



Change Leadership in Higher Education: Exploring of Theories and Practices

Saifaldin Idris Onia

University of Khartoum, Sudan

Corresponding Email: saifonia89@gmail.com

Received: 11-06-2025

Reviewed: 15-07-2025

Accepted: 30-08-2025

Abstract

Change leadership in higher education institutions is very interesting and has been the topic of the scholars worldwide. This paper aimed to shed light on the concept of change leadership, related models and theories of change leadership practices in higher education. This paper is purely a qualitative research where selected papers are reviewed. The selected papers to be reviewed are gathered through extensive literature review from academic papers representing an output of previous studies conducted by various researches concerning change leadership practices in higher education institutions. These studies have been published in relevant websites over the Internet, which include scientific publications, periodicals, studies, scientific research. The paper concludes that higher education institutions need change leaders who have the confidence to adjust an organization's focus. There are several models and theories of change leadership. In this paper three models were reviewed; the Lewin's model of change, Dunphy and Stace's model, and Kotter's model. Lewin theorized a three stage model of change as unfreezing, change, and refreeze. Dunphy and Stace incorporate participatory evolution forced evolution, charismatic transformation, and dictatorial transformation. Kotter's model proposed eight steps in the change process. The eight steps classified into three phases: create a climate for change, engage and enable the whole organization, and implementing and sustaining Change. Hence, higher education institutions need change leaders who have the confidence to adjust an organization's focus, and who have the leadership skills to make sweeping changes in an organization by moving people or groups in a general direction.

Keywords: Change, Change leadership, Lewin's model, Dunphy and Stace's model, Kotter's model.

Introduction

Change defines organizations' conversion about certain things from their current situations into other situations (Gilia, 2016). Change leadership takes a somewhat different angle as it specifically encompasses the leadership needed to make sweeping changes in an

organization by moving people or groups in a general direction (Haas, 2017). In this respect, a change leader should have the confidence to adjust an organization's focus (Phillips, 2014). Organizations need to change processes to be nimble, innovating and introducing more sustainable methods and procedures (Redding, 2012). Similarly, higher education institutions (HEIs) are not immune to these changes as they work in an ever-changing environment: information, technological, administrative, etc. Temple (2011) stated that universities are also under a series of changes to guarantee their contribution and societal relevance like other organizations. Ramaley (2014) confirmed that Universities are changing in today's world because the world itself is changing, and complex problems confront us daily (Filho et al., 2020).

The importance of change leadership in higher education has been the topic of the scholars worldwide. Al-Hubob (2012) aimed at identifying the reality of the culture of change in Yemeni universities. Among the most prominent results are those Yemeni universities face many challenges that make them unable to keep pace with change requirements (Niță & Guțu, 2023). Perhaps the most notable of these challenges are the rigidity of academic references, the absence of change management, the lack of transformational leadership, and the dominance of traditional teaching curricula and methods (Sauphayana, 2021). The researcher recommended activating the university's role in spreading the culture of change.

Another study conducted by Al-Asbahi (2007) aimed to propose a model for change leadership in Yemeni public universities in light of contemporary reality and trends. The study found that the reality of change leadership in Yemeni public universities from the point of view of the administrative leaders was average. In the six study areas, namely; the field of the university's role in bringing about change, the role of universities in bringing about change in light of contemporary administrative trends, the role of administration in bringing about change, the practical steps of the change program, the elements on which change is based, and the university's role in building the leadership personality capable of change (Aboramadan et al., 2020).

Similarly, Al-Haqbani (2007) aimed to determine what areas of change are most vulnerable to employee resistance. Its causes and the most prominent indicators of resistance to change, and the most critical leadership methods for dealing with change resisters from the viewpoint of the academic and administrative members at Umm Al-Qura University. The researcher found that the routine is one of the most important reasons for employees' resistance to change leadership (Antonopoulou et al., 2021). The researcher concluded with the importance of making change leadership and development part of the university's culture.

Literature Review

Some studies seek to identify the level of change leadership practices in the universities. For instance, Saqqa (2011) aimed to identify the skills required by academic leaders to lead change and the degree of their practice of those skills at Umm Al-Qura University. The study reached the change leadership of educational leaders from the faculty members' point of view,

and the degree of practicing the motivation skills of the academic leaders was high. Al-Lihyani (2011) aimed to monitor the degree of department heads' practice of change leadership from the point of view of deans, department heads, and faculty members. The most important results the heads of departments in the Faculties of Education practice change to a high degree.

Abu Samra (2014) aimed to identify the degree of practicing change leadership to the heads of academic departments in the Palestinian universities. The findings included the degree of practicing change leadership to the heads of academic departments in Palestinian universities from their perspective (4.01) and rated (%80.27). This rate meant that there was a high degree of approval.

