LEADING ARTICLE

CRISIS, CHANGED LEADERSHIP, CHANGE MANAGEMENT AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

F. Waghid
Fundani Centre for Higher Education Development
Cape Peninsula University of Technology
Cape Town, South Africa
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3881-2771

ABSTRACT

Higher education has been challenged in recent years to reimagine itself in response to a shifting labour market. It is argued that Educational Technology (EdTech) as a democratised form of teaching and learning may assist higher education institutions in their efforts to produce graduates who are able to successfully navigate the current labour market. However, the adoption of EdTech has been slow. This could be attributed to a lack of urgency, resulting in a state of complacency in higher education. It is argued that change management must facilitate EdTech adoption and implementation. The change management model utilised in this article is based on John Kotter's eight-step approach. This approach uses a crisis to emphasise the need for change. In the absence of a perceivable crisis, the approach also considers how complacency can be reduced to ensure that change is driven by urgency. In addition, it is argued that change management requires changed leadership, an ethical form of leadership, in order to support change management initiatives.

Keywords: crisis, leadership, change, management, educational technology

INTRODUCTION

In the current corporate university environment, the performance of students and the university is measured in statistics, reviews, and rankings (Waghid 2022). To this end, teaching and learning are habitually aligned toward a metric tool for evaluating student success, namely the examination. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2015) suggests that this has led to pedagogical practices attuned to this metric tool. That is, lecturers teach students to pass examinations. Although higher education institutions (HEIs) recognise the important role they play in producing graduates entering society, their financial solvency takes precedence over producing these graduates. Public universities rely primarily on state subsidies to ensure financial solvency.

Should there be a comparison between the change in the adoption of two technology-

enhanced teaching and learning practices, blended learning and what has recently been described in the literature as "pandemic pedagogy" (Schwartzman 2020), we may gain some insight. Considering the adoption of blended learning, considerable theoretical development of and debate on blended learning were at a peak almost a decade ago (Hrastinski 2019). Still, the widespread adoption of blended learning has been slow. In contrast, during the COVID-19 pandemic, HEIs embraced digital technology. This article reiterates that technology-enhanced teaching and learning that "pandemic pedagogy" does not equate to blended learning.

Consistent between blended learning and the adoption of "pandemic pedagogy" are some of the same barriers to implementing technology-enhanced teaching and learning. These are institutional, staff, technical support, and infrastructural barriers (Antwi-Boampong 2018). The impetus to overcome these barriers remains distinctly different. During the pandemic, universities were forced to close, and with that, the reliance of the corporate university environment on financial subsidies was potentially at risk. This crisis served as a driving force for the rapid adoption of digital technology as part of lecturers' pedagogical practices to ensure the completion of the academic year. In contrast, the adoption of blended learning has not had a similar impetus in the form of a crisis propelling its adoption.

Appeasement and ensuring compliance with the corporate university environment have resulted in no perceivable crises. Crises can play an important role in bringing about change in higher education. To this end, we argue for the following:

- the use of crisis causes transformative leadership to drive the change to educational technology by HEIs;
- crisis and transformative leadership could support change management efforts in adopting educational technology;
- democratic action, as value-informed effort, should inform the ethical behaviour of transformative leadership; and
- educational technology represents a form of democratic action.

WHAT CONSTITUTES EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY?

Before we consider the role of crisis in bringing about transformative leadership and supporting change management, it is imperative to discuss that towards which we are proposing change. As educational theories are often defined by the thoughts and conceptions guiding their use, similarly, EdTech – as a teaching and learning theory – may be defined by the rationale for its use. The rationale for EdTech espoused in this article is for the value-informed realisation of

democratic action. Waghid, Waghid, and Waghid (2016) suggest that using digital technologies, such as hardware and software, may afford opportunities by which deliberation, critical thinking, problem solving, rhizomatic thinking, autonomy, and being mindful of issues pertaining to social justice may be enhanced. Waghid et al. (2016) argue that, with the realisation of these values, there is the potential for democratic action. As every educational context is unique, the use of hardware and software may vary dramatically, depending on the student cohort and the resources available to support teaching and learning. For example, we have seen lecturers demonstrate great ingenuity during the pandemic in enacting EdTech with low-tech solutions, such as WhatsApp messaging groups, to engage with learners in deliberative spheres, demonstrating democratic action. Consequently, EdTech may be enacted in many ways, with the potential for democratic action.

WHY THE NEED FOR EDTECH?

EdTech, as a form of democratic action, aligns with the ethical aspirations of HEIs. For instance, HEIs are being challenged by future employers to capacitate graduates who can act autonomously, deliberate, and demonstrate critical thinking and problem-solving abilities (Waghid 2022). Such values and skills are outlined in the list of graduate attributes found on HEI websites.

