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Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to explore, analyze and reflect on the meaning, nature, causes and associated dynamics of change in higher education within a Pakistani cultural context. Resistance was a major component of understanding this change. I focused on multiple factors that induced individual/group tendencies to resist or avoid making changes and to devalue change generally. This study employed a multiple case study approach. Semi-structured interviews with designated stakeholders of the planned change initiative were the primary data-collection method. Document analysis, members check and observations were used to triangulate the interview data. The data were analyzed on an ongoing basis. The findings revealed the complex dimensions of participants’ compliance and/or resistance with respect to change at the beginning of the twenty-first century when the Pakistani higher education system was shifting dramatically from a local to global perspective. Despite serious issues and weaknesses, change was gradual over time and the most strongly contested reforms were those that did not align with existing practices. In sum, the findings support the notion that change is complicated, and that the reasons for this complexity stem from factors that are structural, emotional, political and personal. The results of this study will be of interest to administrators and educators as they prepare for future challenges within the Pakistani context. The theoretical and practical implications of these findings are discussed, and directions for future research are identified.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Interest in educational change, including its successes and failures, has continued to grow over the past few decades. One focus has been the challenges of implementing sustainable reforms, particularly in schools, which have been traditionally resistant to change because of their unique institutional culture, bureaucratic complexity, traditions, structures and unique contexts (Fullan, 1991a; Fullan, 1999; 2001a; 2001b; Hargreaves, 2003). Change-management literature implies that understanding and exploring the multidimensionality of employee resistance to change is vital in developing and implementing a successful change initiative. One of the scholars who pointed to the massive failure of educational innovations in early educational research and practice in the 1960s and 1970s was Fullan who argued that change must be understood as a multivariate process rather than as a single product or event (Fullan, 1991a). He notes that we do not adequately understand what constitutes good change, why some changes succeed while others fail, or when to resist rigorously proposed change programs that could be harmful. Since his 1991 publication, Fullan encouraged further study of educational change to understand more fully how it affects our lives in order to avoid unfavourable change as well as the repetitive cycle of non-change events. According to Fullan (1991a), a fundamental problem in education today is that people do not have a clear, coherent sense of the meaning of educational change – neither what it is, nor how it proceeds. Fullan argues that, even when the educational content of a particular change is more or less understood, the process of change in general is not. In order to gain a better understanding, we need to comprehend how the process works and how the factors that affect change function. Fullan’s theory of educational change explains this. His theory, however, is heavily grounded in the elementary and secondary environments. It has not been tested to any significant degree in the higher education context nor in a South Asian context such as Pakistan.

The higher education sector in many developing countries has also undergone major restructuring over the past decades. Pakistan, the developing country with one of the oldest public education systems, has been transforming its higher education system through large-scale reforms. The newly implemented reforms initiated by the Higher Education Commission (HEC) since 2002 mark a dramatic change in the underlying educational philosophy and practices, which draw on deep cultural and historical roots in Pakistani society. The objectives of these reforms were to increase the efficiency and productivity of universities and to increase the
professional accountability of higher education institutions in general. The main purpose of this study was to explore, analyze and reflect on the meaning, nature, causes and associated dynamics of change in higher education, as initiated by the Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan. The study explored the strategies and mental constructs of those involved in the implementation process. The particular focus was on identifying any tactics or strategies that stakeholders used to express and overcome resistance to change.

**Origin of the Study**

My interest in this topic originated from my personal work experience as an Additional Sub-divisional Education Officer (ASDEO) with the Punjab Ministry of Education, Pakistan. While working as an evaluator with the Ministry, I often observed that there was a general lack of acceptance of changes in educational institutions. However, as a beginning professional, I naively believed that innovations in the Pakistani education system were desirable and that therefore the implementation process would be effortless and easy to accomplish. Although I had the help and support of many senior officials, I had to struggle socially, culturally and politically with the target organizations. I began to wonder: Why do people (stakeholders) devalue or resist change, and why are some individuals and groups in the higher education sector more reluctant to change?; What factors obstruct people in bringing about constructive change in their workplaces?; What are the factors that can play an important role in defining and facilitating the antecedent conditions that ultimately lead to systemic change?; and, finally, how do my colleagues in the Ministry experience, perceive and react to resistance? These questions helped me to frame my research questions for this inquiry.

Situated in this context, this study investigates the myriad of ways in which change was perceived, conceptualized and experienced (Marton, 1994) by a selected sample of participants: program implementers (*i.e.* Ministry officials); university administrators; and professors. I was interested in conducting this research in Punjab, Pakistan for multiple reasons. First, limited research has been done on this topic in the region. Second, it is the most populous province and the main focus of the Pakistani government with regard to educational innovations. Third, historically there have been many challenges associated with the implementation of transformational change efforts in the province of Punjab. During the last few decades, the Punjab Ministry of Education has sought to adopt and implement many forms of innovation inspired by
quality movements in the education sector around the world. Therefore, Punjab province appeared to be an opportune site and a robust environment for an empirically based study geared towards expanding our knowledge of change because of the jurisdiction’s historical infrastructure in educational institutions where the civil-service rules and policies are in place but where organization and control has often been left in the hands of the military-appointed staff. Last, I worked with the Ministry of Education for many years and taught at one of the selected universities. Therefore, my personal contacts and involvement as an insider (Chaves, 2008) provided me with an opportunity to have access to a variety of participants and documents.

**A Brief History of Higher Educational Reforms in Pakistan**

In order to provide insight into the change process and the people involved in the change initiative, it is necessary to situate the research in a particular context. Educational policy-makers in Pakistan have always acknowledged the importance of education in the socio-economic development of the country. This has been reiterated in every education policy since the 1950s and in all eight five-year plans. However, until the establishment of HEC in 2002, this commitment has never been backed by: a) any constitution putting a direct responsibility on the government for education by any specific date; b) any allocation of adequate funding to education particularly to higher education; c) any provision to higher education of its due share of resources and political commitment to improve standards (Malik & Courtney, 2011; Saeed, 2007). Despite being part of a national agenda and having governmental support, in Pakistan many higher-education reforms have failed and have encountered severe resistance from target organizations (Ahmad, 2001; Rahman, 2004) due to many factors including political instability, economic constraints, poor strategic plans, and cultural and policy-related issues (Ahsan, 2003; GoP, 2006a).

Quantitatively, Pakistan’s education system (described in chapter 3) has shown significant growth (Khalid & Khan, 2006; Malik, 2007a; Saeed, 2007), but, qualitatively, “Pakistan’s educational system has a checkered past of high ideals and promises and a dismal record of achievement. Higher education in the last 53 years, has remained an arena of experimentation and implementation of divergent, often contradictory policies” (Ahmad, 2001, pp. 69-71). Alongside various Higher Education Policies (chronologically in 1947, 1959, 1970, 1972, 1979, 1992, 1998-2010), the Pakistani government also produced eight five-year plans.
Throughout the history of this country, new policies and plans were often prepared without giving due consideration to the causes of the failure of previous policies and plans (Ahmad, 1997; Farooq, 1993; Gafoor & Arshad, 1994; Jalil, 1998). Indeed, following the First Education Plan (1952) and the First Education Conference (1957), it became a tradition to have a new education policy with each change of government (Ahmad, 2001; Kazmi, 2005; Khan, 2001; Saeed, 2007). Over the years, Pakistan has launched many projects that have been discontinued abruptly without any evaluation. As a case in point, the recommendation of the second five-year plan to extend the bachelor’s degree programs in Arts, Science, and Commerce from three to four years was implemented and then withdrawn because of opposition by the academic community (Ahsan, 2003; GoP, 2002a; Hoodbhoy, 2008; Mughal & Manzoor, 1999). These reforms, whether aborted or attempted, were not intended to be narrowly focused on small organizations or activities; rather, they were conceived as system-wide efforts seeking to change the pattern of behaviour across a broad range of actors and institutions. It is noteworthy that the evaluation reports of most of these plans and policies have not been published (Ahsan, 2003; Khan, 2001; Malik, 2000). When these projects ended, there were no opportunities for reflection about what the project meant to the beneficiaries and to the people who worked on them and, in consequence, there was no learning of lessons (Ahsan, 2003). My hope in doing this research is that it will contribute to the possibility that those involved in the HEC-initiated reforms will improve conditions in the future.

Since the late 1990s and the early years of the new millennium, the Government of Pakistan has again initiated multiple ambitious reforms aimed at rapidly increasing the quality of education in the higher education sector. But previous failures raise doubts about the sagacity of yet another round of reforms. A realist might question what factors make the current initiatives more likely to succeed than their predecessors. Even an idealist would be compelled to ask how and under what conditions the previous efforts could have succeeded, and whether those conditions or approaches can be created or could be made to inform the present effort (Afridi et al., 2002; Ghaffar, 2003; Khan, 2001). There are few studies about the fate of change initiatives in the public-education sector in Pakistan, and the literature that does exist about education-sector reforms essentially mirrors the negative picture that researchers have presented about the business-sector initiated reforms (Ali, 2000; Farooq, 1994; Kanu, 2006; Khan, 2001; Zia 1999). As a result of this bleak record of organizational change, there has been an increased level of
interest among academics and practitioners in Pakistan in exploring why change efforts fail (e.g., Hoodbhoy, 2008; Kazmi, 2005; Rahman, 2004; Saeed, 2007). Although a number of factors have the potential to undermine planned reforms in the education sector, *resistance to change* consistently surfaces as among the most significant (Chaudhry, n.d.; GoP, 2002a; Isani & Virk, 2004; Zia, 2003). This study takes a step towards understanding stakeholders’ perceptions and experiences relating to a specific change effort through a qualitative approach and from a multidimensional viewpoint. The following section provides an overview of the selected educational reforms initiated by the Higher Education Commission (HEC) that provide the focus of this research.

**Selected Reforms Initiated by the Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan**

In the 1990s, many researchers (e.g., Chapman et al., 1999; Dougherty et al., 1994; Kerr, 1995; Khurshid, 1998) observed that institutions of higher education, like other organizations, were facing increasing demands and opportunities in their respective environments. In order to compete and survive, these institutions began examining and redesigning programs and processes, adapting where possible and reorganizing and restructuring where necessary (Dougherty et al., 1994). Since 2000, the Government of Pakistan initiated a series of focused examinations and initiatives to improve public-sector higher education that I will describe in more detail in chapter three. Among the most significant initiatives were the formation of the Task Force on Improvement in Higher Education (TFHE) in 2001, the Study Group on Science and Technology (SGST) in 2000, the Steering Committee on Higher Education (SCHE) in 2002, and most importantly the Higher Education Commission (HEC) in 2002, which is solely responsible for the development of higher education in Pakistan. The HEC is also responsible for quality assurance and the improvement of the higher education sector. In response to the academic community’s request (which was stimulated by the 2000 World Bank publication of an *International Task Force Report on Higher Education in Developing Countries*), the Federal Minister for Education constituted the TFHE comprised of deans and vice-deans of public-sector universities to review higher education systems in Pakistan and to recommend ways of improving their quality (GoP, 2006a; 2008a). The TFHE reviewed the impact of the past policies and plans for higher education and identified for the immediate attention of policy makers some crucial strategic recommendations that apply principally to universities (both public and private).
and are intended to bring about significant change by providing a solid platform for introducing additional reforms (GoP, 2006a; 2006b). In January 2002, the Task Force presented its recommendations to the Federal Minister of Education. The TFHE, consistent with the Education Sector Reforms of 2001, established the following vision statement:

Transformation of our institutions of higher education into world class seats of learning, equipped to foster high quality education, scholarship and research, to produce enlightened citizens with strong moral and ethical values that build a tolerant and pluralistic society rooted in the culture of Pakistan (GoP, 2002b, p. 9).

Following the publication of the TFHE report on the improvement of higher education in Pakistan, the Higher Education Commission (HEC) was established as an autonomous body attached to the Ministry of Education. The key feature of the Higher Education Commission (HEC) was the explicit adoption of a systems perspective (GoP, 2006a; HEC, 2005). This meant approaching the various institutions of education, research, funding, communication, publication and management, not as a set of isolated structures but as an integrated system. The HEC’s reform-oriented initiatives have, among other outcomes, mobilized a nation-wide community dedicated to the improvement of quality, access, equity and transparency in institutions of higher learning in the country (GoP, 2006a; GoP, 2008a). Consequently, various steps were taken at different levels to work towards higher education reform in the country, both at the policy-formulation level (rhetoric) and at the policy-implementation level (practice) (Ahsan, 2003; Saeed, 2007). The range of problems identified and their potential solutions are vast. A detailed overview of these reforms is presented in chapter three. During my yearly visits to Pakistan, I had the opportunity to meet with my former colleagues who are currently working as senior ministry officials. I discussed my research interest in change management – more specifically with respect to “resistance to change” – and I was encouraged by my colleagues to focus on the HEC initiatives. I was told that, despite good intentions and a clear and agreed-upon need for reforms in the higher education system, the HEC was struggling to achieve its mandated goals and the HEC officials were facing resistance from the target institutions (universities and colleges). In addition, some of the local newspapers drew my attention to this matter. For example, one of the university professors published an editorial in a local newspaper that stated, “HEC is setting into motion very dangerous, potentially catastrophic, systemic changes…. HEC reforms are set to make a bad situation worse rather than better…. Allowing these reforms to continue will destroy
what little there is today” (Hoodbhoy, 2005a, p. 8-9). Given the fact that HEC-initiated reforms were in their implementation phase, I decided to situate my study in the context of these reforms in order to study the dynamics of change. By using a qualitative approach to develop a more holistic understanding of the selected reforms, I focused on the factors that may induce individuals/groups to resist or avoid making changes and to devalue change in general. Conducting a qualitative study on change offers insights on some of the subtleties and nuances involved in developing reforms in general, and on the implementation and maintenance of strategies for specific reforms in particular.

**Research in Educational Change**

The body of knowledge on educational change has significantly expanded in the West during the last three decades (Fullan, 2006; Hargreaves, 2005a; 2005c; Sahlberg, 2006). According to Hargreaves & Goodson (2006), reforms in educational organizations have gone through three consecutive phases. The first phase up to the late 1970s was the age of optimism and innovation. Growing student populations and economic growth in this area promoted optimism about individual emancipation and technological enhancement through education. Educational reforms during this period were large scale and aimed to increase teachers’ professional autonomy and school improvement and innovations. The second phase up to the mid-1990s was an age of complexity and contradiction. Educational reforms that were focused on increasing external control of schools, inspections of teaching and learning, and evaluations and assessments led to an increase of regulations in schools but to a decrease in the autonomy of teachers. There was a need for inclusive approaches and for a shift in the emphasis to learning for all because the student population was becoming more diverse. The third phase from the mid-1990s to date is an age of standardization and marketization. Educational reforms have been designed based on centrally prescribed curricula, on learning standards monitored through intensive assessment and testing, and on increased competition between schools.

This existing body of change literature in the West, especially in Canada and the United States, has focused extensively on stages of educational changes, the responses of individuals to change initiatives, and the key strategies and processes to achieve change; however, it did not show the improvement that was expected to be created by ongoing educational-change efforts (Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006). Many change strategies have not proved to be sustainable and
most curriculum innovations have failed to progress beyond the stage of being formally adopted by schools (Fullan, 2006; Hargreaves, 2005a; 2005c; Sahlberg, 2006). Fullan (2003) argues that educational change is an ongoing and complex process, rather than a discrete event. The once-accepted idea of planning change and implementing reforms rationally in a linear way should be discredited because it does not take into account the specific contexts and conditions of the change. Due to the increasingly complex nature of large-scale educational reform efforts, which combine political, economic and technological developments in the attempt to change traditional cultural assumptions and educational practices, educational researchers and scholars (e.g., Broadfoot, 1997; Carson, 2006; Fullan, 2006; Hargreaves, 2005c) stress the need for a sophisticated understanding of the meaning of change in relation to particular political, cultural and ethnic contexts.

While the available literature on educational change constantly reminds us that it is too naive and unrealistic to expect educators to change their practices based on a particular prescribed plan or set of strategies, there has been little insight about the meaning that change has in the lives of those who are recipients of well-planned large-scale innovations (Carson, 2006). Despite the amount of research on change in Pakistan, the paradigm of Pakistani educational research is still dominated by positivist scientific logic, which mainly focuses on the external forces of change. It is not uncommon in Pakistan that research is merely a theoretical review based on existing literature and statistics provided by educational administrative offices. My intention was to contribute to the existing literature on educational change by exploring, analyzing and reflecting on the meaning, nature, causes and associated dynamics of change in higher education within a Pakistani cultural context through a qualitative approach.

**Research Objectives and Research Questions**

The overall research objectives of this study are: 1) to present and analyze the content and context of the particular change initiative that pertains to the study; 2) to investigate and understand the myriad ways in which change was experienced, conceptualized and perceived by the selected participants; 3) to identify the forces and influences that contributed to the development of resistant behaviour, and 4) to deepen understanding of this phenomenon within the Pakistani cultural context. During the course of this investigation, the following research questions guided the study:
1. How do the professors and administrators express their values, beliefs and attitudes regarding the change effort?
   a. Did he/she resist? If not, why not?
   b. Why did she/he resist and why does she/he think that other people resisted?
   c. How did the participants express their resistance or compliance?
2. What perceptions/circumstances obstruct administrators in bringing about change in their workplaces?
   a. What perceptions/circumstances play an important role in defining, facilitating and resisting the conditions that “ultimately” lead to systemic change?
   b. How are resistance mechanisms and strategies similar to, or different from, the various resistance constructs discussed in the literature?

**Research Paradigm and Methodology**

Understanding and effectively leading institutional change are central concerns for today’s academic leaders (Kezar, 2001). Analysis of change in organizations such as universities can draw on the generic literature on change management but, as Kezar (2005) suggested, a case study (or in this case a multiple case study) method of research provides a deeper view. Such an approach allows the study of structure, culture, institutional processes and history within unique institutional contexts (Kezar, 2005). The more that leaders of higher education can understand the process of change, the better positioned institutions will be to lead change initiatives efficiently and effectively (Ford, 2005; Fullan, 1991a; 1999; 2001a). As detailed in chapter four, the inquiry was qualitative in nature and was underpinned by a constructivist perspective. Within the constructivist paradigm, realities are considered to be “apprehendable in the form of multiple intangible mental constructions” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 10). The research process was inductive and was guided by relativist ontology (Lincoln & Guba, 2000), which assumes multiple, local, constructed and contingent realities.

As mentioned earlier, my prior work experience with the Ministry of Education and my teaching experience in one of Pakistan’s universities helped me gain access to the organizations in which research was conducted. Over a period of four months, I conducted semi-structured, open-ended interviews with 24 participants in total. Seventeen of the 24 interviews were audio
taped and those which were taped were transcribed for data analysis. To ensure accuracy, participants were asked via email to review transcripts and to provide changes and clarifications. Although interviews were the major source of data in this study, other sources were used to triangulate the interview findings. Documents related to HEC-initiated reforms included in this study were as follows: open forum minutes written during the implementation process; policy newsletters; evaluation notes on the unit-council meetings that are part of the change projects; available pre- and post-evaluation reports; follow-up implementation plans; and newspaper articles. Throughout the research, memos/field notes were used to record and collate the data into recognizable clusters, and to record my personal understandings on issues of resistance to change separately. This research design helped me to become more aware of my personal beliefs (my feelings, thoughts, difficulties and impressions) about the phenomenon (Merriam, 2002) while analyzing the data.

To organize and analyze my data, I used Merriam’s (1998) within-case and cross-case analysis and Creswell’s (1998) “data analysis spiral” techniques. Creswell discussed the “spiral of analysis,” whereby he begins with the gathering of data, moves into data management and the importance of writing, reading and reflecting, continues with the art of describing, classifying, interpreting, categorizing and comparing, and, finally, concludes with representing and visualizing the data. As detailed in chapter four, the visual concept of data analysis used for this study took the form of a spiral which is basically a representation of analytical circles that together form a complete spiral, with each loop in the spiral representing a stage in the analysis process. As we shall see in chapter five, multiple themes emerged that will make important contributions on the practical, theoretical, and methodological levels.

**Contributions of the Study**

In the Western world, especially in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom, there is a sizable literature that is devoted to the important issues of how to engender and sustain educational change, and this literature has built impressive theories. In part there is a gap between the developed world, where some of the ideas about educational change have been thrashed out, and the developing world, where people are working hard to bring about much-needed reforms but often without a theoretical framework. This study is an attempt to bring together theory and findings on educational-change initiatives and to apply them to the reality of
HEC-initiated reforms in order to see how theory and findings illuminate each other. By applying Western theoretical perspectives of organizational change to HEC-initiated reforms in Pakistan, I hoped to arrive at depersonalized findings on my key research questions, and to make recommendations about what circumstances might have to be in place if future educational-change initiatives in the Pakistani higher education sector are to bring positive and much-needed change. The design and implementation of effective reforms in developing countries constitute an important subject for research because many of the poorest citizens in these countries could greatly benefit from meaningful improvements in policies and programs (Isani, 2001; Isani & Virk, 2004; Mustafa, 2007b; Ullah, 2005). This study makes a contribution to the development of knowledge by situating the problems and challenges faced by both faculty and staff in Pakistan’s higher education systems within the global as well as the South Asian context. The qualitative nature of this research involves directly asking faculty members, staff and ministry officials about their perceptions of resistance and the impact of these perceptions on the successful implementation of reforms. I hope that this study will help in creating a better understanding among those who are directly or indirectly part of higher education in Pakistan.

This inquiry will assist educators to better understand change on practical, theoretical and methodological levels. First, this inquiry attempted to gain insight into resistance experiences from the perspective of implementation-level employees in order to enable practitioners to refine their practices and make institutional reforms more meaningful. For those engaged in the implementation of planned educational reforms, this study should help to identify reasonable and realistic strategies and expectations to build acceptance in a dynamic world of change. Second, this study contributes to the body of literature available on planned educational reforms in the higher education sector within the Pakistani context. I aimed to illuminate some of the systemic issues and factors associated with planned transformational change and associated resistance for further research. Since change continues to be complex and multi-dimensional, there are questions to be explored within this framework of complexity (Hunt, Bromage, & Tomkinson, 2006). And, since change has been characterized as problematic and needing more context-based studies, the study of a change initiative would be of value (Kezar, 2001).

Third, by adopting a qualitative approach, this inquiry took a different approach towards investigating resistance to change and moved away from the positivist paradigms that currently dominate the scholarly literature in the region. Finally, the study informs the research locale. By
creating an awareness of what works and what does not work, not only will educational planners be in a better position to avoid the mistakes of the past, but they also be better able to set themselves up to be successful in comprehending how things will actually work in the future (Rowley & Sherman, 2001). Since we know that change is inevitable, it follows that tools to assess problems and challenges will be of substantial value. Lessons learned may provide the foundation upon which other initiatives involving change can be built (Ricard, 2000).

**Assumptions**

There were a few assumptions of which I was aware during the process of research. First, the participants, who were all highly qualified individuals, understood and properly interpreted the questions, intent and exploratory nature of the study. Second, each participant responded with honesty. Third, the participants were familiar with their respective organizational context, decision-making processes and professional expectations (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Mok, 2001).

**Limitations of the Study**

In qualitative research it is important to prevent personal biases or issues of subjectivity from influencing the research (Peshkin, 2000). Finding meaning can be particularly problematic if the researcher is set on looking for something in particular. I am not aware of any overt personal biases that may have influenced this study. I kept a reflective journal where I consistently questioned my techniques, motives and findings in order to avoid overweighting facts or confirming instances far more easily than questioning them (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

There were, however, a number of limitations to this study. First, even though I tried to recruit participants from all administrative departments and from as many faculties as possible, the selected sample was not representative of all the faculty and administrators in Pakistani universities and the HEC. Second, as the institutional culture in all organizations is different, the results of this study might not be representative of other universities. Indeed, the reader may find similarities and differences based on the particular context in which they are working, and may apply the pertinent findings accordingly. Third, some may see the fact that the researcher previously served as an administrator with the Ministry of Education as a considerable limitation. This concern may lead to other concerns associated with doing “backyard research” (Glesne,
Fourth, in relation to sampling technique, I used a purposive sample followed by a snowball design to locate additional participants; therefore, the sample was not randomized. As in all contextual research, this study intended to provide beginning points from which further research could be drawn, and therefore offered information rich in detail that could not be obtained through the use of a randomized sample.

Fifth, another significant limitation of this study occurred during the data-collection process; the trustworthiness of this research relies exclusively on the credibility of the participants’ descriptions of their experiences. The data are only as accurate to the extent that the participants have the ability to remember past situations and to the extent that they were willing to talk about their experiences. There is a possibility that some respondents may have forgotten key aspects of the initiation and implementation process or that some key documents are no longer available. Nevertheless, the participants’ relative longevity in selected organizations had made them very familiar with the reform initiatives in question. Triangulation of data also enabled me to mitigate this problem. In addition, at the beginning of interviews I asked more general questions about the HEC and its role in the higher education sector, but later I limited the questions to the types of HEC-implemented reforms with which the participants had had work experience. Some interviewees gave me very brief responses that gave me almost nothing to work with. This was mostly the case with the senior administrative staff in both universities.

Sixth, another limitation was related to the documents reviewed for this research. Most of the policy documents and pre- and post-evaluation reports reviewed for this inquiry used specialized statements and jargon intended to appeal to specific groups of stakeholders (i.e. members of boards of directors, policy makers and, in a few cases, the President of Pakistan). The views of the university faculty and staff members were almost non-existent in those documents. As a result of the decision to examine policy documents intended for a limited audience and purpose, this study might not reveal some of the consistencies and inconsistencies in people’s perceptions. Seventh, another source of apprehension could be the fact that the study was done in a fixed period of time. People’s perspectives are not fixed (Merriam, 2001). Consequently, some might advocate a longitudinal study that has the potential to provide a more illuminating approach to study topics involving human perceptions and experiences. The analysis presented does not take into account participants’ prior work experiences elsewhere. Lastly, the results of this study may be affected by the length of time that has passed since the original
implementation of the HEC-initiated reforms on the one hand and the gathering of research data concerning individual perceptions and the acceptance of the implementation-change process on the other hand.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

There are seven chapters in this dissertation. This first chapter offers an introduction to the focus of this research. It highlights the context of the reforms, and outlines the research questions and the methodology and methods that guided the study. It also briefly identifies the significance and limitations of the research. The second chapter comprises two sections. The first section reviews the relevant literature in the field of resistance to organizational change which laid the foundation for this study. The second section provides a detailed description of the conceptual framework used for this study. The third chapter describes the following: the education system in Pakistan; the context of reforms in higher education in Pakistan; selected reform initiatives; and research sites and participants. The fourth chapter outlines in detail the research design and methodological procedures that guided the study. This chapter also outlines the research methods employed in this study and the forms of data analysis used. The fifth chapter presents and analyzes major findings. The analysis is organized according to the perceptions of the participants about the educational reforms, the implementation processes and the resulting outcomes. The sixth chapter synthesizes the interpretations into a unified whole and discusses the overall results. The seventh chapter presents the conclusion and implications of the study, along with personal and methodological reflections as well as recommendations for further inquiry. Implications of the study are discussed for policy and practice, and future directions for research are suggested.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In order to develop a comprehensive understanding of the impact that reforms and the resistance to them can have on organizations and employees, it is crucial to review the relevant Western and Eastern literature that helped me in conceptualizing this research. Over the last few decades, there have been vast changes in the world of work (Akmal & Miller, 2003; Edwin, 2008; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Rapidly changing conditions in global and local markets, along with increased competition, economic factors, government regulations and cultural forces, have prompted a significant rate of organizational change (Fullan, 1999; 2001b; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1999; Winum, Ryterband & Stephenson, 1997). Striving to reinforce and sustain their competitive advantage, organizations are reorganizing, downsizing, innovating and implementing initiatives at a rapid pace (Wanberg & Banas, 2000). The phenomenon of change is expected to continue to accelerate and to become more complex in the future (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). As Apps (1994) warns, change swirls around organizations and their leaders, and it is likely to increase in intensity, complexity and ambiguity. Since change is inevitable, it is important to study the change process and its components in order to understand it better (Barnett, 2005).

Theories of Organizational Change Management

Prominent researchers in education have proposed several change process models (Edwin, 2008; Ellsworth, 2000; Fullan, 1991a; 1999; 2001a; Hargreaves, 2005a; 2005c). As we move through the second decade of the new millennium, change theorists continue looking for a more inclusive theory and more sophisticated strategies for change agents to utilize as they encounter more complex cultures of change in the twenty-first century. In order to represent the unique ways in which Fullan defines educational change, it is necessary to describe and analyze other scholars’ change models including: Wheatley’s (1992) chaos theory; Senge’s (1992) learning organizations; Rogers’ (1983) classical theory of innovation; Hall & Hord’s (1987) Concerns-Based Adoption Model, Ely’s (1990) conditions of change, Van de Ven & Poole’s (1995) four ideal types; Havelock & Zlotolow’s (1995) change process; and Zaltman & Duncan’s (1977) resistance to change. I will explain their main tenets and their relevance to my work in subsequent pages. Over the past few decades, management literature has evolved from rational theories that have focused on efficiency and the alignment of systems, to theories that
seek to explain dynamic complexity (Senge, 1990). The following discussion of management theories provides a basis for understanding their influence on policies for educational change.

There is broad agreement in the management literature (e.g., Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993; Owens, 1998; Porter-O’Grady, 1992a; 1992b; Quinn, Kahn & Manhl, 1994; Schmidt & White, 2004) that Taylor (scientific management), Fayol (administration) and Weber (ideal bureaucracy) were the leading organizational theorists in the 1920s. Their ideas stressed efficiency, productivity, rationality, security, impersonality, formal role relationships and vertical hierarchy with managers as sole custodians of their subordinates. These traditional theorists advocated the hierarchical structures and generally prescribed traditional management practices for success. Not surprisingly, competing ideas gradually challenged these classical concepts of management and administration. Some of the critics included Deming who introduced the idea of total quality management in the 1950s. The 1990s began an era of trying to equate organizations with living systems that survive in direct proportion to their capacity to learn and adapt, rather than of comparing organizations to machines described by the simple linear models of the early twentieth century. The scientific revolution of chaos and complexity theory changed the prevailing thinking about organizational change. In between rational theories and complexity theories, however, are the transitional or bridge theories of learning organizations and systems thinking (Holmberg, 1995).

Wheatley in his 1992 work described chaos theory and the ways in which organizations move from chaos to order when undergoing major change by using examples from physics and biology. Wheatley’s work was followed by Hammer & Champy (1993) who used the term reengineering to describe organizational change. The dynamic-systems paradigm has resonated with the scientific definition of chaos that “…is not disorder, but a process in which contradictions and complexities play themselves out coalescing into clusters” (Fullan, 1993, p. 18). Mintzberg & Lampel (1999) have suggested that organizational researchers not fall headlong into “declaring chaos theory the source of truth”; rather, they have called for management as a field to “seek an understanding of its own evolution” (p. 28). Senge’s (1990) work introduced organizational learning as the central factor in the ability of an organization to respond to change. Senge often has been credited with equating learning organizations with systems thinking. In spite of early writings and the extensive literature that has evolved regarding change management, one thing that these scholars share is the fact that they all describe the
change process in terms of stages or phases (e.g., Kanter et al., 1992; Kotter, 1996; 2007; Rogers, 1995). Most of the change-management studies are primarily based upon Lewin (1951), who argued that the process of change involved three basic phases: unfreezing, changing and refreezing. Unfreezing begins when a need is felt for some sort of revolution or adjustment within an organization. Change occurs when a real adjustment or revolution is actually being implemented. Refreezing occurs after the new initiative has become part of an organization.

What is useful about this framework is the fact that it gives rise to thinking about a practical and procedural approach to the change implementation process. Lewin essentially advised that, in order to implement change, organizations first should unfreeze the target group by preparing it for the change, then should implement the change affecting that target group and, finally, should refreeze the target group with the change in place. Lewin’s (1951) three phases of change remain the basis and starting point for the bulk of the scholarly thinking about change, such as Bridges’ (2004) three critical phases in any transformation (an ending, a neutral zone and a new beginning); Beeson & Davis’s (2000) systems-based theory; Brower & Abolafia’s (1995) structural model; Goodlad’s (1999) concept of educational renewal; and Fullan’s (1982) change implementation model of adoption, implementation and institutionalization/continuation.

Rogers (1983), in defining his classical theory of innovation, explains that social change is caused by both invention and diffusion, which usually occur sequentially. Diffusion is defined as “the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system” (p. 5). There are four elements in the diffusion of innovations. These are the innovation itself, communications channels, time and the social system. Innovation is defined as “an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption” (p. 11). Two important dimensions of the innovation are uncertainty and information. Innovations have five characteristics. The first one is relative advantage, which is defined as the “degree to which an innovation is perceived as better than the idea it supersedes” (p. 15). The second one is compatibility, which indicates the “degree to which an innovation is perceived as being consistent with the existing value, past experiences, and needs of potential adopters” (p. 15). The third one is complexity, which refers to the “degree to which an innovation is perceived as difficult to understand and use” (p. 15). The fourth one is trialability, which is the “degree to which an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis” (p. 15). The fifth and last characteristic is observability, which is the “degree to which the
results of an innovation are visible to others” (p. 16). Along with these characteristics is the concept of re-invention or the “degree to which an innovation is changed or modified by a user in the process of its adoption and implementation” (p. 17). The key point here is that innovations are not invariant, as Rogers (1983) succinctly states: “… adopting an innovation is not necessarily a passive role of just implementing a standard template of the new idea” (p. 17).

Communication channels, the second element of diffusion, refer to those “…means by which messages get from one individual to another” (p. 17). Important principles related to communication channels are homophily and heterophily. Homophily refers to the “degree to which pairs of individuals who interact are similar in certain attributes, such as beliefs, education, social status and the like” (p. 18), while heterophily refers to the degree to which these attributes are different. Even though “more effective communication occurs when two individuals are homophilus” (p. 19), the problem is that “in the communication of innovations the participants are usually quite heterophilous” (p. 19). In addition, “A change agent, for instance, is more technically competent than his clients” (p. 19). This difference can lead to a breakdown in communication. However, the nature of diffusion is such that it implies the necessity of communication and hence at least some degree of heterophily. Time, the third element of diffusion, involves three aspects. These are as follows: “(1) the innovative-decision process by which an individual passes from first knowledge of an innovation through its adoption or rejection, (2) in the innovativeness of an individual or other unit of adoption and (3) in an innovation’s rate of adoption in a system…” (p. 20). The innovative-decision process consists of five phases: knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation and confirmation. Innovativeness classifies adopters in five categories: innovators (venturesome), early adopters (respectable), early majority (deliberate), late majority (skeptical) and laggards (traditional). A third and final way in which time affects the diffusion process is the rate of adoption. This is defined as “the relative speed with which an innovation is adopted by members of a social system” (p. 23).

The fourth and final element of diffusion is the social system. This is a “set of interrelated units that are engaged in joint problem solving to accomplish a common goal” (p. 24). Important elements of the social system are the impact of the social structure, the role of norms, and emergence of opinion leaders and change agents. Rogers defines the change agent as “an individual who influences clients’ innovation decisions in a direction deemed desirable by a
change agency” (p. 312). Rogers added that in most situations “a change agent seeks to secure the adoption of new ideas, but he or she may also attempt to slow the diffusion process and prevent the adoption of certain innovations” (p. 312). Rogers (1983) suggested that change agents should fulfill evolving roles when introducing a single innovation. They should “develop need for change; establish an information exchange relationship; diagnose their [clients’] problems; create intent to change in the client; translate intent into action; stabilize adoption; and prevent discontinuances and achieve a terminal relationship” (pp. 315-316). In order to be successful, change agents must attend to the following factors: making a true effort to communicate, acquiring a client orientation while representing the change agency, acting with a client-needs mindset and focus, and having empathy for the clients. In addition, Rogers (1983) states that the role of the change agent in ensuring that innovations are successfully implemented is positively related to “credibility in the clients’ eyes” (p. 329); “homophily with clients” (p. 324); “the extent that he or she works through opinion leaders” (p. 331); and “increasing clients’ ability to evaluate innovations” (pp. 332-333).

Rogers (1983) mentions three types of innovation decisions. They include optional innovation decisions defined as “choices to adopt or reject an innovation that are made by an individual independent of the decisions of other members of the system” (p. 29); collective innovation decisions defined as “choices to adopt or reject an innovation that are made by consensus among the members of a system” (p. 29); and authority innovation decisions defined as “choices to adopt or reject an innovation that are made by a relatively few individuals in a system who possess power, status, or technical expertise” (p. 30). Innovations have consequences. Rogers (1983) defined these as “the changes that occur to an individual or to a social system as a result of the adoption or rejection of an innovation” (p. 31). Consequences can be classified as “desirable versus undesirable; direct versus indirect; and anticipated versus unanticipated” (pp. 31-32).

Hall & Hord’s (1987) educational change model, the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), focuses on the intended users. This model is guided by seven notions. The first notion involves understanding the point of view of the participants in the change process. They are emphasized to ensure that the perceptions and expectations of clients as well as those of facilitators not be neglected. In their second notion, they considered “change a process, not an event” (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 8) because there are steps and phases that one must go through in
the process of implementing innovations. The third notion involves the possibility “to anticipate much that will occur during a change process” (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 9). Change facilitators should not be surprised by unexpected events and happenings if they do adequate planning. Their fourth notion was that “innovations come in all sizes and shapes” (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 9) and can be product or process based. In making their fifth assumption, they equated innovation and implementation as “two sides of the change process coin” (Hall & Hord, 1987, pp. 9-10). According to them, procedures and steps for both innovation development and implementation must be carefully taken into account. Their sixth idea was that “to change something, someone has to change first” (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 10). The ultimate gatekeeper is the user or the adopter and innovator – the person who is receiving and implementing the innovation. Their last idea was the proposition that “Everyone can be a change facilitator” (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 10). Moreover, “The facilitator’s job is to facilitate, which means to assist others in ways relevant to their concerns so that they become more effective and skilled in using new programs and procedures” (p. 11). Change facilitation is a process that must be played by all actors involved in it.

There are four dimensions of the CBAM model: stages of concern, levels of use, innovation configurations and intervention taxonomy. The first component of the CBAM model, stages of concern, is primarily concerned with the teachers’ point of view. It “describes the feelings, perspectives, and attitudes of individuals as they consider, approach, and implement use of an innovation. ‘Stages of concern,’ about the innovation move from early self-oriented concerns, to task-oriented concerns, and ultimately to impact-oriented concerns” (p. 204). Hall & Hord (1987) further illustrated seven stages of concern and in each stage focus shifts among different aspects of the innovation. Those stages are: awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration and refocusing. The second component of the CBAM model, levels of use, is primarily concerned with whether the innovation itself is being used and, if so, to what extent. Hall & Hord (1987) further illustrated multiple levels of use: non-use; Decision Point A I Orientation; Decision Point B II Preparation; Decision Point C III Mechanical Use; Decision Point D-I Routine; Decision Point D-II Refinement; and Decision Point E. During this last level, changes are initiated based on input of and in coordination with what has been done by others involved. The third dimension of the CBAM model, innovation configurations, is primarily concerned with defining the innovation itself or with separating and identifying the
aspects that are important for implementation. The focus here is the variation found among the user’s implementation of innovations. This dimension acknowledges that implementation of an innovation depends heavily on the components, skills, goals and attributes that users choose to consider. An innovation configuration component checklist is developed in order to determine which elements are critical and which are related. The innovation configuration checklist is also used to inquire about what the users (teachers) are doing as well as to observe a classroom in order to detect critical innovation components. The fourth dimension of the CBAM model, intervention taxonomy, is primarily concerned with the change facilitator’s responsibility to intervene, on the basis of the assessment already conducted, in order to ameliorate those aspects of the change process that contribute to the success or failure of change attempts. The change facilitator is called upon to provide strategies that will help the users (teachers, etc.). Hall & Hord (1987) also emphasize “developing supportive organizational arrangements; training; providing consultation and reinforcement; monitoring and evaluation and external communication” (pp. 202-203). Their conceptual framework of interventions provides the change facilitator the opportunity to analyze the change process, to predict or anticipate problems endemic in the change process and to plan for ways to deal with imminent barriers.

The focus of Ely’s (1990) educational change model, Conditions for Change, is on the environmental conditions that promote and/or inhibit change. Ely’s educational change model consists of eight conditions that help the adoption, implementation and institutionalization of educational technology innovations. These include the following: “dissatisfaction with the status quo; knowledge and skills exist; resources are available; time is available, rewards or incentives exist for participants, participation is expected and encouraged; commitment by those who are involved and evidence of leadership” (Ely, 1990, pp. 300-302). Ely (1990) describes the first condition, *dissatisfaction with the status quo*, by saying, “Something is not right. Things could be better. Others are moving ahead; we are standing still. There must be something we can do to improve” (p. 300). Ely pointed that there might be multiple sources of dissatisfaction. Ely (1990) describes his second condition, *knowledge and skills exist*, by saying, “The people who will ultimately implement any innovation must possess sufficient knowledge and skills to do the job” (p. 300). Ely (1990) describes the third condition, *resources are available*, by saying, “The things that are needed to make the innovation work should be easily accessible. This condition is probably most self-evident of all” (p. 300). Ely (1990) describes the fourth condition, *time is
available, by saying, “Implementers must have time to learn, adapt, integrate, and reflect on what they are doing. Time is often considered to be a resource, and indeed it is” (p. 300). Ely (1990) cites Miles, Ekholm & Van den Burghe (1987) in describing his fifth condition, rewards or incentives exist for participants, by saying,

There must be sufficient reason to consider change and that is where incentives play an important role (Miles, Ekholm & Van den Burghe, 1987). Incentives vary for individuals. For some it may be new and more teaching materials. For others it may be personnel assistance – an assistant or secretarial help, while some people are satisfied by new experiences that offer relief from current routines. Whatever the reward, intrinsic or extrinsic, it should be there in some form (p. 301).

Ely (1990) describes this sixth condition, participation is expected and encouraged, by saying, “This means shared decision making, communication among all parties involved, and representation where individual participation is difficult. It seems obvious that individuals should be involved in decisions that directly affect their lives. However, in education, decisions are often made by others and handed down for implementation” (p. 301). The seventh condition is commitment by those who are involved, which Ely (1990) describes by saying, “An unqualified go-ahead and vocal support for the innovation by key players and other stakeholders is necessary. Commitment occurs at all levels” (p. 301). The eighth and the final condition is evidence of leadership, which Ely (1990) describes by saying, “Two-pronged leadership is necessary: (a) by the executive officer of the organization and (b) by the project leader who is more closely involved in day-to-day activities” (p. 302).

Van de Ven & Poole’s (1995) four ideal types – life-cycle, teleological, dialectical and evolutionary theories of change – provide internally consistent accounts of change processes in organizational entities. The life-cycle theory of change depicts the process of change in an organizational entity as progressing through a necessary sequence of stages from its initiation to its termination. The teleological theory of change assumes that development proceeds in the direction of a goal or end-state. In contrast to the life-cycle theory of change, “teleology does not prescribe a necessary sequence of events or specify which trajectory development will follow… but a cycle of goal formulation, implementation, evaluation, and modification of goals on the basis of what was learned by the entity” (Poole et al., 2000, p. 61). Once an entity attains its goals, it does not follow that the entity stays in permanent equilibrium. Goals are considered to
be socially reconstructed and enacted based on past actions. The *dialectical theory of change* explains

...stability and change by reference to the relative balance of power between opposing entities. Stability is produced through struggles and accommodations that maintain the status quo between oppositions. Change occurs when these opposing values, forces, or events gain sufficient power to confront and engage the status quo (Poole et al., 2000, p. 63).

According to the *evolutionary theory of change*, change proceeds “through a continuous rotation of variation, selection, and retention” (Poole et al., 2000, p. 63). Thus, the evolutionary theory explains change as a recurrent, cumulative and evolving process (Francesco & Gold, 1998; Pool et al., 2000; Proehl, 2001; Sullivan, Barnes & Matka, 2002).