Al-Qarni (2016) aimed to recognize the reality of the practice of the heads of academic departments at Tabuk University to change leadership from the viewpoint of faculty members. The study revealed that the reality of the heads of academic departments at Tabuk University for practicing change leadership from the viewpoint of faculty members was high, and average (4.02), the dimension of the modeling of behavior got a very high estimate.

Another study conducted by Al-Kurdi (2017) aimed at formulating a proposed strategy for the development of change leadership in the higher education institutions in Gaza governorates in the light of the principles of sustainable development; through identifying the reality of change leadership in the Islamic University of Gaza (IUG). The study reached to the total degree of the questionnaire of the development of change leadership in the light of sustainable development from the viewpoints of (deans, deputy deans, heads of departments, and directors) was high (Aung & Hallinger, 2023).

In addition, Al-Thubaiti (2017) aimed to determine the degree of change leadership in educational administration departments in Saudi universities in light of the Kotter model of change (Mohamed Jais et al., 2021). The study results indicated that the degree of change leadership in educational administration departments in Saudi universities was moderate, with an average of 3.20. The results showed that the first dimension of the Kotter model for change, "create a sense for an urgent change", came with a high degree, while the degree of the other seven dimensions of the Kotter model of change came in a medium degree.

Therefore, the importance of change leadership in higher education was the strong motivation for the researcher to write this paper, hence this paper strived to shed light on the concept of change leadership, related models and theories of change leadership, and practices of change leadership in higher education.

Research Method

This paper is purely a qualitative research where selected papers are reviewed. The selected papers to be reviewed are gathered through extensive literature review from academic papers representing an output of previous studies conducted by various researches concerning change leadership practices in higher education institutions.

These studies have been published in relevant websites over the Internet, which include scientific publications, periodicals, studies, scientific research.

Data analysis for this paper is conducted based on the content analysis. The keywords and phrases used in the research include the concept of change leadership, theories of change leadership; and practices of change leadership in higher education and details are discussed below.

Result and Discussion

The Concept of Change Leadership

Change has often been associated with leadership. According to Kotter (1996), leadership determines what the future should look like, aligns people with that vision, and encourages them to make it a reality despite the challenges. However, change leadership takes a somewhat different angle as it specifically encompasses the leadership needed to make sweeping changes in an organization by moving people or groups in a general direction (Haas, 2017). In this respect, a change leader should have the confidence to adjust an organization's focus (Phillips, 2014). Griffith-Cooper and King (2007) defined change leadership as a set of principles, strategies, or practices applied to the human aspects of implementing change to influence intrinsic acceptance while reducing resistance. So, change leadership is an engine that drives the change management process (Kotter, 2011).

Accordingly, change leadership is about the driving forces, visions, and processes that fuel transformation on a large scale (Grady, 2013). As a result, change leadership includes creating a vision for the future, gaining people's hearts and minds to work towards a common goal, designing strategies to make dreams of leadership a reality, and ensuring that people adapt to change (Gill, 2002). Consistent with this idea, Hooper and Potter (2000) specified that change leadership includes creating a vision for the company, making strategies that enable that vision to become a reality, and ensuring that the people in the organization are driving towards the same goals. Put simply, change leadership allows the forceful movement of the masses towards common visions and dreams (Gill, 2002; Fullan, 2011).

Burke (2014) stated that change leadership behaviors should include: scanning the environment and gathering information, recognizing the need for change, providing clarity of vision and direction, communicating the need for change, attracting employees' attention, and overcoming resistance. Equally, Herold (2008) and Liu (2010) mentioned that the specific change leadership behavior aims to see, enlist, empower, monitor, and assist with individual adaptation. So, it is pretty evident that creating a vision and putting vision into action is an essential part of change leadership. Besides, motivating and inspiring employees to embrace the change effort is also the responsibility of change leaders to make a better future. They also encourage their followers to look at old problems with new perspectives (Daft, 2014).

Miller (2001) argues that successful change leaders focus on what is essential, make sure that the need for change is emphasized, and personally lead the implementation. Moreover, Fullan (2011) defines a change leader as someone who can generate energy and passion in

others. Besides, a change leader should have the confidence to adjust the direction of an organization (Phillips, 2014). Change leaders think and act outside the box when appropriate and motivate others to do the same (Cloud, 2010). Consequently, Serina and Kotnour (2015) stated that change leaders need to understand how their employees perceive change and ensure that they accept change and are ready to do so. Therefore, change leadership refers to the approach a leader (or leadership team) takes about a specific change initiative (Farkas, 2013).

It is important to indicate here the difference between change management and change leadership. However, despite the similarities, the difference between them is that management is concerned with managing the complexity of any organization; leadership is about vision and progress creation (Bencivenga, 2002). According to Kotter (1999), change leadership is direction. It develops a vision for the future. It aligns people and increases followership by delegating authority and influence. Because leadership motivates, inspires, and empowers the employees to rise above political and bureaucratic barriers. Whereas change management is concerned with budgets, planning, creating steps and timetables for results, allocating resources, organizing staff, and delegating the responsibility and authority to carry out the leader's plan (Kotter, 1999).

