen the biggest incentive is making the employee think that he's part of the organization by taking his idea and making amendments based on his opinions and if the employee feels he is the part of the organization he will be highly motivated to made improvements on daily basis. This in turn fosters the effectiveness of kaizen implementation in the organization. Thus based on this points for the prospect of kaizen implementation the following are essential (1) suitable organizational culture for CI (2) employees motivation for change (3) adequate knowledge of kaizen (4) incentive for employees.

2.7 Ethiopian Experience of Kaizen

The Government of Ethiopia implemented Organizational performance and effectiveness philosophy before implementing Kaizen called Business Process Reengineering (BPR). According to the government of Ethiopia it has embarked on reforming its civil service organizations with the objective of improving the public-sector service delivery system. It was applied in Government bureaus, an idea introduced to bring radical changes among state institutions but, in the process, virtually stalled them for months and now widely deemed to be a failure. The Ethiopian government started advocating the idea of Kaizen a Japanese management philosophy—among private and state-owned companies; the idea was first brought to the attention of Ethiopia's late PM MelesZenawi in 2008 (Negussie, 2009).

In this instant the government of Ethiopia inspired by the practicality of the Kaizen policy and strategy adopt the exemplary approach. In 2008, as a result of the request made by the Government of Ethiopia the Japanese Government agreed to help Ethiopia. Before implementing and fully institutionalizing the Kaizen unit on a large scale, the then Ethiopian Ministry of Industry and Trade (MOIT) reviewed about 63 companies in 2009 that were located within 100-kms of Addis Ababa to ascertain their quality and productivity status from October 2009 to June 2011(Berhanu, 2014). After a preliminary diagnosis of the 63 companies only 30 companies (i.e., 10 from Metal; 6 from Agro processing; 6 from Chemicals; 4 from Leather and; 4 from Textiles) were chosen to serve as pilot projects. Pilot companies from this, ten, five and three companies have been awarded good, best and excellent status respectively by Ethiopian Kaizen unit (EKI, 2012).

The criteria for selecting of those companies are (a) had proximity or outskirts of the city of Addis Ababa (i.e., they were within 100km distance), (b) contributed towards export and /or

import, (c) achieved scale of capital, and (d) had qualified employees. After observing the successes of the above implementation 2011, the Ethiopian Kaizen Institute, was established as a full-fledged consulting unit to provide ideas, support and assist in the development and enhancement of the quality and productivity framework for the entire country, (EKI, 2012).

The institute claimed that the outcome of the work in the enterprises was, value added by the firms and workers, and the profit margin of the pilot firms who went through the Kaizen process increased by 176%, 105%, and 210% respectively, mainly due to labor productivity (Asayehgn, 2013). These indicate that after implementation of Kaizen the process includes center of competency takes place and accreditation expected from the implementers are achieved successfully.

2.8 Roles of National Stakeholders in Kaizen Implementation

2.8.1. The Roles of Federal Government

The roles of government almost always perform the formulation of policy and strategy for the country at large. The Ethiopian government saw Kaizen as the key to its growth (JICA, 2016), therefore it was imperative for Ethiopian policy makers to support and confirm the institution of Kaizen from others in order to overcome the uncertainty of industrial situation. Hence, the government role on policy formulation is setting appropriate policy framework in the country at large after proper investigation of research. Due to this fact Kaizen select and set as government policy and then stream to the stakeholders to implement as strategic plan. (EKI, 2012).

2.8.2. The Roles of Ethiopian Kaizen Institute

According to Kidus the Ethiopian Kaizen Institute (EKI) was established by the council of Ministers order number 256/2004 (Kidus, 2014). EKI is providing Kaizen consultation and trainings to large, medium, small and micro enterprises with Japan's support (JICA, 2016). The objective of the institution is to carry out broad based activities of on-going quality and productivity improvement and thereby enhance the expansion of competitive industries. The institute shall have the roles, power and responsibility:

1. Formulate strategy and plan that assist in the dissemination of the Kaizen concept and tools and implement same upon approval.
2. Create country wide quality and productivity movement that could enable to effectively implement government policies and strategies;

3. Prepare, and distribute Kaizen training and consultancy manuals customized to micro, small, medium and large enterprises and follow up their applications; etc. (EKI, 2012)

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

In the research descriptive research design was used to describe the challenges and prospect of kaizen implementation. According to Kothari (2004) to describe the characteristics of particular Phenomena, descriptive research is preferable. Mixed approach (both Quantitative and qualitative) was also employed to answer the basic research questions.

