

https://dspace.org/

Educational leadership and the management of change in higher education : implication of module-based teaching and learning at National University of Rwanda.

Nkurikiyumukiza, Phocas

2012-02-10
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/11276

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Education Leadership and Management

Educational Leadership and the Management of Change in Higher Education: Implementation of Module-Based Teaching and Learning at National University of Rwanda

Research Report Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Award of the Degree of Master of Education in Education Leadership and Management

By Phocas NKURIKIYUMUKIZA

Supervisor: Dr. James Stiles

Johannesburg, October 2010

Declaration

I, Phocas NKURIKIYUMUKIZA, declare that this research report is my own original work. It has never been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other university. I am submitting it for the degree of Master of Education in Education Leadership and Management at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Signed ……

October, 2010

Dedication

This research as well as this degree are dedicated to my family: spouse and children. God bless those who we have the great luck to have them alive. For their eternal and unconditional support; for having kept and formed the highest expectations of me. Thanks for everything. I love you.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the help and support from all persons who significantly contributed to the completion of this work. May they find in whatever success is granted to this research the reward for their contributions of different kinds.

First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to **Dr. James Stiles**, my supervisor, who, kindly accepted to supervise this work. I wholeheartedly thank him for his invaluable guiding, encouragement and motivational support which enabled me to complete this report.

Then I am greatly indebted to all the lecturers in the ELPS department of the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand for having enlightened my intellectual journey.

My deep thanks go to all the Deans, HoDs and lecturers at the National University of Rwanda, who participated in this research, and whose names cannot be mentioned here for ethical reasons. But especially to Dr. Etienne Serupiya who accompanied me along my data collection I express my deep gratitude. With them I hope that this research report will contribute to improve innovative academic practices for student outcome achievement.

Special thanks are conveyed to my family for accepting my absence from home as a necessary step forward in our lives. Without their unconditional love and moral support, I could not have undertaken this step. Last but not least, I wish to thank all my friends and colleagues students at the University of the Witwatersrand in South Africa, particularly the 2009 cohort of Rwandan students at Wits School of Education for supporting me all the way long.

I am extremely grateful and may the Almighty God richly bless you all.

Abbreviations

MBTL	: Module-Based Teaching and Learning
NCHE	: National Council of Higher Education
HEI	: Higher Education Institution
NUR	: National University of Rwanda
HEP	: Higher Education Policy
HoD	: Head of Department
DQA	: Director of Quality Assurance
VRAC	: Vice-Rector of Academic Affairs

Abstract

On the assumption that leadership involves individuals with distinct qualities who take much ingenuity, energy and skills to trigger greater capacity in the organization for moving people towards organizational vision and goal achievement, the aim of this study is to identify and describe the leadership shown by managers and lecturers for the successful implementation of academic programme change at National University of Rwanda. That includes investigating the improvement of academic practice in the higher education institution while implementing change, i.e. introduction of the Module-Based Teaching and Learning (MBTL) methodology which is a new approach to schooling, as well as defining an appropriate leadership style needed for the management of this implementation.

The research was carried out at National University of Rwanda as a case study and supported by the aid of interviews with faculty managers and lecturers as they are the main developers and users of teaching and learning programmes. Next, data collected were complemented by means of textual analysis. The findings revealed that the MBTL introduced at NUR as an innovation in academic practice was a top-down decision made by the policy makers without consultation with academic staffs and implemented without adequate preparation whereas they are the main actors in the implementation. Coupled with the change in the language of instruction from French to English and the lack of educational material required by the MBTL approach, the situation had an unenthusiastic impact on the engagement of NUR academics for accurate successful implementation.

The overall conclusion is that inadequate management of the introduction of an educational change programme leads to misadoption and reluctance at best and resistance by the implementers at worst.

Key terms: higher education, educational leadership, change management, Module-based teaching and learning, academic improvement, student outcome achievement, curriculum reform, innovation, academic culture.

Table of content

Declaration ii
Dedication iii
Acknowledgements iv
Abbreviations v
Abstract vi
Table of content vii
Chapter 1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION 1
1.1. Introduction 1
1.2. Context of the study and Problem statement 3
1.3. Research questions 8
1.4. Research aims and rationale 9
1.5. Structure of study 10
Chapter 2. LITERATURE REVIEW 12
2.1. Introduction 12
2.2. Characteristics of Higher Education Institutions (HEI) 13
2.3. Conceptual framework 16
2.3.1. Educational leadership 17
2.3.2. Managing educational change 23
2.3.3. Higher Education institutions' culture 28
Chapter 3. METHODOLOGY 34
3.1. Qualitative research 34
3.2. Data collection process 34
3.2.1. Interview method 35
3.2.2. Interviewee selection 36
3.2.3. Interview guide 37
3.2.4. Ethical considerations 37
3.2.5. Documents analysis 38
3.3. Data analysis 38
3.4. Trustworthiness and credibility 39
3.5. Limitations 40
Chapter 4. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 41
4.1. Introduction 41

4.2. About participants 41
4.3. Coding and categorization of data 42
4.4. Data analysis 43
4.4.1. Educational change management 44
4.4.2. Educational leadership 66
4.4.3. Higher Education teaching and learning culture 77
4.5. Discussion of findings 82
4.6. Conclusion 85
Chapter 5. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS 87
References 91
Appendix 98

Chapter 1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Change in education, especially higher education, has been a paramount objective for Rwanda following the problems resulting from the genocide of 1994 which nearly destroyed the country, particularly the national elite. For that reason, Rwandan Higher Education has to deal with heavy demand for higher standards of students. These include the setting of a general goal in order to build a functional education system able to provide a national workforce with skilled and educated workers, and deliver research, innovation, and knowledge transfer to support social and economic development[1]. In response to these national imperatives, Rwandan Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are expected to innovate and improve their educational system. Yet, to improve the quality of education often requires a consistent restructuring of the educational organisation.

Further, the policy of the Rwandan National Council of Higher Education has linked the emergence of quality higher education with a new approach that is focusing on student outcomes and achievement. In other words, it advocates for an approach moving from the traditional wide and deep knowledge base covering the entire possible syllabus which had been in practice in Rwandan HEIs, especially in the National University of Rwanda (NUR), to a more limited syllabus which focuses on what knowledge students can gain and how they can demonstrate it with what they have learned. This approach requires the students to take a higher degree of responsibility for themselves and their learning and stress is put on practical actions rather than being confined to theoretical findings. Therefore, the general purpose is to build a higher education system able to provide the country with citizens capable of imagination, creativity and talents that should enhance economic strength and social harmony.

This approach requires HEIs to define a clear educational vision by identifying key factors constituting strategies to successfully change academic practices, i.e. stating how suitably the institution accomplishes its mission, identifies areas for improvement, develops its

[1] Higher Education Policy, 2007, p. 5

plans to reform academic curricular structure, and implements the plans or new programs effectively and efficiently. Further in order to be effective, this reform must be managed by appropriate academic staff characterised by an enlightened educational leadership committed to achieve the HEI's goals. Particularly, lecturers, researchers, academic leaders, administrators, and students must work together for the success of this endeavour.

But a review of the literature on higher education innovation approaches, hints at two main issues: first that many reforms targeting the best practices of teaching and learning fail to produce significant improvements because of fundamental characteristics of HEI (Van Vught, 1989). Actually, despite good ideas, good intentions about improved teaching and learning, substantial funds and even more political support (Berman & Mclaughlin,1974), changes introduced in education have not often achieved the expected results.

The second comment relates to the ways an education system is managed in order to achieve the new goals. This has been a subject of great debate amongst educational researchers since the early 1980s. It was of high importance to make people realise the need to change and rethink the importance of the change. Developing academic improvement requires changes in the way students learn, teachers teach and institutions are run (Hopkins, 2006). So care must be taken by all of the community to build the capacity of all educators and to provide adequate time for designing, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of not only the curriculum but also all the management of academic organization.

This research, conducted by a current member of the academic staff on study leave, wants to contribute to the literature on management of educational change, such as that introduced at the National University of Rwanda. The aim is to analyse the commitment in terms of academic staff leadership to the implementation of Module-Based Teaching and Learning (MBTL) method at the National University of Rwanda, in order to gain insight into how a programme of change has been developed and implemented in a higher education institution and to analyse possible obstacles against the implementation of MBTL.

1.2. Context of the study and problem statement

Rwanda is a country without sufficient natural resources to provide economic stability; it relies mainly on its population for its development in all sectors of national life. This is one of the reasons why so much emphasis is put on the area of education. Consequently, change in education, especially higher education, has been a paramount objective, after problems related to the four years of conflict that culminated with the genocide which occurred in 1994. After the genocide was stopped by the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), the new government was challenged by the big problem of reconstructing the country from practically zero. Therefore, the Rwanda National Council of Higher Education (NCHE) has targeted providing the country with a capable graduate workforce as one major strategy for achieving this mission[2].

The government has put the focus on HEIs because they have characteristics fitting with that vision. Actually, their mission is to be "creative in producing the necessary scientific and technological breakthroughs and educating professionals able to handle and organize innovations that will follow upon these breakthroughs" (Van Vught, 1998, p. 250).

In response to the government endeavour, the National University of Rwanda introduced a curriculum reform in 2008 with regard to its methods of teaching and learning. The new method is based on module teaching and learning approach which focuses academic activities on students' achievement rather than on a wide and deep knowledge base covering the entire possible syllabus[3]. The former teaching method was mainly didactic and a teacher-centred approach focusing on knowledge breadth. In this one way teaching transmission, lecturers themselves controlled and communicated the content of courses and did not take students' competences into account. With less attention to knowledge application or its transfer to practical life (Tyler, 1949), the assignments consisted of just what students knew and could reproduce.The NCHE (2007) observed that this method did not allow students to achieve standards enabling them to meet requirements of modern society, and the national needs. We read in *Destruction and Restoration: the organisation of higher education in Rwanda*, a reference document produced in 2007 by the Rwandan National Council of Higher Education, that "many graduates do not reach

[2] Rwanda Higher Education, 2007; p.2.
[3] Ibid, p.5.

the standard required of them – not in academic knowledge, but in the ability to apply the knowledge they have gained – in competence and academic and employability skills" (p. 2).

Subsequently, the NCHE recommended to Higher Education Institutions in Rwanda to move from a pure content delivery approach to an interactive and student-centred way of managing student learning. The NCHE adopted the Scottish Qualifications Framework model for the development of learning schemes as the one most compatible with the Rwandan 4-year degree[4], and introduced a new form of pedagogy based on a module system of teaching and learning. Instead of containing the only staff contact hours as were the former courses, the modules comprise also student learning hours, and are supposed to encourage the planning of student time so that it includes self-directed learning activities outside classes, as well as, time spent in classroom attendance (NCHE, 2007). But as Scott (2000) asserts, to just have a new idea, does not make it happen. Therefore, according to this author, to put a good idea into practice requires lecturers and authorities to be more accountable for its successful implementation through ways that suit the change and the context.

Scott emphasizes the crucial role of teachers and managers for the successful implementation of an educational reform. Actually, Van Driel, Nico Verloop, Van Werven & Hekkers` (1997) state that the failure of many innovation projects in education is always attributed to the failure of teachers to implement the innovation as properly required.

As suggested by these authors, the NCHE (2007) recommended to Rwandan Higher Education Institutions undertaking the reform, involving lecturers in devising new ways of working with students, to support skills and responsible auto-directed learning as well as knowledge transfer. Therefore, in introducing the MBTL the NUR was assumed to associate Deans, Heads of Departments (HoDs) and even lecturers in the planning of how the innovations were to be thoroughly introduced and adapted to their practice. On the contrary, in April of 2007, the MINEDUC called in a meeting at the national level the NUR Vice-Rector in charge of Academic Affairs (VRAC) together with other national HEI

[4] Ibid, p. 3

representatives and they developed several regulatory documents related to the programme of higher education reform in Rwanda (NCHE, 2007). Afterwards the NUR hastened to implement such a change programme without a suitable preparation.

Specifically, the NUR academic senate in its session of June 2007 adopted the programme change and appointed the VRAC and the Director of Quality Assurance (DQA)[5] to supervise the implementation. The NCHE planned to create a National Centre for Academic Practice and Quality Enhancement with a mission to supply and support academic staff development, but unfortunately, the reform at NUR was launched before the installation of the Centre was set up. The DQA assembled Deans and HoDs and explained to them the principles of the reform and asked them to be ready to start the implementation during the 2008 academic year. Subsequently, he organised a short seminar intending to show HoDs how to help lecturers to construct modules. Lecturers were required to construct their modules from the current curricula, keeping in mind that the new structures were to be implemented during the 2008 academic year in accordance with the programme reform recommended by the NCHE.

We need to keep in mind that the former university teaching and learning system was characterized by concentrated face to face lectures. The programme included short courses divided into a certain number of credits (generally between 2 and 6 of 15 teaching hours each). Courses were intensely taught and assessed through examinations. Students had to manage a time for their extra reading, documentation or research. Very often that time was not enough given the great number of short courses they had to complete during the academic year. Because of these time constraints, during the examinations, instead of demonstrating their intellectual performance, students often merely reproduced what their lecturers had said in class or what they read from their handbooks. It is necessary to note that students could take a long time before sitting for examinations which often resulted in their failure. Moreover, students who were taught by expatriate visiting staff who normally had a short-term stay at NUR, were evaluated directly after the course without being given time to review and master the content.

[5] The newly appointed DQA in charge of leading the implementation of MBTL at NUR was Pr Roger Sapsford. His wife Pamela Abbott was also charged of NCHE. Both went from UK through the educational cooperation framework with Rwanda. They were accused by NUR academic staff of having whatever imposed the MBTL in Rwanda without any preparation and convinced the MINEDUC to adopt it.

In the new method, there is a "new way to do things" (Stoll, 2007). It is not a radical change of NUR educational curriculum content, but rather a restructuring and revision of teaching and learning methodology in accordance with the new vision of National Council of Higher Education. The general direction focuses on what students can autonomously do with what they have learned. Lecturers had to restructure their former courses into modules. These modules which are the basic elements of degree programmes, are not defined in terms of lecturers' contact hours with students, but rather on student learning hours, with one credit set at 10 notional student learning hours, and a typical module set at 200 student hours. Instead of having 15 to 18 short courses in a programme, lecturers had to construct them in 6 to 8 modules of a maximum of 20 credits each[6].

A module may be spread over a whole semester and taught on the principle of team teaching with a coordinator team leader, whereas in the former system each lecturer had his courses to manage on his own. The module design comprises a bigger proportion of students' hours than those reserved to lecturers' hours. This is to allow students to plan their time so as to include learning activities outside classes as well as lecture attendance.

In the former method, the lecturer was asked to design his course giving only the teaching objectives and an abstract or a handbook of the course content. With the new method, he is now required to outline the learning objectives as well as the learning outcomes in terms of the knowledge students are expected to gain, the abilities to acquire, and the cognitive and other transferable skills they will demonstrate at the end of the module. Strategies for assessment also had to be planned for and set in advance in order to help students get acquainted with the new learning pattern (autonomy, responsibility, and capability to work with others). The structure requires moving from a significant face-to-face teaching method to one which emphasizes student self-directed activities.

The following table shows the comparison between the former system and the module based teaching and learning at NUR.

[6] Rwandan National Qualification Framework for Higher Education.

