Essay Review

Planned Change in Higher Education: Oxymoron, Miracle or Mirage?

The Process of Change in Higher Education Institutions
by Robert Nordvall
Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1982

> "You cannot step twice into the same river, for the waters are continually flowing in" **Heraclitus**, *Fragments* (c. 500 B.C.).
>
> "Wood may remain ten years in water, but it will never become a crocodile." **Congolese Proverb**.

Two statements about change. The first reflects it inevitability, the second its improbability. While contradictory, both depict the nature of change in higher education. Like the picture of the vase/two faces, higher education is simultaneously evolving and unchanging, depending on your perception of the "figure" (the object of focus) and the "ground" (the context or backdrop). To be sure, there are aspects of higher education that do not change: degrees are granted, courses are taught by persons called "faculty", students are evaluated on their performance. But equally reliable is the fact that other things have and do change: students are demographically different from their predecessors and increasingly less prepared for the rigors of college, new forms of higher education institutions have emerged, new disciplines have erupted on the borders of old.

The plethora of articles, books and monographs written about change in higher education attest to its place on the national agenda. "The times they are a changin'" and so must colleges and

universities to successfully compete in the academic marketplace for students, faculty, research monies and other support. But what is meant by the term change? To what extent can higher education control their destinies? Can change be planned and purposeful or is it merely reactive?

In The Process of Change in Higher Education, Robert Nordvall reviews the research on planned change in colleges and universities and provides suggestions as to how to facilitate change within these institutions. The monograph is divided into five main sections, briefly reviewed below.

Resistance to Needed Change

While Nordvall acknowledges that social trends impact higher education, he uses an internal lens to focus on how individuals and organizations respond to these pressures for change. Individuals, he writes, generally resist change if it is perceived as a threat to basic security, not understood or is imposed. He further contends, and his observations are supported by Clark (1983), that faculty tend to resist change because they are endemically conservative, having been socialized in graduate school to discipline loyalty that "inhibits receptivity to nontraditional approaches". Adaptation of ideas used elsewhere can be seen as admission that education is a standardized task that can be made more efficient through the use of explempary procedures. For some academics this makes teaching (and I would add research as well) too much like an industrial process; they are skeptical about the idea that it should be a goal to make the university efficient (Nordvall, p.5).

Nordvall relies on the work of various authors in his discussion of why organizations resist change, noting several features that stagnate organizations:

- inertia
- conformity to organizational norms
- desire to maintain coherence
- vested interests
- the sacrosanct
- rejection of outsiders
- recruitment of similiar members
- clinging to existing satisfactions

Several higher education characteristics were also noted as exacerbating the general tendency of its organizations to reject change:

- vertical fragmentation
- pluralistic power sources
- horizontal fragmentation and subgrouping
- academic reward system that emphasizes teaching and research, not "innovative activities"
- change oriented people that are marginal to community members and not in key positions (p.6).

Models of the Change Process

A plethora of models have sprung up over the years that in some way or another attempt to explain the organizational change process. Nordvall introduces the section with a review of the primary decision making concepts that underlie change in higher education, including collegial, bureaucratic, political and atomistic models. He continues the section with eight categories of "change" models: research, development and diffusion; problem solving; action research and organizational development; social interaction; political; linkage; adaptive development; and systems theory. Each is analyzed using a five point framework comprised of primary emphasis, intellectual orientation, activities, key individuals and criticisms and summarized in Figure 1.

(INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE)

Readiness For Change: Organizational Structure, Character and Planning

Organizational Structure

The third section of the monograph focuses on the readiness of organizations to undergo change. Nordvall contends that there are three structural characteristics that impact an organization's openness to innovation. While there is consensus that *institutional size* impacts readiness for and success of change efforts, optimal size studies contradict each other. Ladd (1970)and Hefferlin (1969) found that small schools are more likely than large to have successful change efforts; Blau (1973) and others point to the large university's

decentralization and penchant for research as fertile change ground. But perhaps there is no controversy connected to the findings, only multiple definitions of change. Levine (1982) offers some insight into the conundrum, noting that large (and perhaps planned) change is more common in small school; small (incremental or emergent) changes in large institutions.