3.2. Population of the study

The populations of this study were Wolkite University administration employees. Based on the data obtained from the human resource department of the university the total number of employees in the university's administration is 943 currently.

3.3. Sample Size and Sampling Design

To conduct this study, the researchers were use probability and probability sampling technique. In probability sampling the researchers used simple random sampling and for non-probability sampling the researchers were employed purposive sampling design. The researchers employed simple random sampling design because it gives equal chance for respondents to be selected in which it makes the researchers to obtain genuine information without bias and on the other hand purposive sampling design chosen as a result of the need for obtain data from experts in kaizen. From the total number of population 90 respondents were selected by using Taro Yamane (1967) formula with 90% of confidence level and 10% of precision level so the sample size are calculated as follows.

$$n = N/1+N(e)^2$$

$$n = 943/1+943(0.01) = 90$$

Whereas, N= Number of total population

n= Number of samples

e = Margin of error

3.4 Sources and Methods of data collection

The data which is served as material for the study was directly gathered by the researchers from both primary and secondary sources. The primary source of data collected through self-administered questionnaires, structured interview, and observation. In addition Secondary sources such as, study findings, working papers, and online references were also consulted.

The quantitative aspects of the research refers to generalization from descriptive statically analysis. The survey carried out from response of the respondent using questionnaire and the qualitative approach is used to analyze the attitude of employees about the challenges and prospects of kaizen implementation from the response of structured interview and the researchers also analyzed the data qualitatively which they obtained from observation

3.5. Methods of data analysis and Presentation

The data that are collected from primary and secondary sources arranged, organized and presented systematically. Then study was constituted both qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative data was organized by descriptive analysis. On the other hand quantitative data also analyzed by using simple statistical tools such as percentage and tables.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Demographic data

Total of 80 questionnaires were distributed to Wolkite University administration employees and 60 were collected which is a response rate of 75%.

Table 4.1: Demographic data

Demographic data		N	&
Sex	Male	36	60
	Female	24	40
	Total	60	100
Age	18-25	25	41.6
	26-35	28	46.7
	36-45	7	11.7
	Total	60	100
Education level	Diploma	25	41.6
	First Degree	30	50
	Master's Degree	5	8.4
	Total	60	100

As table 1 shows out of the total study participants (60%) of them were males and 24 (40%) of the respondents are females.

As Table 1 indicate from the whole respondents, 25(41.6%) of them were in the age range of 18 to 25, 28/ (46.7%) of respondents were in the age range of 26-35 and the remaining 7(11.7%) of respondents are in the age range of 36-45. This outcome indicates that 88% of them are between 18 and 35. This shows the work force in the university is dominated by youth.

As Table 1 revealed 30(50%) of the respondents were found to have a first degree, 25(41.6%) of them have diploma, and the remaining 5 (8.4%) were completed master's degree. Accidentally, staffs below diploma and above master's degree were not included in the study.

4.2 Kaizen Implementation in Wolkite University

Table 4.2 Kaizen implementation

Item		N	%
Do you think you have enough awareness about Kaizen?	Yes, I have	21	35
	I have a little	35	58.4
	No, I haven't any	2	3.3
	I am not sure	2	3.3
	Total	60	100
If you are given a chance to choose from implementing Kaizen or not which one do you choose?	I choose to implement	59	98.3
	I don't choose to implement	1	1.7
	Total	60	100
Do you agree Kaizen is implemented as it designed	Strongly Agree	6	10
	Agree	23	38.3
	Strongly Disagree	7	11.7
	Disagree	24	40
	Total	60	100

Source: Own Survey, 2011

As Table 4.2 indicate, out of the total respondents 35 (58.4%) respondents said that they have a little awareness about Kaizen, 21 (35%) responded that they have enough awareness about Kaizen and the rest respondents don't have awareness or not sure they have or not. The respondents' answers indicate that although their degree of awareness about Kaizen is varying, 93.4% of the respondents have awareness about Kaizen in which 58.4%.of the respondents have insufficient knowledge about Kaizen and the remaining 35% are well aware about Kaizen.

