Change in Higher Education; How to Fail? How to Succeed?

Dr Mossab Saud Alholiby

Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Management, King Faisal University, Hofuf, Saudi Arabia
Email: malholiby@kfu.edu.sa

Abstract: *From outside and inside there is ongoing pressures drive change in higher education institutions. Change in higher education is a reality that cannot be avoided, and in many cases, it is necessary. Currently, there are several trends in higher education domain that are influencing decisive changes in educational administration policies and the procedures of academic work. This article discusses the issue of change in social institutions, with a focus on the higher education sector. It provides a comprehensive picture of the change theory, through a definition and review of concepts and models, in order to understand the triggers of change, change objectives and the challenges that usually accrue within the implementation process. This article also presents a number of strategies and lessons that may help in the planning and implementation of the change process efficiently and flexibly, and in dealing with potential failures.*

1. Introduction

Human societies are looking for change to improve their living conditions and continuously face ongoing challenges. From a practical perspective, change is a key attribute of all political, economic, social and cultural institutions, because any immutability of a particular system may lead to a wasting of opportunities and the delaying of the organisation's achievements. Change explains the growth in an organisation's capabilities. Success or failure reflects organisation's capacities to respond to change and how they interact with change, internally and externally.

Change is a constant across the developed world. In particular, public sector organisations have been transformed into private ones; market mechanisms have been rehabilitated; large organisations have been dispersed and others have faded away. The education sector has been part of these wider currents and orientations. Change in business organisations is at the forefront of many developments and has an impact on all domains of life. Although there are fundamental differences between the worlds of education and business, the vast knowledge and experience that has grown up around the management of change in business and industry has been borrowed to support the education sector in its management of change (Morrison, 1998, Carnall, 1999).

Education is one key area where change has become more than just a necessity, especially in an era of rapid information development, innovation in education curricula and diversity of disciplines. Sursock et al. (2010) point out that higher education institutions have been affected by several change factors in the past decades, including increasing participation rates, globalization, an increasing importance attached to knowledge, its impact on the orientation of global economies and increased international competition.

Addressing the issue of change is an essential introduction to building a clear concept of change or development practices: its factors for success and failure. This article provides a review of change concepts in public organisations and especially in the higher education sector, global trends, strategies of change, models and lessons learned. It defines essential processes and components that suit the higher education sector through the perspective of scholars and researchers in the field of public organisation and education.

2. The Concept of Change in Higher Education

It can be difficult to determine the meaning of the term 'change' as is an umbrella term that includes numerous concepts linked to reform, renewal, development, innovation, enhancement and improvement. Sengupta et al. (2006) have defined change as a method of altering an existing institution to enhance its effectiveness in terms of achieving its objectives through organisational change that aims to make modifications to the institutional structure, methods and processes, or introduce new notions and behaviours. According to Kanter (1997):

> …change involves the crystallisation of new possibilities (new policies, new behaviours, new patterns, new methodologies, new products or new market ideas) based on the reconceptualised patterns in the organisation. The architecture of change involves the design and construction of new patterns, or the reconceptualization of old ones, to make new, and hopefully more productive actions possible (p. 279).

According to Anderson and Anderson (2001), there are three types of change in organisations. Firstly, a developmental change that aims to improve existing skills, methods, performance criteria or states that seem not to be compatible with current or future requirements. Secondly, transitional change is a complex type of change that begins when leaders or staff recognise that a problem in the current operation needs to be tackled, or when an opportunity is not followed up, thus requiring a change to provide better services to meet current and future demands. The third type of change is the most complex change that has recently been confronting organisations − i.e. transformational change, which is a revolutionary shift from an existing condition to another. French and Bell (1999) have indicated that change has several facets. It can be planned or unplanned; it can be large or small. It can be comprehensive and reach all parts of an

organisation or only some parts. Change can be fast and revolutionary, or slow and gradually moving. It can change a situation fundamentally or involve only slight modifications. Thus, it is important that leaders and practitioners be aware that each type and case of change requires specific preparation and actions.

Any nation's progress depends on the extent to which it builds and develops its human resources. Higher education represents one of the most important means of developing human resources, which in turn are considered a strategic investment for any country (Al-Anqari, 2006). Through higher education programmes nations seek to fulfil their need for a knowledgeable and skilled labour force which meets the demands of the labour market and which is required for national development. Globally, HE exhibits many of the changes, transformations and challenges imposed by the technical and informational developments of contemporary civilisation (Bush and Coleman, 2000, Al-Anqari, 2006). Higher education has required to be restructured to meet the needs of an increasingly technology-oriented economy, to deliver the requisite research, highly trained people and the knowledge to equip a developing society with the capacity to address national needs so to participate in a rapidly changing and competitive global context (Duderstadt et al., 2003).

Bush and Coleman (2000) have stated that educational organisations grow in a particular political, economic and social context. Educational organisations are social organisations, and therefore they are vulnerable to rapid changes in the surrounding environment. At times they legislate new policies and at times must adapt in response to multiple changes in society (Christensen et al., 2006). The development of education is a matter of great concern in all countries of the world (Madani, 2002). According to Madani (2002) there is a realisation that developing countries need to reform their education systems. It is helpful, he argues, to understand change in higher education at a global level in the light of four axes: the expansion of education policies; the reformation of systems and methods of study; the guidance of scientific research in universities to serve the community and the movement towards quality of HE.