Decentralization of decision making is the second structural aspect that impacts an organization's ability to change easily. Nordvall cites Blau's (1973) research in his discussion of decentralization, noting that it "may promote structural flexibility which facilitates institutional innovation" (p. 22). Others, he writes, fear that decentralized decision making limits the power of the president to implement sweeping reforms. Dill and Friedman (1979) note that high degrees of complexity in an organization promote initiation of change, but implementation of change is better accomplished in a less complex, more ordered environment. An interesting observation, and one with significant ramifications given the fact that change is not really change until it is institutionalized (Louis, 1986).

The third structural characteristic affecting change is *instability.* Nordvall reported conflicting evidence on the impact of organizational instability as well. He notes that Hefferlin (1969) and Bennis (1965) contend that some type of instability (e.g.conflict over goals, financial problems, expanding faculty) is needed for the initiation of change; however, others (e.g.Peterson, 1982) believe that institutional stability is a condition neccessary to sustain a program of planned change. Nordvall does not comment on these paradoxical observations, but it is this author's believe that the disparities are due to the observations being made at two distinct points in time in the process. The organizational requirements of each phase of the change process appear to be radically different. What makes change so difficult and slow is the organizational character is often out of sync with the rational change process steps. Somehow the organization must "catch up" in order for implementation to continue.

Organizational Characteristics

Nordvall writes that innovative istitutions seem to share certain characteristics. He identifies six drawn from the corporate literature: decentralization, emphasis on quality, recognition of expertise throughout the organization (not just at the top), lateral communication consisting of information rather than instruction, commitment to the organization as a whole, and external prestige based on institutional membership. Nordvall goes on to describe characteristics of innovative educational organizations: internal cohesiveness, self-examining, consensus on goals, open communication, leadership dedicated to managing the change process, support and promotion of innovative persons, fewer bureaucratic or routine requirements, use of temporary ad hoc groups for problem solving, and general openness to change.

Planning

Nordvall writes " an organization with structural features and a character condusive to change ideally will develop a planning process to monitor and respond to the need for change". He mentions briefly the difference between different types of planning (e.g. long range, strategic, tactical) and reviews the major steps in the planning process:

1. Clearly state the goals and objectives of the institution
2. Gather and analyze information about how these are currently being met
3. Describe current programs meeting goals and objectives
4. Identify problems and opportunities facing institution
5. Outline resources currently available to the institution
6. Revise goals and objectives
7. Determine resources needed to meet new goals and how to obtain them
8. Develop specific plans to reach goals and objectives
9. Implement plans
10. Evaluate success of plans

Key Individuals in the Change Process

Change Agents

According to Nordvall's review of the literature, several different types of individuals can play key roles in the change process. Change agents are perhaps the people most often associated with planned change efforts. They can be either outside consultants or insiders, with each having distinct advantages and disadvantages. Insiders know the organization, its culture, structure and politics. They are less threatening to their colleagues and have a vested interest in making the innovation work. And perhaps most importantly, they provide continuity during the innovation's implementation phase. But several potential disadvantages bear repeating, including bias, organizational illegitamacy and impotence, and role ambiquity.

Conversely, outside consultants start with a clean slate and no preconceived notions. They can bring independence, prestige and an element of risk-taking to an organization. The disadvantages are clear: they may present a threat to staff and the status quo, are unfamiliar with the organization, lack commitment and often cannot follow an innovation through all phases of adoption.

Key Insiders

In addition to change agents per se, there are certain people within organizations that can facilitate or hinder change. It is at this point of the monograph that Nordvall acknowledges the role politics and power play in changing organizations, noting that it is important, though not in itself sufficient, to have the support of top administrators. Senior faculty, department chairs and "gatekeepers" (left undefined) were also mentioned as loci of power and therefore instrumental to a change effort.

Interest/Ad Hoc Groups

Often, Nordvall observes, the innovator pushing for change is not an individual, but a group. This group may be appointed to study a problem, but just as easily can be self-appointed with its own agenda. According to Nordvall, groups seeking change are more successful when they are legitimate in the eyes of the unit they are trying to impact, represent all levels and types of staff involved in the problem or proposed solution, have respect for all members, and maintain an effective group process. Effective group members, he continues:

1. understand their role in the group
2. understand the group's role in the institution
3. communicate effectively with each other about issues of group efficiency
4. support each other
5. understand the behavior and dynamics of a group
6. uses conflict in a positive way
7. collaborate rather than compete with each other
8. work well with other groups on campus
9. have a sense of interdependence (p. 30-31).