However, the data that we got from observation is not consistent with the respondents' replies during our study we observed that there is lack of awareness among employees about Kaizen. In the offices where we go to gather data around 10 staffs who were requested to fill the

questionnaire refused to fill because they said that they even do not know whether kaizen is implemented in their office and they have no idea what Kaizen is.

The data that we got from the interview also indicate that there is lack of awareness about kaizen in the offices. The interview respondent in the registrar bureau stated that “Lack of awareness about kaizen is prevalent in our office. Office staffs do not have enough awareness about Kaizen.”

As Table 4.2 revealed in regard to choosing between implementing and not implementing Kaizen, 59 (98.3%) of respondents replied they prefer to implement Kaizen philosophy and the remaining one respondent refused to choose implementing Kaizen. Earlier the data showed that there is deficiency in the awareness about Kaizen in which more than half of respondents (58.4%) have little knowledge however even they have little knowledge they are able to understand the benefit of Kaizen and choose to implement it if they have the chance.

As Table 4.2 shows, out of the total respondents 31 (51.7%) of them replied Kaizen is not implemented as it designed while, 29 (48.3%) of the respondents are positive in that Kaizen is implemented as it designed. From this scenario we can understand that the study respondents almost have proportional positive and negative attitude towards the implementation of Kaizen in line with its design.

On the other hand, the 51.7% questionnaire respondents’ reply is consistent with the researchers’ observation. During observation the investigators observe that the Kaizen boards in the university do not indicate the progress of Kaizen in the university in which the Kaizen boards are prepared to reveal the progress of Kaizen in the institution however the figure below shows that the Kaizen boards of the university do not serve their purpose. They are empty with no data on them.

Figure 1: Kaizen Board in University’s Cafeteria & Registrar Office



Source: Own Survey, 2011

The interview with interview participants of the Cafeteria and Registrar office revealed that Kaizen is not implemented as it is designed. According to the interview informant in the cafeteria “implementation of Kaizen is not an easy task and it’s difficult to get the full consent of employees to practice kaizen as it designed.”

With regard to how Kaizen is implemented in the University the interview informant from clinic said that “we implement Kaizen by setting standards for works and we record the progress that made in our the offices” The interview participant in the registrar bureau explained to the researchers “Our implementation of Kaizen involves scheduling, work allocation, capacity management, communicating, development of information monitoring systems and overall coordination and control of the solution program.” And the informant in the cafeteria also said that “we apply Kaizen by identifying the problems and work towards to solve the problems and monitoring system is carried out to check the progress.”

4.3 Changes after the Implementation of Kaizen

4.3.1 Changes in the offices

Table: 4.3 Changes in the administration offices after Kaizen Implementation

Item		N	%
Do you observe changes in your office after Kaizen implementation?	Yes, I do	25	41.7
	No, I don't	23	38.3
	I am not sure	12	20
	Total	60	100
Do you believe that the working culture of your office has been changed after kaizen applied?	Strongly Agree	11	18.3
	Agree	18	30
	Strongly Disagree	10	16.7
	Disagree	21	35
	Total	60	100
Do you think work flow reduced after implementation of Kaizen?	Yes	32	53.3
	No	28	46.7
	Total	60	100
Do you think the service given	Yes	27	45

by your office after Kaizen implementation is customer centered?	No	33	55
	Total	60	100
Do you believe that quality of work and space consumption improved after the implementation of Kaizen?	Yes	29	48.3
	No	31	51.7
	Total	60	100

Source: Own Survey, 2011

As Table 4.3 revealed out of the total respondents 25 (41.7) responded that the saw change their office, 12 (38.3%) of them replied they didn't saw any change after the implementation of Kaizen philosophy and the remaining 12 (20%) were not sure whether there is change in their office after Kaizen implementation.

