



## Journal of Organizational Change Management

Leading changes through adaptive design: Change management practice in one of the universities in a developing nation

Girma Shimelis Muluneh, Matebe Tafere Gedifew,

### Article information:

To cite this document:

Girma Shimelis Muluneh, Matebe Tafere Gedifew, (2018) "Leading changes through adaptive design: Change management practice in one of the universities in a developing nation", Journal of Organizational Change Management, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-10-2017-0379>

Permanent link to this document:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-10-2017-0379>

Downloaded on: 01 August 2018, At: 01:56 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 41 other documents.

To copy this document: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 28 times since 2018\*

### Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

,"Walking the tightrope: gender inclusion as organizational change", Journal of Organizational Change Management, Vol. 0 Iss 0 pp. - <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-05-2017-0197>

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:382728 []

### For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit [www.emeraldinsight.com/authors](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors) for more information.

### About Emerald [www.emeraldinsight.com](http://www.emeraldinsight.com)

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

\*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

# Leading changes through adaptive design

## Change management practice in one of the universities in a developing nation

Girma Shimelis Muluneh and Matebe Tafere Gedifew  
*Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia*

Received 3 October 2017  
Revised 4 January 2018  
8 February 2018  
Accepted 17 March 2018

### Abstract

**Purpose** – Universities are making changes to fulfill their education, research and community service responsibilities. However, the effectiveness of change initiatives is always in questions because changes especially in developing nations are carried out under multidimensional pressures. Exacerbated by limited experience of systemic change management approaches, most change initiatives fail to address institutional problems. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to propose adaptive design as a promising approach to create adaptive changes in universities. Guided by pragmatic philosophical viewpoint, this research followed a practice theory to understand actions and decisions related to changes. Staffs and students were made to reflect their perception for the principles and tactics extracted from adaptive design and their implementation in the university. In addition, the study tried to identify major challenges to create adaptive changes. In doing so, the research used mixed method—sequential explanatory approach. Survey and interviews were made to gather relevant data. The finding of this research confirm that adaptive design is an excellent alternative approach to create adaptive changes in universities. This may prove the significance of the approach if accepted and scaled up as an alternative change management theory. However, in the target university, leaders and change agents rarely used a change management approach that resembles adaptive design, which in turn may be the reason for failing to bring adaptive changes (deep and pervasive). Consequently, it was reflected that business as usual do not suffice, and hence, universities have to continually update themselves with up-to-date change management approaches like adaptive design. Besides, it was outlined that institutions should revisit why and how they are introducing changes.

**Design/methodology/approach** – The study followed mixed research—sequential explanatory approach. Multistage stratified random sampling was used to select respondents which included staffs and students. Questionnaire for 219 respondents and in-depth interviews with purposely selected six relevant interviewees were employed. One sample *t*-test, ANOVA and content analysis techniques were used to analyze data.

**Findings** – The finding of this paper reflected that tenets of adaptive design, its principles and tactics are important tools to lead and institutionalize change initiatives. This may prove the significance of the approach if accepted and scaled up as an alternative change management theory. However, in the target university, leaders and change agents rarely used a change management approach that resembles adaptive design, which, in turn, may be the reason for failing to bring adaptive changes (deep and pervasive) in the institution. Consequently, it was reflected that business as usual does not suffice, and hence, universities have to continually update themselves with up-to-date change management approaches like adaptive design. Besides, it was outlined that institutions should revisit why and how they are introducing changes.

**Research limitations/implications** – The basic limitation of this study is the problem of supporting literature evidence from other similar research findings, since the authors hardly find similar research outputs. Besides, this research might probably have a problem of transferability to other organizations, because the samples of this study were too limited given the huge number of staffs, which may not represent the whole population besides the interview was made only with volunteers. Moreover, it was conducted only in universities. For this reason, care must be taken to deduce any of the results to other population.

**Practical implications** – The research reflected that the university has to work to build change adaptive culture. In doing so, developing deep investigation and open discussions of challenges are necessary to understand adaptive problems. Besides, the university has to try to use adaptive design as an alternative change management tool, collaborative thinking for creative solutions, using group change strategies, and creating clear communication systems on the types and impacts of changes (meaning making), as well as acquainting staffs with the necessary skills to do adaptive works are among the practical implications forwarded as recommendations.

**Social implications** – This research has reflected on the change management approaches of higher education institutions. The social value of universities are determined by their contribution as a result of efforts made to upgrade themselves via various reform initiatives. To enhance the reform/change process, universities are investing huge resources to adopt and implement innovative approaches. However, the change efforts need to be guided by a systemic approach and by introducing adaptive design might



contribute a lot for universities to enhance their social contribution. Lessons from adaptive design have implications to overcome challenges associated with human elements like resistance, collaboration, owning and implementing changes, etc.

**Originality/value** – This research is originally conducted extracting valuable lessons from adaptive design introduced by Bernstein and Linsky (2016). This investigation has tried to study adaptive design in one of the universities in a developing nation with a major purpose of supporting or refuting the approach. This study tried to capture staffs' perception for adaptive design approach. Besides, an attempt was made to find out systems that resemble adaptive design in the university's change management process. Moreover, the common challenges to create adaptive changes were traced. Studying the case in the university and common challenges helped to recommend the need of adaptive design confidently.

**Keywords** Change, Adaptive leadership, Design thinking, Adaptive design

**Paper type** Research paper

## Introduction

Change is an indisputable part of organizational life (Hatch, 2013). Organizations are functioning in unpredictable environments with constant changes (Cullen *et al.*, 2013; Wainaina *et al.*, 2014). Different scholars have tried to explain and classify these changes in different ways. The degree of change, focus, intentionality and response time are among the common methods. Increased globalization, rapid technological change, competition, changes in cultural values, more social responsibilities and environmental impacts propel the majority of these changes. These changes, in turn, necessitate adaptation and innovation (Sporn, 2001; Yukl and Mahsud, 2010). Therefore, to survive and thrive, organizations and leaders will have to be continuous learners and adaptive (Schein, 2010).

As part of the larger system, higher education institutions (HEIs) are also undergoing a series of changes to guarantee their contribution and societal relevance (Temple, 2011). Including the above-mentioned causes, the pressures for change in HEIs may emanate from different angles. There are internal pressures like the wish to improve the quality of student learning, academic and supportive staffs' development and/or the learning experience as well as external pressures due to governmental policies and programs. In addition, novel ideas may swap from one institution to another and may trigger changes. Institutional theorists attributed the change to "exogenous shocks" like a crisis, technological innovation and/or regulatory change (Hatch, 2013, p. 294). Woldegiyorgis (2014) and Gornitzka (1999) revealed the magnitude of governmental pressures—through the perspectives of resource dependency and neo-institutionalism. In developing nations, leaders and change agents adopt taken-for-granted practices mimetically (Woldegiyorgis, 2014).

Accordingly, this environmental precariousness requires HEIs to develop their adaptive capability by fostering systemic change management approaches. Adaptability is an essential proficiency of organizations in a rapidly changing environment (Hamtaux *et al.*, 2013). We may find different definitions of adaptability (Ployhart and Bliese, 2006). For example, Cameron (1984) explained adaptation as a process whereby changes are instituted in organizations. It is also understood as the capacity for change in order to manage transitions at work as well as being able to manage effectively change-related stress (Heuvel *et al.*, 2013). However, adaptations require displacing, reregulating, and rearranging old structures and cultural practices (Heifetz *et al.*, 2009; Creyton, 2014; Sporn, 2001). Such changes may include changes in leadership, strategy, structure, technology, work processes and cultures of organizations.