Table 1: **Former and new teaching and learning methods at NUR**

Characteristics	**Former system**	**Module-based system**
Focus	Lecturer delivery	Student acquisition
Methodology	-Didactic (transmission) -More face-to-face teaching	-Engaged (changing mind) -more student self-directed activities
Duration	-Concentrated teaching -1 credit= 15 teaching hours -course = 3-4 credits	-Modules spread over a semester - 1 credit = 10 student hours - module = 20 credits
Pacing	- Hours	Weeks
Assessment	Reproduction	Demonstration
Course description	Objectives Indication of content Assessment strategies	Objectives Indication of content Learning outcomes Transferrable skills Teaching/learning strategies Assessment strategies
Course management	Course per lecturer Course as isolated unit	Module team teaching Integration of sub-topics

Column two in table 1, clearly demonstrates how the new system moves the focus away from teacher transmission of content to a student-centred demonstration of learning. This change represents a significant redirection of the educational enterprise.

It was a huge task lecturers were asked to accomplish in a short time without thorough preparation. Understandably, they were confused. They have been kept away from both conception and design of the programme of reform, despite their being the key actors of its implementation (Van Driel et al, 1997). Consequently, when one considers the several warnings and memos from NUR officials in charge of academic curriculum execution, about the multiple delays in the submission of module designs and related documents (booklet outline, assessment strategies, etc), lecturers seemed to flounder in their application of the innovations. Not only were they asked to redesign the syllabus from the former pattern to module templates provided by NUR officials, but also to deliver the content according to the new approach. The middle managers (so called by Bush et al., 2009) at the level of Faculties, Departments, programme leaders and module leaders also seemed to be challenged by the situation.

The main reason for the confusion is that policy makers have failed to take into account the lecturers' professionalism and the culture of teaching and learning in which the innovation was embedded. Yet, a successful implementation of every programme change or reform requires an effective commitment of all role-players in the project (Tobin & Dawson, 1992). Therefore, we can ask whether all those education actors responsible for this curriculum change had enough leadership and guidance to carry out the implementation of the new method.

1.3. Research questions

Building on Rogers (1995), Kenny (2003) defines innovation as an "idea, practice or object that is perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption… If the idea seems new to the individual, it is an innovation" (p. 11). Indeed the NUR decided to implement the reforms recommended by the NCHE and took on innovations of its academic practice. But the decision to adopt change was made only at the top management levels, whereas a strategic change may have been shaped on a "shared vision agreed through a combination of top down and bottom up process" (Kenny; 2003, 11). Consequently, it is clear that the solely top down introduction of innovations in NUR teaching system should strongly affect the expected implementation.

The research conducted by a working member of the NUR staff on research leave, depicts attention to the likely impact of academic staff involvement in the NUR teaching and learning change process. The study conducted amongst the staff involved in a programme change should contribute to the literature on the management of a teaching and learning innovation and implementation. Specifically, the study investigates the lecturers' culture with regard to teaching and learning. The literature on educational change tells us that the established culture of a university usually does not change easily, and impacts on teaching practice. Therefore, if the educational organisation culture is not taken into account, a programme of innovation is unlikely to be successful (Van Driel et al, 1997).

Another theme on which the research focuses is the way the programme of change is managed at the level of middle management, i.e. the level of deans, heads of departments, programme and module leaders. On this point Kenny (2002) builds on

Laurillard (1997) and contends that innovative projects cannot be done effectively outside a certain organisational management process**.** Because of the non-hierarchical nature of universities**,** higher education projects involving innovation require more open management processes and a higher commitment from academic managers and professional staff. Furthermore, Hopkins et al. (2003) argue that a programme of innovation will not easily succeed if the staffs are not associated with its development from conception to implementation. Hargreaves (2002) concludes that once teachers have participated in the development of programme reform, they will be highly motivated to apply it.

Finally the study tries to investigate the instructional leadership of the main players of the implementation of the Module-Based Teaching and Learning at the NUR. Indeed, here leadership refers not only to power positions but to the engagement of people in working towards a successful implementation of the programme change (Astin & Astin, 2000).

Therefore the study tries to answer this main question: How did the managers and teachers of NUR implement the new module-based teaching and learning methodology at the NUR? The purpose of this question is to establish how successful the implementation of the new methodology is being conducted at NUR from the perspective of various stakeholders. This aim should be reached by answering these sub-questions.

Sub-questions:

- How has the former system of teaching and learning influenced the introduction of Module-Based Teaching and Learning at NUR?
- What was the preparation of the NUR lecturers for the implementation of the Module-Based Teaching and Learning?
- What is the commitment of NUR managers and lecturers to successful implementation of the Module-Based Teaching and Learning system?

1.4. Research aims and rationale

In order to understand the key role of NUR lecturers with respect to educational change at NUR, the study aims at analyzing the commitment in terms of leadership of NUR managers and teachers to the implementation of Module-Based Teaching and Learning

methodology at the National University of Rwanda. The focus is put on three elements: the NUR culture of teaching and learning, the management of educational change, and academics' leadership since they are the key actors for successful implementation of educational innovation whose purpose is to increase student achievement as recommended by the National Council of Higher Education through the National Learning and Teaching Policy.

Sub-aims:

- To get an insight about how a programme of change has been developed and implemented in a higher education institution;
- To analyse possible obstacles to the implementation of the Module-Based Teaching and Learning.

The analysis in this study highlights the influence of management style and educational change philosophy on the culture of teaching and learning at NUR as a higher education institution through its effect on academic staff attitudes. The focus on this point sheds light on issues which arose during the implementation of the new teaching methodology and the management of educational change (Littledyke, 1997). And relating the findings to relevant literature and theory, it discusses possible ways for the organisation to develop a good and effective management as well as desirable management practices of educational change.

1.5. Structure of study

This study is organised in five chapters: the first chapter introduces the research report by outlining the background of the study and problem statement and describing what the research question and rationale are. The second chapter aims to review the theoretical foundation upon which the research is based by reviewing the relevant literature. The third chapter is related to the methodology used in this study. It describes the analytical framework and research procedures used to collect and analyze data in order to solve the research question. The fourth chapter shows how the data discussion is organised. It presents and tries to interpret the findings on each question linked to a specific theme related to educational leadership and change management in higher education institution.

The fifth and last chapter is the conclusion of the research report. It summarizes the aim of the study, provides an overview of the chapters and shows the contribution of the present study to the improvement of educational change management in higher education, especially at National University of Rwanda.

Chapter 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

Many authors have written on the management of educational change with the objective of student outcomes achievement. This study attempts to put forward a contribution to the adequate management of the implementation of the module teaching and learning system which is an innovation in teaching and learning system in application at the National University of Rwanda.

Innovation and change is a successful theme in the current language of educational systems. Actually, many demands are made on teaching organizations for higher standards of students, and academic leaders are expected to innovate and improve. Rwandan Higher Education Policy stipulates that higher education is a fundamental tool for development, thus it needs to be strong and vibrant to meet the incremental demands "for skilled and educated workers, and deliver research, innovation, and knowledge transfer to support social and economic development"[7]. At this particular juncture, the call for effective instructional practices creates a greater need to redefine the way to carry out academic curriculum management. Indeed, the quality education improvement often requires a consistent restructuring of the learning organization, as well as effective leadership.

Hargreaves (2002) is one among other authors to claim that the approach to quality education requires educators to define a clear educational vision by identifying key factors constituting strategies to change teaching and learning practices successfully, i.e. stating how suitably the institution is accomplishing its mission, is identifying areas for improvement, is developing its plans to reform academic curricular structure, and is implementing innovations effectively and efficiently. Further, Fullan (2003) argues that the reform in order to be effective must be monitored by an appropriate management plan, led by an enlightened leadership in order to achieve the educational goals.

The challenge is for an organization to make people realise the need to change and rethink the importance of the change. According to Hopkins (2006), improving education

[7] Higher Education Policy, 2007, p5.

requires change in the way students learn and teachers teach. So as Kenny (2003) asserts, care must be taken by stakeholders to build capacity for all educators and to fulfill requirements for initiation and implementation of educational change. Van Driel et al. (1997) clarify how research has been able to identify such practices with increasing precision and has also underscored the centrality of academic staff as instructional leader in promoting and implementing these practices.

Miles (1964) has given in his work the notions related to educational change (e.g. change, system, innovation, innovation in education, strategy…) Building on the Canadian context, Fullan (2005) not only gives the history of education management change but also addresses the problem of the desire for change. In the same way, other researchers like Kelly & Murphy (2008), and Scheerens (2005) tried to enhance student outcomes by focusing on teaching and learning process as well as strengthening the teaching institution's capacity for managing change in education. For that to occur, the change must be well reasoned and planned. Hopkins (2006) with his "approach to large scale for long term reform" demonstrates that every school can be a great school if it is empowered and curricula designed according to the needs of the society (Tyler, 1949).

It is in this line that the NUR decided to introduce in its educational system the Module-Based Teaching and Learning methodology. Through the National Teaching and Learning Policy was outlined the imperative to reform the former teaching and learning approach, because this was no more responsive to the needs of temporary Rwandan society. Nevertheless, one can ask now whether the NUR as an Institution of Higher Education, was empowered in terms of adequate material and trained academic staff to design and implement curriculum innovations in accordance with this imperative, or whether the managers as well as lecturers are endowed with enough leadership to carry out successfully this project. In this part of the study I present first the characteristics of higher education institutions which encourage successful programme of change, and secondly I develop some theories and review researches that informed this study.

2.2. Characteristics of Higher Education Institutions (HEI)

It is important to note with Davidoff and Lazarus (1997), that although educational institutions including higher education institutions are particular kinds of organizations

with particular goals, and ways of pursuing those goals, they also have features which are common to all organizations. Actually, in every organization, there are particular aspects or elements which make up that organization, and each of these needs to be functioning healthily for the whole to be healthy. Any unhealthy or malfunctioning element will have a negative ripple effect throughout the institution.

According to researchers (among others Van Vught, 1989; Andrews et al., 1998), HEI should be the kind of organizations that easily offer opportunity to change. The reason given by Van Vught (1989, 258) is the fact that they represent the authority of the professional experts which can be hardly contradicted and whose "fundamental activity is the handling of knowledge". Actually, universities are provided with academic experts so that all fields of knowledge are represented by specialists who take decisions with authority.

Andrews et al. (1998) state that the particular characteristic of Higher Education Institutions takes shape on their purposes and mission. Scott (2004) argues that these include the education of appropriately qualified people to enable them to take a leadership role in the intellectual, cultural, economic and social development of the nation, the creation and advancement of knowledge and the application of knowledge and discoveries of the betterment of society. Further, drawing from Argyris (2001), Celinšek & Markič (2008) point that HEIs are the kind of learning organizations that are endowed with adaptability, flexibility, avoidance of stability traps, propensity to experiment, readiness to rethink means and ends, inquiry orientation, realization of human potential for learning in the service of organizational purposes, and creation of organizational settings as context for human development.

Another important characteristic drawn by Van Vught (1989) is the organizational principle that Higher Education Institutions are organized in somewhat autonomous cells so that central knowledge-oriented activities take place. In general, universities have considerable freedom to determine their own policies and priorities in a wide range of activities. In fact such autonomy is particularly spread to setting academic structures and course content and the employment of academic staff. Specialists in specific knowledge fields, group together in order to teach and undertake research and they use their autonomy to perform the basic activities of the HEI.

Enhancing Andrews et al.'s (1998) argument, Van Vught (1989) describes a decision-making power as a further fundamental characteristic of HEI. He argues that higher education is like a federal system in which departments, faculties and schools work as if they were autonomous sovereign states since they "pursue self-interests and stand over against the authority of the whole"(p. 259).

Therefore, this situation makes particular the distribution of authority in HEI. The authority is practically located at the low levels of the institution so that institutional administrators have limited capacity to steer the whole organization. So when decisions have not been deliberated and diffused properly, they cannot be easily applied (Kenny, 2003). Van Vught (1989) concludes that HEI are known to cherish traditional norms and values.

But on the other hand, central authorities commonly have control over certain other features of higher education, in particular, defining national vision or goals, borrowing funds or setting tuition fees (OECD, 2003). In his work, Kerr (1987) contends that in spite of HEIs are endowed with adaptability and flexibility, their professional autonomy and limited administrative authority make them difficult to control. So that setting up innovations becomes problematic.

In fact, building on Bok (1986), Van Vught (1989) asserts that fundamental characteristics of HEI put them in a contradictory situation:

> "Universities are large, decentralised, informal organisations with little hierarchical authority over teaching and research. These characteristics favour innovation by making it easy for any of a large number of faculty members to experiment in search of better ways of educating students. Unfortunately, the very factors that aid experimentation make it harder for successful initiatives to spread throughout the institution or from one institution to another" (p. 261).

From that point of view, the successful implementation of innovations will depend on its usefulness to the staff. Unless they are judged worthwhile for the faculty member's own activities**,** innovations would be difficult to adopt. Hopefully, building on Clark, Van Vught (1989) contends that innovations in higher education will mainly take place by incremental adjustments and building up to larger flows of change. But also a solution to this sticky problem may be given by an adjustment of management found in Senge's (2006) idea of developing systemic thinking (which requires special skills for all staffs),

adjusting various mental models, shared vision, and development and practice of team learning. Otherwise the solution will occur by negotiation as pointed by Van Vught (1989) quoting Becher & Kogan (1980):

> "We are not dealing with a hierarchical system, where change can be decreed from above, but rather with a negotiative one, in which individuals, basic units and institutions each regard themselves as having the right to decide what is best for them. It follows that any innovative proposal has to be finally sanctioned by those who are in a position to put it into effect" (p. 121).

It is important to note at this point that the change programme at NUR was decided at the higher level of NCHE which the NUR was asked to apply. Yet fundamental characteristics of HEI, such as professional autonomy, limited administrative authority, and powerful organizational decentralization, make the control of these institutions difficult when it is to introduce change from outside. However, researchers are unanimous in saying that outside innovations, to be acceptable and successfully implemented, should be those staff judge fitting with their own activities and introduced by incremental adjustments of shared vision and linked with initiatives or opinions inside the HEI (Van Vught, 1989).

On the other hand, as a set of authorized professional experts in different fields of knowledge, ready to rethink means and ends of human development endows HEIs with adaptability and flexibility so that they would easily adopt innovative proposals which they choose (Owen & Demb, 2004). The important thing is to involve them in time but also to refer to their understanding of leadership (Van Driel et al., 1997).

2.3. Conceptual framework

This part provides current research findings regarding the role and effectiveness of academic staff in successful implementation of curriculum innovation in higher education. It focuses on three dimensions of the study: educational leadership, management of educational change and teaching and learning culture in which the innovations are imbedded.

As the study's main concern is educational leadership of different actors involved in the management of educational change at NUR, it is important to give an overview of the works of some of the leading researchers in the field of higher education management,

change, higher teaching and learning culture, and different models of higher educational leadership.

In the field of organisational behaviour and development, leadership (the notion of great contemporary interest in most developed countries) and management are two concepts that often conflict, although some authors go as far as saying that "the separation of management from leadership is dangerous" (Gosling and Mintzberg, 2004). But several researchers convene nowadays with little disagreement that they are slightly different. They consider leadership as a process for influencing decisions and guiding people towards vision achievement, whereas management involves the implementation and administration of institutional decisions and policies (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bush**,** 2008; Carnall, 2003; Fidler, 1997; Taylor & Machado, 2006; Scott, 2003).

2.3.1. Educational leadership

Most of the literature on change management in education consists of discussing the methodology of application and focuses on performing the management of change by strengthening the notion of leadership. Academic leadership is the key element of the successful academic activities because without active and innovative leaders in higher education, the autonomy agenda cannot work (Hopkins, 2006). This author goes to argue that it is about creating a vision for success and student's achievement, building the capacity for leadership and demonstrating commitment and morale of leadership.
Several researchers on educational change argue that school improvement depends, in a large part, on a genuine leadership (Bush, 2008; Rayners, 2008; Hopkins, 2006; Fullan, 2003; Slavin, 1994; Levin, 1993). According to Hopkins (2006), it is the leadership which enables systemic educational reform to be both generic in terms of overall strategy and specific in adapting to individual and particular situations. Further, Fullan (2003) adds that "the role of leadership is to trigger greater capacity in the organisation in order to get better".