The interview with the informants in the cafeteria, clinic, registrar office and library revealed that there is change after the Kaizen implementation. The interview participant in library explained that "after the implementation of Kaizen there is a change in the work flow of the library in which books are shelved in their order and students are served by the library staffs efficiently." The informant from clinic also mentioned changes in the clinic that are seen after the implementation of Kaizen. He stated "the services given by the clinic have been enhanced after the implementation of Kaizen and the clinic recorded progress of the work Moreover, work flow has been reduced and the document of patients properly recorded in return it makes our work easy" The researchers were also observed this phenomenon during their survey. The registrar office manager also commented that "Kaizen demonstrated some changes that are not seen before its application however the changes are seen in some degree"

With regard to working culture the data that presented in Table 4.3 showed that from the total respondents 31 (51.7%) of them replied that the working culture of their office is not changed after kaizen applied whereas, 28 (48.3%) of them agreed that after Kaizen implementation the working culture of their office is changed.

On the other hand the researchers observation is go in line with the response of questionnaire respondents who said working culture is not changed after Kaizen implementation. In the

observation the researchers were able to witness that the existing working culture in the university is not changed in that traditional hierarchical work still is persisted.

As indicated in Table 4.3, 32 (53.3%) respondents believe after the implementation of Kaizen work flow has been reduced while 28 (46.7%) of them disagree on the reduction of work flow in their office after Kaizen implementation.

The observation revealed that that there is still long bureaucratic chain in the university and the investigators were able to observe this during their effort to get the data for the study. In regard to proper documentation the investigators observe positive trend in which some offices of the university document files properly and the university libraries properly shelved the books in which it fostered the services given by them.

As Table 4.3 showed out of the total respondents, 33 (55%) of the respondents feel the service provided by their office is customer centered after Kaizen implementation and the remaining 27 (45%) respondents responded the service is not customer centered.

Regarding to quality of work and space consumption the data in the Table 4.3 indicated, 31 (51.7%) of respondents of respondents which constitute slightly more than half of the respondents responded that the work quality and space consumption is not improved after Kaizen implementation while 29 (48.3%) respondents are positive in that after Kaizen implementation the work quality and space consumption of their office is enhanced

4.3.2 Changes in the Institution

Table 4.4 Changes in the Institution

Item		N	%
Do you think Kaizen has brought about radical change in Wolkite University?	Yes	26	43.3
	No	34	56.7
	Total	60	100
What are the radical changes it brought?	It reduce waste	7	26.9
	It improve the work standard and performance of the institution	12	46.1

	It creates favorable environment for change	4	15.5
	Other	3	11.5
	Total	26	100
Do you agree that the implementation of Kaizen improved the quality of services provided by Wolkite University?	Strongly Agree	11	18.3
	Agree	27	45
	Strongly disagree	6	10
	Disagree	16	26.7
	Total	60	100

Source: Own Survey, 2011

As Table 4.4 revealed from the total respondents, 34 (56.7%) of them responded Kaizen is not bring radical change in Wolkite University and 26 (43.3%) of the respondents believe Kaizen brings radical change in the university.

As Table 4.4 indicated out of the twenty six respondents who agreed on the idea that Kaizen brought radical change, 7(26.9%) of them responded that Kaizen reduced waste in the university, 12 (46.1%) of the respondents said Kaizen improved the work standard and performance of the institution, 4 (15.5%) responded it creates favorable condition for change and 3 (11.5%) responded with other answers that Kaizen brought in the University. This indicates that the majority of respondents believe Kaizen improved the work standard and performance of the institution in diversified way such as reduction of waste, improvement in the work standard and creation of conducive environment for change.

On the other hand, those who believed that Kaizen does not bring radical change give various reasons for their stance in the questionnaire's open ended part among them the following are the major reasons, Kaizen fail to brought radical change because it is new for the university's community and there is lack of enough awareness on the staff about how to apply Kaizen as it is. Low level of implementation of Kaizen policy and commitment by the top level of management was also mentioned for the failure of Kaizen to bring change in radical manner.

