

1-1-2010

## Leadership in Higher Education: Handling Faculty Resistance to Technology through Strategic Planning

Kelli McBride

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/alj>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

McBride, Kelli (2010) "Leadership in Higher Education: Handling Faculty Resistance to Technology through Strategic Planning," *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal*: Vol. 8 : Iss. 4 , Article 41.  
Available at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/alj/vol8/iss4/41>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Peer-Reviewed Journals at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Leadership: The Online Journal by an authorized editor of FHSU Scholars Repository.

# Academic Leadership Journal

## [Leadership in Higher Education: Handling Faculty Resistance to Technology through Strategic Planning](#)

Issues: [Fall 2010 - Volume 8 Issue 4](#)

Posted On 2010-09-28 07:36:00

Author(s): [Kelli McBride](#)

People often recognize leadership in the concrete, mostly by identifying an effective or ineffective leader, but they have a much more difficult time explaining leadership in the abstract – what qualities result in transformational and visionary leadership. Often this lack of understanding does not surface until a crisis or challenge arises in an organization, when a gap occurs between what is and what should be. Higher education faces such challenges, and it needs transformational leadership, especially concerning faculty resistance to technology (Buckley, 2002; Hagner, 2000; Moore, Fowler, & Watson, 2007; Scott, 2003). As many organizations see online learning as their chance to be globally competitive in a highly competitive environment, they require the leadership to help them identify needs, plan for the future, and transition to this new method of delivering courses (Clark & Gottfredson, 2008). Studies show, though, that faculty resistance to change, especially technological change, is high (Bonk, 2010; Madsen, 2008). This causes a gap, a crisis and challenge. Colleges must have a plan to create an environment where campus leaders do not ignore or leave behind those resistant to change but instead collaborate with different groups in an effort to meet student needs through the use of technology where appropriate. Part of this plan should include instructional designers who can help transform colleges into learning agile organizations.

### **The Growing Importance of Learning Agility in Higher Education**

Clark and Gottfredson (2008) define learning agility as the most important component in an organization's ability to succeed in today's global environment. It is "the ability to continuously acquire new knowledge and skills assets during or ahead of changes in the market" (p. 4). Glen (2008) echoes this, writing that "all human institutions must constantly struggle to establish their relevance, attract attention, and mobilize resources to compete for survival" (p. 246). Agility is different from competence, which primarily covers the skills and knowledge an organization needs to perform in the present. In today's lightning fast world, being competent very well may indicate that an organization is already behind.

To determine learning agility, Clark and Gottfredson present five primary factors that must work together. Those are:

- Environmental context – external factors such as market conditions, trends, industry stability that effect the organization. This is a factor the organization cannot control (Clark & Gottfredson, 2008, p. 5). Clark and Gottfredson (2009) now use the term intelligence function to indicate that this is an information gathering system (p. 19).

- Learning mindset – what the organization’s primary view is about how people learn, what its attitude and habits are concerning learning, and what role it sees itself playing in learning.
- Leadership behavior – how leaders act during any particular time frame, both patterns and themes of behavior.
- Learning technology – what technology does the organization use to enable learning, both standard and cutting edge.
- Organizational support – what does the organization do to help employees acquire knowledge that will help them make the organization more agile. (Clark & Gottfredson, 2008, p. 5)

To help facilitate change when gaps occur in these areas, instructional designers (ID) are often called in (as outside contractors or as in-house employees with design credentials), and they must exhibit the very best leadership qualities. ID, even when entering a work environment with little knowledge of how an organization came to such a crisis, must be able to assess and address problems without appearing to take sides. However, the skills an ID uses to improve an organization’s learning agility often places them in the center of an organization’s turmoil. Rothwell and Kazanas (2008) write that designers must conduct research to discover what an organization’s needs are (p. 61), have effective “written, oral, and visual communication” (p. 350), and interact with others so that they “establish rapport, state the purpose of an interaction, ask questions, provide explanations, listen actively, deal with friction, handle resistance to change, keep people on track, secure commitment, and select appropriate behaviors for effective interpersonal interaction” (p. 367).