Rayner (2008) and Bush (2008) analyse the transition from the traditional educational management characterised by a bureaucratic system to a transformational management focusing on leadership and they give the characteristics of this one as "people with distinct qualities, developing particular skills and framing leadership as a social activity

involving decision-making and moving people forward". This therefore supposes for leaders to be at the heart of the educational institution and act as an engine within it, i.e. to always focus on understanding, facilitating and evaluating the needs and goals of the organization in order to realise a preferred outcome and in any context. Thus, it is hopeful to achieve this objective by "the perfect scenario of the right person, at the right time, in the right situation, with the right followers" (Taylor and Machado, 2006).

On the other hand, many scholars like Rayner (2008), are convinced that in order to move towards its goals the educational institution needs an active leadership that "takes much ingenuity, energy and skills while managing and is maintaining efficiently and effectively current [educational] organisational arrangement" (Bush, 2008). It is in this way that for a better improvement, leadership is required to be more accountable, i.e. to be aware of institution obligation to society, since it is the key element responding to community concerns and at the same time proactively being the school reporter (Lashway, 2000).

From Levin's (1993) analysis, functioning educational institutions are likely to be more successful in achieving in-depth learning when leaders work with staff and the community to build a collective educational vision that is clear, compelling, and connected to teaching and learning. This idea is enhanced also by Hopkins (2006) who contends that "a vision of education … is shared and owned well beyond individual [campus] gates". This collective vision helps focus attention on what is important, motivates staff and students, and increases the sense of shared responsibility for student achievement.

Thus it would be easy for academic leaders assisted by all staffs to undertake successfully the academic reform as needed to achieve educational goals. For example, Levin (1993) suggests that leaders can work with a staff-based management team to identify needs or changes in organization to support attainment of students' achievement. It is also with the active assistance of all the staff that managers can come over the sticky problem of getting availability of resources, planning nature of incentives and disincentives, establishing academic goals and priorities; brief, launching the programme of innovation (Fullan, 2003).

But the introduction of change requires leaders to be confident and strong. Here strong does not mean dictatorial in the bureaucratic system but in the sense of being efficient, dynamic and geared to progress. Actually writers affirm that quality education improvement needs leaders who believe that all students can learn and that their organizations must make a difference between success and failure (Hopkins, Ainscow &West; 1994). This is illustrated by Hopkins (2006, 42): "The roles and activities of leadership flow from the expertise required for learning and improvement, not from formal dictates of the institution". For that reason they must be opened to moving forward "through front-line innovation and closing the gap between the least and most effective schools through transferred innovation" (Hopkins, 2006; 43). In other words, leaders are persons who bravely take decisions to seek out innovative curricular programmes, set expectations for their quality through the use of standards and guidelines, observe these, and adopt them.

Viewed from Hopkins (2006) point, leadership is linked with change for improvement and consequently is a process that is ultimately concerned with fostering innovation and implies a process where there is movement – from wherever we are now to some future condition that is different.

Consistent with the notion that leadership is concerned with educational change, a "leader" is basically considered by Astin et al. (2000) as a change agent, i.e., "one who fosters change." Leaders, then, are not necessarily those who merely hold formal power positions, but as drawn from Rayner (2008), all people are potential leaders.

Astin et al. (2000) assume that effective leadership may be considered from two dimensions: as group process and as individuals who work together within the group in order to foster change and transformation. They maintain that leadership involves principles and values for the group to function and qualities for individual members of the group to contribute efficiently to the effective functioning of their group.

1. Group qualities

A group that practices leadership shows a set of qualities contributing to cohesion and efficiency:

- Collaboration

As a group, leadership may demonstrate a will to work collaboratively. According to Astin et al. (2000), collaboration empowers each member individually, engenders trust and confidence within the group and moreover, enables growth of members' talents. In addition, according to Handy's (1984) research, the way in which the faculty is organized as a cluster is the best context which allows such a culture of collaboration. This includes the development of shared values and mission; the importance of trust between Deans and HoDs on one side and lecturers on the other side; the need for open access to information and constant feedback on decisions and performance; the flattening of management hierarchies; and the exercise of leadership at many levels of the organisation.

- Shared purpose

In order to achieve an educational improvement, it is important to have a common and total understanding of the learning organization goals and work towards their fulfillment. The "why" of innovation, "what" innovations to undertake and "how" to introduce change may have the common sense for the group. The efforts of everybody are interdependent frequently spanning boundaries for the attainment of the organization objectives. Moreover, Lashway (2000) contends that educational leaders must recognize and assume a shared responsibility not only for students' intellectual and educational development, but also for their personal, social, emotional, and physical development. The increasing needs for high standards in education places a premium on educational leaders who can create a vision of success for all students, and use their skills in communication, collaboration and community building to ensure that the vision becomes a reality.

- Disagreement with respect

Inside the same group it is quasi normal to have differences amongst different members. But for the best of the group, members must address them with mutual respect. Leadership thus knows how to use differences as a means of cohesion instead of division.

- Division of labour

For the best of the group functioning and aiming at common outcome achievement, each individual is aware of his responsibility and the value it makes in the overall effort. This is a quality much essential in the delivering of modules at the NUR since it is required by the team teaching methodology.

- A learning environment

Within the organization, leadership contributes to create an atmosphere of continuous development. “Members come to see the group as a place where they can not only learn about each other, themselves, and the leadership effort, but also acquire the shared knowledge, interpersonal competencies, and technical skills that the group will require to function effectively” (Astin & Astin, 2000; p. 12).

2. Individual qualities

Within the group, individuals may demonstrate some qualities contributing to their efficiency while acting towards improvement.

- Self-knowledge

This is a paramount requirement for an individual to integrate usefully into the organisation. One may be aware of personal weaknesses and strengths in order to participate actively to the common effort towards improvement. As Astin at al. (2000) assert, the self-knowledge enables individual awareness of fundamental motivations of seeking change and innovation.

- Authenticity and integrity

Everywhere and every time everybody must be aware of consistency of actions that are felt as being significant according to ones’ values and beliefs. He must also behave accordingly and constantly.

- Commitment

Astin et al. (2000) consider that a leader must demonstrate passion, intensity and persistence towards effort because these feelings are at the core of individual motivation

to any effort to success. So commitment is required to all individuals engaged in any change programme.

- Empathy/understanding others

This quality is the cornerstone of collaboration and team building in an organisation which deals with change programme. Astin et al. (2000) maintain that the capacity to put oneself in the person's place contributes to build mutual trust and resolve differences from group points of view.

- Competence

This quality as described by Astin et al. (2000) refers to knowledge, skills, and technical expertise that are required for successful project management. Astin et al. (2000) go on to say that all these qualities interact and are, therefore, mutually reinforcing. Each of them reinforces every other quality and consequently, the quality of any group leadership activity is enhanced.

Regarding the mission of HEI in general and academic staff in particular, Astin et al (2000) believe that their work will improve and they will be more accountable if they model these qualities in their daily activities. In a particular case of implementation of educational change, the above qualities will facilitate the management of the innovation project that the institution engages in. Enhancing this idea Kelly & Murphy (2007) claim that competent academic leadership may also be dynamic, optimistic, forward looking, supportive of academic endeavour, outcomes focused and concerned with change and development.

In addition, Celinšek & Markič (2008) develop another dimension of educational leadership which shows the leaders as responsible for creating a motivating environment. Drawn from a constructivist point of view, this approach considers leadership as promoting quality learning. Lecturers and leaders are considered as continually reconciling new ideas to gain more satisfactory explanations of classroom and academic change efforts. Responsible for student learning, thus the lecturer is perceived as really committed to student outcome achievement by providing working conditions that lead to

meeting the learning objectives: create motivating atmosphere and promote cooperative learning.

2.3.2. Managing educational change

This study is concerned with implementation of innovation in teaching and learning at National University of Rwanda. Specifically this part presents the theoretical grounds for good management of change programme in HEI. Many theories on management of educational change have been developed and to provide the context for the study I will develop Lewin, 1957 presented by Carnall (2003), Levin (1993), Kotter (1996) and Kenny (2003).

According to Celinšek & Markič (2008), nowadays higher education institutions are faced with rapidly changing circumstances and pressure to quickly move from problems to solutions. This meets the desire for Rwandan Government to make its Higher Education system a tool for its overall development (HEP, 2007). Therefore, innovation and implementing change has been welcome at NUR, especially in the area of teaching and learning, which is expected to respond to this government aspiration.

Stoll (2007) claims that change just means doing something habitual in a different way. Particularly in education, authors unanimously claim that the ultimate aim of change is to improve the achievement of students' outcomes. This approach requires educators to define a clear educational vision by identifying key factors constituting strategies to change academic practices successfully (Kenny, 2003).

The purpose is to see educators acquire more "accountability and responsibility to provide students higher achievement" (Creemers & Reezigt, 1997) and higher education become more effective. It is in that context the NUR has reformed its academic curriculum in order to take on innovation in its teaching and learning methods. The emphasis is put on problem solving and educational change; change in learning style, in teaching techniques and in managing teaching and learning.

In his "Every School a Great School", Hopkins (2006, 40) emphasizes also that "the improving quality of education aims to enhance student outcomes through focusing on

teaching-learning process as well as strengthening the school's capacity of managing change". Therefore, given that this approach implies high expectations for student achievement, institution and students' needs may be defined and gaps located. Here are four models on which NUR could build to developing successfully the implementation of its programme change.

2.3.2.1. Lewin's Model

Different steps of the student improvement process are developed by Carnall (2003). Drawing on Lewin (1957), he outlines three steps in the management of innovation project. The first one is to *unfreeze* institution structures, systems and attitudes. It includes the identification of the problem, and data collection and problem diagnosis. Specifically, data collection provides with baseline information about the institution history, data on students and staff, academic facilities… all information on which innovation may be planned. This will enable change managers to proceed to staff development, needed recruitments and promotions. By freezing structures and systems, the current practices are revised.

The second step and the big one, comes with *change*. It is the movement of action planning and implementation. By this step effective changes are developed, new patterns put in practice so as to achieve required position for change. The goals and vision can be redefined if necessary according to the evolution of the implementation. The third and last step is a *refreezing*. It relates the monitoring and stabilization of the new situation by evaluation of the institutionalization of the change, including outcomes, new recruitments and system of staff development. These basic principles are summarized below:

STEPS	**ACTIONS**
UNFREEZE	. Identify problem . Gather data . Problem diagnosis
CHANGE	. Action planning . Implementation
REFREEZING	. Follow up and stabilisation . Assessment of consequences . Learning from the process

Figure 1: Source: Carnall, 2003; 12

2.3.2.2. Levin's model.

Another model of managing change programme was developed by Levin (1993) and defined in four steps. The first step is a data collection like in Lewin's model. The second step is the development of school vision focusing on expectations of school as a whole but also in smaller components given that the school must work for students, staff and community. But on this point, Hopkins, Ainscow and West (1994) argue that individual goals and new specific school vision may be defined in advance (i.e. in the first step). By the third step, the new vision is compared to the baseline report and all the actions to be undertaken are specified in order to move from the present situation to the future vision. Changes to be introduced are also determined at this level. The fourth and last step relates to adoption and implementation of the program of change. The major priorities are defined, the level at which the change might be applied fixed and even the deadline of execution be determined (Levin; 1993), although the programme has to show the continually express expectations for improvement of teaching and learning.

Levin's (1993) model explains more clearly the difference between the phase of decision to change, the preparation of innovation and the implementation of change. However it does not show how to evaluate and to give a feedback (i.e. to learn) on the project. Another dimension introduced by Levin's (1993) work, is the involvement of staff in all the process, especially when setting the organizational new vision of education. In effect, Everard & Morris (1992) claim that the more staff are involved, the more they are enthusiastic to implement.

2.3.2.3. Kotter's Model

Kotter (1996) also developed a model of managing change. The model in eight steps is more concerned with companies than higher education institutions. But mutatis mutandis, managers of HEI can learn much from it.

1. **Creating urgency for change**: The first step is to convince people of the institution that the change is necessary for the improvement of outcomes. At the same time it should be communicated that the change is achievable without any detrimental effects.

2. **Build a team for the change**: By this step members of a committee in charge of the project within the organization will be appointed.
3. **Construct the vision**: The team establishes a simple vision and sets up a strategy, focusing on emotional and creative aspects necessary to drive service and efficiency.
4. **Communicate this vision**. In order for the vision to work it must be fully understood by the future users, which means that it is necessary for the leaders of the change group – the change managers according to Kenny (2003), to follow this vision.
5. **Empower the actors** to execute the change. It is still important to think of the way to remove obstacles, enable constructive feedback and lots of support from leaders - reward and recognise progress and achievements.
6. **Short term goals:** These aid the actors to accept the change by showing them progress. Positive reinforcement and to show how rewarding is essential in this step.
7. **Build on or consolidate improvement of Change.** The seventh step is about persistence because change should continue even after short term goals are met or the original plan for change fails.
8. **Fasten the innovations**. The final step is to make the change permanent by fitting it into the culture and practices in use.

Carnall (2003) contends that Kotter's (1996) model is good in the sense that it may be easy to understand and consequently to apply. Further it does not focus on the change itself, but rather on the acceptance and readiness for the innovation, which makes it an easier transition. On the other hand, it can be reproached to be a top-down model that does not allow any aside initiative (Scott, 2003). Thus it can lead to deep frustrations if individual contributions are not taken into account especially in Higher education. Further, it is linear which means that steps cannot be skipped otherwise the change process will completely fail.

2.3.2.4. Kenny's Model

The model of managing educational change specifically developed about higher education remains that drawn by Kenny (2003). The pattern includes five stages divided into two sub-processes: a sub-process of initiation with two stages and a sub-process of implementation with three stages.

a. **Initiation**: by this phase, directions and priorities of the project of reform are set up:

- Agenda setting is the step of launching the process of change. It is the moment of gathering all data about strengths and weaknesses of current situation of the institution. Vision and goals are stated; directions and priorities are also decided.
- Matching is the phase in which solutions are identified to meet the organization needs and their feasibility is tested.

b. **Implementation**: this means that the process of change has reached its application. Here it is important to note that Kenny (2003) drawing on Rogers (1995), introduces the notion of an innovation leader within the higher levels of the institution. The sub-process consists of three phases:

- Redefining/restructuring: Kenny (2003) points the mutual adjustment of innovation and organization structures trying to accommodate each other once the implementation is started.

- Clarifying: As long as the innovations are being applied, the meaning becomes clearer and people come to understand better.

- Routinising: It is the last step when the innovation becomes a part of daily activities of the institution.

This is the model suggested by Kenny (2003) indeed, as Scott (2003) asserts good intentions are not enough. These must be supported. Hopkins (2006) draws educational drivers which, if pursued appropriately, may lead a programme change towards achievement. These are (1) personalised learning which is the tailoring of teaching practice together with the curriculum and learning support to meet the needs and aspirations of students individually; (2) professionalized teaching which requires teachers to continually shape their knowledge to new methods, to relate teaching strategies to standards and connect to students' realities; (3) networking and innovation is a strategy of improving school by connecting schools in order to enhance collaborative and further more competitive school activities; and (4) intelligent accountability which requires schools to be more responsible towards the community. There is a worth guideline of both internal and external principles of academic evaluation in order to give a positive response to educational requirements.