EdTech as a value-informed action is imperative to realising those values towards which HEIs aspire. Waghid (2022) suggests that, if teaching and learning informed by democratic action were prevalent in our higher education campuses, we might not have seen the crises of student protest, such as the protests calling for the decolonisation of university curricula. Colonisation, which represents a form of marginalisation, may be mitigated through teaching and learning informed by democratic action. In EdTech, there is the potential for students to engage in deliberative spheres as autonomous individuals, augmented through digital technologies. There is a need for teaching and learning informed by democratic action, such as EdTech. In the next section, we explore the role of crisis in supporting change efforts towards enacting EdTech.

CRISIS AS THE CATALYST

A crisis is a period of danger, difficulty, or doubt when problems require resolution or decisions (Oxford Learner's Dictionaries n.d.). A crisis may trigger urgency, which is the perception or conviction that something should be handled promptly (Cameron and Green 2009). It is a strong motive for individuals to partake in change (Schneidt 2022). In contrast, complacency is "a feeling of being satisfied with yourself or a situation, so that you do not think any change is

necessary" (Oxford Learner's Dictionaries n.d., n.p.). Kotter (2012) suggests that, where complacency is high in an organisation, transformations go nowhere, as individuals are not interested in change. With low urgency, putting together a group with the credibility to influence change remains challenging (Kotter 2012). To this end, urgency and complacency exist on different ends of a continuum. Where a crisis raises the urgency levels, change is reinforced. In the absence of crisis, complacency predominates, weakening change efforts. In the next section, we explore instances of complacency prevalent in the higher education context concerning EdTech. We acknowledge that there may be many reasons why EdTech adoption is not ubiquitous. However, we will focus on instances where no perceived crises result in complacency.

SOURCES OF COMPLACENCY

In a previous section, an argument was made for teaching and learning practices informed by democratic action, such as EdTech. Although there are instances of urgency to adopt EdTech, there remains much complacency in higher education. Kotter (2012) proposes nine sources of complacency that hinder organisational change, namely –

- the absence of significant and visible crises;
- too many visible resources;
- low overall performance standards;
- organisational structures that focus on the narrow functional goals of employees;
- wrong internal measurement performance indexes;
- a lack of performance feedback from external stakeholders;
- low candour;
- denial; and
- too much "happy talk" from senior management.

The first three of the above nine sources of complacency, as mentioned by Kotter (2012), may be attributed to government subsidies. Students finishing their studies and institutions receiving subsidies for these students who have graduated may cause a crisis, as there aren't any significant or obvious problems. As the functioning of a university relies on subsidies, receiving subsidies for students finishing programmes ensures no discernible crises. It may be argued that, with no crisis, the ensuing complacency has sustained the status quo of pedagogical practices attuned to teaching students to pass examinations. Although the reward of subsidies

does not constitute a visible crisis, recent student disruptions may point to an imperceptible crisis. This also relates to the complacency of "low overall performance standards", outlined by Kotter (2012) as a source of complacency. As mentioned above, the reliance by higher education on subsidy emphasises metrics – such as the number of courses a lecturer teaches, and the number of students passing – is used as the focal performance standard by which a "good" lecturer is measured. The result is that many lecturers are more concerned about these metrics than about holistic student development that could potentially be enacted through the democratic action of EdTech. Kotter (2012) suggests, that too many visible resources further heighten organisational complacency. His book describes a corporate headquarters furnished with luxurious furniture, oil paintings, and deep carpets, signifying a picture success. Although HEIs may not have this show of excess, the fact that they receive subsidies for students passing examinations denotes that they are doing something right. As the pedagogical practices attuned to supporting students to pass examinations play a focal role, little urgency exists to disrupt that status.

Kotter (2012) also proposes that organisational structures that focus on the narrow functional goals of employees play a role in maintaining complacency. Although specific reference is made to employees in a company, exploring Kotter's (2012) sources of complacency within the higher education context necessitates exploring the role students play in university teaching and learning practices. Students play an integral role in innovative teaching and learning practices, such as EdTech. Considering the narrow functional role within which students place themselves may provide some insight into complacency. Students may be attuned to teaching and learning practices that prepare them to pass examinations (Waghid and Waghid 2020). They may be indoctrinated to believe that the role of a lecturer is to be in front of a class and to disseminate course content (Waghid and Waghid 2020).

Furthermore, students reference how lecturers adopting innovative teaching and learning practices receive negative student feedback. Such negative feedback relates to students demanding to be "taught" the content they would need to regurgitate back at lecturers in an examination. Waghid and Waghid (2020) suggest that this narrow role is exacerbated by students coming from a deeply flawed schooling system. Students are largely subjected to teacher-centred pedagogies for years (Waghid and Waghid 2020). Due to their perceived narrow functional role in the university teaching and learning context, there may be little urgency necessitating them to engage with lecturers in the enactment of EdTech if they need to acquire course content. Waghid and Waghid (2020) suggest that this type of teaching and learning propagates cognitive damage. Invariably students are marginalised by the dominant hegemonic understandings of the lecturer and the course content (Waghid and Waghid 2020).

When students enter higher education, it is sometimes hard for them to comprehend that teaching and learning constitute a form of pedagogical engagement (Waghid and Waghid 2020). This perceived narrow functional role may represent a source of complacency.