Scott (2004) points out those changes in higher education institutions can vary in terms of their conditions and extent. Some institutions have never instituted change before, so they have to develop change from the very lowest level. Others have focused primarily on change that helps them adapt to suit specific circumstances. There is also the fact that some changes are broad in scope and affect the whole university or entire sectors of an institution, whereas others are much more local and individual in nature.

From another viewpoint, Storberg-Walker and Torraco (2004) argue that higher education institutions are facing transformational changes that affect all sections and levels of the institution. Leaders, managers and practitioners therefore have demanding work to do in the management of change. Change can take place as a result of collective action among academics, expanded discussions, exchanges of views, all focusing on educational quality and excellence and with consideration for academic traditions. The structure of administration, managerial levels and the diversity of cultures in higher education institutions contribute to an acceleration of the process of change, which, compared to change in the business sector, is considered to be slow (Storberg-Walker and Torraco, 2004).Levin (1999)has demonstrated that changes take place in higher education at different levels and that there are significant factors through which changes can affect higher education institutions. For example, change can affect the academic profession and administration, students' affairs, the curriculum, funding, educational technology and communications, productivity and efficiency, external competition, restructuring, state intervention, partnerships, training and finance.

Change Forces in Higher Education
Higher education institutions find themselves in a new era where they are facing many challenges and factors that force and drive them towards change (Storberg-Walker and Torraco, 2004). Hellriegel and Slocum (2010) point to four significant forces of change in organisations: (1) globalisation (numerous marketplaces are global and are managed and served by worldwide or international organisations); (2) technology (which has a profound impact on individuals, teamwork, and institutions); (3) social networks (which change approaches to securing a job, communicating and forming groups); and lastly (4) the differences between generations and personal attitudes towards work.

In another classification, Sengupta et al. (2006) and Kiritsis (2009) have indicated that there are two types of pressures: internal and external. The main internal forces are, firstly, expanding organisation size, which drives change in organisational structure and in the complexity of operations. Secondly, when an organisation identifies a gap between its objectives and the results, an organisation faces the inevitability of change to reduce or bridge the gap. Thirdly, a change in the values and needs of staff leads to a change in the organisation's policies − for example, demands for increasing financial incentives. The last potential factor is that a change in the senior management may lead to changes in ideas regarding operating the organisation's system, structure and processes. External change factors are technology, external stakeholders' demands and the economic, political and demographic conditions of the surrounding environment.

Changes can occur in any institution, especially social organisations such as universities. The significant systems operating in universities are affected by various challenges and pressures that occur inside or outside the institution (Kiritsis, 2009). Altrichter and Elliot (2000)argue that the economy, in particular, impacts on the education sector in several ways. Economic conditions influence the educational budget and policies on educational spending. The trend of the business sector towards reducing costs and increasing productivity is reflected not just in the education budget, but it also puts pressure on education institutions to reduce costs and increase their productivity. Another issue is the close connection between education and economic development. In a reciprocal relationship, good education improves technology and qualifies individuals so that they can obtain

a high-level job. This relation influences education policy. In addition, a number of educators have pointed out that the concepts and models of the economic sector permeate educational practices and policies. Firm structure, for instance, is applied as a model for educational institution governance (Boyd et al., 1994).

As most scholars of higher education suggest, the major reason for the new directions in higher education is aspects of globalisation, which is seen to be changing the nature of higher education. It affects the field of education as it affects the economic, political and social fields. The educational system has become an open system that is influenced by global political, economic and technological changes. This is reflected in the trends and objectives of education systems and their components, from inputs, processes, outputs and management. Therefore, educational systems seek to change and adapt to the requirements of the era in which they exist (Howaidy and Guenuah, 2013). Alhadi (2013) suggests that, more than in developed countries, the higher education institutions in developing countries must interact with global changes and the requirements of new realities. They must have the flexibility and dynamism necessary to move towards the future because these institutions are obliged to adapt to the reality imposed by the era of globalisation and to the use of modern technologies.

Multiple factors have been identified as driving globalization in today's society. The internet, easy international communication, transportation technology and the increasing flow of students and highly educated individuals across borders (Altbach, 2004, Castells, 2010 and Hellriegel and Slocum 2010), all contribute to this process. Lightfoot (2016), from a critical perspective, argues that globalization can be described as unfettered capitalism which places restrictions upon democracy and limits the ability of governments to act, except in ways determined by the free market. In this case, education becomes simply an economic resource, with the school curriculum determined by commercial and utilitarian deliberations. Storberg-Walker and Torraco (2004), and Altbach (2004) claimed that the globalization phenomenon in HE and science is unavoidable. They consider that academia has always been international in scope and has continuously been characterised by inequalities. It becomes difficult, in the 21st century, for an academic system to be established in a form of national isolation. The challenge is to recognise the complexities and diversities of the modern context and then seek to form a global academic environment that recognises the need to make sure that academic relationships are comparatively equal. Altbach (2004) underlines the importance of ensuring that globalization does not become the neocolonialism of the 21st century.