Strengthening the argument, Fullan (2005) points out implications of implementation of innovation. He suggests that effective management of change depends on the three **R**s:

- **R**elevance of the improvement of innovation in terms of needs, quality, practicality, clarity and complexity;
- **R**eadiness of staff to become involved; and
- **R**esource and support availability including time.

And Carnall (2003, pp.22-23) outlines the requirements for change implementation as

- "that we build an awareness of the need for change;
- that the case for changes is made convincingly and credibly;
- that the process of change is a learning process – you don't get everything right initially;
- that dramatic changes can feel chaotic and uncertain as people seek to come to terms with new skills etc.;
- that attention must be given to broadening and mobilising support for change, whether through task forces and project teams, through the use of incentive systems and training, through pilot schemes and so on;
- crystallizing the vision and goal for the organisation but not necessarily – at the outset. Indeed initially, the vision may be very broad, and much has to be learned before an emerging strategic vision can be articulated;
- that the focus is on people and on the process of change."

2.3.3. Higher Education institutions' culture.

Another point drawn from the literature on management of educational change is the importance given to the teaching organizational culture. According to Kotter (1996) culture refers to norms of behaviour and shared values among a group of people. Thus, history, structure, and tradition of the institution, are the elements that are very important for the implementation of programme change in educational organizations. Lumby & Foskett (2008) argue that every educational institution has its culture, derived from the context in which it operates and the values of its members over time. This culture is revealed:

a) conceptually, through the ideas that are valued and promoted;
b) verbally, through the language, terminology and discourses in use;
c) behaviourally, through the activities, social interactions and rituals that occur;
d) visually, through the designs and styles adopted by the organisation in its physical and material components.

On their part, Sarason (1994), and Handy and Aitkon (1984) have explained what culture is in a teaching and learning organization, and Hargreaves (2002) said that the motive of exploring one's own culture in education is to enhance effectiveness or as an element of a programme of student improvement. It means that the organisation may have a certain vision for its future and how the culture must change to support the accomplishment of that vision. Once the current organisational culture is understood, the institution must then, decide what the organizational culture should look like to support success. There, successful implementation of innovations depends on sustained efforts to deal with existing culture while aiming at changing teaching and learning conditions and other related internal dispositions. Still the key factor in educational change remains undoubtedly the teachers.

2.3.3.1. HEI Teachers' culture

What Van Driel et al. (1997) call teachers' knowledge is nothing less than the culture they live within the higher educational institution. Actually, as they assert, many programs of change failed because developers failed to take into account the teachers, the students, and especially, the culture in which the innovation is embedded. In effect, over years people living together in an organization establish so solid interactions between themselves and the whole environmental context so that willing to move on this relation feel like rolling rocks uphill. Van Driel et al. (1997) assume that those beliefs, values and behaviours, both explicit and implicit, have to be taken into account during the process of development and implementation of innovation.

Van Driel et al. (1997) outline three major components of learning organisation culture which are of particular interest in the context of curriculum change as it is the concern of this study:

1. Teachers' past experiences

Over years, the organisation culture has acquired forms that have longevity by their nature such as behaviours and beliefs that reaffirm the organisation's core ideologies, values and norms. It is those forms of culture that may guide decisions on academic practice.

2. Current teaching situation

The current situation imposes constraints on action lecturers have to take on. The expectations of all stakeholders and the dictates of the programme change both direct and restrict the appropriate behaviour to be considered. Kenny (2003) outlines four key issues on lecturers' current practices to be addressed while implementing innovations:

- Interaction between academics and peers, their adaptation to change and development of professional expertise. These elements are crucial for the success of educational change and innovation projects;

- The lecturers' autonomy is very important. Traditionally the independent nature of academics' work makes them critical towards change. So, it will influence significantly the ultimate outcomes of the educational innovation;

- Time: Teachers and staff need time to understand, interpret, contextualize and adopt change; especially when innovation implies change in teaching practices it involves considerable time and support.

- Teachers' involvement: The teachers' professionalism may be taken into account during the whole agenda of educational change, especially at the level of implementation because as practitioners they have to interpret the innovations.

3. Vision of the future teaching situation

When there is discordance between the vision and teaching practice, or when the vision has not been explained enough, lecturers are confronted with painful dilemmas. Obviously, such a dilemma may also arise when changes in teaching practice are proposed which contradict lecturers' vision of the ideal. This is stressed by Van Vught (1989, 261) who claims that "innovation takes place only by virtue of the professional belief that certain innovations are worthwhile. Faculty members will only adopt

innovations when they judge them to be worthwhile for their own activities**".** He goes on to say that academic professionals are basically resistant to comprehensive changes, especially when these are launched from above. An innovative idea may be accepted on intellectual grounds, but face severe difficulty if it appears not to fit the current practice, or to conflict with some existing behaviours**.** The ideal should be communication and debate on the project. Change initiators have to correctly analyse the existing culture, and evaluate it against the cultural attributes needed to achieve strategic objectives and forward a productive change.

2.3.3.2. Resistance to change

Common knowledge considers resistance to change as action taken by individuals or groups when they perceive that the occurring change constitutes a threat to them. Particularly, as Garrison & Kanuka (2004, 102) remind, "higher education institutions, especially universities, are notorious resisters to change". Researchers (Van Driel et al., 1997; Van Vught, 1989; Everard & Morris, 1992) convene that resistance to change is natural and inevitable. The essential is to know how it would be understood and managed. Resistance comes with change and may increase when people concerned with change "suffer from innovation fatigue" (Carnall, 2003, 8). The point is more marked with the launch of change implementation.

Stoll (1996) claims that fear also plays an important role in resistance to change. She contends that people are often afraid of the unknown, failure, having difficult to act. Analyzing the phenomenon of resistance, Everard & Morris (1992) arrive at the conclusion that at the beginning of the change project, the majority of staff are likely to be followers. So many people need to be persuaded, but energy must be put on change drivers than on total resisters in order to secure those who accept changes.

To deal with resistance is the toughest task that is ever taken on while implementing innovation. Everard & Morris (1992) give however a range of techniques to apply in order to overcome resistance. Their work was summarized Changing Minds.org as follows:

Facilitation
The best approach to creating change is to work with them, helping them achieve goals that somehow also reach the goals of the change project. When you work with people, they will be happier to work with you. This is a good practice when people want to collaborate but are struggling to adjust to the situation and achieve the goals of change.

Education
When people are not really involved in the rationale for the change, they may well come around once they realize why the change is needed and what is needed of them. In particular, if new skills are required, they can be provided via an appropriate training.

Involvement
When people are not involved physically or intellectually, they are unlikely to be involved emotionally either. One of the best methods of getting people bought in is to get them involved. When their hands are dirty, they realize that dirt is not so bad, after all. They also need to justify their involvement to themselves and so persuade themselves that is the right thing to do.

Negotiation
When the other person cannot easily be persuaded, then you may need to give in on something in order to get their participation. Sit them down and ask what they are seeking. Find out what they want and what they will never accept. Work out a mutually agreeable solution that works just for them and just for you.

Manipulation
Manipulation means controlling a person's environment such that they are shaped by what is around them. It can be a tempting solution, but is morally questionable and, if they sense what you are doing, it will lead to a very dangerous backlash. Only consider this when change is necessary in the short term and all other avenues have been explored.

Coercion
Even more extreme than subtle manipulation is overt coercion. This is where you sit them down and make overt threats, for example that if they do not comply that they will lose their jobs, perhaps in a humiliating and public sacking. This should only be used when speed is of the essence or when the other persons themselves have taken to public and damaging actions. (ChangingMinds.org)

Naturally, people have tendency to resist new things, but when they have understood that it is a vital (and even continuous) part of life in education, and also have the means to do what is needed, they are better able to handle change as well.

Chapter 3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the different methodological steps made regarding this work. It begins with a brief discussion of the choice of research methods for this particular study, which is a qualitative one, and continues with a description and discussion of features of the data collection process and data analysis that were adopted, and concludes with a description of ethic considerations.

3.1. Qualitative research

As my study intends to examine a case study of a single institution known nationally as the avant-garde of higher education in the country and which has been engaged in a programme of reform, the research approach that is used is a qualitative one. The purpose of a qualitative research as put by Patton and MacCalman (2000) is to understand how reality is interpreted and experienced by those who are immersed in the process of change. Further, as Owen and Demb (2004) assert, it is a methodology suited for analyzing detailed data in order to frame issues and formulate emerging themes. Thus my focus in this research was put on the leadership of the current NUR lecturers and managers for the successful implementation of a new method of teaching and learning at NUR where a certain educational culture was already shaped. Therefore, the dynamic interaction between teaching and learning culture, leadership, and educational management change, was investigated by listening to individual perceptions and stories since “facts do not speak for themselves: someone has to speak for them” (Gillham, 2000: 10).

3.2. Data collection process

According to Briggs & Coleman (2007), collecting data is gathering information that relates to the research enquiry, and thoughts responding to a research question. It is with this idea in mind that for this study, interviews were conducted at National University of Rwanda and a set of data was collected. Two groups of individuals were interviewed: faculty administrators (i.e. Deans and Heads of department) and lecturers. These groups were targeted following the strategy of Celinšek and Markič (2008) who suggest interviewing individuals who are “intimately immersed in the innovative changes on campus as developers, implementers, and/or end users.” (Owen, 2004)

The Deans and HoDs were requested due to their position of having key information about modules development on campus as well as for having information about the planning and strategies to promote change towards the implementation of the programme reform.

3.2.1. Interview method

The technique I used for my data collection is the interview method. According to Best and Kahn (1998:255) interviews are used "to gather information regarding an individual's experiences and knowledge; his/her opinions, beliefs, and feelings; and demographic data". Therefore I contend that interviews were a good and reliable way of obtaining appropriate data to address the questions of my research. Interviews were used to get NUR academic staffs' opinions, beliefs, and feelings about the way the management of educational change at NUR was conducted.

I acknowledge that the full complement of staff at university is affected by such innovation, but being an academic myself I focused on the experiences of only the academic staff, managers and lecturers. While not ignoring, denying or minimizing the effect on the administrative support staff, the focus of the research is on the decisions made by academic managers and how those decisions were implemented by lecturers. Also, in order to minimize bias, I tried to approach the research problem without prejudice attempting to adopt the only viewpoint of the respondents (MacMillan & Schumacher, 2006). The aim in the research process was not to interfere with the interviewees' own interpretations of their reality, but to understand reality from their point of view (Gillham, 2000).

Data were therefore collected through semi-structured qualitative interviews. This method was used in order to leave room for me to learn additional information from different participants by asking additional follow-up questions when judged necessary. According to Robson (1993), the semi-structured interview allows the interviewer setting questions in advance, but also being able to change the way questions are ordered, to give explanations, and to leave out particular questions, which seem inappropriate with a particular interviewee or include additional ones in regard of the perception of what is likely appropriate in the context of the 'conversation'.

In addition to that, as suggested by MacMillan & Schumacher (2006), during the interviews, interviewees were allowed to move their line of responses in different directions and express and emphasis areas they themselves regarded as important, and so doing leaving rich and varied thoughts on the studied subject.

This kind of interview was judged fitting to my data collection method because, dealing with respondents in the context of higher educational change management, it was more likely that additional questions would be added to the core list and some explanation provided to get specific information appropriate to my specific research subject.

As suggested by Owen and Demb (2004) "by interviewing people experiencing the change, observing related events, and analyzing institutional documents for evolving rationale, value statements, and indications of institutional direction, leadership issues and aspects of the change process" in use at NUR surfaced.

3.2.2. Interviewee selection

All interviewees were academics at National University of Rwanda. The NUR has seven Deans, and 26 HoDs and a little more than 450 lecturers. Study participants were chosen from four departments within two faculties. I interviewed the two Deans from the selected Faculties, and two lecturers per department.

Marshall & Rossman (2006) point out that academic staffs usually work under demanding time constraints that creates difficulties to gain access to them. Therefore, an interviewer may have to rely on prior appointments. I made a preliminary visit to the two NUR Faculties to launch contact with different potential interviewees.

During the preliminary meeting with Deans, they indicated to me the concerned HoDs I could contact and the Head of Department provided me with a list of names of academic staff who could be interviewed. From this list, I selected two lecturers involved in the programme i.e. who teach in first, second or third year programme and possibly with at least one year of experience[8]. Every potential participant received an email explaining the background and purpose of the research, and preparing them for subsequent contact. When I subsequently contacted them by telephone to ask for interviews, the responses

[8] The MBTL programme was implemented since 2008 academic year. Therefore when I was collecting data the 1st cohort of students were starting the 3rd year.

were mostly positive; eight out of ten lecturers consented to an interview, and I managed to have a formal meeting with them individually to ask for interviews. However, one lecturer dropped the appointment and one Dean away on a mission out of the country was represented by his Vice Dean.

3.2.3. Interview guide

The interviews were based on a semi-structured model. This type of interview is composed by relatively specific topics and questions, which make it particularly useful when the focus of the research question is fairly clear and straight forward, especially for a less experienced interviewer (Patton, 2002). On the other hand, the semi-structured interview also allows the researcher to jump between topics, change and invent new questions along the way (MacMillan & Schumacher, 2006), and it is possible to probe and ask interviewees to elaborate on answers as it is absolutely essential for the research. Actually, "a good interview question should contribute thematically to knowledge production and dynamically to promote a good interview interaction" (Kvale 1996, p. 129). Dheram (1995:162) adds that "semi-structured interviews give the researcher an opportunity to elicit information, and the respondent freedom to throw light on issues the researcher might otherwise have overlooked".

Hence, when constructing the interview guide, it has been necessary to start by breaking down the research question into thematic interview questions, and then formulate easy-going and dynamic questions that could generate spontaneous responses and rich descriptions (the interview guide appears in Appendix). The interviews were conducted using open-ended questions adjusted in two separate guides (one for lecturers, and another for faculty managers) to accommodate the different roles of the interviewees.

3.2.4. Ethical considerations

As the research involved human subjects, the ethical guidelines for conducting the research were followed. Permission to collect data was requested and obtained from NUR authorities. Ethics clearances were applied for and obtained from both Ethics Committees of the University of the Witwatersrand and the National University of Rwanda. Moreover, in order to ensure that data items were approved and NUR image were preserved, the authorities of NUR appointed someone to accompany the researcher

during the data collection exercise. Then, each interview session was opened by reminding the interviewees about the background and purpose of the research, explaining that everything they will say would be treated confidentially, and that their names would not be exposed in the report. Thus just pseudonyms or codes will be used and the information given will be only used for the research purposes. They were also told that their participation was voluntary, and that they were allowed to withdraw at any time during the process. Finally, voice recording was accepted as the way of collecting information. Once all these conditions were agreed every interviewee was invited to sign a consent form, and interviews lasted for between 30 minutes to 1 hour and they were all recorded on a digital voice recorder.

3.2.5. Documents analysis

There is a large number of documents which raise important issues and efficient information on the restructuring of teaching and learning methodology at NUR. This research also dealt with these documents with the ultimate objective of understanding how the content might inform my understanding of the motivation, development and management of the MBTL project. The documents which were examined included NUR records, texts related to official policy on Higher Education in Rwanda, Office orders, Memos as well as lecturer's works related to module development, such as course outlines.

3.3. Data analysis

Data analysis is defined as the process of drawing or finding responses out of the data, (Freeman, 1999). Different researchers use different methods to analyse data depending on the nature of the data itself, the nature of the research question(s), and many other factors (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). However, "qualitative data has no clear and accepted set of conventions for analysis corresponding to those observed with quantitative data" (Robson, 1993:370). As this research is a qualitative one, qualitative data shape the analysis approach conducted upon them. Therefore I used various methods of data analysis used by other researchers for qualitative studies (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Seidel, 1998; Patton, 2002; MacMillan & Schumacher, 2006).