Models of Change leadership

The previous literature has been comprised several models of change leadership, but the researcher will go in-depth in review three models; the Lewin's three steps model (planned approach to change), Dunphy and Stace's model of change (contingency model of change), and Kotter's eight steps model. Kotter's change leadership model is more like Lewin's (1951) force-field model of change in that it prescribes how managers should sequence or lead the change process (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2008). Interestingly, to some degree, these eight measures follow the template of Lewin. The first four steps represent Lewin's "unfreezing" stage. Steps 5, six and seven represent "changing," and step 8 corresponds to "refreezing" (Kotter, 1995).

Kurt Lewin's model of change (The planned approach to change)

Planned change as a term was first used by Kurt Lewin to differentiate change that is planned and change that happens by impulse, accident or that is forced upon organization (Marrow, 1969). Therefore, the planned change exists when the organization recognizes the need for major change and device a proactive plan to ensure the attainment of change like the good implementation of a strategic plan, reorganizational plan and others (Jalagat, 2016). In the views of French and Bell (1995) planned change is a systematic approach in which leaders strive to achieve a particular set of goals through hard and diligent. This approach is well documented and is based largely on the work of Kurt Lewin. Lewin created the action research model and the three-step model. In particular, the three-step model is the basis for many of the subsequent planned change management models and theories (Burnes B, 1996).

Lewin's model of change can be traced in 1951 where the focus is on the planned change that relates to group decisions, implementation and social change (Jalagat, 2015). This model assumes that the transition is expected and emphasizes that whatever changes are made (i.e. structure, system or behavior-related), people are always the root of the change (Calder, 2013). Lewin's model is a key contributor to organizational change; indeed, if you scratch any

account of creating and managing change, Lewin's model will not be far below the surface (Hodges & Gill, 2014). Hossan (2015) stated that Lewin's model examined two sets of human factors that occur during the implementation of any kind of change in any organization. The first is the driving forces that support changes, and the other one is the resisting forces which reduce the probability of the acceptance of the change effort. Forces of resistance consist mainly of emotional and psychological obstacles. Wirth (2018) carried out that the significance of this theory was the positioning of individual and organizational change within the context of psychological processes that requires prior learning to be rejected and replaced with a new foundation.

Kurt Lewin theorized a three-stage change model that has become known as the unfreezing-change-refreeze model requiring rejection and replacement of prior learning. Unfreeze refers to the process of 'melting' the behaviors, beliefs or established status quo in certain organizations or particular individuals for the purpose of decreasing the obstructive factor towards the change process. This first phase is the basis of self-preparedness to embrace the transition that is taking place. In this stage, the willingness to move towards the change point is catalyzed by the motivational desire of wishing to change, due to the sense of necessitating toward certain new changes or to substitute the previous behaviors (Aziz et al., 2017). Schein (1996) describes three mechanisms required for unfreezing: disconfirmation of status quo legitimacy, initiation of guilt or fear for survival, and development of psychological safety.

Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder (1993) stated that the concept of unfreezing is similar to the concept of "creating readiness for organizational change". Mills, Dye, and Mills (2009) revealed that in the "Unfreeze" stage organizations come to the conclusion that a change is needed and necessary, they break down the existing state of affairs aka status quo and begin to build the new way of doing things. In this stage, it is important to work on the resistance, reducing forces and change the attitude, in addition, to make the people understand the change and support them. If there is resistance, management needs to find solutions for its prompt, so that the process can follow through the un-freezing stage and move on to the "Change" stage (Blomqvist, 2017).

Change (transition) Lewin called the change process a transition. Transition a process that takes time. Likewise, the transition is the internal progress of individuals or organization which occurs in response to a change (Siddiqui, 2017). According to Siddiqui (2017) at this stage, the required changes are completed. The shifting stage is daunting, however, as people and organizations are unsure about the transition, but if support is available in terms of training, mentoring, and error learning, it could be handled well. Also, communication at this stage is very critical to share the progress toward anticipated change. Moreover, Mills, Dye, and Mills (2009) stated that in the "Change" step, things start to happen and the organizations move toward wanted and desired state.

Refreezing once an appropriate change is identified and implemented, the refreezing stage begins; its objective is to incorporate the new changes in a quasi-equilibrium state so that they are learned and assimilated sufficiently to be maintained in the future (Liebhart & Lorenzo, 2010). Lewin suggests that routines and norms regarded by the group are supposed

to be altered at this stage (Bakaria, Hunjrab & Masood, 2017). Blomqvist (2017) stated that in this step the changes are taking shape, people within the organizations comprehend the new ways of doing things and the changes are implemented in the organizational culture. Rewards and acknowledgment are used to re-in force change.