Another form of complacency may result from organisations focussing on performance metrics. The Future of Jobs Report compiled by the World Economic Forum (WEF 2016) suggests that, by the time a student completes a four-year qualification, approximately 60 per cent of the course content presented may be outdated (Schwab and Samans 2016). Yet, pedagogical practices attuned to students passing examinations by regurgitating course content are generally ubiquitous. Kotter (2012) suggests that the performance of organisations is often rigged to ensure everyone can accomplish their narrow functional goals. In higher education, this may be seen as lecturers supporting students to pass examinations. This focusses primarily on developing students' memorisation abilities. However, this is not necessarily what students require. The Future of Jobs Report (see WEF 2016) suggests that, for graduates to navigate the changing labour market of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR), students should be encouraged to develop skills, such as complex problem solving, critical thinking, creativity, people management, coordinating with others, emotional intelligence, judgement and decision-making, service orientation, and cognitive flexibility. These skills can be taught through a teacher-centred pedagogical approach. Instead, these skills should be realised by creating opportunities for democratic action, such as EdTech. For instance, students could be given group assignments to demonstrate many of the abovementioned skills. The use of digital technology platforms, such as Microsoft Teams, ZOOM or the Google suite of collaborative applications, would be able to support students in enacting many of the skills mentioned above. EdTech may be necessary for equipping students to function effectively in the ever-changing labour market. Yet, as Kotter (2012) suggested, complacency in the form of internal measurement systems focussing on students passing an examination predominates.

A lack of performance feedback may be another source of complacency diminishing a sense of urgency. There is little urgency for change when internal performance sources indicate that there are no issues. As mentioned earlier, students passing examinations could be deemed an internal performance source that shows very little is wrong in an HEI. For universities, benchmarking data may be a crucial source of external performance feedback. Through the evaluation process of a benchmark, HEIs can measure and compare their programmes, procedures, strategies, and policies (McCubbin, Hammer, and Ayriss 2022). Universities need to grapple with how they prepare students for the place of work. Consequently, benchmarking the programmes, processes, strategies, and policies supporting teaching and learning may be an essential external data source to reduce complacency.

Kotter (2012) suggests that a low confrontational culture plays an adverse role in organisations wishing to raise urgency levels to drive change. To this end, the role of academic staff developers should be considered. Within higher education, academic staff developers are often mandated by management to support lecturers in improving the quality of teaching and learning, such as through the enactment of EdTech. The staff development offered at different universities is not homogeneous. Staff development is often tailored to the unique contextual variables prevalent at an institution. Although not in every institution, the enactment of EdTech is – in many instances – supported by academic staff developers. These developers in EdTech are often highly skilled individuals with a keen understanding of digital technologies. They can support the diverse pedagogical needs of lecturers in different subject disciplines. Staff development opportunities are often offered in the form of workshops. During these sessions, staff developers must often deliberate with lecturers as to why innovative teaching and learning, such as EdTech, is apposite to the needs of students. However, these sessions may be typified by low candour. Staff developers must support the realisation of EdTech but also be cognisant of lecturers' contexts. Lecturers may dispute that they have little time as their duties comprise teaching many classes, teaching large classes, and presenting at conferences whilst also having to produce research outputs.

Consequently, the morale of a lecturer may be subdued. Academic staff developers thus need to engage with lecturers with a level of decorum, exempt from candour. Kotter (2012) suggests that individuals highlighting potential shortcomings, such as a staff developer highlighting the shortcomings of traditional teacher-centred pedagogical practice, may be treated with scorn. Low levels of candour may also be reinforced since lecturers pride themselves on their academic freedom, which is described as –

> "[T]he right, without constriction by prescribed doctrine, to freedom of teaching and discussion, freedom in carrying out research and disseminating and publishing the results thereof, freedom to express freely their opinion about the institution or system in which they work, freedom from institutional censorship and freedom to participate in professional or representative academic bodies." (UNESCO 2007, 632).

To this end, low candour may be maintained through the need to respect the academic freedom of lecturers. Amid such forms of low candour, complacency may ensue.

The last two forms of complacency outlined in Kotter (2012) are denial and happy talk from management.

"Denial", as a source of complacency concerning training opportunities for staff, should be considered. The National Framework for Enhancing Academics as University Teachers

(NFfEAUT), compiled by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) in South Africa, suggests that training should not be imposed on lecturing staff (DHET 2018, 3). Consequently, university staff developers offer staff development, focussing on innovative teaching and learning practices, but this is not imposed on lecturing staff. Attendance of these sessions remains mixed. Poor attendance of continual professional development programmes (CPDPs) was attributed to ineffective communication, the lack of a perceived need for continuous professional development, time constraints, financial implications, and attitude (Viljoen, Coetzee, and Heyns 2017). A respondent in their study mentioned, "the more I know, the more I have to do ... responsibility increase[s] with knowledge", in their identification of attitude as a reason for poor CPDP attendance (Viljoen et al. 2017, 74). This is in congruence with Kotter's (2012) identification of "denial" to reinforce complacency and thus mitigating the urgency for change. With lecturers in denial, they may not feel the urgency to attend staff development sessions.