An important step in working with voice-recorded interviews is the transcription of the recorded information. The interviews were transcribed word for word, without any intention to do a full discourse analysis, but in order to obtain an overview of the information contained in them. In addition to that, as during the interviews, the respondents had been allowed to answer in whatever language they felt comfortable which resulted in a mixture of three languages: English, French and Kinyarwanda. The French and Kinyarwanda transcriptions were then translated into English.

With the data transcribed and translated, I decided to use content analysis to make sense of my collected data, because according to Ritchie and Lewis, "content analysis … [is] mainly concerned with capturing and interpreting common sense, substantive meanings in the data" (2003:202). Moreover, I thought most appropriate to use an analysis rooted in participant perception that allowed me to focus on leadership issues, change management process and on NUR teaching and learning culture.

In order to deal with the unstructured raw material from data collection results, I proceeded to data coding technique as defined by Patton (2002), intending to put relevant thoughts into categories and patterns that were used in the analysis. A code is defined as a symbol applied to a group of words to classify or categorize them (Robson, 1993:385). As suggested by Miles & Huberman (1994), the coding of data was related to research questions divided into thematic questions as they appeared on the interview guide. Therefore themes representing categories of information were identified as presented in chapter four, and they were used in the analysis.

Once the interview data were written and coded, the data specific to leadership strategies and change management and the interaction between education cultures at NUR were clustered for analysis according to these dimensions.

3.4. Trustworthiness and credibility

Trustworthiness and credibility were obtained by triangulation of data collection methods, interviews, and document review, and analysis (Patton, 1990). Triangulation was used because, as Robson (1993:383) asserts, it "is particularly valuable in the analysis of qualitative data where the trustworthiness of the data is always a worry", and according to Freeman (1999), who states that its aim is linked to eliminating - or at least

minimizing - bias in findings and thus to increasing confidence in finding while analysing data.

Therefore as suggested by Patton (2002), I used data triangulation or triangulation of sources method, which makes use of several sources of data with the aim to examine the consistency of different data sources by comparing different staff points and information from NUR documents.

To reach the credibility, it is necessary to conduct the research according to rules and guidelines for qualitative research. Therefore interviewees were invited to listen to the product of the interviews and to confirm the results before analysing them. So the respondents themselves validated the data (Briggs & Coleman, 2007). However, as it is not possible to reach total objectivity in qualitative research (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006) it was necessary to act in good faith. Thus the confirmability of results may be increased by reflecting upon and critically examining personal values as a member of NUR regarding the research topic, to diminish their influence on the research design, process and result.

3.5. Limitations

This study on academic staff leadership in implementing a programme of change includes looking deeply at their role as defined by participants, and the approach would be to look at the leadership and management challenges academic staff faced in implementing a new working method. Thus, obviously the study may face some limitations.

First of all the fact that the researcher is a member of NUR academic staff on study leave can in one way or another create biasness when conducting research because the researcher knows some of the Deans, HoDs or lecturers who participated in the interviews.

Moreover, given the socio political context of the research field and the fact that NUR appointed someone to ensure that the institutional image was preserved during the data collection exercise, some of the participants seemed not to be comfortable and may have reserved important information due to the sensitive nature of some issues.

Chapter 4. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the major themes that resulted from interviews with NUR academic staff, and discusses the findings as they relate to the literature review. The themes around which the interviews were built are those leading to comment on the changes proposed in the MBTL approach, targeting the participants' attitudes on the management of educational change and their thoughts on academic staff leadership to implement successfully the programme change.

It became necessary to interview participants from both academic management and lecturers' staff because according to Hopkins et al (2002) it becomes the educational administrator's responsibility to work with teachers to define instructional objectives and set academic goals, provide the necessary resources for teaching and learning, and to create opportunities for student and staff development.

For this reason, data in this study are denoted according to the subjects' position, in order to show the value attached by interviewees and their attitudes towards changes in NUR academic practice.

4.2. About participants

The participants were selected for their ability to contribute rich information to the question under investigation (Patton, 2002). In choosing participants with varying levels of experience, I was interested in their understanding and ability to analyse the NUR teaching and learning culture with regard to former and new methodologies as well as the management of change. I would note that one lecturer was a Head of Department when MBTL was introduced and contributed consistent information to data regarding the preparation of MBTL implementers.

Table 2: Biographic information of participants (ordered by when interview took place)

Participant	Position level	Years of experience in HE
1	Lecturer	12
2	Lecturer	10
3	Lecturer	16
4	Dean	12
5	Lecturer	7
6	Lecturer	3
7	Lecturer	5
8	HoD	10
9	HoD	22
10	HoD	10
11	Lecturer	10
12	HoD	10
13	Vice Dean	10

The thirteen participants were from NUR academic staff levels that closely linked to students activities. Two were from Faculty level (one Dean and one Vice Dean), four from Department level (HoD) and six lecturers. Their experience in higher education ranges from three to twenty-two years. Thus they were used to the former system so that they could judge it compared to the new one.

4.3. Coding and categorization of data

The data used in this research is complex and a system of categorization and coding was needed in order to organize the analysis. That is to identify ideas, concepts, behaviours, interactions, incidents, and phrases used (Taylor & Renner, 2003). To distinguish between respondents, the following coding was used:

$\mathbf{L_{1\ (.....7)}}$ for NUR Lecturer from 1 to 7

$\mathbf{H_{1\ (....4)}}$ for NUR Head of Department from 1 to 4

$\mathbf{D_{1\ (...2)}}$ for NUR Dean of Faculty from 1 to 2

Though lecturers and managers were interviewed on separate interview guides, the themes and revealed patterns emerged from a categorisation of the interview results in a single composite structure.

4.4. Data analysis

In order to reach findings, data are analysed according to theories discussed in the literature review and methodology chapters, allowing the data to speak as suggested by Patton (2002) and Miles and Huberman (1994). The aim in this section is to present the analysis of lecturers, Deans and HoDs views, attitudes and beliefs about the introduction of the Module-Based Teaching and Learning methodology at NUR and the way its implementation is being managed. It shows what they think about the NUR teaching and learning culture and their understanding of the innovations which have occurred in their institution and about the implementation of an educational change programme. Based on questions asked to NUR academic staff members and their responses which generated categories and subcategories used in this analysis, the findings are presented using direct quotations and as suggested by Neuman (2003) they are substantiated by means of a discussion to recontextualise it in terms of relevant literature.

Table 3: **Participants' views on management of implementation of educational change**

Themes	Patterns	Categories
Education change management	-Introduction approach	-Need to change -Academic staff preparation -Opposition to change
	-Implementation approach	-Current management -Desired management -Getting a shared understanding
	- empowerment of institution and implementers	- Implementers training -Seeking for material
Educational leadership	-Requirements of proper Implementation	- Psychological preparation - Technical preparation
	-Managers leadership	- Lack of leadership - Commitment of managers - Difficult to change
	-Lecturers engagement	- Real commitment - De-motivation - Dispassionate
Higher education culture	-Mixed opinions on innovations	-Positive appreciation - Negative appreciation - Sceptic
	-Influence of former educational system	- Difficult to change - Lack of MBTL skills - Resistance to change

4.4.1. Educational change management

In general, findings in this research demonstrate that NUR lecturers were aware of the management of educational change and the problems encountered. This awareness appears in their responses to questions on this theme and reveals three patterns of views. Participants spoke about how the programme change introduction was approached, on the way it was implemented thus far, and the extent to which their institution as well as different actors were empowered to successfully undertake the implementation.

4.4.1.1. Introduction approach

Kenny (2003) contends that innovation decision making is a generalised process in which the first step called *matching* is for the organisation to identify solutions to match the needs and to test their feasibility. NUR academics have mixed opinions about how the introduction of the innovation was approached. These can be divided into three categories: the need for NUR to change its teaching and learning system, the preparation of the implementers and their views on the change programme.

a. NUR's need for change

According to authors such as Kotter (1996) the first phase of change process is to make all people involved in the change effort internalise the need for it. There is a category of participants who agree that the innovation "was needed in order to major up courses so far offered at NUR and meet students' needs" (L_2). Moreover, since the MBTL is applied in much of the world, NUR needed to adopt it to enter the world system, and thus not to be left behind. Some NUR academics also think that the education system must be dynamic. Therefore it was time for the NUR teaching and learning system to change because many of its components were obsolete and needed to be updated:

> It was much needed because there are some points which were obsolete and needed to be accorded to the world system. This module system is used in many countries, so NUR has not to be left behind (L_7).

However, there are some respondents who find that the MBTL is a helpful approach with consistent principles but it is so demanding that it is difficult to apply. As implementers, they face many problems as pointed by this participant:

> I think that this innovation is good; it is generally good; the problem was the implementation, every programme change is a process… there are some critiques that it is still difficult to manage the hours allocated to auto directed learning for example. Maybe they [students] were familiar with the system of continuous evaluation and an examination after every course… now they keep away their notes and wait the examination period… it is why they are overloaded. The problem we have is the management of their own learning hours on one side and on the other side to know how [the students should] work by themselves. However, this is a process, step by step they will get used to that… (D_1).

He is echoed by another one who compares MBTL with the former NUR system of teaching and learning:

> They could combine courses according to their similarities but let us continue to apply the system because with the MBTL approach, how do you control if the students did their self studies (H_2).

Another respondent targets the MBTL requirements that are not fulfilled to allow its successful objective achievement:

> The advantage, Ok? It is this: allow students to work more, right? However, I said that there are some requirements. It requires students to be committed to work hard, Ok? He must have means to do it Ok? He may have material enabling him to do what is required of him. So far that is not fulfilled. That may not lead the system to achieve its objectives. (L_3)

b. A fashionable system

Another set of NUR academics judge that the change was absolutely unneeded because the former method was performing. They argue that there was no problem with the former method since it allowed teachers to prepare and suitably deliver courses and enabled students to work:

> I didn't see any problem with it [the former system]…lecturer had time to prepare and deliver his lessons. You see? Finally students did not lack of time to do their practices. I did not see any problem with the former system (L_3).

Moreover respondents think that there are some advantages the former system had and that are missing in the new one:

> I didn't see any problem with the former. Furthermore, it had advantages that are missing in this one. Formerly we gave knowledge widely. The former system provided with knowledge and it doesn't mean that once in workplace [students] were unable to work. However I'm afraid that with this one students leave the institution devoid of knowledge as well as ability, because I tell you, practices are not well conducted and readings are not done according to module requirements… ($L_{4)}$.

Like this one who acknowledges not having enough knowledge about the MBTL methodology, other participants find that the new method did not bring any innovation and reject it:

> Saying that it was needed; I cannot say it because I don't see any innovation, right! That it brought. Because … I know it badly. The module system, I know it badly ($L_{3)}$.

Other participants reject the MBTL system because they judge it as a foreign fashionable system in use in foreign countries and brought by funders in a country where many changes are occurring:

> I think that this MBTL was introduced because it is fashionable. It is a fashion of funders mainly from European countries especially UK and Anglophone countries who presented it to our decision makers because maybe they studied in that system. So it was like a trampling to spread the module system in which they studied… (H_2).

Referring to one of NUR managers, he goes on to say that MBTL was introduced only by the desire to change not by necessity because everything was changing in the country.

> … for me according to our context, we have to accept it because everything changed: national emblem has changed, the national flag has changed, national anthem has changed…so NUR also must change… (H_2).

As Scott (2000) asserts, change is not an event that happens inopportunely. It is a process that involves several actors. Whenever change is set as a priority for an institution, it is important to identify what upcoming implementers consider as relevant for their daily practice and should be taken as innovation.

c. Implementers' preparation

The introduction of an innovation supposes an adequate preparation of the organisation and implementers. Everard and Morris (1992) claim that the more staff are involved, the more enthusiastic they are to implement. The preparation of a programme change

relates not only to providing different actors with wide knowledge of the innovation but also to involvement of forthcoming implementers in the conception and designing of the innovation programme (Levin, 1993). However this preparation seemingly did not happen when the MBTL was being introduced at NUR. This appears clear in participants' responses:

> No preparation for lecturers, Deans and HoDs whereas there was no model, no shared understanding. There was no adequate preparation to enable them to assimilate and own that (L_2).

This viewpoint is strengthened by a colleague who underlines the lack of implementers' knowledge of the MBTL rationale:

> … that preparation did not happen. To explain [to] us why to abandon the former system and to adopt the module system, its advantages… they didn't tell it to us at all… (L_3).

Another goes farther and qualifies the introduction of MBTL as catastrophic:

> The way it was introduced, I find that it was in catastrophic conditions. This means that people have never been prepared… It was introduced abruptly (L_7).

According to participants that lack of adequate preparation of implementers could lead to resistance: "... just that preparation did not happen. It is the reason why there was a vague resistance on the lecturers' side …" (D_1). Academic staff feel disenfranchised by decisions being made and over which they believe they have little control.

Moreover, this lack of preparation was concurrent with the introduction of the change of instructional language from French to English as the only language of instruction in the whole country at all levels of education. This situation contributed to a sense of great confusion amongst NUR lecturers.

> …they didn't explain to lecturers what the system they were going to introduce was; then, not only that but also the instructional language change was simultaneously introduced. In my opinion, they associated this system with the mastering of language. That is as if you don't master the language, English, you don't master the system. It was very difficult for lecturers (D_2).

Participants report that some seminars were organised in the beginning of MBTL implementation but they emphasize that their purpose was only to give orders about launching MBTL and to implement it:

> I think there have been some seminars about that… but only to tell us the decisions taken by policymakers (L_6). Once at Kigali there was a meeting of Deans but the aim was to give them directives; no one understood what it was (L_2).

The faculties were then asked to prepare modules but were not informed about what MBTL was and how it functions.

> … in seminars people were asked to revalidate modules… I attended for the 1st time the training, I mean the module preparation; it was not easy for me to understand what exactly the module is and other components related to it… (L_5).

Even in the Department of Geography where one year prior to the module system had been introduced through a cultural cooperation with Holland and where lecturers took seminars by experts, respondents described the seminars as not convincing. Consequently lecturers are still floundering in the application of the MBTL like their colleagues in many other Departments. According to this respondent,

> … they tried to explain but it was not clear. So in the Department we started [implementing MBTL] without being convinced because we didn't take any workshop for demonstration or practice… (H_2).

Moreover another respondent declares that these seminars were organised likely for volunteers not for all implementers, and at a time that most of lecturers were not available:

> …one seminar was organised in the Petit Prince Hotel, but it was organised when lecturers were on vacations. I think it was planned for lecturers who showed the will. How many lecturers came to follow? Very few. So I think that the mistake was to organize the seminar at the moment when most of lecturers were absent. If they had organised it at the time all lecturers were available and organised it as being compulsory for everybody, possibly it would have been a success. It is the reason why most of us are still using the former system because we have never received explanations about MBTL (L_7).

However, participants pointed out that in one Department before designing modules, the HoD, assisted by some qualified lecturers, began by studying all information about the MBTL approach and then came to teach their colleagues in workshops.

> I remember with the former HoD, we left the workshops and we came into the office to read and reread instructions… so we had many sessions of training lecturers to design and deliver module. Every lecturer of this Department knows how to design a module, its principles… (H_4).

It appears from the responses that the preparation of academic staff was at best clumsy and inconsistent. Contrary to what Scott (2000) suggests, the policy makers did not share the new vision and goals they intended for NUR with the future implementers. Understandably, this approach ran the risk of seeing their project rejected during implementation by the lecturers as not being relevant to their needs.