Practical Advice about Change

The final section of this monograph offers practical ideas about how to facilitate change. Divided into five sections, it examines 1) prerequisites for change, 2) first steps in the change process, 3) fashioning a change proposal, 4) strategies for obtaining approval, and 5) implementation.

Prerequisites for change

Nordvall discusses the importance of timing and groundwork in this section, stressing organizational readiness and receptivity to the proposed innovation. While dissatisfaction can serve as the impetus for change, he warns that it can be counterproductive "if emotions rise to an unmanageable level " (p. 32).

First steps

Once the prerequisites are in place, four steps must proceed the actual devleopment of the change proposal: 1) establish the relationship between the change agent and the organzation by defining what role (problem definer, solution giver, catalist, data collector/feedback agent, resource linker, mediator, or process helper) she or he is to play in the process; 2) conduct a needs assessment or in some other way clarify the problem; 3) provide information about the generic change process to those involved in the change, both as planners and plan implementors; and 4) determine the scope and unit of change.

Fashioning the change proposal

After the "plan to plan" phase is completed, the change proposal or plan is drafted. This plan must flow logically from the needs assessment results of the previous step and contain alternative solutions (including models from outside the institution) that are most compatible with local context and economic constraints. Ideally, the proposal is shaped by those most likely to do the actual implementation and is responsive to the members' needs. The substance of the proposal, of course, will depend in large part on the specific institutional circumstances. However, Nordvall offers several generic pieces of advice about writing quality proposals, based primarily on the innovation literature. We are advised to stress the *relative advantage*, or profitability of the change, integrating organizational and individual needs. The content of the change must be *compatible* with the organization's values, history and traditions. He also talks about compatibility between the change and the existing structure, stating "compatibility will be served if the new idea can be institutued without instituting new organizational units." Less clear advice is given about whether complex or simple change proposals are more likely to be approved. While simple innovations may be more clearly communicated, complex innovations are more likely to be adopted in higher education because they are equated with excellence, a predominant value (Clark, 1968). Likewise, Nordvall explains, innovations that are more complex and a little vague are more likely to supported in a political environment where each party can attach its own agenda to them. (Of course, implementation becomes problematic...) Finally, he talks about trialability (the ability to test an innovation before fully adopting it),

divisability (the ability to adopt or implement the innovation in part), communicability and observability being critical considerations when fashioning the change proposal.

Strategies to obtain approval

Strategies designed to further the approval of the innovation should be developed simultaneously with the change proposal itself. Nordvall proposes that a Force Field Analysis be conducted to identify forces which will foster and impede the proposed change for each of the five developmental stages of innovation: exploration, formulation, trial, refinement, and institutionalization. .

A second strategy for securing the desired change plan is the active involvement of persons with the "right characteristics": high energy, commitment, persistance, tenured status, membership in or access to faculty leadership, reputation for professional competence, interpersonal skills, and knowledgable about campus politics. Change agents, on the other hand, should appear altruistic and apolitical (p. 39).

Thirdly, as discussed in an earlier section of the monograph, it is important to win the support of top administrators and to foster a broad sense of ownership in the innovation. This leads into the final suggestion--development of a communications strategy that includes oral presentations, workshops, conferences, group discussions and print materials about the innovation.

Implementation

The final phase of the change process described by Nordvall is implementation. He warns that this is often the most difficult stage of change, the point at which an innovation more often than not disappears into a bureaucratic or autonomous Black Hole. Therefore, implementation problems must be considered up front, while the original plan is being made. Implementation failure is almost guarenteed, he writes, when the innovation is not fully understood, skills to implement the innovation are not in place, resources are unavailable or insufficient, or the organizational structure is in some way incompatible with the innovation. Successful innovations seem to be less radical in scope and content, have had contiuity of leadership throughout the change development and implementation process, were accomodated financially via regular department budgets, were profitable, and were compatible with existing structures and norms.