In the pursuit of understanding and enhancing adaptation, various scholars have developed different perspectives and recommendations. Doz and Kosonen's (2008) fast strategy framework focuses on: strategic sensitivity (heightened strategic alertness, high-quality information, open strategy process), collective commitment of the leadership (top team renewal, working together as a team, shared agenda and mutual dependency, leadership style and capabilities) and resource fluidity (mobility of capital and people, modularity and resource access). Lehman (2002) also tried to examine the motivational

---

readiness, institutional resources, staff attributes and organizational climate. In addition, many scholars focus on individuals' adaptability to enhance adaptation (Cullen *et al.*, 2013; Hamtiaux *et al.*, 2013; Sony and Mekoth, 2014; Tariq *et al.*, 2011; Ployhart and Bliese, 2015; Wainaina *et al.*, 2014).

Moreover, Heifetz *et al.* (2009) and Randall and Coakley (2007) explained that beyond technical competence of leaders, successful changes require sensitivity to political and human dimensions of organizational life. Related to this, many scholars like Blackwell (2003), Creyton (2014) and Heifetz *et al.* (2009) indicated that leaders' approach to change influences adaptability. According to Sporn (2001), a well-communicated vision by leadership reduces resistance, increases motivation and enhances identification with the change. Furthermore, Parent and Lovelace (2015) pointed out that adaptability could be enhanced through positive organizational culture, job engagement and individual adaptability to changes.

Despite this awareness of institutional adaptability, making successful changes in HEIs remains a critical challenge. Usually, it is noted that the ability to deal with change is a critical challenge for university leaders (Drew, 2010). Therefore, testing and introducing clearer, concise, comprehensive and more practical change management approaches like the adaptive design approach of Bernstein and Linsky (2016) was expected to have a significant contribution for HEIs, especially in developing nations. This approach advocates that for successful change initiatives, there must be a clear understanding of the need to change, possible impediments, innovation, collaboration and dynamic leadership.

### **Rationale of the study**

Initiating, implementing and sustaining changes are the most challenging aspects of change management in developing nations' HEIs (Mehari, 2016; Woldegiyorgis, 2014). Many institutions and governments expend huge resource to institutionalize changes; nevertheless, a significant number of these efforts are unsuccessful. In most cases, changes in the study context are adopted from developed nations, although there are occasional glimmers of homemade changes. Mostly, changes introduced in HEIs at different times disappear without making significant impacts (Woldegiyorgis, 2014). It is a huge loss when change initiatives fail while massive investments are made to implement them. In the studied nation HEIs, we can mention many changes like Business Process Reengineering, Balanced Score Card, modularization, etc. which have been introduced as fashions and have produced no significant contribution (Woldegiyorgis, 2014). Unfortunately, as far as the understanding of the researchers, no similar research studies attempt to understand adaptability in-depth contextually.

However, many studies indicate that resistance, incompetent leadership, contextual factors, organizational politics and resource limitation are the dominant factors contributing to the failure of most change initiatives (Oreg, 2006; Wainaina *et al.*, 2014; Woodward and Hendry, 2004). Due to many reasons, HEIs are extraordinarily resistant to changes (Marshall, 2010). The unique nature of HEIs, especially being loosely coupled systems with professional autonomy, and the unique culture of the academy require a distinct approach to manage changes (Mehari, 2016). Moreover, most changes are introduced typically in a traditional top-down approach, which promotes leader-driven solutions (Woodward and Hendry, 2004). This is usually done in universities without open communication of the issues in a timely fashion with academicians and supporting staffs as they are directly linked to or involved in the process. As a result, academicians lose commitment, ownership and attention. They tend to adopt an observational standpoint (Mehari, 2016). Bernstein and Linsky (2016) suggested that adaptive design could potentially contribute to alleviating change-related problems.

Therefore, adaptability may be determined by various factors; however, understanding the institution's adaptability through the lens of adaptive design is helpful to understand the intricacies of change and adaptability. Consequently, using adaptive design as a conceptual

framework, this investigation examines the approach HEIs are using to lead and institutionalize change. Ultimately, this investigation was expected to have a theoretical, practical, contextual and empirical impact on adaptive capacity, particularly in HEIs, which, in turn, might contribute to improved institutional performance. Finally, yet importantly, this investigation can contribute to organizational development, organizational learning, strategic planning, policymaking, evaluation and associated issues.

Hence, this investigation has tried to study adaptive design in one of the universities in a developing nation with a major purpose of evaluating the contribution of this approach. This study tried to capture staffs' members' perception of the adaptive design approach, the implementation of adaptive design principles and the challenges to creating adaptive changes. Understanding the case of the selected university and the common challenges to create an adaptive change was expected to provide practical ground to support or refute the approach. With this intent, the following basic questions were developed to guide the study:

- (1) How do the university's staffs members and students perceive the importance of adaptive design as an approach to lead change initiatives?
- (2) To what extent has an adaptive design approach been implemented in the university?
- (3) How do adaptive organizational changes happen in the university?
- (4) What are the basic challenges in creating adaptive changes in the university?

### **Theoretical framework**

An adaptive design may be a powerful approach to change management. Recently, Bernstein and Linsky (2016) introduced adaptive design as part of the tools and tactics required to lead changes in complex adaptive systems. In this design, adaptive leadership and design thinking are merged to complement each other. These approaches are well-regarded forms of change management independently but can be more powerful together.

#### *Adaptive leadership*

According to Heifetz *et al.* (2009), adaptive changes require adaptive work. According to these scholars, adaptive work includes responding to problems outside of the usual way of operating, identifying adaptive challenges, sharing responsibility regardless of positions, building changes on the past-preserving important assets and progress for the future via learning, encouraging independent judgment and developing leadership capacity. Adaptive problems do not need someone who exerts authority (Heifetz *et al.*, 2009; Creyton, 2014). However, such problems require a leader who is willing to frame and ask tough questions, challenge the status quo, confront reality, draw out issues, challenge current procedures and most importantly, transfer responsibility of solving problems to people who have to make the change.

According to Heifetz *et al.* (2009), the prevalent weakness of leadership is treating adaptive challenges as technical problems. Technical problems are easy to identify, often can be solved by an authority or expert and solutions can often be implemented quickly. Due to this visible and simple nature of technical problems, leaders usually tend to focus on fixing technical challenges. On the other hand, according to these scholars, adaptive challenges are difficult to identify. They require changes in values, beliefs, roles, relationships and approaches to work. Stakeholders with the problem do the work of solving it, and it demands people to change their culture than continue to operate according to current structures, procedures and processes.

---

Heifetz *et al.* (2009) developed a series of principles to accomplish adaptive work by mobilizing systems. This involves six stages: identifying adaptive challenges; focusing attention on the problem (to make stakeholders aware of change needs); framing the issues to sustain attention; maintaining stress at a productive level (to ensure continued efforts toward change); securing ownership of both the problem and solution from the stakeholders themselves; and creating a safe environment for them.

Even though adaptive leadership is an excellent approach to create sustainable change in an organization, it is not a flawless approach. Bernstein and Linsky (2016) pointed out that it provides few resources to visualize the elements of an expected future or to devise specific interventions. Besides, adaptive leadership has limitations in enhancing excitement or inspiration. Alongside managing the loss, pain and fear that often come with changes, practitioners need to engage people by providing a sense of fun, a spirit of collaboration and visible signs of progress. However, it is essential to enable members of the organization to identify and confront the choices that they faced. Thus, adaptive methods are not enough to help generate innovations. Therefore, design thinking is important to fill such limitations.

### *Design thinking*

Design thinking is based on the principles of human-centered design to solve problems in the business, social and educational sectors (Bernstein and Linsky, 2016). Human-centered design places people at the center. This approach begins with a simple principle: if you design a chair, design it for the person who will sit in it for eight hours a day. More recently, design-thinking practitioners have begun to apply this method to services and to organizational improvements.

Design thinking involves four steps: empathy, definition, ideation and prototyping (Bernstein and Linsky, 2016). Empathy is about understanding the true needs of users. This requires understanding the need and relevance of the change to address organizational challenges. Understanding this will help us to have a clear definition of the problem, which is the second-stage “definition.” Having a clear definition of the problem is important to name the problem correctly and most importantly to generate innovative ideas that frame the problem as an opportunity.