Havelock & Zlotolow (1995) present the change process as consisting of seven stages. This model is known as the C-R-E-A-T-E-R model. The seven stages to consider are: care, relate, examine, acquire, try, extend and renew. Havelock & Zlotolow (1995) state that their model is one that is circular this time, as opposed to linear. The first stage, care, is identified as stage “zero” because it represents “… the rock bottom prerequisite for a change, often taken by granted…” (p. 6). The change agent in this stage must be fully alert regarding two aspects. One consists of the four circumstances under which the change agent may be aware of the system wanting to change: when everything seems fine; when widely different concerns are held throughout the system; when the expressed concerns appear to be symptoms of another unstated concern and when concerns are extremely intense (Havelock & Zlotolow, 1995, pp. 55-57). The other aspect includes ethical obligations. Since the change agent will encounter considerable discrepancy between his or her assigned duties and the reality of his or her clients, he or she is called to strike a balance between the risk of harm that can be caused by the gap and the feedback and consent that must be obtained in order to continue in his or her functions. During stage two, relating, which is described as the period which focuses on “building relationships” (Havelock & Zlotolow, 1995, p. 59), the change agent is expected to become familiar with the norms that govern the system by building a team that is more likely to help in the change effort. The function of the change agent in this stage is two-fold: to build and maintain relationships and to facilitate collaboration among clients. Havelock & Zlotolow (1995) provided a checklist of aspects that serve to signal the ideal client relationship. These include: reciprocity, openness,
realistic expectations, structure, equal power, minimum threat, confrontation of differences and involvement of all relevant parties (pp. 73-76).

In stage three, examine, the client is treated as the patient. When engaged in diagnosis, the change agent should identify the problems and potential opportunities and examine the weaknesses, obstacles, strengths and opportunities within that particular context. Havelock & Zlotolow (1995) advise the change agent to be extremely careful for he or she may fall into five traps: “analysis/paralysis, avoidance or denial, destructive confrontation, house diagnosis and fire fighting” (pp. 86-88). They suggested that change agents should diagnose by formulating questions regarding the system’s goals, structure, openness (in communication), necessary capacities and rewards (Havelock & Zlotolow, 1995). Stage four, acquire, is about “seeking and finding relevant resources, which may be as diverse as electronic or print materials, people, or products” (Havelock & Zlotolow, 1995, p. 91). There are seven purposes for acquiring resources in support of change: diagnosis, awareness, evaluation before trial, trial, evaluation after trial, installation and maintenance. Havelock & Zlotolow’s resource-acquisition strategy includes a number of activities that can be pursued: using the client representative who contacted you as a source; using other key sources within the system, especially those representing key factions, perspectives or interest groups; interviewing an assembled group representing all key stakeholders; and observing key stakeholders “in action” in the client system (pp. 96-98). For each of these actions, it is recommended that the change agent listens, reflects and inquires.

In order to acquire valid information regarding a particular diagnosis, the change agent can do the following: observe and measure system outputs; organize a self-diagnostic workshop for representatives of all key stakeholders in the client system; engage the services of an external diagnostic research team; and use a collaborative internal/external team to design, conduct a contextual self-diagnosis and analyze data from continuous diagnostic monitoring activities (Havelock & Zlotolow, 1995, pp. 99-100). Once the diagnosis has been made, the change agent’s work is to build and maintain awareness. The change agent builds awareness by experience, and maintains awareness by reading the literature and/or using mass media. In order to decide whether to implement or not, a process that Havelock & Zlotolow (1995) called “honing in,” a six-step process sequence is recommended: (1) obtain an overview of the problem(s) and solution(s) from a comprehensive, written source; (2) obtain a similar overview from at least one person who has had direct experience with the problem(s) and/or solution(s); (3) observe the
innovation in a concrete or “live” form; (4) obtain evaluative data from an objective source, if possible, or from at least two persons, representing different perspectives, who have had direct experience; (5) obtain the innovation for trial; and (6) acquire or develop a framework for evaluating its results before actually conducting the trial (pp. 102-105).

Stage five, try, consists of a six-step process. These are: (1) assemble and sort the relevant findings from the acquire stage; (2) derive implications from the knowledge base that affect the client system and its objectives or circumstances; (3) generate a range of solution ideas based on the possible solutions identified in previous stages and on the unique needs, strengths and limitations of this change effort in these circumstances; (4) test feasibilities; (5) adapt the remaining solution(s) to the unique characteristics and needs of the client system; and (6) act (choose one or, in some cases, more than one solution). Pilot testing and evaluation of results to arrive at a decision are recommended (Havelock & Zlotolow, 1995, pp. 109-110). Stage six, extend, is described as the period for “gaining deeper and wider acceptance” (p. 125). The extend stage is divided into five sections: (1) how individuals accept innovations; (2) how groups accept innovations; (3) strategies for solidifying adoption; (4) strategies for diffusion to a wide audience; and (5) strategies for flexibility during implementation (p. 125). Havelock & Zlotolow (1995) suggested that this can be accomplished by the employment of the following techniques: continuing rewards, practice and routine, structural integration into the system, continuing evaluation, maintenance and adaptation capability (pp. 139-141).

The final stage, renew, calls for the change agent to put together a team of all stakeholders for an after-action review to do an evaluation of the entire change cycle. Havelock & Zlotolow (1995) state that this evaluation process should seek to respond to the following questions: What resources were devoted to this stage?; Were these resources adequate?; Was this stage successful in meeting its stated objectives?; What could we have done to make it better or more successful?; and Would a better plan or process have improved the outcome? (p. 152). Six recommendations are provided in order for the change effort to continue beyond the presence of the change agent: (1) having new internal members; (2) adapting to changes in the local environment; (3) expanding the definition of the client; (4) re-evaluating the nature of the concern in light of what has happened (experience); (5) checking on the availability of new resources or knowledge; and (6) remaining open to further adaptation or repackaging of the innovation (pp. 155-156). This process needs four critical elements: positive attitudes; internal
members who are capable of facilitating constructive change; a paradigm that values seeking external information; and a view that looks at the future as something that can and should be planned (p. 156). This self-renewal process will be institutionalized if clients are committed to renewing the authority or sanction for the change process under internal ownership; if continuing resources are guaranteed; and if new roles of change agents, as well as the inter-relationships that result, become accepted and legitimized (Havelock & Zlotolow, 1995, pp. 159-162). Once self-renewal is established, the organization is then ready for more fundamental and transformational change. Havelock & Zlotolow (1995) remind us that stage six “...is an end point and a new beginning and a whole new series of stages all rolled into one” (p. 168).

Zaltman & Duncan’s (1977) educational change model focuses on resistance to change. They defined resistance as “any conduct that serves to maintain the status quo in the face of pressure to alter the status quo” (p. 63). According to them, resistance can come from four sources: cultural, social, organizational and psychological barriers. Cultural barriers to educational change are cultural values and beliefs, cultural ethnocentrism, religious ideologies, saving face and incompatibility of a cultural trait with change. Social barriers to educational change are group solidarity, rejection of outsiders, conformity to norms, conflict and group insight. Organizational barriers to educational change include: threats to power and influence; organizational structure; behaviour of top-level administrators; climate for change in the organization; and the absence of technological skills. Psychological barriers to educational change are perception, homeostasis, conformity and commitment, and personality factors. People might reject the adoption of a new innovation because of any of the barriers listed above.

The definitions and perspectives described above represent ways of describing and classifying educational reform and change. At best, researchers and theorists have attempted to describe the nature and complexity of changes. The theories described above directly and explicitly indicate the notion of a paradigm shift. Fullan’s (1991) groundbreaking work The New Meaning of Educational Change is an integral component of this paradigmatic revolution about education innovation, reform and change. Fullan stated that educational innovators should attend to implementation as a process, rather than as a mere event. What distinguishes Fullan’s scholarship on educational change from the change process strategies mentioned in the above-mentioned models is the fact that it is centered on the concept of the “stakeholder as change agent.” Its aim is to explore the sources and meanings of educational change, as well as
the causes and processes of initiation, implementation and continuation, in addition to ways of planning, doing and coping with change. More specifically, it is about demonstrating that rationally planned strategies are not rational when it comes to dealing with people and the problem of meaning (Fullan 1991a; 1999; 2001a; 2001b). This neglected area of process was first identified by the organizational-change scholars Tannenbaum and Hanna in 1985 who, after an investigation of the topic, stated that “very little, if any attention has been given to the working through of the potent needs of human systems to hold on to existing order…to that which is… and to avoid the powerful feelings that changed circumstances can trigger” (Tannenbaum & Hanna, 1985, p. 99). They conclude that deeply felt experiences such as shock, frustration, anger, helplessness and depression have been largely ignored.

Since the 1980s, Fullan has explored what educational change means from the perspectives of the various human participants in the process: teacher, principal, students, district administrator, consultant and parent, and the community. As Fullan & Stiegelbauer (1991) declared, “School improvement is related not just to what the teachers do and think. Equally important is what those around them at the school, district, provincial/state, and federal levels do” (p. 143). Fullan’s scholarship focuses on the meanings that different stakeholders bring to the educational change process. It is about the perspectives of the participants. This is what makes this model unique. I will explain his works later in this chapter under the heading theoretical framework.

**Why Educational Reforms Fail**

Current Western and Eastern research maintains that some of the obvious reasons for the lack of change in high schools include: bureaucratic complexity of institutions; the rapid, numerous and often contradictory waves of imposed reform (Baraldi, 2010; Chapman, 2000; Diefenbach & Klarner, 2008; Hargreaves, 2003; Herold et al., 2007; Nazir, 2010; Sarason, 1990); poor implementation of reforms (Baraldi, 2010; Datnow, Hubbard & Mehan, 2002); high leadership and staff turnover rates before reforms can be inculcated into the culture (Baraldi, 2010; Basu, 2006; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Madhani, 2007); and lack of system thinking (Fullan, 2007a; Sarason, 1990). Educators are often not given the time, resources and professional development to build the capacity to achieve desired outcomes. This is especially the case in large-scale reforms with compulsory standards and high pressure for compliance.
Until the preconditions for reform are in place and there is a fundamental investment in and restructuring of teachers’ work (Gitlin, 1995) so that they are given the time, opportunities and training to make well-considered choices for their own schools and students, it is likely that schools will continue to be intractable to change. Literature on cultural perspective addresses the human side of change, such as habits, meanings and perspectives and how they relate to factors such as age, generation gaps and years of teaching experience. Fullan (2001b) states that “We have become so accustomed to the presence of change that we rarely stop to think what change really means as we are experiencing it at the personal level. The crux of change is how individuals come to grips with (the) reality” (p. 29). He distinguishes, then, between the subjective meaning of change for individuals in schools, and the objective description of the process of change. Fullan (2001b) argues that you cannot achieve “context-specific” expertise exclusively from the outside. Rather, internal commitment and ingenuity by professionals who learn to do the right thing over and over again in the face of constant internal and external change forces creates a flexible, interactive bond. This living, growing, organic cluster gradually fuses ranks as a learning community. The cultural perspective “…rests on an image of community. Central concepts include culture, values, shared meanings, and social relationships… the primary concern is cultural integrity” (House & McQuillan, 1998, p. 198). Many reasons for the lack of change in organizations are cultural, such as the experiences of the members, generational resistance to change (Hargreaves, 1994), comfort with the status quo and commitment to established norms. Little & McLaughlin (1994) made similar findings in their research on teachers’ workplaces (as cited in Little, 1996). Teachers who worked in places with “powerful norms of privacy and unchallenged sacred principles or personal beliefs” (Little, 1996, p. 99) never received the critical feedback and introduction to new ideas and practices necessary to renew and reflect upon their teaching. Their learning reached a plateau and their practice continued unchanged and unchallenged for many years. These teachers also tended to become angry and cynical towards new ideas since their norms were so ingrained in their classrooms.

In addition to the cultural side of maintaining the comfort and conventions of institutions, there is additional political pressure to preserve and revert to existing structures. The political perspective entails negotiation, group conflict and compromise, power and authority, and conflict over interests (House & McQuillan, 1998). The key concepts to consider in the political perspective include “power, authority, and competing interests…and the primary concern the
legitimacy of the authority system” (House & McQuillan, 1998, p. 198). According to House & McQuillan (1998), reformers who interpret educational change and reform in a school or system from the political perspective may frame problems or successes as an issue of centralization or decentralization. As the authors point out, reformers may have a consensus that an issue is political, but they may disagree on a course of action. Political reasons, such as prior assumptions and beliefs, defense of unearned privilege and the ignored realities of unfair advantages among the nations’ schools (Herold et al., 2007; Lareau & Horvat, 1999; Oakes & Lipton, 2002), all contribute to the lack of change in schools. Schools encounter macro-political issues such as state-imposed standardization mandates and micro-political issues such as internal power struggles between departments, administrators and teachers. These internal and external power struggles add to the complexity of implementing change and reform in schools. Although the implementation of a reform program is technical, the reform and its anticipated result are often politically motivated with the purpose of either maintaining or challenging existing structures (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Sergiovanni, 2000; Nazir, 2010). House & McQuillan (1998) explain that school reforms fail in part because they ignore, neglect or are unable to control forces related to all three perspectives. Indeed, “purely technological reforms fail because they lack adequate consideration of political and cultural factors. Purely political reforms fail because they lack appreciation of technical and cultural factors, and so on” (p. 199). They explain that reformers want to create broad appeal for reform efforts and are thus inclined to impart simplistic and one-dimensional views of complex problems.

Recent research (e.g., Hargreaves & Goodson, 2003; 2006) on educational change suggests that lasting and achievable change is difficult to achieve for a myriad of reasons. Structural, emotional, political and personal factors all play a role. The difficulty of change can be structural because of multiple factors such as: borrowed change models; employees’ difficulty and frustration with the rhetoric of improvement; the size of the organization; the complexity of the institutional culture; and lack of internal consistency and consensus among stakeholders. Part of the difficulty of change implementation is emotional. Reform requires more than just physical labour and technical know-how from those implementing it. It demands emotional labour that draws on and utilizes different resources and different modes of coping (Hochschild, 2003). Another difficulty of reform is political, especially at the institutional level which is called micro-politics. Micro-politics explores the daily realities of teachers in schools: their search for
the materials, resources and relationships that will maintain and sustain their professional and personal lives in the classroom (Blasé & Anderson, 1995). Kelchtermans & Ballet (2002) argue that teachers learn the micro-politics of the school in order to protect their selves, materials, and organizational, cultural-ideological and social-professional interests. In order to protect these interests, teachers will resort to “talking, pleading, arguing, gossiping, flattering, being silent and avoiding comments, avoiding taking sides, accepting extra duties (in exchange for a contract), changing the material working conditions, the use of humour, etc.…” (p. 117). According to Schempp, Sparkes and Templin (1993), one popular political strategy is silence. They stated that teachers “formed a society of the silent… afraid to express opinions to peers and administrators that might be considered controversial and thus jeopardize their chances for success and survival in the school” (p. 468). The political difficulties of change do not just happen at the level of the teacher within a school, particularly when it comes to mandated reform. Politics often play out at the district and even the level of the state.

Change theorists (e.g., Fullan, 1991a; 1999; 2001a; Goodlad, 1975; Horsley & Loucks-Horsley, 1998; Oakes et al., 2000) maintain that, in an attempt to implement change, most educational institutions have focused on structural reforms designed at the level of the state and implemented at the district level rather than focusing on concern-based management at the local level. These researchers maintain that government-introduced educational policy has for the most part continued focusing on one-size-fits-all change efforts, labeled by Oakes et al. (2000) as the reform-mill approach and described by Horsley & Loucks-Horsley (1998) as a structural approach to preparation and training that identifies benchmarks and announces a change effort, and then adopts a decision and begins preparation and training. Oakes et al. (2000) point out that this traditional reform-minded policy approach does not come close to capturing the idiosyncrasies of true reform, which is contingent upon local contexts of “relationships, histories, and opportunities” (p. 19). Oakes et al. (2000) explained that, by the time reform initiatives make their way through the reform mill for implementation at the local level, the school culture is usually at a point where local educators are far too removed from the motivation that brought about the initial reform effort to receive much implementation support. Then policy makers, the public and educators, disappointed with the results of the last reform, turn their attention to the next reform offering new funding and new leadership (Fullan, 2001b; Oakes et al., 2000).
Datnow, Hubbard & Mehan’s (2002) research shows that the politics of mandated reform do not just occur at the level of the teacher; principals, district administrators and even state officials participate in the dance that takes place between reform designers and reform implementers. Personal concerns caused by a variety of issues can play an equally important role in how people respond to change. These factors include, but are not limited to, gender issues, age, job experience with change, and career stage (e.g., Acker, 1995-1996; Bruno, 2000; Chan & Mok, 2001; Torff & Sessions, 2008). Levin & Eubank’s (1989) research contains an analysis of the problems associated with local reforms, using site-based models and empowerment assumptions. They identify six obstacles to the successful implementation of reforms including: 1) inadequate time, training and assistance; 2) difficulties of stimulating considerations and adaptation of inconvenient changes; 3) unresolved issues involving leadership and enhanced power among other participants; 4) constraints on teacher participation in decision-making; 5) administrators’ reluctance to give up traditional prerogatives; and 6) restrictions imposed by school boards, by state and federal regulations and by contracts and agreements with teacher organizations.

Among the many factors, the concepts of trust, commitment and cynicism have also been significant in determining the success of any change effort. Mino (2002) examines the relationship between trust, commitment and cynicism during a change effort. Mino’s study argues that, as the levels of trust increase, organizational cynicism decreases, which will consequently increase the level of organizational commitment (p. 11). Another barrier to the implementation and institutionalization of change is the time needed to learn and assimilate new ideas, strategies and methods (Oakes et al., 2000). Loucks-Horsley et al. (2003) also point out that “it will take devoted time to address the reforms in… professional development and student learning being heralded by national standards” (p. 82). Such time must be embedded “within the school day and the life of teachers, and must include a variety of experiences over time, supportive learning environments, and time for reflection” (p. 82).

Fullan (1991a) notes Pink’s (1989, pp. 22-24) observation from the four projects on the barriers to effective change implementation which involve: an inadequate theory of implementation; including too little time to plan; district tendencies towards faddism and quick-fix solutions; underfunding the project or trying to do too much with too little support; attempting to manage projects from the central office instead of developing school leadership and capacity; lack of technical assistance; lack of awareness of the limitations of teacher and
school administrators’ knowledge about how to implement the project; employee turnover; too many competing demands or overload; failure to address the incompatibility between change initiative requirements and existing organizational policies and structures; failure to take into account site-specific differences; and, finally, failure to clarify or negotiate the role of relationships and partnerships involving the district and local university, who usually have their individual roles in the project.

Resistance has also been identified as the main reason for the failure of reforms. Resistance to change can be defined as employee action or inaction that is intended to avoid change and/or interfere with the successful implementation of change in its current form (Herscovitch, 2003). Almost all of the literature that I reviewed for this study identifies “resistance to change” as one of the main barriers that makes it difficult for any change agent to institutionalize change in the organization. Judson (1991) argued that “resistance to change by those affected is often the single most formidable obstacle to its successful realization” (p. 77). Similarly, according to a survey of Fortune 500 executives, the primary reason for which change fails in organizations is resistance (Maurer, 1997). In addition to claims about the prevalence and seriousness of resistance to change, theories on the causes of resistance pervade the change literature. Indeed, the literature (e.g., Arkowitz, 2002; Coch & French, 1948; Carson, 1997; Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Ford, 2005; Kotter, 2007; Giles, 2006; Nadler, 1998; Strebel, 1996) essentially provides an exhaustive list of why employees “might” resist change. Some of the cited reasons include routine-seeking, fear of the unknown, perceived loss of control, uncertainty, low self-efficacy, disbelief in the need for change, cynicism, perceptions of injustice, habit, mistrust and poor communication (Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Folger & Skarlicki, 1999; Hultman, 1998; Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979; Kotter, 2007; Nadler, 1998; Strebel, 1996; Tvedt et al., 2009). Likewise, a multitude of strategies have been recommended for overcoming resistance, such as better communication, better training, greater organizational support and employees’ participation (e.g., Bridges, 2003; Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Herold et al, 2007; Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979; Lueddeke, 1999; Machin et al., 2009; Zell, 2003).

Three types of resistance to change emerged from the literature that I reviewed – active resistance, passive resistance and aggressive resistance (Coetsee, 1999). According to Hultman (1979), it is important to distinguish between the symptoms of resistance to change and its underlying causes. Symptoms of active resistance include finding fault, ridiculing, appealing to
fear and manipulating, which can easily retard a change process. Passive-resistance symptoms include agreeing verbally but not following through, feigning ignorance and withholding information. Symptoms of aggressive resistance include terrorism, destruction and violent boycotts. Aggressive resistance is the easiest type to identify, because it is overt and no effort is made to disguise the refusal to change (Coetsee, 1999). Passive resistance is considered as the most difficult form to detect because it is subtle and appears to be supportive. Most of the time, passive resisters are followers, and they will usually do what they see most people doing, but sometimes they can turn out to be active resisters. Active resisters explicitly resist change, the status quo or authority, perhaps to obtain attention or to rationalize their own commitment to comfort zones. Managers in control of the workplace often discipline them but this approach can bounce back (Coetsee, 1999; Judson, 1991). Much of the theorizing, research and policy-making on change in education is driven by the assumptions that change is good and resistance is bad (Brower & Abolafia, 1995; Cohen, 2005; Ford, 2005). Employees who resist are often viewed as obstacles to be overcome in the organization’s attempt to change. In fact, resistance has distinct diagnostic qualities that can be utilized as a resource to increase efficiency and productivity. If understood functionally, resistance can serve as a directing force towards collective efforts. A closer look at resistance in many cases reveals that people most often resist change for very pragmatic reasons. The research on resistance to change has failed to capture this breadth of resistance experiences, especially in varied administrative settings. This study aims to contribute to this body of knowledge.

**Conceptual Framework**

A review of the literature on organizational change and resistance to change and of my previous role as an educational administrator alerted me to a number of concepts that offered the potential to provide an in-depth understanding of the complexity of the change process in general and of resistance in particular. The organizational-change literature is rich in concepts on approaches to implementing change initiatives; the same literature illustrates the important principle that one size does not fit all when it comes to change approaches (Fullan 1991; 2001a; Scott, 2004). My explorations were informed by a variety of theories as discussed in this chapter but were explicitly guided by Fullan (1991a; 1999; 2001a; 2001b). Fullan’s perspectives on
educational change seem more promising in capturing the multidimensionality of change and its associated dynamics, including resistance to change.

Fullan was one of the scholars who pointed to the massive failure of educational innovations in early educational research and practice in the 1960s and 1970s. During the early 1970s, the core idea running through Fullan’s writings was his realization that the “implementation” perspective was missing in the corresponding educational innovation and diffusion era. The key idea behind Fullan’s writings in the 1980s and early 1990s is his advocacy for considering the “meaning” of educational changes. Fullan noted the critical need to take into account “meaning” by focusing on the following elements: researching the agenda for implementation; the sources, assumptions and processes underlying educational innovations; the roles of actors and stakeholders; the dilemmas inevitably present in educational change; and the need to go deeper and wider to bring significant improvements on teaching and learning within schools (Fullan, 1981). He acknowledged that attention to implementation issues was certainly critical and that its process-oriented nature demands a broader re-conceptualization and re-examination of the stakeholders in education.

Fullan developed his theory of change in his 1982 work *The Meaning of Change* and subsequently revised it in his 1991 work entitled *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. His theory consists of three phases or categories: initiation, implementation and continuation. Initiation is the “process that leads up to and includes a decision to adopt or proceed with a change” (p. 49). Implementation refers to “both the intended and unintended outcomes of the change if it is put into practice” (p. 49). Continuation refers to the long or short life of the innovation and the efforts required to sustain it. The implementation phase, which dominates the change process, includes nine factors that interact and affect putting the innovation into practice. The continuation phase is the institutionalization of the innovation to the extent that the innovation gets built in as an ongoing part of the system (Fullan, 1991a). According to Fullan, if changes are to take root, change initiatives have to be correctly oriented at each of the three stages because each stage has a different life span and maintenance requirements, and because mere planning for change would not make it happen. “Meaning” was one of the important issues in educational change. Fullan stressed that no one who is involved in a change initiative can adopt another person’s understanding of what the change means, or of how to make it happen. Therefore the challenge for each participant to arrive at a deep meaning of any educational reform.
is real and highly individual. He further noted that it was possible – and indeed happened frequently – that participants, for any number of reasons, were unable to achieve this deep meaning. They may have rejected or thought little about the proposed change, they may have reached a partial understanding or they may have achieved “false clarity” (1991a; 2001b), where their meaning bore little or no resemblance to the proposed idea. Fullan suggested that, for proponents of change, the issue of meaning should be a pivotal concern. “Coherence” or “alignment” was another important factor in educational change for Fullan. According to Fullan, in coherent organizations, key factors in an organization were aligned to meet the stated goals. To him, an incoherent organization was one in which the right hand did not know what the left hand was doing or in which there was inconsistency between what was said and what was actually being done. In a coherent organization, according to Fullan, there is a broad-based sense that the philosophy and activities are in concert with one another. He debunked popular notions about the importance of vision, strategic planning, site-based management, strong leadership, collegiality and consensus, accountability and assessment, and argued that they contributed to superficial thinking about reform of educational institutions and processes. Instead, he emphasized the necessity of forms of collaboration that not only tolerate but embrace conflict, diversity and resistance to change. This was different than his approach in his previous works where he focused more on individual educational reforms and listed factors that characterized successful change initiatives.

By the time Change Forces: The Sequel (1999) was published, Fullan had concluded that it had become necessary to borrow from the field of chaos and complexity theory in order to develop a clear understanding of the post-modern educational environment, which featured high-paced and multifaceted reform, against a backdrop of rapid technological and societal upheaval. To cope with the non-linear and non-stop effects of educational change, one had to develop the capacity to see the “feedback loops” (Fullan, 1999, p. 5) that exist in seemingly chaotic situations, and to use these to understand, but not to attempt to control, the constantly shifting education picture. Fullan (1999) explores the implications of complexity theory for the change process; the nature and meaning of inside as well as outside collaboration; the need to define the problem of transferability – “why obvious good ideas do not get used by others, and how to reframe the matter so that larger-scale change become possible” (p. ix); and “the essential fusion of intellectual, political and spiritual forces” in the change process (p. ix).
In explaining the propositions upon which the complexity theory of organization is built, Fullan (2001b) cites Stacey’s (1996) arguments that “all organizations are paradoxes” and that organizations such as local schools and districts, as well as state organizations and other people involved in the schools’ change initiatives, are connected by “webs of nonlinear feedback loops” (Fullan, 2001b, p. 102). Complexity theory offered new strategies for developing an understanding of the patterns in which teachers and educational leaders cooperate, interact and intensely pursue instructional improvement. It soon became apparent to Fullan that numerous educational reforms were doomed to failure because the contexts in which reforms were being introduced were so deeply flawed. Therefore, his recent prescriptions for increasing capacity for change in schools have centered on topics that recognize schools as living systems and that encourage educators and policy makers “to learn to use key complexity concepts to design and guide more powerful learning systems” (Fullan, 2003, p. 21).

Fullan (1999) has synthesized these prescriptions into what he called “complex change lessons” for education (p.18). The eight lessons include: 1) moral purpose is complex and problematic; 2) theories of change and theories of education need each other; 3) conflict and diversity are our friends; 4) understanding the meaning of operating on the edge of chaos; 5) emotional intelligence is anxiety provoking and anxiety containing; 6) collaborative cultures are anxiety provoking and anxiety containing; 7) attach incoherence: connectedness and knowledge creation are critical; and 8) there is no single solution: craft your own theories and actions by being a critical consumer. Fullan (1999) has said that the first lesson “must be assisted by the other seven lessons which can combine to provide the infrastructure and resources necessary to make headway in very difficult terrain” (p. 19). He called moral purpose complex and problematic because the moral purpose of schooling involves external accountability, but relies on local solutions. According to Fullan, “Top-down mandates and bottom-up energies need each other” (p. 19). In his explanation of his first lesson, he has established that the dynamic complexity pattern of including two elements that are in tension within a single message can appear, at first glance, to be inherently contradictory.

Fullan (1999) defined moral purpose as “making a positive difference in the lives of citizens” (p. 11). The reason why moral purpose is complex and problematic, he said, is that the pressure created by external systems of mandates is a necessary element of change; however,
for schools to live out the moral purpose of widespread student achievement, there also must be attention paid to the local capacity to inspire, be flexible and design unique ways to promote “resilience-related outcomes” (Fullan, 1999, p. 20). The scrutiny that education has received has resulted in calls for accountability that Fullan (2003) has said can be addressed only through a renewed passion for shared moral purpose among educators. As for his second lesson, Fullan (1999) pointed out that theories of change for schools can be empty and directionless without theories of education; conversely, theories of education without the implementation mechanisms of change theory can be ignored and be treated as irrelevant. Fullan claimed that both organizational theory and pedagogical assumptions must be made explicit in order to engender successful change. His third lesson is that conflict and diversity are our friends. In chaos theory, conflict is considered a necessary disturbance in the system. Fullan (1999) said that purposefully introducing individuals with diverse ideas into an organization can help to identify how to bridge ideas among groups before the chasm becomes too great. “In complexity theory terms”, he has explained, “if you avoid differences you may enjoy early smoothness, but you pay the price because you do not get at the really difficult issues until it is too late” (p. 23). He has found that “conflict, if respected, is positively associated with creative breakthroughs under complex, turbulent conditions” (p. 22).

As with the previous three and remaining elements affecting change capacity for schools that Fullan has identified, the introduction of contradictory elements is said to ensure productive change. With regard to operating on the edge of chaos, Fullan has said that the “edge of chaos” is where school systems capitalizing on the change process should operate. In contrast to total chaos which would foster anarchy, Fullan has suggested that “the edge of chaos has both structure and openendedness” (p. 24) where leaders would “keep most actively loosely structured by relying on critical structure points of priorities, targeted measures, real deadlines and responsibilities for major outcomes” (p. 24). In order for schools to adopt this philosophy, however, there must be trust in the process and belief in the mental model that supports complexity theory because “one cannot direct a living system, only disturb it” (Pascale, 1999, p. 85). Fullan’s (1999) summary of lesson four is “do not try to micromanage change through lots of rules, rigid structures and formal channels of communication… rather, set up a system of people-based learning framed by a few key priorities and structures” (p. 24). Fullan’s fifth lesson, emotional intelligence, follows from the fourth, which is operating at the edge of chaos.
Upholding a moral purpose and not shying away from conflict will inevitably bring with them the stress of confronting the unknown. Fullan (1999) believes that “emotionally intelligent people handle stress better” (p. 25), not because they avoid it but because they have the type of resilience that Goleman has categorized into five domains. These are knowing one’s emotions, managing emotions, motivating oneself, empathy and interpersonal effectiveness. Stacey (1996) has advocated for “high quality interconnectedness” (p. 162) that Fullan (1999) has seen exhibited by collaborative cultures that face the stress of tackling difficult problems, an approach that is contrary to the alternative of turning to “bureaucracy, hierarchy, and/or dependence on the leader” (p. 26). Fullan states that, while collaboration and teamwork certainly build capacity for problem-solving, they will be effective only if they “foster a degree of difference” (p. 25). Hargreaves (1994) also sees teaching as a collective enterprise regardless of its often isolating structure that promotes “singular models of expertise which preclude sharing and the inadequacies it might expose” (p. 152).

Two elements to increase schools’ capacity for change on Fullan’s (1999) eight-point list are connectedness and individualism. Whether it is connecting, mediating, or reconciling, change agents in complex adaptive systems must be vigilant to make sense of conflicting agendas and fragmented reforms (Fullan, 1999, p. 26). The structure by which individuals work apart from other workers is one of the clear realities of teaching (Lieberman & Miller, 1991), and the need to retain individual voice without imposing isolation is one of the biggest challenges facing school leaders (Fullan, 1993). Given the importance of the individual and of individual situations, any prepackaged solution to reform, Fullan (1999) has offered, will “turn out to be roads to superficiality and dependency” (p. 28). Speaking directly to educators, he has said that, “as you follow a process continually converting your tactical knowledge about change into explicit change knowledge, refining and marrying it with insights from the change literature, you begin to craft your own theories of change” (p. 29). Fullan does not favour any single solution; instead, he encourages change agents to craft their own theories and actions by being critical consumers. These points contain an inherent contradiction that dynamic complexity theory suggests is necessary for change. In fact these two points themselves might appear to contradict one another. In a world view driven by rational theories of change, one might ask how connectedness and individualism can coexist? In a world view driven by complexity theory, one might speculate on the possibility of increased capacity by assuring
tension within and between elements. Having observed educational change efforts over the past 30 years, Fullan has characterized each lesson to present the dynamic tension between opposing values, constituencies and states of mind – as with Sergiovanni’s (1987) second mindscape – to acknowledge that “complexity, dynamism, and unpredictability are not merely things that get in the way. They are normal” (Fullan, 1993, p. 125).

During the last decade, the guiding theme in Fullan’s work has been his advocacy of system reform or transformation. He has highlighted this theme through six trends: (1) the return and increasing presence of large-scale reforms; (2) the question of turnaround leadership and its need for re-conceptualization; (3) the tri-level (i.e. school, district and state) argument; (4) the need to overcome dysfunctional infrastructures through both pressure and support strategies; (5) the critical criterion issue of sustainability (i.e. adaptive breakthrough); and (6) the re-definition of professional development (Fullan, 2001a; 2001b; 2005c). In the new millennium, Fullan’s discourse on large-scale reform is driven by a host of complexities and dilemmas. He emphasizes many critical factors that must be considered in implementing large-scale changes.

Fullan (2001a) argues that, in order for long-term change to begin to become institutionalized, three fundamental issues – principal support, understanding and interaction – must be interwoven effectively with four problems related to change: active initiation and participation; pressure and support; change in behaviour and support; and the problem of ownership. He further declares that a delicate balancing act must also occur in order for institutionalization to take place. For example, while pressure is a necessary prerequisite for actions leading to change (Fullan, 2001a), it must be balanced with the right amount of staff support. As Fullan states, “pressure without support leads to resistance and alienation” and “support without pressure leads to drift or waste of resources” (p. 92). According to Fullan (2001a), institutionalization of change involves a process of “incremental and decremental fits and starts” (p. 93). Most planning for change fails, he explains, because “It is hyperrational” (p. 96), luring organizational members into the change process with no true consideration of “local context and culture” (p. 96). He further argues that strong commitment to a particular change might be a barrier to setting up an effective process of change since change and the change process are two “distinct aspects of social change” (p. 96). Fullan advises that, in order to facilitate institutionalization of change, “Promoters of change need to be committed and skilled
in the change process as well as in the change itself” (p. 96). He adds that the success of change lies in the change process.

In his work following in 2001, Fullan (2001b) simplifies his three change phases which are viewed by most change researchers as the non-linear pathway to successful organizational change with student learning and organizational capacity as outcomes: phase one, initiation, includes mobilization and adoption; phase two, implementation, entails initial use involving two to three years of trial and error putting reforms into practice; and phase three involves institutionalization, continuation, incorporation and routinization of making change systemic or deciding to discard the reform altogether (Fullan, 2001b, p. 50). In this work, he supports a new meaning of learning and change, advocating the idea that we must work both as individuals and as a collectivity to bring about successful educational change. In acknowledging the necessity of what Spillane (2000) refers to as the big-picture view of organization and change, Fullan (2001b) compares the principal of the future to the sophisticated business leader who is attuned to the big picture and who transforms the organization through individuals and teams. In addition to the importance of the big-picture view, Fullan (2001b) recognizes that a more local-picture view regarding how individuals understand and experience change is also necessary. The small-picture view, according to Fullan, concerns the presence or absence of subjective meaning “for individuals at all levels of the educational system” (p. 8) and the presence or absence of mechanisms designed to address problems of meaning. In support of his stance that educational change must have meaning both to the organization and to individuals within the organization, Fullan (2001b) writes:

Learning is meaning-making that requires a radically new way of approaching learning...one that guides the development of individual minds through many minds working together. The theory of change has taken on new meaning in what I called the 25/75 rule. Twenty-five percent of the solution is having good directional ideas; 75% is figuring out how to get there in one local context after another. (p. 288)

Fullan (2001b) maintains that the reason why traditional bureaucratic approaches to change remain predominant today is that “neither local school system nor state or federal agencies have been able to establish a processual relationship with each other” (p. 87). Instead, what he calls “episodic events” continue with local systems developing plans for change, applying for state or federal support, and submitting progress reports. This traditional process of reform maintains both physical and chronological distance between local systems and the
agencies in the best position to offer support, resulting in what Fullan refers to as “paperwork” rather than interactive and supportive “people work.” Fullan emphasizes the importance of shared meaning and contends that the success of change depends upon the interaction between “individual and collective meaning and action in everyday situations” (p. 9). While identifying policy makers as the initiators of change, Fullan (2001b) names principals and teachers as the main agents or blockers of change. To him, the success of change is contingent upon policy makers and local practitioners each becoming aware of the others’ “subjective world.” Without this awareness, reform is doomed (Fullan, 2001a). In terms of large-scale reform, Fullan clearly identifies and expresses the purpose of school reform, its main enemies and the need for capacity-building and sustainability at the three levels – school, district and state. Fullan (2001b) states that the “primary purpose of school reform is not to adopt or even internalize a valuable external model. The primary goal is to alter the capacity of the school to engage in improvement” (p. 5) through working with whole systems. This calls for both an accountability pillar and a capacity-building pillar. As Fullan explains,

The former refers to standards of performance, transparency of results, monitoring of progress, and consequential action. Capacity-building concerns training, resources (time, expertise and materials) and incentive-based compensation as well as recognition for accomplishments. These pressure and support pillars must act in concert in order to produce large-scale reform. (Fullan, 2001b, p. 11)

In addition to acknowledging the return of large-scale reform and its enemies, and suggesting that it takes place at the school, district and state levels with sustainability as the goal, Fullan points to leadership and professional learning communities as crucial factors. Fullan (2001b) examined leadership cases in business and education and identified commonality of leadership across these sectors in that learning organizations in complex times are characterized by the following: moral purpose, an understanding of the change process, strong relationships, knowledge-sharing capacities and coherence, and connectedness-making abilities. Fullan considered these aspects components of the framework that should guide educational leaders who lead in a culture of change. Fullan questioned and debunked the three assumptions prevalent in contemporary leadership literature. These refer to the assumptions that “leadership needs to be transactional and managerial in nature” (p. 75) when driving large-scale reform; that “transformational leadership is typically, if not necessarily, provided by talented leaders” (p. 75) and that “distributed and hierarchical forms of leadership are somehow incompatible; and that
distributed forms are superior” (p. 75). He emphasized the need for a greater and more complex orientation and application to leadership “…than much of the literature would suggest and one that seems prone to exaggerated claims rooted in democratic ideology” (p. 76). In addition to highlighting the importance of good leadership, Fullan underscored the necessity of relationships. Fullan (1999; 2001b) stresses the importance of developing relationships beyond individuals. Indeed, “Development of individuals is not sufficient. New relationships (as found in a professional learning community) are crucial, but only if they work at the hard task of establishing greater program coherence and the addition of resources” (Fullan, 2001b, p. 65). Furthermore, he emphasizes nine critical factors that must be considered: need, clarity, complexity, quality/practicality, district, community, principal, teacher, and government and other agencies. Fullan claims that the need for implementing change has to be recognized as important and that it has to be more important relative to other implementation factors in order for implementation to succeed. He further clarifies the distinction between opportunistic needs (i.e. needs tied to change programs for financial reasons rather than for their educational value) and problem-solving needs (i.e. needs tied to concrete site-specific needs). Fullan claims that problem-solving change generates meaningful change, whereas opportunistic change generates only temporary compliance. According to Fullan, even when local organizations acknowledge the importance of a perceived or felt need, complications can arise in meeting that need. Fullan (2001b) lists at least three complications in prioritizing needs: overloaded improvement agendas, clarity regarding precise needs and the interaction of perceived needs along with the other eight critical factors involved in building an organization’s capacity to implement change.

The second important factor, clarity, for Fullan involves stipulating a concise understanding of what should be done differently than in the past, but this should be done before the implementation begins. He argues that clarity about the goals of change and the means of attaining those goals is essential for successful change implementation and must be taken into account in every phase of the change process. In a review of change research, Fullan (2001b) finds that clarity has been a problem area in reform from the early research by Gross et al. (1971) when teachers had trouble identifying the essential features of the innovation that they were attempting to implement, to more modern situations where clarity problems emerge from the complexity of determining what a particular change will be like, what it will mean in actual practice and what the means of implementation will be (Fullan, 1999). Fullan (2001b) cautions,
however, that some change leaders may oversimplify change in an effort to create a clearer image of the proposed change for implementers. According to him, change leaders face three fundamental issues: a tendency to oversimplify change in order to impose a solution, pathways problems stemming from not knowing what success looks like or how successful strategies will be adapted from one situation to fit their own situation, and uncertainty about the required passion and commitment among the change implementers (Fullan 2001b, p. 90). Four related areas that Fullan identifies as interacting with these issues include: active initiation and participation, pressure and support, change in behaviours and beliefs, and the problems of ownership (Fullan, 2001b, p. 91). Although oversimplification makes implementers more comfortable and the change process less complex, false clarity causes implementers to focus so narrowly on one aspect of change that significant features of the overall policy or goals are ignored. Fullan (2001b) found clarity of project goals to be one of the most important factors in the implementation of all projects, especially comprehensive change projects significantly affecting implementation during planning and project continuation following funding.

Fullan defines complexity, the third factor affecting implementation, in relation to the difficulty level and extent of change required of those participating. Complex changes that require alteration of beliefs are difficult to understand and, therefore, difficult to implement (Fullan, 1991a; 2001b). Fullan (2001b) notes that, while greater degrees of complexity increase the problem of clarity, they also increase the likelihood of actual change. Quality and practicality constitute the fourth implementation factor. Fullan (1991a) claims that implementing quality of a good change, although hard work must not be underestimated. Implementation quality involves careful preparation for the change project through development and continual refinement of innovations that have already been proven to work. Following more than 30 years of change research, Fullan now concludes that high-quality teaching and training materials such as print, video and electronic materials are needed to boost teachers’ capacity for reform but, without accompanying deeper understanding, teacher use of these materials results in “superficial implementation” (Fullan, 2001b, p. 24). Fullan asserts that the lack of quality due to a lack of careful planning time or even a lack of basic materials and resources results “when adoption decisions are made on the grounds of political necessity, or even on the grounds of perceived need without time for development” (2001b, p. 79). He further maintains that “When adoption is more important than implementation, decisions are frequently made without follow-up or
preparation time necessary to generate adequate materials” (p. 79). When policy makers place more emphasis on adoption than implementation, they often rush the implementation stage of the change innovation by expecting changes in outcomes before initiation and clarification of the innovation have had time to naturally occur. Fullan (2001b) questions the depth and sustainability of change as supportive school and district administrators move on to other leadership positions, as well as the depth and sustainability of changes brought about by statewide reform efforts, such as the HEC in Pakistan. Quality, he claims, can be sacrificed by political decisions, by over-ambitious projects and by inadequate materials (Fullan, 1991a; 2001b). His definition of practicality includes two components – salient needs which fit well with the specific teaching setting (classroom), and practical how to possibilities. He further points out that a key to the success of complex change can be attributed to breaking the change process into divisions or increments but warns that other variables, such as sustained assistance, are also important.

His fifth factor, district, has two components that affect implementation: past change experiences and administrative support. According to Fullan (1991a), districts with successful implementation records are likely to implement future reforms successfully. Capacity or incapacity for implementing change is developed over time and influences subsequent implementation projects. In addition, Fullan claims that, if the administration does not value innovation, superficial compliance will develop and the implementation will fail. The sixth implementation factor is board and community. The school board effects change through the selection and dismissal of administrative staff that promotes change. The role of community is difficult to predict or manage because of its level of involvement in the change initiatives. Fullan (1991a) further stated that politically stable communities are more likely to support implementation through active involvement. The principal is the seventh factor who, as Fullan (1991a; 2001b) states, needs to be an active supporter of the innovation for the implementation to succeed. An active, supportive principal is one who understands the problems that can obstruct implementation and who becomes a systemic problem-solver (Fullan, 1991a; 1991b). The teacher is the eighth implementation factor. Fullan (1991) claims that teachers’ characteristics and collegial working relationships among teachers influence the implementation process. Where a collegial and trustful school culture prevails, implementation is more likely to succeed (Fullan, 1991a; 1991b). Fullan believes that implementation procedures that are perceived as meaningful are likely to succeed. The last factor that Fullan identified is government and other external
agencies (i.e. provincial/state offices of education, federal ministries, departments and agencies, faculties of education, and corporate research and development divisions) (Fullan, 1991). Since education is a social process with social consequences, Fullan (1991b) claims that government and other state agencies have a legitimate interest in and concern for better schools (Fullan, 1991b). Government agencies have been more interested in adopting change, whereas school districts have been more interested in implementing it (Fullan, 1991a). These divergent approaches inhibit implementation since misinterpretation of actions and motives is almost guaranteed (Fullan, 1991a). The presence of these divergent approaches confirms the necessity of establishing “processual relationships” which Fullan defines as those in which both the local and provincial/state or federal agencies understand their respective roles, communicate effectively about expectations and recognize their limited authority concerning the process (Fullan, 1991a). Fullan (2001b) claims that most large-scale changes fail due to barriers he identified as “lack of role clarity, ambiguity about expectations, absence of regular interpersonal forums of communication, ambivalence between authority and support roles of external agencies, and solutions that are worse than the original problems” (p. 87). Fullan claimed that change efforts have a better likelihood of succeeding if all parties – teachers, students, parents and administrators – understand their own feelings, reactions and challenges and can see the feelings, reactions and challenges of other parties as legitimate; this is the “small” picture. There is also the bigger picture, where larger entities, such as government, teachers’ unions, school systems and communities, and the forces that push and pull them intersect with the elements of the smaller picture. It is important to put in the effort to understand the effects of these countervailing factors and forces, Fullan asserts, because “change makes sense” (2001b, p. xi), and the likelihood of changes taking root can be enhanced if change dynamics are understood. Indeed, the failure to achieve educational change can often be reliably attributed to one fatal circumstance: “the infrastructure is weak, unhelpful, or working at cross purposes” (Fullan, 2001b, p. 18).