Comments and Reactions

Nordvall has provided his readers with an incredible amount of information in a relatively brief monograph. Unfortunately, even in this small morsel, he has bitten off more than he, and perhaps his audience, can chew and digest at one time. Cognitive indigestion occurs not because of the complexity of the subject matter, but the shotgun approach used to present the material. Several sections suffer from superficiality; all lack smooth transitions and possible explanations of how the research cited can be simultaneously contradictory and accurate. In short, Nordvall has given readers hungry for a 7 course dinner a platter of mixed hors d'oeurves.

Perhaps the greatest weakness of the monograph overall is its lack of definitional clarity. The title infers a comprehensive look at "the process of change in higher education institutions". As we read further, we find that it's really a discussion of planned change (undefined), sometimes limited to "adoption of innovation", a very narrow avenue by which change is introduced into an organization. Granted, the paper is a review of a very diverse literature drawn from both business and education. Still, parallel theoretical frameworks (pure or hybrid) based on the second section of the monograph could have been used to organize at least the remainder of the review (see Dill and Friedman, 1979). Instead, serial descriptions are presented, which leave the reader grasping for a common thread.

Besides the overall organizational problems with the paper, Nordvall has omitted what I feel are important pieces of literature in his discussion of change in higher education. For instance, he neglects several key aspects of higher education in his synthesis of resistance to change. At least six other characteristics of higher education significantly impact how change occurs within colleges and universities, including:

1. *goal ambiguity*. Organizations are goal oriented and structure themselves to reach those goals. Most private and non-profit organizations have clear cut missions and goals, based on an agreed upon and funtional identity. Higher education, on the other hand, has vague, amorphous goals. That is, members of the organization, as well as those outside its walls, function under their own definitions of what teaching, service and research are. While goal ambiguity allows the flexibility to redefine and focus their efforts on the individual faculty or academic department level (Clark, 1983), it makes institution wide change extremely difficult due to the structural loose coupling inherent in the system (Wieck, 1983).

2. *problematic technology*. Production in higher education is unlike industry production, where combining certain raw materials with a set production process consistently yields a known product. In higher education, the "product" is difficult to identify. Is it educated students? Knowledge? Solutions to social problems? Even when the product is identified, it is nearly impossible to determine what combination of resources, student characteristics, and educational technology produced it. Wieck (1983) describes this phenomenom as "loosely coupled" technology where there are unclear relationships between input, process/intervention, and outcome. This technological loose coupling make evaluation of innovations difficult if not fruitless in many cases.

3. *professionalism*. Higher education is characterized by its professional staff. Professionals demand autonomy in their work, resist bureaucratic impositions, and demand peer evaluation of their work (Baldridge, et. al. 1978), making many types of innovations difficult to implement.

4. *academic culture*. Academia is culturally laden at four levels-the discipline (e.g. shared paradigms, idols, vacabularies, methodological standards); the institution (e.g. sagas, rituals, heros, traditions); the profession (e.g. community of scholars, academic freedom); and the system (e.g. open access, training for private and well as public sector) (Clark, 1983). Change is limited by the parameters imposed by these cultural norms.

5. *the institutional nature of HE*. Education is a social institution that derives its legitimacy from adherence to society's expectations of it. It is fraught with rules, assumptions and social myths that define what it is, how it is organized and who can perform it. These social standards provide stability and continuity over time and across locations (Meyer, 1977). Academic innovations which threaten these standards will be resisted by the general public as well as faculty, staff and students.

6. *presidential limitations*. Unlike the CEO of a private corporation,university and college preseidents lack power (Cohen and March,1974). Their employees tend to be more commiteed to their professions than to the institution. Resource providers, in the form of government, private contributors, and alumni, often

intrude directly into organizational affairs. There are restraints on the ability to wield rewards and punishments. And open debate, broad participation and approval from representative bodies are expected (Chaffee, 1985) making top down change is difficult in higher education .