It is worth mentioning that while the discussion above suggests that universities are not immune from the impacts of globalisation and change, "not all nations have responded to globalisation in the same way because of the specificities of their national history, politics, culture, and economy." Therefore, "we must contextually analyse the interaction between a range of critical shaping factors in the local context and the impetus for change driven by global trends" (Mok, 2000, p. 174).

Change, Challenges and Reasons for Failure

Understanding and managing change in organisations requires that complex tasks be carried out to face potential challenges. Planning for change may sometimes not succeed, and may lead to the challenge of change results that have not been taken into account. Organisations, therefore, must be able to adapt quickly and effectively in order to be able to continue their activities. Rapid and complex change may be a difficult test for the adaptation capacity of the leadership and members in the organisation. If they fail, the cost may be very high. It is necessary that the stakeholders understand the nature of the change requirements, the expected outcomes and the alternatives available to bring about change (Hellriegel and Slocum, 2010).

Newman (2006) indicates that change in an organisation can be more likely to fail if there is insufficient support from leaders, insufficient buy-in from stakeholders, anxieties about consequences and accountability, slow reactions to obstacles and continuing allegiance to old methods. Harris et al. (2003) have outlined other obstacles to fostering change, including perceived misconceptions, lack of organisational resources and an inability to evaluate efforts based on criteria.

Kotter (1995) considered more than 100 organisations undergoing change and identified eight critical reasons why the failure of a change initiative might occur. These are: (1) not creating a sufficient sense of urgency or motivation for change; (2) failing to establish sufficient power and support; (3) lacking a sensible vision; (4) no credible communication to broadcast the vision; (5) permitting barriers that block the way to the new vision; (6) not designing a plan for short-term wins; (7) the announcement of success before the change becomes ingrained in the organisational culture; and (8) neglecting the consolidation of the change culture in the organisation (pp. 60–67). Furthermore, Longenecker et al. (2007) conducted a study of more than a hundred companies in the United States to identify errors that led to the desired results of change not being reached. The study agreed with some of the reasons identified in Kotter's study but also added other significant reasons for failure. These included: poor skills and channels of communication; unclear strategic direction; inability to adapt quickly and change old habits; poor empowerment and delegation; lack of integrity and trust; inability to lead people and encourage them; lack of planning; weakness in monitoring performance; failure to recruit qualified individuals and development; and, lastly, mismanagement of resources.

Change may cause pressure and tension among both those who are leading the change and opponents or those fearful of change (Carnall, 1999). Change in an organization is usually seen as a threat rather than an opportunity (Kanter, 1999). Kiritsis (2009) provides several examples of reasons for resistance. Individuals might perceive change as a threat because it could lead to a loss of position, job, status and power. Leading staff to the change without explaining the reasons for change, what it will involve and expected advantages, will lead to resistance and critical challenges. Moreover, a lack of knowledge and limited qualifications on the part of staff reduces the desire to participate in the change process. Deal and Terrence (2008) have the same

perspectives, they believe making changes in a workplace where tasks are usually conducted routinely makes employees feel concerned and confused, especially when they are asked to do new work, or they have not participated in its development or they have a lack of necessary skills for the implementation. The likelihood is that they will not just reject the change, but may also may not participate in it and, furthermore, seek to thwart the process. And, if they are forced to change, they will work superficially. Rehabilitation of individuals, scientifically and psychologically, is necessary before implementing change, until the staff understand and feel comfortable with the new working methods.

Perlmutter (2005) raises some significant points in regard to academia. Professors work for many years in the same position, engage in the same tasks and teach the same subjects. This leads them to prefer the same routine and method followed in the work, and means they are not willing to change. Change may cause disorder and uncertainty. In addition, academics become resentful when change comes from the top. It is important to recognize that administrators' views change differently from academics, who prefer to feel that change is for their benefit. Olson (2006) highlights the lack of trust between faculty and administrators where the promotion of the idea of a conspiracy further creates an atmosphere of stubbornness and defiance among all parties. Thus change fails. The administrators must work with academics to develop an atmosphere of confidence and trust and to move away from the suspicion of conspiracy. If they do work well together then change will succeed.

The implementation phase in respect of change is one of the most critical stages: it engages more participants than those who were engaged in the planning stage (Law and Glover, 2000). From a psychological point of view it has been suggested that people are able to respond to change if the structures and strategies have been prepared, there is a healthy environment for communication, there is an appreciation of individuals' successes and the creation of an atmosphere that helps individuals to grow and develop. Continuous evaluation of the process of change and the methods of operation, the monitoring of results and monitoring of ambient conditions contributes to knowing whether the change succeeded or not (Cameron and Green, 2009). Strategies should be selected to manage the process of change and its challenges and should take into account all the factors affecting change phases, whether inside or outside the organisation, to ensure the highest levels of success and to reduce losses.

Approaches, Models and Strategies for Managing Change
Many disciplines are involved in the literature relating to change; because change is a natural cycle of life in all types of organisation, whatever their purpose. Profit and prosperity are crucial, especially for business organisations that wish to survive. Therefore, specialists in business administration have had a prominent role in enriching the literature on change and developing models and strategies that can assist a successful change. These efforts help all types of organisation to achieve their goals, including higher education organisations.