In his 2003 work, Fullan argued that the emphasis in educational reform efforts must be directed towards the very daunting goal of changing the context. Fullan (2003) claims that long-term and sustainable change will never be able to take hold in unreformed, unhealthy contexts. In his recent works, Fullan (2007a; 2008a; 2008b) have focused more on leadership and have aimed to give advice to leaders in business, education and non-profit organizations regarding the skills and awareness that will help them lead their organizations better, especially in achieving lasting
change and improvement. He emphasizes that moral purpose is essential to successful leadership and reiterates his claim that organizational leaders need to engage far beyond the confines of an individual institution or system. Moral purpose in the creation, building, nurturing and sustaining of professional learning communities in the midst of an increasingly standardized reform era is not only about individual but also about organizational development (Fullan, 2008a). According to Fullan (2003), “Leading schools... requires principals with the courage and capacity to build new cultures based on trusting relationships and a culture of disciplined inquiry and action” (p. 45). These new cultures should be built not only at the individual and school levels but also at the regional and societal levels for large-scale system transformation to occur. Fullan (2003; 2008a; 2008b) outlines his strategy for breakthrough in the system through personalization, precision and professional learning.

**Why I Used Fullan’s Theories**

Contrary to some of the theorists discussed above, Fullan’s scholarly work seems to be guiding change agents in leading large-scale reforms instead of just providing a perspective on why certain initiatives succeeded and others did not. In comparison, Rogers’ (1983) model is based on the theory that the change process focuses on both invention and diffusion. It is also noticeable that Rogers’ model examines the reasons for which decisions concerning innovations are made and the stages under which an innovation is implemented. This work is commendable because it highlights the role of the change agent and the source of the change itself. However, compared to Fullan’s (1991a) model, it is somehow limited and narrow. The success and failure of innovations in schools and districts cannot be fully and clearly explained by looking at stages and sources. Educational reforms are often initiated by political mandates and include a disparity of populations as well as different degrees of capacity that prevent from focusing on innovations by themselves. There is a social system that needs to be attended to.

Ely’s (1990) model for educational technology innovations is also laudable for examining what conditions promote or inhibit change. He makes it clear that there is a critical need to look at environmental conditions such as: dissatisfaction with the status quo; knowledge and skills; resources; time; rewards or incentives; and commitment. However, Ely’s conditions of change seem narrow because they seem to treat innovations as ends in themselves. In education, the change process itself is about more than the adoption, implementation and institutionalization of
innovations. It is about deep and continuous changes in the culture of the schools and of entire systems. Fullan’s (1991) model responds to this whole-system reality. Perhaps, Havelock & Zlotolow’s (1995) change process model is closer to Fullan’s (1991) model. This model shares the assumption that change is a process, not an event. The difference is that, while the former model clearly delineates a step-by-step process, Fullan’s model does not specify or propose such steps or stages. Fullan’s model assumes that change is a process but that this process is to be constructed by its different stakeholders in order to achieve organizational development and system improvement. Likewise, Hall & Hord’s (1987) attempt to measure the impact and effectiveness of innovation by underscoring its levels of use and the role of the change facilitator is very appropriate because these factors encourage not only a closer scrutiny of the innovation itself, but also of opportunities to analyze the change process or to predict or anticipate issues and ways to deal with barriers. However, this theory is limited in that it analyzes innovations and the role of the change facilitator rather than redefining the role of actors and institutions and thus advocating for strategies at the system level that lead to sustainability (Fullan, 1991a; 1991b; 1999; 2001a; 2001b).

Zaltman & Duncan’s (1977) model highlights the reality of resistance and stresses its systemic nature. In the context of change, the presence of resistance is understandable. Educational reform will always confront resistance because this process demands tinkering with the prevailing norms and values of autonomy and conservatism that are so prevalent in many classrooms. What distinguishes Fullan’s work is his attempt to welcome and embrace resistance and conflict as friends, though conflict and resistance are not critically dissected and Fullan calls for improvement of the entire system. Compared with Wheatley’s (1992) description of chaos theory and the means by which organizations move from chaos to order when undergoing major change, Senge’s (1990) equating of learning organizations with systems thinking seems to be more consistent with some aspects of Fullan’s (1991a; 1999; 2001a; 2001b) works in which Fullan considered a systemic approach appropriate. Fullan acknowledges the arrival, reality, need and complexity of large-scale reform (Fullan, 2008b). To him, overload and fragmentation are its main enemies. His proposed solution is coherence through a redefined and reframed social- and action-based systemic application of leadership and professional learning. Capacity-building and sustainability efforts are at the core of this equation. Professional learning communities can help accomplish large-scale reform. Moral purpose demands a re-
conceptualization of leadership and a clear realization of the continuum from individual to organizational development (Fullan, 2008b). In his 2008 works, he is advising change agents to resurrect the concept of links or linkages. Since his 2008 writings, Fullan is concerned with the following: linking curriculum and sustainability (Fullan, 2008a); linking theory and action (Fullan 2008b); linking individual and organizational development; linking a competitive economy and cohesive society (2008b); linking leadership and system improvement; and linking the long term and the short term of educational change (Fullan, 2008a). Hargreaves (2008) presents the same view by saying that “The challenge is not to choose between rewards today and tomorrow. It is to detect and select the good against the bad versions of each, and then to create better synergy between the two” (p. 16). Fullan’s writings during the last decade urge change agents to re-conceptualize educational change theory in ways that acknowledge the problems, realities and conditions of the system.

My intention was not to elevate Fullan’s model to be superlative or the most successful. My purpose was to highlight how Fullan’s perspectives on the change process may seem more appropriate in education. His emphasis and focus on the perspectives and roles of participants and institutions in the change process in schools, districts and governments and his intent on treating innovations not as ends in themselves distinguish Fullan’s change-process models from others. As part of developing an inclusive understanding of how selected participants experienced, observed, understood and used resistance to the planned transformational change initiated by Pakistan’s Higher Education Commission (HEC), my particular interest was to explore how professors and administrators’ express their values, beliefs and attitudes regarding the change effort and what perceptions/circumstances obstruct them in the course of bringing about change in their workplaces. I was also interested in identifying any tactics or strategies that stakeholders used to express and overcome resistance to change in their everyday practice. Fullan’s (1991a, 1999; 2001a, 2001b) perspectives provided the conceptual model needed to frame my research.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH CONTEXT AND CASE DESCRIPTION

Institutions of higher learning train people to be specialists and set the basis for social, political, religious, cultural and economic growth. Over the past decade, a lively, informative and intellectually stimulating debate has taken place in institutions of higher learning in Europe on the role of higher education. The discussion is focused on addressing the issues of social exclusion and the need to build societies and higher education institutions that are more inclusive and responsive to the needs of the changing societies (Askonas & Stewart, 2000; Diefenbach et al., 2008; Giles, 2006; Goldstein, 2006). This debate informs and guides us to understand that, globally, universities are taking initiatives and concrete steps to be inclusive and they are responding to emerging social needs such as addressing the important issues of “social class, gender, ethnicity… and inequality in distribution of opportunity” (Halsey, 1993, p. 129). In this regard it is useful to consider the document released by the World Conference on Higher Education in 1998. This conference emphasized the need for improved access to higher education and linked human rights with access to higher education in the following words:

a) Higher education shall be accessible to all on the basis of merit. No discrimination can be accepted;

b) Each higher education institution should define its mission according to the present and future needs of the society;

c) Help understand, interpret, preserve, enhance, promote and disseminate national and regional, international and historic cultures, in a context of cultural pluralism and diversity;

d) Access to higher education for members of some special target groups, such as indigenous peoples, cultural and linguistic minorities, disadvantaged groups, peoples living under occupation and those who suffer from disabilities, must be actively facilitated (UNESCO, 1998, pp. 3-7).

The report encourages policy makers and educators all over the world in developing polices that are inclusive and intentional in offering higher educational opportunities to deserving and qualified men and women. While discussing the importance of institutions of higher learning, Goastellec (2008) suggests that higher education is emerging on the political agendas of an increasing number of higher education public authorities and institutions’ governing bodies. He analyzes the global debate on access to higher education in the context of demographic, economic, and political pressure (Goastellec, 2008, p. 72). Burki (2005) asserts that Pakistan has an adult literacy rate of only 43.5 percent for the population above the age of 15 years. In comparison, the rates for Sri Lanka and India are 92.1 percent and 61.3 percent respectively. In
the South Asian context, only Bangladesh has a slightly lower rate of 41.1 percent. In terms of literacy and other measures, Pakistan ranks 142th in terms of the UNDP’s Human Development Index. In comparison, Sri Lanka ranks at 96, India at 127 and Bangladesh at 138 (Burki, 2005, p. 17). Better access to higher education in South Asian countries can play an instrumental role in developing well-qualified and professional human resources. Countries that are developing their industrial, agricultural and service sectors can benefit a great deal from a highly educated populace. For instance, Andaleeb (2003) analyzes the condition of higher education institutions in Bangladesh in the following words:

Higher education in Bangladesh today faces similar crises: it is beleaguered with lack of vision; deteriorating quality; abysmal mismanagement; high uncertainty; poor standards; and continuing turmoil, chaos, and violence in campuses across the country. Consequently, the traditional post-secondary institutions appear to have lost much of their luster up and glory, and their pursuit of excellence has been replaced by dismal mediocrity. (Andaleeb, 2003, p. 487)

Let us take a comparative look at total populations and at public spending on education in total and as a percentage of GDP, as well as at male and female tertiary gross enrollment ratios in Pakistan, India, Bangladesh and Nepal. According to the World Bank (2006, pp. 35-40), higher education enrollment Pakistan lags behind India, Bangladesh and Nepal. In terms of total enrollment, India, Bangladesh and Nepal are 7.3%, 1.5% and 1.1% respectively ahead of Pakistan. With regard to public-education spending, India, Bangladesh and Nepal are ahead of Pakistan. India, Bangladesh and Nepal are respectively spending 0.6%, 0.1% and 0.8% more than Pakistan (The World Bank, 2006, pp. 35-40). Rahman (2004) asserts that since independence the ruling elite and policy makers did not give much importance to the development of universities in Pakistan. He further adds that, from the very beginning, institutions such as the military and the civil service received power, financial support and prestige. This argument is elaborated later in this chapter.

Pakistan’s population is estimated at over 170 million. After China, India, the United States, Indonesia and Brazil, Pakistan is the sixth largest country in the world, as Burki (2005) notes. He further adds that about 25 million are below the age of 18 years. Pakistan, in other words, has one of the youngest populations in the world. To put this in perspective, “In 2005, the United States had fewer people below the age of 18 than did Pakistan, even though the American
The system of higher education in Pakistan

Education in Pakistan presents a patchwork picture of almost bewildering complexity and magnitude (Khalid & Khan, 2006). In its structure, it shares many features with educational systems in Western countries. There is a pre-school level for children aged three to five years. This is followed by five years of primary-school education (grades 1–5) and subsequently five years of secondary education (grades 6–10). Students then enter what is termed intermediate or higher secondary education (grades 11–12). In Pakistan, higher education refers to all levels of education above grade 12 (Malik, 2000; Saeed, 2007). In contrast to bachelor’s degree programs in most of the Western world, a substantial proportion of first degrees in Pakistan were of two years’ duration (that has changed since the inception of the HEC). Master’s and doctoral degrees are typically of similar length (Saeed, 2007). A two-to-three-year M. Phil degree after the master’s degree is a prerequisite for entry into a Ph.D. program. Overall, the structural aspects of tertiary education are complex and continue to evolve (Saeed, 2007). Appendix V outlines a snapshot of the overall education system in Pakistan.

The higher educational system comprises both private and public colleges and universities. At present there are more than 100 recognized public- and private-sector universities in Pakistan. Most of the universities extend their capacity for certification through
the system of affiliating colleges that prepare students for the university-degree examinations, ensuring the availability of higher education even in remote and less developed areas. Universities in Pakistan are usually categorized as general and professional. While they do offer undergraduate programs, their major emphasis is on post-graduate education and research. Thus, public-sector universities control the quality of higher education provided to a large proportion of the students in Pakistan (Hathaway, 2005; Ullah, 2005).

Education in Pakistan is mainly centralized. Although the federal Ministry of Education (MOE) supervises Pakistan’s entire system of education, education is largely a provincial matter with each of the four provinces guiding its own provincial Department of Education. The central government is often in charge of policy making. Educational institutions located in the federal capital, Islamabad, are administered directly by the MOE. All other universities and other institutions of higher education are administered by the provincial governments, but are funded by the federal government through the Higher Education Commission (HEC) (Ullah, 2005). In 2002, the University Grants Commission was replaced by the HEC. All degree-granting universities and other institutions, both public and private, are directly or indirectly supervised by the HEC, which is responsible for coordinating reviews and evaluations of all academic programs. The HEC also oversees the planning, development and chartering of both public and private institutions of higher education (Sedgwick, 2005).

In examining the situation of higher education, the Pakistani researcher Malik (2006) argues that it is difficult to solve the challenges in higher education unless we make a very serious attempt to understand and address the very nature of the Pakistani education system. He adds that there is not one but two Pakistans. One Pakistan belongs to and serves the interests of the elite, privileged, selected and few, whereas the second one is that of the deprived and oppressed. One education system serves the interests of the elite and uses English as the medium of instruction from primary school to the university level and standards are maintained; in comparison to the other system jobs are easily available for this product and it has been taken over by the international system of education. The other system belongs to the non-elite class; here the language problem is unresolved, standards are low, the dropout rate is high and job opportunities for graduates are insufficient (p. 12). Mustafa (2007a) also presents similar views by stating that, although Pakistan is often referred to as a failed state in the political context, its
biggest failure lies in educating its population. She further argues that the education system in Pakistan is tailored to the needs of the urban elites.

There are multiple reasons responsible for the underdevelopment of public universities in Pakistan and, according to Rahman (2004), they are a) subordination to the government, b) paucity of funds and c) lack of high academic standards. Rahman (2004) asserts that in Pakistan the idea of a university as a liberal institution where students have access to quality education and where we learn, teach and bring new ideas, is under threat. He argues that most public universities are run and managed by leadership that comes from the armed forces of Pakistan. This strengthens the power of the military and provides a privileged platform for disseminating its views on national interests and the future of the country. His argument makes sense when one considers that, during the Musharraf period that ended in August 2008, the Federal Minister for education was a retired military general. In addition, there were serving military officers in the Ministry of Education who were part of curriculum development and teacher training. The Vice Chancellors of Punjab University and of the Engineering University of Lahore were retired military generals. People who belong to the armed forces bring along their own culture in running academic institutions and their style of management can often be authoritarian and controlling. This kind of management is not conducive to creating an academic environment that allows open debate and freedom of expression.

The current state of universities does not mean that access to quality education and academic standards were never good in Pakistan. During the late 1960s and the 1970s, the situation in Pakistani universities was much different. Hoodbhoy (2008) reports that at that time it was stimulating and that intellectual, scientific, cultural and literary activity flourished. However, things begin to change significantly since 1979 when military dictator General Zia-ul-Haq got power and started a well-planned program of curtailing academic freedom at universities. Public universities as they exist in the Western world allow and encourage diversity of opinion. Universities are places where intellectual development takes place and space is provided to express ideas freely. Discussions and lively debates take place inside and outside the classroom. Faculty members encourage ideas and students express their views without any fear. These are academic values that public universities in Pakistan need to promote. Rahman (2007) touches on and elaborates a critical theme when he says that, in our society, only access to
Critical education can help us in reducing and ultimately breaking the power of feudal lords over peasants, the bureaucracy over the public and the military over the political process.

Organizational Structure of Pakistani Universities Before HEC Initiated Reforms

Pakistan invested poorly in education, especially in higher education, until 2002 (GoP, 2000). According to Rahman (2004), the foundation for the current system of higher education in Pakistan can be traced back to 1857, when the directors of the East India Company decided to set up universities in India to educate a lower level of bureaucracy comprised of locals who would be able to work in the lower level government jobs. There was a need to Westernize and educate the Indians enough to be able to fulfill these minor responsibilities. These institutions were not supposed to equal the academic calibre or prestige of Western institutions of higher education, which were autonomous institutions. It was, therefore, necessary for the British colonialists that the University of Calcutta, the first Indian university in the Western tradition, not be governed by academics. The governor general was the chancellor, and the chief justice of the Supreme Court the vice-chancellor. As a result of the long period of colonization, the “mentality of subordination” (Rahman, 2004) seems to be a deeply rooted part of South Asian institutions of higher education. Universities in the sub-continent, for the most part, retained their colonial characteristics. Even after 1947, with the partition of India and the departure of the British, the institutions of higher education retained their non-autonomous characteristics (Rahman, 2004). As Rehman (2004) states, “The powerlessness of the academic, which the colonial bureaucracy has ensured, has only increased in the half century of Pakistan’s existence” (p. 27).

The system in the newly established country comprised many interlocking institutions which included federal and provincial ministries and their attached departments; the offices of the chancellors of public universities (generally the provincial governors or the president); the university grant commission; external publishing houses; research institutions; tuition centres; examination coaching centres; and NGOs (GoP, 2006a). Under this system, the separation of policy and management issues were ensured by entrusting policy matters to government agencies and management to the university syndicates and vice chancellors. Yet, many management issues (such as the appointment of deans and department chairs) were in the hands of the chancellors (governors) who were advised by their respective ministries (Khan, 2001; Khalid & Khan, 2006; Khurshid, 1998). At the top of the university hierarchy was/is the chancellor who is
in fact the governor of the province or the president of Pakistan in the case of federal universities. The chancellor approves the amendments to statutes, and appoints the vice chancellor, most syndicate members, the deans and the treasurer. In some universities, the federal or provincial Minister of Education is the pro-chancellor and may discharge the chancellor’s responsibilities in the latter’s absence (Ahsan, 2003; GoP, 2000). The federal Ministry of Education is the chancellor’s secretariat for federal universities but has little, if any, direct interaction with universities in the provinces. The former University Commission was established to promote common higher educational standards across universities but, later on, became mainly a funding channel (GoP, 2000; GoP, 2006b; Hathaway, 2005. The vice chancellor (VC) was and continues to be the chief executive and chief academic officer of the university, appointed by and accountable to the chancellor. The VC chairs the syndicate, the academic council, and all other administrative and academic bodies. All senior university officials are appointed by the syndicate on the recommendation of the selection board, which is chaired by the chancellor. The senate (where it exists) may have more than 100 members, including all department heads, deans and directors of programs, as well as faculty and alumni representatives, a representative of the provincial assembly and appointees of the chancellor. The senate usually had the voting power over budget and any proposed changes to statutes. The syndicate is the executive body of the university, responsible for all matters except for changes in the statutes. It usually has 15 to 20 members either elected by the faculty members or appointed by the chancellor (Ahsan, 2003; GoP, 2000; GoP, 2006a; 2006b; Rizvi & Elliot, 2005).

The academic council might include more than 100 members. Academic councils consider all curricular matters. Chaired by the VC, it comprises some senior management staff, deans, department directors, full professors, some librarians, elected faculty members, chancellor’s nominees and representatives of colleges. The selection board is convened on an as-needed basis to consider appointments and other personnel matters. Chaired by the VC, it comprises a representative of the Public Service Commission, nominees of the syndicate, department chairs, and the deans who are directly concerned. Appointed by the chancellor, the treasurer is the chief financial officer of the university and is responsible for ensuring that all financial rules are followed (GoP, 2000; GoP, 2006a; World Bank, 2005). The controller of examinations manages the examination system. The registrar is the secretary of all executive committees which gives him or her considerable power. The registrar is responsible for enforcing all administrative
policies and prepares institutional reports. Deans are appointed by the chancellor, and have mainly academic responsibilities. Heads of departments are appointed by the syndicate and have both academic and administrative powers (GoP, 2000; GoP, 2006a; Khurshid, 1998; Malik, 2000).

**Higher Education Policies and Plans Before HEC Initiated Reforms**

Quantitatively, Pakistan’s education system has shown significant growth since its establishment (Ahmad, 1997; Jalil, 1998; Zia, 1999) but, qualitatively, “Pakistan’s educational system has a checkered past of high ideals and promises and a dismal record of achievement. Higher education in the last 50 plus years has remained an arena of experimentation and implementation of divergent, often contradictory policies” (Ahmad, 2001, pp. 69-71). Sadly, the available funds were used for quantitative expansion and not for qualitative expansion. There have been several education policies since Pakistan’s origin, changing with changing rulers and ideologies (Ahsan, 2003). Ahsan contends that Pakistan does not pay enough attention to education development in the overall development of the country. Ahsan (2003) exposed how educational policies have been and still are full of unrealistic objectives and are therefore continually changing. New policies and plans were often prepared without giving due consideration to the causes of failure of previous policies and plans (Ahmad, 1997; Farooq, 1993; Gafoor & Arshad, 1994; Jalil, 1998). Some landmarks in Pakistani educational policy were the Education Conference, 1947; the Commission on National Education, 1959; the New Education Policy, 1970; the Education Policy, 1972, 1979, 1992, 1998-2010; and The Education Sector Reforms and Strategic Plan 2001-2004. All these policies primarily focused on literacy levels and primary education. One interesting effect of the First Education Conference (1957) was that it became a tradition to have a new education policy with each change of government (Ahmad, 2001; GoP, 2009; Khan, 2001).

I did a comprehensive study of the relevant literature and official documents (e.g., Ahmed, 1997; GoP, 1999; 2000; 2006a; 2006b; Hussain, 2008; Kazmi, 2005; Mughal & Manzoor, 1999) that helped me capture the constitutional provisions, educational policies and five-year plans affecting higher education in Pakistan. The constitution of any country ought to reflect the collective will of a nation about the way in which it wants to order the lives of its citizens. When Pakistan achieved its independence in 1947, it acquired an interim constitution in
the form of the *Government of India Act* of 1935 and the *Indian Independence Act* of 1947. Under these statutes, education was the joint responsibility of both the federal and the provincial governments. More precisely, administration and finance were the federal government’s responsibility and implementation and research were the responsibility of the provincial governments (Ahsan, 2003; Mahmood, 1990). Pakistan framed its first constitution in 1956, wherein sole responsibility for basic education was on the provincial government. The constitutions of 1956 and 1962 did not spell out any mandatory responsibility of the state. The constitution of 1962 mentioned that free and compulsory primary education should be provided to all citizens of the country, while the 1973 constitution went one step further by stipulating that free and compulsory secondary education would be provided (Ghaffar, 2003; Malik, 2000). However, the lawmakers failed to mention any deadline by which this target could be achieved. The result is quite evident that, more than three decades later, the goal mentioned in the 1973 constitution has not yet been achieved. The constitution of 1973 was framed in light of some of the experiences gained and learned from the traumatic breakup of the country and brought the responsibility for education back onto the state (Ghaffar, 2003). It was then when higher education was given greater importance. The parliament passed three acts to ensure that the state would have the necessary power to discharge its obligations. These acts were: the *University Grants Commission Act* of 1974; the *Centres of Excellence Act* of 1974; and the *Federal Supervision of Curricula, Textbooks, and Maintenance of Standards of Education Act* of 1976 (Ahsan, 2003; Ghaffar, 2003; Ghafoor & Arshad, 1994). The University Grants Commission (UGC) was established in 1974 to coordinate higher education more effectively. The main function of the UGC, as laid down in section 2 of the *University Grants Commission Act*, is:

Promotion and coordination of university education, the determination and maintenance of standard of teaching, examination and research in universities, the promotion of national unity and solidarity, the orientation of university programs to national levels.

(Government of Pakistan (GoP), 2006, p. 9)

The establishment of Centres of Excellence in universities aimed to contribute towards improving teaching and research practices. The state also got control over curriculum, textbooks and maintenance of standards of education under the *Federal Supervision of Curricula, Textbooks, and Maintenance of Standards of Education Act* (GoP, 1999; 2007). This act was passed, keeping in view the need to build national cohesion by: promoting social and cultural
harmony; designing curricula compatible with the basic national ideology; and maintaining high standards of education. The report of the Commission on National Education (1959) was the first document emphasizing the importance of higher education (Ahsan, 2003). Many recommendations were made to reform the higher education system that were hoped would meet the individual as well as collective needs and aspirations of the people of Pakistan. Suggested reforms included: decentralization of educational administration; financial autonomy; and changes in the duration of various degree programs (Ahsan, 2003; GoP, 2000; 2006a). These recommendations were not realistic when compared with the availability of resources and the lack of political will. In September 1962, a general strike was called against the National Education Commission’s reforms. The government was not able to take a firm stand on those reforms and the program was withdrawn (Ahsan, 2003).

The new education policy of 1970 laid great emphasis on: establishing new universities; improving the affiliation of colleges with universities; strengthening post-graduate research and academic freedom of higher education institutions; revising the curriculum and pedagogy; and making improvements in the efficiency and discipline standards of the university staff (GoP, 1999; 2002a; 2006b). For these purposes, universities were advised to open their respective Centres of Excellence. A National Fellowship Scheme was instituted to further strengthen university research and to support research scholars. The announcement of this policy coincided with the rise of political instability in the country. Political disruption prevented this policy from being implemented. The new policy of 1972-1980 evolved under the new management in the country. This new policy made recommendations similar to the 1970 policy, but its key focus was the nationalization of the institutions. National cohesion, social and cultural harmony, and the preservation and promotion of Pakistan’s basic ideology were some of the key expressions repeatedly used in the whole policy documents (Ahsan, 2003; GoP, 2006b). This policy was implemented to a certain extent and, in 1979, yet another education policy was presented with a focus on the “harmonization of education” (Ahsan, 2003) with Islamic principles. For the higher education sector, this policy emphasized the strengthening of libraries and cultural events, and on-the-job training for students enrolled in the sciences and in technical and vocational programs. One basic change that was introduced through this policy was that the national language (Urdu) would be used as the medium of instruction in public schools because language was considered a crucial factor in strengthening the ideological foundation of the nation and in
fostering unity of thought, brotherhood and a sense of patriotism (Rahman, 2008). Private schools were allowed to have English as the medium of instruction. This led to the operation of two different systems of education within the country – that is, one for the elite and another for the rest of the nation (Ahsan, 2003; Khan 2001).

The 1992-2002 policies were further attempts to streamline the process of education, which had fallen victim to both external and internal inefficiencies. The education policy of 1992 introduced a qualitative shift for higher education from an emphasis on supply to demand-oriented programs. In addition, the policy placed emphasis on student discipline, research and community participation. Students were encouraged to do community service (GoP, 2006b). The policy also stated that teachers should be subjected to accountability through performance evaluations on the basis of which rewards and punishments would be awarded by review boards established for the purpose. The education policy of 1998 acknowledged the need for faculty development, revision of curriculum, academic audit, a corruption-free system of examination, and diversity of higher-education institutions (GoP, 1998). The basic objective of this policy was to restructure the educational system along modern lines, and to bring social change within the scope of the teachings of Islam (GoP, 1998; 2006a). In the context of higher education in Pakistan, the implementation has never matched the fine words of the policies. In addition, throughout the history of education in Pakistan, various five-year plans were designed to achieve the goals stated in its various educational policies.

In addition to various educational policies, multiple five-year plans were also made. The first five-year plan 1955-1960, which actually received approval in 1957, was an attempt to make educational development in consonance with socio-economic development by allocating more funds and by improving the physical facilities of professional institutions (GoP, 2006a; Saeed, 2007). This plan recognized that some of the prerequisites of a stable, vigorous and economically sound system of higher education did not exist in the country. Those include the form of coordination and integration among higher education institutions and the freedom of higher education institutions to make administrative and academic decisions to preserve and promote the spirit of scholarship and research (Ahsan, 2003). The plan lamented the fact that the system of higher education was a “direct inheritance of the colonial system, which had the purpose of training people for specific jobs by specific government agencies” (GoP, 2006, p. 121). The plan essentially recommended two changes to meet the demands of the newly independent state.
There were improvements in the content and quality of instruction and research, and reorganization of the administration and financing of institutions. As with the educational policies, this plan was disappointing in terms of accomplishments. None of the targets were met as stated in the original plan report (Saeed, 2007).

The second five-year plan (1960-1965) had similar goals including a special emphasis on the leadership aspect. Provision was made to increase the duration of the engineering program to four years. This plan did well in terms of achievements. At the higher education level, significant advances were made in the provision of physical facilities, the inclusion of buildings, scientific equipment, laboratories, study rooms for faculty members and other essential amenities (GoP, 2006b; Saeed, 2007). The third plan was formulated within the framework of the 20-year perspective plan (1965-1985) and in light of the achievements and shortfalls of the previous two plans. Improvement in the quality of existing institutions and libraries, separation of colleges from universities as independent degree-awarding institutions and opening of multi-disciplinary research units in selected universities were among the few major provisions of this plan (GoP, 2006b). In terms of achievements, this plan was not able to achieve even half of its target goals.

By the end of 1970, a decision to reset priorities was taken and measures were adopted to improve education, with the focus shifting towards the qualitative aspects of educational development. With that focus came the fourth five-year plan (1970-1975) which sought to integrate social change leading to economic progress (Saeed, 2007). Some of the significant achievements of this plan were the establishment of the University Grants Commission (UGC), Centres of Excellence in selected universities and formal scholarship programs in universities (GoP, 2006a).

The fifth five-year plan (1977-1983) and the sixth five-year plan (1983-1988), as with previous plans, aimed at improving the quality of instruction and at consolidating and upgrading the existing institutions. The fifth plan specifically emphasized the need to establish a National Academy of Higher Education in Islamabad, with the focus being on organizing seminars, workshops and discussion groups of college and university faculty members (GoP, 2006a). The plan aimed to encourage faculty to undertake more research and, in order to achieve this, the UGC was advised to offer fellowship grants and provide research facilities where required (Ahsan, 2003). The sixth plan emphasized the need to extend socio-economic opportunities to women (GoP, 2006b). It was for the first time in the history of Pakistan that any plan recognized
that women can play a significant role in the development of the country (Ghaffar, 2003). Despite the realization, adequate funds were never allocated for this purpose. One of the strengths of this plan was its encouragement of the private sector in the development of educational facilities in the country. This plan also clearly stated that no new university would be set up.

The seventh five-year plan (1988-1993) was prepared in light of the experience gained from the implementation of the sixth plan. The seventh plan called for a series of reforms in the higher education system including: improved financing; the enlargement of research facilities; the establishment of Guidance and Placement Centres in every university; the introduction of evening classes in colleges; revisions in the curriculum; improvements in the academic and administrative environment; raises in faculty members’ salary; and changes in the minimum qualification for a university teacher to M.Phil. (GoP, 2006b). The eighth five-year plan (1993-1998) reflected the same trend as that of the seventh plan. The ninth five-year plan was under preparation but, before it could be finalized, the government changed its planning policies and this was mostly because of global pressure which I will describe in the next section. Before the establishment of the HEC, the government used yearly roll-on planning (GoP, 2009). Consequently, the only reliable data available is with regard to funds allocated. The actual targets and the broader perspective within which they were situated are impossible to find, if they even exist (Khalid & Khan, 2006; Saeed, 2007). An assessment of all plans taken together reveals a common trend in the sense that each plan acknowledges the great importance of education in general and of higher education in particular. Yet, for a variety of reasons, none of these plans was successful. Some reasons include: political instability; lack of commitment shown by leaders and policy makers; lack of funding; and, in some cases, lack of will among citizens (Ahsan, 2003; Malik, 2000; Ullah, 2005). None of the ambitious goals articulated in the various policy documents have even been fulfilled through implementation.

Challenges in Higher Education in Pakistan Before the HEC Initiated Reforms

Issues related to higher education as a whole should be examined contextually. One set of solutions should not be considered to apply everywhere. Each situation is unique and unwanted events can take place at any time. Furthermore, given the fact that domestic and global circumstances can change quickly, it follows that governments and governing institutions should
remain alert to new and unexpected situations and should respond accordingly. Today, as the world becomes increasingly interconnected, higher education is considered to be critical for the achievement of economic progress, political stability and peace. As mentioned earlier, historically there have been issues of quality in the education sector in general and in the higher education sector in particular in Pakistan (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b; Sheikh, 1998; World Bank, 2002). The most pressing issues of higher education in Pakistan include, among others, a flawed institutional framework, inefficiency and ineffectiveness, the problematic nature of the design and delivery of service, irrelevance and wastage of resources, an inadequate student support system, underfunding and low productivity in research, outdated curricula and lack of interface between university and industry (GoP, 2002a; 2002b; 2006a). In 1987, Hayes also found similar problems plaguing the educational system of Pakistan which he characterized as “multidimensional.” Those problems included: the population explosion; the lack of resources; scarcity of qualified staff; inconsistency in the policies of various regimes; political instability; inefficient educational management systems; wastage of resources; unfavourable bureaucratic attitudes towards change; and poor implementation of policies and programs, to name a few. Ten years later in 1998, Dr. Virk summarized the operating conditions of universities in Pakistan in the following words:

The universities in their present form are not geared to create new knowledge, nor do their graduate-study programs measure up to international standards…. Rapid expansion of the system of higher education, limited financial input, and periodic student unrest have eroded the teaching and learning process despite the modernization of curricula. The supply of funds to the universities is limited and coupled with insufficient use of public funds. The autonomy of the universities provided under their Acts is not only inadequate but also distorted. The research base in the universities is weak, and inadequately equipped libraries and laboratories and a shortage of qualified teachers continue to hinder the progress of higher education towards excellence (Virk, 1998, p. 9).

Pakistan’s higher education system proved to be unable to provide the skills and opportunities necessary to achieve the dual objectives of nation building and achieving global competitiveness. One of the research participants, Bilal, who is a senior administrator at the HEC, reflected on the state of universities prior to the HEC-initiated reforms in following words:

The primary weakness was a lack of emphasis on the fundamental role of a university – that of knowledge accumulation, creation and dissemination. Research is critical to the existence of a university and this emphasis simply did not exist. There was also lack of accountability and competitiveness in the faculty and no mechanism to define good
faculty and distinguish the good from the bad. Universities were also critically under-funded which was hampering every aspect of their development…. (First Interview with Bilal).

Pakistan inherited a very weak base of higher education (Ahsan, 2003). At the time of Pakistan’s partition with India in 1947, there was only one university, the University of Punjab, in the country. With independence, higher education received considerable attention. Initially the pace of development was slow but gradually, like its population growth, the number of higher education institutions increased significantly (GoP, 1999). Before the HEC reforms, there were around 37 public-sector universities, and 22 private-sector universities. All over the world, higher secondary education is part of school education, whereas in Pakistan it was part of college education.

All policy documents starting in 1959, recommended the splitting off of the eleventh- and twelfth-grade classes from colleges and the raising of the high school level up to the twelfth class. Even under the HEC reforms, this plan has not been accomplished to its fullest (Saeed, 2007). The other structural deficiency from which the system of higher education suffers was the existence of the two-year bachelor program (instead of four years) and the affiliation of degree colleges with universities. The system of affiliation contributed significantly to the deterioration of academic standards in Pakistani higher education. Except for control over final examinations and the awarding of degrees, the universities had little to do with these affiliated colleges. Universities hardly played any role in the academic monitoring of the colleges affiliated to them. The total time available to universities for the academic year was very low. The duration of vacations and strikes was increasing and universities remained closed for months. Less than 30 percent of university faculty members had their doctoral degrees. Seniority governed the principle of promotion for the faculty. The system in general provided little incentive for hard work and the research base in universities was rather weak. Furthermore, admission criteria were based solely on the marks obtained in the final annual examination which were not sufficient to test the knowledge and aptitude of the student (GoP, 2002a; 2002b; 2006a; Khurshid, 1998). There was a strong need to modernize Pakistani higher education by improving inputs and relating education to national needs. The trigger for a series of initiatives in higher education in the late 1990s and early 2000s was the World Bank’s report on higher education in developing countries, as is detailed in the next section.
The Trigger Behind the HEC Reforms: The World Bank-UNESCO Task Force Report on Higher Education in Developing Countries

The 1998 World Development Report focusing on the topic *Knowledge for Development* and the 1998 UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education brought to the forefront some of the key challenges facing higher education in developing countries, revealing the urgency with which such challenges must be tackled if countries expect to reach economic and social development goals. The Task Force on Higher Education and Society was composed of education specialists from 13 countries who were associated with various universities, foundations and corporations. The premise of the work of the task force was that “a more balanced approach” to education at all levels is needed (GoP, 2000; 2002b). According to the task force, during the past two or three decades,

…attention has focused on primary education, especially for girls. This has led to a neglect of secondary and tertiary education, with higher education in a perilous state in many, if not most, developing countries. With a few notable exceptions, it is under-funded by governments and donors. As a result, quality is low and often deteriorating, while access remains limited. Higher education institutions (and whole systems) are politicized, poorly regulated and sometimes corrupt (The World Bank, 2000, p. 19).

In 2000, the task force released its report entitled *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*. The report provided a deep analysis of the challenges facing higher education in developing countries and offered recommendations on how policy makers and institutions might address them. The report pointed out that “Escaping the low-level traps necessarily requires substantial and wide-ranging improvements, rather than the all too frequently patchy and incremental steps” (p. 29). The report advocated that developing countries invest in higher education that prepares graduates for versatility and the skills of life-long learning, rather than narrowly in specific disciplines, in order to enable them to both identify and capitalize on trends in development as they emerge during their lives. This report has exerted a strong influence on developing countries’ approaches to dialogue on higher education. Pakistan was one of the first countries to consider how the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force recommendations could be applied to their local context. The publication stimulated a review of higher education in Pakistan by the academic community at a seminar held at the Lahore University of Management Science (LUMS) in February 2000 and arranged by the pro-
chancellor of LUMS, who was a member of the World Bank-UNESCO International Task Force. Senior policy makers in education, the heads of leading universities, leading educators of the country and representatives of international development agencies participated in this seminar and in a follow-up seminar that was arranged by the president of Agha Khan University, Karachi (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b; Haider 2008). Both meetings generated considerable discussions on the factors contributing to the ills of the system in higher education in Pakistan. The academic community presented recommendations from their discussions to the federal Minister of Education (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b), who later formed a task force to comprehensively reform the overall higher education system in Pakistan.

Higher Education Reforms in Pakistan

In April 2001, the federal Minister of Education constituted a Pakistani Task Force on Higher Education (TFHE) to carry out an in-depth study of the country’s higher education system and to issue recommendations for improvement. The Task Force on Higher Education was convened by the education community (though mostly by Ministry officials and bureaucrats) to bring together experts (including deans and vice-deans) from major Pakistani universities for the purpose of exploring the future of higher education in Pakistan. The terms of reference required an in-depth investigation of higher education and recommendations for improvement, with special reference to systems of quality assurance and accreditation, funding and financial stability, and effective governance and management (GoP, 2002a; GoP 2002b; Zia, 2003). The TFHE was required to submit their final report by December 2001. The Task Force on Higher Education created the following vision statement:

Transformation of our institutions of higher education into world class seats of learning, equipped to foster high quality education, scholarship and research, to produce enlightened citizens with strong moral and ethical values that build a tolerant and pluralistic society (Government of Pakistan, 2002a, p. 9)

The Task Force on Higher Education spent almost a year reviewing the recommendations of past education commissions, plans and policies, and followed a consultative process through seminars across the country before presenting its report. This report identified several longstanding issues afflicting higher education in Pakistan. The most prominent among the issues identified were: ineffective governance and management structures and policies; ineffective use of available resources; lack of sufficient funding; poor faculty recruitment
practices; insufficient faculty and staff development; inadequate attention to research and support; politicization of faculty, staff and students; and strong skepticism about the realization of reforms (GoP, 2002a; 2002b; Saeed, 2007).

The task force pointed towards the fact that all policies and plans clearly indicated the need to reform higher education. However, implementation did not match the many significant recommendations. While financial allocations has been inadequate, several recommendations that were not dependant on finance were also not implemented as planned (GoP, 2002a; GoP 2002b). The task force gave a few examples to support this claim. First, when the simplification and strengthening of administrative and academic functions through a revision of the University Act of 1959 was suggested, nothing was done even though financial resources were not required. The second example included the recommendation to extend the bachelor’s degree programs from two to four years which was implemented but later withdrawn because of opposition by the academic community. Another example was in reference to the recommendation to include admission tests for university admissions. Universities’ inability to implement these policies was due to a lack of appropriate support from the leadership at higher levels and to resistance from students and society in general (Ahsan, 2003; Khalid & Khan, 2006). Upon consultation with the educational community in Pakistan, the Pakistan Task Force presented its detailed recommendations to the President of Pakistan in January 2002. As a result, a Steering Committee for Higher Education (SCHE) was constituted to present an “implementation plan” for higher educational reform (GoP, 2002a; GoP 2002b; GoP, 2006a). The recommendations of the task force were operationalized and improved upon by the steering committee. The president approved the recommendations of the task force and the steering committee and established the Higher Education Commission (HEC) to refine and implement the recommended actions (GoP, 2006a; Haider, 2008). The Higher Education Commission was established in 2002 as an autonomous body attached to the Ministry of Education.

As mentioned earlier in chapter one, the key feature of the Higher Education Commission (HEC) was the explicit adoption of a systems perspective. This strategy meant approaching the various institutions of education, research, funding, communication and publication, and management not as a set of isolated structures but as an integrated system (GoP, 2006a). The HEC was fully empowered to carry out evaluation, improvement and promotion of higher education, research and development, to formulate policies, guiding principles and priorities for
higher education institutions, and to prescribe the conditions under which institutions, including those that are not part of the state educational system, may be opened and operated (GoP, 2006a; Haider, 2008). The mandate of the HEC encompassed all degree-granting universities and institutions, both in the public and private sectors, and aimed to support the attainment of quality education by facilitating and coordinating self-assessment of academic programs and their external review by national and international experts (GoP, 2006a; Haider, 2008). The HEC also supervised the planning, development and accreditation of public- and private-sector higher education institutions. Its goal was to facilitate the reform process. One of the participants, Hafeez, a senior professor, optimistically commented on HEC’s contribution as follows:

The real change on the ground has occurred after the formation of the Higher Education Commission. Developing countries typically have a store room full of reports that are launched with great fanfare but fizzle out in the implementation stage. In Pakistan, the difference has been the creation of an institution that is well-funded, independent and supported at the highest levels of the government to bring out real change in the higher education sector (second interview with Hafiz).

Task Force on Higher Education’s (TFHE) Recommendations

In their 2002 report to the federal Minister of Education, the task force listed many reasons for the declining standards of higher education in Pakistan. Some of those conditions included: outdated curricula; lack of financial resources for the faculty and graduate students; insufficient use of available resources; inadequate funding; ineffective governance, management and recruitment practices; external political influence; inadequate provisions for research; the absence of accountability and transparency, poor assessment and evaluation systems, and inefficient distribution of funds within the universities (Ahsan, 2003; GoP, 2002b). The report concluded by stating that “The higher education system in place neither educates learners to participate adequately in the economic, social or political life of the country nor creates the basis for the good society envisaged in the vision statement derived by the task force” (GoP, 2002a, p. 31). The recommendations proposed by the TFHE encompassed university governance and management; central coordination and support for quality; increased funding; improved faculty and staff recruitment and development; improved assessment and evaluation; and curriculum reforms. Many participants grouped all these proposed reforms into three broad categories: institutional reforms (including challenges of governance and management), curriculum reforms
(including challenges of pedagogy) and fiscal reforms (including challenges of financial solvency). Most of these recommendations were based on a close examination of the institutional structure of public-sector universities in the U.S. (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b; GoP, 2006a). Succeeding sections will elucidate different areas of university administration and functions to help understand the context and scope of the HEC reforms.