A second informational oversight in the monograph is in Nordvall's section on change models. While it has some very good information, it neglects the very critical research of several higher education and social science writers who have perhaps more accurately depicted organizational change. First, it downplays the very real role that politics plays in the change process in higher education. Nordvall criticizes the political model as being inapplicable to the academia due to the professional autonomy of its members. He doesn't seem to realize that that faculty autonomy may be the very cause of some conflict! Nordvall also ignores the fact that most major decisions in higher education involve policy development, which is a very political process (see Baldridge et. al [1978] and Pfeffer [1981]).

Secondly, the section omits at least three alternative change models which should be included in any comprehensive discussion of higher education decision making or change:

1. Organized anarchy/garbage can decision making. Cohen and March (1974) have described universities as "organized anarchies" where:

> "each individual...is...making autonomous decisions...Neither coordination ...nor control are practiced...The 'decisions' of the system are a consequence produced by the system and intended by no one and controlled by no one" (p. 33)

Rather than "rationally" and planfully conceived, an organized anarchy is comprised of a collection of choices looking for problems, issues and feelings looking for decision situations in which they might be aired, solutions looking for issues for which they might be the answer, and decision makers looking for work. Decisions are made in garbage cans ("choice opportunities") where the actual decision made depends on 1) the labels attached to the cans, 2) what garbage is being produced at the moment, 3) the mix of cans available and 4) the speed with which the the garbage is collected.

In this type of system inertia reigns; anything requiring a coordinated

effort to start or be stopped is unlikely to occur. The authors warn that most decisions have low salience for most people and that any attention devoted to a change issue is tied more to its *symbolic significance* than its content, an area of organizational change Nordvall has ignored.

2. Culture and symbols. Several contemporary authors stress the importance of culture and symbolism in managing and changing higher education organizations. Tichy (1983) warns that trying to change a technical aspect of an organization without corresponding adjustments in its political and cultural aspects is doomed to failure. Cameron (1984) depicts planning as a symbolic activity, engaged in when external constituencies question the worth of existing practices. Change to Cameron, is often simply reinterpretation rather than actual change. He notes that interpretating history and current events, rituals and ceremonies, how administrators use their time, redesigning physical plant, and introducing doubt are often the most effective ways for affecting change in organizations. Written plans become symbols, advertisements, games and excuses for interaction (Cohen and March, 1974), rather than blueprints for change.

3. Organizational life cycles. Cameron and Whetten (1983)'s work on organizational life cycles provides additional insight into how organizations change. They propose that organzations go through four stages: the creation and entrepreneurial stage, the collectivity stage, the formalization and control stage, and the elaboration of structure stage. Each has corresponding characteristics that depict the level of organizational commitment, structure, dependence and priorities. This literature might suggest that planned change efforts need to be conducted within a larger life cycle context, a point Nordvall has ignored.

And finally, there are many authors who believe that planned change, at least as it is presented in this monograph and elsewhere in the organizational development (OD) literature, is really only a figment of some planner's imagination. According to Cohen and March (1974), "despite the unanimous acceptance of the importance of planning, there is little evidence of planning in American colleges and universities..." Baldridge and Okimi (1982) concur, finding in their study of planning at higher education institutions that despite the rhetoric, administrators are crisis-oriented, have little time for long range planning, and rarely clarify

their goals. Indictments such as these from such prolific researcher and writers, lead me to believe that we're once again trying to pound round universities into square corporate holes. The internal lens used by Nordvall and other OD theorists, if not used judiciously, can cause myopic responses to complex problems and conditions that require clear binocular vision. While "planned change" and "adoption of innovation" techniques and processes may work for small scale, limited change, it is totally ineffective for the massive structural changes needed to revitalize and rescue departments, colleges and universities torn apart by retrenchment. To focus clearly, the internal lens must be balanced by an external one, one that sees the messiness of the system and its environment. Until both lenses are in focus, we will continue to grope, plans in hand, toward blurred futures.

Bibliography

Baldridge, V. and Okimi, P. (1982) Strategic planning in higher education: New tool-or gimmick? *AAHE Bulletin*, 35: 6-18.

Baldridge, V. et. al. (1978) *Policy Making and Effective Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W. (1965) *Changing Organizations.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Blau, P. (1973) *The Organization of Academic Work.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Cameron, K. (1984) Organizational adaptation and higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 55:122-144.