According to Mills, Dye, and Mills (2009), the re-freeze stage is crucial for not letting people get back to their old habits but continuing with the new ways of doing things. Therefore, the main point regarding refreezing is that new actions will, to some extent, be consistent with the rest of the learner's behavior, temperament, and climate, or simply lead to a new round of disconfirmation (Schein, 1996). That's why Lewin saw successful change as a group activity because unless group norms and routines are transformed, changes in individual behavior will not be sustained (Burnes, 2004). In terms of organization, refreezing also requires changes in organizational culture, standards, policies, and practices (Cummings and Huse, 1989).

Dunphy and Stace's model of change (The contingency model of change)

A contingency approach has been taken by Dunphy and Stace (1993) who proposed a model of organizational change strategies and developed methods to place an organization within that model. They advocate an approach that reflects not only that organizations are operating in ever-changing environments, but also that there is a range of approaches to change (Macredie, Sandom, & Paul, 1998). According to Hodges & Gill (2014), the contingency approach is founded on the theory that the structure and performance of an organization are dependent on the situational variables that it faces. The variables can relate to the environment within which the organization operates and can include economic and competitive factors, technological change, political and legislative factors, and social and cultural influences. The variables can also relate to the organization itself and can include its size, organization structure, management and governance, strategies and the nature of its staff (Needle, Guest, and Howard, 2010).

Dunphy and Stace (1993) examined change from an organizational transformation perspective. Within this perspective, they maintained that organizations needed a model of change that was essentially a 'situational' or 'contingency model', which includes both the formulation and implementation requirements of various types of change and leadership styles. They also maintained that change does not always occur on an incremental basis, but can also occur on a discontinuous basis. Equally, they suggested that transformational change is not only consultative but is also coercive in nature (Dunphy and Stace, 1992). Their model (1993) incorporate; participatory evolution (collaborative approaches to fine-tuning); forced evolution (coercive approaches to fine-tuning); charismatic transformation (collaborative approaches to radical change); and dictatorial transformation (coercive approaches to radical change).

Dunphy and Stace (1993) argue that management has choices varying between collaborative and coercive approaches and influenced by the scope of change, which they describe as ranging from fine-tuning to radical. In addition, Dunphy and Stace (1993) clarify that fine-tuning organizational change can include refining policies, methods, and procedures; developing specialized units and linking systems to allow increased volume and unit quality and cost attention; developing staff particularly suited to the current strategy; fostering

individual and group dedication to the company's mission and departmental excellence; fostering faith in accepted standards, beliefs and myths; and clarifying existing roles (James, 2005). These processes allow a leader to manipulate the leadership styles to suit the situation. Thus, the significance of this model is that it “conveys dynamic interdependence, an understanding of the importance of incorporating more than one change dimension” (Ishitani, M., 2016, p.71).

Hodges & Gill (2014) therefore explained that the strength of contingency theory is that it describes organizational change from a behavioral point of view where managers make decisions that account for specific circumstances, concentrate on those most directly relevant, and respond with the most appropriate actions. Furthermore, the best course of action is the one that is fundamentally situational, matched to the needs of the circumstances. However, the contingency approach proposes no formulas or guiding principles for organizational change; instead, the focus is on achieving alignment and a good fit to ensure stability and control.

Kotter's model of change (The emergent approach to change)

The emergent model of change was the response to criticisms leveled against the planned model of change (D'Ortenzio, 2012). The term ‘emergent’ is used to denote that the theories in this group are deeply intertwined with the factors affecting the organization during the change process. Likewise, it is suggested that the success of the change process will be determined by how quickly and effectively the organization responds to the demands of changes in the internal and external organizational environments (Lawler & Sillitoe, 2010). Therefore, advocates of emergent change emphasize that it is the uncertainty of the external and internal environment that makes it more pertinent than the planned approach (Bamford and Forrester, 2003).

Kotter's model (1996) advocates' emergent change proposed eight steps in the change process. John Kotter, a specialist in the management of change and leadership, created a model of the transformation to address what he considered to be eight main reasons for organizational Change (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2007). Kotter wrote the article "Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail" in 1995. The article is based on an analysis of dozens of organizations that had the same goal in almost every case to make changes to cope with challenges in the environment (Kotter, 1995). The article highlighted eight main risks when implementing organizational change. Following this essay, Kotter wrote his bestseller, *Leading Change*, in 1996. Instead of handling it, he focuses on driving the transition. His model shows that management at the top level has a strong responsibility to lead his company through a change. The book outlines the eight-step process to implement changes. The 8-step process summarizes steps that are crucial for successful change implementation (Calder, 2013).