The final source of complacency highlighted by Kotter (2012) is a false sense of security created by management through what he refers to as happy talk. Kotter describes happy talk as insincere, implying past success reinforcing an haughty culture, thus, reducing the urgency for change. Again, we have seen HEIs boast about their pass rates. An article posted in *Business Tech* (2019) (which references South African government statistics) indicated that 58 560 students graduated in 1994, which was much less than the 210 931 graduating students in 2017. While management at HEIs may boast about past accomplishments, the same article highlighted that only 22 per cent could complete their three-year degree within three years (*Business Tech* 2019). There may be many contextual variables attributing to these low pass rates. These might include the use of ineffective pedagogical approaches. Managers may thwart the urgency to drive the enactment of EdTech at HEIs, reinforcing complacency through "happy talk" about how well the institutional pass rates are. In this way, complacency may be maintained.

This section provided examples of complacency prevalent in some HEIs. It may be argued that these complacency forms may inadvertently perpetuate crises. Many of these forms of complacency have already brought about crises in some form, such as student protests. The inability of higher education to shift to pedagogical practices towards democratic action, such as EdTech, might see higher education in a state of perpetual crisis. In other words, although complacency levels are low due to the lack of a perceived crisis, the low complacency levels allowed to fester in HEIs may inadvertently place higher education in perpetual crises. To this end, there is a need for an ethical form of leadership, recognising the need for value-informed action, of EdTech, as a means to move higher education out of crises.

TRANSFORMATIVE LEADERSHIP

Kotter (2012) makes a clear distinction between leadership and management. There is often a misconception that all leaders are managers. Leadership is often implemented by stakeholders not in defined management positions. Management and leadership are not synonymous activities (Bass and Stogdill 1990). It is argued that leaders and managers further the advancement of organisations, such as HEIs, in distinctly different ways (Zaleznik 2004). Leaders advocate, whereas managers carry out responsibilities, exercise authority, and oversee the operational activities to run smoothly (Zaleznik 2004). Although leadership and management are distinct, they are complementary. In this section, we explore an approach to leadership, namely transformative leadership, in relation to crises.

Organisations, such as HEIs, face numerous challenges necessitating dealing with change effectively (Caldwell et al. 2012). Transformative leadership is an ethnically based leadership model that integrates a commitment to values and outcomes by optimising the long-term interests of stakeholders and society and honouring the moral duties owed by organisations to their stakeholders (Caldwell et al. 2012). Transformative leadership integrates ethical mandates, behavioural assumptions, and the fundamental requirements for an organisation (Caldwell et al. 2012). Transformative leadership can be essential in committing stakeholders to action, converting followers to leaders, and converting leaders into agents of change (Bennis and Nanus 2003). As transformative leadership pursues virtuous outcomes, it can also be crucial in establishing systems that sustain and support organisational values (Tichy and McGill 2003). It can facilitate change by removing barriers (Deming 2018), and aims to disrupt traditional ways of doing things, seeking new ways to resolve problems (Caldwell et al. 2012).

Caldwell et al. (2012) reference six leadership perspectives as an embodiment of transformative leadership, namely –

- the ability of charismatic leadership to create personal relationships;
- the humility and resolve of level 5 leadership;
- the adherence of principle-centred leadership to values and principles;
- the service of servant leadership to stakeholders;
- the contribution of covenantal leadership to meaning; and
- the focus of transformational leadership on synergistic change.

As an embodiment of transformative leadership, these leadership perspectives share much congruence with value-informed actions of democratic action. As the six above-mentioned

leadership perspectives can be viewed as an embodiment of transformative leadership, exploring these perspectives in relation to the values underpinning democratic action could provide insight into how this ethical form of leadership can support change.

The charismatic leadership perspective may inspire a shared vision and utilisation of personal relationships to bring out the best in others in response to a crisis. It may be inferred that, in response to a crisis, individuals are encouraged to demonstrate their autonomy toward realising an inclusive vision. Earlier, it was argued that autonomy and inclusion constitute democratic action.

The humility and resolve of level 5 leadership in terms of transformative leadership require people to be treated fairly. In response to a crisis, this leadership perspective can encourage individuals in an equal setting to realise their potential and be free to innovate ways to mitigate the negative implications of a crisis. Although fairness and equality are not the same, they are interrelated themes that promote the value of inclusion constituting democratic action.

The contribution of principle-centred leadership to transformative leadership is that it promotes adherence to moral principles and values that may benefit society. For instance, being mindful of issues about social justice may be an essential consideration when dealing with a crisis. This may encourage being conscious of issues about social justice.

The transformational leadership perspective enables the pursuit of a synergy interest in employees and an organisation. Although synergy does not denote inclusion, it can be essential in promoting an inclusive and collaborative environment to promote democratic action. This leadership perspective can ensure that decision-making in response to a crisis is a collaborative and inclusive process.