Table 1. Focus of Reforms for HEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Reforms for HEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Governance and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff Appointments and Conditions of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity between role, responsibility and authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of research incentives and poor Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Teaching Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Reforms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Governance and Management

Traditionally, university governance and management were under the control of the provincial governor and the ruling political parties. The task force recommended more autonomy and independence but also more accountability for universities in terms of their governance and management (Saeed, 2007). The task force discouraged direct control by the Ministry or any other political body, though affiliations with the Ministry and provincial departments were considered acceptable. Moreover, it suggested that the Governing Board (which may be called the Senate, Syndicate, Board of Governors or Board of Trustees) of a university must function separately and be accountable to society for the utilization of the institution’s resources and the resulting performance (GoP, 2002a; GoP 2002b). The task force recommended that candidates for membership in the governing board should be independent thinkers who are ethical, broad-minded and constructive. Evidence of these attributes could be obtained from the developmental nature of their accomplishments and from significant engagement in the development of human resources or knowledge or service. As well, the chairperson and members would serve in a
voluntary capacity (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2006a). According to the task force, the governing boards
should be comprised of the following members: the chairperson who is selected by the
nominating committee of the board; one member from the academic community from the
province in which the university is located who is at the level of professor or of the principal of a
college but who is not employed by the university concerned; two members from the academic
community from other provinces who are at the level of professor or of the principal of a college;
five respected members from society to ensure representation of the public interest; one member
from the alumni; two members from the federal or provincial government not below the rank of
joint secretary; the chief executive officer of the university (vice-chancellor, rector or president);
and two faculty members at the rank of professor, these being the most senior dean and most
senior professor identified by the CEO (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b; GoP, 2006a).

The governing board must ensure that the performance of the university is consistent with
its mission, and that the institution has the appropriate human, physical, and financial resources
to achieve the relevant and requisite quality of the end product. The board should be responsible
for the nomination of candidates for the board; the appraisal of the board’s performance; the
recommendation of candidates to the chancellor for the appointment of the vice-chancellors; the
approval of university policies; appointments of senior faculty (professors and associate
professors) and senior administrators; the approval of budgets; the approval of strategic plans
and development; and the approval of financial resource development (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b;
Sajjad, 2002).

The task force also recommended that separate structures should be responsible for the
senior management of academic and non-academic functions, while ensuring that the requisite
critical coordination between them is achieved. Structures and processes at the lower levels
would be determined by the management in accordance with institutional needs, and with the
guidance and approval of the governing board (GoP, 2002a). In general, an executive council
was deemed necessary for non-academic functions and an academic council was considered
essential for academic functions. The academic functions relate primarily to quality assurance of
academic programs and research as well as to accountability for these activities which includes:
the selection, development and management of faculty; the selection, support and development
of students; and the planning, implementation, monitoring and review of educational programs
and research (GoP, 2002a; 2002b; 2006a).
Faculty and Staff Appointments and Conditions of Service

Traditionally, hiring criteria were vague and people often received tenure because of seniority and without any performance appraisals (Chaudhry, 2005). The task force recommended that faculty and staff appointments be based on processes defined by the university management and governing board. All initial appointments were recommended to be made for a specified period, renewable based on performance appraisals, and tenure should be given in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the governing board (GoP, 2002b; Saeed, 2007). There were no structured mandatory professional-development programs in place for the faculty members. In order to make human resources more effective contributors to the institution’s mission, the task force emphasized the need to have a structured performance-appraisal system and mandatory in-service training available for the faculty and staff (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b).

Accountability and Transparency

The task force considered the lack of accountability in Pakistani universities to be a direct consequence of the flawed nature of the administrative structure in place (Ahsan, 2003; GoP, 2000; 2002a). The most problematic among those were the appointment of vice chancellors by the chancellor, the appointment of the syndicate through the same process and the chairing of the syndicate by the vice chancellor. Most of these appointments were based on political patronage or nepotism (Saeed, 2007). The fact that the vice chancellor was nominated, not elected, and the fact that the syndicate was similarly constituted led to the effective collusion of the power brokers and resulted in dysfunctional systems within the university system. To make matters worse, there was no transparent mechanism for the evaluation of the performance of faculty and administrative staff. Merit played a minimal role in their advancement; it was essentially based on who knew whom (Afridi et al., 2002; Malik, 2000).

Ambiguity Between Roles, Responsibilities and Authority

A fundamental organizational principle is that, if a person is to be held accountable for his or her performance, he or she should have full authority to take decisions within his or her jurisdiction without outside interference, and his or her responsibilities must be suited to his or her expertise. Contrary to that principle, most of the individuals holding important positions in
the university management had responsibilities inappropriate to their respective roles, with limited authority and without being held directly accountable (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b).

Lack of Research Incentives and Poor Financial Management

Another fundamental problem in universities was poor financial management (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b). Research funding in universities was, in many cases, controlled by the heads of the departments who in most cases had little to do with the research being conducted. There were no offices dedicated to the task of handling research funds in the universities. The university system did not reward, either materially or in terms of prestige, faculty with superior research credentials. To make matters worse, faculty pay structures were fixed and not dependent on performance (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b; GoP, 2006a). In addition, universities lacked suitable administrative structures to facilitate efforts by faculty members to attract research money (Haider, 2008). One reason for this omission was the fact that there was no direct monetary benefit to the university when the faculty member obtained funds for research. In Pakistan, universities never received reimbursement either by the faculty member or the funding agency for the use of their premises, facilities and utilities for carrying out research projects. Moreover, there was no strict mechanism for the protection of intellectual property developed in the universities (Haider, 2008; Malik, 2000). The task force emphasized the need to create a significant capacity for research in Pakistan in order to enable the country to guide its development, understand its problems and find solutions for them (GoP, 2002b). In addition to funding, the task force requested that the government support the HEC to develop the capacity of faculty and students for research, not only in science and technology but also in the social sciences and humanities (GoP, 2002a).

University Teaching Approaches

The university teaching approach had been a prime national concern in Pakistan. A wide group of academics and government authorities (Aly, 2007; GoP, 2006a; Hoodbhoy, 2005b; 2008a; Malik, 2006; Rehman, 2005; Siddiqui, 2006) reported that teaching strategies, learning activities and assessment techniques have been mostly based on traditional models in Pakistan. Malik (2006) noted that Pakistani students are more reliant on rote memory and examination-oriented learning. In their research, Ahmed (1992) and Inam Ullah et al. (2008) concluded that
more than two-thirds of classroom time was used up in talking by teachers. University teachers tended to dictate from outdated notes and, in most cases, class lectures were a boring experience for the students. The “learning” was rote in nature and assessments simply tested the ability to memorize (Aly 2007; GoP, 2006a; Hoodbhoy, 2005a, 2008a; Malik 2006; Rehman 2005; Siddiqui 2006). A majority of students (58%) was not satisfied with the general university teaching behaviour in the country (Ali, 2005). Moreover, assessment was limited to written examinations, focused upon the limited role of promoting or failing the student. The examination system was heterogeneous and lacked quality assurance at every step (Aly, 2007; GoP, 2006a; Hoodbhoy, 2005a, 2008a; Malik, 2006; Rehman, 2005; Siddiqui, 2006). Students primarily learned things for the sake of assessment, and there was little practical life application of anything learned in the classroom. Employment agencies like the Federal Public Service Commission also have reservations about the teaching behaviour in the country (GoP, 2006a).

**Tuition Fees**

Tuition fees in the public-sector institutions have been consistently low while the cost of imparting education has been steadily rising (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b; GoP, 2006a). The task force recommended an upward revision of tuition fees that reflects the cost of education. However, the task force made it clear that tuition fees should neither be the main source of funding nor an impediment to access for those who cannot afford the cost of education (GoP, 2002a).

**Curriculum Reforms**

Curriculum-related matters, such as outdated curricula, an unreliable annual examination system, early specialization and the duration of education required for a bachelor’s degree, were taken seriously by the task force (Ali & Kassim-Lakha, 2002; GoP, 2002a). The practice of early specialization through segregation of students into arts and science streams from grade 8 in schools was considered detrimental to general education and limited career choices at later stages (Ali, 2000; Malik, 2000). This system was based on false dichotomies among the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities.

A general curriculum was recommended, not only for the secondary and higher secondary levels but also for baccalaureate programs, in order to prepare students for critical and
moral reasoning, effective communication and self-directed life-long learning. Such enrichments to the curriculum were considered essential to encourage good citizenship, adaptability and innovation, thus facilitating the continuous renewal of the economic and social structures relevant to a fast-changing world (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b; GoP, 2006a). The TFHE report defines a general education as “a curriculum [or a part thereof] aimed at imparting general knowledge and developing general intellectual capacities in contrast to a professional, vocational, or technical curriculum” (GoP 2002a, p.59). This general curriculum is characterized by its focus on the whole development of the individual, apart from his or her occupational training. The TFHE emphasized the fact that the core curriculum should be rooted in Pakistan – culturally, politically and economically (Malik, 2000; Saeed, 2007). The situation of textbooks and course materials was also seen as dismal. At the higher education level, most courses used imported texts that were both high in cost and lacking in local content (and therefore likely to be viewed as irrelevant to social needs). To deal with this problem, the task force recommended abolishing various textbook boards and replacing them with an independent review and rating agency to produce quality textbooks that were locally published (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b).

Furthermore, the task force condemned the annual examination system at the school level which tested memorization and recall and thereby promoted rote learning which is detrimental for understanding and for the application of knowledge at all levels, as well as the poor preparation for higher education (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b). The task force criticized the National Testing Service for the fact that the public examination boards were not standardized and for the fact that there was considerable variation in the scores for a given level of performance. Consequently, admission to higher education institutions, on the basis of examination scores, facilitated some students and created difficulties for others. The task force concluded that the purpose of standardization could be served if entrance tests were given by colleges and universities that select their students from a pool of applicants who present scores given by several boards. Problems in the administration of examinations and its security system were also criticized (GoP, 2002a; GoP, 2002b; GoP, 2006a). Based on these above-mentioned problems, it was considered important to establish a more efficient central body (i.e. the HEC) to coordinate and support the quality of higher education in Pakistan.
The Higher Education Commission (HEC)

Before 2002, the University Grants Commission (UGC) was the central body responsible for monitoring and regulating public higher education in Pakistan (GoP, 2002b; 2006a; 2006b). Due to its limited resources, limited scope of responsibilities and exposure to political influence over its decision-making, the UGC was more or less assisting the government in implementing its various projects. The task force conceptualized the central body as a vital component of a network of independently governed and managed institutions that provided diversity of expertise, and that promoted synergy and efficient utilization of the country’s resources for education and research (Ali & Kassim-Lakha, 2002; GoP, 2002b). The task force recommended that there should be a central body known as the Higher Education Commission (HEC) which would be conceptually different than the UGC and that would replace the UGC (GoP, 2002b; GoP, 2006a). In order to establish the HEC, the task force recommended the appointment of a steering committee in order to develop a plan for implementation in accordance with the recommendations, oversee the drafting of necessary legislation, and establish the HEC. The role of the HEC was considered to be a

…pacemaker, stimulant, guide, critical appraiser, supporter, and collective conscience of the network of universities and other institutions of higher education. It must, however, avoid assuming a controlling role and work always towards creating an enabling environment in universities (GoP, 2002b, pp. 58-59).

The key feature of the report by the task force was the explicit adoption of a systems perspective, which meant approaching the various institutions of education, curriculum, research, funding and management, not as a set of isolated structures but as an integrated system (Ali & Kassim-Lakha, 2002; GoP, 2002b). The task force firmly believed that the implementation of its recommendations (the principles of which applied to both public and private institutions) would result in significant improvement in the quality of public higher education in Pakistan (GoP, 2002b). Since its inception in 2002, the HEC has had the following purposes and responsibilities:

1. In respect to the quality of higher education, the mandate of HEC encompasses all degree-granting institutions, public and private including professional colleges. It serves as a national resource for higher education based on its comprehensive nation-wide information and data on experience in other countries.
2. HEC supports the attainment of quality education by facilitating and coordinating self assessment of academic programs and their reviews by national and international experts.
For public sector educational institutions, the HEC links Federal Government funding with the quality of performance (akin to the principle used by the Higher Education Funding Council in the UK) and the need and justification for institutional development.

3. HEC is responsible for the planning, development, accreditation and fund raising for all institutions of higher education. (GoP, 2002a, pp. 43-45)

Based on the mandate, HEC would administer the following functions:

1. In order to support accreditation and maintenance of academic standards, HEC coordinates the initial and subsequent assessment of the quality of academic programs in established and new higher education institutions.
2. Provides support for enhancement of the quality of higher education and research. Facilitation of funding based on the quality of performance and needs is also HEC’s responsibility.
3. HEC participates in the formulation of federal government policy on matters of higher education. It also advises the Federal government and provincial governments on planning and development related aspects of higher education such as on all proposals for granting a charter to award degrees, in both public and private sectors.
4. HEC also advises the Federal government and provincial governments on the legal status and functional value of degrees and other certification of academic achievement given by all higher education institutions and recommends appropriate action.
5. HEC also supports the cause of national integration and cohesion through co-curricular activities. It also performs other incidental or consequential functions to the discharge of aforesaid functions. (GoP, 2002a, p. 44)

The public higher education system, meaning not only Pakistani universities but also the colleges that offer bachelor’s and master’s level degree programs, are implementing reforms put forward by the Higher Education Commission. Since 2002, higher education institutions all over the country have received a considerable increase in the allocation of financial resources. Similarly, “The universities are being developed through a program of faculty development, scholarships and stipends to the poor, curriculum revision, equipping laboratories and libraries. Annual budget allocation has been increased from $15 million a year to $150 million while that for science and technology increased from $3 million to $100 million” (Hussain, 2008, p. 7).

While the HEC is associated with the Ministry of Education, it is managed and governed independently to achieve the above-mentioned functions. As to the task force’s recommendations, the HEC has the autonomy to do the following: undertake its functions in cooperation with institutions of higher education; organize its management; select its Chief Executive Officer and staff; and develop its programs and recommendations in consultation with
Pakistan’s institutions of higher education, the provincial and federal governments, and any other agency in the country or abroad (Ali & Kassim-Lakha, 2002). There were some loopholes in relation to membership criteria for the HEC. On the one hand, the task force emphasized that the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and members should be based on merit, free from governmental, political, bureaucratic or other extraneous influences. On the other hand, the task force recommended that all members of the Board of Governors of the HEC should be appointed by the President of Pakistan (GoP, 2002b; GoP, 2006a).

The CEO is held accountable to the Board of Governors for the functions of the commission and is responsible for the management of the HEC. With regard to financial resources, the HEC has a strong financial system to control the allocation of funds to the institutions of higher education, based on performance. In acknowledgement of the fact that, historically, the Government of Pakistan has not always provided adequate financial support for higher education (either in absolute terms or in comparison with the efforts being made in other countries), the HEC works on its own fundraising efforts rather than solely relying on contributions from the federal government. The HEC conducts its own independent surveys to establish realistically the requirements for funding (Ali & Kassim-Lakha, 2002; GoP 2002b). Under this plan, the HEC managed its own functions, including: quality assurance; accreditation; finance; resource development; planning; information and communication technology; and two-way communication with the institutions and with members of the higher education academic community in order to obtain both input and feedback (GoP, 2006a).

The workings and achievements of the Higher Education Commission are contested and debated by people who are directly or indirectly part of the education system. However, it is important to briefly mention that General Musharraf is credited with the establishment of the HEC and that, under his control, the system experienced significant growth. Between 2002 and 2007, the total public budget allocated for higher education was increased from 3.2 billion rupees to 33.7 billion rupees (Hoodbhoy, 2008, p. 13). President Musharraf resigned in August 2008 and, since then, the new government headed by Mr. Asif Ali Zardari has made budget cuts to the HEC and there are reports and rumours about how the efficiency of the HEC is declining.

A critical analysis and challenge to the establishment and workings of the HEC can be performed in the same way in which Saigol (1995) analyzed the development of the education system in post-colonial countries in the global capitalist economy. She suggests that education
systems are used to reproduce the dominant social, political and economic ideologies. Ghazanfar (2005) notes that education reform is a classic good-news and bad-news problem. He further argues that the changes in the higher education system are part of a globalization process and that, eventually, the universities in developing countries such as Pakistan either will become franchises of Western universities or will compete with each other as providers of services and human resources to developed countries. The role, objectives and workings of the Higher Education Commission in this regard have created controversy.

Kalam (2005) asserts that the commission blames public higher education institutions for their low quality of education and their lack of research work. In response, the university administrations argue that at least 80 percent of the work of any professional university is to concentrate initially on teaching in order to produce the high quality professionals needed in the country. In addition, “Research and development work in any developing country has first to complete its record and documentation stage before it can reach the advanced stage of original research and development” (Kalam, 2005, p.12). The remainder of this chapter introduces the three selected research sites and participants. Appendix VI provides a snapshot of the participants’ profiles.

**Context of the Research/Study Sites**

[Diagram showing the context of the research sites with Pakistan at the top, followed by Higher Education Commission (HEC), Alama Iqbal Open University (AIYOU), and Fatima Jinnah Women University (FJWU) with their respective administrators and professors.]
Pakistan

Pakistan, officially called the Islamic Republic of Pakistan since 1956, is located in South Asia, bordering India (to the east), China (to the north-east), Afghanistan (to the north-west) and Iran (to the west). Pakistan gained independence from the British Empire in 1947. According to Pakistan’s 2008 census, the country has a population of over 172 million people (World Bank, 2008). Pakistan is a vast country with four provinces – Sindh, Punjab, Balochistan and the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (formerly the Northwest Frontier Province (NWFP)), as well as the federally administered tribal areas including the frontier regions. It is the sixth most populous country in the world and has the second largest Muslim population after Indonesia. It is an ethnically and linguistically diverse country, with a similar degree of variation in its geography and wildlife (Vazir, 2004). While Urdu, the national language, is spoken throughout Pakistan, English is extensively used in official and commercial circles, and in the cities. The regional languages are Sindhi in Sindh, Balochi in Balochistan, Punjabi in Punjab, and Pashto in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Many other regional languages are also spoken by local people in different regions. The population comprises several main ethnic groups including: Punjabis, Pashtuns, Seraikis, Muhajirs, Balochs, Kashmiris, Hindkowans, Kalshians, Burusho, Brahui, Khowar, Ranghar, Meo, Balti, Shina and Turwalis. The Punjabi population dominates with more than 45% of Pakistan’s total population (GoP, 2008). Pakistan’s census does not include immigrant groups such as the more than two million registered Afghan refugees from neighbouring Afghanistan. About 97% of the population is Muslim. Minority groups include Christians, Hindus, Baha’i, Sikhs, Parsis and Buddhists (GoP, 2008).

Pakistani society is largely hierarchical, with a high regard for local cultural etiquettes and traditional Islamic values which govern the personal and political lives of people. Within Pakistan’s patriarchal social framework, women continue to have a marginalized status in all spheres of life – political, economic and social. Gender segregation is prevalent whereby women and men occupy different ideologies and social spaces. Dominant gender ideologies are also reflected in the preference for gender-segregated schooling, particularly when children enter puberty (Ashraf, 2004). Pakistan has experienced a turbulent political situation since achieving its independence. The country has been ruled by both military and civilian governments, each with their own vested interests. According to Vazir (2004),
Pakistan has suffered civil strife, poverty, bureaucracy in government structures, feudalism, corruption at all levels, power-hungry rulers, an aid dependent economy, low rates of literacy and education, and gross socioeconomic status disparities. These problems arise partly from the legacy of pre-independence colonialism and partly from modern factions and pressures. (p. 3)

Punjab is the second largest province and is the most developed, most populous and most prosperous province of Pakistan. It is the nation’s only province that touches every other province and that surrounds the federal enclave of the national capital city of Islamabad. The greater Islamabad-Rawalpindi Metropolitan Area, where this study was conducted, is the third largest conurbation in Pakistan with a population of over 4.5 million inhabitants (Pakistan Census, 2008). Geographically, the city of Rawalpindi is in the province of Punjab whereas Islamabad has historically been a part of the crossroads of Punjab. The diverse population in both cities reflects visible paradoxes in lifestyle and opportunity between the very rich and those living in extreme poverty (Pakistan Census, 2008).

**Higher Education Commission (HEC)**

The first organization that I selected as a research site was the HEC in Islamabad because I was interested in studying the phenomenon of resistance to change from a policy makers’ and planners’ perspective alongside the implementation-level employees’ perspectives from the target organizations. I have already covered the HEC’s mandate and responsibilities; in this section, I will explain the HEC’s administrative structure, its various departments and various activities to improve the quality of higher education in Pakistan. Since its inception in 2002, the HEC has been the primary regulator of the higher education system in Pakistan. The HEC facilitates the development of the higher education system in Pakistan and the upgrading of the country’s universities to be centres of education, research and development. Before the establishment of the Higher Education Commission, there were many different ministries and departments responsible for higher education such as the University Grants Commission, the Curriculum Wing, the Literacy Commission, the Planning and Management Division, the Finance and Development Division and the Educational Testing Services (GoP, 2002b, 2006a). Since its commencement, the HEC has instituted major upgrades for laboratories and information and communications technology, the rehabilitation of facilities, the expansion of
research support and the development of one of the best digital libraries in the region. There are six main divisions in the HEC: finance, planning and development; human resource management; quality assurance; academic and co-curricular activities; research and development; and learning innovation.

The finance, planning and development division deals with funding to public- and private-sector universities, monitors and evaluates the financial aspects of the HEC, and manages developmental projects in the higher education sector (www.hec.gov.pk). The human resource management department is responsible for evaluating the credentials of Ph.D. supervisors, providing scholarships to students and faculty members and offering foreign scholarships. The hiring of experts and researchers from abroad and local retired eminent faculty members is also this division’s responsibility. This division also seeks the services of foreign experts in various disciplines from universities in leading industrialized countries to provide consultation in a variety of critical areas. The HEC has mandated consultation from foreign experts when universities award Ph.D. degrees, thus ensuring that each thesis is refereed and approved by at least two experts from technologically advanced countries before a doctoral degree is awarded (www.hec.gov.pk). The quality-assurance division of the HEC determines the standards of equivalency and recognition of degrees, diplomas and certificates awarded by institutions within the country and abroad. Faculty hiring criteria, the plagiarism policy and the preparation of the HEC-recognized journals are also this division’s responsibility. In a nutshell, the quality-assurance agency is engaged in the systematic implementation of quality-enhancement procedures and criteria to attain improved levels of international compatibility and competitiveness at the institutional and program levels (www.hec.gov.pk).

The academic and co-curricular division deals with, among other things, curriculum revision, institutional development, the upgrading of laboratories and libraries, the announcement of new scholarships, the determination of recognized journals, the establishment of admissions criteria and the evaluation of study area centres. The research and development division is responsible for supporting, financing and evaluating research programs, travel grants and other fellowship programs. The learning innovation division is responsible for introducing and managing innovations in the higher education sector. This division has initiated many programs such as short- and long-term faculty development programs, professional competency
enhancement programs for teachers, the establishment of a national committee on examination
systems, the incorporation of technologies in education, innovative governance programs for
university administrators, and reforms in English-language teaching (www.hec.gov.pk).

The creation of the HEC has had a positive impact on higher education in Pakistan. Since
its inception, university enrollment and salaries of scientists had tripled by 2008, and more than
50 new universities have been established. The expansion of international research publications
from Pakistan has become a norm along with a phenomenal increase in scholarships for graduate
and post-graduate students. These developments have been described as constituting a “silent
revolution” by many World Bank reports (World Bank, 2000). Pakistan’s accomplishments in
the higher education sector have been recognized in one of the leading science journals, Nature,
which stated that what Pakistan has accomplished under Professor Atta-ur-Rahman’s leadership
during the period from 2002 to 2008 is a lesson for other developing countries (Haider, 2008). In
addition, Pakistan won many prestigious international awards for the revolutionary changes in
the higher education sector that were brought about under Dr. Atta-ur-Rahman’s leadership
(Haider, 2008). Unfortunately, following the (forced) resignation of Dr. Atta-ur-Rahman, the
performance of the HEC has begun to decline and the culture of work in the HEC is changing.
Appendix VI provides a snapshot of the HEC participants’ profiles.

Allama Iqbal Open University (AIOU)

I selected this university as one of the research sites because it has a unique status in
Pakistan because of its philosophy, system, approach, functions and overall structure. Allama
Iqbal Open University (AIOU) was established in 1974 in Islamabad. It is the first Open
University in Asia and Africa and is second in the world after the U.K. Open University which
was established in 1969. It was initially named as the People’s Open University and was
renamed as Allama Iqbal Open University in 1977 in the honour of the national poet and
philosopher, Allama Muhammad Iqbal (AIOU, 2008). The idea of an “open university” was
presented with the enunciation of broad principles in the Education Policy of 1972-80, in these
words:

Open Universities are being used in several countries to provide education and training
to people who cannot leave their homes and jobs for full time studies. An open university
will, therefore, be established to provide part-time educational facilities through correspondence courses, tutorials, seminars, workshops, laboratories, television and radio broadcasts and other mass communication media…. (p. 19)

AIOU provides multi-disciplinary education from basic to doctoral level programs. AIOU’s main objective is to provide educational opportunities to those who cannot leave their homes and jobs, especially women. The idea of distance education assumed greater relevance and acceptance in Pakistan due to the factors of poverty and the relative deprivation of women (www.aiou.edu.pk). The university has its main campus in Islamabad with a vast network of regional centres spread all over the country, even in the remotest areas of Pakistan. The regional network at present consists of 39 regional campuses/centres with 110 part-time regional coordinating offices throughout the country (AIOU, 2008). As of June 2008, the university had established 1,274 study centres annually in coordination with formal educational institutions and study centres offering the latest computer lab facilities for students studying in the fields of science, technology and/or computer science in collaboration with private institutions of high repute in all major cities of the country (AIOU, 2008).

AIOU’s main clientele are from all over Pakistan and from the Middle East. In terms of student enrolment, it is the largest university of the country that provides education at the doorstep of students at an affordable cost. The fee structure of this university is perhaps the lowest in comparison to the fee structures of other universities in the country. Unlike other universities, this university also provides study materials to the students. The period for completing their certificates and degrees is linked with students’ own pace and convenience. The AIOU utilizes all possible media for instruction, including correspondence materials, radio and television, satellite transmission, online teaching, non-broadcast media, tutorial instruction and group-training workshops. The Central Library of the University is the largest in the country (AIOU, 2008). The AIOU started with five courses and an enrolment of less than 1,000 in 1974, and since that time it has expanded in all directions. At present, the total number of programs and courses offered are 116 and 1,377 respectively. In the year 2007-2008 when I did my data collection for my research, student enrolment was 1,031,951 and course enrolment was 2,982,420, of which the female participation rate was 51 percent (AIOU, 2008). There were four faculties, 37 academic departments and an Institute of Mass Education that offered a wide range of courses from functional non-credit course to the M.Phil. and Ph.D. levels. At present, the
university offers 14 doctoral programs, 46 doctoral courses, 198 courses at the M.Phil. level, 516 courses at the M.S./master’s level, 67 courses in teacher education, 282 courses at the bachelor’s/diploma level, 80 courses at the higher secondary school level, 30 courses at the secondary school level, 12 women’s middle education courses, and 114 functional non-credit / women’s basic education courses (AIOU, 2008). This university is technologically savvy and uses the most updated technologies to educate its students. Approximately 950 examination centres are established yearly at the Tehsil and District level with coordination of a regional network to facilitate its program and student evaluations. The university broadcasts around 300 radio and 400 television educational programs to facilitate education for its distance learners (www.aiou.edu.pk). The university has also established a video-conferencing network in selected regions to conduct classes online for computer science courses. AIOU generates 80 to 90 percent of its annual budget from its own resources, which is very different than other public-sector universities in Pakistan (AIOU, 2008). Appendix VI provides a snapshot of the participants’ profiles.

Fatima Jinnah Women’s University

I selected Fatima Jinnah Women’s University (FJWU) as a research site for several reasons. First, this institution has a reputation as an innovative university with a very competitive organizational culture. Second, FJWU was established only a few years before the Government of Pakistan started major transformations in the higher education sector. Third, as the only women’s university in Pakistan, it has its own philosophy of conduct which is sometimes dramatically different from traditional norms. This university offers a unique opportunity to research the phenomenon of resistance to transformational educational reforms within a group of women. Fatima Jinnah Women’s University, which is the first public-sector university for women, was established in 1998 at the Old Presidency in Rawalpindi. FJWU is named in commemoration of the contributions made by “Madr-e-Millat” (“Nation’s Mother Fatimah Jinnah”) to the cause of women’s emancipation. In a short span of time, it has become one of the leading institutions in the country. FJWU aims to equip women with professional and social skills, and to empower them to live up the challenges of the world and to contribute to national development (http://www.fjwu.edu.pk/). FJWU is known and is often criticized for its innovative practices. It has an enrollment of about 2,000 students (http://www.fjwu.edu.pk/). FJWU was the
first university that required applicants to pass an entry test followed by an interview. Applicants who qualify on the entry test are called for the interview. National Testing Services conducts the entry tests. A minimum of B+ average is required to enter into any bachelor’s program and a minimum of an A- average is required to enter into a master’s program. The university’s main clientele is comprised of women from all over Pakistan and from around the globe. FJWU has five faculties and 17 departments (http://www.fjwu.edu.pk/). At the bachelor’s level, there are 15 programs of studies which are on a regular and self-supporting basis. These are software engineering, computer arts, economics, education, English, environmental sciences, communication sciences, defence and diplomatic studies, behavioural sciences, business administration, Islamic studies, gender studies, public administration and fine arts. FJWU offers 13 programs at the post-graduate level. They are behavioural sciences, business administration, communication sciences, computer sciences, defence and diplomatic studies, economics, education, English, environmental sciences, fine arts, Islamic studies, gender studies and public administration (http://www.fjwu.edu.pk/).

The university has among the most advanced and equipped research centres and laboratories relative to other universities in Pakistan. It has a separate Quality Enhancement Cell to improve the quality and standards of its programs and operations. The university has also recently opened a campus in Sialkot, Punjab. FJWU has an enrollment of around 4,000 students, and around 200 full- and part-time faculty members (http://www.fjwu.edu.pk/). Since its inception, the university has adopted a different system of operations which is generally based on Western systems, including its semester system and foreign curriculum. FJWU strives to improve in quality and standards of higher education in order to meet national and international needs. The university has also established research collaborations with selected universities and research organizations in the United States, Canada, Europe and South Asia. At present, the university offers seven doctoral programs, approximately 36 doctoral courses, 400 courses at M.S./master’s level, 43 courses in education, roughly 170 courses in the bachelor’s programs and 22 courses in gender studies (http://www.fjwu.edu.pk/). Appendix VI provides a snapshot of the participants’ profiles.
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY AND METHOD

Purpose of the Inquiry

This chapter describes the research approach, research design, participants and procedures. In order to explore, analyze, describe and reflect on the meaning, nature, causes and associated dynamics of change within a specific cultural context, I applied a holistic analysis of change by not only looking at how participants defined resistance to change in their own words and at how resistance manifested itself in the workplace, but also by looking at its dimensionality and its relationship with other variables. During the course of this investigation, the following research questions guided the study:

1. How do the professors and administrators express their values, beliefs and attitudes regarding the change effort?
   a. Did he or she resist? If not, why not?
   b. Why did she or he resist and why does she or he think that other people resisted?
   c. How did the participants express their resistance or compliance?

2. What perceptions/circumstances obstruct administrators in bringing about change in their workplaces?
   a. What perceptions/circumstances play an important role in defining, facilitating and resisting the conditions that “ultimately” lead to systemic change?
   b. How are resistance mechanisms and strategies similar to, or different from, the various resistance constructs discussed in the literature?

Conceptual Framework

People’s perceptions about the implementation of the HEC reforms in the Pakistani higher-education sector are the focus of this study. In order to understand more deeply the implementation of this reform initiative, it is important to consider the historical context of the reform efforts, theories of educational change and barriers to organizational change. These areas taken together form the conceptual framework for this study. A detailed discussion of each of the areas in this framework is provided in chapters two and three. The findings are interpreted within this framework, drawing most heavily on Michael Fullan’s (1991a, 1999, 2001a, 2001b) views on how educational change can be understood. As the critical review of literature will later substantiate, the process of change often leaves us with more questions than answers – questions
that are determined by the varying contexts of reform projects. Given the nature of education and educational reforms there are questions of power, policy and responsibility at stake as well as a host of human factors including emotions and values. A review of the literature on organizational change, resistance to change, and the role of administrators and employees in change implementation, especially in Fullan’s work, alerted me to a number of concepts that offered the potential to provide an in-depth understanding of the complexity of the change process in general and of resistance in particular (Fullan, 1991a; 1999; 2001a; Lipman, 2002).

**Research Design**

Descriptions of the what, how, when and why of individual resistance were achieved through the adoption of a qualitative research design combined with a multiple-case-study approach. The structure of this research will reflect the constructivist paradigm as outlined by Guba & Lincoln (1994), as well as the multiple-case-study approach suggested by Creswell (1998) and Merriam (1998). I used a qualitative research approach because it is helpful to explore, understand and explain any social phenomenon through the words of participants who have lived the experience (Creswell, 1994). This approach is particularly useful for studying a complex issue, understanding the contexts in which the issue is experienced and empowering “individuals to share their stories [and] hear their voices” about this overall experience (Creswell, 2007, p. 40). The key words associated with qualitative methods include complexity, context, exploration, discovery and inductive logic (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). By using an inductive approach, the researcher can attempt to make sense of a situation without imposing pre-existing expectations on the phenomenon under study. Thus, the researcher begins with specific observations and allows the categories of analysis to emerge from the data as the study progresses (Mertens, 1998). This inquiry can be considered what Merriam (2001) refers to as a “basic or generic qualitative study” (p. 11) in that it has sought to “discover and understand a phenomenon...or the perspectives and worldviews of the people involved” (p. 11). In this type of approach, which is very common in education studies (Merriam, 2001), data are often collected through interviews, findings emphasize description and analysis, and analysis emerges from “the identification of recurring patterns...that cut through the data” (p. 11). This inquiry can also be considered a “topical life story” (Plummer, 1995) in that it focuses on participants’ career-life stories during the time that they were working within their respective institutions. Furthermore,
the inquiry does not attempt to capture individuals’ entire lives but rather explores a specific issue during a particular period of their lives.

A case study, or in this case a multiple case study, “…is an exploration of a bounded system…. This bounded system is bounded by time and place” (Creswell, 1998, p. 61). It allows the researcher to “enter the field of perception of participants; seeing how they experience, live, and display the phenomenon; and looking for the meaning of participants’ experience” (p. 31). A case study needs to be contextualized. The context of the case involves situating the case within its setting, which may be a physical setting or the social, historical and/or economic setting for the case. The socio-cultural context of Punjab represents a distinct setting for this research. Moreover, “A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 1994, p. 13). The case study design allows the researcher to gain an “in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved” (Merriam, 1998, p. 19).

Merriam suggested that case studies should be used when the researcher is interested “in process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific variable, in discovery rather than confirmation” (p. 19). The advantages of case-study design in applied fields are apparent. Merriam (1998) suggests that within this design “problems and programs can be examined to bring about understanding that in turn can affect and perhaps even improve practice” (p. 14). Within the case-study tradition, there exists a variety of approaches (Creswell, 1998). Due to his focus on qualitative inquiries and a strong naturalistic, holistic and phenomenological foundation, Stake’s (2000; 2006) approach was used for this study. Stake (2006) identified three types of case study within his approach: intrinsic, instrumental and collective. When the researcher is intrinsically interested in a particular case and “the purpose is not to come to understand some abstract construct or generic phenomenon” (Stake, 2000, p. 436), the study is considered to be an intrinsic case study. Theory building may or may not be the objective. If a case is used to facilitate understanding or provide insight into another issue, Stake terms it an instrumental case study. In this instance, the case is of secondary interest and is selected based on its merits in order to advance understanding of the other interest. Lastly, in a collective case study, the researcher studies a number of cases in order to investigate a phenomenon. The cases may or may not be similar and are chosen to lead to a better understanding of a larger collection of cases. In this inquiry, a collective-case-study approach was adopted. The advantage of using
multiple cases rather than a single case lies in the replicative nature of the method. Similarities and differences among cases can be identified and trends noted. By using multiple cases, interpretations from the inquiry are likely to be more compelling (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1994).

Setting and Site Selection
This study was conducted in Pakistan. The impetus for this study was the participants’ resistance to the implementation of changes initiated by the Higher Education Commission (HEC) in the higher education sector in Punjab, Pakistan. The HEC’s main purpose was to upgrade the country’s universities. Its main programs included: faculty development, curriculum reform, university infrastructure development, changes in scholarship and grant allocation, research and research development, and quality assurance, to name a few.

As mentioned in chapters one and three, historically there have been many challenges associated with the implementation of transformational-change efforts in the province of Punjab, Pakistan. During the last few decades, the Punjab Ministry of Education has sought to adopt and implement many forms of innovation suggested by the quality movement. Therefore, Punjab province appeared to be an opportune site and a robust environment for an empirically based study geared towards expanding our knowledge of resistance to transformational change. The selection of these sites was purposeful. According to Stake (2006), the sites should be selected based on their relevance to the concept being examined and to the research questions, as well as based on their ability to provide diversity across contexts.

For the purpose of this research, I focused only on the HEC head office and on two public-sector universities – Alama Iqbal Open University and Fatima Jinnah Women’s University – where the reform process initiated by the HEC had been implemented since the HEC’s inception. By interviewing ministry officials, university faculty and university staff, I was hoping to speak to participants who would be able to provide contrasting perspectives that might assist in mapping out connections, shifts and contradictions. Selected participants from the HEC head office helped me understand resistance to change from the policy makers’ perspective and participants from the two universities helped me understand the phenomenon under study from the target populations’ perspective.

I also intentionally selected a co-educational university and a women’s university to explore whether and to what extent gender affects people’s reactions to educational reform. Both
participating universities were in their seventh year of the implementation process when data were collected for this research. The HEC head office was selected based on its involvement in implementing, monitoring and evaluating the reform initiatives. Demographic information about the participants is presented in Table 1 below. To maintain the anonymity of the participants, categories of identification related to age, years of experience, professional status and institution will be used throughout the thesis.

Table 2

Demographic Information on Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asma</td>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bina</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salma</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asad</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilal</td>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Junior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shehryar</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghafoor</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariq</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehman</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJWU Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abir</td>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musarat</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Professor</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farhana</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazia</td>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooria</td>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahira</td>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior Professor</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushra</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Professor</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saira</td>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIOU Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryam</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khawaja</td>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Junior Administrator</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ijaz</td>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Junior Professor</td>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zia</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Professor</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafeez</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Professor</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daoud</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Professor</td>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sampling and Participants

While it is valuable to understand the theoretical reasons for the importance of the resistance phenomenon, it is likewise valuable to understand the perspectives of those who personally encountered and generated resistance and to interpret how they describe their understandings of the resistance experiences. The purpose of qualitative sampling is to maximize the information obtained, not to facilitate generalizations. The study was conducted not to make generalizations, but to represent the problem under study in order to understand and appreciate its particularities and complexities. I selected a sample from a pool of professionals from whom I expected to learn the most (Merriam, 1998). I used two strategies for selecting respondents: purposeful and snowball sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). The sample was determined using a set of criteria to guide the identification of respondents who could provide information pertinent to the study. One criterion for participant selection included the requirement for participants to have been working at their respective institutions for a minimum of eight years, which was well before the beginning of the HEC-initiated reforms in higher education. This was done with the hope of obtaining a historical view of higher education reforms. The second criterion stated that participants must be either directly involved in or directly affected by the HEC-initiated reforms. The third criterion concerned the participants’ familiarity with the traditional higher education curriculum, the traditional institutional structure, and the context and history of the HEC.

In general, the participants in this study were highly educated (with a minimum of a master’s degree) and all Pakistani citizens ranging in age from their early thirties to their late fifties. They all spoke English, but their first language was one of the following: Urdu, Punjabi, Sindhi, Siraiki, Pashto or Balochi. Thirteen respondents were females and 11 were males. Notably, in both universities, there were almost an equal number of male and female professionals but, at the HEC, only 25% of the professionals were female. I intended to include both male and female participants to explore if there are any gender-specific reactions to educational reforms. Almost all respondents had been working in the respective organizations for eight to 25 years. In order to preserve anonymity, pseudonyms were used in place of real names.

Procedures to Access Sites and Participants

Familiarity with the study’s context can be a valuable asset for data collection and data analysis (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). As discussed previously, I worked with the Pakistani Ministry of
Education for many years and my involvement with various change initiatives provided me with the opportunity to make and maintain contacts with many professionals. This affiliation later helped me gain access to various participants and documents at the HEC head office. I did not have to apply for any formal approvals to recruit my participants.

A year before my actual data collection, I visited the HEC and the two universities to talk informally with three policy makers and four university personnel about my research interests. The selected policy makers had been working with the HEC since its establishment and were involved in the planning, coordination and evaluation of HEC initiatives in the Punjab province. The personnel (both administrators and professors) from the universities were responsible for implementing the HEC-initiated plans within their respective institutions. I talked about my research interest and asked them some of the general questions about their perceptions of resistance, the types of resistance that they had experienced and coping strategies used to deal with resistance. The responses to these questions aided in the development of a semi-structured interview guide and provided direction on the actual data collection. The depth of their responses and their willingness to share their thoughts about the phenomenon during this informal visit provided me with an opportunity to determine which personnel were best suited for participation in a more in-depth investigation.

Unfortunately, after a year when I returned to collect data, only four out of these seven people were interested in participating. Therefore, in order to recruit more participants for this study, I directly called a few more HEC professionals, faculty members and university administrators responsible for their own respective units. Their contact information was easily accessible through institutional directories. I left voice messages with a few participants in cases where I was not able to make direct contact. Some people returned my calls but refused to participate. I met the eight individuals who agreed to participate at their earliest convenience. During those first meetings with those eight individuals, I provided them with the participant information sheet and invitation letter, as well as with the participant consent form. I described the purpose of the study and explained anonymity, confidentiality and the fact that their participation was voluntary. Then I invited them to ask any questions pertaining to the study. Seven participants shared their discomfort with their interviews being recorded and I assured them that I would respect their request. These first meetings with the participants were very informal and were more or less like a background interview that lasted between 40 and 80
minutes. During these first meetings, we scheduled the times and sites where person-to-person, 60-90 minute, semi-structured interviews were to be conducted.

Conversations about change can be personal; therefore, I met the participants in spaces where they felt comfortable sharing this type of information. The time and meeting place were finalized based on the participants’ convenience. A few interviews were cancelled and rescheduled due to participants’ requests. The location for each interview varied from personal offices to cafeterias, participants’ homes and public libraries. In order to counteract any sampling bias that might have been associated with my selection of my first four participants, each interviewee was asked during these first meetings to identify anyone in their organization who might be interested in this study and/or who might envision the efforts differently than they did. This procedure resulted in 24 participants in total: 15 university personnel (both administrators and professors) and nine HEC-affiliated personnel who were involved in planning, coordinating or evaluating HEC initiatives in the Punjab province. Appendix VI provides a snapshot of participants’ profiles.

**Data Collection**

Merriam (1998) indicates that, in qualitative research, “the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” (p. 52). Given the fact that a hallmark of case-study research is the multiple sources of evidence, the sources of evidence used in this research included semi-structured interviews and documents collected over a period of four months. In addition, I also consulted websites, kept research memos to track my personal interpretations and insights (Miles & Huberman, 1994), and employed member checks over the course of data collection.

**Document review**

Document review as a data-collection technique was used to unveil the historical context of reforms in the higher education sector in Pakistan, and to understand the interviewees’ statements and concerns about the HEC-initiated reforms in the higher education sector. The document-review process provided the foundational knowledge upon which the participants’ reactions to the implementation of the educational reforms could be built. Documents reviewed for this study included: previous educational policies since 1952; open-forum minutes written
during the implementation process; policy newsletters; evaluation notes on the unit council meetings that are part of the change projects; pre- and post-evaluation reports; and follow-up implementation reports and plans.

I visited three libraries. They included: the Planning and Development Division, Punjab Ministry of Education Library; the UNESCO Islamabad Library; and the Alama Iqbal Open University Library. I started with documents to understand the HEC-initiated transformational initiatives as thoroughly as possible and the context of each initiative from multiple perspectives. I read executive summaries and preambles of the contents covered in policy documents and reports by researchers of the UNESCO Islamabad office. Some of the reports were very generic in nature, primarily on literacy strides in Pakistan and on Pakistan’s accomplishments towards fulfilling different educational plans sponsored by international funding agencies including UNESCO. Many studies were on Pakistan’s progress towards the Dakar Goals on Education for All (EFA). I was also able to retrieve some of the unpublished but very important documents related to HEC-initiated reforms in the higher education. Those documents included: open forum minutes written during the implementation process; evaluation notes on the unit council meetings that are part of the change projects; and pre- and post-evaluation reports from the Ministry of Education’s library. These documents helped me understand how policy makers understood the implementation of reforms and the associated resistance from “their” viewpoints.