As Bernstein and Linsky (2016) pointed out in the ideation phase, designers produce as many ideas as possible. This is an excellent opportunity to involve all stakeholders. Finally, the agreed-upon solution, i.e. process or product, is tested in the prototyping phase. Besides, it helps to instill a creative mindset within both individuals and institutions. When people work with a “design mind,” they become more optimistic, more collaborative and more willing to take risks. However, this approach lacks the conceptual and practical tools needed to manage the consequences of perceived threats. Collaboration, creativity, rapid action and comfort with failure can also be significantly counter cultural. In young institutions, people often celebrate this way of working. In more established institutions; however, it can be threatening. When people in those organizations begin to think and behave like designers, they inevitably disrupt the status quo. Sometimes their efforts are so disruptive that they put their jobs at risk (Bernstein and Linsky, 2016). Therefore, when important lessons of design thinking and adaptive leadership are integrated, we can have a more comprehensive and effective approach to leading change.

### *Adaptive design*

According to Grogger, making adaptive change is very difficult, especially if changes work against long-held belief. Design thinking can offer innovative ideas but this approach fails to address the underlying resistance to implementing these ideas. On the other hand, adaptive leadership provides change makers the tools needed to address challenges in implementing new ideas but fails to provide the right environment for creative thinking. Thus, taking the

---

best features from both approaches can make the change process more successful. The model derived from the combination of these two approaches is known as adaptive design (Bernstein and Linsky, 2016).

Bernstein and Linsky (2016) suggested two ways of blending design thinking and adaptive leadership, including using one after the other sequentially and merging both as an integrated approach. This study advocates the merging of the two methods to form a new model. Therefore, the new model will have four steps, starting with: the first phase, empathetic observation, which involves gathering information about the true needs of users and applying the empathetic understanding. The second phase involves practitioners understanding and determining technical and adaptive challenges. Practitioners should use concrete language when pinpointing challenges and frame each challenge as a creative opportunity. In the third phase of the adaptive design model, practitioners will join in ideation. In this stage, practitioners will be able to generate as many ideas as possible. Finally, in the fourth stage, practitioners will create and test an intervention (process or product) or change initiative.

Grogger suggested that adaptive design is a promising method that could help organizations create innovative solutions and resolve potential challenges that hinder successful implementation. Therefore, by blending design thinking and adaptive leadership, sustainable and pervasive changes can be achieved in HEIs. Design thinking can help to generate collaborative and innovative solutions. Nevertheless, it is not pertinent to address the underlying challenges or human barriers to implementing changes. On the other hand, adaptive leadership provides tools needed to address those challenges but fails to provide opportunities for creative thinking.

Accordingly, principles and procedures elicited from adaptive design were used as a theoretical framework to guide the study. Consequently, the study was made to revolve around issues such as: clear understanding of problems (true needs, open discussion and identifying adaptive challenges), innovative and collaborative solutions, enhancing adaptive changes (via learning and experimentation, and changing the status quo working culture), adaptive leadership (empowering everyone to feel as leader regardless of position and acting politically) and establishing clear communication (type and implication of changes, and building clear vision).

### **Research methodology**

This research followed a modern perspective that attempts to discover universal principles and laws that govern organizations (Hatch, 2013). However, to understand the assumptions, values and practices of the target university, it extends its approach to incorporate individuals' viewpoints and social constructs. To benefit from both perspectives (modern and interpretive), this research was guided by pragmatism. Thus, to achieve the purpose of the study, a sequential explanatory mixed methods approach was used. As noted by Creswell (2009, p. 215) "The purpose of the sequential explanatory design is to use qualitative results to assist in explaining and interpreting the findings of a primarily quantitative study."

The study participants included academic staff members, administrative staff members and students. However, the participants did not include expatriate staff members, staff members on study leave and contractual staff members. In addition, first-year students and postgraduate students were excluded because these groups were assumed to have little experience and exposure to the changes happening in the university. Mainly, an attempt was made to include around 30 percent of colleges, faculties and/or institutes. At the target university, the Institute of Textile and Fashion Technology, College of Business and Economics, Faculty of Education and Behavioral Science, and School of law were randomly selected using a lottery system from the 13 academic units (colleges, faculties and institutes).

---

In these units, there were about 279 academic staff members, 3,648 students and 75 administrative staffs who fulfilled the inclusion criteria of the research. Thus, a sample of 162 academic staff members, 348 students, and 65 administrative staffs were selected using the simple random sampling (lottery) method with a 5 percent margin of error and 95% confidence level.

Accordingly, a questionnaire with close-ended items was prepared based on the study's conceptual framework. While designing the questionnaires and framing each question, necessary efforts were made to maximize the complete and accurate communication of ideas. The survey was piloted on 20 respondents from different groups (academic staffs, administrative staffs and students) and the reliability was found to be 0.744 at Cronbach's  $\alpha$ . Necessary corrections were made before administering the questionnaire to the sample population. Then, 219 complete and useful questionnaires were returned from 63 academic staff members, 58 administrative staff members and 98 students, which provided an approximately 40 percent response rate.

To support questionnaire results, in-depth interviews were made guided by semi-structured questions. The interviews included two academic staff members (both of them in leadership positions), two administrative staff members, one institutional transformation directorate member and one quality assurance directorate staff. These individuals were purposely selected considering their experience and exposure to obtain sufficient information about the issue. To ensure ethical conduct of the research, permission was asked from higher officials and sample participants were communicated, and participants for interview were informed about the purpose of the study. In addition, an attempt was made to clarify participants about the confidentiality of the information they provided.

The data collected through questionnaires and interviews were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively in a way to meet the research purposes. One sample *t*-test was used to check respondents' agreement on the theoretical importance, practical implementation and on the challenges to creating adaptive changes. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also used to check differences among respondent groups including academic staffs, administrative staffs and students. On the other hand, in order to analyze the qualitative data, content analysis technique was employed. This analysis was based on data organization procedures and techniques, as recommended by Bogdan and Biklen (1998). Thus, in organizing the data, the researcher revisited and listened to each audiotape to ensure the accuracy of data. The interviews were later analyzed as follows: first, the answers to each question were separated into meaningful categories, named and coded as R1, R2, R3 and R4, where "R" refers to the respondent. Second, the conceptualized statements were collected together. The third step, repeated ideas were avoided. Finally, the identified results were explained and related to each other. In this approach, each set of data collected was reviewed so that key issues, recurrent events or activities in the data became categories of focus.

## Results and discussion

In this section, we have tried to present the results of the study and a discussion of key findings. Accordingly, the perceptions of respondents about adaptive design principles, the implementation or the practical manifestation of these principles in the studied university, how the university is creating adaptive changes, and finally challenges to create adaptive changes are presented.

### *Perception toward adaptive design principles*

Academic staffs, administrative staffs and students were asked to indicate their agreement on the theoretical importance of adaptive design principles. The questionnaire offered



options for strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, partially agree = 3, disagree = 2 and strongly disagree = 1. The results are given in Table I.

Table I presents the results of survey respondents' perceptions of specific adaptive design principles. For the sake of presentation, the perception of respondents can be synthesized into four major categories expected of adaptive design, i.e. problem identification, collaborative solution, enhancing adaptive changes and clear communication.

*Problem identification.* According to the results of the one sample *t*-test, the mean value of all the groups' perception of the problem identification mechanisms recommended by adaptive design was found to be significantly higher than the test value, which was 3. The average mean (4.48) of all groups indicated the existence of strong acceptance for problem identification systems, i.e. identifying true needs/challenges, critical investigation of reoccurring problems and open discussion of problems. Heifetz *et al.* (2009) indicated that a clear understanding of problems via open discussions and a meticulous investigation is important. Supporting this idea, Creyton (2014) explained that a proper diagnosis of the adaptive challenge is the most challenging aspect of working adaptively. However, too often, we attempt to seek quick or palatable causes rather than working to identify the central underlying issue/challenges.