Cameron, K and Whetten, D. (1983) Models of the organizational life cycle: Applications to higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 6:4, 269-299.

Chaffee, E. (1985) Three models of strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 10:1, 89-98.

Clark, B. (1983) *The Higher Education System. Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective.* Los Angelos: University of California Press.

Clark, T. (1968) Institutionalization of innovation in higher education. *Adminstrative Science Quarterly*, 13: 1-25.

Cohen, M. and March, J. (1974) *Leadership and Ambiquity.* Boston: Harvard Business School.

Dill, P. and Friedman, C. (1979) An analusis of frameworks for research on innovation and change in higher education. *Review of Educational Research,* 49: 411-435.

Hefferlin, J. (1969) *Dynamics of Academic Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladd, D. (1970) *Change in Educational Policy Making.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Levine, A. (1982) Personal correspondence (to Nordvall)

Louis, K. (1986) Permanent innovations: Theoretical and administrative issues in institutionalizing educational change. In Voogt, J. and Reints, A. (eds.) *Naar Beter Onderwijis (Toward Better Education).* Tilburg: Zwijsen.

Meyer, J. (1977). The effects of education as an institution. *American Journal of Sociology,* 83: 55-77.

Peterson, M. (1982) An outsiders view. Prelude, interlude or postlude. In Hipps, G. (ed.), *New Directions for Instituional Research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pfeffer, J. (1981) *Power in Organizations.* Boston: Pittman.

Tichy, N. (1983) *Managing Strategic Change: Technical, Political and Cultural Dynamics.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wieck, K. (1983) Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. In M. Peterson's *ASHE Reader on Organizational Governance in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: ASHE.

Figure 1

MAJOR MODELS OF CHANGE

Model	Emphasis	Intellectual Orientation	Activities	Key Individuals	Criticisms
Research, development and diffusion (national planning)	Development of a good idea and convincing presentation. Does not seek to change people or organizational structure	Scientific Research Rational sequence of events for applying and evaluating innovations to passive, rational consumers	a. build hypothesis b. design alternatives c. test alternatives d. select alternative e. disseminate info regarding alternative f. use empirical-rational strategy to convince people to try the new idea	a. Researchers who develop ideas b. On-campus individuals or committees who develop change proposals (using ideas developed elsewhere)	a. ignores non-rational motivations b. Non-uniform impact of change (what's rational for one unit may be disastrous for another or the entire organization c. More appropriate for diffusion of technological rather than organizational innovations
Problem Solving	How people feel the need for change and become willing to change. Replace competition and closed attitudes with openness and collaboration. Emphasize changing attitudes and values of individuals - not organizational structure	Humanistic Psychology including applied behavioral psychology and human relations school of business administ. Proponents = Mayo, Bennis, Argyris and Likert	a. diagnose problem b. search for alternatives c. emphasize solutions based on improved individual and peer group relations [T-groups, brainstorming, sensitivity training, etc] d. select solution that solves both current problem and builds capacity for solving future problems. e. use selected normative reeducation strategy	a. Outside consultant acting in any or all of several roles: 1. resource linker 2. process helper 3. catalyst	None listed

Figure 1 Continued

MAJOR MODELS OF CHANGE

Model	Emphasis	Intellectual Orientation	Activities	Key Individuals	Criticisms
Action Research and Organizational Development (Problem solving variation)	Systematic collection of data to help diagnose cause of dissatisfaction. Goal is not to change individual personalities, but the functioning of work groups within an organization. Emphasize open climate for problem solving so can deal with constant change.	Humanistic Psychology (Also associated with organizational development)	a. bring together people responsible for implementing solutions to plan the research to gather diagnostic information b. collect data c. provide feedback on data d. provide "action training" to provide skills for taking necessary steps in problem solving (neutral site) e. implement steps	a. outside consultant b. implementors	a. based on premise that changing individuals can change organizations (faulty assumptions) b. implies conflict results from miscommunication (whereas can have conflict with good communication) c. high cost d. difficult to prove that improved employee morale results in higher productivity e. ignores role external factors play in change
Social Interaction	Process by which the idea of change is communicated to and accepted by potential users. Concentrates on the diffusion part of research, development and diffusion. Does not seek to change people or the structure of organizations. Considers innovation to be a type of change	Empirical Research (Primarily of diffusion of agricultural and medical innovation). Considers innovation to be a type of of change rather than a generic term for change	a. (no diagnosis of user need) b. convey information about relative advantage and other desireable features of innovation c. disseminate info widely, but focus effort on opinion leaders d. no further action once adoption process begun, assumes all efforts follow predictably	a. outside consultant who starts process b. key opinion leaders who convince others because of status c. "innovators" and "early adopters" who convince others by demonstrating the innovation works	a. individualistic bias that ignores organizational aspects of change b. transferability of results from agricultural innovations to education is not clear c. stops at adoption - real problems begin during implementation d. stresses non-manipulable factors; characteristics of opinion leaders and innovators