In the interview with the key informant from the cafeteria he acknowledged that Kaizen is failed to bring radical change in the University and stated that “it’s too early to expect radical change from Kaizen not only as it is new for the university but also for the country. In order to obtain radical change from Kaizen there are tasks that are needed to be done by from the top management up to employees.”

As Table 4.4 revealed 11 (18.3%) of the respondents strongly agree on the idea that after the implementation of Kaizen the quality of services provided by institution improved, 27 (45%) of them agreed while 6 (10%) of them strongly disagree and 16 (26.7%) disagreed. This statistics indicated that the majority of respondents (63.3%) are in favor of the idea that the implementation of Kaizen improved the quality of services given by the university.

4.4 Challenges of Kaizen Implementation

Table: 4.5 Challenges of Kaizen Implementation

Items		N	%
Do you think there are problems hindering the application of Kaizen in your institution	Yes	52	86.7
	No	8	13.3
	Total	60	100
What are the challenges of Kaizen Implementation	Lack of awareness	32	61.5
	Change resistance	9	17.3
	Lack of suitable environment	8	15.4
	Other	3	5.8
	Total	52	100
Do you think the above mentioned challenges can be solved?	Yes	49	81.7
	No	4	6.7
	I am not sure	7	11.6
	Total	60	100

Source: Own Survey, 2011

With regard to the respondents 52 (86.7%) responded that there are challenges that are hindering Kaizen and out of the total respondents 8 (13.3%) respondents said there is no problems faced in the application of Kaizen. This respondent statistics indicate that the significant number of respondents agree on the existence of challenges in implementation of Kaizen and it shows there is deficiency of awareness towards Kaizen by employees..

As Table 4.5 revealed that lack of awareness comprise the majority share in the challenges of Kaizen implementation it constitute 32 (61.5) of the respondents, 9 (17.3%) of the total respondents who said yes for the existence of challenges mentioned change resistance as a challenge while 8 (15.4%) of them mentioned lack of suitable environment as hindrance for the success of Kaizen. From these responses lack of awareness takes a significance share in which it constitute 61.5% of the respondents.

The observation result yield that around 10 employees who were asked to fill questionnaire do not even know whether Kaizen is implemented in the institution and the researchers were also observe that Kaizen training is given to top level management so the lower level employees do not have insufficient awareness about Kaizen.

The interview informant in the registrar office stated that “In implementing Kaizen we frequently encountered lack of awareness and it hinder the effectiveness of its implementation” The interview participant from clinic also explained to the investigators that ‘among various challenges that we face during Kaizen implementation, insufficient awareness and lack of internalization of Kaizen among employees, change resistance and unable to make continuous improvements and lack of adequate training for employees about Kaizen implementation are the major challenges”

As Table 4.5 showed out of the total respondents 49 (81.7%) believes the existed challenges could be solved, 7 (11.6%) were not sure whether they can be solved or not and the remaining respondents believe the challenges couldn't be solve. From this scenario it's possible to argue that significant number of respondents believes the challenges could be solve if possible measures are taken.

4.5 Discussion

The presentation of data began by assessing the awareness level of staffs. As discussed earlier in the literature review, awareness about Kaizen increases the likelihood of Kaizen success in

which it enable employees to devote their selves to the effective implementation of Kaizen (Eden, 2017). From the total respondents 35% were confident that they have enough awareness about Kaizen and the respondents which constitute more than half of the whole respondents (58.3%) acknowledged that they have insufficient awareness about Kaizen.

The finding of the study reveals that among the total questionnaire respondents 51.7% of them believe Kaizen is not implemented as it designed and the remaining 48.3% agree that it implemented as it directed. The significant number of respondents (51.7%) is consistent with Eden's (2017) study finding in which her finding revealed gap between the design and the experience of Kaizen. Tiwari's (2017) study result also indicated that the concerned institutions in Ethiopia are not playing their role for implementation of Kaizen as it is designed.

In regard to changes that Kaizen brought to the university, Improvement in the work standard and performance was mentioned by the significant number of respondents. It received 46.1% response rate thus this response go in line with the study of Prosic (2011) in that he argued maintaining and improving standard is the core objective of Kaizen because maintaining and improving standard is the drive force for the long lasting improvement in the given organization or institution (Prosic, 2011).