Approaches to Change
An approach to managing a change initiative is affected by context and the surrounding conditions. Types and orientations of stakeholders, cultural components and organisational structure are factors that need to be considered to determine the appropriate approach to change (Priestley, 2011).

There are two main approaches to change in organisations: emergent change and planned change (Burnes, 2004). The planned change approach means that the change goes through a planning stage first and then proceeds in predictable cycles and stages (Kennedy, 2004). Wilson (1992) argues that planned change strategies would be those processes in which there was a smooth transition from some previously articulated strategic vision towards a future desired state. On the other hand, the emergent change approach follows a point of view that says that change cannot be planned and that those who are change drivers must be aware of all the internal and external factors affecting the organisation, must react quickly, and then must conduct the necessary changes (Kennedy, 2004). Burnes (2004)argues that "the focus of emergent change is continuous, synergistic, interconnected change which, though small or medium-sized in nature, affects the organisation and its major sub-systems" (p. 397).

Kezar (2001) argues that there are two critical reasons to develop an elaborate approach to making a change in HEIs: the first is that ignoring some of the influential factors results in mistaken analysis of an institution's situation and mistakes in the selection of appropriate strategies. The second reason is that using concepts that are foreign to the values of the academic community may fail to convince the stakeholders to participate in the change process.

Some projects of change in higher education institutionshave a significant impact on all related components and needs a clear strategic vision and widespread involvement of people. Several well-known models that have been discussed in the literature under the umbrella of planned change approaches will be reviewed.

Models of Change
Lewin (1945) has stated that "nothing is as practical as a good theory" (p. 129). Ghoshal (2005), has more recently suggested that "nothing is as dangerous as a bad theory" (p. 86). This means that bad management models are likely to destroy good management practices. Models that cannot be explained and applied are therefore not models but fall into the category of wishes, hopes or sermons.

The term "model", according to Tichy (1983, p.38), ''refers to assumptions and beliefs which together represent reality. These models or theories guide action''. Many models of organisational change have been developed theoretically and practically. Leaders and managers who are successful adapt, learn and act quickly, while less effective managers try to control and curb the wave of change. It is important for the change leader to choose an appropriate model to help the organisation survive and grow (Pryor et al., 2008).

Kezar (2001) provides a list of key features that need to be taken into account when developing or applying a model of change in higher education institutions or thinking systematically about change: encourage the self-discovery of the organisation, the understanding and awareness of the organisation culture; recognise political influences; lay the groundwork; focus on adaptation; strengthen interaction for the development of mental models; create a balanced atmosphere between the internal and external environment; combine traditional teleological tools like vision development, planning, or strategy with the social and cultural cognitions and political strategies; enhance participation in governance and decision-making; create a risk culture and help individuals change their beliefs; realise that every kind of change and every part of the organisation may need to follow different models. (see Kezar (2001, pp. 113–123).

Five models of change will be discussed and compared. These models have been chosen because they present as suitable for use in leading some types of change initiative in higher education. The table 1 outlines the steps of the following models of change, which are given as examples in the change management literature: the three-step model (Lewin, 1947); the eight-phase model (Kotter, 1995); the ten-step model (Jick, 1999); the seven-step model (Garvin, 2000); and the twelve-step model (Mento et al., 2002).

Three-step model (Lewin, 1947)
It is proposed that there are three main steps of making change: unfreezing, moving and freezing of a level (Lewin, 1947). Unfreezing: in this step the requirement is to define the current situation, remove prejudices and complacency and identify the desired goals. Moving: this is the implementation phase of the change and the transition to a new stage, through participation. Freezing: at this stage a new situation is installed through policies and bonuses and the development of new standards (Kennedy, 2004, Cameron and Green, 2009). (See table 1).

This model is based on the idea that when change has been implemented it must be re-frozen; otherwise, it will be short-lived because people return quickly to their previous practices. It is proposed in order to change the culture of the organisation and its policy, then maintaining the change and upgrading to a higher level (Kennedy, 2004, Robbins and Judge, 2013). Pryor et al. (2008) point out this model is for planned change and may not respond to emergent change; however, it may be applicable in a case when there is an expectation of the emergence of some future changes.

Eight-phase model (Kotter, 1995)
Kotter has developed an eight step model after investigating 100 organisations that varied in their size and type. After consulting with these organisations, he identified eight mistakes that could lead to a failure in a change initiative. Kotter developed this model as a way to help organisations avoid such major mistakes (See table 1). The model highlights the key steps in implementing change by addressing the main issues, such as feeling the need for change, communicating the vision and the importance of keeping communication active during all phases of the implementation process (Mento et al., 2002, Cameron and

Green, 2009). The model should be used at the strategic level of organisations to change their vision and thence to achieve a comprehensive form of transformation (Pryor et al., 2008).

There are two significant lessons to be learned from Kotter's model: the process of change goes through several stages that take time; and major mistakes at any stage may cause devastating consequences for the momentum of the process (Mento et al., 2002, Pryor et al., 2008).