4.4.1.2. Implementation approach

Participants expressed their views on the decision per se to introduce the MBTL at NUR. On this point Van Driel et al (1997), highlight the extreme importance to associate implementers (here lecturers) in the process of a programme of change. Van Vught (1989) also claims that professionals in Higher Education are basically reluctant to apply comprehensive changes, especially when they are launched from above.

a. A top-down decision

There is a high degree of uncertainty amongst NUR lecturers because the introduction of MBTL as an innovation in their practices was perceived to be a top-down decision made by higher level of educational policy makers (they mentioned National Council of Higher Education) and brought at NUR by its administrators.

> I don't know how the new system came… they brought it and introduced it in University…and we had to apply it…it was introduced from the top to the bottom… so practically, it is a decision from the top and they told the lecturers: 'do this, do this'. We didn't know why, we didn't know what the objectives were... When an order is given it must be applied (L_4).

The decision was made without taking into account the middle managers and the lecturers and involving them in the process of change whereas these are the main implementers with great responsibility for its successful implementation.

Their views are summarised by this participant who says:

> The introduction of the module based system was a decision from the top to the bottom. A decision made by the High Council of Education then brought to the University and the lecturers who are the implementers of the new programme were not consulted…. (H_3).

For NUR academics, the abrupt decisions were a sign of lack of planning and contributed to the confusion amongst the lecturers who were uncertain on how to apply the new method because they were not thoroughly prepared.

> …at NUR it seemed to me that it was not planned. It was just a decision brought by the Rector and the Director of Quality Assurance, and suddenly they started saying we have to make some modules and nobody knew what module was (H_3).

A colleague strengthens the idea by saying: "… for the lecturers who were told to cope with the new system, it was not easy… when somebody has adopted a system for a long time, a new system is not easy to deal with…" (L_5).

When it is coupled with the language change, the risk of resistance is increased:

> It is the reason why it was a vague attempt of resistance on the side of lecturers because the module reform occurred at the same time with the reform of the language of instruction. You see it was two programmes [that were] not immediately compatible… (D_1).

Concurring Everard & Morris (1992) this one way decision making typifies an awful introduction of a programme change and it caused many uncomfortable feelings among implementers contributing to a lack of ownership of the innovation and undermining their commitment to implement it with enthusiasm.

b. Current management

Through the responses provided by participants it appears that MBTL implementers at NUR are still struggling with the methodology and the new language of instruction. Although NUR academic staffs claim that they might not have had any preparation for the implementation of MBTL because it was introduced abruptly, most of them are aware of the importance and effectiveness of the method. The problem is that they say that it cannot be applied as needed.

> … I think that this innovation is good; it is good widely; the problem was the implementation… you cannot shift abruptly from a reform to another. I don't think it is worth to stop the process and go back now (D_1).

Actually as Celinšek & Markič (2008) argue, people need enough time to understand and adjust to an innovation. However this was not the case for respondents: "The policy was

formulated to be implemented directly without giving time to allow people to prepare for it" (L_5). It is for this reason that lecturers did not understand the method from the beginning and continue to flounder as says L_3: "we started to apply it, but we don't understand what we do". He goes on saying that even their managers cannot explain exactly what to do: "when you talk to one of those managers he also tells you that he doesn't understand" (L_3).

A concrete example is given by this participant:

> Every department manages as it fits to it because modules are not similarly designed everywhere… some have many units and they have problem to link them. Further, some units come back in other modules (L_2).

He is echoed by this one:

> We have not yet reached a common view on workload. The module teams are tempted to share module hours as they did for courses in the former system, then they try to manage students hours but [this is difficult] because in that we are still groping [for our way] (L_4).

They are confused and are still struggling with both methodology and English language as asserted by (H_3): "I noted that this MBTL programme started to take place at the same time as the change of the medium of education which is English. Now both of them have confused lecturers", echoed by (L_4): "Everybody is struggling with the new method as well as the English language that we don't master". Some respondents would have preferred the new approach being introduced in French:

> "We should have perfectly implemented the system in French as well!" (D_2). Another enhances: "If the method had been introduced in French, we should be struggling only with the module design and delivery" (L_4).

Other participants think that the disruption being felt is understandable given that in the beginning, every innovation is difficult to implement and step by step people get used to it: "There were problems in the beginning, but now things begin to go well. People are getting used to it because every new programme faces problems of understanding" (H_1).

The way the NUR administrators are managing the implementation of methodology is described positively by a part of participants. In some department the follow up is done and things seem to go as well. Following what Campbell and Levin (2008) suggest, the HoDs organise regular meetings aimed at examining problems raised by MBTL

implementation. Module team and programme leaders follow up satisfactorily the implementation in spite of the lack of adequate material. Some of their answers are put in these words:

> Now things are going on for the best… Through meetings in the Department, we discuss the situation and we complete each other... widely, we have got used to the system. because if we say that we have problems, they are aware a module leader is not able to organise correctly and designate lecturers for units in accordance with qualifications… if lecturers should be empowered enough, should have material, internet connexion, even enough offices… you can understand that those are still lacking (H_4).

In those Departments, people are convinced that things may go forward because "there is a will to improve" (L_6). This HoD deals with lecturers' reluctance to change their practices:

> Yes we do some meetings to resolve problems related to module. For example when it is a problem related to this conservative attitude for lecturers, we approach them and then we try to correct that … For more problems related to the resistance or bad way of teaching we regularly hold meetings particularly at the beginning of the semester (H_3).

And the problem that worries lecturers is that when they submit a report to senior managers, there is no feedback. This participant said:

> It is submitted in SEPU [the former DQA] …there is no feedback given to lecturers, no…rather it should be helpful. Because with feedback the lecturer knows how student appreciated the teaching and the points to improve. But since I am here I have never see such feedback (L_4).

He is echoed by this HoD who is talking about material:

> We always report to the dean that we need LCD projectors. He also report that to the VRAC or to the Board of Directors but we are still waiting for the answer (H_3).

But in other departments things have degenerated; some of respondents find that there is no follow up of what is being done.

> ... I have never seen any manager coming to observe how lecturers are applying the approach…when you are a coordinator in a system you don't own, you cannot invite people in a meeting in order to put logical links between units... the Department meetings are for routine matters, they discuss for example the delays on timetable. But never a coordinator of a programme or the HoD can tell colleagues how a certain module can be taught… (L_7).

The HoDs of these departments also confirm that there is no effective management of the application of the method. This one confesses:

> I have to tell you that I cannot do a daily follow up of lecturers I don't have time. I cannot verify if a lecturer is in class or not I am informed when students come to complain in the office… (H_2).

About senior managers, he goes on saying that they stay in offices managing only documents:

> The DQA? What he does is only to examine reports: the number of hours written by students in books provided. He is requesting at the end of every week course progress report as recorded…people have done this and that. But in terms of number of hours not in terms of quality (H_2).

This point will be further developed in the section on managers' leadership.

c. Getting a shared MBTL implementation understanding

Lack of information on the rationale and poor preparation of implementers lead to divergence of views and erode the successful implementation of change (Ford et al., 1996). Participants express their perceptions on what should be done in order to reach a shared understanding of the innovation to implement (Scott. 2000). An effective management involving implementers would have begun by educating people to MBTL approach.

1. Implementers' education to MBTL approach

According to Kenny (2003) sharing ideas about innovation reduces uncertainties during the implementation. Participants find that the first way of making NUR academics share MBTL understanding involves reintroducing the approach. They say that implementers need further explanations of what MBTL is, its rationale in NUR teaching and learning culture in order to own the new system.

> To reach a shared understanding of the new system in the institution the authorities should start at the beginning. I mean they should make lecturers owners of the new programme. Because as a lecturer I'm not like a peasant person who takes thing without asking why or when he doesn't see even the logic behind what he is doing. People always question what they are doing. So …this institution, authorities should come, approach the lecturers who are the main

> implementers and show them the rationale of the new programme, show the weakness or the former programme they were using, or the methodology they were using in teaching and then they should take advantage and show the benefit of the new programme in the MBTL and they should also convince them and then motivate them and so create a conducive environment for the successful implementation (H_3).

In addition to that, they say that the reform has not been built on a prior empirical study of the former system which would have shown faults to be corrected. Even the document on Higher Education Policy doesn't give any reference to evidences showing that there was any empirical research on former NUR teaching and learning methodology. It is what is explaining this respondent:

> ...the biggest problem which prevented an immediate adoption of the system is that there was no document explaining that the former system was wrong. They brought a system presented as good but they didn't show any document of a study report explaining the defaults of the former one. This why people didn't immediately understand and move in the same way towards its implementation (H_1).

This education on the MBTL approach for NUR academic staff must have been done through compulsory meetings, seminars and trainings and managers should have allowed people to express their views on both systems through open discussions. The reason is that when people sit together in a meeting, "they hear the same things, share views and reach the same understanding" (H_1).

Their views are summarised by respondent L_7:

> ...they must organize seminars. They should organize them when people are available e.g. Wednesday afternoon compulsory and Pr Roger should come. Everybody should attend and discuss from the beginning to the end. Moreover explanations should be provided and material so that everybody should reach ownership of the system...everybody should internalize the system and feel it as it is its own.

2. Effective management

Participants point out the importance of an efficient management in getting a shared understanding of MBTL implementation. They find that the way NUR leaders are managing the innovation cannot lead to its achievement as seen earlier. They say that to lead people, managers should share their understanding on the approach, managers (especially senior managers) may follow up its implementation more closely by getting

out of their offices and approaching lecturers, guiding and coaching them as suggested by (Bush et al., 2009).

> [The] Director of Quality Assurance must be an expert of modules so he is expected to be more a coach than an administrator. If you have a problem of sharing teaching hours and students' hours, he comes and coaches you, guides you and shows us how to do, instead of being always in his office. I think at that moment we should see how to reach a common understanding in the institution and sharing our views we should do things in the same way. (H_2)

Managers may also provide with model if necessary

> We wish he (DQA) could come near us and explain those things and their purpose; that issue of workload for example, we could discuss in a meeting, and could know how to do it; they could tell it to all of us together, and so we should reach the same understanding. Otherwise everyone understands as they want, each Faculty does it on its own and differently from another. It would be a model for all faculties and previously explained techniques (L_4).

The new system of dealing with workload seems to worry many lecturers who find that their career is threatened, because they believe that managers may only consider the hours spent in face-to-face teaching activities. The principle of learner-centred methodology does reduce lecturers' hours in front of learners and emphasizes more student learning autonomy. Therefore this new method has increased the amount of time academic staff spent supervising student auto-directed learning activities. Furthermore, academic staff time spent preparing lectures, doing research and in marking students' assignments is no longer accounted for in a person's workload. Their workload may be considered according to these elements instead of telling them that they will be sacked if they don't have a full workload (in terms of contact hours), as explained by this respondent:

> ...and they should also avoid appreciating this new programme module with such a workload; which is one of the hindrances towards the notion of this new programme. Because they say the module system came to change the workload and this module programme doesn't guarantee the face-to-face workload which is required. And this is a threat to lecturers; if you don't have the 360 face-to-face teaching hours then you are chased (H_3).

3. Involvement of implementers in MBTL management

Participants note that NUR lecturers do not view MBTL in the same way and given the lack of ownership that they do not implement it properly. Some say that the reason is that they have been excluded from the policy formulation and decision making:

> First of all before the implementation of the policy all the community should be sensitized in a manner that the lecturers themselves are involved in the policy formulation. I'm not sure this happened. I don't think so. But currently you cannot stop the process. What is needed now is maybe to include the lecturers in the management of this process (L_5)

Otherwise they continue to call it "things of Roger and Pamela": "Why do they call it 'things of Roger, things of Pamela?' Because they have not been involved in the system" (D_2).

Lecturers feel a need to be included in the management of the innovation by introducing a structure of training the trainers. In every department, one or two lecturers could be selected to be trained by experts and if needed be sent to advanced institutions, or even abroad, and on their return should train their colleagues

> ...whereby for example a team of lecturers from the Department can be sent somewhere for further training related to that. So that when they'll come back, they'll help other lecturers to …the process (L_5,).

Other respondents think that it is necessary to introduce an effective dialogue between managers and lecturers. That would be a collaboration framework allowing lecturers to be consulted before making decisions about issues in which they are concerned:

> If it should be established a real collaboration! If it is introduced, the management staff will be informed about problems faced by implementers. Especially they should explain to those who don't understand. Managers should also understand their difficulties in implementing the system. In order to lead successfully the system they could cope with these difficulties in collaboration with the implementers of course. Even with students. Then together they will seek for solutions, together they will conduct an evaluation (L_3).

Managers could listen to different viewpoints of lecturers that should be taken in account when they have to make decisions:

> Another thing which is necessary on the part of the administration or leaders is to engage in a dialogue. To be open to the lecturers, whenever they have problem the administrators should also be open to changes, to listen to problem of this... encountered by lecturers. So together, in that mutual understanding; then the programme also can be implemented without a lot of delays … without any conflict at all (H_3).

d. Monitoring MBTL implementation

Carnall (2003) contends that in order to achieve the goals of a change programme, the most important task for the project management staff is monitoring the progress of the project and exercising control over it. Under this sub-theme participants' responses are divided into two arguments, one supporting the way the MBTL implementation is monitored, and the other suggesting that it lacks accurate monitoring.

1. MBTL monitoring

Drawing on research (Leithwood, 2006; Robinson, 2007; Hoadly, 2007), Bush et al. (2009) argue that successful outcomes result from strong involved leadership in classroom practice. Especially when it is to introduce change in an educational system, the implementation of an innovation may be seriously monitored and regularly evaluated in order to make adjustments (Bush et al, 2009). At NUR, some participants in this study find that in spite of problems, the monitoring of MBTL innovation is well conducted not always on the same level in the whole university, but at least in many departments.
Managers and lecturers meet regularly for MBTL follow-up and discuss issues related to its implementation or at least when a problem arises. Sometimes students are also associated in academic and administrative problem solving. Suggestions of solutions are submitted to high level of NUR administration (Deans, DQA, or NUR Vice-Rector) in order to seek a solution, but unfortunately many times feedbacks delay to follow

> Yes, we do some meetings to resolve problems related to module. For example when it is a problem related to this conservative attitude for lecturers, we approach them and then we try to correct that, for example that lack of teaching aids such as those we were talking about. But we always report to the dean that we need LCD projectors. He also report that to the VRAC or to the BOD but we are still waiting for the answer. For more problems related to the resistance or bad way of teaching we regularly hold meetings particularly at the beginning of the semester. In the middle of the semester, to see the course progress and also monitor this through class representatives meetings, because we have to hold class representatives meetings to know. It is a way which allows me to know what

> exactly is happening even small problems which occur among lecturers and students (H_3).

These challenges may be understandable given the socio economic context of the country:

> …the University tried harder, because you don't click on a button to see coming computer labs, or qualified lecturers, or adequate classrooms, the university makes efforts but doesn't get all things immediately (H_4).

But respondents are also convinced that some of these problems would have been avoided if the implementers (the lecturers) had been involved in the process of the programme change

> If lecturers had been involved from the beginning, I think that all these challenges would have been taken up by lecturers because they are in classes, in labs and know exactly what is missing for a right implementation of the innovation. I think that those higher managers were not informed about that lack of requirements. Only lecturers know all those things that are missing. Unfortunately, they had no opportunity to contribute to the introduction of that system... (D_2).

Actually, in a programme change, Blaze & Blaze (1999) state that to value the implementers professionalism is a cornerstone of effective management and that encourages them to become aware of and critically reflect on their practice.