Kotter's model is the conventional wisdom for leading Change (Nitta et al., 2009) and the most effective change management formula for success (Phelan, 2005). Kotter believes that any change has components both emotional and situational and has proposed a multi-step change model. The model is based on three key assumptions: the globalization of markets and competition has precipitated a climate of significant hazard and great opportunity requiring organizations to initiate large-scale change to be effective; successful large-scale change efforts

tend to be a multi-stage process creating sufficient power and motivation to overwhelm all sources of inertia; and successful efforts to change high-quality demand leadership, not just excellent management (Miles, 2015).

Kotter's Change Model (1996) has been described as a simple model with a double focus: firstly, it involves a step-by-step process of change implementation, and secondly, it allows individuals to accept and prepare for change as part of the change management process (Bhola, 2010). Likewise, the model is divided into three phases to help leaders deal with the challenges inherent in any initiative for change (Campbell, 2008). Kotter pointed out that before progressing to the next stage, each step needs to be completed fully. Skipping measures create the illusion of pace and never yield a satisfactory result. He also noted that the eight steps could be classified into three phases: Steps 1 to three (create a sense of urgency, making the directional team, developing a change vision) to create a climate for change. Steps 4 to six (communicating an idea, removing obstacles, induce short-term wins) are aimed to engage and enable the whole organization, while Steps 7 & 8 (building on change, make it stick) for implementing and sustaining Change (Kang'ethe, 2014). Therefore, the three basic dimensions of Kotter's change leadership model are discussed below.

Creating a climate for the Change

In creating a climate for the change process, practical leaders need to make a climate for change by creating a sense of urgency; this step involves helping employees to see what the need for the change is? What is driving the change? People need to know the context (Kavanagh, n.d). If only a few people agree with a concept, it will not be implemented (Magnsdóttir, 2018). According to Kotter by creating, a sense of urgency is making people in the organization see that the change is needed, and it is required now (Kotter, 2012). They are also converting the importance of acting immediately by showing potential threats and scenarios showing what would happen in the future if the changes would not occur (Kotter, 2007).

Kotter (1995) further states that leaders must find ways to communicate the information "broadly and dramatically" in the organization to keep the employees up to date. He believes the first step is vital as many individuals need active collaboration to implement organizational changes. The need for change must be recognized; otherwise, the change agents would lack the "power and legitimacy to implement the necessary change program" (Kotter, 1997). In addition, Kotter (1996) advises using consultants as a strategy to create a sense of urgency and challenge the status quo. Armenakis et al. (1993) support Kotter's argument by recommending that sources be hired outside the organization, as they can reinforce the message of the change agent.

Kotter (1996) stated that the first task of the guiding coalition was to formulate a "clear and sensible vision" for the transformation effort in this step of developing a change vision. Without a clear vision, the change goals will quickly devolve into a jumble of incompatible projects that lead the company in the wrong direction or nowhere at all (Kotter, 1996). This step involves the creation of a vision, which is designed to help direct the change effort and also develop some strategies for achieving that vision (Kavanagh, n.d). Whelan-Berry and

Somerville (2010) defined the change vision as a vital part of the change process. According to Kotter (1996), an effective vision is essential in breaking the status quo and looking beyond the immediate goals of the organization.

Engaging and Enabling the Organization

Kotter confirmed that engaging and enabling the organization, is a process in which the practice leader and the steering team need to formulate plans for implementation that will include all levels of the organization in the process of change. Specifically, the practical leaders need to accomplish: communicating a vision; the management must engage and enable the rest of the organization to share the vision after building the climate for change (Kotter, 2012). Thus, the vision has to be clear and frequently communicated and implemented into the day-to-day work, applying the vision in all operations from training to performance reviews (Kotter, 2007). Communication is a crucial element of the cycle of change leadership because it can minimize confusion (Bordia et al., 2004) and may influence the form of positive or negative response to changes in the organization (Nelissen & Van, 2008). Kotter claims that "two-way contact is always better than single-way communication" (Kotter, 1996, p.90).

According to Kotter, an organization needs to abolish all obstacles that would interfere with the change, change systems or structures this is a step of removing barriers (Kotter, 2012). This Step involves eliminating any obstacles to modify, reverse systems, or any of those structures that seriously undermine the vision and encourage related risk-taking, nontraditional ideas, activities, and actions (Kavanagh, p. 3), is everything in line with the vision? the structure of the organization, job requirements, compensation processes, and results (Kotter, 2007).

It takes a long time to achieve significant and severe transformations. Short-term targets are to be set to keep complacency down and to effectively carry out the plan. In this way, it is quite possible to avoid employee resistance over a long period required to achieve such a long transition successfully (Zec & Shurrah, 2013). Also, the result of success motivates us to work forward on change. Kotter claims that invoking visible and apparent short-term wins related to the change effort induces short-term wins (Kotter, 2012). This step involves planning for those achievements that can easily be made visible to the organization, planned follow-through with those achievements, and recognition and rewards for employees involved (Kavanagh, p. 3). With the short-term goals and the result of success, the process can be vulnerable to negative thinkers and criticism that can slow down or even hurt the whole change initiative (Kotter, 2007).