Ten-step model (Jick, 1999)
Jick developed a tactical model to drive the implementation of major change in organisations. This model can be seen as a recipe that serves a change process or evaluates a change that is already emerging in the organisation (Mento et al., 2002, Pryor et al., 2008). These commandments provide a useful blueprint for organisations that seek to change by following a 10-step list and to draw their own strategies for the implementation of the process of change (Jick, 1999). (See table 1).

The model understands change as a journey of discovery through thoughtful questions being asked in each phase (Mento et al., 2002). Jick states that "implementation is also a process of asking questions like these: Are we addressing the real needs of the company or taking the easy way out? How shared is the vision? How do we preserve anchors to the past while moving to the future? Does everyone need to feel the same sense of urgency?" (Jick, 1999, p. 8). Questions are presented as helping the organisation to focus on being flexible, and to remind change leaders that the implementation of the change is a process of continuous discovery (Jick, 1999).

Seven-step model (Garvin, 2000)
This model follows the change concepts of Lewin (1947), unfreezing, movement and refreezing, as the main elements of the change process. The model focuses on the role of the change driver in establishing the urgency of the change, ensuring that employees understand the reasons for change, formulating and communicating the vision of change, making the change and developing a long-term plan, measuring the progress at all stages, and refreezing the change by altering or shifting systems and structures (Garvin, 2000, Mento et al., 2002). (See table 1).

Twelve-step model (Mento et al., 2002)
Kezar (2001) suggest that the principles of various change models can be combined to develop a comprehensive model or a complex approach to change. Based on the models (Kotter, 1995, Jick, 1999 and Garvin, 2000), Mento et al. (2002) have developed a comprehensive framework with twelve steps to help those who want to implement change processes in their organisations. (See table 1).

There are broadly similar characteristics across all change models as they follow the same route and make use of similar procedures. In general, the models provide guidance, including a series of process steps for the transition from one state to another. It is important to note that overlap between the steps can happen in all models. This is normal – change rarely goes in a straight line (Biech, 2007).

Table 1: Models of Change

Three steps model (Lewin, 1947)	Eight phases model (Kotter, 1995)	Ten steps model (Jick, 1999)	Seven steps model (Garvin, 2000)	Twelve steps model (Mento et al., 2002)
Freezing	Establish a sense of urgency	Analyse the organisation and its need for change	Leading change	The idea and its context
Moving	Forming a powerful guiding coalition	Create a shared vision and common direction	Creating a shared need	Define the change initiative
Refreezing	Creating a vision	Separate from the past	Shaping a vision	Evaluate the climate for change
	Communicating the vision	Create a sense of urgency	Mobilizing commitment	Develop a change plan
	Empowerment of others to act on the vision	Support a strong leader role	Making change last	Find and cultivate a sponsor
	Planning for and creating short-term wins	Line up political sponsorship	Monitoring progress	Prepare your target audience
	Consolidating improvements and producing still more change	Craft an implementation plan	Change systems and structure	Create the cultural fit - Making the change last
	Institutionalizing new approaches	Develop enabling structures		Develop and choose a change leader team
		Communicate, involve people, and be honest		Create small wins for motivation
		Reinforce and institutionalise the culture		Constantly and strategically
				Measure progress of the change effort
				Integrate lessons learned

Strategies of Change

A strategy is "the direction and scope of an organisation over long-term, which achieves advantage in changing environment through its configuration of resources and competences with the aim of fulfilling stakeholders' expectations" (Johnson et al., 2008, p.3). Multiple issues need to be considered before the selection and application of any change strategy. Nickols (2010) indicates that seven issues might influence the selection of a strategy: the degree of change (radical or less radical), the degree of resistance, the number and diversity of stakeholders, types of risks, time required for the change, availability of change experience and dependency (the relationship between the organisation and employees).

Kezar and Eckel (2002) conducted a study based on a case study of six higher education institutions in the USA, to ground a transformational change process both theoretically and empirically. They identified the following core strategies to facilitate the process of change initiatives:
1) Senior management support reflects positively on the financial support initiatives, incentives and new structures to support change efforts.
2) The existence of a collaborative and shared leadership that includes senior staff and others contributes in creating communication channels with stakeholders through seminars, training programmes and sessions in which open debate can take place.
3) Leaders need to develop a robust design of a future that makes change desirable by setting goals and drawing a flexible plan to achieve that future.
4) Staff development is essential to provide staff with knowledge and leadership skills, which will help them to communicate effectively in carrying out the required changes.
5) The visible implementation of action steps is important because it highlights the results of hard work and effort, which enhances the feeling of the new sense resulting from change and maintains momentum.

The style of management behaviour is one significant factor for succeeding in the implementation of organisational change initiatives (Mullins, 2006).Bush and Coleman (2000) have asserted that good management makes an obvious difference in the quality of educational organisations and students' results. The role of a change director must be noticeable and active in all stages of a change processes (Hiatt and Creasey, 2012).

Kotter and Schlesinger (2008), assert that many managers do not pay attention to the adequacy of the reaction of individuals to change and the ways in which they can have a positive impact on individuals and groups. The reason for this may be the lack of understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of familiar ways. Kotter and Schlesinger (2008), furthermore stress the importance of continued efforts, the choice of an appropriate strategy to overcome resistance by looking at the amount and type of resistance, the positions of resisters and supporters, the information available to design the change and the energy available for its implementation, and, finally, the potential risks. In addition, they highlight six ways change leaders, mangers or agents can deal with resistance. These are described briefly in the following table 2with consideration of the situations in which they can be used plus their advantages and disadvantages.