*Collaborative solution.* As presented in Table I, respondents reflected strong agreement on the importance of a collaborative solution to institutional problems. The mean results indicated

Perceived importance of adaptive design principles	Group	n	One-sample <i>t</i> -test				Sig.(2-tailed)
			Mean	SD	<i>t</i> -value	df	
Change needs to originate from true needs	Ac. staffs	63	4.460	0.8766	13.221	62	0.001
	Admin' Staffs	58	4.586	0.7017	17.215	57	0.001
	Students	98	4.591	0.6554	24.04	97	0.001
Critical investigation of recurrent problems	Ac. staffs	63	4.220	1.210	8.012	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	4.327	1.0984	9.204	57	0.001
	Students	98	4.428	0.6735	20.99	97	0.001
Open discussion of problems/Speaking the elephant in the room	Ac. staffs	63	4.460	0.9808	11.817	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	4.224	1.0436	8.933	57	0.001
	Students	98	4.153	1.0087	11.316	97	0.001
Problems should be considered as opportunities	Ac. staffs	63	4.160	1.003	9.167	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	4.465	1.1272	9.901	57	0.001
	Students	98	4.387	0.8327	16.497	97	0.001
Problems require collaborative solution	Ac. staffs	63	4.290	0.7710	13.236	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	4.258	1.1326	8.463	57	0.001
	Students	98	3.785	1.2289	6.329	97	0.001
Fundamental cultural/status quo change	Ac. staffs	63	4.510	1.029	11.623	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	4.224	1.4393	6.477	57	0.001
	Students	98	4.112	1.0141	10.857	97	0.001
Everybody is a leader	Ac. staffs	63	4.510	0.6444	18.574	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	4.517	0.9222	12.529	57	0.001
	Students	98	4.204	0.9411	12.665	97	0.001
Change requires learning and experimentation	Ac. staffs	63	4.220	1.084	8.947	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	4.379	0.9143	11.488	57	0.001
	Students	98	4.081	0.9380	11.415	97	0.001
Identifying supporters and opponents	Ac. staffs	63	3.810	1.479	4.343	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	4.327	1.066	9.484	57	0.001
	Students	98	4.428	0.7864	17.981	97	0.001
Clear communication with all stakeholders	Ac. staffs	63	4.430	0.9790	11.582	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	4.741	0.6087	21.787	57	0.001
	Students	98	4.428	0.7321	19.315	97	0.001

**Table I.** Respondents perception on major adaptive design principles

that problems require collaborative solution ( $m = 4.1$ ) taking them as opportunities ( $m = 4.33$ ) and empowering everyone to be a leader of changes ( $m = 4.4$ ). Similarly, once adaptive challenges are identified, it is necessary to encourage stakeholders to collaborate on innovative solutions (Bernstein and Linsky, 2016). This also enhances distributive leadership, which makes everyone responsible and accountable for the change endeavors. Heifetz *et al.* (2009) also clearly stated the need to shift responsibility from the shoulders of authority figures and authority structures to stakeholders. One interviewee said, "People are naturally resistant to order unless they are part of the decision," which is similar to themes in Parry (1999) and Woodward and Hendry (2004) of the need to involve stakeholders in change decisions.

Holman *et al.* (2007) explained the importance of collaborative/group change strategies. Collaboration can accelerate action, bring different people with different knowledge and experiences together, and increase shared understanding and dissemination of collective strategy or direction. Besides, participants bring core needs and concerns into the discussion, and the opportunity for cross-fertilization of ideas helps participants to have a clear understanding of the change issue and dissemination of information. Moreover, group change strategies help participants to develop ownership and commitment by disseminating change and energy throughout the organization. Oelofse and Cady (2012) indicated that collaborative approaches can improve the commitment and the performance of organizational members. Furthermore, as Holman *et al.* (2007) suggested, meaningful participation, co-discovery and co-planning with the group of people with different interests and experiences increase the sustainability of results. These arguments are compelling to utilize collaborative/group-oriented change strategies for organizational change.

*Enhancing adaptive changes.* The fundamental purpose of focusing on adaptive challenges and enhancing collaborative solutions is to create adaptive change. The aggregate perception of respondents reflected that the changes in institutions ought to be adaptive and pervasive. The mean value of fundamental cultural/status quo change ( $m = 4.2$ ) and change necessitate learning and experimentation ( $m = 4.2$ ) indicated the felt importance of enhancing adaptive changes in institutions. According to Heifetz *et al.* (2009), the basic assumption of adaptive leadership is about promoting change that enables the capacity to thrive. They indicated that new adaptations have the potential of significantly displacing, reregulating and rearranging old structures. Moreover, adaptive challenges can only be addressed through changes in people's values, beliefs, habits and loyalties; thus, adaptive change takes time. Therefore, theoretically, respondents agreed that changes should be pervasive, because there are times in which institutions go back and forth to the new system and old approach, unable to forget the old approach.

*Clear communication.* Establishing a clear communication system is important for successful changes. The perception of respondents on clear communication with all stakeholders ( $m = 4.53$ ) and identifying supporters and opponents ( $m = 4.18$ ) signified the value of clear communication. To ensure proper communication, the level and adequacy of change-related information are vital. According to Jimmieson *et al.* (2004), a change in information is positively related to an adjustment in terms of "well-being, job satisfaction, and client engagement". Similarly, it has been found to be predictive of higher authenticity of change (Wanberg and Banas, 2000) and less resistance to change (Oreg, 2006). Thus, adequate provision of information regarding the change is an important mechanism that institutions can use to enhance employees' understanding and acceptance.

Following strong agreements on the principles extracted from adaptive design, ANOVA was also calculated to see differences among the perceptions of different groups. No significant differences were observed in most principles at the level of  $\alpha = 0.05$  except on the perception toward the need for learning and experimentation during change, on identifying supporters and opponents, and on the need to have open discussion of problems

( $F(2, 210) = 6.99, p < 0.05, F(2, 214) = 5.37, p < 0.05$  and  $F(2, 213) = 13.33, p < 0.05$ , respectively). To understand where the difference occurred on these issues, *post hoc* tests were conducted.

Although the mean agreement was positive, in the *post hoc* analysis, a relatively lower mean was observed in students than among other groups on the perception for the need to make learning and experimentation, and on the need to discuss problems openly. Correspondingly, a relatively lower mean was observed among academic staff members for the need to identify supporters and opponents of change. This is in line with interview results; for example, one interviewee said, being logical and reasonable is better than acting politically as adaptive design suggests to manage change initiatives. This means academic staff members emphasize the need to stick to rules, regulations and rationality rather than manipulating followers through political actions suggested by principles of adaptive leadership.

However, generally, we can understand the existence of a positive perception of adaptive design principles. Cullen *et al.* (2013) indicated the value of a positive perception of change approaches. This suggests that if the adaptive design is introduced as an adaptive change approach, it can make change initiatives successful. Tariq *et al.* (2011) also made clear that our perceptions of change initiatives determine adaptability. Therefore, we may say there is a good impression of adaptive design principles, which, in turn, may indicate the existence of fertile ground to implement these principles of change management.

#### *The implementation of adaptive design principles*

Obviously, because leadership work involves many tacit assumptions, many leaders cannot clearly explain their leadership or change management approach. Especially in developing nations, leaders usually make decisions based on their instincts, and we rarely see scientific, organized or explicit leadership approaches. Based on the question "Can we find a change management approach that resembles adaptive design?", this study was extended to examine the practice of change management. If being implemented, respondents were asked to rate the frequency of major principles explained above in four groups. The responses were rated as always = 5, often = 4, sometimes = 3, rarely = 2 and never = 1. The result of the one sample *t*-test is presented in Table II.

According to respondents, the practice of adaptive design principles was infrequent. The responses indicated the rare manifestation of adaptive design principles in leadership practice. There were limitations on the practices of identifying adaptive challenges, collaborating to solve problems, providing adaptive leadership and creating clear communication systems. More specifically, there was a limited use of critical investigation to identify reoccurring problems, making adaptive changes, empowering everybody to feel like a leader regardless of position, and identifying supporters and opponents of change.