For these elements of communication, research, management and leadership to create positive change on a widespread level, the organization must collaborate effectively. Senge (2000) stresses that “systemic change requires working together” (p. 52). But even people trying to help may only create more chaos or enmity. Sample (2008) describes congenital naysayers as a great hindrance to agility because they think in the negative. “Rather than imagining how a new idea might possibly work, they instinctively think of all the reasons why it won’t” (p. 119). Naysayers might believe they are helping the group by pointing out potential problems with an idea, but they really present a dampening effect, cutting off creative thinking that is vital to innovation (p. 119). Some stakeholders might intentionally sabotage change efforts out of fear, self-interest, and distrust (Heifetz & Linsky, 2008, p. 448). As higher education becomes more firmly rooted in the global economy and must increase its learning agility to stay competitive, leaders, including instructional designers, need strategic plans to prepare for such contingencies.

## **Leadership Challenges in Higher Education**

Though higher education should lead the way in the most diverse and cutting edge learning methods, the truth is that many faculty fall into what Clark and Gottfredson (2008) call learning 1.0 and 2.0, satisfied with the skills they had when hired or only interested in maintaining current status. They often see little need to change their ideas, to receive further training, and are resistant to new methods and innovations that would require they change. Those in learning 2.0 may attend conferences and workshops to maintain skills, but they mainly do so in isolation, not working collaboratively or accessing the variety of resources available via the web. Because “most organizations still tolerate a significant amount of non-learning from employees” (Clark & Gottfredson, 2008, p. 16), campus struggle with a

significant number of faculty who work mostly to maintain a certain level of proficiency, not to bring in innovative ideas or look for new solutions, which is learning 3.0 (pp. 16-17). Leaders must be aware, though, that learning 3.0 has a dark side. Technology is not the answer to all problems and cannot solve issues based in an “outdated learning mindset or autocratic leadership” (p. 17). If people try to force technology onto these people, the result will be more turmoil and resistance. Schein (2008) states that “learning and change cannot be imposed on people” (p. 369). This is due in part to the culture of an organization, which “becomes a powerful influence on members’ perceiving, thinking, and feeling, and these predispositions, along with situational factors, will influence the members’ behavior...[C]ulture at this stage of organizational evolution will be clung to even if it becomes dysfunctional” (p. 367). No matter how effective new ideas are, without the right presentation that avoids top-down dictates that have little to no input from stakeholders, and without open minds willing to try something different, the organization will not be agile. People must have motivation to change (Kotter, 2008a, p. 371).

Motivation is the responsibility of leadership, but too many people think of leadership in narrow boundaries, and do not recognize their own part in creating positive change. Kouzes and Posner (2007) write that “leadership can happen anywhere, at any time” (p. 8). For organizations to overcome resistance to change, stakeholders (including instructional designers) at all levels must become involved. When overcoming obstacles, Kotter (2008a) writes that “action is essential, both to empower others and to maintain the credibility of the change effort as a whole” (p. 378). Part of this action is learning. Schein (2008) describes one aspect of leadership needed for organizations to survive as “a commitment to learning to learn” (p. 363). This involves a “shared assumption that learning is a good thing and something worth investing in, and that learning to learn is itself a skill to be mastered” (pp. 363-364). Paul and Elder (2002) call this “intellectual perseverance,” an essential aspect of higher-order thinking (p. 29). Leaders must inculcate in their organizations the quality of critical thinking. The more stakeholders who practice advanced critical thinking, the more learning agile the organization will be. Critical thinkers “do not see opposing points of view as a threat to their own beliefs. They see all beliefs as subject to change in the face of new evidence or better reasoning. They see themselves as lifelong learners” (Paul & Elder, p. 96). However, those resistant to change or different points of view are often guilty of narrow-mindedness, which can come from “limited education, innate socio-centrism, natural selfishness, self-deception, and intellectual arrogance” (p. 105). Because the world today moves so quickly, requiring learning agility, those with poor critical thinking skills are often the most vulnerable because reasoning involves problem solving done “within some point of view or frame of reference” (pp. 112-113). The new world in which higher education must operate, though, has no one point of view or frame of reference. Schein (2008) warns that “simple, linear causal logic” is not the way to handle the change forces in the world today, and that leaders must “believe that the world is intrinsically complex, nonlinear, and interconnected” (p. 366).

Clark and Gottfredson (2008) argue that “unless an organization can learn at or above the speed of change in its environment, it faces the grave risk of irrelevance and failure” (p. 3). Colleges must transform themselves into organizations that meet and exceed the needs of their constituents. This means keeping an eye to the future. Scott (2003) agrees, writing that not only must higher education be wise in choosing which “waves of change” to adopt and which to let pass by, but that it must also “keep an eye on the future (on the waves of change that are approaching from over the horizon” (p. 74). Resistant faculty, clinging to tradition and unwilling to change, will undermine a college’s ability to meet new challenges and continue growing. To survive, campuses must adapt wisely, and visionary leadership on all levels can help the college do so. One of the first steps in defusing resistance is

understanding why it occurs.