2. Lack of monitoring

Another category of respondents contend that some of the problems with the MBTL implementation are because there is inadequate monitoring of the process. Managers are not visible to organise meetings to discuss problems related to MBTL:

> We did not hold any meeting in order to discuss the way to improve the module based teaching. Such meeting hasn't been organized yet. Even at Department level. For that we have not yet met. We meet only when they want to tell us which modules we will teach how to share them, right? Eeeuh... So, saying that they follow how people understand this system and apply it, and so on… they don't do anything (L_3).

But this Dean intending to clear himself from this breach tries to explain this attitude arguing that it is early to conduct an evaluation on a system which is in application for only two past years:

> The success of a reform cannot be evaluated after only two years. The success of educational reform or whatever reform may take time. There may be intermediate evaluations but the appropriate evaluation may be carried out after 4 years (D_1).

But the lack of ownership is another argument brought by respondents explaining this problem of lack of monitoring MBTL implementation and prevents managers to organise such meetings:

> When you are a coordinator in a system that you don't own, you cannot invite people in a meeting in order to put logic links between different units. Everyone comes and teaches his part regardless of other parts (L_7).

Unless they find that there have not been many big problems (L_6) encountered so far. Meetings organised are informal and only for routine:

> When we meet in Department council it is a routine meeting; they ask for example why there is a delay on the timetable, etc. But never a coordinator of programme or HoD tells colleagues how a certain module may be taught (L_7).

Further, according to participants' views, the MBTL implementation monitoring is handicapped by managers who don't understand what they have to do. They are floundering, since "… when you talk with one from those managers he also tells you that he doesn't understand" (L_3), and don't give clear instructions:

> Those meetings would be done in inter-break. But there are no clear instructions about that. To tell the truth when a lecturer has a problem, you tell him to manage it on his own or you send him to the Dean, but sometimes he also doesn't have a solution, or to DQA who gives an informal information. He doesn't write it for everybody to tell how to deal with that issue (H_2).

On the other hand the monitoring is difficult because "they have been ambitious" (L_2) in introducing an innovation for which they were not ready. But also the managers explain the issue saying that they are highly overloaded and do not have time:

> It is a bit difficult; maybe we don't have those meeting regularly, because of the system. Really we work and the academic year is overloaded so that we cannot have the time for that. We close the year and immediately we start another (D_1).

This view is clarified by a colleague:

> I have to tell you that I cannot do a daily follow up of lecturers. Because I have also to prepare my lessons, like them I have a minimum of hours to complete and in addition to that I may take on administrative work, so I don't have time (H_2).

Consequently the Heads of Departments often practise a kind of laisser-faire management.

e. Accurate implementation of a programme change

NUR lecturers and mangers were asked how a programme of innovation could best be implemented. Their answers appear in two categories; some believed that an accurate implementation depends on an effective management while others thought that it depends on the readiness of both the implementers and the institution.

1. Effective management

Participants who think that an accurate implementation of a programme of innovation depends on effective management suggest a closer monitoring in the field. Researchers such as McCroskey (2008), Bush et al. (2009) or Taylor et al (2008) concur, in this regard once managers are flexible and get out of their offices to approach lecturers, they will be aware of problems encountered and advise people on the way of dealing with the issues more appropriately (the significance of this point was already discussed in the section on getting shared understanding.)

2. Readiness of the institution and implementers.

In addition to effective management, participants suggest that an accurate implementation of a programme change depends on the readiness of implementers and of their institution to meet requirements of the innovation. This readiness begins by considering the socio economic context in which the innovation may be implemented:

> Then they will see if here in Rwanda according to our socio economic context, our capability, this system is possible or not. And they should derive an appropriate conclusion (L_3).

The next step in readiness is an adequate preparation of implementers. This involves providing them with in-depth explanations of the rationale of the innovation, including

demonstrating the gaps in the former system and the benefits of the new one. The change literature highlights the extreme importance for the management of organizational change to conduct of in-depth assessments of the current situation, which evaluate institutional strengths and weaknesses and environmental opportunities and threats (Kenny, 2003; Owen and Demb, 2004), and the development of common goals and strategies:

> …this institution, …authorities should come, approach the lecturers who are the main implementers and show them the rationale of the new programme, show the weakness or the former programme they were using, or the methodology they were using in teaching and then they should take advantage and show the benefit of the new programme in the MBTL and they should also convince them and then motivate them and so create a conducive environment for the successful implementation (H_3).

The readiness involves also organising meetings aimed at people's sensitization in order to convince them "to change their mind-set" (L_6), to own the innovation and to share its understanding and "overcome resistance" (L_6).

> I think that it is because there was no preparation... we should have discerned the advantages. Instead of coming and say: "this is what you have to do, nothing else". Otherwise it was good, but they must provide us with further explanations and then we should reach ownership, we should share understanding, we should reach common guiding principles. No prior preparation for NUR community staff, community at large (H_2).

Moreover implementers will be provided with enough time to think on the innovation and internalize it:

> Then since the new programme requires all lecturers to disown, the new system disowns them of what they had as theirs. That is the problem. It is not a resistance as such but because it is new then it should take time or give much time to people, lecturers I mean to internalise it and they should be also shown the benefit of it before implementing that new system (H_3).

In the meantime, lecturers should be provided with trainings on designing and delivering teaching and learning and evaluation including study trips in advanced institutions for models.

> We should also do exercises and make sure we master it before launching the application. This step would take a long time: one or two years during which there should be organised study trips in experienced institutions, material should be collected, everybody should learn and understand, prepare courses, so that there would not be any problem at the starting moment. Meanwhile expert

> consultants should have built model of module from which one can design one's own, and provided with trainings (L_4).

The last point brought up by participants on the readiness of implementers and institution is related to seeking educational material required by the implementation of the innovation to take place adequately as it is pointed by this previous participant. Even if it is difficult they do not have to give up. It is what this participant is explaining:

> But also the University tried harder, because you don't click on a button to see coming computer labs, or qualified lecturers, or adequate classrooms, the university makes efforts but doesn't get all things immediately (H_4).

4.4.1.3. NUR and academics empowerment for MBTL implementation

Participants find that NUR and its academics were not empowered to create a successful implementation of MBTL. This lack of empowerment is typified by two sets of comments: the first relates to lecturers and the second to the material.

a. Lecturers' empowerment

As noted previously, participants think that MBTL implementers are in need of training with respect to their ability to implement MBTL properly. Respondents note that many lecturers are inexperienced in module design and delivery and need training and assistance by experts in this area:

> Some lecturers are inexperienced and need assistance. We don't have to invent the wheel... The BOD needs to outsource for sustainability. Invite expert consultants to train our lecturers in modules (L_2).

This view is shared by many others who find that lecturers do not have appropriate knowledge allowing them to handle properly the new method:

> Very few lecturers know how to handle module in this new system. Each lecturer was responsible of his own course and knew how to manage it. ...it's only last year that these lecturers knew this new system. And there were no preliminary trainings, no workshops informing them what it was about. The reason why I can really say that most of the lecturers, a part from reading from internet, reading about the module, they are not empowered, they don't have enough package about module system (H_3).

Respondents think also that, in addition to those trainings, MBTL implementers at NUR need models. For example they should go on study trips in advanced institutions in the application of module system:

> Because if we had been prepared, and moved gradually, taken on workshops and trainings, been sent in other institutions to see how the system was being implemented, I think it should have been better. Then we should have discerned the advantages. Instead of coming and saying: "this is what you have to do", and nothing else (H_2).

They say also that NUR lecturers need further explanations allowing them a better understanding of the programme change. They are convinced that they have not been involved in the process of change; therefore they need further explanations on the rationale, the principles and the functioning of the methodology:

> I would say that regarding knowledge, lecturers don't have enough knowledge enabling them to teach in that system…. I said that lecturers had not been involved in that system. That is they did not received explanations about the way modules had to be taught. Many lecturers did not understand what a module is, how the module system functions, its purposes, the way of self study control, what other requirements are, etc, etc… (D_2).

Complicating the new introduction of MBTL, over 70% of lecturers/implementers have not yet mastered the English language. "They need support in English skills" (L_7) in order to implement MBTL properly. Not only is it difficult for lecturers to apply the principles involved in MBTL, but also they are confused and handicapped by this language:

> Now this MBTL programme started to take place at the same time of the change of this medium of education which is English, now both of them have confused the lecturers. Those who are not able to teach in English and that together with the module implementation both of them have confused lecturers. They don't know what to do (H_3).

The view is strengthened by a colleague who notes that there are lecturers who simply turn down because of this lack of English language skills:

> In addition to that is the problem of language: the programme is in English but many people don't understand it. Let us tell the truth, NUR lecturers don't understand English. So an individual who doesn't know English and was taught in the former system especially those who are aged, seems to slip away saying: "I don't understand anything on this system" and he turns down (L_7).

b. Seeking material

Participants also expressed their views about the empowerment of NUR and academics regarding educational material. They find that at NUR the leaders "have been ambitious" (L_2) since the institution lack the materials required to properly implement MBTL. There are not enough books in NUR library to allow students to carry out all activities related to their auto-directed learning.

> …if you recommend to them a certain book and finally they don't find it in library,… if he wants he comes and tells you: 'I didn't find the book'. So the student tells you: 'I didn't find the book' and he or she sits and keeps quiet saying that the book recommended is not available (L_3).

Books are few, and most that are in the library are old and are written in French while the new teaching methods now require English.

> …most of books in this university are in French except those we give out. Translation is difficult; so they write very little or write only what they invent because they didn't do research (L_4).

According to a respondent, only the Department of Geography has some updated books given through a cultural cooperation with Holland:

> In addition to that there are not enough books in library. Books in use now are new books which are not yet available in library. Except our department which received books from a cultural project with Holland, most of departments don't have books. If we had books we would recommend students to read and summarize some chapters for discussion in class (L_7).

And the Faculty of Sciences which keeps up a cooperation with Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

> In the library books are there but they are old, no journals. But there is improvement, there is some really good efforts now since you can download some journals; now with cooperation with MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology…) there are some books that you can download from internet (L_6).

In addition to that shortage of library equipment, participants said that MBTL requires a constant use of internet and ICT equipment. However they find that NUR does not have reliable access to internet, computer labs are few and roughly equipped. . Moreover, NUR has not subscribed to many online journals. Consequently participants find that

those conditions cannot allow lecturers to assign readings to students for their auto-directed learning as required by MBTL.

Their views appear as follow:

> Yes, lecturers are aware… you can ask students to consult books, to read on internet etc… all what you can do. but lecturers also ask how to request students to go to consult a book in library when they know that either the document does not exist there, or there is only one copy for 200 or 300 students?... so this is why the implementation of this system is difficult, because if in a module, it is expected that ⅓… let's say for a module of 200 hours, it is required to only use 66 or 70 hours in contact and you know well that students will not read what you recommended. It is why sometimes lecturers pick upon learning hours and use them in contact because they know well that the library is not able to serve all students or not only it can't serve them but also there are no books. There is no internet; there are not enough computers for all students. How are you going to ask students to read? Lecturers say that sometimes you request students to read a document on line whereas it requires a subscription and the university has not subscribed to it. Then how are you going to ask students to read that document when it is not accessible? It is why the lecturer will try to summarise the document and add on contact hours in order to explain and give enough studying material to students…. (D_2)

The respondents say also that in respect to the material required for a good application of MBTL methodology, NUR empowerment regards also the small size of classrooms with regard to big number of students.

> … enough material, enough rooms … ICT facilities…a very hindrance to the successful end of this programme. …let me show you how the outcome of a meeting we held last week with the Rector was. Most of HoDs went on issue related to the rooms, because the timetable is there. Let me give a clear example: I have a class of 227 students. However the timetable stipulated that these students should be allocated a class which has a capacity of receiving only 15. Do you imagine this environment which put the Rector to change the view of lecturers and students in terms of flexibility? (L_5)

Toward this end, the empowerment includes providing the personal and institutional resources that can be used to maximize all opportunities allowing engaging resolutely in change programme.

Considering the theme of education change management, the findings show that the management of change at NUR is a big issue. Kenny (2003) contends that the approach to change process in tertiary education affects academic staff adoption and subsequently their commitment to apply it. The apparent mismanagement of the introduction of

change including the lack of consultation in the conception and inadequate preparation led to psychological consequences. Coupled with the change in instructional language of this situation clearly affected the adoption and ownership negatively impacting on the application. So in order to gain better results the new approach must be reintroduced by enhancing the professionalism of academic staff and creating a conducive environment as a core responsibility of educational leaders, because as Scott (2000) suggests, the empowerment facilitates and reinforces individual and collective efforts to practice innovations.

4.4.2. Educational leadership

Concurring the literature on educational change leadership (Lashway, 2000; McCroskey, 2008; Rayner, 2008; Taylor et al., 2008), the basic purposes of educational leadership here is NUR managers' and lecturers' capability to thrive change and transformation in NUR community so that it can more effectively enhance teaching and learning, by efficient application of the new methods proposed by MBTL.

The analysis of data reveals participants' views on the requirements to properly implement innovation such as the MBTL approach, on their managers' commitment to manage the change and on their own engagement towards innovation.

4.4.2.1. Requirements

Participants think that MBTL methodology is highly demanding. Implementers are required to be "psychologically and technically prepared" (L_2) to implement it properly.

a. Psychological readiness

Participants describe how MBTL implementers must behave towards change process. The behaviour is characterised by being committed, aware of incumbent responsibility; ready to sacrifice and focus on MBTL duties:

> To implement correctly MBTL qualities required are: Commitment of course; Sacrifice, understand why and how it may be done. Responsibility (accountability) of everybody especially module team leader who is committed must be connected with Programme leader who often is HoD. HoDs and Deans may serve

> as model. Another thing required is to learn from external experiences and relate them to Departments' needs (L_2).

MBTL implementer may also be communicative, open to dialogue, flexible and motivated:

> The new system requires all implementers to be flexible, to be open to the change and adopt it. Another thing which is necessary on the part of the administration or leaders is to engage in dialogue. To be open to the lecturers, whenever they have problems, the administrators should also be open to change, listen to disruptive problems encountered by lecturers (H_3).

However, as it will be discussed below, participants views differ about the way NUR academics demonstrate these qualities which contribute to their leadership.

b. Technical preparation

The participants state that MBTL implementer must show clear understanding of the approach and be open to change in order to see clearly what to do why to do it and to have a clear vision of where he or she is going:

> Because as a lecturer I'm not like peasant people who take things without asking why or when they don't see even the logic behind what they do. They don't always question what they are doing (H_3).

The MBTL implementer may be also academically qualified as it is stated by this respondent:

> It needs qualified lecturers because it demands ability …designate lecturers for units in accordance of qualifications e.g. a master holder who has never taught... If he has a long experience, it's Ok. Normally it would be better if you teach a subject related to your research field (H_4).

This idea is supported by this respondent who adds that implementers have to be experienced and used to working with students since the major part of the workload is allocated to self-directed learning which may be supervised as well.

> "… you must be familiar with working with student. To give assignment regularly to students, monitor them, and guide their presentations" (L_7).

On the other hand, he goes on to note that for the MBTL approach to be properly implemented, it requires ICT use and lecturers are required to be familiar with this tool: manipulate easily internet, PowerPoint and its components:

> Then you must use Power Point,… ICT, so that students report their assignment and conduct presentations I noticed that on that point young lecturers are more performing than their seniors who don't master English, who don't know to use ICT, or internet (L_7).