In addition, the Boston Consulting Group’s (2001) report on “Higher Education in Pakistan” and the Ministry of Education, Pakistan’s (2002) report on “Challenges and Opportunities,” authored by the Task Force on the Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan, were extensively used as sources of guidelines for all former education polices and plans initiated by the Government of Pakistan. One of the other reasons to use these documents was the fact that many published and unpublished reports were referring to these two documents as the main policy documents that guided the planning, design and implementation of the HEC-initiated reforms. Some of the action verbs that appeared in almost all the documents reviewed included the following: plan; organize; provide, assist, coordinate, facilitate, train, communicate, mobilize, monitor, assess and evaluate. These action verbs/words helped me craft my conversations with the participants in order to ascertain how much was practically done before, during and after the implementation of reforms as compared to what was recorded in the policy documents and minutes of the meetings that I reviewed for the study.
Interviews

After reviewing the documents, I started interviews with the participants. Patton (2001) suggests that researchers interview individuals in order to uncover things that cannot be directly observed, such as thoughts, feelings and intentions. He stated that “We cannot observe how people have organized the world and the meaning they attach to what goes on in the world… the purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective” (Patton, 2001, p. 341). Interviewing was therefore the primary means of data analysis in this inquiry. As mentioned above, those who agreed to participate were asked to take part in at least one formal 60 to 90 minute in-depth individual interview at a mutually agreeable time. The main purpose was to explore the meaning, nature, causes and associated dynamics of resistance towards the HEC-initiated reforms within the participants’ specific contexts. This methodology is also described as a “conversation with a purpose” – the purpose being to gather information from the perspective of the individuals being interviewed (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Interviewer flexibility, situational sensitivity and the use of open-ended questions are the main features that define this type of interview (Patton, 2001). The interview questions were designed to be “open-ended and informal in that the questions are designed to stimulate and trigger natural responses” (Fisher & Echols, 1989, p. 7). The interview guide is attached as Appendix III.

Conducting in-person interviews with selected participants allowed for observation of non-verbal communication that produced additional insights into the participants’ attitudes and perceptions (Creswell, 1998). Interview questions explored the participants’ understanding of resistance, and related specific events, roles and responsibilities, beliefs, norms and behaviours that they felt contributed to or impeded the successful implementation of programs. Resistance remained as the central construct of interest; yet, data concerning it were elucidated through probing questions around the selected change initiative. An essential part of conducting a qualitative study involves being open to the possibility of surprise revelations, commentaries or materials. Therefore, as a researcher, I was open and alert to unexpected questions and/or comments that might emerge during the discussions. Some comments required adjustment to and extension of questions posed to a few of the study participants. Additional questions formulated during the interview were also used for purposes of clarification and in pursuit of additional information. It is important to note that “This format allows the researcher to respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic”
Seven participants were not comfortable with their interviews being audio taped. Therefore, for these individuals I took detailed notes and paraphrased their responses often to ensure accuracy. For these interviews I wrote summaries immediately after the interview sessions and took note of insights and themes. The remaining interviews were audio taped, transcribed and analyzed for “insights, observations and recurrent themes” (Fisher & Echols, 1989, p. 7). Member check of interview transcripts was done through a personal third meeting with each participant. Participants were asked to review and sign off on the transcripts of their individual interviews. Once sign-off was obtained, the transcribed notes were reviewed, analyzed and summarized. I promised my participants that, upon completion of my research, a brief summary of my research would be offered to all participants.

In total, I had three planned meetings with each participant in accordance with the recommendation of Seidman (2006) for a “three-interview” series, in which participants are interviewed on three separate occasions and each interview lasts for approximately an hour. During the first meeting with each of the participants, the purpose and structure of the inquiry was explained and each was encouraged to ask questions if he or she was unsure of any aspect of the inquiry. As stated in the informed-consent form, the participants’ participation was strictly on a voluntary basis. No one was obligated to participate and all participants were told in the informed-consent form that all responses would be completely anonymous and that no individual responses or individual identities would be revealed to anyone. I assured the participants that their anonymity would be maintained in any reports and publications resulting for the inquiry through the use of pseudonyms. The participants were also assured that all data would be secured in a locked cabinet and that the responses would be available only to the researcher. In general, my first meeting with the participants was very informal and was more or less like a background interview that lasted between 40 and 80 minutes. Many of these meetings even lasted longer than an hour and a half due to informal conversations relating to my background and the general everyday banter that appeared to expedite the relationship-building process. Consequently, at the end of my initial meetings with the participants, I felt that we were comfortable in each other’s company. During this meeting, I formally invited them to participate in this study and I discussed its purpose in detail. I wanted to obtain demographic information as well as their general perceptions and experiences of resistance and their coping strategies in relation to themselves and
their colleagues. For example, one participant, Dina, a senior administrator from the FJWU shared the view that

Those who prefer to keep things as they are, are satisfied with what they have now. They fear that change will disrupt their relationships, reduce their power, and certainly will create more work for them, so they do their best to resist it.”

Another participant, Khawaja, a junior administrator from the AIOU shared his opinions in the following words:

Commitment to the national and institutional culture and norms are the triggering factor behind resistance towards behaviour…. You can’t expect rather impose a drastic change and expect people to accept it. In a very conservative and a traditionalist country like Pakistan... what they don’t have is the “patience” and time to talk, listen and involve us.

In addition, Saira, a junior administrator from the FJWU shared her own experience during the first meeting by saying, “I was initially resistant and I still don’t think HEC initiatives are any different or are in the proper direction” and “This type of initiatives didn’t work since the 70s….what HEC needs is a reality check.” These initial conversations helped me structure my interaction with each participant. For example, a few participants gave me very precise responses during the first meeting and I used that knowledge to ask them for specific examples or incidents during the actual interview. With more talkative participants, I asked many emergent questions based on their responses to bring their focus back onto the topic of resistance in relation to the HEC-initiated transformational reforms. During the second meeting, I met participants to conduct the actual interview for this research. At this stage, I did feel that the participants gradually became more comfortable in articulating their insights to me. Prior to my third meeting with the participants, I sent them summaries of their interviews in a question-answer format and requested them to read the summary and write down any comments that they had in the wide three-inch right margins allocated for this purpose. I also wrote a few questions in the margins directed at the participants in order to clarify some of the issues that were unclear to me when reading through the transcripts. An informal letter was attached with the summaries to the participants (Appendix IV). The third meeting provided me with an opportunity to validate the accuracy of the data and my interpretations. I also asked them to talk about any topic that they considered important but that they felt we had been unable to cover during the interview session. To summarize, it was worthwhile to examine resistance to change exclusively through the
experiences of these groups in order to critically compare narratives gathered through interviews that can potentially lead to genuinely new insights which may influence how educational change is administered, frustrated and occasionally realized within the context of higher education in Pakistan. Six months after the data collection, four follow-up interviews were also conducted over the telephone. These interviews could not be done face to face as I was not in Pakistan at the time of the follow-up interviews. I contacted these selected participants via email and they all agreed and provided me with a telephone number at which they could be reached. Because of the time difference between Canada and Pakistan, I emailed and asked them to identify a convenient time and day when I could call to conduct the interview. The purpose of the follow-up interviews was essentially to ask them questions that emerged after I started writing the initial analysis. These interviews were relatively quick, lasting between 15 and 20 minutes. Occasionally we were disconnected and that certainly broke the rhythm of the conversation. I also found that the participants were more interested in how I was and what I had been doing since we met, and in when I would be returning to Pakistan. They repeatedly tried to steer the conversation back towards me. I think this reflected the relationship that I had developed with the participants. Three meetings, a telephone conversation and constant contact through emails with the participants enabled me to maintain trust with them and to obtain a more complete understanding of the participants’ stories.

Throughout the research, hand-written field notes / research memos were used to record and collate the data into recognizable clusters, and to record my personal understandings on issues of resistance to change separately. This approach in fact really helped me to put aside my personal beliefs (my feelings, thoughts, difficulties and impressions) about the phenomenon (Merriam, 2002) while analyzing the data. I tracked my personal interpretations and insights (Miles & Huberman, 1994) as this was valuable in data interpretation. Entries to my research memos were written soon after each interview session with the participants, thus assisting my meaning-making processes in order to portray the essence of my experience and my understanding of the phenomena under investigation.

Data Analysis

Data analysis is an active, ongoing dialogue between the researcher and the data, demanding openness, creativity and flexibility “to see beneath the obvious to discover the new”
There is no single correct way to analyze qualitative data (Cote, Salmela, Baria & Russell, 1993). Because of this, qualitative researchers must make their procedures, decision criteria and data manipulation explicit, such that readers can follow the study and understand the ways in which the final results were obtained (Cote et al., 1993). A detailed description of the analysis process follows in an effort to satisfy the above criteria. Data analysis was guided by Merriam’s (1998) within-case and cross-case analysis, and by Creswell’s (1998) “data analysis spiral” techniques. Merriam stresses the need for identifying the themes within each participant’s interview, the links between individual accounts and the relationship between those overarching themes. Merriam also stresses the importance of category construction in data analysis and further suggests that “data analysis is done in conjunction with data collection” (p. 181). Merriam (1998) suggests that categories should first and foremost reflect the purpose of the research – that is, they should answer the research questions. In addition, she suggests that they should be exhaustive, mutually exclusive, sensitive to what is in the data, and conceptually congruent (p. 181-182). Creswell’s (1998) data analysis spiral – the visual conceptualization of data analysis used for this study – largely took the form of a spiral which is essentially a representation of analytical circles which, when taken together, form a complete spiral with each loop in the spiral representing a stage in the analysis process.

5. Refining, representing and visualizing
4. Forming themes and comparing the data
3. Describing, classifying, connecting, and interpreting
2. Reading, reflecting and making notes
1. Data Managing

**Figure 1 The Data Analysis Spiral**

The data analysis spiral is open-ended to enable the researcher to move back and forth during the data-analysis process. The spiral begins with data collection and moves into data management and the organization of materials into files and units. Moving through the loop, the
second phase is to read the transcripts through several times while reflecting and taking notes. In the third loop, the researcher describes, classifies and interprets the data, putting it into context and forming categories and comparisons. During the fourth and final loop, the data are presented in a visual form that helps to illuminate the final narrative (Creswell, 1998). Both within-case and cross-case analyses were also conducted. All the data that were collected through interviews and all documents, in addition to my research memos/field notes, were kept in separate files created for each participant. On each set of data, the time, date, location and source were recorded. After each interview was conducted and transcribed, steps were begun to systematically analyze the data. I read and reread the interview data to create an understanding of the participants’ described experiences. I wrote comments and notes in the margins with regard to interesting data that were relevant to the research questions. At this stage, I also began to develop a preliminary list of emergent categories/themes into which I grouped my notes and comments. These thematic categories were guided by the purpose of this research, my knowledge based on the literature and the meanings made explicit by the participants (Merriam, 1998).

The next set of data collected (i.e. my field notes / research memos; open forum minutes written during the implementation process; evaluation notes on the unit council meetings; and pre- and post-evaluation reports) were then carefully read and, with the previously constructed list of categories in mind, notes, comments and observations were once again recorded in the margins. The notes, comments and observations forming the second set of data were then grouped into categories and a list of the categories was compiled. Then, I compared and merged the two lists to create a master list of thematic categories that reflected “the recurring regularities or patterns in the study” (Merriam, 1998, p. 181), and I wrote my findings. Once the analysis of the individual participants’ experiences was completed, comparisons were made of the findings across the participants. Once I felt well acquainted with the essence of the data, I started the process of extracting statements that would best illuminate the participants’ experiences and that would eliminate redundant statements which would not contribute to furthering my explanation of the participants’ accounts, and I wrote my personal notes in the margins. Direct quotations were used throughout the analysis in order to preserve the voice of the participants. In order to ensure respect for the voices of participants, cross-case analysis relies heavily on two types of participant excerpts: longer quotes in the form of a short paragraph that have been indented, and embedded
quotes that “consume little space and provide specific concrete evidence, in the informant’s words, to support a theme” (Creswell, 2007, p. 182).

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness in qualitative research is a topic of ongoing controversy (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Maxwell, 1996). For the purpose of this research, the definition of Lincoln & Guba was deemed the most appropriate. They describe trustworthiness as an affirmative response to the question, “Are these findings sufficiently authentic… that I may trust myself to act on their implications?” (p. 178). Maxwell asserts that it is important that conclusions drawn from the study are credible “within the setting or group studied” (p. 97). Maxwell adds that the strength of qualitative research lies in the ability to expose the complexities of a particular situation, and these findings can then be used as a lens with which to examine other similar cases or issues.

The conventional terms “internal-validity,” “external validity,” “reliability” and “objectivity” used within the post-positivist paradigm to judge the soundness of research have been rejected by many qualitative researchers. These criteria are grounded in the positivist ontologies and epistemologies of naïve realism and objective reality and, as such, are deemed inappropriate for the constructivist paradigm (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Instead Guba & Lincoln (1989) outline four criteria (credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability) for assessing the quality of constructivist inquiry – that is, its trustworthiness. However, it should be also pointed out that, in the present study, over the course of interviews with each participant there was a sense of internal consistency and authenticity regarding their explanations. For example, it was not uncommon for a participant to return to a particular anecdote from a prior conversation in order to expand upon a situation. In addition, at times they laughed at the situations that they were recollecting, whereas at other times their voices dropped dramatically when describing particularly difficult moments. I was also careful to avoid putting words into their mouths or redirecting their thinking in ways that would compromise the way in which they portrayed their understandings of their experiences. In this research, trustworthiness was strengthened by a number of factors. Creswell (1998) suggested that researchers engage in at least two verification procedures in any given inquiry. In the remainder of this section the techniques that I used to judge the quality of this inquiry are presented.
Prolonged engagement is one method for strengthening the credibility of an inquiry (Creswell, 1998; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Merriam, 1998). In this inquiry I was in regular contact (i.e. via telephone, emails and personal meetings) with participants over the first four-month period of the data-collection process. I had between three to five individual contacts with each participant, each session lasting between 40 minutes to more than one hour. As mentioned earlier, I was able to “establish rapport and build the trust necessary to uncover constructions” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 237). Through many meetings I was able to check for misinformation or distortion, both on the part of the participants and myself. These meetings also allowed me to clarify issues and obtain any information that I had missed in previous interactions.

Triangulation is another procedure that I used to strengthen the credibility of this inquiry. Triangulation involves multiple sources, methods, investigators and theories to provide corroborating evidence (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998). However, Mathison (1988) argued that it is unrealistic to “expect various data sources and methods to lead to a singular proposition about the phenomenon being studied” (p. 13). He recognized that data are frequently inconsistent and contradictory and that the researcher therefore must rely on “holistic understanding” of the situation to make sense of what he or she finds. Indeed, Patton (2001) emphasized that “understanding inconsistencies in findings across different kinds of data can be illuminative and important” (p. 556). In this case, triangulation “places the responsibility with the researcher for the construction of plausible explanations about the phenomenon being studied” (Mathison, 1988, p. 17), rather than being seen as a method that allegedly demonstrates that different data sources provide essentially the same result (Mathison, 1988; Patton, 2001). In this research I used different methodologies, semi-structured interviews, document analysis and member checks. Participants often reconstructed specific events more than once and sometimes in more detail, thereby furthering my understanding of the situation and allowing me to rule out contradictions or to correct misunderstandings.

Member checks is another approach used to strengthen credibility of this research. This approach is strongly advocated by Creswell (1998) and Merriam (1998), and involves returning the data and interpretation to the participants and soliciting their feedback. Lincoln & Guba (1985) also consider member checks to be the most important technique for establishing the credibility of a qualitative research project. In this research, participants were provided the opportunity to read and amend their transcripts from their interviews. This technique gave
participants full control over the data used in the study and reduced researcher bias. Participants were satisfied with the transcripts. Some of them made a few changes, including asking for people’s names to be omitted.

Of course, the findings of the present study are not generalizable; this is true for all qualitative studies. The provision of “rich, thick description” detailing the participants and context allows readers to make decisions regarding transferability (Creswell, 1998; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Merriam, 1998). It is hoped that, through the use of “rich, thick description” (Creswell, 2007, p. 209) of the career lives of the participants, readers will be able to draw connections between the findings and their own contexts and experiences. In order to help the reader establish the degree of transferability, I have also provided a detailed description of the setting in chapter three and profiles of the participants in the Appendix IV. Multiple cases constituted another approach used to strengthen the credibility of this research. Evidence drawn from multiple cases, especially cases with variation, is often considered more compelling (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1994). In this inquiry, I interviewed 24 participants from three different organizations. The intention was to “ensure that the conclusions adequately represent[ed] the entire range of variation” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 71). Variations among participants with regard to gender, age, skill level and work experience proved to be beneficial for the research.

**Ethical Considerations**

The willingness of participants to share their experiences with the researcher is a privileged opportunity, which should not be undertaken lightly. Ethical considerations in any research project should focus predominantly on the generic issues of “informed consent and protecting participants’ anonymity” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 90). Spardley (1980) asserts that participants’ welfare should be of first priority, with their rights being respected and the confidentiality of the information revealed being assured. These underlying principles have guided this inquiry through all phases of the research process.

The letter of invitation (Appendix I) to recruit participants outlined the objectives of the study, discussed the voluntary nature of their participation in this inquiry and provided an overview of issues related to confidentiality and anonymity. The interviews were conducted in privacy with only one respondent at a time. All participants were required to sign a consent form (Appendix II) indicating that they fully understood the nature of their participation and their right
to withdraw from the study at any time. Audio tapes were transcribed by myself and were kept under lock in a secure place at my home. Names of participants have been removed and the privacy of individuals has been maintained through pseudonyms. Participants reviewed their transcripts to ensure that they were comfortable with the material to be used in the data analysis and to verify the authenticity of the content.

Throughout the research, I took the position of wanting to understand the problem and phenomenon of resistance to educational reforms and did not judge participants for any lack of cooperation or any negativity. I was aware that questions about resistance needed to be asked in a way that their responses would not provoke any negative repercussions on their employment situation. Therefore, questions about resistance and their reactions towards educational reforms were sometimes posed indirectly or in general terms to explore problems that participants encountered on a regular basis. I took care to prevent any personal biases or subjectivity issues from influencing the research (Peshkin, 2000). I was not aware of any overt personal biases that may have influenced the study. As being of Pakistani origin, I had to establish that I was a doctoral student, that the interviews were being carried out only for the purpose of research and that I had no association with the government and other agencies for a decade.

The Researcher’s Position

Guba & Lincoln (1989) state that the disclosure of the investigator’s impact on the research process is an acknowledged strength of qualitative methods. I would like to shed some light on the possibilities of being misread, and on the process called “bracketing” in educational research. According to Van Manen (1997), “bracketing allows the researcher to bring into focus the uniqueness of a particular phenomenon” (p. 350). The researcher must come to realize his or her understanding or conceptualizing of the phenomenon before beginning an inquiry. The researcher must recognize and reflect on her position with respect to the participants, her potential effect on them as an interviewer, and the background and presuppositions that she brings to the inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Merriam, 2002). In qualitative researches like this, the researcher is the main instrument and, therefore, it is important to consider my competencies and skills.

My previous graduate studies (twice) at the master’s level, in addition to doctoral academic preparation, provided the background knowledge and the analytical and research skills
required to undertake a study of this nature. Furthermore, professional practice as an educator, evaluator and researcher with the Ministry of Education for more than five years provided an understanding of the context, a familiarity with the issues involved in collaboration and insight into some of the challenges confronting participants within the context of higher education in Pakistan. Nor did the experience of the researcher provide easier access to participants, but it also proved to be very beneficial in understanding the local jargon used in the context of the working environment, as well as the speech genre used during the interview process. The assumptions that I brought to this inquiry were rooted in my academic and working experience. My working experience with the Punjab Ministry of Education, Pakistan, was diverse. I served many roles on the administrative team and worked for more than five years with the ministry on many projects. So I was very much familiar with the bureaucratic system in government organizations. In addition, while I was completing my master’s thesis in education in Pakistan, the HEC initiatives were first introduced and then implemented. Given the fact that I already had a master’s degree in English literature prior to completing my master’s degree in education under a traditional system, I was able to observe the dramatic changes in terms of the expectations and process for graduate students. I personally experienced the discomfort and observed the extreme anger and overt frustration of university personnel towards these newly implemented reforms. I shared this background with the participants. This knowledge eased the development of relationships with the participants and greatly facilitated the interview process. But, as I proceeded through the analysis of the data for the current research, I was cognizant of my previous experiences and of how these might affect the way in which I perceived the data. My field notes helped me put aside my feelings and assumptions.

A qualitative researcher seeks to understand how people see, explain and describe the world in which they live (Bogdan & Biklin, 1992). According to Bogdan & Biklin (1992), the qualitative researcher must be aware of the requirement that the world be approached with the assumption that nothing is trivial, that everything has the potential to provide a clue that might unlock a more comprehensive understanding of what is being studied. I was aware of this approach to avoid being locked into “taken-for-granted” assumptions. Clarifying researcher bias is important so that the reader understands the researcher’s position and any of the assumptions that may have impacted the inquiry (Merriam, 1998). I had the opportunity to view the HEC-initiated reforms from the perspective of both a ministry official and a graduate student. This
study is personal to me; I have experienced more than a few feelings and issues similar to those expressed by the participants. But I was always curious to learn how “others” view reforms, why reforms are often unsuccessful in achieving targeted goals and why people resist reforms so much. In order to help the reader to understand any biases that may have impacted this inquiry, prior to the start of data collection I reported on my past experiences with the Ministry of Education, Pakistan, and noted any orientations that may have shaped the interpretation and approach to this research (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2001). During data analysis I exercised caution to avoid leading participants towards predetermined conclusions. During data analysis I made the effort to organize the data in different ways and to look for alternative explanations of my findings.

In summary, this chapter describes the research methodology upon which this inquiry is based. It describes the purpose of the study, the research questions and the research design, and it outlines the participant selection, the data-collection procedures, the data-analysis techniques and trustworthiness. During the recruitment of participants and the interview sessions, it became apparent to me that the research topic was sensitive and highly charged. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the ethical issues raised and addressed in the study, and an appraisal of my role as researcher and of how this could potentially impact on the data analysis and findings. The following chapter of this dissertation presents the findings and themes that emerged from this research.
CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I will view the findings through the lenses of the theoretical frameworks that were used to present how changes were initiated, supported, avoided and evaded in both passive and active ways by all participants. As I mentioned earlier, I selected all three research sites with a specific purpose. AIOU University was one of my first choices because it has a unique status in Pakistan because of its philosophy, system, approach, functions and overall structure. It is one of the oldest universities in the country and is the only public-sector university that offers distance-education services for adult learners. It has the most extensive and versatile educational programs available for students as compared to other universities in Pakistan and its clientele are from all over the world.

I selected the second university FJWU as a research site for the following reasons: 1) its reputation as an innovative university with a very competitive organizational culture; 2) its establishment only a few years before the Government of Pakistan started major transformations in the higher education sector; 3) the fact that it is the first and only women’s university in Pakistan; and 4) the fact that it has its own philosophy of conduct which is sometimes drastically different from traditional norms.

The third organization that I selected as a research site was HEC. I selected HEC because I was interested in the studying the resistance-to-change phenomenon from a policy maker’s and planner’s perspective alongside the implementation-level employees’ perspectives, from the target organizations (i.e. universities). The experiences of the participants in this study are as complex as the study of change in any organization. I have organized this chapter according to major themes that emerged based on my analysis of interviews. Appendix VIII describes the initial coding and development of themes with definitions. Table 2 below documents significant themes and corresponding participants. In the explanation of themes in this chapter, each participant’s exact words are used without any alterations.
Table 3  Themes and Corresponding Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azra</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bina</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahra</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajid</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bial</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daizhoor</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiekoa</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariq</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehman</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWAU Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aibic</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustafa</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathana</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najiya</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoodia</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diba</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taha</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basha</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spira</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDIU Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryam</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behejia</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqra</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dua</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hameed</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabood</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* JA: Junior Administrator
* SA: Senior Administrator
* SP: Senior Professor
* JP: Junior Professor
Defining Resistance to Change

When asked to define resistance to change, most of the participants from all three sites, but especially from HEC, defined it as a behavioural construct; only four participants from both universities defined it as a cognitive or emotional construct. Asma, a junior administrator at the HEC, defined it as “behaviour that shows rebellion against new authority or against new processes implemented by the authority.” Salma, a senior administrator also from the HEC, defined resistance as “any action that is performed with an intention to slow or stop the change being initiated.” Another participant Bilal, a junior administrator at the HEC, shared the view that “Resistance can be seen in instances where people who resist changes continue to do things the way they are used to doing it, and refuse to cooperate when change has to be made.” Lastly, Rehman, a senior administrator at the HEC, defined resistance as a behaviour “where people either ignore the new or do it wrong on purpose, they either argue or refuse new policies,” while Zia, a senior professor at the AIOU, declared that “resistance can be seen when people express their discomfort and frustration to a change initiative.”

Daoud, another senior professor from the AIOU shared the opinion that “To resist means you do not want to do what you are told to do.” Maryam, a senior administrator at the AIOU, defined resistance as a cognitive construct by stating that resistance means “to view the change as negative and as a threat to valued norms.” Hooria, a junior administrator from the FJWU, defined resistance as “a person’s inability to compromise with a different type of reality and it comes with the fear of the unknown and unfamiliar…habit, low self-esteem, closed-mindedness or skepticism might be the few possible reasons.” Hafeez, a senior professor from the AIOU, stated that resistance is the result of “an internal force that pushes people to either slow down or stop movements towards something different.” Ghafoor, another senior administrator at the HEC, thinks that the root cause of resistance is the emotional apathy that people feel towards innovations and that this usually results in disobedience and disloyalty. He shared the opinion that a “resistant attitude is the outcome of the felt emotional attachment with the status quo and the instinctive alliance against change initiatives.”

Vision, Planning and Transparency

Problems with the vision, planning and process transparency were among other significant issues mentioned by many university participants. It is an established fact that, if the
planning or initiation stages of change projects are flawed, the implementation and continuation of these projects will also offer considerable scope for problems. It is not uncommon to observe that, in Pakistan, timelines and expectations are optimistically conceived and may not be appropriate for the difficult conditions in which projects are carried out at the institutional levels because each institution has its own unique organizational, structural, logistical and human-resources challenges. It does not take long for the clear and uncomplicated world of the plan to be supplemented by the diverse and complicated reality of the institutional context. It was clear from participants’ interviews that, if there were to be significant positive changes in higher education, it was essential to have a shared vision and to ensure that everyone kept the objectives in mind. If the transitions were to be meaningful and sustainable, target populations should be facilitators of changes and that could happen only if people found clarity in relation to the vision and strategic goals.

All the participants from the HEC, except Rehman and Ghafoor, did not feel that the resistance that they experienced had any connection with the vision as, according to them, the vision and mission of all HEC reforms were very clear since the HEC’s inception. University personnel, especially from the AIOU, on the other hand felt the need to have a clear, shared and agreed-upon vision for any large-scale change. Nazia, a junior administrator at the FJWU, shared the view that “it is great that we got a new vision and it is important. But what we really needed to know was what does the new vision mean?” Likewise, Abir, a junior administrator at the FJWU, declared that “There have been so many changes and so many people are just doing their own interpretation of the original idea.” Another junior administrator Khawaja from the AIOU stated, “There was a lack of clarity about the vision on the part of the administration.” From the HEC, Rehman, a senior administrator, mentioned that “the implementation mechanism of reform is the most critical issue and one that needs to be well thought out. I do not mind accepting the fact that at HEC we didn’t really have time to carefully think through many initiatives that we started as part of the major reforms in the higher education sector.”

Scholarly literature underscores the fact that a lot of “change management” is about embracing the need for change and proper preparation. Dwight Eisenhower asserted that “Planning is everything. The plan is nothing.” I realized the importance of this quote when I listened to my participants who considered good planning to be crucial for change implementation. Participants from all three sites mentioned the importance of proper planning
and preparation and some held this aspect responsible for much unnecessary resistance at the universities. Only two participants, Ghafoor from the HEC and Ijaz from the AIOU, had specific opinions that they shared. Ghafoor, a senior administrator, concluded that

> Once I resisted a change proposed by one of my colleagues, who wanted to introduce a new evaluation system in a way that was easy to implement and gave responsibility for certain work to people who did not have the experience. He hadn’t actually discussed anything with anyone in his department. I said he could implement the system once he had done some basic research on the topics, if at the end he was still convinced it was the right thing to do. I know he left thinking I was an old fogy who resisted change. The reality is I have seen far too many implementation plans that do not consider the needs of either the organization or of the people.

In a similar vein, Ijaz, a junior professor from the AIOU, concluded that

> The focus of the HEC on quality issues is a step in the right direction if pursued carefully, systematically and prudently. Change, as we are all aware, is sensitive and must take place gradually based on a sound strategic plan, to get sustainable results. Unnatural speeding up of the process without proper planning can lead to more harm than good and this is what we are observing right now. Revolutionary change is exciting but may cause devastation and elimination of our promising higher-education institutions both in the public and private sector and if that happened I would have to blame the poor preparation of HEC and the hasty way they are approaching various aspects of these reforms.

Defending the Status Quo

Another significant finding of this research was the fact that people resist and rush to defend the status quo if they feel that their job security or status is threatened. It was interesting to observe that all HEC professionals considered the tendency to defend the status quo to be one of the obvious factors resulting in resistance to change. They mentioned that technical difficulties might give rise to the resistance that they encountered as people had to do things differently from what they were accustomed to. As a case in point, Bilal, a junior administrator at the HEC, stated that “Not only did faculty members not want to have to do things differently; they didn’t want to have to think about new ways do doing things.” He further asserted that “People resist change because they have to learn something new and do things differently than before. It’s not easy especially for many professionals especially professors to do anything differently from what they are accustomed to.” Likewise, Shehryar, a senior administrator from the HEC, talked about his frustration with people’s unwillingness to change. He considered comfort with the status quo to be the primary reason for this resistance. He shared one of his recommendations to his superiors
that “Status quo oriented universities that lead to stagnation of thought should be given incentives to innovate and practice quality and gradually a positive change will be seen in our higher educational institutions.” At the same time, Asad, a senior administrator at the HEC, declared that

If we can convince people to come out of their comfort zones to question the so-called “best ways of doing things” we will eventually get there…. Daring to ask “why” needs courage and this is something that is generally not found in Pakistani educational institutes. Even when a student asks the question “why,” it is looked upon as a retort, or equated with standing up to authority and talking back to the teacher. If students choose to deviate from the path allotted, they become rebels, non-conformists and the penalty for deviance is a row of Es and Fs. Even in the Pakistani society in general, people are reprimanded for asking why something is a certain way and are scolded for asking whether there could be a different way to what others are proposing.…. What else can you expect from these institutions when the whole social system is built that way.

The university participants who resisted preferred the previous system and did not like the change to the new system. University professionals had much of their professional identity rooted in their knowledge of the old system and this amplified the stress associated with the transition to the new, entirely different system. Khawaja, a junior administrator at the AIOU, remarked how

…the existing university system is broken and the current university reform strategies are compounding the problem by concentrating on glitzy things like internet access, digital libraries, virtual learning, etc., while ignoring basic problems. Allowing these “reforms” to continue will destroy what little there is today…. My requests for the HEC are: stop the creation of worthless new universities; stop funding and rewarding research that really isn’t research; stop dishing out useless PhDs; stop playing the numbers game; and stop feeding academic corruption.

During the reform processes, cultural implications are at the core but traditions and norms can easily become overlooked when trying to modernize a society. The issue of the compatibility and appropriateness of reforms is also critical, especially in a traditional society like Pakistan. As described in the chapters above, the education system is embedded in a very hierarchical and bureaucratic administrative structure which is strongly supported by the manner in which the values of the society have been defined by Indian-subcontinent traditions (Ahsan 2005; Isani, 2001). In case of HEC-initiated reforms, one of the problems was that the new reforms did not match the norms already in place (Hoodbhoy, 2005b; 2008b). Those who viewed traditional norms as part of their social and personal identity had negative opinions about reforms. The
second related problem was the involvement of foreign experts in the policy formulation. Most of the participants from both universities did not feel ownership of the change because they did not participate in the process of decision-making. I could sense the distrust after seeing participants’ reactions during interviews. Based on my analysis, I observed how, when people of different nationalities facilitate change in developing countries, pride and cultural differences can cause friction. As Zia noted, “It is like someone walking in to you and saying, my way is the best way and it is how it should be in any context is simply arrogant, ignorant and disrespectful.”

Although the participants from the HEC did not at all discuss their commitment to the culture and norms in relation to resistance, many participants from both universities considered commitment to the culture and norms to be a triggering factor behind resistant behaviour. As a case in point, Hooria, a junior administrator at the FJWU, acknowledged that “Pakistan is a patriarchal society with very conservative views towards anything different… resistance to change will surface if the change ignores the already established institutions in the group.” She further asserted that “People would resist any change unless it is implemented in a sensitive manner in order to encourage ownership and acceptance of change.” With regard to other senior staff and faculty members, Hooria noted the following: “People in authority are generally unable to adapt to anything that requires them to listen to and accept the ideas of others within a culture that places an emphasis on respect for authority.” Another participant, Saira, also a junior administrator at the FJWU, elaborated on a similar point:

Many special interest groups are also in conflict with the HEC’s imposed changes in the higher education system. These reforms have been designed by foreign experts, and are based on Western models of education. Implementation has been difficult in the face of old habits of meaning and action, and social pressure to conform to traditional roles and practices based on cultural norms and societal expectations.

She further suggested that

If experts from other countries are to make a relevant and sensitive contribution, then there is a need to work in partnership, developing an awareness of the local culture and the nature of the education system. Otherwise, expertise becomes limited to the “general” or the “foreign”…. No one expects or will accept solutions to their problems provided by outside experts.

In a similar vein, Hafeez, a senior professor from the AIOU, stated that

What was sought in Pakistan was not merely a change in the higher education system but a major shift in the way people think about each other and manage relationships, as well
as an appraisal of views about the creation of knowledge and what constitutes valued, valid sources of knowledge…. The perception that development strategies and components of education systems can be lifted from one culture and inserted in another, is absolutely insane.

More generally, Dina, a senior administrator from the FJWU, talked about the importance of the institutions of family and religion in relation to reforms in education. She noted that

We can see how people from various disciplines and institutions reacted to HEC reforms. Newspapers are full with the negative feedback, which is deliberately ignored. I cannot speak for others but this significantly affected the enrolment rate of students in our university. This is a women’s university and parents are very cautious and sensitive about their daughters. Things like assigned male supervisors, travels and internship requirements necessary for few programs are only a couple of factors that created this tension.

Conversely, Tahira, a junior professor from the FJWU, shared a somewhat different opinion about resistant behaviour,

Parents obviously feel passionate about the issues especially if there are challenges or threats to the traditional cultural values. But those who resist at the university level, their behaviour has more to do with their lack of readiness and unwillingness to act. They sometimes use social norms and traditional values as a tool to protect themselves…. It shows up in this…let’s band together and not do anything.

These conversations show that gender roles, institutional values, and cultural values and expectations dominate the society in general as well as educational institutions in particular.

**Fear, Lack of Ownership and Threats to Professional Identity**

Interviews, especially with the FJWU university professionals, made it clear that change was a personal, reflective and complex situation for them and these university professionals were unprepared for the changes imposed upon them by the HEC. While the university’s governing body was supportive of the reforms initiated by the HEC, many stakeholders feared the change and were resistant to its implementation. Dina, a senior administrator at the FJWU, declared that “Here are some things that I would not want to say to anyone… because I fear for my job. A lot of people are very fearful of what to say, what not to say, who to say it to, who is friend or enemy.” Farhana, another senior administrator at the FJWU, also shared her disappointment with
the “university governance which is also a reason for the anxiety, uncertainty and fear people are experiencing in this university.” She further elaborated that

We need better, more transparent and accountable ways to recruit vice-chancellors and senior administrators. What we have now is a patronage system that appoints unqualified and unsuitable bureaucrats or generals as vice-chancellors, and that staffs universities with corrupt and incompetent senior administrators. This all makes the work environment very uncertain. It is worrisome in a sense as we don’t know what will happen and what we are supposed to do?

Another participant, Abir, also a junior administrator at the FJWU, noted that

HEC reforms have created winners and losers within institutions. Many people are able to develop their careers not because they were capable but because of “who they know.” There is no transparency in the system of scholarships, grants, promotions and distinctions. Some people met requirements that were not acknowledged or rewarded, don’t know why…. There is this fear among many as they don’t know what will happen to those who don’t know the “significant others” to get the opportunity to move ahead.

Likewise, Tahira, a junior professor at the FJWU, observed that “people sometimes want change, they fear its outcomes, especially when they are not involved in the decision-making, when they are not well informed and when change is imposed upon them.” In a similar vein Bilal, the only junior administrator from the HEC among the participants, stated that “In many cases there is not a disagreement with the benefits of the new process, but rather a fear of the unknown future and about their ability to adapt to it.” Few professors at the AIOU reported no change or no readiness to change what they have been doing for years especially because they did not feel “ownership” of the change.

Two faculty members from the AIOU, Zia and Hafeez, more openly shared their feelings about a diminished sense of control over their jobs. They recalled the time when things were different, when they felt that they had more control over their choices as teachers and when they were more valued as professionals. They expressed how university faculty members are now being asked to teach differently than they had learned, in classrooms that look very different from the ones in which they sat decades ago. More precisely, Hafeez, a senior professor from the AIOU, characterized the HEC initiatives as

…threats to my academic freedom and professional identity. Why would I do something that I don’t believe in? I don’t feel any ownership in any of the imposed changes. I cannot be what I am not.
He felt that it would have been easier to institutionalize change if it was bottom-up change which unfortunately was not the case in this situation. Many of the comments by professors at the AIOU seem representative of their generally negative attitude to HEC initiatives. According to Zia, a senior professor at the AIOU, “I was initially resistant and I still don’t think HEC initiatives are in the proper direction” and “This type of initiative didn’t work since the 70s.” He also noted that

In real life and in real organizations, centrally planned theoretical reforms do not work, because practitioners work in the real world with real problems where ideal philosophy cannot accomplish much. It is a time for the ministry to do a reality check before implementing any further changes they design with the help of foreigners.

Most of the professors admitted that they implemented only the parts of the HEC-mandated initiatives that “they felt right.” For example, Zia mentioned that

Our government had to acknowledge the fact that dealing with the academic world is different than any other field. We are more qualified compared to some of those sitting in Islamabad. We can think and decide how to do our jobs. If they expect “yes” for everything then I am afraid to say they are under an illusion…. Why don’t they simply continue reforming basic and adult education as they have been doing for over fifty years with no commendable results?

As explained in chapter four, in the traditional Pakistani education system, there was limited accountability for tenured faculty and university administrators. But, since the establishment of the HEC-initiated reforms, faculty and staff are made more vulnerable and that “vulnerability is a strong motive to resist changes in these directions” (Connell, 2006, p. 99), as seen in the comments expressed by Khawaja. Khawaja, a junior administrator from the AIOU, argued that “professors resist every attempt that make them accountable to anyone for their own or for their students’ learning. They don’t want to give up their power over their students. So for me I think adapting to a culture of accountability is the major challenge among academics.” Conversely, Ijaz, also a junior professor from the same organization, said “Things like enhancement of the quality of higher education are the functions of the higher education institutions. Any outside interference, no matter how well intended, will erode the autonomy of the institution and demolish a conducive and an energetic academic environment.”
Power, Politics and Emotions towards an Authoritarian Approach

It was clear through the participants’ conversations that their lack of control over changes had implications for both the amount of resistance and the forms in which the resistance was manifested. When change is imposed upon employees against their will, there may be a natural tendency to fight the change directly by refusing to cooperate, or indirectly through covert behaviours. When change is imposed by those who hold power, many of the principles of procedural and interactional justice may be violated. When individuals are unable to modify the change proposal due to not having access, not having any power or being unable to persuade decision-makers, it is likely that they will revert to indirect forms of resistance. Some participants (especially professors and university administrators from the AIOU) stated, in the words of Zia who is a senior professor from the AIOU, “Instead of engaging top academics, the HEC has taken an authoritarian approach toward making its various reforms.” He further shared the view that “The deeply rooted issues, such as the professional respect, the sense of powerlessness, the autocratic leadership, the unnecessary bureaucratic procedures, and ultimately poor leadership and poor communications were the ‘tipping point.’” Maryam, a senior administrator from the AIOU, also commented on the HEC’s way of operating: “The HEC is operating in a very personalized, improvised, hodgepodge manner… people merely learn to cope rather than to work well.” Daoud, another senior professor from the AIOU, offered his opinions:

It is better to involve people in the process…. When you involve me, I will own this work and will feel just like you feel…. I will take more interest and do my job better. If HEC had done this, they could have avoided many problems including resistance.

He further mentioned that

Sometimes we had conflicts at meetings. What staff wanted, they did not include. We fought for months, that they considered resistance, and finally included a few of our items. They said their knowledge was greater than ours. We said that we have the working experience and we have a more practical and realistic outlook on those issues. So we fought only from this base. The story didn’t end there, they had limited capacity to accept and incorporate the outcomes of that agreement… it is because people are unwilling to relinquish power. They knew for change this cooperation was needed, but when they felt that their own authority was undermined, they preferred not doing anything. We considered this “resistance” from them… eventually we all lost the spirit for change.
Institutional politics cannot be eliminated from organizational life which involves various motives, conducts, maneuvering, tactics, power plays, perceptions and self-justifications of change agents at the level of lived experience. Based on participants’ conversations, I realized that university administrators are usually placed in difficult positions when educational change is necessary. Khawaja, a junior administrator from the AIOU, argued that

We are faced with the news media that is often less than complimentary; political agendas of various interest groups; requirements for accreditation; and demands of our communities, our faculties and staff on a day-to-day basis. Many of us are now responsible to make sure that our institution complies with federal standards and requirements. It’s not easy to manage these multiple demands and still please everyone. Our job requires us to be strategic…. Of course there is politics of those involved including ourselves.

Daoud, a senior professor from the AIOU, declared his perspectives: “Implementation was certainly problematic. Political instability and political interference interfered substantially with the implementation process. There were frequent changes in the position of ministry officials, secretaries and project directors who had their own ideology to work.” Hafeez, a senior professor from the same university, shared how many people simply left the organization because of institutional politics. Indeed,

An administrator suspected two specific individuals who might stand up for some issues and might create an alliance against the administration. He reported that to the vice chancellor and all that we know was that he called them in his office for some open conversations. Within three months both of these individuals were no longer with the organization. One person was not tenured but the other was, who was asked to resign.

In a similar vein, Bushra, also a senior professor from the FJWU, reported one incident where the

…university administration was able to identify few people who would say no or might go against institutional decisions during HEC’s periodic visits. So the senior administrators brought them in individually for meetings. It was really not my proudest moments. I felt very uncomfortable with what we were doing. They were trying to convince them that this was in the best interest of the university if we show agreement as a group. After hours long conversation a couple of them agreed that they will not vote against anything, but few said they can’t agree with what they don’t believe in. And then we said, well can you not show up to that meeting? It was pretty bad in that regard.
Many junior and senior administrators from both universities, including Farhana, Saira and Khawaja, discussed how people would periodically use the media presence to voice their objections to obtain some kind of reaction from the administration. Furthermore, faculty who disagreed or resisted a variety of elements of the transformation would sometimes engage students to assist in protesting the initiatives. At other times, deals were cut between individuals to gain support. Many times resistance was ignored by the senior administrators from all participating institutions in the hope that the situation would resolve itself. Saira, a junior administrator from the FJWU, noted that

At one point students contacted the local media, speaking very strongly against the initiatives. They were trying to play up as much as they could and that negatively affected the general public’s opinions about HEC initiatives. I don’t even remember what the triggering point was, but it wasn’t a fight or anything like that. It didn’t affect HEC’s decision to change anything. But we got another round of tension brought on campuses and the media lingering around campuses.