As presented in Table II, the overall perceptions of the practices of adaptive design were low. The grand average mean (2.39) indicated rare implementation of these principles in the studied university. According to the one sample *t*-test, there were differences in the perception of different groups on the level of significance. Respondents of all groups reflected significantly low mean results on open discussion of problems, considering problems as opportunities, the practice of collaborative solution to organizational problems, and on the presence of change-related clear communication system with stakeholders.

However, the ANOVA result showed significant differences among groups only on the implementation of a collaborative solution to solve organizational problems ( $F(2, 214) = 3.064, p < 0.05$ ). The *post hoc* analysis also showed that while academic and administrative staffs have similar perceptions, slight differences were observed with students' mean. This may be interpreted as almost all groups have agreed that adaptive design principles are rarely seen in the change management process of the university. Even we may say there are limitations on problem identification, collaboration, changing via adaptive leadership and establishing

Change  
management  
practice

The practice of adaptive design principles at the university	Group	n	One-sample <i>t</i> -test				Sig.(2-tailed)
			Mean	SD	<i>t</i> -value	df	
Changes are originated from true needs	Ac. staffs	63	2.507	0.93106	0.068	62	0.946
	Admin' staffs	58	2.275	0.8333	-2.048	57	0.045
	Students	98	2.561	1.0751	0.564	97	0.574
Critical investigation is done to identify reoccurring problems	Ac. staffs	63	2.690	0.75423	2.088	62	0.241
	Admin' staffs	58	2.440	1.0009	-1.181	57	0.243
	Students	98	2.530	0.9654	0.314	97	0.754
Open discussion of problems/Speaking the elephant in the room	Ac. staffs	63	2.238	0.8559	-2.429	62	0.018
	Admin' staffs	58	2.137	1.0165	-2.713	57	0.009
	Students	98	2.183	0.88919	-3.522	97	0.001
Problems are used as opportunities for progress	Ac. staffs	63	2.031	0.9994	-3.719	62	0.000
	Admin' staffs	58	2.155	1.1817	-2.222	57	0.030
	Students	98	2.265	0.85616	-2.714	97	0.008
Collaborative solution for organizational problems	Ac. staffs	63	2.079	0.8289	-4.028	62	0.000
	Admin' staffs	58	2.080	1.0477	-3.008	57	0.004
	Students	98	2.487	0.8690	-1.279	97	0.204
Changes in the university require fundamental cultural/status quo change	Ac. staffs	63	2.440	0.7356	-0.599	62	0.551
	Admin' staffs	58	2.479	1.1672	-0.787	57	0.434
	Students	98	2.408	1.1291	-0.805	97	0.423
Everybody is empowered and feels like a leader regardless of position	Ac. staffs	63	2.670	1.0625	1.245	62	0.218
	Admin' staffs	58	2.517	1.1583	0.113	57	0.910
	Students	98	2.460	0.92172	-0.329	97	0.743
There is learning and experimentation along with changes	Ac. staffs	63	2.079	1.0519	-3.174	62	0.002
	Admin' staffs	58	2.293	1.1548	-1.364	57	0.178
	Students	98	2.346	0.9958	-1.521	97	0.131
Identifying supporters and opponents of change	Ac. staffs	63	2.428	0.6889	-0.823	62	0.414
	Admin' staffs	58	2.517	1.1583	0.113	57	0.910
	Students	98	2.673	1.0231	1.678	97	0.197
Clear communication with all stakeholders	Ac. staffs	63	2.317	0.8766	-1.653	62	0.013
	Admin' staffs	58	2.172	1.1103	-2.247	57	0.029
	Students	98	2.316	0.91490	-1.987	97	0.050

**Table II.**  
Respondents  
perception on  
the implementation  
of adaptive  
design principles

clear change-oriented communication systems. Congruent with the quantitative data, almost all interviewees indicated the absence of careful observation for a clear understanding of adaptive challenges. One interviewee said, "We usually spend most of our time fixing the shortage of materials, procedural problems, and other inconsistencies, in most discussions we dwell on such issues." This may be attributed to the visible and simplistic nature of technical problems (Heifetz *et al.*, 2009; Creyton, 2014). Likewise, vivid gaps were observed in the change management approach of the university.

Therefore, the university has a lot to learn from adaptive design principles of change because successful and pervasive changes will happen if institutions are able to use similar structured change management approaches.

#### *How do adaptive organizational changes happen in the university?*

According to the questionnaire results, adaptive design principles are rarely implemented in the target university. This kindled a question: are there unique mechanisms the university has been using to lead change? The interview respondents indicated that the government introduces almost all change initiatives in the university. Similarly, Woldegiyorgis (2014) stated that the Ethiopian government is mostly the initiator and ultimate owner of changes, which might be true in other developing nations. Mostly, staff members and higher officials strive to incorporate change initiatives proposed by the government into their plans.

Respondents' experiences showed that the university's mission and vision have been guided by the government agenda, which, in turn, are shared and cascaded among leaders and staff members in different positions. Paradoxically, respondents believed that change is successful when it emanated from the bottom through discussion and collaboration, which was similar to the literature reviewed.

Therefore, the participation of both academic and administrative staff members seems primarily focused on how to achieve a predesigned change agenda from the government. This was almost in line with quantitative results, which suggested that the attempt to initiate changes based on true needs was minimal. One of the interviewees said, "It is not common to create change ideas and even subordinates are perceived as incompetent." Encouraging innovation and collaboration is an important aspect of adaptive design (Bernstein and Linsky, 2016), but it seems uncommon in the interviewee's perceptions. This was quite similar to quantitative results where collaboration to solve institutional challenges was rated as significantly low.

Nevertheless, most interviewees agreed that, regardless of the source of change initiatives, as long as ideas are important for university's progress, it was good to implement them. One interviewee said, "Look! Kaizen, it was an important change idea, but since it has been introduced by the government, people tend to resist it." Despite the value of changes, most people understand reforms as burdens or tools of the government to control people according to interviewees. Here, we can appreciate the value of adaptive design to clear up misunderstandings. Besides, public universities face enormous pressures from academics to maintain their identities while responding to the government reform agendas (Mehari, 2016). Moreover, one interviewee said, "Most changes in the university has been implemented as fashions and to satisfy bosses" contradictory to the principles of challenging the status quo and "thriving" through adaptive leadership, as advocated by Heifetz *et al.* (2009).

Consequently, we may say that the approach that the university has been using was not sufficient to bring adaptive changes because most change ideas were prescribed by the government (rather than being identified by ground-level users), of the absence of collaborative solutions, and of limited attempts to convince and make implementers part of the change. Rather, changes were initiated top-down from the government, often meeting resistance from staff members. This might be a common incidence in HEIs of developing nations; thus, the researchers were interested in identifying frequent challenges in making adaptive changes.

#### *Challenges to carryout adaptive changes*

Various causes hamper change initiatives in HEIs. Many kinds of literature indicated that resistance, incompetent leadership, contextual factors, organizational politics and resource limitations are among the dominant factors (Oreg, 2006; Wainaina *et al.*, 2014; Woodward and Hendry, 2004). Besides, the unique nature of HEIs, i.e. being loosely coupled systems, professional autonomy, the unique culture of the academy and other features may be potential challenges (Mehari, 2016). However, for the sake of manageability, participants were asked to rate the most common challenges of change based on reviewed literatures. Responses were rated from very high (5), high (4), medium (3), low (2), very low (1). The results are presented in Table III.

The grand average mean (3.3) indicated that almost all challenges were moderately reflected as challenges although their intensity varies. The mean values of one-sample *t*-test in all groups showed the significant result of poor communication strategies, problems related to facilitating changes and lack of followers' involvement in decisions. This indicated that the university has to work on these areas as a high priority. Next to these problems, comparatively, unwillingness to accept changes, poor readiness and commitment of leaders and a failure legacy of previous changes were also perceived as significant bottlenecks.