## **Resistance to Change**

Heifetz and Linsky (2008) write that “managing conflict is one of the greatest challenges a leader of organizational change faces” (p. 453). Leaders must strive to “manage people’s passionate differences in a way that diminishes their destructive potential and constructively harnesses their energy” (p. 453). Even as leaders reach out to resisters, they must also connect with those who are committed to finding new ways and doing what it takes to make those visions reality. This group usually includes instructional designers who, if properly trained and credentialed, should possess the most cutting edge skills and up to date knowledge about curriculum design and learning styles. Using this knowledge of technology and learning, instructional designers are in a unique leadership position to help bridge the gap between learning 3.0 and learning 1.0-2.0. This is vital because trying to innovate with those clinging to outdated learning mindsets or autocratic leadership styles (Clark & Gottfredson, p. 17) will undermine efforts to create dynamic environments. These include what Buckley (2002) calls later adopters (careerists who are motivated primarily by career advancement and rewards), and resisters (a small group who are suspicious or fearful of change) (p. 33). Other faculty categories are lone rangers (innovators who embrace instructional technology and education) and early adopters (more hesitant innovators who tend to avoid risk). Because early adopters fear making mistakes, they may form the large part of what Heifetz and Linsky (2008) identify as uncommitted people in the middle, wary of change, who “have a stake in the comfort, stability, and security of the status quo” (p. 451). This group will most likely have the largest population in an organization, and their support will be essential to the success of any leader’s plans (p. 451).

Hagner (2000) identifies the four most common faculty “sources of hesitancy” when campuses make technological changes to the learning environment. These groups come from the second-wave of technology adopters and include:

- **Fear of the unknown:** Mostly older faculty who feel like the technology craze has taken away faculty control of their methods and materials, and who are daunted by the steep learning curve that technology often presents;
- **If it ain’t broke...:** Skilled communicators in traditional settings who resist technological change by arguing that they are already great teachers so why should they change, that technology might mess with their success, and/or that if they try technology but fail to implement it effectively an entire class will not receive the education it deserves;
- **We’re all alone in this together:** As more faculty from the second-wave try to adjust to using technology, the more isolated others will feel. These isolated faculty will generally gravitate to one of the first two sources of hesitancy listed;
- **Know thyself:** Understanding how technology can increase learning requires analysis and self-evaluation of personal teaching styles and approaches, activities that are too often absent in educators who lack training in curriculum design or learning theories. This group will cling to their established methods because they either do not recognize the need for change or are afraid of admitting that they do not know how to change (Hagner, p. 30-31).

The learner-centered, instructional technology environment is a major paradigm shift in education, and

higher education must “step out of the box to advance both faculty transformation and institutional change” (Buckley, p. 30). In order to successfully make this transition, and provide the best education opportunities and environments for students, higher education organizations must provide leadership that understands the campus culture, helps faculty connect to this new environment by matching needs to new methods, and manage resistance by providing positive and authentic motivation to change. Without this leadership, campuses will waste time, money, and resources. By hiring instructional designers or using in-house people qualified to perform ID, colleges can reduce the chance of failure because designers have trained to provide exactly the services needed to make such transitions. The authenticity that hiring instructional designers brings to creating a more technologically innovative learning environment can build support among faculty. Scott (2003) writes that “people will not engage in or stick with a change effort...unless they see it as being relevant, desirable, and feasible for them to do so” (p. 73). He also argues that teachers are the leading agents of change on a campus because “they are the final arbiters of whether or not a great sounding change idea...is actually put into practice in a way that works for students” (p. 74). Unless leadership is strong and appropriate, and the learning changes are truly embedded into a new system of education rather than tacked on to the existing one, too many faculty will be able to fake compliance to the new methods or simply use the technology at its bare minimum without truly incorporating these tools into their instruction. These changes, though, must make sense. Change for change’s sake, or in areas where technology is not the best option, will only weaken an organization’s learning agility and create poor morale in its campus community.