The objectives of Kaizen include eliminating or reducing waste or activities that add cost but not value for the institution (Prosic, 2011).The finding of the study indicated that 26.9% of respondents believe the implementation of Kaizen reduced waste. However, the researchers' observation revealed that there is weak waste reduction in which the investigators were able to observe waste materials in the offices they visit.

On the idea of improvement in the quality of services provided by Wolkite University after Kaizen, 63.3% of respondents were agreed on the existence of improvement. As Eden (2017) stated Kaizen is designed to prompt about continuous improvements in organizational structure. If it is properly implemented it likely bring about effective and efficient delivery of services in the given organization or institution.

According to Imai (1986), Kaizen is about organizational culture change; it is about changing the status quo and existing working culture. In this regard, overcoming the traditional hierarchical work trend is important for the success of Kaizen. However, this study's finding is not indicate

the change in the working culture of Wolkite University in which 51.7% of the respondents replied they see no change in the working culture of the institution.

The study finds out that there are challenges in implementing Kaizen in Wolkite University. From the total respondents for questionnaire 52 (86.7) of the respondents who constitute the significant number of respondents agreed on the existence of challenges. Among the mentioned challenges by the respondents' lack of awareness about Kaizen comprise the majority response rate in that it received 61.5%. It's consistent with Eden's (2017) study she stated that lack of technical knowledge and awareness among staff members are the major challenges of Kaizen implementation. Berhanu (2014) also mentioned that lack of awareness about how to implement Kaizen is the main problem in the application of Kaizen. Asayehgn et al., (2014) conducted a research on the Kaizen Implementation and his findings indicated that as a result of lack of awareness there was a lag in the implementation of the kaizen management system in Northern Ethiopia's Manufacturing Industries.

Next to lack of awareness about Kaizen change resistance was mentioned as the challenge of Kaizen implementation it received 17.3% response rate of the questionnaire respondents. The study conducted by Garcia-Sabater & Marin Garcia (2011) also revealed that if there is change resistance within the employees the chance of Kaizen success in the organization is minimal.

Lack of suitable environment was also pointed as the challenge for the effective Kaizen implementation. From the total respondents 15.4% of them mentioned it as a challenge this is consistent with study of Berhan (2014) he argued that lack of clean working environment is mentioned as one of the challenges in the implementation of Kaizen.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the Challenges and Prospects of Kaizen implementation in Wolkite University. An attempt was made to identify the implementation of Kaizen and major obstacles to its implementation.

The objective of this study paper was to assess challenges and prospect of Kaizen implementation in Wolkite University. Hence, based on findings investigators were finding out the implementation of Kaizen and its problems by distributing questionnaires and interview for the staffs. Based on the findings, the following conclusions were made:

Kaizen is implemented in the university as a management philosophy. This study revealed that there is some level of awareness among employees. And almost all respondents were preferred to implement Kaizen. The study also finds out that Kaizen is not implemented as it designed.

Based on the study findings the researchers were able to identify the changes that Kaizen philosophy brought. The first change that Kaizen brought is proper documentation in that the administration offices keep documents in proper order and the researchers were also able to observe this phenomenon during their survey.

The service provided by the university have been also enhanced after Kaizen implementation and the interview informants explained to the investigators that they their work become easy and efficient after Kaizen implemented.

In trying to assess the challenges that hinder the implementation of kaizen in the university the study were able to find out the following major challenges: lack awareness about Kaizen,

Change resistance and lack of suitable environment for change were identified as the main challenges for the implementation of Kaizen

5.2 Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study from the respondents as well as researchers observation, the following recommendations are suggested.