Participants, especially from universities, shared their dissatisfaction with the technical aspect of the HEC-initiated reforms that encouraged a very task-oriented behaviour in the work environment. Task-oriented behaviour is concerned with accomplishing the tasks, using personnel and resources efficiently, and maintaining orderly, reliable operations (Yukl, 2002) without any consideration for human relationships, needs and feelings. The taxonomy of these behaviours includes organizing work activities to improve efficiency, planning short-term operations, directing and coordinating activities, monitoring performance, and resolving problems that appear to disrupt the work. Most of the participants from both universities talked about managing many projects during their professional career and had confidence because of their understanding of these technical steps of the policy-implementation process. These task-oriented steps, however, only represent the portion of the project that is observable on the surface. What was largely ignored was the relationship/people-oriented part of the implementation process which is much larger and much more challenging for the personnel and organizations involved. In this regard, Abir, a junior administrator from the FJWU, declared that

People-oriented behaviour includes support and encouragement from superiors, expressing confidence that people can meet challenging objectives, socializing with people to build relationships, recognizing contributions and accomplishments, and consulting with people on decisions affecting them is something that’s important for an efficient work flow, especially during a transformational change. Unfortunately that part is missing somehow.
Many administrators, both male and female, were more anxious about the technical part of the implementation process than the relationship part. Their position was summed up in the comments expressed by Tariq, a senior administrator from the HEC, who stated that he was “Not going to waste my precious time on bookish fancy terms such as ‘relationship building’ and ‘people-centered’ approaches. I have a job to do and they have a job to do so people should be clear about this.” Some of the strategies used, such as coercion, were not positive in nature but did work for a few administrators. Another participant Bilal, a junior administrator from the HEC, informed me that

People-centered approaches rarely work in this culture. Sometimes you get tired of listening to those who have maniac responses to things. Just ignoring them would not work either. Using threats or pressuring people to support initiatives or to gain some kind of cooperation is sometimes needed, especially when you know people are not wasting your time and resources without any concrete logic.

HEC personnel were more concerned with results and they basically held dispositional factors more responsible for resistant behaviour. Their strategies to deal with resistance were technical and detached. Asma, a junior administrator from the HEC, stated what she felt was the best way to deal with resisters: “Rather than wasting time on answering their questions, take resisters with you and get them out there talking to folks who are doing it the new way and let them ask their negative questions. They will be more sold out on it when they will leave.” Rehman, also a senior administrator from the HEC, recalled that “when we switched directions of us telling them what to do, they were not happy about it at all”. Another participant Ghafoor, a senior administrator from the HEC, expressed his disappointment with the university staff and the faculty in the following statement:

This is proving to be a tough group to sell the programs to. They don’t seem to see any relevance to their professional practice. They often talk about loss of control on their jobs and their preference for stability…. They are only concerned about the amount of time this will take to implement…. It is going to take a great deal of time to get them where they should be.

Asad, another senior administrator from the HEC, shared his views on how people express their feelings:

What I do see are people who say “I just can’t fit that in, it’s not going to work, I just can’t do it, it’s not the way I want to go ahead and I won’t do it.” This shows me their need for self-continuity or unwillingness to accept what is imposed upon them.
Prior to the initiatives launched by the HEC, university professionals, due to their seniority and length time of working together, had fulfilled their basic needs (job) and their safety and security (tenure and benefits) and belonging needs and had achieved a level of self-esteem commensurate with their existing roles and responsibilities. The introduction of the new initiatives threatened their esteem as Maryam, a senior administrator from the AIOU, asserted. She was very critical of her staff and shared her opinions about her staff in the following words:

They don’t have full comprehension of these massive tasks on an operational level. The very thought of what else is coming up is stressing everyone out. They don’t have that confidence in themselves. No one feels ready for anything. Everyone seems to be complaining that new roles and responsibilities will be beyond their knowledge and experience…. They certainly are concerned about their self-enhancement and job security.

Conversely, Tahira, a junior professor from the FJWU, was very optimistic about the future of higher education in Pakistan. However, she recognized that there will be many obstacles to overcome. She observed that, “As in all systems, in universities and all HEC-affiliated departments, people have their own set beliefs that are resistant to change… it will take time because it is basically a change in attitude.”

Another significant finding was people’s emotions towards change. Some of the strongest emotions were anger, depression, sadness, anxiety and frustration. Some participants did mention that occasionally people do understand that a change is desirable, but are emotionally incapable of making the shift and resist for reasons that they may not entirely understand themselves. According to many participants in the universities, the beginning years of the implementation evoked the reactions of strong denial (refusal to accept that the new initiatives would/should be implemented), anger (at being forced to give up the old system) and depression (because of a lack of communication, support, feedback and training). Hafeez, a senior professor from the AIOU, shared how for more than a year he along with his colleagues…

…couldn’t understand the logic behind this many reforms. We suffered in silence and waited for conditions to improve…. We were once faithful employees who built the history here and suddenly we were considered incompetent and backward. They never realized how frustrating that period was…. We were emotionally shattered…. We learned to cope not accept.

Hooria, a junior administrator at the FJWU, asserted that she was angry with the unrealistic expectations but soon gave up: “I went through arguing, complaining and then
compliance…. I am doing okay but I do not have any commitment and passion for my job. Once my contract ends, I will leave for sure.” Meanwhile Nazia, another junior administrator from the FJWU, observed that “When we started working on these reforms, initially we experienced a lot of frustration but gradually things got better as we learned more, we got more support and with experience we managed a lot of things much better than when we started.”

From my analyses of the interviews, it became clear that positive change did occur in some of the participants’ behaviour over time. While they did not acknowledge it directly, they indirectly talked about changes in their work practices. However, it was clear that university participants’ perceptions and feelings for HEC initiatives did not change much. Even after mentioning that positive change did occur, most of the participants from both universities kept talking about their frustration with the initiatives. Very few talked about their acceptance of reforms but “without any enthusiasm” when they realized that “implementation was going to happen as the HEC had the authority to take any action and make any decision to make the changes happen,” as mentioned by Nazia, a junior administrator from the FJWU.

For some senior members of the university like Zia and Daoud, both senior professors at the AIOU, the new initiative caused them to seriously consider the possibility of retiring or resigning. A persistent focus on increasing achievement, without taking into account the more personal, moral and emotional needs of employees as well as the conditions under which change occurs, contributed to a loss of employee morale. Improvement in professional bureaucracies like universities with highly qualified stakeholders (i.e. professors) requires respect for autonomy so that they can implement positive quality-enhancement changes in ways that suit their context and institutional culture. The majority of the professionals from both universities felt that the HEC’s controlling nature and intrusion was defeating the improvement process in universities. Musarat, a senior professor from the FJWU, asserted that

Policy formulation is a sensitive and critical matter on the path to human development which is not generally given serious consideration in Pakistan. Policies and plans are made in Islamabad without taking due consideration of the nature of the problems at the grass-roots level. Such mandated plans usually face resistance from the target population especially in professional bureaucracies like universities.

Another participant, Tahira, a junior professor from the FJWU, shared her opinion about the imposition of a change initiative and its consequences:
If people affected by the change have pressure put on them to make it happen instead of having a say in the nature or the direction of the change, then of course that will result in resistance from those who have to make it happen…. There are many historical examples available to prove that purely politically motivated decisions have been disastrous for the country. We need to learn from those examples.

Bushra, a senior professor at the FJWU, made a different point by stating

We were once ruled by the kings, now we are ruled by the generals. An authoritarian system is present not only in the way HEC is approaching initiatives in higher education, but it is present in almost every walk of life. It’s a reflection of our social set up. That’s why I usually get surprised to see people resisting HEC initiatives so passionately.

Not responding to resistant behaviour or totally ignoring resisters in favor of mandated change initiatives was one of the strategies used by some senior administrators, both at the HEC and selected universities. Ijaz, a junior professor from the AIOU, outlined one of his strategies that he learned in his work experience with one of the organizations. He suggested that

You simply say, for example, the train has left the station and it is going in this direction. If you want to come on with us, the door is always open. But we are not going to force you…. That helps sometimes because resisters get the message that their behaviour is not going to change anything.

Ijaz also shared his dissatisfaction with the fact that resisters receive most of the attention, not those who actually support the change. He suggested that change agents should be

…devoting much more energy to those who are going to be doing the work and taking us where we wanted to go – obviously not totally ignoring people who were resisting, but telling them, “You are not going to get my attention and you are not going to deviate my attention from what we are doing.” Whether this is said out loud or implied by actions, I think that a lot of people get that easily.

These opinions affirm how administrators focused on mandating change initiatives and at the same time ignored people’s feelings and beliefs.

**Internal Competition, Work Overload and Employee Turnover**

Internal competition was another widely cited issue by the participants from the FJWU. Personal beliefs, priorities, perceptions, temperaments and personalities come into play, especially in all transformations. The mere fact that people might be members of the same department does not imply that they all will be collegial or that they will even get along. Even though the members of a university are interdependent, the academic culture of the university
promotes an individualistic approach to work as Musarat, a senior professor from the FJWU, remarked. She shared her opinions on the HEC’s manner of conduct in the following words:

HEC invoked a sense of powerlessness in universities and created a number of stressful conditions, new uncertainties about roles of individuals, threatened people’s sense of competence by making them feel inadequate and insecure. It created a competitive working environment where relationships between people and departments changed negatively.

She further talked about her dissatisfaction with the internal competition in the following statements:

Research is a critical function of universities for which adequate resources and support are available from the government. For teaching excellence HEC has paid some lip service, with no real incentives or rewards. Faculty should be rewarded for excellence in teaching also because that’s what we have these institutions for. It’s sad to see excellent teachers with excellent teaching evaluations unable to get tenure. Most of the tenured staff has lists of publications but poor teaching evaluations because they don’t spend time in improving their teaching. Sadly, they are the ones who are members of the academic council and are getting all benefits in terms of funding, prestige and respect. It creates a hostile institutional environment and bad collegial relationship between faculty members.

Because of the negative competitive work environment, Nazia, a junior administrator from the FJWU, openly suggested that

There should be at least an annual review of the HEC’s performance, processes, outputs and outcomes of its interventions. This review may be undertaken by any external organization or by the former task force on improvement in higher education, which had recommended the elimination of the University Grants Commission and the establishment of the HEC. There should be some sort of accountability for the HEC as well. The way they are operating, it’s ruining the peaceful and collaborative work environment that we once had; all we had now is just competition for everything.

Many university administrators mentioned how people are just not that willing to share anymore. As Dina, a senior administrator from the FJWU, asserted,

There are a few specific people who always feel they have to say something against the majority agreeing to a new idea. At every turn, the same people would speak up and just basically rip the new ideas, or just get nasty by saying “This is a ridiculous idea. This is terrible and we shouldn’t be doing this.”… The funny part is you never hear from them “What is a better idea and what should we be doing?”

According to Nazia, some people became very aggressive if they did not like a new idea or new plan and were not even afraid to use threats. She shared one occasion where two faculty
members said in a meeting “We are not going to go along with this whole thing and we are going to kick holes in the boat if we can, and mostly that happens because people cannot get along with the person who serves as a change agent. There is too much unhealthy competition going on.”

When asked, participants, especially junior administrators from both universities, asserted that they were overworked and mostly rushing through the implementation process. Dina, a senior administrator from the FJWU, openly talked about this issue in the following statement: “There were many demands which were often incompatible and which resulted in an increase in the burnout rate among members…more sick leaves, more absenteeism and high turnover.” Most of the university administrators mentioned how they had a large number of meetings at the beginning to determine action plans to deal with various requirements. Hooria, a junior administrator from the FJWU, remarked how…

…the atmosphere of meeting rooms was usually really tensed and heavy. We discussed for hours and hours but there was no solution to many issues. We couldn’t agree on how to do this and that. We were under the pressure that time is passing by so quickly and we have lots of things to do for the day.

Much of the confusion amongst university participants, especially junior administrators, seemed to reflect the lack of access to information and the lack of a balanced structure for involvement in planning, decision-making and budgeting. Dina, a senior administrator from the FJWU, responded how she was cautious about the projects for which she was responsible from their inception. She did not see any real value in most of those different projects. She stated how she was “overwhelmed” by the paper work associated with multiple new initiatives: “This has increased the paper load for me quite a bit. I could not evaluate everyone’s paper the same.” She looked forward to when she could put this aside as another program that had reached its conclusion. Removing oneself from the process by resigning a particular post or leaving the organization entirely was one of the extreme responses to reforms. Likewise, Khawaja, a junior administrator from the AIOU, mentioned that

…the consequences of change are just few examples of behaviours available to less powerful resisters. Among those who resisted change, those with more influence on decision-makers were able to engage in more direct, overt and active resistant behaviours. Those with less power mostly used indirect, covert and passive forms of resistance to avoid any negative consequences.
In a similar vein, Hafeez, a senior professor from the AIOU, felt that he was “over-pressured and under-thanked.” He recalled one of his short-term contract-job experiences with the HEC ended with his resignation as a response to an authoritarian organizational culture:

Speaking from experience, I know that nobody cared when I resigned. No questions were asked; the only recognition from my senior administrators was a letter acknowledging the receipt of my letter of resignation followed by a simple thank you for my service. They never questioned why I no longer wanted to work for them.

Another participant Musarat, a senior professor from the FJWU like Hafeez, also mentioned her dissatisfaction and her decision to leave one of her appointments at the HEC headquarters in the following words:

Yes I did resign. It was based on this feeling that I wasn’t making any difference there. It was just a lot of tension and a lot of pressure, and I felt like there was a complete abandonment of academic integrity. Not just academic integrity, but integrity, period.

Because of the heavy workload and constant pressures, junior administrative staff felt more stressed and emotionally exhausted. Saira, a junior administrator from the FJWU, indicated her intention to leave if the situation did not improve. She shared her feelings in the following words:

Since I took up this job, I no longer have time for myself. I have developed a very bad temper. I simply cannot control my emotions which has affected my private life. I will definitely leave if the situation does not improve.

According to Nazia, a junior administrator from the FJWU, organizations sometimes encourage the departure of those who were unwilling to work in accordance with the new standards. She further explained this in the following words:

It is the people who the organization misses whom I wish had not been pushed out. We have had a lot of people leave. Turnover is high and it has always been high since HEC started imposing its way of doing things. There is no independence and freedom to do anything.

Likewise, Hooria another junior administrator at the same university, shared a situation where one of her colleagues politely said to one of the employees,

Let me help you find another position where you can feel as if you are contributing and you are doing the best job that you can be doing…. Some of them were bad-mouthing the plan and they were negative energy for the organization. I think it is one of the better ways
that you can tell others to move on rather than placing them on a list and treating them poorly, unethically or maligning them in some way.

Lack of Support, training and the Role of Change Agents

There is no disputing the fact that successful implementation requires significant staff development, especially where large-scale changes generate a need for extensive training; however, lack of adequate training was a commonly expressed issue among participants. In the context of the HEC reforms, the resources and training required have not been properly applied as planned. Many university administrators felt that the projects have been rushed into, which resulted in a lack of time and training for such multifaceted initiatives. The changes in activities, documentation and expectations during the plan led to confusion and non-acceptance of the program. Hooria, a junior administrator from the FJWU, exemplified this feeling: “I don’t think just one time an hour long seminar is enough for people to be able to really do this. I do not feel adequately trained.” “There simply was not enough time for training,” echoed Khawaja, a junior administrator at the AIOU. Moreover, “I do not feel adequately trained for everything I am responsible to manage. I do feel this all came too fast. If there was a gradual infusion of the project, it would have been better.” Many other participants also did not feel they had adequate and hands-on training, including Farhana, a senior administrator from the FJWU who asserted,

There was so much to do and I didn’t have time to think everything through and for the most part in the first few months I was operating pretty much on instincts. And it was frustrating to hear things like “It could have been done better.”… No one bothered to train us on how…. And those who took the effort to try doing things got negative criticism. Sometimes I thought I was better off not doing anything like those who complained about one thing or the other.

Dina, another senior administrator from the FJWU, reported that “Many people were not always enthusiastic about the minimal training mandated by the Ministry of Education.” Meanwhile Saira, another junior administrator from the same university, concurred that “Administrators had little or no experience with such reforms in the past or any training on implementation issues in their own education. It was difficult to understand the ‘how’ to accomplish what seems to make much sense in the mandated training.” Tahira, a junior professor also from the FJWU, felt that the “…implementation of the ‘cookbook’ or ‘cookie-cutter’ approaches was not easy as institutional complexities were different, time was limited, and support from the top was minimal.” Many participants mentioned ministry expectations as being
unrealistic; “In reality ‘there is no magic wand’ that can drastically change the traditional system” said Maryam, a senior administrator from the AIOU. Bushra, a senior professor from the FJWU, found that the occasional meetings were a big waste of time and she did not see anybody taking them seriously. Khwaja, a junior administrator from the AIOU, shared his story:

At the beginning, I often encountered staff’s questions that I couldn’t answer right away. I felt okay to tell them that I don’t know the answer. I used to spend hours and hours to gather information about those questions. It was embarrassing. These types of incidents happened a lot at the beginning of the implementation process. We never got any training of any kind or detailed information about things. The handbooks and information booklets we got were not complete to help us.

About one third of the participants mentioned their dissatisfaction with “policy makers’ efforts to raise standards through a global competition,” as summed up in the comments of Hooria, a junior administrator from the FJWU. She also stated that planners “seemed to forget the goals of our nation’s unique identity and sense of community.” In general, university administrators advocated the position that contemporary attempts at restructuring the higher-education system should be aimed at restoring the balance between global trends and local values whereby everyone involved feels connected to local norms and is still able to follow the international trends, and whereby policy makers can secure commitment to change by not expecting any quick fixes within a strict time frame. Maryam, a senior administrator at the AIOU, confirmed this perspective where she stated “I agree with the saying that ‘if it is not broken, don’t fix it.’”

Local change agents, such as university senior administration, must facilitate change, or “let” change happen in a way that empowers the faculty and the staff to take ownership of the change process and that institutionalizes change into the culture of the university so that the change becomes lasting. Many participants, especially junior administrators from both universities, associated resistance with a leader or with a change agent’s unacceptable behaviour. Such perceptions are based on actions that actually are or can be interpreted as “unfair treatment” or simply “not walking the talk.” Khawaja, a junior administrator from the AIOU, observed that “If you don’t do as you say or ask then why should I follow or trust that you will do what you say in the future?” Farhana, a senior administrator from the FJWU, expressed a similar view by saying that “When a leader’s behaviour is not consistent with the espoused values of the transformation initiatives, a disjuncture between what is done and said is expected, and that significantly shrinks the trust laden on the leader.” She further asserted, “Without good
leadership, and people who can set an example, no institution can be reformed because there will be no trust in the system and processes.”

Moreover, certain resisters based their actions on the fact that they simply did not like particular change agents. Nazia, another junior administrator from the FJWU, mentioned that “There were certain personalities, that whatever they suggested, no matter what it was, there were people who were not going to like it.” Ijaz, a junior professor from the AIOU, recalled the atmosphere of the administration at his university:

Walking past the administrative offices, I don’t know why, it always just felt like there was some tension every time you went in there. The administration, especially the head, was a bit harder to work with in terms of communication…. He had no tolerance for ambiguity… really wasn’t a great experience with him.

Hooria, another junior administrator from the FJWU, declared her opinions about the leadership in her institution:

The fidelity of change is impacted by how leaders adapt and respond to various demands and people involved. How they create an environment where everyone can collaborate in close proximity to support a climate of mutual respect based on changes in attitudes of everyone involved. This wasn’t the case here…his priorities have been different from ours….he had his allies….more rebellions appeared, more tension emerged and silent resistance was observed.

Tahira, a junior professor from the FJWU, also stated that “Sometimes people just go to an extreme when they don’t like the change agents or if they can’t get along with those they have to work with.” She mentioned one situation that she heard from one of her colleagues who worked in the administration: “They suspected the actions of a few people to be equivalent to sabotage. They felt that resisters had every opportunity to participate in the process, yet they chose not to, preferring to wait until the HEC’s periodic visit to the university to air dirty laundry. Everyone was extremely disappointed that these people would choose this way to vent their frustration and anger towards the administration.” Bushra, a senior professor from the FJWU, expressed a similar experience of how “Some attacks get personal…instead of attacking issues, people tend to go after people involved…instead of just saying something like ‘this really doesn’t make sense,’ they target the person and try to discredit the person and therefore discredit the process.”

In the whole process of interviews, it was evident that the concept “reform” or “change” did not in themselves pose challenges but that the practices, the implementation process and the
lack of support from the top seemed to create more issues resulting in resistance or reluctance among participants. Many participants from the FJWU and from the HEC mentioned that not receiving support from people was the most counterproductive factor of all. As a case in point, Bilal, a junior administrator from the HEC, concluded that “Not participating, refusing to or, when given a choice, opting not to participate in any aspect of the planning for, implementation of, or established elements of the transformation initiative are some of the forms of resistance from people.” According to Shehryar, also a senior administrator from the HEC,

…to facilitate change a few strategies did work. For example, building coalition, many participants mentioned that using diplomatic skills to build a broad sense of support among diverse stakeholders, so they may positively sway others to also support the initiative, worked in few cases.

Bina, a junior administrator from the HEC, and Dina, a senior administrator from the FJWU, also talked about the use of intellectual arguments and appeals to reason with those who resisted. According to them, in instances where more administrators were willing to listen and answer employees’ concerns, the acceptance rate was increasing. Bina shared her opinion on this:

I must confess that, despite being a loyal member of the higher education community for many years, information alone or argument alone won’t change people’s mind. You have to consider many other strategic, political, social and cultural aspects before even talking to people about change.

Rewarding individuals or departments for change was another strategy used by a few administrators. Dina mentioned that

…offering something in exchange for support or cooperation works, even if it is a reward for an appropriate behavior or making a deal with people to make change work, but, for that, the change in attitude should come from the top. People usually reciprocate behaviour.

Some junior university administrators mentioned their struggle with the reforms because of the lack of support from the top. Abir, a junior administrator from the FJWU, talked about the struggle she was going through:

I have been trying to make some changes but, like many of my colleagues, I feel changes only occurred at the surface level. We don’t really know how to make it happen in a deeper sense. We never got any additional support, information or resources of any kind. I don’t know how to use some of the computer programs yet…. A reform of this scale
should have made provisions for ongoing professional support…. This might be a reason why many others do not want to change.

Rehman, a senior administrator from the HEC, talked about the issue of lack of support in the HEC departments:

From what I can recall, everybody was just kind of in their own small world. People were just completely consumed with what they were doing, not what anybody else was doing. And if something didn’t work for them, they were automatically a bit selfish. Complaining about what they don’t have and then working with what they have…. I found myself always in my own office, taking care of my own business, without getting or giving any support. Realistically speaking, we cannot really expect much support in a situation where ideal goals were established without due consideration given to the actual implementation process and people’s needs and requirements.

**Communication, Trust and perceptions Fairness**

The importance of communication during the implementation of change cannot be overstated. Communication barriers are also one of the key factors causing resistance. Employees needed information and guidance on why certain changes were considered necessary and on the effect that those changes would bring for them. If the employee does not have enough information about the change being introduced she or he would resist change. Communication helps employees to comprehend everyone else’s priorities and concerns regarding the new initiative. Most of the participants emphasized the fact that every opportunity should be developed to make effective communication a formal part of the change plan, which is consistent with the literature on change management.

Studies completed as early as the 1940s by Coch & French (1948) show how work groups within organizations have a natural resistance to any change. Their conclusion confirmed that the best way to combat resistance was through effective communications from the management concerning the need for change. Many junior administrators, especially from the FJWU, talked about a lack of communication or poor communication between the top administration and those who work at the lower level. Dina, a senior administrator from the FJWU, said,

We do more micromanaging of the staff compared to our directors and ministry officials. At our positions and our levels we really see what’s going on out there and we are not included in things that I think we should be.
Saira, a junior administrator from the FJWU, also said that

They [the senior administration] actually need to speak to us…. I think that it would be a good idea to have informative sessions – if not weekly or monthly, maybe every two months, quarterly, or whatever, just for specific things. Such interaction would benefit the services we provide to our staff, students and various publics that we deal with on a day-to-day basis.

Furthermore, Khawaja, a junior administrator from the AIOU, commented that “Resistance is going to be an obvious response if the change is open to a wide variety of interpretations.” A few other junior administrators from the FJWU (e.g., Abir and Farhana) mentioned that it takes time to build a relationship of trust and understanding. Areas where participants had established a rapport of trust and respect before the actual implementation of reforms were able to move forward expeditiously. Those actions that required participants to come together without the foundation of a previously established relationship of respect and understanding faced unpleasant consequences including resistance. Abir remarked that

When I first came here, there was already an established group. They had been here together the longest so, they worked well together. They were more communicative and helpful to each other, not to newcomers. I felt that I can talk about my job-related things, but not everything else.

Daoud, a senior professor from the AIOU, acknowledged the investment of time it takes to establish such a relationship by stating

So, a lot of the time, I only have to say a couple of sentences and the others understand what I am talking about. It takes a long time to develop that sort of relationship with people to think along the same lines. I had this advantage because I have been here for thirty years. We have been together for many years so we know what to do and how to do it because we often do it together.

With regard to trust in government-initiated reforms, Zia, a senior professor from the AIOU, shared his opinion that

Given the history of educational reforms, I didn’t trust the government itself to do any better…. Perceptions of trust in the systems of organizations are commonly linked to perceptions of trust in the people managing those organizations and I didn’t trust them either.

Participants from all three sites who perceived any kind of distributive, procedural or interactional injustice felt a loss of trust, loyalty and commitment, and demonstrated various types of resistance towards change agents and the organization. During the change, participants
from both universities experienced or perceived distributive injustice in several ways. From the early stages, the HEC-initiated reforms placed additional demands on the participants but with no additional outcomes (compensation); most of the incentives were driven towards newcomers/foreign-qualified employees. Many participants from both universities stated that one of the HEC’s key programs – recruitment of more foreign faculty members – has been heatedly opposed by many academics and university administrators who argued that a significant amount of money has been spent to hire unsuitable professors, including some who were not aware of the institutional and cultural context. In addition, more pay for foreigners and less workload were creating another issue within the organization. Bushra, a senior professor from the FJWU, talked about her dissatisfaction with the HEC’s unfair practices. Specifically, she talked about the HEC’s decision to hire faculty members on a contract basis, rather than on a permanent basis:

They want good salespeople not good teachers…. You put too much time and energy into your job and as a return you get nothing not even job security…. Look at the differences in salaries, benefits and workloads between local contract employees and foreigners. It is totally unfair and frustrating.

She further stated that

The recruitment of non-permanent foreign faculty, whether of Pakistani origin or otherwise, is useless and dangerous. People who are not familiar with the culture and social norms are absolutely not needed here. The HEC should spend that money and those resources to help local staff improve their credentials rather than paying lucrative salaries to these foreigners.

Dina, a senior administrator from the FJWU, shared similar views including on the brain-drain issue. She stated that

The salary, financial rewards and benefits for the faculty are very low according to the rising cost of living in Pakistan…. Appropriate action should be taken to provide an attractive and competitive faculty salary; reasonable teaching and research assignments; and fringe benefits to attract top-ranking educators who are leaving the country to find better opportunities abroad.

Farhana, another senior administrator from the FJWU, also concluded that “The commission’s foreign-faculty program is not working, even though it is spending a great deal of money.” Voicing a contradictory opinion, one of the HEC’s senior administrators, Rehman, says that such opposition is inevitable, especially from what he calls “mediocre academics.” In a
similar vein, procedural injustice was perceived as target stakeholders were not given ample time and opportunity for participation. Daoud, a senior professor from the AIOU, remarked that

I was once a member of an advisory board that was supposed to participate in the planning. I seriously thought I could make a difference. Nothing was really done as I imagined, ministry bureaucrats set the agenda and they did result in certain important decisions. Sad to say, the whole idea of having a consultation was eyewash, a waste of time for me and many others like me. On paper we were consulted but in reality we just sat and listened to what we knew will never work.

Interactional justice was missing in the process as well, as a majority of the faculty from both universities felt they were not treated with dignity and respect in interpersonal interactions and were not given adequate justifications or explanations for multiple decisions. Tariq, a senior administrator from the HEC, asserted that “One of the things I just shake my head on is when those who say this is great and it is going to work for me don’t listen to those who were saying ‘this is not going to work for me’…. .” In agreeing with Tariq, Hafeez, a senior professor from the AIOU, talked about the fact that

At the university level, people in authority are unable to listen and accept ideas of others who are going to be affected by those decisions. It’s a culture that places an emphasis on respect for authority, not for fair procedures or for fair dialogues between those who are involved. Authority figures expect others to be submissive only and to follow orders religiously.

Similarly, Khawaja, a junior administrator from the AIOU, commented that “Our administrators and ministry officials never directly addressed professionals’ concerns, never provided adequate explanation and clear reasons for various decisions, and never tried to reduce uncertainty by communicating with us as if we are nothing.” In general, the participants interpreted this lack of communication as a sign that they were insignificant and unworthy of respect which led to perceptions of inequity among employees. Asad, a senior administrator from the HEC, was the only one who openly acknowledged the need for involvement from the lower levels of the bureaucracy. He mentioned that

When we discuss things, my policy is to let people talk. You have to listen to people talk even if they are saying something that you don’t want to hear. You build and keep your critical masses that way. If you start shutting people off, even the people on your side will start jumping ship. People sitting at the top need to understand this very basic thing.
In relation to equal opportunities at the institutional level, even though everyone appeared to have equal access to opportunities and promotion chances if they performed, in reality the chances to perform were far from equal. At the FJWU, I was told that some people were given more chances to perform than others. For example, Hooria shared the view that

In this university, it is obvious that the senior administrators favour compliant people. For example, I am a very easily approachable person who in fact doesn’t know how to say no and therefore the seniors seem to give me more opportunities and those opportunities are somehow related to promotion. I guess my chances of promotion may be better than others. This society in general likes obedience especially from women.

She also shared a story: “One of my colleagues once refused to accept an assignment that she found unreasonable. Our superior did not find that very obedient. She was not asked again and never got any opportunity. Does she have any chance of getting promoted? No, not at all.”

Gender, Age, Job Experience and Reforms

My analysis of the interview data revealed that 19 of the 24 participants reported negative feelings about the reform itself and its implementation. Of these 19, six were males. It is important to note that the five remaining male participants (mostly from the HEC) felt positively about the reform in general. As I conducted my analysis to consider gender as a variable of note, I was still able to note gender differences and similarities because the female participants did discuss gender discrimination in reference to their general work environment and the general societal structure, and in reference to their work experiences even before the reforms were implemented.

A case in point is Salma, a senior administrator at the HEC, who was one of the female participants who talked about her difficulties as a woman among conservative male colleagues. She experienced gender discrimination in all the government departments in which she worked until joining the HEC. She mentioned that, when she was hired, she entered at a lower level than a young man whom they had hired at a monthly rate of Rs. 6,000 more than herself and who only had a bachelor’s degree. She also spoke about an incident when she was an employee with one of the provincial government departments; one boss gave her a difficult time in taking family-related leave to go home and visit a family member when her relative was released from the hospital. She also recalled her struggles with the need for flexibility due to child-care
responsibilities and unplanned overtime and the actual time spent at the office. She also believes that her pregnancy may have set her back somewhat in her career when comparing herself to her male colleagues who started at the same time that she did. Salma noted how her early experiences in various government departments “set the tone for my career… I have spent the past decades fighting at every turn to prove that I can do things and that has given me an attitude.”

My conversations with a few participants, especially junior administrators from both participating universities, revealed that gender had a significant influence on work attitudes. Females indicated that they were significantly more flexible and committed, were more willing to invest extra time and were able to perceive organizational constraints more realistically than their male counterparts. Males shared more frustration about reforms and had more intentions to leave. One of the shocking findings was that two of the junior administrators at the FJWU mentioned that their institution had attempted to succeed in a competitive educational market by exploiting young women, discriminating against motherhood and inciting unnecessary competition among women of different educational qualifications while promoting the patriarchal interests and masculine norms set by the powerful male minority sitting in the federal offices. One of the participants, Hooria, stated that the

…average working hours for most of us were long as compared to other institutions. We were even expected to come and even work over the weekends. Such commitment was possible only for those who did not have, or who could easily escape from, family responsibilities or those who had familial and domestic support. This certainly led to an unreasonable competition among colleagues, even with different qualifications. This threatened collegiality and cooperation.

This significant masculinization of senior administrative positions sometimes accompanied by a feminization of the lower-middle management in the higher-education sector was identified by many Western and a few Eastern researchers (e.g., De Mel, 2002; Kerfoot & Whitehead, 1998; Khan, 2007; Leonard, 1998; Lloyd-Jones, 2009; Mahitivanichcha & Rorrer, 2006; Malik, 2005; Malik & Courtney, 2011; Prichard & Deem, 1999). Feminists have already pointed out that the emphasis on long hours as a sign of organizational commitment and the normalcy of a rigid separation between home and work are masculine-oriented, as only men, single or married (and occasionally some women, single or married, with no family commitments), can qualify as committed workers (e.g., Choi & Lee, 1997; Davies, 1996; Maier,
1999; Malik & Courtney, 2011). Married women have reported being discriminated against at work because of the stereotypes that society holds towards them. Such views were shared by a participant, Nazia, who said,

> In this society it is always the women, married or unmarried, who are responsible for household and caring duties at home. They will have difficulties in becoming the so-called “committed,” “sincere,” or “hard-working” employee. On many occasions, I felt myself torn between the demands, between my responsibilities at home and my responsibilities at work. I could not use my time as flexibly as some of my single colleagues.

In a similar vein, one of the male senior administrators, Khawaja, commented that at the AIOU

> …the staff we have right now might not be able to survive such a heavy workload in the long term. Age will slowly eat up their determination and capability…. If you will notice, most of the junior faculty and administrative staff are comprised of younger women but sooner or later they will get married and become petty-minded.

When questioned about what the university should do about it, his answer was,

> We constantly monitor and push them to work harder. We have made it very clear to them that they either work hard here or they have to go. We generally hire newcomers on a contract basis. They will be part of the institution for as long as their productivity is up to our standards. Once their productivity starts declining, we have no choice except to let them go.

During the data collection, it became apparent to me that perhaps age, more than gender, and the conditions or contexts in which people work might heavily influence individuals’ attitudes and opinions about reforms. With the exception of one participant, Khawaja, no one explicitly said anything to affirm this assumption of mine but, through interviews, I noticed that most of the tenured senior faculty members and administrators were more dissatisfied and conservative, and had more negative things to say about the HEC reforms. Younger participants, both male and female, shared their frustration with the HEC-initiated reforms but they cited pragmatic reasons concerning the lack of support, lack of training, lack of communication and lack of recourses. On the contrary, senior participants talked about the nature of the imposed changes, the lack of cultural relevance and the perceived injustice. My conversations with participants revealed that age alone is not the most important factor affecting employees’ beliefs and opinions about the reform. In complex professional situations, where economic, social,
technical and psychological factors are closely intertwined, it would be insufficient and not very fruitful to limit the explanation of resistance to individuals as an isolated factor, as it is always the result of multiple issues.

The data for this study also reveal that experienced employees with more than 15 years of work experience had more negative opinions about the reform as compared to relatively new employees with less work experience. Consequently, experienced employees perceived change more negatively than employees with less job experience; however, the impact of the length of job experience might also be a result of chronological age. As compared to age, seniority seemed to be a more significant factor affecting participants’ reactions. The ambivalence and anxiety about the change of senior faculty and staff members (e.g., Doud, Hafeez and Zia from the AIOU) emerged because of their fear that embracing the proposed changes would damage their careers. Those with more seniority tended to have a negative opinion on the usefulness of the reforms and they also shared their lack of interest in reforms. The longer a participant had been in his or her department or unit (which implies a certain age and time-hardened work habits), the less likely he or she was to have a favourable opinion, and especially with respect to socio-professional consequences. In contrast, it may have been easier for younger employees and newcomers to accept and implement the changes as an advantage that increases their qualifications and enhances their peer status.

Summary

This chapter reported the findings from my conversations with participants about their perceptions of the process and impact of HEC-initiated reforms. The findings were based primarily on interviews of a representative sample of 24 participants from three different organizations. I presented factors that induced participants’ tendencies to resist or avoid making changes and to devalue change generally. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the use of open-ended and semi-structured interviews was an important aspect of the methodology to obtain details and insight into the research questions. A challenging aspect of presenting findings from large amounts of transcribed interviews was to group data into categories while not losing detail. In order to ensure that concerns about privacy and consent were respected, participants who did not give clear opinions or who did not want to respond despite follow-up questions or probes were counted as valid responses of not having enough knowledge on the subject or of choosing
not to respond because of the sensitivity of the subject matter or because of privacy considerations. The magnitude or intensity of a response was gauged by the frequency with which the issue came up in the conversation or by the details and arguments presented during interviews. Verbatim quotes to illustrate research findings were used to capture greater detail and depth.

In sum, the findings support the notion that change is complicated, and that the reasons for this complexity stem from factors that are structural, emotional, political and personal. Educational organizations have historically struggled with how to innovate and improve. This study found that, despite serious issues and weaknesses, change was gradual over time and that the most strongly contested reforms were those that did not align with existing practices. Some of the issues that participants shared include the persistence of long-standing conventions, institutional politics, poor communication, lack of training and incentives for the additional workload, authoritarian approaches, the disconnect between policy makers and target organizations, involvement of foreign experts, and the lack of support from the top. Consequently, many administrators and professors initially felt stress that led to burn out, absenteeism and turnover intentions. One of the widely cited reasons was the nature of the mandated reforms where expectations were unrealistically raised for target organizations in terms of performance and accountability without any support or rewards.

Some other notable variables of note were gender differences, job experience and seniority. My conversation with participants revealed that these factors had significant influence on the work attitudes of participants. Data for this study revealed that veteran employees had more negative opinions about the reform as compared to relatively newer employees with less job experience. Consequently, they perceived change more negatively than employees with less job experience; however, the length of job experience might also be a result of chronological age. The remaining two chapters will further discuss the findings and will offer suggestions, based on an in-depth look at the research questions, as to what happens to university faculty and staff members who engage in mandated reform over time. How do they react to or cope with the mandated reforms? What can HEC and institutional decision-makers do to support them, and perhaps even renew and invigorate their practices?
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND FULLAN’S THEORIES

This chapter synthesizes the interpretations into a unified whole and discusses the overall findings. The purpose of this study was to explore, analyze and reflect on the meaning, nature, causes and associated dynamics of change in higher education within a Pakistani cultural context. Resistance was a major component of understanding this change. I focused on multiple factors that induced individual and group tendencies to resist or avoid making changes and to devalue change generally. Descriptions of what, how, when and why individuals resist were achieved through the adoption of qualitative methodologies with a multiple case study approach. To frame this study, I used Fullan’s (1991a; 1999; 2001a; 2001b) theories of educational change to capture the multidimensionality of change and its associated dynamics including resistance to change. Fullan’s emphasis on the perspectives and roles of participants and institutions in the change process in schools, districts and governments and his intent on treating innovations not as ends in themselves distinguish Fullan’s change-process models from others. I have divided this chapter into two parts. The first part includes discussions in relation to the research questions. The second part discusses the applicability of Fullan’s theories for this research.

Research Question One:
1. How do the professors and administrators express their values, beliefs and attitudes regarding the change effort?
   a) Did he or she resist? If not, why not?
   b) Why did she or he resist and why does she or he think that other people resisted?
   c) How did the participants express their resistance or compliance?

   In relation to my first research question, I found out that resistance to change, to varying degrees, was present in all three participating institutions. Findings reveal that a substantial amount of participant resistance was explicit and that there were variations in the individual responses towards the implementation of HEC-initiated reforms due to multiple reasons as presented in chapter five and as will be discussed in this chapter. Consistent with the literature, resistance to change was mostly defined as employee action or inaction that is intended to avoid change and/or interfere with the successful implementation of change in its current form.
A QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION OF A REFORM

(Herscovitch, 2003). Based on participants from all research sites, three major themes emerged in relation to a definition of resistance. The majority described resistance as a behavioural construct (e.g., vocal opposition; lack of involvement and support; lack of sharing; trying to prevent change from happening). Very few participants, especially junior administrators from both universities, portrayed resistance as a cognitive or an emotional construct (e.g., fear of the unknown, habit, lack of confidence, discomfort with the change, and negative views about change or the change agent). Some participants from both universities indirectly defined resistance as a social construct as well (e.g., interpersonal issues, lack of cooperation between people and departments, internal politics and competition). Participants from both universities talked about how they expressed their values, beliefs and resistance, either by telling how they exhibited it themselves or witnessed it in others.

Three types of resistance to change emerged from the literature that I reviewed – active resistance, passive resistance and aggressive resistance (Coetsee, 1999) were mentioned by most of the participants. The lack of control over changes has implications for both the amount of resistance and the forms in which the resistance is manifested. When change is imposed upon employees against their will, there may be a natural tendency to fight the change directly by refusing to cooperate, or indirectly through retaliatory behaviours. When change is imposed, many of the principles of procedural and interactional justice may be violated. When individuals are unable to modify the change proposal due to not having access, or being unable to persuade decision-makers, it is unlikely that they will revert to indirect forms of resistance. Withdrawing effort, leaving the organization, or misleading others regarding the consequences of change are examples of behaviours available to less powerful resisters. Among those who resisted change, those with more influence on decision-makers were able to engage in more direct, overt, and active resistant behaviours. Those with less power mostly used indirect, covert, and passive forms of resistance to avoid any negative consequences. In this study, the dimensionality of resistance was uncovered based on the conceptual similarity or dissimilarity of the different forms of resistance and based on the individual participants’ actual behavioural tendencies as revealed through my conversations with them which included: an active versus passive dimension; an overt versus covert dimension; and a constructive versus destructive dimension. For example, an example of overt or active resistance would be attacking the change agent. This form was shown by Hooria, one of the junior administrators at the FJWU, who defined overt or
active resistance as “any explicit movement to defame or undermine change agent leading a change.” Passive or covert forms of resistance according to Hooria can be seen where someone “works behind the scene in a manner that might be described as unfair or unethical. Organizational silence is another example.” Maryam, a senior administrator from the AIOU, talked about destructive forms of resistance that include: using students as pawns, using external media to publicize arguments against the reform, and using threats or ultimatums. Most of the senior administrators from all three research sites talked about resistant behaviours that are usually considered destructive such as: doing the bare minimum, secretly failing to comply, leaving the organization, spreading incorrect information about change, openly continuing to do things the old way, being hostile and verbally aggressive to those involved in the change, using threats to try to prevent the change, and exaggerating problems with the change. Notably, participants did not explicitly define resistance as constructive. A possible reason might be the fact that the word resistance has a negative connotation attached to it; therefore, participants may not have thought about constructive forms of resistance. Another possible reason might be the fact that destructive forms of resistance are more salient and occur with more frequency than constructive ones.

Staff and faculty behaviours that were considered constructive to support change were: making suggestions to improve the new initiatives, gathering information to substantiate concerns about change, open sharing during meetings about change initiatives, voicing concerns openly to change agents, and identifying unexpected problems with the change to improve its efficiency and effectiveness. Regardless of gender and age differences, most of the junior and senior administrators from both universities also talked about behaviours that are usually considered passive and covert such as: standing by and allowing the change to fail, failing to report problems, withholding verbal or explicit support for change initiatives, having hidden agendas against compliance with change initiatives, coalition building, relying on others to perform new tasks, withholding information needed to make change happen, not attending change-related meetings, deliberate delays in change-related tasks, feigning ignorance, increased withdrawal from the job or calling in sick on days of important events and indirectly contributing to the change’s downfall. The opposite overt and active dimension was reflected most strongly by such staff and faculty behaviours as: making formal complaints about change, criticizing the change and change agents, openly refusing to comply with required changes, making it difficult
for those who appreciate change initiatives, using personal networks to create problems, openly trying to persuade others to resist changes and making deliberate errors in performing jobs in a new way.