Implementing and Sustaining the Change

Management needs to implement and maintain the change by building upon the change (Kotter, 2012). This step involves using increased credibility. It takes courage to change systems, frameworks, and policies which do not match the dream. It also includes recruiting, encouraging, and cultivating workers willing to execute the vision and re-energize the organization with new initiatives, concepts, and agents for change (Kavanagh, p.3). According to Kotter, even if the early stages can be successful, there will always be resistance, and the team cannot stop working toward their main goals (Kotter, 2007). It is essential to guide improvements that are being achieved and not ignore the efforts made to achieve an

organization's current success (Zec & Shurrah, 2013). Kotter (2012) stated that Making change is stick is making the change be a part of day-to work and activities, being "the way of doing things" (p.165).

This step involves articulating those connections between the new behaviors and organizational success and developing the means to ensure leadership development and succession (Kavanagh, p. 3). The last step comes to the cultural change, making the change part of the organizational culture (Kotter, 2012). Cultural change can only happen when proven that the new way of doing is better than the old (Kotter, 2007). Hofstede (2001) suggests that culture is a collection of shared norms and values by individuals. Kotter (1995) suggests that new habits are vulnerable to regression if they are not embedded in social traditions and common beliefs once the impetus for reform has been reduced. He cites two factors that are key to the institutionalization of change in corporate culture: showing employees "how new strategies, behaviors, and attitudes have helped to boost performance; as well as making certain that "the most recent approach is reflected by the next generation of managers" (Kotter, 1996, p. 67).

Conclusion

Change has often been associated with leadership. Change leadership is about the driving forces, visions, and processes that fuel transformation on a large scale. This includes creating a vision for the future, gaining people's hearts and minds to work towards a common goal, designing strategies to make dreams of leadership a reality, and ensuring that people adapt to change.

Change leadership practices in higher education institutions is very important and has been the topic of the scholars worldwide, and many literatures are reviewed in this context. There are several models and theories of change leadership, but the researcher went in-depth in review three models; the Lewin's three steps model, Dunphy and Stace's model of change, and Kotter's eight steps model.

Lewin's model of change assumes that the transition is expected and emphasizes that whatever changes are made (i.e. structure, system or behavior-related), people are always the root of the change. He examined two sets of human factors that occur during the implementation of any kind of change in any organization. The first is the driving forces, and the other one is the resisting forces. Lewin theorized a three-stage change model that has become known as the unfreezing-change-refreeze.

Dunphy and Stace maintained that organizations need a model of change that is essentially a 'situational' or 'contingency model', which includes both the formulation and implementation requirements of various types of change and leadership styles. Dunphy and Stace model incorporate; participatory evolution (collaborative approaches to fine-tuning); forced evolution (coercive approaches to fine-tuning); charismatic transformation (collaborative approaches to radical change); and dictatorial transformation (coercive approaches to radical change).

Kotter's change model is based on three key assumptions: the globalization of markets and competition has precipitated a climate of significant hazard and great opportunity requiring organizations to initiate large-scale change to be effective; successful large-scale change efforts tend to be a multi-stage process creating sufficient power and motivation to overwhelm all sources of inertia; and successful efforts to change high-quality demand leadership, not just excellent management. Kotter's model proposed eight steps in the change process. The eight steps could be classified into three phases: create a climate for change (create a sense of urgency, making the directional team, developing a change vision); engage and enable the whole organization (communicating an idea, removing obstacles, induce short-term wins); and implementing and sustaining Change (building on change, make it stick). These three phases help leaders deal with the challenges inherent in any initiative for change.

Therefore, higher education institutions need change leaders who have the confidence to adjust an organization's focus, and who have the leadership skills to make sweeping changes in an organization by moving people or groups in a general direction. Besides, change leaders should understand how their employees perceive change and ensure that they accept change and are ready to do so.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The author declare that there is no conflict of interest in this work.

References

- Aboramadan, M., Dahleez, K., & Hamad, M. H. (2020). Servant leadership and academics outcomes in higher education: the role of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 29(3). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-11-2019-1923>
- Abu Samra, A. N. (2014). The Effectiveness of Decision Taking and its Correlation with Change Leadership of the Academic Departments Heads at the Palestinian Universities. Master thesis, The Islamic University – Gaza.
- Al-Asbahi, A. A. (2007). A proposed model for change management in Yemeni public universities in light of current situation and contemporary administrative trends. (PhD Dissertation). Amman Arab University, Jordan.
- Al-Haqbani, F. (2007). University employees 'resistance to administrative change, its causes, indicators and methods of dealing with it from the point of view of the administrative academic members, Umm Al-Qura University.
- Al-Hubob, A. G. (2012). The university and the culture of change, a critical analytical study of the reality of the culture of change in the Yemeni University, a paper presented to the seventeenth international conference of the University of Philadelphia, the Republic of Yemen, Amman, Jordan.
- Al-Kurdi, Z. M. (2017). A proposed Strategy for development Leading Change in accordance with Principles of Sustainability Development in Higher Education Institutes in the Gaza Strip Governorates" Islamic University Gaza—Case study".