Change  
management  
practice

Challenges of adaptive change in the university	Group	n	One-sample <i>t</i> -test				Sig.(2-tailed)
			Mean	SD	<i>t</i> -value	df	
Unwillingness to accept changes	Ac. staffs	63	3.317	1.16155	2.169	62	0.034
	Admin' staffs	58	2.735	1.38884	-1.385	57	0.172
	Students	96	3.479	1.16961	4.014	95	0.001
Poor readiness and commitment of leaders	Ac. staffs	63	3.682	1.02902	5.265	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	3.094	1.54751	0.444	57	0.659
	Students	96	3.260	1.23327	2.069	95	0.041
Poor communication strategy to introduce changes	Ac. staffs	63	3.587	0.90936	5.126	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	3.471	1.03038	3.333	57	0.002
	Students	96	3.385	1.30883	2.885	95	0.005
Lack of planning and preparation for change	Ac. staffs	63	3.603	0.99255	4.823	62	0.001
	Admin' staffs	58	3.358	1.33149	1.960	57	0.055
	Students	96	3.166	1.21106	1.348	95	0.181
Lack of clear vision in changes	Ac. staffs	63	3.365	1.29890	2.231	62	0.029
	Admin' staffs	58	2.849	1.43307	-0.767	57	0.447
	Students	96	2.906	1.28209	-0.716	95	0.475
Failure legacy of previous changes	Ac. staffs	63	3.285	1.05385	2.152	62	0.035
	Admin' Staffs	58	3.490	1.28036	2.789	57	0.007
	Students	96	3.145	1.43622	0.995	95	0.322
Problems related to facilitating change/proper training	Ac. staffs	63	3.444	1.14691	3.076	62	0.003
	Admin' staffs	58	3.660	1.42698	3.369	57	0.001
	Students	96	3.552	1.18650	4.559	95	0.001
Using coercion and unilateral action	Ac. staffs	63	2.888	1.30892	-0.674	62	0.503
	Admin' Staffs	58	3.018	1.57493	0.087	57	0.931
	Students	96	3.562	1.41282	3.901	95	0.001
Resource limitation	Ac. staffs	63	2.873	1.27624	-0.790	62	0.433
	Admin' staffs	58	2.981	1.30812	-0.105	57	0.917
	Students	96	3.312	1.39407	2.196	95	0.031
Lack of followers involvement in decisions	Ac. staffs	63	3.619	0.83141	5.910	62	0.001
	Admin' Staffs	58	3.811	1.12757	5.238	57	0.001
	Students	96	3.291	1.32122	2.163	95	0.033

**Table III.**  
Respondents  
perception  
of challenges to  
adaptive change

Yet, other stated challenges, which were part of the survey included in Table III, require attention though not as urgently as the other issues identified above.

A further statistical analysis was also made to examine perception differences among groups. The ANOVA revealed significant differences on: unwillingness to accept changes, poor readiness and commitment of leaders, resource limitation and lack of followers involvement in decisions ( $F(2, 207) = 6.441, p < 0.05, F(2, 207) = 3.413, p < 0.05, F(2, 207) = 5.108, p < 0.05,$  and  $F(2, 207) = 3.903, p < 0.05,$  respectively). The *post hoc* test result showed that students had significantly higher mean on perception toward unwillingness to accept changes and resource limitation than other groups, which means these are the most pressing challenges in students' perception. On the other hand, academic staffs mean score was higher in poor readiness and commitment of leaders. Similarly, administrative staffs mean score was significantly higher for the lack of followers' involvement in decisions.

Consequently, a poor communication strategy, problems related to facilitating changes and lack of followers' involvement in decisions were found to be outstanding challenges of change management in the university. Parry (1999), Drew (2010) and Cullen *et al.* (2013) pointed out that communication is an effective adaptive leadership capacity. They appreciate the importance of change-related communication for the success of workplace change by influencing how employees perceive organizational actions. Similarly, the unwillingness to accept changes, poor readiness and commitment of leaders and failure legacy of previous

changes were also significant challenges. Cullen *et al.* (2013), Judge and Douglas (2009), Parry (1999), Ployhart and Bliese (2015), Sony and Mekoth (2014) and Woodward and Hendry (2004) in one way or other indicated willingness, readiness and leaders commitment as key factors for successful change adaptation. Thus, failure to address these issues will likely cause failure to create adaptive changes that are pervasive and long lasting.

Therefore, the presence of these challenges strengthens the need to adapt and use adaptive design, since a lot can be learned from this approach about how to create adaptive changes in HEIs.

### Reflections and recommendations

Based on the work of diverse organizational scholars, the researchers have tried to show the absence of a single comprehensive approach to introduce and manage changes. However, it is important for leaders and institutions to update their understanding of new theories and practices of change management. As explained in the conceptual framework, adaptive design is the most recent change management approach believed to have a significant impact on change management endeavors of HEIs. Based on the practice theory, in this investigation, we empirically tested a conceptual model of adaptive change in an HEI in a developing nation. Below, our key findings and how these findings can be addressed in practice are discussed.

First, the university community perceived adaptive design principles and tactics as important tools to institutionalize changes in HEIs. This may affirm the significance of adaptive design if accepted and scaled up as an alternative change management theory in HEIs. Especially in a context where the key change initiatives are dominated by the government's top-down approach, adaptive design is an important approach. Top-down approaches are vulnerable to leader-driven solutions (Woodward and Hendry, 2004). In this way, fundamental problems may not be clearly understood and the university community is not part of the solution. Besides, change management is usually done in universities without open communication of the issues in a timely fashion with academicians and supporting staffs as they are directly linked to or to be affected in the process. As a result, academicians lose devotion, ownership and attention. Staff members tend to adopt an observational standpoint (Mehari, 2016). Notably, as can be learned from the target university discussed next, which is dominated by a top-down change management approach, problems identified require an intervention of adaptive design principles and tactics.

Second, the study has tried to assess the practical manifestation of adaptive design principles and tactics of change management in the university. This provided us the opportunity to test the approach in practice. However, in the target university, leaders and change agents rarely used a change management approach that resembles adaptive design, which, in turn, may be the reason for the failure to bring adaptive changes (i.e. deep and pervasive changes) in the university. The research found that the principles and tactics derived from this approach were weak. The primary problem identified was related to identifying adaptive challenges/problems. As the approach indicated, successful adaptive changes require a clear understanding of organizational problems/challenges, which could be possible by focusing on true needs, holding open discussion with stakeholders and by identifying reoccurring deep-rooted adaptive problems. Next, there were gaps in innovation and collaboration to tackle institutional problems. Adaptive design strongly advocates that a change should originate from the system itself. According to the known inspirational quote, "When the egg is broken from the inside, life starts [...]." Likewise, when people are part of the solution and perceive themselves to be creators of changes, they will be more likely to implement the changes. This also signals the significance of participatory decision making. The other implementation problem pointed in the study findings is that adaptive leadership was not observed in the university's change management. As explained in the

---

framework, adaptive leadership is vital to managing problems related to the human element of change, especially resistance to changes. Finally, problems related to establishing clear communication systems to facilitate changes were observed in the target university.

Third, in this investigation, an attempt was made to envisage challenges related to creating adaptive changes/deep and pervasive. Although challenges are many, poor change-related communication system, problems related to facilitating changes and lack of followers' involvement in decisions were found significant causes that hamper adaptive changes. Similarly, unwillingness to accept changes, poor readiness and commitment of leaders and failure legacy of previous changes were found pressing challenges. Therefore, the implementation gaps discussed above and challenges identified might be a signal of how far the university lags behind to be a change adaptive institution. Even we may question the presence of deep and persistent changes in the university's change process. Accordingly, we may conclude that the change management of the university was not in such a way to bring deep, pervasive and sustainable changes as adaptive design tools and tactics for organizational change suggest.