Figure 1 Continued

MAJOR MODELS OF CHANGE

Model	Emphasis	Intellectual Orientation	Activities	Key Individuals	Criticisms
Political (Conflict)	How interest groups feels and articulates the need to change and then influence persons within the organization who have the authority to institute the change. Concentrates on reorganization of power structure in organization (structural change) not modification of individual's attitudes or values	Conflict Theory (including mediation through political processes). Assumes subgroups within the organization will attempt to influence those in authority and these authorities will in turn respond	a. group forms who wants a change (no diagnostic or solution general phase) b. coalitions built with influential persons or groups (variety of tactics used here) c. implementation of change (which depends on the power of officials to demand compliance)	a. advocates to champion cause b. gatekeeper who can bring issue to attention of key authorities c. authorities (who also are a vested interest group as well as a body to be influenced)	a. not all inclusive, some changes do not take place through political process b. application of model to education is problematic due to individual member autonomy
Linkage	Dual focus: internal problem solving and linkage to external resources (ideas, people, etc). Internal and external diffusion networks/ systems stressed. Change in both structure and individuals of organization necessary	Synthesis of several models: a. rational planning to develop new ideas b. social networks (interaction) through which ideas exchanged c. problem solving to address human elements of change d. political when needed to get change through Proponent: Havelock	a. reciprocal communication networks established between innovation sources and interested users b. internal problem-solving capacity developed c. portions of other models' activities implemented in a + b above	a. linking agent or agency who: 1. senses needs 2. helps establish communication channels 3. brings external ideas b. examples - campus cosmopolitants, new members, researchers	a. abstract b. theoretical rather than practical c. adaptability to higher education is unclear
Adaptive Development	No single model for instituting change. Planned change is local, but stimulated and guided by adaptation of external innovation not development of new ones. Emphasis on reshaping external innovations. Change may be in both structure and organization.	Synthesis of several models: Based on 5 factors: 1. info and interpersonal linkage 2. active openness 3. involving/influencing leadership 4. ownership 5. rewards Proponents: Lindquist, Gaff	a. identify potential external solutions to internal problems. Solutions must be from: 1. from credible sources 2. compatible with local values 3. adaptable with local circumstance	a. cosmopolitan locals b. gatekeepers c. executive leaders d. key faculty	a. not so much a model as a compilation of useful ideas on how to make change

Figure 1 Continued

MAJOR MODELS OF CHANGE

Model	Emphasis	Intellectual Orientation	Activities	Key Individuals	Criticisms
Systems Theory and Contingency Theory	Change as a holistic process. Change cannot be imported from external sources - no one model can be applied to higher education.	Social Systems Theory: College/Univ. comprised of 5 conflicting subsystems: 1. membership 2. ideology 3. technology 4. organizational structure 5. relations to environment Therefore, rationalistic and diffusion models are not applicable to higher education Contingency Theory Seven variables of higher education influence change effort: 1. organizational characteristics 2. influence of organization on its task environment 3. macro environmental forces 4. characteristics of innovation 5. characteristics of leaders 6. characterstics of members 7. characteristics of change agents Proponents: Ostergren, Glover	a. social system, environment and innovation analyzed b. process of change developed to fit situation	a. depends on individual organization's case	a. little guidance to potential change agents or implementors b. more theoretical than practical

From Norvall, 1982
The Process of Change in
Higher Education Institutions