- Al-Lihyani, A. S. (2011). The reality of the change leadership practice in the colleges of education for girls in Makah from the point of view of deans, department heads and faculty members. Master thesis not published. Umm Al Qura University. Mecca. Faculty of Education.
- Al-Qarni (2016). The reality of the practice of academic department heads at the University of Tabuk to change leadership from the faculty members' point of view. Journal of the College of Education, Al-Azhar University, Issue: (168, Part Three).
- Al-Thubaiti, K. (2017). Leading change in departments of educational administration in Saudi universities by using kotter model of change.
- Antonopoulou, H., Halkiopoulos, C., Barlou, O., & Beligiannis, G. N. (2021). Transformational leadership and digital skills in higher education institutes: During the covid-19 pandemic. *Emerging Science Journal*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.28991/esj-2021-01252>
- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681-703.
- Aung, P. N., & Hallinger, P. (2023). Research on sustainability leadership in higher education: a scoping review. In *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* (Vol. 24, Issue 3). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-09-2021-0367>
- Aziz, N. et al. (2017). The Application of Kurt Lewin's Model of Change in the Implementation of Higher Order Thinking Skills in School. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 7, No. 8.
- Bakaria, H., Hunjrab, A. I., & Masood, M. T. (2017). Managing Organizational Change in Pakistan: Insights from the Work of Kurt Lewin.
- Bencivenga, J. (2002). John Kotter on leadership, management and change. *School Administrator*, 59(2), 36-40.
- Blomqvist, D. (2017). An examination of change management models for successful execution of a change initiative.
- Bordia, P., Hunt, E., Paulsen, N., Tourish, D. and DiFonzo, N. (2004). "Uncertainty during organizational change: is it all about control?", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 345-65.
- Burke, W. W. (2014). *Organization change: theory and practice* (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burnes, B. (1996). 'No such thing as...a "one best way" to manage organizational change', *Management Decision*, 34(10), pp. 11– 18.
- Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: a re-appraisal. *Journal of Management studies*, 41(6), 977-1002.
- Calder, A. M. (2013). *Organizational change: Models for successfully implementing change*.
- Campbell, R.J. (2008). Change management in health care. *The Health Care Manager*, 27(1), 23-39.
- Cloud, R. C. (2010). Epilogue: Change leadership and leadership development. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (149), 73-79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.398>.

- Cummings, T. G. and Huse, E. F. (1989). *Organization Development and Change*, 4th edition. St Paul, MN: West Publishing.
- Daft, R. L. (2014). *New era of management* (11th ed.). International Edition: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- D'Ortenzio, C. (2012). *Understanding change and change management processes: a case study*. University of Canberra.
- Dunphy, D.C., & Stace, D.A. (1992). *Under new management: Australian organizations in transition*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill.
- Dunphy, D.C., & Stace, D.A. (1993). The strategic management of corporate change. *Human Relations*, 46(8), 905-918.
- Farkas, Meredith G., (2013). "Building and Sustaining a Culture of Assessment: Best Practices for Change Leadership". Library Faculty Publications and Presentations. 78.
- Filho, W. L., Eustachio, J. H. P. P., Caldana, A. C. F., Will, M., Salvia, A. L., Rampasso, I. S., Anholon, R., Platje, J., & Kovaleva, M. (2020). Sustainability leadership in higher education institutions: An overview of challenges. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093761>
- Fullan M. (2011). *Change Leader: Learning to Do What Matters Most*. (n.p.): Jossey-Bass.
- GILIÃ, F. (2016). Relationship of teachers readiness for change with their participation in decision making and school culture. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(8), 823-833.
- Gill, R. (2002). Change management –or change leadership? *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 307-318.
- Grady, V. (2013). *Change management vs. change leadership: What's the difference?*
- Griffith-Cooper, B. and King, K. (2007). "The partnership between project management and organizational change: integrating change management with change leadership", *Performance Improvement*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 14-20.
- Haas, J. (2017). *Change Leadership Practices for Effective Implementation of Alternative Breakthrough Models in Blended and Online Learning at Select K-12 Schools: A Phenomenological Study*.
- Herold, D. M. Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S. D., & Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership employees' commitment to a change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, (93)2, 346-357.
- Hodges, J., & Gill, R. (2014). *Sustaining change in organizations*. Sage.
- Hooper, A. & Potter, J. (2000). *Intelligent Leadership*. London: Random House.
- Hossan, C. (2015). Applicability of Lewin's change management theory in Australian local government. *International Journal of business and Management*, 10(6), 53.
- Ishitani, M. (2016). Organizational Change: Exploring the contingency model and some alternative ways. *城西国際大学紀要*, 24(6), 69-76.