Consequently, the identified gaps and challenges in the studied university strengthen our argument, as an adaptive design is an important approach to foster adaptive changes in HEIs. To create adaptive changes, business, as usual, does not suffice. Hence, special emphasis should be given to understand institutional challenges through deep investigation and open discussion of problems. Understanding adaptive challenges requires thinking out of the box. The reoccurrence of problems, the need to have deep behavioral changes, and the absence of a quick solution to existing problems may be common indicators of adaptive challenges. Thus, HEIs need to refrain from finding quick fixes and easy answers to technical problems, instead they need to focus on participatory approach to solving deep adaptive challenges.

Besides, problems should be used as a motive to initiate changes rather than threats; collaborative thinking and innovation has to be encouraged. The change ideas or solutions to problems should emanate from collective thinking. In this regard, leaders and change agents can promote and use group change strategies. For example, open space technology, which is a self-organizing practice of inner discipline and collective activity, helps to release the inherent creativity and leadership in people. World Café also creates a safe space where participants can contribute to the process of knowledge sharing through dialogue and act decisively in pursuit of common aims. In addition, it is useful to use appreciative inquiry, which is a group change strategy to create a holistic picture, energy, momentum and ownership for a change. If used properly, these group strategies are noteworthy to mobilize systems and gather shared thinking through mass discussions (see Nauheimer, 2005; Oelofse and Cady, 2012; Schieffer *et al.*, 2004; Willoughby and Tosey, 2007).

Moreover, a clear change-oriented communication system has to be established. All stakeholders' need to be clear about the type and impacts of changes being introduced into the system. Apparent communication minimizes resistance and enhances the change implementation process. Leaders and change agents may use formal and informal mechanisms to construct the picture of change ideas. Here, it is necessary to make sure that staff members are well informed about the true picture of changes. Establishing an efficient communication system is a profound way to influence positively how staffs understand the change initiatives. The communication system should not be restricted to building positive attitude and willingness among stakeholders; it should also arm frontline workers with the necessary skill to do adaptive work through change-oriented training.

Overall, the findings of this study are expected to help us envisage the extent to which adaptive design is valuable in the change management of HEIs. Building an adaptive university capable of deep and pervasive change is not a matter of choice; rather, it is a necessity to survive and thrive in our ever-changing dynamic environment. Thus, the researchers encourage leaders and change agents to focus on building adaptive universities.



### Limitations and future study

The basic limitation of this study is the problem of supporting literature from other similar local research findings, conducted to see the practical linkages and other scholars' perception of the approach. Besides, this research might probably have a limited transferability to other organizations because the sample of this study was focused on the university setting. Future studies should attempt to collect more precise, longitudinal data to test the approach. More quantitative and qualitative data on how and when exactly adaptive design principles and tactics should be implemented in HEIs will make the approach more useful. Obviously, taking account not only of other aspects of adaptability, for example, contextual resources such as participation and transformational leadership, but also different personal resources, such as (change) self-efficacy and organization-based self-esteem, will further increase the understanding of change management. Finally, the researchers feel that this research should be further strengthened to answer specific factors related to adaptive design and its role to foster adaptive change. However, though not sufficient, this study can provide insight into the intricacies of change, change management and the contribution of adaptive design.

### References

- Bernstein, M. and Linsky, M. (2016), "Leading change through adaptive design", *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, pp. 1-15, available at: [www.ssr.org/articles/entry/leading\\_change\\_through\\_adaptive\\_design](http://www.ssr.org/articles/entry/leading_change_through_adaptive_design)
- Blackwell, R. (2003), *Guidelines for Promoting & Facilitating Change*, LTSN Generic Centre, York Science Park, available at: [www.ltsn.ac.uk/genericcentre](http://www.ltsn.ac.uk/genericcentre)
- Bogdan, R.C. and Biklen, S.K. (1998), *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theories and Methods*, Pearson Education, New York, NY.
- Cameron, K. (1984), "Organizational adaptation and higher education", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 55 No. 2, pp. 122-144.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009), *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Approaches*, 3rd ed., SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Creyton, M. (2014), *Adaptive Leadership: An Approach for Challenging Times*, Volunteering Queensland, available at: [www.volunteeringqld.org.au/docs/innovate\\_Research\\_Bulletin\\_Adaptive\\_Leadership\\_an\\_Approach\\_for\\_Challenging\\_Times.pdf](http://www.volunteeringqld.org.au/docs/innovate_Research_Bulletin_Adaptive_Leadership_an_Approach_for_Challenging_Times.pdf)
- Cullen, K.L., Edwards, B.D., Casper, W.C. and Gue, K.R. (2013), "Employees' adaptability and perceptions of change-related uncertainty: implications for perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and performance", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 29, pp. 1-12, doi: 10.1007/s10869-013-9312-y.
- Doz, Y.L. and Kosonen, M. (2008), *Fast Strategy: How Strategic Agility Will Help You Stay a Head of the Game*, Pearson, Harlow.
- Drew, G. (2010), "Issues and challenges in higher education leadership: engaging for change", *The Australian Educational Researcher*, Vol. 3 No. 37, pp. 57-76.
- Gornitzka, Å. (1999), "Governmental policies and organizational change in higher education", *Higher Education*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 5-31, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003703214848>
- Hamtaux, A., Houssemand, C. and Vrignaud, P. (2013), "Individual and career adaptability: comparing models and measures", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 83 No. 2, pp. 130-141.
- Hatch, M. (2013), *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic and Postmodern Perspectives*, 3rd ed., Oxford University Press.
- Heifetz, R., Grashow, A. and Linsky, M. (2009), *The Practice of Adaptive Leadership: Tools and Tactics for Changing Your Organization and the World*, Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston, MA.
- Heuvel, M., Demerouti, E., Schaufeli, W. and Bakker, A. (2013), "Adapting to change: the value of change information and meaning making", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, No. 83, pp. 11-21.

- Holman, P., Devane, T. and Cady, S. (2007), *The Change Hand Book: The Definitive Resources on Today's Best Methods for Engaging Whole Systems*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- Jimmieson, N., Terry, D. and Callan, V. (2004), "A longitudinal study of employee adaptation to organizational change: the role of change-related information and change-related self-efficacy", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, No. 9, pp. 11-27.
- Judge, W. and Douglas, T. (2009), "Organizational change capacity: the systematic development of a scale", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 6 No. 22, pp. 635-649.
- Lehman, W., Greener, J. and Simpson, D. (2002), "Assessing organizational readiness for change", *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, Vol. 22, pp. 197-209.
- Marshall, S. (2010), "Change technology and higher education: are universities capable of organizational change?", *ALT-J, Research in Learning Technology*, Vol. 26 No. 8, pp. 179-192, available at: <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1018>
- Mehari, Y. (2016), "Governance reform in the Ethiopian higher education system: organizational responses to business management tools in the case of Mekelle University", Academic Dissertation, Acta Universitatis Tampereensis 2202: Tampere University Press.
- Nauheimer, H. (Ed.) (2005), *Open Space Technology: New Stories From The Field*, Berlin, available at: [www.change-management-toolbook.com](http://www.change-management-toolbook.com)
- Oelofse, E. and Cady, S. (2012), "The world café in South Africa: a case study on improving performance and commitment", *Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 79-89.
- Oreg, S. (2006), "Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 15, pp. 73-101.
- Parent, J. and Lovelace, K. (2015), "The impact of employee engagement and a positive organizational culture on an individual's ability to adapt to organization change", *Eastern Academy of Management Proceedings: Organization Behavior and Theory Track*, pp. 1-20, available at: [http://scholarworks.merrimack.edu/mgt\\_facpub/10](http://scholarworks.merrimack.edu/mgt_facpub/10)
- Parry, K.W. (1999), "Enhancing adaptability: leadership strategies to accommodate change in local government settings", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 2 No. 12, pp. 134-157.
- Ployhart, R. and Bliese, P. (2006), "Individual adaptability (I-ADAPT) theory: conceptualizing the antecedents, consequences, and measurement of individual differences in adaptability", *Advances in Human Performance and Cognitive Engineering Research*, Vol. 6, pp. 3-39.
- Ployhart, R.E. and Bliese, P.D. (2015), "Understanding adaptability: a prerequisite for effective performance within complex environments", *Advances in Human Performance and Cognitive Engineering Research*, Vol. 6, pp. 3-39, available at: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3601\(05\)06001](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3601(05)06001)
- Randall, M. and Coakley, L. (2007), "Applying adaptive leadership to successful change initiatives in academia", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 28, pp. 325-335.
- Schieffer, A., Isaacs, D. and Gyllenpalm, B. (2004), "The world café: part one and part two", *World Business Academy Transformation*, Vol. 18 No. 8, pp. 1-9.
- Schein, E.H. (2010), "The learning culture and the learning leader", in Hickman, G.R. (Ed.), *Leading Organizations: Perspective for a New Era*, 2nd ed., Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 331-344.
- Sony, M. and Mekoth, N. (2014), "The dimensions of frontline employee adaptability in power sector", *International Journal of Energy Sector Management*, Vol. 2 No. 8, pp. 240-258.
- Sporn, B. (2001), "Building adaptive universities: emerging organizational forms based on experiences of European and us universities", *Tertiary Education and Management*, Vol. 2 No. 7, pp. 121-134, doi: 10.1080/13583883.2001.9967046.
- Tariq, M.R., Sohail, M. and Muhammad, A. (2011), "Impact of employee adaptability to change towards organizational competitive advantage", *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, Vol. 7 No. 11, pp. 8-15.
- Temple, P. (2011), *Universities in the Knowledge Economy: Higher Education Organization and Global Change*, Taylor & Francis, London.