Table 2: Methods for dealing with resistance to change (Kotter and Schlesinger, 2008, p.136)

Method	Commonly used in situations	Advantages	Disadvantages
Education and communication	Where there is a lack of information or inaccurate information and analysis	Once persuaded, people will often help with the implementation of the change	Can be very time consuming if lots of people are involved
Participation and involvement	Where the initiators do not have all the information they need to design the change, and where others have considerable power to resist	People who participate will be committed to implementing change, and any relevant information they have will be integrated into the change plan	Can be very time consuming if participators design an inappropriate change
Facilitation and Support	Where people are resisting because of adjustment problems	No other approach works as well with adjustment problems	Can be time consuming and expensive
Negotiation and agreement	Where someone or some group will clearly lose out as a result of a change, and where that group has considerable power to resist	Sometimes it is a relatively easy way to avoid major resistance	Can be expensive in many cases if it prompts others to negotiate for compliance
Manipulation and co-optation	Where other tactics will not work or are too expensive	It can be a relatively quick and inexpensive solution to resistance problems	Can lead to future problems if people feel manipulated
Explicit and Implicit coercion	Where speed is essential and the change initiators possess considerable power	It is speedy and can overcome any kind of resistance	Can be risky if it leaves people angry at the initiators

Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) point out that one of the most common errors among leaders of change, when dealing with resistance, is using one method to tackle all kinds of resistance types and using the method separately and not as part of an overall strategy for the change.

Keys for Successful Change
The literature in the field of change in organisations is rich; there are a significant range of tips, lessons, principles and guides that discuss appropriate steps to ensure success. Change planners should be aware that this wisdom may not succeed in all cases; it depends on the culture of the organisation, staff qualifications and the economic and political conditions in the society. This section reviews approaches advocated by scholars and researchers, from various backgrounds and several disciplines, regarding achieving successful change.

The organisational culture should be taken into account when planning for change, not only because it plays a crucial role in the implementation of change activities in terms of acceptance or rejection, but because the chances of success depend on it (Kiritsis, 2009). Aguirre and Alpern (2014) developed ten guiding tips that can be adapted by leaders for use in many cases of change in organisations. These principles stressed the importance of taking advantage of the culture of individuals, the organisation and the community by linking them to the goals of change. This approach will help to create emotional energy to support the project of change.

1) Understanding staff culture and behaviour and then investing them as emotional energy to support the change project by linking the current culture with change components.
2) It is important that senior management and all managers agree on the vision and goals and are committed throughout the process of change.
3) Ensure the participation of all the layers in the organization.
4) Link emotional and logical aspects together in the formulation of objectives to ensure adherence to the project of change.

5) Engagement in behaviours of change, visibly and daily by leaders, will make the staff believe that change is really happening.
6) Strong sustainable change requires constant communication at all stages.
7) Identify informal leaders respected by members of the organisation who can influence and engage them as participants and directors.
8) Activate official solutions to change the behaviour of individuals and convince them about change through support, training, restructuring and an incentive system.
9) Create ownership ethics at work by asking the staff at all levels of the organisation to be responsible for quality, celebrate improvements and achievements.
10) Measure success before moving on to new stages.

The literature suggests that the success of change initiatives depends largely on the impact of faculty through the implementation processes. Therefore it is important to pay attention to human factors and understand the culture of the academic community (Storberg-Walker and Torraco, 2004). In addition, each university has different factors and a unique context that requires an appropriate framework or paradigm of management in order to achieve positive change. Scott (2004) advocates the following nine-change management lessons be addressed appropriately and effectively in higher education institutions (pp. 4–7):

1) It is impossible to address every relevant change idea that occurs.
2) Change is a learning process not an event, and the enthusiasm of key stakeholders regarding engaging in and sticking with it, is vital for a successful implementation.
3) The university culture has a powerful influence on motivation.
4) A change activity in one sector of a university typically leads to a need for change in another sector.
5) Success in a change project results from a team effort.
6) It is necessary to concentrate – at the same time – on the present and the future.
7) Change is a cyclical not a linear process.
8) There is a need to look inside and outside for effective change solutions.

9) Change is always happening, but it must be led.

Carnall (1999) supports a view that change depends on behaviour and directing individuals to carry out new roles makes them behave in different ways; they are trained and encouraged, this will affect the culture of the organisation. To transform individuals from resisters to being supporters one must make them involved and committed. In order to strengthen involvement and commitment Coetsee (1999) identified five elements: (1) knowledge – providing staff training and development; (2) information – how it is disseminated and how staff understand and accept it; (3) empowerment – giving staff the power to participate in making decisions; (4) rewards and recognition – giving moral and financial incentives; (5) shared visions – sharing goals and values clearly and in a convincing manner.

Change in educational organisations may be imposed from outside or it can be a result of an internal evaluation. In any case, it needs effective management. Leaders and managers are required to create a suitable climate for change and to design structures and processes that enable new ideas to be tested and applied. They also need to be able to set priorities and deal with new initiatives (Bush and Coleman, 2000).