Some of the widely cited reasons of resistance as in the popular literature consistent with my findings include: routine-seeking, fear of the unknown, perceived loss of control, uncertainty, low self-efficacy, disbelief in the need for change, cynicism, perceptions of injustice, habit, mistrust and poor communication (Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Folger & Skarlicki, 1999; Hultman, 1998; Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979; Kotter, 2007; Nadler, 1998; Strebel, 1996; Tvedt et al., 2009). Almost all HEC administrators cited resistance from university staff and faculty as a major obstacle negatively impacting the reform process. They cited some of the following reactions from the university population: absence during important meetings, silence during important meetings, formal and informal complaints, explicit negative criticism without logical support, pretending to be unable to carry out change-related duties, spreading false rumors about change, presenting personal opinions and frustrations as others’, coalition-building against the senior administration, absenteeism and intentional slowdowns. Possible reasons for these responses which impeded the implementation and utilization of HEC initiatives to their full potential, as described by the HEC participants, were: habit, routine seeking, emotional instability, lack of self-confidence, lack of ability, short-term focus and, most importantly, cognitive rigidity. I found resistance, reluctance or deviances are potential results if: the target population doesn’t believe in the truth and legitimacy of the accounts provided by policy makers; if the target population perceives less benefits and more physical/psychological/financial investment associated with the change; if stakeholders perceive either distributive (related to fairness of rewards and decisions), procedural (related to fairness of procedures used to make decisions), or interactional (related to social aspects of procedural justice) injustice (Beugre, 1998; Folger & Skarlicki, 1999; Tyler & Lind, 1992). Participants who perceived any kind of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice felt loss of trust, loyalty, commitment, and demonstrated various types of resistance towards change agents and the organization. The set of behaviours identified in this study may not be comprehensive; there may be other forms of resistance that were not identified through selected participants. Future research will help to shed light on the extent to which this is the case. The ultimate goal of this inquiry was to identify the general
dimensions (or types) of resistance to change that can account for any form that resistance might take. The behaviours identified in this inquiry provided a good starting point for doing so.

The HEC administrators refused to acknowledge that resisters might have good intentions underlying their unwillingness or reluctance to change or that resistance can be used constructively to improve the implementation process. It was evident from my conversations with some junior university administrators and faculty members that specifying the resistant individual, who has an intention to avoid or interfere with a change initiative, does not imply that the individual is necessarily malevolent or that he or she does not have good reasons for avoiding and/or opposing the change. In fact, it is unfair to ascribe negative connotations to resistance when, “in some cases, individuals who resist are actually doing so for justified reasons” (as Zia explains it). Studies on resistance to change in the Western literature (e.g., Carson, 1997; Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Edwin, 2008; Ford, 2005; Giles, 2006; Piderit, 2000) support this finding. Employees’ resistance may sometimes be rooted in a genuine concern for the organization’s well-being and/or in the desire to protect the organization’s best interests (Piderit, 2000). The notion that employees might engage in seemingly non-supportive behaviour for the good of the organization is consistent with the literature on whistle-blowing (e.g., Miceli & Near, 1992; Near & Miceli, 1996) and on principled organizational dissent (Graham, 1986). Whistle-blowing reflects “disclosure by organizational members of illegal, immoral, or illegitimate practices under the control of their employees, to persons or organizations that may be able to effect action” (Near & Miceli, 1985, p. 4). Principled organizational dissent is defined as “protest and/or effort to change the organizational status quo because of a conscientious objection to current policy or practice” (Graham, 1986, p. 1). Employees are likely to employ these seemingly rebellious or oppositional responses to potentially threatening conditions, or when they perceive that their organization may be harmed by transformational or drastic changes.

Some of the university participants (e.g., Daoud, Hafeez and Zia), especially from the AIOU, mentioned openly that they believed that their organization might have been harmed in some way as a result of what they considered to be the unrealistically planned and overly ambitious HEC-mandated change initiatives (as apparently exemplified by, for instance, turnover of committed employees, lost resources, dissatisfaction among employees, internal conflicts, and poor internal and external relationships). Some participants (e.g., Dina and Saira) mentioned that the new initiatives were inconsistent with cultural traditions and even inconsistent with the
organizational values as discussed in chapter five. Still, in such cases, the ultimate intention of the resistant employee is to avoid or to interfere with the change – at least in its existing form. This particular definition of resistance to change makes no reference to the actual consequences of resistance. That is, as long as a person has intentions of trying to avoid, or to interfere with, a change initiative, he or she would be considered resistant regardless of whether his or her attempts were actually good and successful. Similarly, a behaviour that actually interferes with the success of a change but was not intended to do so, or that was performed accidently, would not be considered resistance.

Regarding the intensity of resistant behaviour, evidence from my data indicates that the way in which users expressed their resistance was high, moderate or low. Participants’ denial to adopt reforms was considered to show a high degree of resistance. Some senior and experienced male participants, especially at the AIOU (with tenure), showed high resistance by not fully implementing the HEC-initiated reforms; however, in one case a tenured employee was forced to resign as mentioned in chapter five. The participants who displayed high resistance were quite vocal in expressing their dislike about various properties of HEC reforms in strong phrases such as “It is an awful period,” “I was frustrated” and “It was very frustrating,” while other users with milder resistance were more subtle in expressing their displeasure about HEC-mandated reforms. In general, I found participants from the AIOU to be more resistant towards HEC-initiated transformational reforms than the participants from the FJWU. This might be because of the fact that it is the older university with a strong, established organizational culture with people already having job tenure. On the contrary, the FJWU was still in the process of becoming established when the HEC started implementing new initiatives.

Another aspect consistent with popular literature is the fact that educators are often not given the time, resources and professional development to build the capacity to achieve desired outcomes. This is especially the case in large-scale reforms with compulsory standards and high pressure for compliance. Until these preconditions for reform are in place and there is a fundamental investment in and restructuring of educators’ work (Gitlin, 1995) so that they are given the time, opportunities and training to make well-considered choices for their own schools and students, it is likely that educational institutions will continue to be intractable to change. In the similar vein, Dick et al. (1996) assert that mandatory or imposed change threatens the need for control (when psychological ownership is high) and will be therefore resisted. Large scale
reforms threaten the need for self-continuity and are usually resisted. Conversely, individuals are likely to support changes that are self-initiated, evolutionary, and additive, and when psychological ownership is high. When psychological ownership is low, the need for self are neither fulfilled nor frustrated by organizational change. Levin & Eubank’s (1989) research contains an analysis of the problems associated with local reforms. They identify six obstacles to the successful implementation of reforms including: 1) inadequate time, training and assistance; 2) difficulties of stimulating considerations and adaptation of inconvenient changes; 3) unresolved issues involving leadership and enhanced power among other participants; 4) constraints on participation in decision-making; 5) administrators’ reluctance to give up traditional prerogatives; and 6) restrictions imposed the state and federal regulations and by contracts and agreements with teacher organizations. Participants from the AIOU were more explicit and bold in sharing such opinions as compared to the FJWU where participants were occasionally careful and selective in their responses. However, almost all Faculty members talked about the need for developing an understanding of the patterns in which teachers and educational leaders cooperate, interact and intensely pursue instructional and institutional improvement. The faculty members acknowledged that numerous reforms were doomed to failure because the contexts in which reforms were being introduced were so deeply flawed. To them, the success of HEC initiated reforms was contingent upon policy makers and university practitioners each becoming aware of the others’ practical world. Fullan’s (2001b) research also affirms that the reason why traditional bureaucratic approaches to change remain predominant today is that “neither local school system nor state or federal agencies have been able to establish a processual relationship with each other” (p. 87). Fullan also warned that when policy makers place more emphasis on adoption than implementation, they often rush the implementation stage of the change innovation by expecting changes in outcomes before initiation and clarification of the innovation have had time to naturally occur which was one of the concerns shared by most of the university participants.

Interestingly, almost all – and especially younger female – participants from the FJWU asked me many questions about the confidentiality and anonymity of the data. I had to assure them many times over the period of data collection that the information that I received from them would remain anonymous, confidential and carefully stored so that no one would have any access to the data except me. These concerns may have been motivated by the gender differences,
especially in a conservative society like Pakistan where women are subject to greater criticism than men. In addition, most of these younger female participants did not have the security of tenure.

An important point to note for this study is that, even though I interviewed 24 participants (11 males and 13 females), these numbers are not representative of the current Pakistani university faculty and staff, which are predominantly male. An overwhelming proportion of top administrative jobs are held by men, compared with their proportion in the general teaching population (Haroon 2001; Khattak, 2002; Seyed, 2005; Seyed et al., 2009). In South Asia, Pakistan is the country with the widest gender gap, and discrimination against women continues to persist in all areas of life (Khattak, 2002; Haroon 2001; Seyed et al., 2009; UNICEF, 2006).

The theory of the gendered organization (Acker, 1990; Haroon, 2001; Kelly et al., 2010; Mahitivanichcha et al., 2006; Sule, 2011; Talmud & Izraeli, 1999; Whitehead, 2001a) posits that, even within a female-dominated profession, the organization has “male” language, codes and shared narratives, which inhibit the promotion of female employees. Furthermore, this theory argues that it is precisely gender that affects work attitudes (Rosenblatt et al., 1999). As mentioned above, I also found younger female participants to be more selective in their responses as compared to other participants. Notably, participants over 50, regardless of their gender, resisted more than younger participants, perhaps because they were accustomed to the older way of doing things or were more secure in their positions. Bruno (2000) in his research also suggested a generational component to change in terms of how work-related values are different among different generations. In terms of gender, Bruno found that “Older male teachers tended to want more time for self or personal development, whereas older female teachers thought that some school reforms were not worth their time” (2000, p. 156).

Job experience and seniority seemingly played a significant part in the participants’ reactions to the HEC-initiated reforms. Through extended practice in a stable work environment, employees develop knowledge and skills – often executed automatically – that provide fast and efficient task performance (French & Sternberg, 1989; Khan, 2001; Mahitivanichcha et al., 2006; Malik, 2007; Quinones et al., 1995). Studies have indicated that, when tasks change, job experience can actually impair performance (e.g., Betsch et al., 2001; Herold et al., 2007; Kezar, 2005). Skills and knowledge acquired over many years within the same task environment can invoke expectations that do not fit with the changed tasks, making it difficult to think about
problems in a novel way and distorting memory and perception (see Feltovich et al., 1997; Machin et al., 2009). It is very likely that employees with more job experience have more difficulties unlearning routines because they have more knowledge and more routinized skills from which they need to detach. As a consequence, they might rely on obsolete work procedures and resist change. Data for this study reveal that veteran employees had negative opinions about the reform as compared to relatively new employees with less job experience. Consequently, they perceived change more negatively than employees with less job experience; however, length of job experience might also be a result of chronological age.

Consistent with the literature, this study supports the proposition that age is negatively related to the ability and willingness to learn (Colquitt et al., 2000; Griffin et al., 2007; Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004; Warr, 2001; Yeatts et al., 2000). Research on teachers and aging both in the West and the East (e.g., Basu, 2006; Binnewies et al., 2008; Chan & Mok, 2001; Haider, 2008; Madhni, 2007; Niessen et al., 2010) has shown that as teachers age they often become more conservative (Evans, 1996; Government of Pakistan, 2008a; Haider, 2008; Hargreaves, 2005a). Literature supports the idea that, with increasing age, employees’ self-efficacy for dealing with tasks that do not depend strongly on prior knowledge might decrease (e.g., Herold et al., 2007; Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004). In the present study, I was not intentionally exploring the relationship between age and employees’ adaptation to changes in the workplace. This is a theme that emerged during the data collection. Some participants in my study had been with their institutions for over 20 years and thus were more inclined to feel a sense of loss as compared to younger participants. These employees showed minimal willingness to adapt, had more cynical views about the reform and had less faith in the permanence of the changes. My conversations with the older staff and faculty members revealed that senior and experienced participants felt as though their years of work were not being rewarded, and as though their concerns about the required time, space, resources and effort should have been taken into consideration before change efforts were conceptualized and introduced. In sum, the literature cited here supports the notion that change for the academic staff and faculty is complicated, and that the reasons for this complexity stem from factors that are structural, emotional, political, personal and generational.
Research Question Two:

2. What perceptions/circumstances obstruct administrators in bringing about change in their workplaces?
   a) What perceptions/circumstances play an important role in defining, facilitating and resisting the conditions that “ultimately” lead to systemic change?
   b) How are resistance mechanisms and strategies similar to, or different from, the various resistance constructs discussed in the literature?

Participants’ resistance to the implementation of HEC-mandated reforms existed in different forms, which hindered their adoption and the full utilization of many new initiatives. Although the HEC received commendation for its various initiatives from all over the world, it also received criticism about the procedure and implementation of its programs at the local level, in particular from higher education institutions. When asked what perceptions or circumstances obstruct administrators in bringing about change in their workplaces, faculty members and university administrators had reservations about the distribution and utilization of funds, admission criteria, quality-assurance criteria and HEC-approved supervisor criteria to name a few. Some of the other frequently cited barriers that contributed to the formation of resistance, according to participants, were the perceived complexity of the new initiatives, the lack of involvement from the HEC, the lack of support or extra resources, the lack of sufficient time, perceived unfairness, fear of the unknown, threats to traditions and local culture, authoritarian approaches used by change agents, work overload, institutional politics, and lack of communication.

There is no dispute that successful implementation requires significant staff development (Hess, 1999). Unfortunately, administrators were not always enthusiastic about minimal training mandated by the Ministry of Education. Too often, negative attitudes prevail in these sessions and the negativity passes over participants like tidal wave” (Long, 2003, p. 6). Few mentioned the fact as problem that administrators had little or no experience with such reforms in the past or any training on implementation issues in their own education; it was difficult to understand the ‘how’ to accomplish what seems to make much sense in the minimal mandated training. However, participants felt, that the implementation of the ‘cookbook’ approaches offered was not easy as institutional complexities were different, planning time was limited, and support from
the top was minimal. Participants mentioned ministry expectations as unrealistic. University administrators mentioned their dissatisfaction in policy makers’ efforts to raise standards through a global competition. Hooria, a participant mentioned that planners “seemed to forget the goals of our nation’s unique identity and a sense of community”. She advocated that contemporary attempts at restructuring the higher education system should be aimed at restoring the balance between global trends and local values where everyone involved feels connected to local norms and still able to follow the international trends. Policy makers can secure normative commitment to change by not expecting any quick fixes within a strict time frame. One participant even mentioned, “I agree with the old adage that if it is not broken, doesn’t fix it’.

The administrative group particularly encountered difficulties in the performance of their work due to the absence of training and several intra-organizational issues. The majority of the administrative participants from universities, especially the younger and junior-level administrators from the FJWU, were dissatisfied with the training program due to its lack of a hands-on approach, or due to being left out of training sessions. High resistance was evident in this respect. Even those who attended some sort of training criticized the training program through phrases such as “It did not mean anything,” “It was not hands-on,” “It was more theoretical,” “I did not learn much,” “It was all about what is done in the West” and “It was bad.” According to these administrators, their performance had been impeded due to this lack of training and they were facing difficulties in fulfilling their duties. The majority of the participants’ work suffered on this account, and they perceived it as a “bad,” “awful” or “frustrating” experience and they expressed their dissatisfaction in this regard. Almost all of the participants complained that the new initiatives unrealistically increased their workload and consequently their productivity decreased.

Six participants, mostly the junior administrative staff and a few senior faculty members, commented that deans and department chairs did not demonstrate active support for many initiatives. These participants defined administrator support from institutional leaders as “invisible” or “non-existent.” However, these participants did acknowledge some of the possible constraints that the top management might have had to handle. These included heavy workload, financial constraints and scarce resources to meet demands of various institutional units. These participants felt that the support that they received from the HEC was very “superficial” and “not practical.” They characterized the whole reform initiative as “politically driven” and not context
specific. Two participants from the FJWU felt that senior university administrators paid “lip service” only; these senior administrators had promised multiple resources but never kept their commitment. On the other hand, three of the senior administrative participants described junior faculty members and junior administrative staff as stubborn, complainers and lazy. Mishra & Sreitzer (1998) suggested that people’s responses are dynamic – that is, they may shift throughout the change process. More specifically, they speculated that “Employees may progress from responses that require little cost or energy to more costly or demanding responses…from less to more intense responses as dissatisfaction persists” (p. 572).

I also asked participants to explain how much change had taken place in the context of the HEC, and the overall impact of change for the organization and for them personally. Many participants at both universities mentioned that the implementation occurred simultaneously but without giving any consideration to an accepted and agreed-upon action plan. Unlike prior changes initiated by the university administration where parameters were set forth and the faculty and administration proceeded as they saw fit, the HEC imposed a structure and specified timelines. Regarding the conditions that ultimately lead to systemic change, I observed that positive change did occur in a few participants’ perceptions over time. Many participants mentioned that despite many difficulties and challenges they were able to manage their roles and gradually learned to go with the flow. However, there was still anger and negative feelings towards the HEC-initiated reforms. Time played an important role in molding the perceptions and attitudes of users towards the implementation of transformational changes. Nazia, a junior administrator at the FJWU, summed up the general feeling where she observed that

When we started working on these reforms, initially we experienced a lot of frustration but gradually things got better as we learned more, we got more support and with experience we managed a lot of things much better than when we started.

According to some participants, some other factors that played a significant role in dissolving resistance over time were such improvements as: the establishment of a good support system in some departments/teams, keeping participants informed, on-the-job guidance (through co-workers), structural improvements, the enhancement of participants’ experience over time and, most notably, the style of the change agents in a few instances. To facilitate change within universities, a few strategies initiated by the senior administration did work according to junior administrators. As a case in point, a few participants from the HEC and the FJWU recognized
that diplomatic skills helped to build a broad sense of support among diverse stakeholders so that they could positively sway others to also support the initiative. Participants also talked about the use of intellect and appeal to reason with those who resisted. The more administrators were willing to listen and answer employees’ concerns, the higher the acceptance rate. Bina, a junior administrator at the HEC, shared her insights on this approach:

I must confess that despite being a loyal member of the higher education community for many years, information alone or argument alone won’t change people’s mind. You have to consider many other strategic, political, social and cultural aspects before even talking to people about it.

Rewarding individuals or departments for change was another strategy used by some administrators. Dina, a senior administrator at the FJWU, suggested that, “Offering something in exchange for support or cooperation works, even if it is a reward for an appropriate behaviour or making a deal with people to make change work.” Some of the strategies used, such as coercion, were not positive in nature but did work for a few administrators. Bushra, a senior professor at the FJWU, declared that

Sometimes you get tired of listening to anybody who has a maniac response to things. Just ignoring them would not work. Using threats or pressuring people to support initiatives or to gain some kind of cooperation is sometimes needed, especially when you know people are wasting your time and resources without any concrete logic.

By looking at how the HEC proceeded since its inception in 2002, university faculty and the staff learned, as Salma, a senior administrator from the HEC, mentioned, “by trial and error.” There have been significant changes in terms of quantitative results (more universities and colleges, more programs), as described in earlier chapters, but qualitatively (i.e. quality) progress in the higher education sector has been very slow. According to Zia, one of the senior professors from the AIOU,

Many of the programs never were developed to the useful extent. In the university I know, the system is no more functional and even in 2008 it was only functional on paper. The computer lab that was set up was a corruption scandal of highest order. Tons of money were spent to buy computers that were new on paper but in reality were bought from junkyard. Not only they were old and most of the time down, they did not have even a basic anti-virus installed. Developmental budgets even now are spent on stupid things such as new construction and renovation projects in campuses. Old walls are brought down literally to make new walls, very unfortunately in the name of development and renovation, all on the money which is supposed to be used for research and development.
Likewise, Daoud, another senior professor for the AIOU, explained that

A project like teaching a two-year material over a four-year period is not really indicative of quality. But I agree that four is the international standard, but this in itself did not increase the quality of education. Students are still not encouraged to question their teachers. Students know that any criticism will only bring revenge by professors in the form of bad grades for students.

An optimistic and rather diplomatic opinion was shared by Salma, a senior administrator from the HEC. She stated the following:

We will see incompetence and anomalies but it does not warrant a total shut down of the system. Like everything else, higher education deserves a fair chance to grow roots in Pakistan. It is still at early stages. We cannot improve unless we give it a go at all. Neither does it give anyone an excuse to take any credit away from all those who have been working hard to improve something in one of the most corrupt societies on planet.

Findings also reveal that most of the identified resistance mechanisms and strategies were similar to the various resistance constructs discussed in the change-management literature (e.g., Akmal & Miller, 2003; Beeson & Davis, 2000; Brower & Abolafia, 1995; Giles, 2006; Johnson-Cramer et al., 2003; Marshall et al., 2003; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Pichault, 1995; Piderit, 2000). One obvious similarity was the fact that there are multiple reasons that make it difficult to successfully implement any change in “professional bureaucracies” (Mintzberg, 1983) like universities. According to Mintzberg,

Change in the professional bureaucracy does not sweep in from new administrators taking office to announce major reforms. Rather, change seeps in by a slow process of changing the professionals…changing who can enter the profession, what they learn in its professional skills (norms as well as skills and knowledge), and thereafter how they are willing to upgrade their skills. (p. 213)

Many participants at the AIOU in particular were found to be continuing to use the previous system concurrently. It was clear through my conversations with some participants at both universities that some of them were reluctant to completely switch over to the new ways of operating. Further questioning in this regard revealed that this reaction was mostly due to the lack of trust in imposed change crafted by foreign experts, lack of ownership in the change process, their job experience, their belief that the change was not necessary and their belief that change would not work as intended. Zell (2003) also affirms these views by stating that convincing professionals to make changes in their work practices is complicated because
professionals invest time and resources into their careers and are guided by deep-rooted beliefs and values established through years of training and experience. Due to their high skill levels, they are given considerable control over their work and are accustomed to having a voice in organizational change. Unless professionals agree with proposed changes in an organization’s core processes, such changes do not occur (Mintzberg, 1983). Kezar (2001) also provided defining characteristics that were distinct to higher education institutions and that may negatively affect the implementation process. Among these characteristics are the facts that these institutions serve long-standing missions; are closely tied to ongoing societal needs; have set norms and socialization processes based on their mission and the needs of society; and have norms that are closely tied to individuals’ identities.

Overlooking these unique aspects of higher education institutions may result in mistakes in analysis and strategy. Keller (1983) has also warned that the use of concepts foreign to the values of the institutions will most likely fail to engage the very people who must bring about the change. Kezar (2001) concluded that it was because of these unique characteristics that institutions of higher education were less likely to change. Overlooking the unique aspects of higher education may also foster resistance to change which may occur during change efforts in the forms of reduction of output, quarreling and hostility, work slowdowns and pessimism regarding goal attainment (Lewis, 2000). Understanding and exploring the multidimensionality of employees’ resistance to change in professional bureaucracies are vital to developing and implementing a successful change initiative (Fullan, 1991a; 1991b; 1999).

The literature documents multiple reasons as to why people resist change. The idea that human beings have an instinctive tendency to resist change is profoundly embedded in management thinking. My conversations with university staff and faculty revealed that people most often resist change not because they are lazy, but for very pragmatic reasons. People resist change if they do not see any motivation or incentives for themselves; they may also resist it as a result of past experiences, lack of competency, economic reasons, fear of the new initiative or entrenched values to name a few. That change effort might yield inadequate or undesired consequences for their work processes, or the change implementation might be too fast or superficial, or the stakeholders affected by the change might not be identified. These comprise additional reasons for resistance that are supported by many researchers (e.g., Akmal & Miller, 2003; Marshall et al., 2003; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Piderit, 2000; Wanberg & Banas, 2000).
Fiorelli & Margolis (1993) argue that some levels of resistance to change could be to the organizations’ benefit. Not all interventions are appropriate as implemented – the organization might be changing the wrong thing or doing it wrongly. Just as conflict can sometimes be used constructively for change, legitimate resistance might bring about additional organizational change (Fiorelli & Margolis, 1993). Unfortunately, almost all of the HEC staff and most of the senior administrators viewed resistance as something negative which they must overcome.

Another important finding supported by the literature is the fact that uncertainty and fear that change will bring more danger than opportunity could result into a myriad of physical, emotional and relational problems. It was clear through my conversation with participants that, in the face of impending change, they typically became anxious and nervous. They worried about their ability to meet new job demands, they thought that their job security was threatened and, most of all, they disliked the many ambiguities in the process (Bean, 2003; Herscovitch, 2003; Hunt et al., 2006; Judge et al., 1999; Lau & Woodman, 1995; Macri et al., 2002; Vince & Broussine, 1996; Zell, 2003). Some participants talked about leaving their current positions if things did not improve soon. Stress among members was pushed to extremes which affected the level of enthusiasm and passion that they once felt for their jobs.

Politics also played an important role in causing resistance among participants. Uncertainty, lack of communication, lack of ownership and authoritarian approaches heightened the intensity of political behaviour in both universities. Those who attempted to block or sabotage change opted for political tactics whenever they could, potentially triggering a parallel response from those imposing change (Sillince, 1999). Tushman (1977) affirms that diversity of opinion, values, beliefs, interpretations and goals in the context of organizational change inevitably trigger politics. Cox (1997) also points towards the political dimension of change agents causing resistance. Schon (1983) argued that champions of change can expect to encounter resistance to new ideas, and that political behaviour is, by implication, desirable.

Communication issues were also among the critical factors causing resistance among participants. Participants needed clear information and guidance on why certain changes were considered necessary and the effect that those changes would bring for them. If the employees do not have enough information about the change being introduced and if there is no clear evidence of serious problems, people will resist change (Bean, 2003; Herold et al., 2007; Sillince, 1999; Nazir, 2010).
created cynicism among participants and made them doubtful that the current attempt would succeed either (Griffin et al., 2007; Morgan & Zeffane, 2003; Neck, 1996; Tvedt et al., 2009). Even when there was no obvious threat in certain projects, the HEC initiatives met resistance because most of the participants envisioned latent and detrimental implications that they thought would only later become apparent. Any organization wishing to control resistance must help people to adjust to the new initiatives. This can be achieved through effective communication (Bean, 2003; Diefenbach et al., 2008; Nazir, 2010; Sillince, 1999). Management must always probe the objections through effective communication to find the real reason for resistance because every innovation is subject to critiques. Thorough training also helps reduce uncertainties and conflicts (Ahsan, 2003; Grancelli, 1995; Guskey, 2002; Haider, 2008; Morrison & Phelps, 1999).

Many participants identified their institutional leaders, senior administrators or change agents as being ineffective, impatient, technical and detached in their approach. In the change-management literature, change agents have been advised to adopt strategies to overcome resistance such as: looking for signs of grieving; allowing workers to openly vent their anger and frustration; providing information about change in advance; explicitly communicating gradual progress; treating the past with respect; letting people take a piece of the old ways with them; actively and repeatedly communicating mission, vision, philosophy, process, choices and details about change initiatives; working in groups; creating parallel systems that allow some relief from day-to-day work pressures; and providing practice fields in which errors are embraced rather than feared (Dalziel & Schoonover, 1988; Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Folger & Skarlicki, 1999; Mezias & Glynn, 1993; Tvedt et al., 2009; Vallas, 2003). The true art of managing resistance effectively depends upon all the above-mentioned kinds of tactics which change agents need to employ to create psychological, economic and social safety for employees. Unfortunately, my conversation with the junior administrative staff and some faculty members indicates that almost none of these strategies were used by their institutional leaders.

To summarize this section of the discussion, my findings did provide evidence that resistance to change is a multidimensional construct and that resistance can take many different forms – a finding that illustrates the complexity of the construct. Dimensions that emerged based on participants’ actual behaviours in the context of the HEC-initiated reforms closely parallel those presented in the literature; however, many new dimensions emerged, as discussed above
and in chapter five. The literature has multiple definitions of, exemplars of and techniques to manage reforms and overcome “resistance to change.” While examining resistance to transformational change, it is critical that one remains aware of the fact that a plethora of elements as well as logistical factors play a role in determining individual reactions to proposed transformational-change initiatives within a specific context and culture.

**Application of Fullan’s Theory**

To assist change agents in identifying and overcoming barriers to change, Fullan and other change theorists have studied educational reforms in the hope of developing a theory that will guide organizations smoothly on the paths of progressive and successful change that has both depth and sustainability. Many of these theorists have identified a uniform basic process of change that differs in levels of complexity from the process of change itself. Using Pakistan’s 2002 HEC-initiated reforms in the higher education sector as a lens through which to view change and using Fullan’s (1991a; 1999; 2001a; 2001b) change theory as a framework for research, this study provides educational leaders a glimpse of the status of change resulting from the adoption of state-mandated reforms. Fullan’s work in the field of educational change is legendary, and his achievements are far-reaching. He has influenced educational thought and policy throughout Europe and North America, and this study has applied his perspectives on educational change to yet another corner of the world. The HEC-initiated reforms present the kind of scenario that would have been interesting to Fullan at all points in his intellectual life. In his earlier works in the 1970s and 1980s, when Fullan was focusing on the characteristics of individual change initiatives, the HEC-initiated reforms would have been a perfect example of a discrete, well thought-out and fully realized change initiative that could be analyzed for the ways in which it was “built for success,” as well as for the ways in which it has failed to help its participants achieve meaning and coherence as stated above.

Fullan (1991a) describes the three phases of change – initiation, implementation and institutionalization – as non-linear pathways. The HEC-initiated reforms are currently at the institutionalization phase. The institutionalization phase is also labeled as the “continuation,” “incorporation” or “routinization” process of making change systemic or of deciding to discard the reform altogether (Fullan, 2001b, p. 50). Conversations with participants revealed that the
initiation phase, which includes mobilization and adoption, was not fully realized during its first two years of implementation because almost half of the participants interviewed were unaware of these government-initiated reforms. Seven of the university participants from both universities openly stated that they first learned about these reforms either through the media or through the grapevine and that that was months before the HEC formally took over the higher education sector in Pakistan. Up to that time, these reforms were considered just a media stunt or rumours. It was very likely that the felt need was unclear to most of the university faculty and staff members during the initiation phase of the implementation. Conversations with university participants revealed, however, that some faculty members and university staff have changed their practices since the initiation of HEC reforms and that a few have begun to identify perceived needs almost three to five years after the implementation.

The traditional reform-mill approach, as labeled by Oak et al. (2000) and Fullan (2001b), was considered ineffective – with personalized approaches being viewed as the most effective way to begin institutionalizing the change. In general, faculty members from the AIOU declared that the HEC reforms lacked relevance to local needs and were not designed to allow local educational institutions to make their own modifications to meet state-perceived needs. More than half of the faculty members who participated in this research pointed out that their institutional leaders did not clarify the goals of changes and the means of attaining those goals or provide sufficient support to facilitate the change. Institutional leaders did not provide sufficient information about the need for change other than what the change itself was supposed to be. The lack of awareness among the faculty and staff equates to a lack of clarity concerning the goals of change proposed in the HEC plans and concerning the means of attaining them. Above-mentioned are some of the many factors that Fullan (2001a, 2001b) advised all change agents to consider during each phase of the change process.

HEC policy makers and institutional leaders did not consider the complexity of providing the faculty and the staff with appropriate types and levels of professional development that might have allowed them to implement changes within the context of their own jobs. Quality and practicality of the change program are terms that Fullan uses to identify the final critical factors associated with the nature of change (2001b). Quality involves careful preparation of the change project through development and continual refinement of innovations that have already been proven to work. Findings indicate that quality and practicality were a problem for the faculty and
the administrative staff. Participants reported participating in zero hours of informative workshops, seminars or professional development but indicated varying professional-development needs because of differences in years of experience and multiple job requirements (e.g., many junior and senior administrators are cross-appointed in different units).

Findings among the AIOU and FJWU participants indicate that new, especially young, faculty members and staff were different from senior and experienced colleagues in terms of their comfort level in the adoption of reforms. Many of the younger participants shared that they took the initiative and invested a lot of time in researching and understanding the requirements through networking and doing their job when the majority around them was skeptical about how things should work. The one-size-fits-all effort by the HEC, as an example of the reform-mill approach, did not support those who invested the effort to institutionalize changes as planned. Two of the younger junior staff members from the FJWU emphasized that institutional leaders must develop the capacity to identify an array of specific professional needs and to determine the best means of providing professional-development assistance that is both content-specific and differentiated.

Fullan (2001a) recognizes this importance of individual understanding and experience of change. He explains the importance of change leaders’ understanding how individuals within the organization actually experience change, recommending that local leaders have in place mechanisms designed to address problems of meaning during both the introduction and the implementation of new ideas. Fullan (2001b) recommends that principals lead their organizations by transforming professional-development activities aimed at making a difference in individual classrooms into a network of resources that are supportive of sharing and learning within school-wide professional communities. Fullan’s (2001a; 2001b) description of a “superficial implementation” lacking in “interactive infrastructure of pressure and support” (p. 24) is applicable. Faculty and staff members needed support, encouragement and pressure to participate in professional-development activities as well as support from institutional leaders on a more regular basis. According to the study participants, the whole process from its very beginning was and continues to be awash in moral purpose in terms of how international experts and local policy makers created and implemented new reforms in higher education and in terms of how they dealt with resistance to change in particular. Fullan’s ideas about having ambitious goals for large-scale reforms, an understanding of chaos and complexity theory, notions of moral
leadership and consideration of changing the context to effectuate sustainable system-wide change were applicable and observable in the context of the HEC-initiated reforms, and these phenomena may have predisposed the reforms for success or failure.

When the HEC initiative was evaluated against Fullan’s criteria for successful change initiatives, the findings demonstrated that, there were several strengths in the HEC’s initiation, implementation and continuation phases, the Higher Education Commission had the full support of the federal government because it believed that the HEC could tackle all the problems in the higher education system in Pakistan. The dedication and sincerity of the initially appointed staff at the HEC led to quick responses to reform the system. The HEC administrators seemed clear and in consensus about the initiatives and the rationale behind those reforms. However, there were concerns within the academic world about the “clarity” of these initiatives and the cultural suitability of these reforms designed by foreign experts; some also challenged these reforms as being unrealistic and overly ambitious.

In Fullan’s estimation, “Implementation is 25% having good ideas and 75% figuring out how to put them in place” (2001b, p. 191). The study respondents agreed that HEC management or university senior administration never cracked the puzzle of working and communicating with the university faculty or the staff. University administration and the faculty even had no opportunities to work together. Each department and unit acted in isolation from one another. University administrators and faculty members alike shared some of the concerns that Fullan describes as impediments to success. First, HEC administrators did not communicate with any of the important groups that should have had input into, and influence over, what went on in the reforms. In Fullan’s (2001b) estimation, “Implementation is 25% having good ideas and 75% figuring how to put them in place” (p. 191).

As explained in chapter five, many participants from the selected universities stated that the HEC administrators never cracked the puzzle of working and communicating with them or the affected communities in order to lodge the HEC-initiated reforms within the larger educational and societal picture. Faculty and staff members felt isolated and unsupported as they struggled with the innovations and new expectations. Fullan quotes Datnow & Strinfiedg’s (2000) study where the evidence is clear: “Our research has documented that reform adoption, implementation, and sustainability, and school change more generally, are not processes that result from individuals or institutions acting in isolation from one another” (Datnow &
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Strinfield, 2000, p. 199, as cited in in Fullan, 2001a, p. 93). Faculty and staff members in my study explained that, given the way in which the HEC proceeded, even those who had an initial excitement and willingness to adopt changes lost their motivation when they felt that they were left alone to deal with issues and questions that overwhelmed them.

Now I will discuss the extent to which the HEC reforms satisfied Fullan’s (1999) eight complex change lessons and the extent to which these reforms demonstrate the applicability of Western theories of change to the Pakistani higher education context. For my study, the concept of dynamic complexity is represented as a measure derived from his change lessons: “Lesson one says be inspired by moral purpose, but don’t be naïve about it” (Fullan, 1999, p. 19). Fullan pointed out the need for “focusing on local capacity development” while also “combining rigorous external accountability” (p. 19). To achieve this lesson reforms must incorporate rigorous external standards and flexible local methods of achieving those standards. In relation to the HEC reforms, different programs initiated by the HEC are considered to have incorporated external standards as the HEC was and still is in charge of creating, accessing and evaluating the quality and standards of performance in Pakistani universities. The second aspect of lesson one, flexible local methods of achieving the standards, were not an aspect of the HEC’s implementation of multiple reforms. There was limited flexibility for university faculty and staff to meet any of the HEC’s mandated standards.

Lesson two says that theories of change and theories of education are mutually dependent. Fullan did point out that those theories of change for schools can be empty and directionless without complementary theories of education. Conversely, theories of education without the implementation mechanism of change theory can be ignored and irrelevant. In order to meet the second lesson’s standard, reforms must address structural and instructional change. In the context of the HEC reforms, these elements were considered in the design process of the reforms but the alignment of systems that are needed to support change, including information on change theory, was weak at the university level as presented in chapter five. Perhaps the weakness of this alignment was due to the conceptual differences between the policy makers and foreign experts who designed most of the initiatives on the one hand and the university faculty and the staff who were required to implement those initiatives on the other hand. The factors that entail better instruction were addressed explicitly, but structural support for change was not addressed to its fullest. The findings suggest that the HEC allowed for the inclusion of elements
prompted by rhetoric on change without adopting the beliefs on which the reforms were grounded.

Fullan’s (1999) third lesson suggests listening to diverse views because this approach results in finding stronger and more creative solutions. Recognizing diverse points of view considers the need for several different ways to participate in the program and for actively addressing dissent. As chapter five explains in detail, HEC policy makers failed to address these two elements carefully or creatively. Decisions were made solely at the top without soliciting any input from those who were supposed to implement those decisions. Dissent was either ignored or handled poorly and, in consequence, there was an absence of trust between the HEC professionals on the one hand and university faculty and staff members on the other hand.

Fullan’s (1999) fourth lesson involves understanding the meaning of operating on the edge of chaos. According to Fullan, the edge of chaos is the zone in which school systems capitalizing on the change process should operate. “Navigating the edge of chaos,” according to Fullan, requires a “culture of frequent change in the context of a few strict rules” (p. 24). This lesson puts an emphasis on the need for some structure and also on the need for the opportunity to change the structure. Fullan (1999) has suggested that this can happen through “people-based learning framed by a few key priorities and structures” (p. 24). He has defined people-based learning as the way in which organizations can solve problems without always relying on rigid, formal rules and communication systems. This lesson requires continual re-examination of the reform structure, and the incorporation of structure through a smaller number of key priorities. In the context of the HEC reforms, most of the programs within the broader umbrella of reform in the higher education sector were structured around key priorities. In addition, HEC’s ongoing re-examination of the structure of its various programs was also consistent with Fullan’s fourth lesson. Re-examination resulted in changes in standards.

Fullan’s fifth lesson – “emotional intelligence is anxiety provoking and anxiety containing” (p. 24) – indicates that he considers a certain amount of anxiety to be important in the change process while also suggesting that anxiety cannot be so prevalent as to be paralyzing. Both requiring and helping people to face anxiety are necessary components for complex change that involves “facing the unknown” (p. 25). The HEC did not provide a system for the university faculty and staff to acquire knowledge and skills directly related to performance expectations. In
the sixth lesson, Fullan (1999) has suggested that collaboration and teamwork build capacity for problem-solving but that they are effective only if they “foster a degree of difference” (p. 25).

Fullan’s (1999) sixth lesson is constructed like lesson five: both share the “anxiety provoking and anxiety containing” tag. In lesson five, emphasis is on emotional intelligence; in lesson six, the emphasis is on collaborative cultures. The same need for organization to provide what Fullan has called “a good enough holding environment” (p. 26) is related to both lessons five and six. Fullan (1999) suggested that collaboration and teamwork build capacity for problem-solving but are effective only if they “foster a degree of difference” (p. 25). Lesson six concerns opportunities for individuals within the culture to challenge one another to address genuine problems, and to engage in high-quality connections that can be translated as emotional support. The concerns that participants shared about their lack of trust in change agents, lack of participation in decision-making and lack of support, training and mentoring provide an explicit way of determining the HEC’s ability to meet lesson six demands. Even within the organizational boundary (in this case universities), individuals within the institutional culture were not able to challenge each other to address genuine problems, in two ways. University administrators did not try to create a collegial environment where faculty and staff could discuss substantive issues. Top management did not acknowledge what has yet to be solved. The way in which the HEC imposed changes created internal competition among the faculty members that further destroyed any chances of them working together to address areas of improvement.

The seventh lesson begins with a clipped command, “attack incoherence.” Fullan (1999) considered this necessary because “with change forces abounding, it is easy to experience overload, fragmentation and incoherence” (p. 27). It is the role of the leader explicitly to connect new innovation to what is already known so that those who must support the change can understand its meaning. In universities, supporters include those working within the system and also include those external to the system. As Fullan (1999) observed, “Since the natural state in complex societies is confusion, it follows that those who are successful vigorously work at meaning-making” (p. 27). The two seemingly opposing elements to making meaning involve the need to describe continually the developing program to an internal audience while at the same time describing the developing program to an external audiences. In order to make meaning, programs must meet two standards: the creation of internal context and the creation of external context. Findings show that the HEC was able to create external context without making
meaning internally. Participants shared their concerns about poor communication as one of the major barriers in the context of the HEC-initiated reforms. Policy makers did not create the internal context by involving or explaining the initiatives to the target organizations. Communication lacked consistency and participants felt that there should have been documented explanations of expectations and rules.

Fullan’s (1999) eighth lesson states that “there is no single solution, craft your own theories and actions by being a critical consumer” and that “there is great vulnerability to packaged solutions because the change process is so nerve-wracking” (p. 28). At the same time “you get ideas, insights and lines of thought and action” from others’ solutions, and “the only short-cuts available turn out to be roads to superficiality and dependency” (p. 28). A reform that meets both of Fullan’s lesson-eight standards would include the incorporation of elements found to be successful in other settings and the tailoring of those elements to meet the needs of the specific setting. Chapter five explains in detail that participants shared their concerns about the lack of suitability of multiple projects imposed by the HEC. External technical assistance used by the HEC to craft multiple projects was held to be unacceptable by many participants. The majority of the university faculty and the staff did not see these reforms situated within the Pakistani context. Institutional context was not taken into consideration while planning for reforms. Conversations with participants also reveal that the HEC did not try to incorporate local voices to meet the needs of the specific settings. Implementation at the university level ought to be a dynamic interactive process, as Fullan (1991) claims.

This study reinforces two of Fullan’s (1991a; 1991b) main assertions: implementation variables combine in different combinations to produce different implementation results, and variables can work against or for a change. Findings show that implementation factors or variables interact in a dynamic fashion rather than in isolation from each other, and that different combinations of interacting variables can produce different implementation effects. By way of illustration, a combination of variables such as clarity and complexity would produce different effects from a combination of complexity and government agencies. However, I must admit that a few of the Fullan’s ideas on educational reform are inappropriate when applied in the context of Pakistan where the process of educational reform in higher education has only recently been embarked upon. Fullan’s framework does not address some areas that are salient to the HEC-initiated reforms in higher education. One of the aspects is the context. The majority of the
change initiatives that Fullan cites have taken place in the developed world and, in particular, in jurisdictions where funding is generated through taxation, and where governments consult with, and are lobbied by, groups and individuals who press for change. The changes that are suggested and adopted usually originate in, or are adopted from, places that have similar issues. Consequently, the phenomena that can arise from change initiatives in these circumstances are reflected in Fullan’s analysis.

In the case of the HEC-initiated reforms, funding came from the federal government but also from international agencies like UNESCO and some international partners (the Asian Development Bank, USAID, the World Bank); as Burki (2005) notes, Pakistan has spent billions on education with 20 percent provided by the donor community (p. 16). In addition, there was no pressure from parents or local communities to change the higher education system but reform was nevertheless implemented. The HEC reforms were influenced by foreign experts starting from their conceptualization until the evaluation of the various projects. In order to develop a real understanding of how educational change can happen in a developing country like Pakistan, we should consider how poverty and corruption affect educational change. These issues are not addressed in Fullan’s work.

Another area where Fullan may not be appropriate within the Pakistani context is when he suggests that mismanaged change is change that should not have been attempted. Participants’ conversations in relation to the HEC reforms show that attempts at large-scale change, particularly in contexts where change has not been frequently tried (e.g., higher education sector in Pakistan), may have an important impact. Some participants, mostly university junior level administrators did mention that they were capable of change but they were unable to do better because of multiple issues as explained in chapter five. They also point out where the problems were situated. My conversation with participants reveals that despite issues they were able to manage their roles and change was gradual but slow. Even imperfect change initiatives such as the HEC reforms, may make important contributions to the long-term struggle for change in a conservative and a resistant culture such as Pakistan.

Another criticism of Fullan (1993; 2001A) is his support of some sort of moral commitment in saying that the moral purpose is to make a difference in the lives of, but there are no references to ethics. Fullan makes the point that clarity of moral purpose can be a liability of the vision is too strong or rigid. One of the scholars Holmes (1998) argues, “Rigidity is anathema
to liberal school change agents, which may explain their feeble attempts to describe the morality and ethics of educational change” (Holmes, p. 248). Holmes (1998) criticizes Fullan for ignoring people for whom flexible morality and dynamic complexity is part of the problem rather than the solution and for consequently “trying to lay down conditions for all schools” (p. 248).

Another limitation of Fullan’s scholarship is that he rejects truth and tradition (Fullan, 2001). He states, “today, the teacher who works for or allows the status quo is the traitor; and societal improvement is really what education is about” (Fullan, 2001, p. 249). This is problematic while applying his perspectives in a culture like Pakistan where traditions are more important than innovations.