- 
- Wainaina, N., Kabare, K. and Mukulu, E. (2014), "Determinants of employee adaptability to transformational change in commercial in Nairobi, Kenya: empirical review", *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 1-9.
- Wanberg, C. and Banas, J. (2000), "Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace", *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85 No. 1, pp. 132-142.
- Willoughby, G. and Tosey, P. (2007), "Imagine 'midfield': Appreciative inquiry as a process for leading school improvement", *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 499-520.
- Woldegiyorgis, A. (2014), "Adapting to global trends: why and how is the Ethiopian higher education changing?", *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 23-29.
- Woodward, S. and Hendry, C. (2004), "Leading and coping with change", *Journal of Change Management*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 155-183.
- Yukl, G. and Mahsud, R. (2010), "Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential", *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, Vol. 2 No. 62, pp. 81-93.

#### Further reading

- Doz, Y.L. and Kosonen, M. (2010), "Embedding strategic agility", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 43, pp. 370-382.

Appendix 1

**Questionnaire for Academic Leaders and Academic Staffs**

*(This questionnaire was transcribed into local language-Amharic for administrative staffs and students)*

**Dear Respondents,**

The objective of this questionnaire is to assess the practice of organizational change and change management in the university. The information you provide is valuable for the successes of this research project. Therefore, your genuine response is highly appreciated. Please be honest and objective while filling the questionnaire. The information you give is used only for academic purpose and will be kept strictly confidential.

**Thank You in Advance for Your Cooperation!**

**General Directions:**

This questionnaire has two parts: Part I includes your personal information and Part II is about the practice of adaptive change and change management in the university.

**N.B**

Do not write your name

**Part I: Personal Information (Put "X" in the appropriate box)**

1. Sex: Male ..... Female .....

2. Age: ≤ 25..... 26-35 ..... 36-45..... 46-55 ..... ≥ 56.....

3. Academic Qualification/Highest Formal Education Attended:

Diploma ..... First Degree ..... Second Degree ..... PhD and Above .....

4. Present Post/position: .....

5. Number of Years of Service at Bahir Dar University:

≤ 5..... 6 - 10..... 11 - 15..... 16 - 20..... 21 - 25..... ≥ 26.....

6. College/Faculty/School you belongs to:

Social Science and Humanities.....	Dry land Agriculture .....
Natural and Computational Science.....	Veterinary Medicine.....
Engineering and Technology.....	Business and Economics.....
Health Science .....	Law.....

Others (please specify) .....

Part II: The following statements are about the change and change management in your university. Read each of the following items carefully and put "X" mark under the alternative that best expresses your feeling about the statement.

No	Description	Alternatives				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Partially Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	<b>How far do you agree with the following ideas of change and change management?</b>					
	1.1 Changes/reforms have to originate from the true needs of users/customers					
	1.2 Changes/reforms have to be based on critical investigation of deep-rooted & reoccurring problems					
	1.3 Problems should be seen as opportunities for change					
	1.4 Staffs need to collaborate to find solutions to problems					
	1.5 Change/reform has to challenge the status quo & change working culture fundamentally in a new way					
	1.6 Everyone should be leader of change regardless of position/sharing responsibility for change					
	1.7 Learning and experimentation are important in change					
	1.8 It is important to identify supporters and opponents of change/reform process to manage resistance					
	1.9 The character of the proposed changes and their implications must be understood by all participants					
1.10 It is necessary to discuss institutional problems openly regardless of their sensitivity						
2	<b>How often have the following ideas been practiced in change/reform process of the university?</b>	<b>Always</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Never</b>	
	2.1 Changes/reforms are originated from the true needs of users and customers					
	2.2 Changes in the university are made after critical investigation of deep-rooted and reoccurring problems in the university					
	2.3 Organizational challenges/problems are discussed openly regardless of their sensitivity					
	2.4 Organizational problems in the university are used as opportunities for future progress or change					
	2.5 Staffs work collaboratively to find creative solutions to organizational problems					
	2.6 Changes/reforms implemented in the university require a fundamental change in peoples working culture/need learning new ways					
	2.7 Everyone in the university is empowered to be a leader of change regardless of position					
	2.8 There is learning and experimentation along with changes					
	2.9 Change agents in the university review current value, supporters & opponents of the proposed change initiative					
2.10 There is clear communication with all stakeholders about the change						

3	How high are the following challenges in the change/reform initiatives of the university?	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
4.1	Staffs unwillingness to accept changes that can change the fundamental working culture					
4.2	Poor readiness & commitment of leaders for institutional change					
4.3	Poor communication strategy to introduce all stakeholders about the institutional change					
4.4	Lack of planning and preparation for change					
4.5	Lack of clear vision in change programmes					
4.6	The failure legacy of previous change effort					
4.7	Problems related to facilitation and training support to build staffs confidence and competence					
4.8	Using coercion and unilateral action to facilitate change					
4.9	Resource limitation to facilitate institutional changes					
4.10	Lack of followers involvement in decision making					

Interview Guide for Academic Leaders and Academic staffs (*This guide was transcribed into local language-Amharic for administrative staffs and students*)

This interview questions are prepared to find out practices regarding change and change management in the university

Dear Interviewee, I really appreciate your willingness to give me this interviewee. In our dialogue, I would like you to share me the institutional change and change management practices in your university. Please be free to forward your feelings about the issue. I affirm you that the information you are providing will be used for academic purpose only and will be kept strictly confidential:

1. Do you think your university is being changed? In what way? How are changes being made?
2. In your opinion who initiate change in your institution?
3. How far are change initiatives successful in the university? If yes, why? If no, why?
4. What are the problems/challenges in the institutional change process?
5. How do you and other staffs perceive problems and the need to create change in the university? Are there mechanisms to understand the fundamental problems of the institution? If yes, how? If no, why?
6. Are there practices in the institution to collaborate and generate ideas to solve the root problems of the institution? If yes, how? If no, why?
7. What do you think are the role of leaders at different positions in leading systemic changes in the university?
8. What ideas do you recommend in relation to facilitating effective organizational changes in the university?

I am happy by the time we have together. I thank you very much for the interview we had.

### Corresponding author

Girma Shimelis Muluneh can be contacted at: [girmashimelis@gmail.com](mailto:girmashimelis@gmail.com)

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

[www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm)

Or contact us for further details: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)