The servant leadership perspective expresses the commitment to employees to support their welfare, growth, and success. Although this commitment in itself is not democratic, it can be used to promote the values of social justice and equality, characteristics of democratic action. Furthermore, it encourages individuals to enact their autonomy, promoting out-of-the-box thinking (Hayzlett 2019). The servant leadership perspective also fosters leadership in others (Hayzlett 2019). Consequently, this leadership perspective shows much congruence with the values that inform democratic action. In this way, the servant leadership perspective can be critical in supporting change in response to a crisis.

Finally, the covenantal leadership perspective promotes the pursuit of truth and a constant learning culture (Golden-Biddle 2006). This perspective can foster collaboration and trust to enable democratic action.

Transformative leadership, a form of ethical leadership, shares values with democratic action. As it encapsulates values such as participation, inclusion, autonomy, and being mindful

of issues about social justice, transformative leadership may be deemed a form of democratic action. In a sphere of collaboration, trust, and respect, the values underpinning transformative leadership and democratic action may be instrumental in bringing about change in response to a crisis. Furthermore, as transformative leadership, democratic action and EdTech, as espoused in this article, are informed by the same values, there is an opportunity for transformative leaders to identify shortcomings in teaching and learning practices not adhering to democratic action. Transformative leadership can thus identify complacency and raise the urgency to drive change. As mentioned earlier, the complacency perpetuating in higher education teaching and learning practice may be considered a state of perpetual crisis. As leaders are not confined to management positions and can advocate for change, any individual within an organisation, such as an HEI, may enact transformative leadership.

The next section explores the interplay between crisis, transformative leadership, and a change management model. The relationship between transformative leadership and change management is examined in relation to the adoption of EdTech by HEIs. It is recognised that the adoption of EdTech at HEIs is a complex endeavour. It is not the ambition of this article to serve as a panacea or silver bullet as to how higher education could enact EdTech. Instead, the intention is to demonstrate through exemplars how higher education could use transformative leadership and change management to support the adoption of EdTech.

CHANGE MANAGEMENT

Contemporary organisations, such as universities, face disruption and economic unpredictability (Kotter 2014). This requires such organisations to adapt to an ever-changing environment by exploring growth openings and prospects to improve the quality of their offerings whilst reducing costs (Kotter 2014). Change is an inevitable part of an organisation as the organisation traverses technological advancement and mounting competition (Self, Armenakis, and Schraeder 2007). It is often argued that change exists in a continuum that never starts because also never stops (Weick, Sutcliffe, and Obstfeld 2005). To this end, there has been much effort to support managers and leaders in dealing with change.

Change management relates to the activities and processes guiding an organisation from one state to the next (Schneidt 2022). It incorporates information on how stakeholders will disseminate, incentivise, and support the change process. As mentioned, HEIs are complex organisations requiring continual change to remain up to date with necessary societal advances. Kotter and Schlesinger (1989) suggest that reorganisations are caused by accumulations of changes and disruptions of the status quo, perceived as threats. Furthermore, they offer that this often accounts for organisational resistance, as individuals fear uncertainty and failure. This

fear of uncertainty and failure may impact negatively, precisely when we look at the wide-scale adoption of EdTech at HEIs. The unwavering commitment of some lectures to adopt pedagogical practices geared toward preparing students to pass examinations may be deemed the status quo. EdTech adoption does not constitute a one-size-fits-all approach. Successful employment of EdTech in one teaching context does not automatically mean it would be successful in a different context.

Consequently, lecturers may fear the potential repercussions of experimenting with EdTech that does not yield desired student results expected by the institution. This fear of uncertainty and failure may negatively affect the efficiency of the organisation (Kotter and Schlesinger 1989). As mentioned, the enactment of EdTech is not necessarily a one-off event, as hardware, software, and other contextual variables are constantly in flux. Kotter and Schlesinger (1989) suggest that, where change is regarded as an exceptional one-off event, change management encounters much resistance. Similarly, implementing EdTech should be deemed a continuous process rather than an exceptional event.

The change management model congruent with this understanding of EdTech implementation is Kotter's enhanced 8-step change model. The Kotter model has been widely used to support change in an age of economic disruption and instability. In 2014, an enhanced version of Kotter's 8-step change model was published (Kotter 2014). In the enhanced mode, steps in the process are carried out concurrently and continuously rather than sequentially, as was the case in the original model. The 8-step Kotter model comprises the following steps:

- creating and maintaining a sense of urgency through the identification and deliberation of prevailing crises, prospective crises, and the prospects to improve the organisation;
- forming a guiding coalition with identified managers and leaders within the organisation where the coalition will have the impetus to drive change within the organisation;
- creating a shared vision and developing strategies to ensure the realisation of such vision;
- enlisting a volunteer army to help communicate the rationale for change;
- empowering action through the identification of impediments that may shackle the change process. These may include the systems and structures existing within the organisation;
- planning changes that have the potential to generate discernible improvements representing short-term wins;
- ensuring credibility to further change structures, policies and systems;
- anchoring new approaches as part of the new organisational culture.

Kotter and Schlesinger (1989) regard steps 1 to 4 as the phase where the status quo is disrupted. Step 5 to 8 sees the introduction and anchoring of the changes.