- ❖ Kaizen only works effectively and efficiently if every staffs fully understands and internalizes the philosophy in their day to day lives. Employees will perform in their best possible abilities and contribute to improve their work only when they take the pillars of Kaizen as a habit and it takes long last effort and commitment. Thus Kaizen unit and the university management should provide sufficient, continues training to employee and supervisors to enhance the administration staff attitudes about kaizen
- ❖ There should be an incentive system in order to motivate employees and to overcome the change resistance among staffs because employees satisfied when they get credit for what they done and they stay focused on making continuous improvement.
- ❖ The University should take some of the things from kaizen and try to create its own way of doing work, just because the Japanese are successful on Kaizen it doesn't necessarily make it suitable for Ethiopia.
- ❖ The Kaizen implementation process should be regularly assessed and measured by the competent supervisors.
- ❖ In order to carry out sustainable monitoring and evaluation and feedback system, the communication system should be improved and thereby technology transfer enhance.

REFERENCES

- Asayehgn, D. (2013). Why self-proclaimed kaizen management is becoming very fashionable in Ethiopia an observation? Dominican University of California. www.TigraiOnline.com.
- Asayehgn, D., Hadush, B., Alula, G. & Mengistu, A. (2014). Analysis of Kaizen Implementation in Northern Ethiopia's Manufacturing Industries. International Journal of Business and Commerce. Vol. 3, No.8, pp. 39-57.
- Assefa, M. (2016). Factors and Challenges Affecting Implementation of Continuous Improvement (Kaizen) Tools in Garment Factories. Ethiopian Institute of Technology. Mekele: Unpublished.
- BrahanuTadesse (2014). Challenges and practice of kaizen implementation at Entoto polytechnic cluster college the case of woreda three enterprises of Gulele sub-city in Addis Ababa city administration, unpublished. <https://www.google.com.pdf.etd.aau.et>.
- Boca, G.D. (2011). Kaizen Method in Production Management. International Scientific Conference Young Scientists.
- Eden, M. (2017). Assessment of Kaizen Implementation Practices and Challenges in The Case of Tikur Abay Shoe Share Company. Master's Thesis, ST. Mary's University, Business Administration. Unpublished.
- EKI, (2012). Pamphlet on Kaizen implementation in Addis Ababa Companies and industries.
- Ethiopian herald (2017). Addis Ababa. Allafrica.com/stories /201609220950.html.
- Ethiopian news agency (2017), www.ena.gov.et/index.php/economy/item 1768-2
- Garcia-Sabater, J.J & Marin-Garcia, J.A. (2011). Can we still talk about continuous improvement? Rethinking enablers and inhibitors for successful implementation. International Journal of Technology Management, Vol. 55, Nos. 1/2, pp. 28-42.
- Huntzinger, J. (2002), The roots of Lean. Training Within Industry: The origin of Kaizen, Association for Manufacturing Excellence, Vol. 18, No. 2.
- Imai, M., (1986). Kaizen the Key to Japan's Competitive Success. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.

- Robinsom, A. (1991). Continuous Improvement in Operations. Cambridge, MA: Productivity Press.
- Kanbanchi Blog. (2016). What is Kaizen?.Retrieved from <https://www.kanbanchi.com/what-is-kaizen>.
- Kidus, D. (2014). An Assessment of Implementation of Kaizen: The Case of Maru Metal Industries. BA Degree Thesis, ST. Mary's University, Department of Management. Unpublished.
- Mark, A & Jenkins M.D. (2015). Kaizen. Power point.
- Mullins, L.J (2010). Management and organizational behavior. Ninth Edition Portsmouth:UK.
- Mureithi, M. (2013). Effects of Kaizen Tool on Organization Effectiveness: A Case of Davis & Shirtliff LTD. Masters Thesis, University of Nairobi, Department of Project Planning and Management , Nairobi.
- Negussie, T, and Emnet A, (2013). Kaizen revolutionary principle: A marriage of opposing world, Addis standard page 5, 21 Jan 2013.
- Ohno, I. Hhno, K and Uesu, S. (2009). Introducing Kaizen in Africa. GRIPS Development Forum Tokyo: Roppongi, Minato-ku.
- Prošić, S. (2011). Kaizen Management Philosophy. International Symposium Engineering Management And Competitiveness 2011 (EMC2011) June 24-25, 2011, Zrenjanin, Serbia.
- Reddy, S.K. & Karim, S. (2014). Kaizen Approach for Enhancing Quality Management Practices in HEIs. Wollega University,Department of Management. Unpublished.
- Titu, M.A., Oprean, C. & Grecu, D. (2010). Applying the Kaizen Method and the 5S Technique in the Activity of Post-Sale Services in the Knowledge-Based Organization. Proceedings of International Multi Conference of Engineers and Computer Scientists. Volume. 3, Hong Kong.
- Tiwari, P. (2017). Assessment of the Practices and Challenges of Kaizen Implementation in Micro and Small Enterprises: The Case of Manufacturing Enterprises. International Journal of Engineering and Management Research. Volume. 7, No. 4, pp. 313-322.