Resistant faculty, clinging to tradition and unwilling to make necessary and appropriate changes, will undermine an organization’s ability to meet new challenges and continue growing. This resistance may spring from the distrust and cynicism that occurs after faculty have too often faced leadership that has been primarily autocratic or lacked consistent vision, planning, and follow-through. They have seen too many leaders who may have had lots of style, but had little authenticity, what George (2008) identifies as the most essential trait in a leader. Even when new, more transformative and authentic leaders arrive, a history of broken promises, poor communication, a lack of respect for employees, and low commitment to or support for past initiatives (beyond a few speeches and memos), leave some faculty with little to no desire to disrupt their professional lives and classrooms for another reinvention of procedures (Madsen, 2008; Hagner, 2000). These faculty have instead cultivated a considerable interest in protecting and maintaining autonomy and the status quo.

For other faculty, the reason for resistance is simply that they see no value or validity in adding technology to their teaching methods (Bonk, 2010; Buckley, 2002). That does not mean that technology would improve their instruction or be appropriate for all of their classes. The problem is that many have not investigated using technology in order to form an educated and informed opinion on the subject. For others the problem comes from facing other faculty who are anti-technology. Faculty might give up on projects because a very vocal minority may wear them down, making the effort to change not worth the consistent arguing and pressure. According to Paul and Elder (2002), those who dominate and those who submit both seek to get their own way, one by fighting for supremacy and one by pleasing others (pp. 171-172). Both sets of actions result from irrational thinking. Paul and Elder list the following as characteristics of people who are thinking irrationally:

- tuning out when people disagree with them;
- using stereotypes to undermine those who disagree with them;

- ignoring relevant facts or information that would undermine their position;
- bringing everything to an emotional rather than logical basis; and
- justifying their irrational positions in ways that ignore their true motives. (p. 302)

Even leadership can undermine its own efforts to create technological change and improve learning agility. This often happens during training, if the organization provides any at all. Ineffective training that ignores or does not address faculty needs results in faculty feeling like they have wasted their time. Overwhelming training, where faculty face a steep technological learning curve, can leave faculty feeling stupid (Buckley, 2002; Hagner, 2000; Madsen, 2008).

## **Leadership Challenges**

Kouzes and Posner write that leaders, when dealing with the environment present in an organization facing change, must not fear challenging the status quo. Instead, “they search for opportunities to innovate, grow, and improve” (p. 18). This does not mean that they themselves always create or direct this change. Rather, they encourage new ideas, recognize good ones, and will challenge the establishment in order to try out these ideas (p. 19). They also nurture leadership in others and calm fears by providing support. This aspect of authentic leadership “is founded on trust, and the more people trust their leader, and each other, the more they take risks, make changes, and keep organizations and movements alive” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 21). George’s (2008) idea of the authentic leader is someone who “genuinely desires to serve others...[and is] more interested in empowering the people...[than] in power, money, or prestige” (p. 88). George also emphasizes the importance of behavior over personality, and that authentic leaders are compassionate, consistent, disciplined, and passionate people who know their strengths and weaknesses, and work to overcome those weaknesses (p. 88). By setting the example for others to follow, leaders earn respect. To model the way, leaders must “clarify values” that reflect the organization, not merely personal choices, and be consistent in using those values, not merely talk about them (Kouzes & Posner, p. 15). Model the way involves “direct involvement and action” (p. 16). Thus the “collective identity and community spirit that can carry a group through extraordinary tough times” (p. 23) transforms the entire organization.

Change often begins in trust. If stakeholders do not have some sense of trust, even if that is on a very narrow basis, then an organization cannot transform itself. Trust begins with leaders who communicate effectively, consistently, and honorably. Gallos (2008) writes that leaders must have vision and make sense of those visions. Leaders who have theories about what to do but who “won’t see things that don’t fit their preconceptions and won’t revise their theories even when those theories no longer adequately explain and predict the world around them” are on the path to failure (p. 164). Bringing good visions to reality requires planning, budgeting, organizing, and staffing (matching the right employee with the right task), problem-solving, directing, and goal setting (Kotter, 2008b, p. 7), all skills that the instructional designer can bring to an organization. Leaders take part in this process by communicating a vision, inspiring constituents, and then helping choose managers/leaders to bring the vision to life (pp. 7-12). By creating an environment based on communication, collaboration, inspiration, and integrity, leaders can build trust, which leads to learning agility. People will not change if they cannot trust the person who instigates the change, or if they feel this will be one more pointless brainstorm of an administrator that eventually dwindles through lack of attention, design, and dedication.