What may make the enhanced Kotter model attractive to organisations wishing to apply a notion of EdTech is that change is not driven alone in a traditional hierarchy but also, and more importantly, by stakeholders able to exercise leadership.

CREATING AND MAINTAINING A SENSE OF URGENCY

Creating a sense of urgency is the first step in the Kotter model. As was already discussed, urgency may be brought upon by a crisis. It may be argued that it would be hard to raise urgency levels to support a change effort without a crisis. Although HEIs may not acknowledge that a crisis is ensuing, transformative leadership may be able to identify shortcomings concerning the values being realised in existing pedagogical practices. This way, transformative leadership could raise urgency levels by identifying values that are absent in pedagogical practices. Consequently, without transformative leadership, complacency may ensue.

FORMING A GUIDING COALITION

Kotter (2012) argues that it is rare for a single individual to propel significant transformation in an organisation alone. That is not to say it has not occurred, but this individual must be knowledgeable. Such change also requires considerable time. Within the context of a HEI with multiple managerial hierarchies, this may not be realistic.

Furthermore, organisations, such as HEIs, give managers the legitimacy to lead, but this does not ensure they can drive the change required (Lunenburg 2020). Leaders should be able to challenge the status quo, inspiring all in an organisation (Lunenburg 2020). Change should not be led by a single individual but rather by multiple stakeholders with the appropriate power, expertise, and credibility (Kotter 2014). Kotter (2012) suggests that such a guiding coalition should comprise people in powerful positions; expertise representative of different viewpoints; individuals with credibility; and leaders that have proved their ability to guide a change process. Transformative leadership can do much to instil values to support the establishment and support of a guiding coalition. Values, such as participation, inclusion, autonomy, and being mindful of issues pertaining to social justice, may enable a guiding coalition.

At an HEI where EdTech is to be implemented, individuals able to exercise management and leadership, such as vice chancellors, deputy vice chancellors, deans, directors, academic staff developers, information technology (IT) support services, platform providers of learner management systems (LMS), technical support, campus maintenance, lecturers and students can all form part of a guiding coalition, provided they feel the urgency for change. Individuals

representing these hierarchies with the desired drive, intellectual and emotional commitment, contacts, skills, and information are essential in driving change (Kotter 2014). Kotter (2014) suggests that, although there may be the pull to revert to a management-centric hierarchy, under the right conditions, this may rupture this management-centric hierarchy to work together in a new way, informed by the values constituting transformative leadership, agilely supporting the realisation of the vision for change.

It may be considered mundane, but ensuring that campus maintenance replaces damaged equipment, such as a data projector bulb, or that IT services can provide adequate Wi-Fi coverage is fundamental to implementing EdTech. Individuals with the appropriate power to exercise leadership at these different dimensions of the university will ensure that change is driven.

CREATING A SHARED VISION AND THE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

Kotter (2012) states that one of the main reasons organisational transformations fail, is a lack of vision. Vision creation is a critical strategic tool that organisational leaders support to drive change (Belias and Koustelios 2014). Kotter (2012) mentions that vision helps organisations clarify direction, motivate individuals through difficult transitions, and coordinate the actions of motivated individuals effectively. A good vision articulates the possibilities in the best interest of all (Kotter and Schlesinger 1989).

An example of how this step can be contextualised in the higher education context is that HEIs could develop new aspirational strategic visions. A perusal of some of the HEI websites depicting their visions showed advocacy for innovative teaching and learning practices. As Kotter (2012) suggests, visions should be aligned with the current trends and changes in the world whilst being realistically achievable. EdTech is attuned to the higher education vision for innovative teaching and learning practices.

These visions of an HEI may provide the systematic and inspirational elements to drive the adoption of EdTech.

ENLISTING A VOLUNTEER ARMY

Enlisting a volunteer army encompasses involving others in the organisation to facilitate the dissemination of information about the vision and strategy of change. This way, large-scale organisational adoption can be realised (Kotter 2014). A volunteer army, including individuals considered champions, may provide testimony to the advantages of EdTech, and support large-scale adoption. These individuals may serve as champions for the adoption of EdTech.

In a context where champions do not exist, academic staff development initiatives may be

essential in nurturing champions. Even if staff development initiatives for lecturers, such as workshops, are not well attended, they may spark interest in a select few lecturers. These lecturers may become champions through their trial and research of digital technologies, theories, and practices, and can support disseminating information about the change vision and strategy.

Additionally, platforms – such as meetings, email newsletters, website landing pages, social networking platforms, and induction programmes for new staff and students – are viable places to enable these leaders to disseminate the change vision and strategy. Kotter (2012) proposes that communication of the vision be kept simple and jargon-free, include metaphors and analogies, utilise as many platforms as possible, and offer opportunities to explain any perceived inconsistencies. Kotter (2012) explicitly highlights this two-way communication as a powerful means to communicate the vision for change effectively.