Fullan’s advocacy for the combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches suggests that educators at all levels of the system need to become engaged in the development and cultivation of knowledge of good practices through learning communities. Here Fullan ignored the role of relations of power and knowledge in organizations. He does not go beyond the surface of the power issues and resistance struggles that teachers have historically exacted when trying to implement other’s agenda. Pakistan’s history of educational reforms is rich with such stories.

Gitlin (2000) criticizes Fullan for failing to understand the differing nature of organizations. While commending Fullan for raising questions about traditional approaches for reform, Gitlin states that Fullan commits a great error when “using business literature to inform his understanding of schools” (p. 214). The main issue is the “lack of consideration of the difference between making a product which can turn a profit and working with a student to enhance her/his life chances” (Gitlin, p. 215). In short, the use of business literature “does not highlight the different aims of these organizations (Gitlin, p. 215).”

The claim made about Fullan’s theories that they can be applied to all types of educational-change efforts – be they curricular or administrative – and in all types of settings is not accurate. As seen in the case of Pakistan, although Fullan’s theories are inclusive, they are not conclusive in the context of the HEC-initiated reforms in Pakistan. To conclude, Fullan’s ideas on educational change not only assisted me in better understanding the change process but they also offered many promising avenues for investigation that may help me learn to effectuate change better.
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The study provides a holistic glimpse into an educational reform process in the higher education sector in Pakistan and uses Fullan’s change theory (1991a, 1999, 2001a; 2001b) as a framework to study factors that influence, facilitate or impede organizational change. Data were collected from two universities and from the HEC headquarters in Pakistan. With special attention given to the university faculty and staff as critical local components in building an organization’s capacity to implement change, this study provides an opportunity for educational leaders to gain a better understanding of the status of HEC-initiated reforms at the institutional level.

Many of the stories in this inquiry relate to times of stress and discouragement. Perhaps that is when life’s greatest lessons are learned. I began my study of change by looking back through the recent history of educational change in Pakistan and at what changes occurred over time. Societies are constantly calling for various types of educational change, in part to fulfill their need to perpetuate themselves through the education of their youth in a way that each society sees as acceptable. Through this study, I have concluded that, when educational institutions do not value theoretical perspectives, past experiences and the existence of people, their efforts at change are often frustrated. This chapter discusses significant results, analyzes their implications and the limitations of the current research, elaborates on the contributions of this research, suggests some recommendations and ends with a conclusion. In this last chapter, I will also highlight the practical and theoretical contributions of this inquiry. I will then conclude by sharing some personal reflections regarding my professional development and what I have learned from this experience.

Significance of the Study

This thesis lends support to the notion that a holistic understanding of change dynamics is effective in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of educational reform initiatives. Findings are, however, limited to the meanings that arose in the group of selected participants and selected institutions. The aim of this study was to investigate the dynamics of change and resistance to change in Pakistan by “putting reforms into perspective” (Schmidt & White, 2004, p. 207). More specifically, “Putting reforms into perspective literally puts a label on the reform process by examining large-scale reform from the conceptual and personal perspectives of the researchers studying reform and the stakeholders who are asked to implement it” (Schmidt & White, 2004, p.
By studying the experience of participants engaged in the implementation of changes, this thesis provides insights for effective implementation of change initiatives from the perspective of those involved. This research demonstrated that resistance is not a unidimensional construct. Rather, resistance to change is a complex construct with various underlying dimensions that are quite distinct from one another. The articulation of behavioural resistance, the mapping out of its domain and the exploration of its dimensionality will facilitate the development of general theories of resistance to change and the empirical testing of many of the basic assumptions that pervade the change literature in particular. Of course, continued efforts to map out the domain of resistance and explore its structure are necessary and encouraged.

The findings of this thesis will make a clear and significant contribution to the body of knowledge available on change, especially from the perspectives of those who are administratively involved in the process. The findings describe what events and which actors initially generated resistance to the Ministry-initiated reforms, the manner in which the change-implementation process unfolded, and the interactions, discussions and possible negotiations that occurred among the key participants during the change-implementation process. Investigating the dynamics of change and of resistance thereto allowed for an in-depth and contextualized examination of how change is understood existentially in the educational organizations selected for analysis in this study. Furthermore, individuals’ perceptions and understandings of the process through Western theoretical perspectives provided information about strategies, processes and discussions that may help or hinder the successful implementation of innovations in developing countries such as Pakistan. From an academic point of view, the multiple narratives generated through the data-collection process are intended to establish noteworthy themes, methods of inquiry and analytical protocols for further study among similar populations of program planners and implementers.

In this research, emphasis was placed on general factors that (might have) induced individual/group tendencies to resist or avoid making changes and to devalue change generally. Future research, however, should be directed at exploring more dispositional variables. In this inquiry it did become clear that some personality characteristics (e.g., low openness to experience, risk aversion and personality type) made some people averse to change. While I did not directly ask participants about their intrapersonal/disposition characteristics as a main factor of resistance, their conversation did make it very clear that there were personal factors that
significantly contributed to resistance. In future this is one of the areas that I would like to investigate in greater depth.

The findings from this research have important practical implications in terms of the way in which educational organizations think about resistance, and in terms of the way in which changes are implemented and managed in Pakistani higher education institutions. The findings alert organizations to the fact that resistance is an important component of change and to the fact that it can take a number of different forms. The specification of the various manifestations of resistance can be used to inform administrators regarding how resistance might present itself, and to train them to better identify resistance among their employees. These insights could be particularly important in the case of more passive and subtle forms of resistance which are harder to detect and, in turn, manage. Given the vast number of potential resistance behaviours, however, it would be virtually impossible for administrators to be able to identify each and every one, or to employ strategies to manage each individual’s behaviour. In this respect, the three forms of resistance that have been identified should be extremely valuable. These forms categorize the multitude of behaviours in a meaningful way (based on their similarities and differences) and clarify which behaviours are likely to co-occur or serve a similar function.

**Implications for Further Research**

Qualitative research is an exploration of human events, capturing stories and reactions. Because of the complex nature of humans and their experiences, one of the outcomes of qualitative research is more questions to explore. One of my professors during my doctoral program often said that he had no answers, just more questions. I have grown to understand the complexities of this comment.

This study has highlighted several aspects of the implementation of HEC-initiated reforms in the higher education sector. Results could be used for further research in several ways. This study could be replicated in other universities in various other geographic regions in Pakistan. Expanding coverage to other areas would provide a different study context to test for consistency and variation across regions.

Further research could test the robustness of the results regarding findings by selecting a larger sample of participants. The insights that form the outcome of this qualitative study could be
examined on a larger scale using statistical analysis. A longitudinal study might be more useful in capturing how participants’ perceptions about reforms evolve over time.

Another fruitful area for future research that follows from this inquiry includes an examination of relations between resistance and other change related attitudes. As well as an examination of the consequences of resistance for the organization, the individual, and for other organizational members. The present research did not explore the consequences of resistance to change. Resistance, however, is likely to have a major impact on organizations and its members (including those who resist). Thus, the impact of resistance to change (in its different forms) should be examined in future research.

**Personal Reflection**

Engaging in this research was a truly enjoyable experience for me. My goal when I started my doctoral studies was to develop myself as a change manager and researcher, and as a people person. The ability to engage in an uncontrived setting meant a lot to me. I have long felt that there is a greater need for research practitioners to bridge the gap between research and practice in the field of change management. I have also felt that it was important to examine the dynamics of change for populations that have not typically been the focus of such research, such as in a Pakistani context.

Although the inquiry was a positive experience for me overall, there were definitive moments of anxiety. At the beginning I was nervous about how I would be received by the participants. I was conscious of my previous work experience with the Ministry. However, when I questioned the participants about this potential issue, they indicated that my previous experience with the Ministry had no bearing on their perceptions of me as a researcher. First, they mentioned that this was primarily because I was no longer working with the Ministry or living in Pakistan. What was important, according to them, was my enthusiasm in doing this research. Second, participants’ privacy and confidentiality were highly emphasized and respected in the data-collection process. Ethics review and approval constitute a standard requirement for research activities in North America; however, these standards are not strictly institutionalized and applied in educational research activities in Pakistan. The approaches for protecting participants’ privacy and confidentiality sometimes seemed counter to local politics and authorities, particularly in a culture like Pakistan where local authorities and politics play important roles in national or
international research projects. My intention was to provide participants a safe and open
environment in which they could speak from their hearts and from reality instead of following
what was said in documents, policies and school regulations. Because of these factors, people felt
confident in talking about issues openly.

I felt that the conversations in this study were therapeutic for most of the participants.
Participants’ voices were muted or rarely heard in the large-scale educational changes designed
and implemented by the HEC in Pakistan. Participants appreciated opportunities to talk about
their marginalized voices and experiences in adopting the new mandated change initiatives and
in coping with these changes. One participant reflected later in his email that this study is about
us, for us, and I hope that it will help people to make more “people-friendly change plans.”
Despite some anxiety throughout the data collection and thesis writing, I experienced plenty of
joyful moments, especially when my participants shared their knowledge. In reflecting and
writing this dissertation, my enjoyment comes from interpreting texts, representing meanings,
and provoking understandings and possibilities. The latter is more meaningful and important for
me as I believe that provoking new thoughts, understandings, knowledge and possibilities should
be the most important goal of research in education. In conducting this research, I believe that I
continually developed as a researcher. This was my first major project as a qualitative researcher.
Data analysis was a slow and painful process at the start. I felt overwhelmed with data. I
remember seeing a cartoon in my qualitative-research class where someone was dumping a
wheelbarrow load of data in front of a desk. At the time I thought that it was funny; now that I
see the reality in it, the humour has disappeared. Although I struggled at the beginning, it
gradually it became easier as my confidence developed.

Lastly, I grew as a person. The psychoanalytical reflections on my learning and
professional journey make me feel like I am going through a storm in the same boat with the
research participants, with ups and downs, joys and challenges, and experiences of pride and loss.
I learned a lot about myself, especially while writing the dissertation. I met and learned from
many wonderful people, not only the participants but also those whom I have encountered in the
world of academia. The process of writing has enabled me to link together concepts in change
management and has provided me with a solid background on which to draw when consulting
with multiple organizational performers in the future. Although this doctoral program ends with
the final submission of this writing, the learning journey inspired by this study is one without an
ultimate destination. I gradually came to understand how living through change is a life that embraces the very difficulties, ambiguities, sufferings, hopes and possibilities inherent in transformational educational change.

The increased awareness of my own identity that I experienced during this research journey was beyond my expectations. My sense of being a mindful researcher, a global citizen and a person with the capacity for understanding and enjoying learning is not merely manifested in what I look like, what I do and where I have traveled, but is more fully manifested in how I think, feel, understand and appreciate. This growth, realized beyond my expectation, is the one that has made me more interested in sharing with family, friends, colleagues and all other people whom I have met and will meet in the future.

Equally important, this study also offered a critical learning experience for the participants. In their comments and reflections on participating in this study, they indicated new understandings of what it means to conduct educational research; more specifically, research is not just about data collection from documents, reports, surveys and interviews, but on a broader level it is a responsible and ethical endeavour in understanding life experience and how we make and act upon the meanings that emerge out of it. Such research does not simply present scientific knowledge to be learned, but it increases our deep engagement in and commitment to thoughtfulness and tact in facing issues of change in an educational setting. It ultimately grants us as academic professionals an emancipatory and transformative power while maintaining our role in transformational education change.

**Recommendations**

In general, my attitude towards educational research is to approach issues in a way that constructive solutions can be found. Therefore, my objective was not necessarily to criticize policies or policy makers but rather to reveal problems so that improvements might be made. The findings from this research provided preliminary information about the conditions that are likely to lead to different forms of resistance to change. In turn, the results provide some direction for managing resistance. Specifically, consistent with suggestions made in the change literature, organizations that wish to prevent or minimize resistance should make every effort to minimize the degree of the threat to the interests of stakeholders posed by a change initiative.
Educational reforms in Pakistan have a long history of failure, and the forgoing proposals will suffer a similar fate if they are not carried out in ways that depart from this negative historical pattern. Instant reform to Pakistan’s higher education system would be ideal, but this is not realistic or easy to implement. Reforms must be broken down into practical and achievable long- and short-term goals. The findings of this study suggest a few directions for further investigation and form the basis for the recommendations set out hereunder. These recommendations for changes in the development and implementation of improvement plans are drawn from the findings.

First, any improvement plan must have stakeholders’ input from the very beginning of the plan. Allowing stakeholders to be part of the planning process is one efficient way to ensure that they will be investing their energy and time to make the program succeed. Stakeholders must feel that their individual needs and the needs of those affected by the change initiatives are recognized and valued in the improvement plan. Without acknowledging the stakeholders’ needs, resistance from the very beginning of the plan will lead to a lack of acceptance, and ultimately to little change, if any at all. In addition, careful and realistic planning is needed so that the quality of education is not compromised. Second, in the implementation stage of the improvement plan, adequate information must be given to all stakeholders so that their efforts are focused on the needed change. Top-down programs are seldom successful. Input from the stakeholders and open communication with those who must implement the program will help to ensure a successful outcome. It is very important to give employees advance notice of any upcoming plan to change. This approach might help to reduce some of the uncertainty surrounding change because advance notice and a realistic change preview (i.e. communicating both the positive and negative aspects of the change) are considered to constitute a procedurally fair practice (e.g., Brockner, 1990). The appointment of an information broker or specialist to help participants and provide support on a regular basis seems necessary at the beginning stages of implementation.

Third, the administrative leadership must have a clear shared vision of the goal of the required change. In many cases, change initiatives fall through due to loss of focus on the actual goal and/or due to misperceptions about the vision and goals. It is the leadership who must keep the ultimate goal at the forefront of the plan for all the participants. This objective requires leadership that is armed with a well-planned agenda for implementation, as well as staff training.
Without a clear and shared vision, administrative leaders will create an environment of confusion and a lack of confidence among their staff and, as a result, frustration will develop. Fourth, all staff at different levels should be given appropriate training and professional development. It would therefore be expedient to closely align training and refresher courses with the employees’ job functionalities. Those who need hands-on training should be given this type of training, while others who are content with theoretical training should receive that. Training is a change-management strategy that is well supported by the literature (e.g., Hultman, 1998; Maurer, 1996). At the same time, institutional leaders must work to provide assistance that enhances faculty and staff members’ capabilities and improves working conditions without increasing the workload to the breaking point as mandates emanating from the state usually increase pressure for reform.

Fifth, some participants resist due to lack of empowerment, resources and time. Whenever possible, employees should be empowered with a sense of influence over changing conditions (particularly those that most directly affect them). They should be imbued with a sense of confidence that they (as well as the organization) have the ability to successfully change and they should be given sufficient time and resources to make the change required of them. Another important strategy would be employee participation and engagement as suggested by participants and as supported by the literature on organizational change (e.g., Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Hultman, 1998; Wanberg & Banas, 2000). Sixth, changes should also be implemented in a manner that is considered to be fair by stakeholders. Findings made it clear that resistance, reluctance or deviation from expectations are potential results if: the target population does not believe in the truth and legitimacy of the accounts provided by policy makers; if the target population perceives fewer benefits and more physical, psychological and/or financial investment associated with the change; if stakeholders perceive either distributive (related to the fairness of rewards and decisions), procedural (related to the fairness of procedures used to make decisions) or interactional (related to the social aspects of procedural justice) injustice (Folger & Skarliki, 1999; Macri et al., 2001; Tvedt et al., 2009).

Seventh, there should be a trustworthy and quality relationship among all stakeholders. Clarification through ongoing dialogue among stakeholders allows institutional administrators to provide an explanation of the larger need for change and allows the faculty and the staff to understand why change will work for them, where change is headed and what their institution
will become once change is institutionalized (Senge, 1990). Institutional leaders must also help faculty and the staff gain an understanding of how to adapt change to fit their own professional situations and to develop stronger a commitment to bringing about change. Pressure and support from institutional leaders is also crucial as Fullan (2001b) emphasizes that “people need pressure to change” (p. 108), even when they desire change, and that they need a supportive leader who allows them to react, reflect and interact with fellow change implementers while providing technical support and other resources necessary for change and growth. He adds “pressure without support leads to resistance and alienation,” and “support without pressure leads to drift or waste of resources” (Fullan, 2001a, p. 92).

Eighth, change needs to be connected with existing conditions that are familiar to employees as this likely helps to increase employees’ sense of confidence and self-efficacy. As with other development projects in Pakistan, the HEC’s multiple projects are largely designed and staffed by foreigners who bring their own expertise and level of awareness to the professional situation and the culture in which they are guests. That difference with local professionals combined with a lack of information about the situations in the target area engenders yet another set of issues. Most of those who were supposed to serve as change agents were not part of the actual planning. On many occasions they were not able to explain the logic of different initiatives. This resulted in a high degree of resistance, even from those who acknowledged that there was a need to change the higher education system in Pakistan. Therefore, change initiatives should be locally and culturally acceptable and appropriate. Change agents should be those whom employees trust – those who are familiar with local norms and cultural context.

Ninth, the culture in Pakistan is complex and resistant to change, especially if the change is not considered to be locally or culturally suitable. Like a stone dropped in a pond, there may be ripples, soon to fade and be forgotten. To prevent short-lived outcomes, I think that knowledge of the culture, the education system and the society at large needs to be recognized and valued – not so much by foreign experts working in Pakistan, but by the HEC as well. A critical point to be considered by educational planners is the adaptation of a multi-dimensional, flexible and dynamic education system that serves people according to their ability and aptitude and that is responsive to the stakeholders’ economic, social, political and cultural needs. A similar viewpoint is shared by Easterly (2006), who argues that ideas imposed from the outside
do not work in the contexts of economics and politics; I would argue education as an extension of politics within Pakistani society. The great East Asian economic success stories of recent decades were those of Japan, China, Taiwan, South Korea and Thailand – countries that were never successfully colonized by the West. The evolution of these countries was through their own cultures, rules and disciplines which helped build an indigenous foundation for rapid economic growth. A country with a colonized past like Pakistan, even after 60 years of independence, has faced significant development challenges that are largely unknown to countries that did not experience the same form of colonial subjugation.

Tenth, funding is important, but the effective utilization of existing funding is critical. Improvements are needed to ensure that financial assistance is not wasted through corruption and inefficiency. A shift in the fundamentals of the Pakistani educational system may not materialize quickly; however, incremental changes can gain momentum and become substantial movements over time. Eleventh, it would be beneficial to conduct future studies based on both qualitative and quantitative data, so that elements of the study are examined from multiple dimensions. It would also be expedient to test the credibility of this study through further research in a larger population. Last, despite all the books and articles that teach organizations how to prevent, minimize or squelch resistance to change, this inquiry corroborates the view that it may not always be desirable to discourage resistance to change. Relating his experience as a change-management consultant, Connor (1992) stated the following: “Winners increase their resilience by understanding and respecting natural patterns of resistance. They know resistance is inevitable, and rather than fight it they encourage it… they actually reward their people for resisting in an open, honest, and constructive manner” (p. 129). Encouraging constructive expressions of resistance may ultimately help an organization achieve its objectives in the long run, and is also likely to convey a sense of respect for employees’ views. This can be achieved by building formal avenues of appeal into a change program, by soliciting honest feedback from employees and by conveying to employees that their views are welcome (even if they reflect opposing points of view). According to Mishra & Spreitzer (1998), in situations where an organization is totally misguided with respect to a change initiative, “a rebellious critic may be just the person to tell top management that its plan will damage competitive advantage” (p. 582). Indeed, as noted previously, resistance in any form can alert an organization to potential
problems associated with change as well as to concerns of their employees. It may also serve as a signal for problems that exist in the organization more generally.

In sum, the present inquiry will hopefully encourage organizations to think differently about resistance and to consider the potential value of resistance in shaping organizational effectiveness and creating a climate where employees feel free and safe to express their concerns. In keeping with the momentum of transition, rather than impose a final theory or hypothesis, each person who reads this dissertation is invited to think and decide for himself or herself. The concepts presented in this research are based on a selected sample and the degree of transferability is left to the reader. My conclusion is in agreement with Bolognese (2002) who claims,

…that change usually involves an individual’s psyche, so there are no concrete textbook answers and solutions to the problem. Since individuals are different, their perceptions and reasons for resisting are also different. As a result, researchers and scholars can theorize on how to lessen or remove employee resistance to change, but in the final analysis the only way to do so effectively is to understand the unique circumstances within each individual that is causing their particular resistance (p. 7).
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Appendix I

Participant Information Sheet and Invitation Letter

Research Topic: A qualitative investigation of an educational reform initiative in Pakistan

Researcher: Rumasia Shaukat, Ph.D. Candidate, Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa

Thesis advisor: Dr. Brad Cousins, Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa

Brief Description of the research

I am a doctoral student at the Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, Canada. I am conducting a research on the implementation of Higher Education Commission’s (HEC) initiated reforms in higher education institutions. This study investigates different ways in which dynamics of change process is experienced and perceived by policy-makers, and concerned program implementers and administrators in the province of Punjab, in Pakistan, and how they believe these experiences impact the successful implementation of Ministry initiated transformational change efforts in educational settings. The study also aims to investigate the factors that inhibit the successful implementation of Ministry initiated reform projects (in this case HEC), and to contribute to the literature on change management by focusing on the factors endorsing individuals’ tendencies to resist or avoid making changes and to devalue change generally. It is anticipated that the findings of this study will make a clear, rich and holistic contribution to the body of knowledge available on organizational change. The results of this study may be instrumental in re-conceptualizing, designing, and implementing future transformational changes in the education sector in the province of Punjab, in Pakistan. From an academic point of view, this research will offer insights that may benefit those involved in renewal efforts by initiating a shift from a focus on technical issue to a stance that more openly recognize the importance of people and perceptions in effecting organizational change efforts.

Invitation to Participate:

If you agree to participate, your participation will involve a 60-90 minutes interview to this study and an electronic verification of the summary of data from the interview. In the interview, you will be asked to discuss how you see/perceive resistance to the implementation of Ministry initiated transformational change projects. The interview will be scheduled at a time and place that is convenient for you. I would like to audiotape the interview sessions to ensure that I do not miss any important information. The tapes will be used to take notes from the interview and then will be erased for reuse. I might invite you for a follow up interview which will be based on semi-structured, predetermined questions based on your previous responses to the first interview questions. The questions will concern your further insights, ideas, and responses to the phenomenon under study.

The informal interview and an electronic mail verifying the interview data will permit you to further discuss and provide feedback on my understanding of your interpretation. Through an email, you will be asked to review and provide sign off on the transcripts of your interview.
Please be advised that although I understand that electronic email is not a secure means of communication, I will make sure that there is no delicate information on the transcripts sent to you. In addition, a brief summary of my research will be offered to you.

Anonymity Guarantee

Please be assured that your participation is voluntary and that there are no consequences of any sort should you wish to withdraw before or during the interview. In addition, your responses and the audio-taped recordings will remain anonymous, confidential, and carefully stored, and you will not be identified in the research or in any publication related to the research. Neither the organization you work for, nor any other organization will be informed of any individual responses.

I would like to assure you that I respect your choice regarding your participation in this research. I would also to thank you, in advance, for your time and consideration in this matter.

With Regards,
Rumaisa Shaukat (PhD. Candidate)
Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa
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Participant Consent Form

Research Topic: A qualitative investigation of an educational reform initiative in Pakistan

Researcher: Rumasia Shaukat, Ph.D. Candidate, Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa

Thesis advisor: Dr. Brad Cousins, Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa

Invitation to Participate: I am invited to participate in the abovementioned research study conducted by Rumaisa Shaukat, a doctoral student at the Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, Canada.

Purpose of the Study: I have read and understand the purpose of the study which is to investigate different ways in which dynamics of change process is experienced and perceived by policy-makers, and concerned program implementers and administrators in the province of Punjab, in Pakistan, and how they believe these experiences impact the successful implementation of Ministry initiated transformational change efforts in educational settings. The study also aims to investigate the factors that inhibit the successful implementation of Ministry initiated reform projects (in this case HEC), and to contribute to the literature on change management by focusing on the factors endorsing individuals' tendencies to resist or avoid making changes and to devalue change generally.

Participation: My participation will consist essentially of a 60-90 minutes interview to this study and an electronic verification of the summary of data from the interview. In the interview, I will be asked to discuss how I see/perceive resistance to the implementation of Ministry initiated transformational change projects. The interview will be scheduled at a time and place that is convenient for me. The interview session will be audio taped by the researcher to ensure that she might not miss any important information. I also understand that I might be invited by the researcher for a follow up interview which will be based on semi-structured, predetermined questions based on my previous responses to the first interview questions. The questions will concern my further insights, ideas, and responses to the phenomenon under study. I understand that my participation is voluntary. I may refuse to participate in this follow-up interview without adverse effects on me.

Benefits: I hope that through my participation in this study, this research will offer insights that may benefit those involved in renewal efforts by initiating a shift from a focus on technical issue to a stance that more openly recognize the importance of people and perceptions in effecting organizational change efforts. I anticipate that the findings of this study will make a clear, rich and holistic contribution to the body of knowledge available on resistance to change.

Confidentiality: I have received assurance from the researcher that the information I will share will remain strictly confidential and carefully stored, and my identity will not be identified in the research or in any publication related to the research. All data will be stored in researcher’s
office at the faculty of Education, University of Ottawa in a locked filing cabinet for a period of
5 years after the completion of the researcher’s degree.

**Voluntary Participation and Acceptance:** I have read the letter describing the research project. I understand the purpose of the study and what is required of me, and I agree to participate. I understand that by accepting to participate I am in no way waiving my right to withdraw from the study. I understand that my participation is voluntary. I may refuse to answer any questions without adverse effects on me, and I am also aware that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequence. I am aware that any concerns about the ethical conduct of this project may be addressed to the protocol officer of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Ethics Board at the University of Ottawa.

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which is mine to keep.

Participant’s signature: .................................................. Date: ...........................

Participant’s email address: ...........................................................................................

Researcher’s signature: ................................. Date: ..........................
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Draft Interview Protocol

**Research Topic:** A qualitative investigation of an educational reform initiative in Pakistan

Interviewer: ______________________________

Interviewee:______________________________

Name of the organization: _______________________________________________________

Position of the interviewee: ______________________________ __________________________

Years of experience working in the organization: ___________________________________

Number/Name of projects that you worked for: _____________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Time: _____________ Date: ________________

Location: _____________________________________________________________________

Open-ended interview session questions:

How would you define change and resistance to change?

In your opinion, which and what proportion of the institutional staff is usually resistant in the implementation process, and why?

How does staff express their personal values, beliefs and attitudes regarding a change effort? Can you share an example with me?

In the context of the HEC initiatives, what do you think what are the most common reasons for which people refuse to go along with change, and how do they express their disagreement?

How multiple dimensions of an employee’s reaction evolve over time and how such shifts are related to the effectiveness with which change is implemented?

When and why does the realized structure, created by purposive organizational change efforts, match or differ from the planned structure?
What strategy is/was Ministry using to implement reforms? How would you describe the relationship between the Ministry expectations and institutional adoption of the reforms? How do you see the relationship between your reform strategies and the institutional strategies?

In the context of the HEC initiatives, which implementation models (if any) were used and what processes did you use to decide which models to adopt? Have you modified your approaches of implementation from how it was described in the reform proposals, or have you followed them closely?

What have been the greatest challenges or barriers that you have faced in implementing the reforms in selected institutions? How is your department working to address these barriers? (For HEC professionals)

What short-term and long-term challenges/barriers have you faced while implementing Ministry initiated reforms, for example, institutional context, and funding, local issues? What has been done to meet those challenges? (For university professionals)

What and which proportion of the populations in target organizations would you say knew about Ministry initiated projects? What efforts have been made to enlist greater support from target institutions? How successful have these initiatives been?

What professional/financial support has the Ministry provided to help the target organizations to adopt, and sustain the proposed reforms? How successful have these support been? What additional support do you feel is needed?

In your opinion, what are the factors that can play an important role in defining and facilitating the antecedent conditions that ultimately lead to high-fidelity change? And what additional activities might be needed to ensure support from the target institutions for the Ministry initiated transformational change projects?

Do you have any further information, comments, or questions that you would like to share?
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An Informal Letter Sent to Participants Prior to Third Meeting

From the Desk of Rumaisa Shaukat

August 4th 2007,
Dear Participant (insert name)

I wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for your participation in my study thus far. Your time and experience are greatly valued. Your ideas regarding the transformational initiatives implemented by the HEC and associated resistance have made a significant contribution to my research. I have learned a lot as a result of our conversations. I also want to thank you for making me feel very welcome in your setting. This has made my job much easier.

With this letter, I have attached a summary of your interview in a question answer format and am requesting you to kindly read this summary and write down any comments that you might have in the wide three inch right margins allocated for this purpose. I also wrote a few questions in the margins directed at you to clarify some of the issues that were unclear to me when reading through transcripts. Once you are done reading the summary I would greatly appreciate meeting you in person at your earliest convenience, for the last time. This meeting will provide me with an opportunity to validate the accuracy of the data and my interpretations of your stories. During this informal meeting, you can also talk about something you feel we were unable to cover during the interview session.

In addition, I would like to continue to chat with you via email as I will be returning back to Canada on September 4th to complete writing of my thesis. I hope we will be able to continue our conversations over the next several months. As discussed, our discussions and the information you have provided me are strictly confidential and that you are free to withdraw from the study anytime and /or refuse to answer my questions.

Once again, thank you for your time, participation, and openness in my research project. Should you require further information, please email me. I am looking forward to meeting you soon.

Sincerely,

Rumaisa Shaukat
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A Snapshot of the Education System in Pakistan

Types of higher education institutions:
University
College
Institute
Centre
Open/Virtual University
Languages of instruction: English, Urdu, Some Programs in Provincial Languages

Educational Levels:
Primary School Education: (Completion of Grade 5)
Secondary School Certificate (Matriculation: Completion of Grade 10)
Higher Secondary School Certificate (Intermediate Certificate: Completion of Grade 12)
Diploma (In Technical and Vocational Subjects Only)
Bachelors/Undergraduate Degree (Four Years Programs)
Master’s Degree (Two-Four Years Programs)
Master of Philosophy (Three Years program)
Doctorate Degree (Three-Five Years program)

Note: Primary education lasts for five years. Secondary education is divided into three cycles: three years’ middle school, two years’ secondary and two years’ higher secondary. On completion of the second cycle, pupils take the Secondary School Certificate. Pupils may then study for a further two years or three years in the case of technical education, specializing in Science, Arts or in technical and vocational studies. At the end of this period, pupils take the examinations for the Intermediate Certificate/Higher Secondary School Certificate/Diploma of Associate Engineering. Vocational secondary courses lead to the Higher Secondary School Certificate or a Diploma in technical/vocational subjects.

University level studies:
University level first stage: Bachelor’s Degree:
Bachelor’s Pass Degrees are normally obtained after a two-year course and Honours Degrees after a four-year course in Arts, Science and Commerce. First degrees in Engineering, Pharmacy and Computer Science take four years and in Medicine and Architecture five years.

University level second stage:
Master’s Degree (Two-Four Years Programs)
B.Ed. (1-2 Years Programs)
LLB (Four Years Programs)

University level third stage: M.Phil., Ph.D.:
The Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) takes two-three years after the Master’s Degree. It is a research-based program that also requires a thesis.

University level fourth stage: Doctor’s Degree:
The Ph.D. (Doctorate of Philosophy) is a research degree which requires, on average, three years' study/research after the M.Phil. degree and 4 years study/research after the Master's Degree.
The degrees of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.), Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) and Doctor of Law (LLD) are awarded after five to seven years of study.

Note: Entrance exams are required to get into a university. A National Test is required for entry to Engineering, Medicine and Architecture. Some universities also conduct their own admission tests.

Non-university level post-secondary studies:
Polytechnics, technical and commercial institutes and colleges offer courses at Post-Secondary School Certificate level. They provide courses that generally last for two to three years and lead to Certificates and Diplomas in commercial and technical fields.

Teacher education:

**Training of Pre-Primary (E.g., Nursery/Play Group) and Primary School Teachers (E.g., Grade 1-5)**
Primary Teaching Certificate (P.T.C) for primary school teachers (one year program).
Students Age level from: 5 to: 10

**Training of middle school teachers (Grade 6-8)**
Certificate of Teaching (C.T) for middle teachers (one year program).
Length of program in years: 3
Student Age level from: 10 to: 13

**Training of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers (Grade 9-12)**
B.Ed Degree (One to two years program).
Master of Education (M.Ed) Degree after the B.Ed. (One to two years program)
Student Age level from: 13 to: 17

**Training of Higher Education Teachers**
HEC Learning Innovation Section organizes the following in-service training programs for University and College teachers:
1. 12 days curriculum-based in-service training programmes; 2. 3 months faculty development programmes; 3. 6 days English language teaching courses.

Non-Traditional Studies:

**Distance Higher Education**
Distance higher education is offered by the Allama Iqbal Open University and the Virtual University of Pakistan. The first provides a wide range of courses at different levels in Humanities, Teacher Education, Technical Education, Business Management, Commerce, Social Sciences, Arabic, Pakistan Studies, Islamic Studies, and Home Economics and Women’s Studies. It uses multi-media techniques, such as correspondence packages, radio and television broadcasts, tutorial instruction... The second is specifically established to cater for the needs of students at tertiary level of education in the field of computer science and provides on-line knowledge-based instruction.
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A Snapshot of Participants’ Profiles

Selection Criteria
✓ Education: At least a graduate degree
✓ Work Experience: Minimum eight years
✓ Job Title: Multiple
✓ Knowledge and Familiarity:
  o with the traditional higher education system
  o with the context and history of HEC reforms
  o direct involvement with the HEC reforms

Affiliated Departments in HEC
*some participants were cross appointed in more than one department.
Total Participants: 9
Males: 6  Females: 3

Affiliated Departments/Units at the AIOU
*some participants were cross appointed in more than one department.
Total Participants: 6
Males: 5  Females: 1

Affiliated Departments/Units at the FJWU
*some participants were cross appointed in more than one department.
Total Participants: 9
Males: 0  Females: 9
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The Chronological Sequence of Events Leading to HEC Reforms Starting 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two:</td>
<td>The above mentioned report lead to the creation of a Pakistani Task Force on Higher Education (TFHE) in April 2001 to carry out an in-depth study of the country’s higher education and offer recommendations for improvements in their report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In January 2002, TFHE Identified Major Problems in the Following Areas</strong> Ineffective University Governance and Management and Recruitment Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Political Influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and Staff Appointments and Conditions of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absence of Accountability and Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguity between Role, Responsibility, and Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Research and Research Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdated Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor Assessment and Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Three:</td>
<td>In January 2002, a Steering Committee for Higher Education (SCHE) was constituted as a result to prepare and present an implementation plan for higher education in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Four:</td>
<td>In 2002, the Higher Education Commission (HEC) was established to refine and implement the recommendations offered by the TFHE and SCHE. Since its inception, HEC regulates the higher education sector in Pakistan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX VIII

**Emergence of Thematic Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Themes</th>
<th>Sub Categories</th>
<th>Final Themes</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Corresponding Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
*“behaviour that shows rebellion against new authority or against new processes implemented by the authority”*.  
**“any action that is performed with an intention to slow or stop the change being initiated”*.  
***“to view the change as negative and as a threat to valued norms”.  
“an internal force that pushes people to either slow down or stop movements towards something different”*. | *Asma (HEC)  
**Salma (HEC)  
*** Maryam (AIOU)  
****Hafeez (aiou) |
| Clarity and Organization | Problems with Vision, Planning, Preparation and Transparency | Vision, Planning, and Transparency | Flawed planning or initiation stages of projects negatively affect the implementation and continuation of projects.  
*“it is great that we got new vision and it is important. But what we really needed to know was what does the new vision mean? ”*  
**“there was a lack of clarity about the vision on the part of the administration”*  
*** “Unnatural speeding up of the process without proper planning can lead to more harm than good and this is what we are observing right now”.  
****“there is no transparency in the system of scholarships, grants, promotions and distinctions”*. | *Nazia (FJWU)  
**Khawaja (AIOU)  
***Ijaz (AIOU)  
**** Abir (FJWU) |
| Cultural Issues | 1. Cultural and Traditional Norms (Universities)  
2. Defending the Status Quo (HEC)  
3. Involvement of Foreign Experts | Defending the Status Quo | 1. Issues of compatibility and cultural suitability of reforms is critical in a conservative society like Pakistan.  
2. People resist and rush to defend the status quo if they feel their security or status is threatened.  
*“Implementation has been difficult in the face of old habits of meaning and action, and social pressure to conform to traditional roles and practices based on cultural norms and societal expectations…….No one expects or will accept solutions to their problems provided by outside experts”.  
** “what was sought in Pakistan was not merely a change in the higher education system but a major shift in the way people think about each other and manage relationships….. the perception that development strategies and components of education systems can be lifted from one culture and inserted in another, is absolutely insane”.  
*** “This is a women’s university and parents are very cautious and sensitive |
| | | | | *Saira (FJWU)  
**Hafeez (AIOU)  
***Dina (FJWU)  
**** Bilal (HEC)  
***** Asad (HEC) |
A QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION OF A REFORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Factors</th>
<th>Fear, Habit, lack of ownership, Perceived Threats to Professional Identity</th>
<th>Fear, Lack of Ownership and Perceived Threats</th>
<th>Participants feared that change will bring unpleasant outcomes because they had no say on anything.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“a person’s inability to compromise with a different type of reality and it comes with the fear of the unknown and unfamiliar…habit, low self-esteem, closed-mindedness or skepticism might be the few possible reasons”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“here are some things that I would not want to say to anyone … because I fear for my job”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“people sometimes want change, they fear its outcomes, especially when they are not involved in the decision making, when they are not well-informed and when change is imposed upon them”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“in many case there is not a disagreement with the benefits of the new process, but rather a fear of the unknown future and about their ability to adapt to it”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“threats to my academic freedom and professional identity. Why would I do something that I don’t believe in? I don’t feel any ownership in any of the imposed changes. I cannot be what I am not; I can’t preach something that I do not believe in”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th>Anger, Depression, Sadness, Anxiety, Frustration</th>
<th>Power, Politics and Emotions towards an Authoritarian Approach</th>
<th>Participants felt many negative emotions in response to change. Such as anger, depression, sadness, anxiety, frustration, shock, disgust etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“They never realized how frustrating that period was…..we were emotionally shattered… we learned to cope not accept”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I went through arguing, complaining, and then compliance… once my contract ends, I will leave for sure”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“HEC invoked a sense of powerlessness in universities and created a number of stressful conditions, new uncertainties about roles of individuals, threatened people’s sense of competence by making them feel inadequate and insecure”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical, Conceptual, and Structural Issues</th>
<th>Technology issues, Implementation Approaches/Models, Power, Politics, and Authoritarian</th>
<th>Lack of control on changes and an authoritarian approach of implementation had implications for employees’ reactions to reforms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“the whole idea of having consultation was eyewash, a waste of time for me and many others like me. On paper we were consulted but in reality we just sat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hooria (FJWU)  **Dina (FJWU)  ***Tahira (FJWU)  ****Bilal (HEC)  *****Hafeez (AIOU)  
* Daoud (AIOU)  **Tariq (HEC)  ***Hafeez (AIOU)  ****Hooria (FJWU)  *****Musarat (FJWU)
and listened to what we knew will never work”.

*** “One of the things I just shake my head on is when those who say this is great and it is going to work for me, don’t listen to those who were saying ‘this is not going to work for me’.

**** “It’s a culture that places an emphasis on respect for authority, not for fair procedures or for fair dialogues between those who are involved. Authority figures expect others to be submissive only and follow orders religiously.

***** In this university, is obvious that the senior administrators favor compliant people”.

****** “Policies and plans are made in Islamabad without taking due consideration of the nature of the problems at grass roots level”.

******* “there are many historical examples available to prove that purely politically motivated decisions have been disastrous for the country, we need to learn from those examples”.

**********“implementation was certainly problematic. Political instability and political interference interfered substantially with the implementation process. There were frequent changes in the position of ministry officials, secretaries, and project directors who had their own ideology to work”.

**HEC created a competitive working environment where relationships between people and departments changed negatively….. It’s sad to see excellent teachers with excellent teaching evaluations unable to get tenure. Most of the tenured staff has lists of publications but poor teaching evaluations because they don’t spend time is improving their teaching. Sadly, they are the ones who are members of the academic council and are getting all benefits in terms of funding, prestige and respect. It creates a hostile institutional environment and bad collegial relationship between faculty members”.

** “There should be some sort of accountability for HEC as well. The way they are operating, it’s ruining the peaceful and collaborative work environment that we once had; all we had now is just competition for everything”.

*** “the atmosphere of meeting rooms was usually really tensed and heavy. We discussed for hours and hours but there was no solution to many issues. We couldn’t agree on how to do this and that. We were under the pressure that time is passing by so quickly and we have lots of things to do for the day. …..Average working hours for most of us were long as compared to other institutions. We were even expected to come and even work over the weekends. Such commitment was possible only for those who did not have, or who could
easily escape from, family responsibilities or those who had familial and domestic support. This certainly led to an unreasonable competition among colleagues, even with different qualifications. This threatened collegiality and cooperation”.

“Speaking from experience, I know that nobody cared when I resigned”.

“Yes I did resign. It was based on this feeling that I wasn’t making any difference there. It was just a lot of tension and a lot of pressure, and I felt like there was a complete abandonment of academic integrity. Not just academic integrity, but integrity, period”.

“Since I took up this job, I no longer have time for myself which is very unhealthy. I have developed a very bad temper. I simply cannot control my emotions which has affected my private life. I will definitely leave if the situation does not improve”.

| Strategic Issues | Lack of Support, Leader/Change Agent’s Role, Training and Development Issues, | Lack of Support, training and the Role of Change Agents | To make change happen, leaders/change agents play a vital role. Institutional support, open and clear communication, and trust building, are also among critical success factors that a change agent must not ignore.

* “when a leader’s behaviour is not consistent with the espoused values of the transformation initiatives, a disjuncture between what is done and said is expected, and that significantly shrinks the trust laden on the leader”.

** “some attacks get personal…instead of attacking issues, people tend to go after people involved…instead of just saying something like this really doesn’t make sense, they target the person and try to discredit the person and therefore discredit the process”.

*** “We never got any additional support, information or resources of any kind. I don’t know how to use some of the computer programs yet…. A reform of this scale should have made provisions for on-going professional support…. when I first came here, there was already an established group. They had been here together the longest so, they worked well together. They were more communicative and helpful to each other, not to new comers”.

**** “given the history of educational reforms, I didn’t trust the government itself to do any better…. perceptions of trust in the systems of organizations are commonly linked to perceptions of trust in the people managing those organizations and I didn’t trust them either”.

***** “look at the differences in salaries, benefits and workloads between local contract employee and foreigners. It is totally unfair and frustrating…..the recruitment of non-permanent foreign faculty, whether of Pakistani origin or otherwise, is useless and dangerous. People who are not familiar with the culture and social norms are absolutely not needed here.”

****** “for the most part in the first few months I was operating pretty much on instincts. And it was frustrating to hear things like; it could have been done better…No one bothered to train us on how”.

*Farhana (FJWU) **Bushra (FJWU) ***Abir (FJWU) ****Zia (AIOU) *****Bushra (FJWU) *******Farhana (FJWU) ********Khawaja (AIOU)
"I often encountered staff’s questions that I couldn’t answer right away. I felt ok to tell them that I don’t know the answer. I used to spend hours and hours to gather information about those questions. It was embarrassing. This type of incidents happened a lot at the beginning of the implementation process. We never got any training of any kind or detailed information about things. Handbooks and information booklets we got were not complete to help us “.

**Saira (FJWU)**

**Abir (FJWU)**

*They [the senior administration] actually need to speak to us…. I think that it would be a good idea to have informative sessions – if not weekly or monthly, maybe every two months, quarterly, or whatever, just for specific things. Such interaction would benefit the services we provide to our staff, students and various publics that we deal with on a day-to-day basis”.

**When I first came here, there was already an established group. They had been here together the longest so, they worked well together. They were more communicative and helpful to each other, not to newcomers. I felt that I can talk about my job-related things, but not everything else”.

**Hooria (FJWU)**

**Salma (HEC)**

**Khawaja (AIOU)**

Some other variables of note that significantly influenced participants’ attitude towards reforms were: gender discrimination/differences, job experience/seniority and age of the participants.

**“This society in general likes obedience especially from women”**.

**“I have spent the past three decades fighting at every turn to prove that I can do things and that has given me an attitude”**.

**“the staff we have right now might not be able to survive such a heavy workload in the long term. Age will slowly eat up their determination and capability…..If you will notice, most of the junior faculty and administrative staff comprise of younger women but sooner or later they will get married and become petty minded”**.