## Leadership Strategy for Change

The situation in higher education demands a new leadership approach that will provide vision, motivate faculty, establish incentives, creative opportunities for positive input and debate, and proactively anticipate and take steps to resolve resistance. This approach will understand the importance of delineating between leadership, management, and conflict management. Kotter (2008b) defines management as “coping with complexity” (p. 6). Managers focus on planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving (p. 7). Leadership involves “coping with change” and includes setting an organizations direction, aligning the right people to the right task, motivating and inspiring, creating a vision, building support coalitions, and communicating to the organization the vision for the future (pp. 6-7). Managers succeed through rules, regulations, low-risk taking, efficiency, and routine. Leaders succeed through credibility, innovation, articulation, creating think tanks of innovation, delegation, and recognition of effort and success (pp. 10-12). Conflict management involves both managers and leaders. According to Weiss and Hughes (2008), organizations must develop ways to handle conflict constructively in two ways. First, develop “strategies for managing disagreements at the point of conflict” and second, develop “strategies for managing conflict upon escalation up the management chain” (p. 350). Leaders help facilitate conflict management by enabling others to resolve the problems themselves, through informal channels if possible, before more formal actions must take place. This will help protect relationships from damage during the conflict and resolution phase. Weiss and Hughes suggest organizations establish the following for managing conflicts directly. These are creating a common policy and procedures for handling conflict, include specific areas where they can negotiate terms, and incorporate mentoring and coaching opportunities in the process (pp. 351-354). For conflict that cannot be resolved on the local level and moves up the chain of command, Weiss and Hughes recommend a policy that requires “joint escalation.” This means that all parties involved in the conflict must agree to take it to the next level, and all must present their case to their superior. A second policy requires supervisors to handle the conflict directly rather than being able to pass it to the next level, unless absolutely necessary. Transparency is the last criteria for effective conflict resolution. Once a manager has made a decision, employees should understand the basic reasoning behind the decision. This not only lowers the chances of the losing party being able to sow dissent by making exaggerated or false claims about how he or she was treated, but it provides guidelines for future conflicts (pp. 358-359).

Leaders play a more indirect part than managers do in conflict resolution. Leaders provide the input when they help create policies and procedures. They enable stakeholders to have a say in the rule-making process by asking for and listening to their feedback. And since leadership occurs at all levels, many people may have opportunities to help resolve the conflict by offering advice or modeling behavior. Ultimately, an organization does not want leaders to step in and resolve conflicts because that indicates an inability of people to work together to resolve disputes. The formal leaders, those on the upper levels of the hierarchy, should only enter the process in extreme circumstances, when all else has failed. Organizations that struggle with cynicism, distrust, apathy, and division among the ranks will face problems resolving conflicts.


Change is often at the heart of conflict, and managers with employees who resist technology must deal with the conflict this presents to the organization. Rather than wait until after the conflict arises, leaders must be proactive and develop plans for change management. These plans should include consideration of seven strategic areas that will not only support positive attitudes, but will also lead to

greater acceptance of technology as an added tool to teaching and not a mandated burden that resistant teachers will either refuse to use or grudgingly try to fit into their current curriculum. These seven areas are:

1. Collaboration: This includes not only building coalitions, both small and large, but also the respect and support for teaching that will value faculty input rather than just allowing faculty to talk in order to maintain the appearance of collaborative leadership (Cohen, Feters, & Fleischmann, 2005; National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2008). It also means faculty must work to eliminate the routine distrust of administration that is present on most college campuses (Moore, Fowler, & Watson, 2007).
2. Communication: Leaders cannot assume everyone understands the reasons for change (Bonk, 2010; Cohen, Feters, & Fleischmann, 2005; Moore, Fowler, & Watson, 2007). They must work to articulate a clear and consistent message that aligns with the organization's mission. Leaders must also develop personal relationships with faculty and staff, making time for face-to-face interactions (George, 2008; Kouzes & Posner, 2008).
3. Needs-based, relevant and product-oriented training: Rather than waste faculty time and energy on training that is not targeted to its needs, organizations should allow for faculty to suggest topics for training, create interactive training that demands faculty create content rather than just watch demonstrations, focus training on the most common needs of faculty, connect topics to issues faculty care about (Bonk, 2010; Moore, Fowler, & Watson, 2007; National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2008).
4. Creating a powerful and focused coalition: This involves not only gathering supporters to provide support and protection, but it also means keeping resisters and enemies close as well in order to keep watch on them and try to integrate them into the change process in positive ways (Bonk, 2010; Heifetz & Linsky, 2008; Kotter, 2008a).
5. Understanding culture: Leaders must not only understand the culture in terms of general conventions and practices but also in terms of the specific history of culture at that organization (Haymes, 2008; National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2008; Roberts, 2008).
6. Articulating a shared vision: Leaders cannot lead if their vision is only of their own desires and dreams. They must create a future for the organization that all stakeholders share. This is the motivation that will open lines of communication, create excitement and momentum, and help stakeholders work through challenges (Nanus, 2008; National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2008; Roberts, 2008).
7. Dealing with obstructions: Conflict management is a vital and unavoidable aspect of leadership (Haymes, 2008; Roberts, 2008). Leaders can eliminate or neutralize obstructions by providing incentives to change, such as pay increases, stipends, promotions, professional development opportunities, awards, tuition reimbursement, or even the reality of losing a job. Incentives also include appealing to the more intellectual values of the welfare of the organization, benefits to students, and contributions to education or knowledge (Bonk, 2010; Hagner, 2007; Heifetz & Linsky, 2008; Kotter, 2008a; Madsen, 2008).

To implement these seven strategies, leaders must identify the organization's stakeholders. Once identified, leaders should listen critically to them, realizing that not all stakeholders may have relevant or valuable information for every issue (Mind Tools, 2010; Paul & Elder, 2002). Mind Tools (2010) provides a stakeholder analysis that uses a power/interest grid, as shown in Figure 1, to classify stakeholders, which would help identify who falls into Buckley's four faculty groups (such as innovators and resisters). Each position on the grid indicates the actions leaders must take towards that stakeholder: high power/interested; high power/less interested; low power, interested; and low power, less interested. Mind Tools suggests color coding names to indicate whether the person is supportive or resistant to the change. Names fit on a continuum of low to high, indicating a hierarchy of interest and power for each person.

Figure 1. Power/interest grid for stakeholder prioritization. Each position on the grid indicates the actions leaders must take towards that stakeholder. Adapted from "Stakeholder Analysis: Winning support for your projects," by Mind Tools, 2010. Retrieved from [http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newPPM\\_07.htm](http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newPPM_07.htm). © Mind Tools Ltd, 1995-2010, All Rights Reserved



Successful planning and implementation includes gathering knowledge, then using it effectively. Leaders do this through the obvious channels of communication and discussion, but they also learn by enabling others to act, by keeping the organization's mission and vision close in mind, and by practicing empathy and clarity in order to understanding different cultural views.

## Conclusion

Though educators at any one organization have very different views of how best to educate, they all must share the same values and same vision in order to compromise to form a system that works. By focusing on values and vision, people can often overcome personal preferences or prejudices in order to work for the common good or a greater cause than their own self-interests. Kouzes and Posner (2007) offer five actions that can be the start of any change effort. Those are:

- clarify values: "find your voice" and "affirm shared values" (p. 47),
- set the example: "personify the shared values" and "teach others to model the values" (p. 76),
- envision the future: "imagine the possibilities" and "find a common purpose" (p. 106),
- enlist others: "appeal to common ideals" and "animate the vision" (p. 133), and
- foster collaboration: "create a climate of trust" and "facilitate relationships" (p. 224)

Kouzes and Posner write that "leadership is everybody's business" (p. 337), and that to make a difference, stakeholders must see it as a moral issue with a higher purpose (p. 345). This requires they abandon hubris and embrace humility, "the only way to resolve the conflicts and contradictions of leadership" (p. 347). People do care about education, but sometimes they find it hard to let go of their personal experiences and objectively view the system. In this rush-rush-rush society, people often want

simple and immediate solutions to complex problems. The truth is that most problems have multiple causes and require multilayered solutions that take time and consistent, sustained effort by many stakeholders, including instructional designers who can provide important leadership in the area of faculty resistance to technological change. Without broad support and time investment, not just money, organizations cannot create a higher education system where advanced learning agility is the rule, not the exception. There must be risk takers and innovators, willing to try something new and willing to give up something in order to gain much more. There must be people to model the way for others to follow, and to communicate the necessity and benefits of short-term sacrifices for long-term gains. That is real leadership. Only then can real change develop and grow. With such positive change, organizations can increase learning agility and lower the resistance to technology and change that too often result in stagnation and obsolescence.