EMPOWERING ACTION THROUGH THE IDENTIFICATION OF IMPEDIMENTS

Kotter (2012) proposes that four organisational impediments may hinder employees from partaking in a change process, namely the structures, skills, systems, and supervisors.

Kotter (2012) argues that organisational structures that fragment resources and authority may play an impeding role. For a university aspiring to implement EdTech, structural silos need to be ruptured, as it may be that an existing organisational structure is not conducive to a change process.

Kotter (2012) claims that skills may be another barrier. Employees must learn new behaviours, attitudes, and skills to partake in a change process. For HEIs wishing to adopt EdTech, academic staff developers would be integral in the capacitation of lecturing staff. These academic staff developers may take a decisive leadership role to help drive the change toward EdTech.

Kotter (2012) also asserts that the systems of performance, evaluations, promotion, and compensation may be either an incentive or a disincentive to a change process. Ensuring that innovative teaching and learning practices form part of a critical performance for teaching staff may serve as a crucial extrinsic driving force supporting the adoption of EdTech.

The final barrier proposed by Kotter (2012) may be a manager. Kotter argues that many managers may negatively affect change processes due to second-guessing employees' actions. In the context of higher education, the adoption of EdTech should afford staff the freedom to experiment without being second-guessed. This way, they would be able to enact the roles of a leader. Kotter (2012) suggests that this barrier can be traversed through honest dialogue and setting clear expectations. Some of these barriers may be mitigated through collaboration, trust,

and respect.

GENERATING SHORT-TERM WINS

Kotter (2012) points out that short-term wins are essential to ensure perseverance in terms of the change process. These wins should be visible, unambiguous, aligned to the change effort, and timely. Exemplars of such short-term wins in higher education may include:

- Increased student engagement and collaboration. There are currently an array of hardware and software packages to support student engagement and collaboration. These tools may provide analytics data that could be used to show a marked increase in student engagement and collaboration.
- Increased student access to resources. As student resources can be stored on software, such as learner management systems (LMS), analytics data may also be generated when students access resources. This can show an increase in access to rich multimedia resources.
- Improved student outcomes. Lecturers could also use assessment performance data to show improvements in how students can answer higher-order thinking questions. Comparing assessment performance data between pre- and post-EdTech adoption could be used.
- Student evaluations could also be used as a visible and unambiguous indicator. They can be done close to the end of a semester course, ensuring timely feedback.

Leaders driving for change in adopting EdTech could use these exemplars to support the change process.

CONSOLIDATE SHORT-TERM WINS

The penultimate phase of the Kotter model is to use small-scale changes and integrate them as part of the organisational culture. With the short-term wins providing credibility for the change process, the opportunity for an organisation to scale up the changes across the whole organisation can be supported. In higher education and EdTech, this may represent scaling up from the individual champions' employment of EdTech in a department to the whole department, the faculty, and ultimately the entire institution. Consequently, this consolidation phase ensures that the benefits of change are sustained over time. Kotter (2012) suggests that leaders should focus on communicating and reinforcing the vision for change in the

organisation during this step. In this way, the organisation will clearly understand how they are contributing to the change vision.

INSTITUTE CHANGE

The final phase of the Kotter model is to anchor any change, such as adopting EdTech, as part of the organisational culture. Kotter suggests that culture operates at two levels, namely the norms of behaviour and shared values. Furthermore, he claims that, although the values of an organisation stay the same, shifting the standards of conduct should be prioritised. This may be facilitated by incorporating EdTech as part of the university policies, procedures, and practices. The focus or the aim of education should therefore be on cultivating the holistic humanity of students rather than the mere transfer of knowledge and skills. In part, such a shortcoming is due to the learning and teaching pedagogy used. Unfortunately, the outcome of such "teaching" in the corporate university environment often results in graduates that are mere technicians of learning rather than well-rounded democratic citizens who can contribute to the realisation of greater equality and justice (Waghid and Waghid 2020).

CONCLUSION

Regarding crisis, transformative leadership, change management and EdTech, we make the following suggestions.

We argued for an understanding of EdTech as a form of democratic action. The values that inform this democratic action are inclusion, deliberation, critical thinking, problem solving, rhizomatic thinking, autonomy, and being mindful of issues pertaining to social justice. As transformative leadership represents an ethical form of leadership, it should be informed by the values that inform such democratic action. Consequently, it may be argued that adopting EdTech is tantamount to adopting the ethical action of transformative leadership. As complacency levels in higher educational institutions remain low due to a lack of perceived crisis, transformative leadership may unveil a crisis perpetuated by pedagogical practices attuned to seeing students pass examinations. With the crisis exposed, it may be used to support a change management process.

REFERENCES

Antwi-Boampong, A. 2018. "Faculty Perspectives on Barriers of Blended-learning Adoption: A Ghana Technology University College Case Study." In *EDULEARN18 Proceedings* 1: 9352–9361. https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2018.2210.

Bass, B. M. and R. M. Stogdill. 1990. *Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research & Managerial Applications*. New York: Free Press.

Belias, D. and A. Koustelios. 2014. "The Impact of Leadership and Change Management Strategy on Organizational Culture." *European Scientific Journal* 10(7): 1857–7881.