- Totonchi, J & Kakamanshadi, G (2011). Globalization and E-Commerce. 2nd International Conference on Networking and Information Technology.Singapore.
- Whitelaw, A (2012). Total Quality Management. South African Accreditation System. Durban, South Africa.
- Workspirited. (2018). The History of How the Kaizen Philosophy Gained Global Popularity. Retrieved from <https://workspirited.com/history-of-kaizen>

APPENDIX 1

WOLKITE UNIVERSITY



COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

Questionnaire

This questionnaire is prepared by Zelalem Mekonin, Tamirat Tesfaye and Dinknesh Manedo who are the graduating students in Governance and Development Studies. The objective of this questionnaire is to gather data from administration employees of Wolkite University about, challenges and prospects of kaizen implementation in the university.

Dear respondent your responses are very important for the success of the study and you are kindly requested to fill the questionnaire. Besides the researchers doesn't give any of your response to the third party without the consent of you and no report of the study will ever identifies your identity.

➤ General Instruction

You do not need to write your name and address, only write the necessary information in the space provided and choose your response from the given alternatives for the close ended questions and fill the open ended questions.

Thank you for your cooperation!!

PART I- Demographic Data

1. Age: A) 18-25 B) 26-35
C) 36-45 D) Above 45
2. Sex: A) Male B) Female
3. Educational level: A) Up to grade 12 B) Certificate

10. Do you think there are problems hindering the application of Kaizen in your institution?

- A) Yes, there are problems
- B) No problems faced

11. If your answer for question number 10 is "yes" what are the problems?

- A) Lack of awareness
- B) Change resistance
- C) Lack of suitable environment
- D) If other, please specify

12. Do you think the above-mentioned problems can be solved?

- A) Yes, they can be solved
- B) No they can't be solved
- C) I am not sure

13. If your answer for question number 12 is "yes" how can they be solved? Please Explain

14. Do you agree Kaizen is implemented as it designed?

- A) Strongly agree
- B) Agree
- C) Strongly disagree
- D) Disagree

15. Please explain your answer for question number 14 here.

16. Do you believe that the working culture of your office has been changed after kaizen applied?

A) Strongly agree

B) Agree

C) Strongly disagree

D) Disagree

17. If you are given a chance to choose from implementing Kaizen or not, which one do you choose?

A) I choose to implement

B) I don't choose to implement

18. Do you think the service given by your office after Kaizen implementation is?
Customer centered?

A) Yes

B) No

19. Do you think that the work flow reduced after implementation of Kaizen?

A) Yes

B) No

20. Do you believe that quality of work and space consumption improved after the implementation of Kaizen?

A) Yes

B) No

21. Do you agree that the implementation of kaizen improve the quality of services provided by Wolkite University administration office?

A) Strongly Agree

B) Agree

C) Strongly disagree

D) Disagree

22. If you have any additional comments on Kaizen application in your office please write down here.

APPENDIX 2
Interview questions

1. Do you think Kaizen brought about some change in your office? What are the changes?
2. What are the major challenges you faced in implementing Kaizen in your office?
3. Do you think the challenges can be solved? If so how and what are the Possible solutions to solve the problems?
4. Do you think Kaizen is implemented as it is designed? How?
5. What are the best practices from your office in applying Kaizen?
6. Do you think Kaizen implementation improve the performance of the Wolkite University in terms of quality, time consumption, space, work flow process and revenue?
7. Do you believe that Kaizen brought structural changes in terms of work flow process?
8. Do you think Kaizen bring about a radical change in higher educational institutions in General?