## References

- Bonk, C. J. (2010, January 11). Overcoming the technology resistance movement. *Inside the School*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidetheschool.com/articles/overcoming-the-technology-resistance-movement/>
- Buckley, D. P. (2002, January/February). Pursuit of the learning paradigm: Coupling faculty transformation and institutional change. *Educause Review*, 37(1), 29-38. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/EDUCAUSE+Review/EDUCAUSEReviewMagazineVolume37/InPursuitofthe>
- Clark, T., & Gottfredson, C. (2008). *In search of learning agility*. Retrieved from <http://www.elearningguild.com/content.cfm?selection=doc.1054>
- Clark, T., & Gottfredson, C. (2009, December). Agile learning: Thriving in the new normal. *Chief learning officer*, 8(12), pp. 18-21. Retrieved from <http://www.nxtbook.com/nxtbooks/mediatec/clo1209/index.php?startid=18#/20>
- Cohen, A., Feters, M., & Fleischmann, F. (2005). Major change at Babson College: Curricular and administrative, planned and otherwise. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(3). DOI: 10.1177/1523422305277173.
- Gallos, J. V. (2008). Making sense of organizations: Leadership, frames, and everyday theories of the situation. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.) *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 161-179). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- George, B. (2008). Leadership is authenticity, not style. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.) *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 87-98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Glen, P. (2008) Leading geeks: Technology and leadership. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.) *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 244-254). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hagner, P. R. (2000, September/October). Faculty engagement and support in the new learning environment. *Educause Review*, 35(5), 27-37. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/EDUCAUSE+Review/EDUCAUSEReviewMagazineVolume35/FacultyEngag>
- Haymes, T. (2008, October/December). The three-e strategy for overcoming resistance to

technological change. *Educause Quarterly*, 31(4), 67-69. Retrieved from <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/EQM08411.pdf>

Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2008). A survival guide for leaders. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.) *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 447-462). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kotter, J. P. (2008a). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.) *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 370-381). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kotter, J. P. (2008b). What leaders really do. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.), *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 5-15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco: CA: Jossey-Bass.

Madsen, S. R. (2008, January 9). Preparing Faculty and Staff for Change. *Academic Leadership The Online Journal*. Retrieved from [http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical\\_research/246.shtml](http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical_research/246.shtml)

Moore, A. H., Fowler, S. B., & Watson, C. E. (2007, September/October). Active learning and technology: Designing change for faculty, students, and institutions. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 42(5), 42-61. Retrieved from <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERM0752.pdf>

Mind Tools. (2010). *Stakeholder analysis: Winning support for your projects*. Retrieved from, [http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newPPM\\_07.htm](http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newPPM_07.htm)

Nanus, B. (2008). Finding the right vision. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.) *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 311-323). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2008). *Enhancing leadership quality*. Retrieved from <http://tqcenter.learningpt.org/publications/EnhancingLeadershipQuality.pdf>

Paul, R. W., & Elder, L. (2002). *Critical thinking: Tools for taking charge of your professional and personal life*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Roberts, C. C. (2008, January). Implementing educational technology in higher education: A strategic approach. *The Journal of Educators Online*. 5(1). Retrieved from <http://www.thejeo.com/Archives/Volume5Number1/RobertsPaper.pdf>

Rothwell, W. J., & Kazanas, H. C. (2008). *Mastering the instructional design process: A systematic approach* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Sample, S. B. (2008). Thinking gray and free. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.) *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 115-124). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (2008). Creating and managing a learning culture: The essence of leadership. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.) *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 362-369). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Scott, G. (2003, November/December). Effective change management in higher education. *Educause*

*Review*, 38(6), 64-80. Retrieved from  
<http://www.educause.edu/EDUCAUSE+Review/EDUCAUSEReviewMagazineVolume38/EffectiveChar>

Senge, P. (2000). Systems Change in Education. *Reflections*, 1(3), 52-60. Retrieved from  
[http://www.solonline.org/repository/download/SystemsChange%20in%20Education.pdf?item\\_id=373740](http://www.solonline.org/repository/download/SystemsChange%20in%20Education.pdf?item_id=373740)

Weiss, J., & Hughes, J. (2008). Want collaboration? Accept-and actively manage-conflict. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.) *Business leadership: A Jossey-Bass reader* (2nd ed., pp. 349-361). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

VN:R\_U [1.9.11\_1134]