Bennis, W. G. and B. Nanus. 2004. *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper Press.

Business Tech. 2019. "South Africa's University Pass Rate Shocker." https://businesstech.co.za/news/government/353575/south-africas-university-pass-rate-shocker/. (Accessed 20 December 2022).

Caldwell, C., R. D. Dixon, L. A. Floyd, J. Chaudoin, J. Post, and G. Cheokas. 2012. "Transformative Leadership: Achieving Unparalleled Excellence." *Journal of Business Ethics* 109(2): 175–187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1116-2.

Cameron, E. and M. Green. 2009. *Making Sense of Common Sense for Change Management: A Complete Guide to the Models, Tools & Techniques of Organizational Change*. London and Philadelphia: Kogan Page.

Deming, W. E. 2018. *Out of the Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11457.001.0001.

Department of Higher Education and Training. 2018. *National Framework for Enhancing Academics as University Teachers*. Pretoria, South Africa: DHET.

DHET *see* Department of Higher Education and Training.

Golden-Biddle, K. 2006. "A Review of: 'Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline'", ed. Kim S. Cameron, Jane E. Dutton, and Robert E. Quinn. *International Public Management Journal* 9(2): 199–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967490600767035.

Hayzlett, J. 2019. "4 Principles of Servant Leadership." *Entrepreneur*. https://www.entrepreneur.com/leadership/4-principles-of-servant-leadership/340791. (Accessed 26 February 2019).

Hrastinski, S. 2019. "What Do We Mean by Blended Learning?" *TechTrends* 63(5): 564–569. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-019-00375-5.

Kotter, J. 2012. *Leading Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kotter, J. 2014. *Accelerate (XLR8): Building Strategic Agility for a Faster Moving World*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kotter, J. P. and L. A. Schlesinger. 1989. "Choosing Strategies for Change." In *Readings in Strategic Management*, ed. J. P. Kotter and L.A. Schlesinger, 294–306. London: Macmillan Education UK. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-20317-8_21.

Lunenburg, F. 2020. "Leadership versus Management: A Key Distinction – At Least in Theory." *Main Issues of Pedagogy and Psychology* 3(3): 1–4. https://doi.org/10.24234/miopap.v3i3.15.

McCubbin, A., S. Hammer, and P. Ayriss. 2022. "Learning and Teaching Benchmarking in Australian Universities: The Current State of Play." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 44(1): 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2021.1934244.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. 2015. "Decoloniality as the future of Africa." *History Compass* 13(10): 485–496.

Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/. (Accessed 25 February 2023).

Schneidt, J. 2022. "Strategies to Promote Inclusive and Supportive Technologically Enhanced Informal Learning Spaces on Campus." Unpublished Master thesis. Berlin: Berlin University. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.32829.74722.

Schwab, K. and R. Samans. 2016. *Global Challenge Insight Report: The Future of Jobs*. Cologny, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.

Self, D. R., A. A. Armenakis, and M. Schraeder. 2007. "Organizational Change Content, Process, and Context: A Simultaneous Analysis of Employee Reactions." *Journal of Change Management* 7(2): 211–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010701461129.

Schwartzman, R., 2020. “Performing pandemic pedagogy.” *Communication Education* 69(4): 502–517.

Tichy, N. M. and A. R. McGill. 2003. “The Ethical Challenge: How to Lead with Unyielding Integrity.” *University of Michigan Business School Management Series*, Vol. 31. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

UNESCO. 2007. “Recommendation Concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel 11 November 1997.” In *Standard-setting at UNESCO*, 617–635. Brill: Nijhoff. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004164543.1-760.67.

Viljoen, M., I. Coetzee, and T. Heyns. 2017. “Critical care nurses’ reasons for poor attendance at a continuous professional development program.” *American Journal of Critical Care* 26(1): 70–76.

Waghid, Y. 2022. *Education, Crisis and Philosophy: Ubuntu within Higher Education*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003270300.

Waghid, Z. and F. Waghid. 2020. “Re-examining Instances of Cognitive Damage in South African Universities: Invoking Democratic Action through Educational Technology.” In *University Education, Controversy and Democratic Citizenship*, ed. N. Davids and Y. Waghid, 81–100. Cham: Springer International. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56985-3_5.

Waghid, Y., F. Waghid., and Z. Waghid. 2016. *Educational technology and pedagogic encounters: Democratic education in potentiality*. Dordrecht: Springer.

WEF *see* World Economic Forum.

Weick, K. E., K. M. Sutcliffe, and D. Obstfeld. 2005. “Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking.” *Organization Science* 16(4): 409–421.

World Economic Forum. 2016. “Global Challenge Insight Report: The Future of Jobs – Employment, Skills, and Workforce Strategy for the Fourth Industrial Revolution.” https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Future_of_Jobs.pdf). (Accessed 1 March 2023).

Zaleznik, A. 2004. “Managers and Leaders: Are They Different?” *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2004/01/managers-and-leaders-are-they-different. (Accessed 20 March 2023).