3. Conclusion

Change in higher education requires time (often more than expected) to enhance a deep emotional and well-established cultural atmosphere that supports such an initiative. Each institution has its own culture, and each case of change has specific circumstances, therefore it is important to choose effective management models to manage the change and linked resources. Opening communication with all stakeholders involved, inside or outside the institution, is an urgent need in order to ensure the spread of the change message and increase acceptance and support. Enhancing the sense of responsibility among individuals will help to increase involvement, commitment and integrity. Providing rewards and appreciation for the efforts and achievements of individuals and teams promotes continuity in supporting a change initiative. It is also necessary to carry out ongoing evaluation of change processes and take advantage of feedback in order to repair errors and achieve success quickly. Further, the discussion leads us to the conclusion that there is no strategy or model that is effective in all times and places. All strategies and models support the improvement of the process of change implementation and seek to make it sustainable. The preference in the selection of any one model or strategy is influenced by several conditions, such as the objectives of the change, its type and the available time and resources. It is vital to emphasise the importance of the organisational culture, which is a crucial factor in the selection of the appropriate model or strategy. Furtherresearch effort should be geared towards the impact of social or organisational culture on stakeholders' engagement in change operations.

References

[1] AGUIRRE, D. and ALPERN, M. (2014). 10 Guiding Principles for Leading Change Management. *Industry Week.*

[2] AL-ANQARI, K. (2006). Higher Education in Saudi Arabia: Achievements and Aspirations, [online]. Available at:

[3] ALHADI, I. S. (2013). Change management in Arab higher education institutions towards quality and excellence performance. *Arab Jurnal for Quality Assurance in Higher Education,* 6 (11), pp. 234 - 305.

[4] ALTBACH, P. G. 2004. Globalization and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World. *Tertiary Education and Management,* 10**,** 3-25.

[5] ALTRICHTER, H. and ELLIOT, J. (2000). *Images of educational change*. London: McGraw-Hill Education.

[6] ANDERSON, D. and ANDERSON, L. A. (2001). *Beyond Change Management : Advanced Strategies for Today's Transformational Leaders.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[7] BIECH, E. (2007). *Thriving through change: A leader's practical guide to change mastery*. American Society for Training and Development.

[8] BOYD, W. L., CROWSON, R. L. and GEEL, T. V. (1994). Rational choice theory and the politics of education: promise and limitations. *Journal of Education Policy,* 9 (5), pp. 127-145.

[9] BURNES, B. (2004). *Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organisational Dynamics*. London: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

[10] BUSH, T. and COLEMAN, M. (2000). *Leadership and Strategic Management in Education.* London: SAGE.

[11] CAMERON, E. and GREEN, M. (2009). *Making Sense of Change Management: A Complete Guide to the Models,Tools and Techniques of Organizational Change*. London:Kogan Page.

[12] CARNALL, C. A. (1999). *Managing change in organizations*, 3^(rd) ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

[13] CASTELLS, (2010). *The rise of the network society,* Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell

[14] CHRISTENSEN, C. M., MARX, M. and STEVENSON, H. H. (2006). The Tools of Cooperation and Change. *Harvard Business Review,* 84 (10), pp. 73-80.

[15] COETSEE, L. (1999). From Resistance To Commitment. *Public Administration Quarterly,* 23 (2), pp. 204-222.

[16] DEAL, I. L. G. and TERRENCE, E. (2008). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership-4/E.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[17] DUDERSTADT, J. J., ATKINS, D. E. and VAN HOUWELING, D. (2003). The development of institutional strategies. *Educause Review,* 38, pp. 48-59.

[18] FRENCH, W. L. and BELL, C. (1999). *Organization Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvement*. Prentice Hall.

[19] GARVIN, D. A. (2000). *Learning in action: A guide to putting the learning organization to work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.

[20] GHOSHAL, S. (2005). Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices. *Academy of Management Learning and Education,* 4 (1), pp. 75-91.

[21] HARRIS, D. L., DEROSA, D., LIU, P. L. and HASH, R. B. (2003). Facilitating academic institutional change: Redefining scholarship. *Family Medicine: Kansas City,* 35 (3), pp. 187-194.

[22] HELLRIEGEL, D. and SLOCUM, J. (2010). *Organizational Behavior*. Cengage Learning.

[23] HIATT, J. and CREASEY, T. J. (2012). *Change Management: the people side of change*. Prosci.

[24] HOWAIDY, A. B. and GUENUAH, A. (2013). The impacts of globalization on university education system in the field of social sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences-Biskra University,* 30/31, pp. 23-38.

[25] http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492430.pdf [accessed 26 July 2018].

[26] http://www.mohe.gov.sa/en/aboutus/Pages/Achievements-and-aspirations.aspx [accessed 20 June 2018].

[27] http://www.mohe.gov.sa/en/aboutus/Pages/Achievements-and-aspirations.aspx [accessed 20 June 2018].

[28] JICK, T. D. (1999). Implementing Change, Note. *Harvard Business School Press,* 9, pp. 114-191.