Change Leadership in Higher Education: Exploring of Theories and Practices

- Jalagat, R. (2016). The Impact of Change and Change Management in Achieving Corporate Goals and Objectives: Organizational Perspective. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 5, 1233-1239.
- James, Wendy (2005). The Impact of Corporatization and National Competition Policy: An Exploratory Study of Organizational Change and Leadership Style. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(4):pp. 289-309.
- Kavanaugh, E. Exploring the Kotter Model and Appreciative Inquiry as Organizational Change Vehicles for Non-Profit Human Services Agencies.
- Kotter International (2011). Change Management vs. Change Leadership – What’s the Difference? Forbes.
- Kotter, J. (1999). Change leadership. *Executive Excellence*, 16(4), 16-17.
- Kotter, J. (2012). *Leading change*. 1st ed. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business Review Press. Pages 3-153.
- Kotter, J.P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, John P. (2007). *Leading Change; why transformation fail*. [Harvard Business review].
- Kreitner, Robert, & Kinicki, Angelo (2007). *Organizational Behavior*, fifth Edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Lawler, A., & Sillitoe, J. (2010). Perspectives on instituting change management in large organizations. *Australian Universities' Review*, 52(2), 43.
- Liebhart, M., & Garcia-Lorenzo, L. (2010). Between planned and emergent change: decision maker’s perceptions of managing change in organizations. *International journal of knowledge, culture and change management*, 10(5), 214-225.
- Liu, Yi (2010). When change leadership impacts commitment to change and when it doesn’t: A multi-dimensional investigation. Dissertation, Limited publication. George Institute of Technology, USA.
- Macredie, R. D., Sandom, C., & Paul, R. J. (1998). Modelling for change: an information systems perspective on change management models. In *Modelling for added value* (pp. 3-16). Springer, London.
- Magnúsdóttir, H. K. (2018). *Implementing Strategy Using the Kotter 8-Step Change Process: A Case Study in a Large Consultancy Firm in Iceland* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Mohamed Jais, I. R., Yahaya, N., & Ghani, E. K. (2021). Talent management in higher education institutions: Developing leadership competencies. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.20448/JOURNAL.509.2021.81.8.15>
- Miller, D. (2001). Successful change leaders: What makes them? What do they do that is different? *Journal of Change Management*, 2(4), 359-368.
- Needle, D., Guest, D. and Howard, M. (2010). *Towards Partnership: An Analysis of the Literature on Organizational Change*. Final report, King’s College, University of London.

- Nelissen, P. and van Selm, M. (2008). "Surviving organizational change: how management communication helps balance mixed feelings", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 306-18.
- Niță, V., & Guțu, I. (2023). The Role of Leadership and Digital Transformation in Higher Education Students' Work Engagement. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20065124>
- Nitta K, Wrobel S, Howard J, Jimmerson-Eddings E (2009). Leading Change of a School District Organization. *Public Performance & Management Review* 32:463-488.
- Phelan M (2005). Cultural Revitalization Movements in Organization Change Management. *Journal of Change Management* 5:47-56.
- Phillips, J. J., & Phillips, P. P. (2014). Developing a human capital strategy in today's changing environment: Eight forces shaping HC strategy. *Strategic HR Review*, 13, 130–134. doi:10.1108/SHR-01-2014-0002.
- Ramaley, J. A. (2014). The changing role of higher education: Learning to deal with wicked problems. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(3).
- Redding s., (2012). Change Leadership Innovation in State Education Agencies. Academic Development Institute, Lincoln, IL
- Saqqa, R. M. (2011). The skills required for academic leaders to change leadership at Umm Al Qura University from the point of view of faculty members "Importance and practice" master thesis is not published. Umm Al Qura University. Mecca. Faculty of Education.
- Sauphayana, S. (2021). Innovation in higher education management and leadership. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 11(6). <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2021-0137>
- Schein, E. H. (1996). 'Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: notes towards a model of management learning'. *Systems Practice*, 9, 1, 27–47.
- Serina Al-Haddad Timothy Kotnour, (2015). "Integrating the organizational change literature: a model for successful change". *Journal of Organizational Change Management*. Vol. 28, Iss 2, pp. 234 – 262.
- Siddiqui, S. T. (2017). A Critical Review of Change Management Strategies And Models. *International Journal of Advance Research*, 5(4), 670-676.
- Temple, P. (2011). University branding: What can it do? Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education. *Perspectives*, (15)4, 113-116.
- Whelan-Berry, K.S. and Somerville, K.A. (2010). "Linking change drivers and the organizational change process: a review and synthesis", *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 175-93.
- Wirth, R. A. (2004). Lewin/Schein's change theory.
- Zec, M., & Shurrah, H. (2013). The eight-step change model in practice a case study on Ericsson.