[29] JOHNSON, G., SCHOLES, K. and WHITTINGTON, R. (2008). *Exploring Corporate Strategy: Text and Cases*. Financial Times Prentice Hall.

[30] KANTER, R. M. (1997). *The Change Masters: Corporate Entrepreneurs at Work.* London: International Thomson Business.

[31] KANTER, R. M. (1999). The enduring skills of change leaders. *Leader to Leader,* 1999 (13), pp. 15-22.

[32] KENNEDY, A. (2004). Change management. *School of Computing Dublin Institute of Technology*.

[33] KEZAR, A. (2001). Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century. *ASHE-ERIC higher education report,* 28 (4), No. 4.

[34] KEZAR, A. and ECKEL, P. (2002). Examining the institutional transformation process: The importance of sensemaking, interrelated strategies, and balance. *Research in Higher Education,* 43 (3), pp. 295-328.

[35] KIRITSIS, V. J. (2009). *Managing change in educational organizations: managing and leading higher education in an era of change in Greece. Case study: University of Indianapolis, Athens.* Middlesex University.

[36] KOTTER, J. P. (1995). Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail. (cover story). *Harvard Business Review,* 73 (2), pp. 59-67.

[37] KOTTER, J. P. and SCHLESINGER, L. A. (2008). Choosing Strategies for Change. *Harvard Business Review,* 86 (7/8), pp. 130-139.

[38] LAW, S. and GLOVER, D. (2000). *Educational Leadership and Learning: Practice, Policy and Research*. London: McGraw-Hill Education.

[39] LEVIN, J. S. (1999). Missions and structures: Bringing clarity to perceptions about globalization and higher education in Canada. *Higher Education,* 37 (4), pp. 377-399.

[40] LEWIN, K. (1945). The Research Center for Group Dynamics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. *Sociometry,* 8 (2), pp. 126-136.

[41] LEWIN, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. *Readings in social psychology,* 3, pp. 197-211.

[42] LIGHTFOOT, M. 2016. *Education technology policies in the Middle East: globalization, neoliberalism and the knowledge . economy,* Switzerland, Palgrave Macmillan.

[43] LONGENECKER, C. O., NEUBERT, M. J. and FINK, L. S. (2007). Causes and consequences of managerial failure in rapidly changing organizations. *Business Horizons,* 50 (2), pp. 145-155.

[44] MADANI, G. (2002). *Development of Higher Education as one of the tributaries of human development in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The future vision of the Saudi economy until 2020, 19-23/10/2002*. Riyadh: Planning Ministry.

[45] MENTO, A. J., JONES, R. M. and DIRNDORFER, W. (2002). A change management process: Grounded in both theory and practice. *Journal of Change Management,* 3 (1), p. 45-59.

[46] MOK, K. H. (2000). Impact of globalization: A study of quality assurance systems of higher education in Hong Kong and Singapore. *Comparative Education Review,* 44 (2), pp. 148-174.

[47] MORRISON, K. (1998). *Management theories for educational change*. Sage.

[48] MULLINS, L. J. (2006). *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. Financial Times Prentice Hall.

[49] NEWMAN, D. (2006). Quick change. The change acceleration process has been used successfully in business all over the world. *Hospitals and health networks/AHA,* 80 (2), p. 84.

[50] NICKOLS, F. (2010). Four change management strategies, [online]. Available at: http://www.nickols.us/four_strategies.pdf [Accessed 10/08/2015].

[51] OLSON, G. A. (2006). What Conspiracy? *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 52 (25), pp. C2-C3.

[52] PERLMUTTER, D. D. (2005). We Want Change; No We Don't. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 52 (10), pp. C2-C3.

[53] PETTIGREW, A. M. (1985). *The awakening giant: Continuity and change in Imperial Chemical Industries*. Oxford: Blackwell.

[54] PRIESTLEY, M. (2011). Schools, teachers, and curriculum change: A balancing act? *Journal of Educational Change,* 12 (1), pp. 1-23.

[55] PRYOR, M. G., TANEJA, S., HUMPHREYS, J., ANDERSON, D. and SINGLETON, L. (2008). Challenges facing change management theories and research. *Delhi Business Review,* 9 (1), pp. 1-8.

[56] ROBBINS, S. and JUDGE, T. A. (2013). *Organisational behaviour*. Pearson Higher Education.

[57] SCOTT, G. (2004). Change matters: Making a difference in higher education. In: *Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum, 2004*, pp. 35-51.

[58] SENGUPTA, N., BHATTACHARYA, M. S. and SENGUPTA, R. (2006). *Managing change in organizations*. PHI Learning.

[59] STORBERG-WALKER, J. and TORRACO, R. (2004). Change and Higher Education: A Multidisciplinary Approach. *Online Submission*, pp. 811-818, [online]. Available at: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492430.pdf [accessed 26 July 2018].

[60] SURSOCK, A., SMIDT, H. and DAVIES, H. (2010). *Trends 2010: A decade of change in European Higher Education*. Brussels: European University Association.

[61] TICHY, N. M. (1983). *Managing strategic change: Technical, political, and cultural dynamics*. John Wiley.

[62] WILSON, D. C. (1992). *A Strategy of Change: Concepts and Controversies in the Management of Change*. International Thomson Business Press.