Unfortunately NUR does not have enough facilities to allow meeting all these requirements. Participants note a serious lack of computers in labs and a very weak connectivity to internet:

> Because the principle of module system is that students may develop by themselves. That will be possible once they will have enough means. There is nothing here, no enough computer labs. The few computer labs we have are always full because we have too many students. So you cannot obtain good results without means. Lecturers don't have documentation. I use my own books and I download other documents because I know how to do it. I have a modem. I have connexion and I have enough time since I have an office (H_4).

The few facilities are not useful for those old lecturers who are reluctant because they don't know how to use these modern equipments:

> … but there is also the group of the old generation members who don't have time to spend on internet or even don't know to use it in downloading those documents sent by Roger. It is those who say: "what is this?" It is those who resist. They don't master the internet use whereas all documents related to MBTL are communicated by internet (L_7).

Since all programmes and almost all documents on MBTL approach are written in English, implementers are required to be familiar with this medium of MBTL instruction:

> You must master the language. You must understand English perfectly. That is the first quality. So you will be able to read and understand because now all programmes were put in English but many lecturers don't understand it (L_7).

As pointed out by Scott (2000) leaders of change are not only the policy makers or senior managers, but everyone involved in the process especially teachers. Thus NUR academics staff have enormous task to have up-dated skills in order to accurately implement the innovations introduced in the institution.

4.4.2.2. Managers' leadership

Respondents have mixed views on MBTL implementation managers' leadership at NUR. Some of them are convinced that they are committed to successful implementation of MBTL methodology; others consider their engagement with criticism while others find that managers do not show any visible leadership.

a. They are invisible

Participants who find that managers lack of leadership argue that they are not visible on the field of MBTL implementation. They do not follow-up the academic activities on the field. They do not take on any supervision or coordination in this area. This respondent outlines this position:

> I don't see those managers anywhere. Saying that they follow how people understand this system and apply it, and so on... I don't see them coming to verify if things are going well. Why do they call it "things belonging to Roger"? One can talk about it. Really no one has never seen that Roger. He hasn't yet given us a model showing the technique; telling how he wants us to do it. Everyone manages as they like. There is no real coordination. We wish he would come near us and explain those things and their purpose … (L_4).

Some participants see in that attitude a certain lack of ownership:

> There is no ownership, no conviction... Who is managing that? Quality, the Director of quality (*sic*). But what he does is only to examine reports: the number of hours written by students. Did the lecturer teach? What did he teach? Is it in accordance with the programme and the handbook? He never descends on the field to observe practically what's happening.... Instead of daring to send messages saying that one who will not have modules will be sacked. There are several messages like that. Or someone dares to say: "I'll react logically and vengefully." We received that message; we have it. So you understand that there is no ownership but it is … pressure (H_2).

However, all managers are not the same. Participants talk about those who try to understand the need for the institution to improve and behave accordingly. They try to cope with the situation and engage in concrete actions towards the implementation of innovation.

b. Managers show a certain commitment

Those who consider that managers show a certain leadership argue that they try to cope with environment to achieve MBTL objectives, given it is an order received from above and may be executed as such. That is claimed by this respondent:

> The policy was formulated to be implemented directly without given time to allow people to prepare for it... of course they try to cope with the environment that I mentioned, they are really committed in spite of issues I mentioned related to the motivation and so on. But they are committed. Because you know that teaching is a vocation. That's why you cannot say that somebody comes here without that kind of commitment (L_5).

Others find that their leadership is a bureaucratic one since they lead from their offices, where they manage documents and control only timetable completion:

> So far I noticed only one kind of commitment... they set up a system: Deans gave to students books in which they count the number of taught hours. At the beginning, let say the Director of Quality, he is requesting at the end of every month, now it is every week course progress as recorded in those books, people have done this, have done this. But this is in terms of number of hours, not in terms of quality. Because I don't know the feedback of this control. That is what I noticed they do. ... Yes we give assignments but I doubt their monitoring...their management…? Only in their offices. In the manner that a lecturer can convene with students and they write 30 hours whereas he taught only 20. Yes. It happened to me (L_7).

Of course managing the timetable is key to guaranteeing that the flow of teaching and learning goes on in the most predictable circumstances, but it is not sufficient to ensure the curriculum content. Thus manager's leadership falls prey to being termed a dictatorship as claimed by respondent (H_2) mentioned above.

c. It is difficult to change

On the other hand there are participants who maintain that managers do what is possible for them to manage successfully the innovation but the problem is that it is difficult to change (Everard & Morris, 1992). In the beginning, "every programme change faces problems" (H_1); even if there is leadership, it is not perceptible. Everybody is floundering because they don't understand what they have to do.

> I find that they did all what they could if I consider what the situation at the beginning was. And they asked us to teach according to the new system, no one was allowed to continue the former system. The problem for lecturers is to adapt

> to the system and apply it correctly .Lecturers especially, don't deeply understand. But I think that commitment would come at the end… it is a process; we learn step by step. Things don't happen immediately for example the issue of workload (L_4).

Either it is difficult to people to adjust to innovation because as Lumby & Foskett (2008) assert, it takes time to break with a culture:

> They were told that a system is being implemented, the new approach of student centred teaching. However some lecturers, especially those who were old did not cope directly with the system. Because of the following challenge: You know when somebody has adopted a system for a long time, a new system isn't easy for him to deal with... (L_5),

or it is due to inappropriate preparation of the implementers:

> I think on the basis that I see colleagues they are struggling in order to access those programmes, the modules, and how to implement them, that preparation did not happen. They would have taken 2 or 3 days or why not a week during vacations and organised a seminar to explain to people because it was a new spirit, a new structure, a new method of teaching we started to apply (H_2).

But the lecturers are handicapped by a malfunctioning of politics in matter of education leading to a lack of continuity in management as noted (L_2): "Sometimes rupture in leadership hinders nurture of programme".

4.4.2.3. Self engagement

Participants were invited to discuss to what extent they were concerned by the implementation of MBTL in their institution. Their responses can be categorised under these three patterns. The first category includes implementers who feel concerned by the innovation and engage resolutely in the application; the second comprises others who are demotivated by the austere situation and stand away, and the third is related to implementers who are dispassionate and stand in a neutral position.

a. Implementers committed to MBTL applications

Participants say that there are lecturers and managers who really are engaged in applying the methodology. By making sure that it is applied as required, they engage in concrete actions towards MBTL implementation and really are willing to help students to improve:

> I think that would be my commitment... to try to really help student, right? I mean in the teaching process. I should follow them, when I give them an assignment of reading in library, or some writing, I should follow and verify if they did it, right? If someone has a problem I invite him or her and we talk since there are hours planned for students' guiding, in order to listen to those who have problem and need help. I'm ready to do that" (L_3).

Even they can see that to be fully helpful to the student achievement, MBTL should be applied without rejecting the former system because it served as basic content to MBTL:

> That is my commitment regarding module system. However I don't give up totally the former theory. I ask it to them in their assignment and I ask them to refer to the theory (L_4).

However, through their responses, some academics deplore the laxity of some managers towards their efforts to undertake actions focusing the successful MBTL implementation:

> When I want to invite an external specialist in a field I am not supported enough by senior managers as I told you. Then it is a problem. But normally I might do that, then students would participate and after we can evaluate and provide with feedback (L_7).

On the side of managers, there are also those who show that commitment and as leaders, engage in action leading to successful implementation. These ones say that with the assistance of lecturers, they design objectives and goals, assign modules leaders and explain as possible the MBTL methodology, and even model the teaching:

> It's just to help them by giving them a clear example of how for example they should take the unit. Because that is to know how to handle the unit as part of module not as a course which is the isolation. To help them for example by a clear example of how much time they should spend on face to face lecturing and how much time they should spend in other,… in consultative hours for example or in other activities. Because for them it is still a problem to know how far they should go (H_2).

b. Implementers who are demotivated

In this category we have responses that show some NUR lecturers and managers who do not feel concerned by MBTL approach. Even if they are against, it is an order from policy makers which must be executed:

> "…you cannot say that they don't want it because it is like an order received. Moreover, I don't find any reason to reject it because when an order is given you must execute" (L_4).

Another trend of this category is shown by participants who think that they have been left out of the process of innovation programme. It is those who call MBTL "those things of Roger" who feel that they are disowned of their courses.

> I think that if lecturers had been involved from the beginning, we should have had a well functioning system with all material required. But since lecturers haven't been involved, that's why they say 'those things of Roger, … things of Pamela, those things of I don't know who else', they stand out of the system, and they refuse to engage in it (D_2).

Others are discouraged by the requirements that are not met and they continue to use the former methodology including the French language and material:

> … the problem for lecturers is to adapt to the system and apply it properly… there are those who don't understand yet the methodology because there is not enough material which could help them. Most books in this University are in French. Translation is difficult… (L_4).

This kind of attitude is found also among managers. This HoD says that he cannot communicate or teach a change spirit to lecturers because he does not feel authorised to do so. He goes on to say that he is discouraged by the lecturers' lack of commitment and demotivation in MBTL implementation:

> Some people are willing, some others are not. ... I don't want to name any people, but I tell you that there is a guy who was away for training when we started the system, yet he has never taught by it. And there are many like him…so, it is a challenge. Call on lecturers and give them the spirit, I think that it is not up to me to do it. I plan to ask the Dean or DQA to come and explain it to them through a workshop. But I am afraid that they won't attend and finally I become ridiculous... At the end of the day, the problem is that administratively, I don't know if I'm authorized to do that [pause] and socially also (H_2).

But on the other hand we have managers who give up their responsibility by simple laxity like this one who finds that it is not necessary to follow up the lecturers activities because they know what they have to do:

> ... I think that it is not difficult. Meaning that modules are well designed, what is very interesting for me is that in module system programmes are well designed, contents... so all is written in detail. It is easy to follow up lectures,... if all is done

> as it was prescribed. That means that the lecturer knows exactly what to do for a correct implementation of the system (D_2).

But a major part of respondents in this category, find that MBTL is a highly demanding methodology so that they are overloaded and cannot find time to monitor, follow up and evaluate properly the implementation.

> This system brought too much administrative work etc… I don't know. You see we finish the 1st semester, you gave examinations, you must mark them quickly (1 or 2 weeks) you proceed 2nd sitting and you continue teaching… (H_2).

c. Neutral implementers

Through participants' responses appears a category of lecturers and managers who do not show any position. On one hand they apply the MBTL because they cannot do otherwise. They are in the system which may go forwards:

> So I'm not saying that they want to change, they are obliged to change because the language they were using before has changed, the medium of education has changed. They are obliged to change and adopt English and then use it in education but always with a lot of difficulties and even sometimes a lot of complaints because they don't know why this change has come (H_3).

They do what they can and have conviction that at the end of the day things will be better as this respondent is claiming:

> ... But I think that commitment would come at the end… it is a process; we learn step by step. Things don't happen immediately... (L_4).

4.4.2.4. Leadership impact on MBTL implementation

Lecturer and manager participants in this research interview were asked how students and colleagues perceive their impact on the implementation of MBTL approach towards success. Their responses are divided into two categories. There are those who are convinced that they are positively appreciated and others who confess to not knowing how they are appreciated especially by students. This question aimed at analysing the NUR implementers' role in leading the innovation to success but seen from external viewpoints.

a. Positively appreciated

For those who are convinced that they are positively appreciated, it is because of their concrete actions undertaken towards MBTL implementation:

> Students perceive it when I'm explaining to them the programme structure: compulsory and elective modules. Because they have just arrived from secondary school, they don't know the University yet. I explain modules components: not considering their lecturers separately but as a whole (H_4).

Others mention that at the beginning of the year they have signed a contract of performance with NUR administration and managers follow up the completion of the contract so that at the end the year they state their appreciations:

> Apart from that, managers also can make their own investigation on follow up... Which means that every year we sign a contract whereby, for example we say: "After this year we will have to complete this." So the issue arises at the implementation of what we signed. Sometimes there are discrepancies related to ethics, professional ethics. So those who attended and did not comply with professional ethics, are quoted... This implies that the managers perceive our work in positive way (L_5).

Another claim that, building on how they are regularly consulted about MBTL concerns, they are positively appreciated:

> Your approach is compared to your colleagues you share the module i.e. when one gives brief notes and other gives detailed, they are not equally considered by students. But for me there is no problem because I prepare students to understand and I was there from the beginning (H_1).

a. Implementers have no idea of their appreciation

On the other hand, we have a category of those who confess that they do not have any idea of how they are perceived because either they were not at all evaluated so far, or they have been evaluated, but do not have any feedback:

> Yes, they fill it, and they write what they learned and then submit it in SEPU (DQA).... there is no feedback given to lecturers regarding teaching ... No, rather it would be useful. Because with feedback the lecturer knows how students have appreciated the teaching and the points to improve. But since I am here I have never seen such feedback (L_4).

Or simply they reject the idea of being evaluated especially by students:

> Let me tell you the truth. The first year we did it in our Department ... but when we looked at the results we found that we couldn't publish them because if we had published them some lecturers would have been dismissed. So that system doesn't exist any more. The system of module delivering and lecturers' performance evaluation, etc doesn't exist in my Department (H_2).

This view is strengthened by a colleague who says that students do not know how to appreciate lecturers' teaching activities:

> I believe that our students have not yet understood how to evaluate teaching. Because when a student has failed the course or module, for him the teacher has not taught his course well. For a student who has a good note, he or she may say Ok, this or that (D_2).

Consequently, they resist allowing the students to evaluate the new courses, because they are worried by the kind of evaluation which H_2 describes previously. However there are some HoDs who recognize that they get helpful information about MBTL implementation from students' representatives and therefore can follow up what is happening in their departments:

> ... when students are not happy, they complain. I have here a file full of their correspondence, and they do it before, during and after the module delivering... it is useful for the management of change, because their representatives participate in our meetings and they communicate all information they have regarding MBTL. For instance, there are lecturers who have been dismissed because they couldn't conform to the system (H_4).

The above points that while applying the MBTL approach, lecturers need to be regularly evaluated in order to appreciate consistently their impact on its potential success.

Consistent with the notion that all people inside the institution are susceptible to practice leadership if they can foster change (Astin & Astin, 2000), the findings show that NUR academic staff commitment to adopt and commit to the success of the innovation was influenced by their readiness and the way it was led. When the MBTL was introduced NUR academic staff were not ready to implement it accurately. They had not been

psychologically prepared and did not receive any training on the new methodology they had to apply.

Therefore, some of them were exited to apply a method in use worldwide. But even if Everard and Morris (1992) contend that it is difficult to change, others apparently demotivated by the inadequate preparation were reluctant to apply a system judged as merely fashionable and brought in from outside by funders. Furthermore Bush et al. (2009) concur in this regard that academics must be approached, guided, and even coached by the senior managers who are expected to supervise the implementation, and in so doing eradicate the resultant feeling of being overwhelmed. But many lecturers commented that at NUR these managers are confined in their offices managing documents instead of approaching the MBTL users in the field.

4.4.3. Higher Education teaching and learning culture

Van Vught (1989) claims that innovations take place when implementers in HEI judge them worthwhile for their usual practice and Lumby & Foskett (2008) enhance the idea noting that successful implementation of innovation relies on sustained efforts of implementers to deal with existing culture while aiming at changing teaching and learning and other related internal conditions. The NUR academics express their appreciation of changes proposed by MBTL approach and how they deal with the influence of their former academic culture

4.4.3.1. Views on innovations proposed by MBTL

On innovations proposed by MBTL, the NUR academics views show that there are those who positively appreciate change while others perceive them negatively and others who are sceptic.

a. MBTL innovations are negatively perceived.

NUR academics who are against MBTL innovation say that “there are no noticeable innovations that it brought” (L_3). They find that student work more than before but nothing shows that they improve

> [Students] are supposed to work but it is not so evident that they improve. It appears evident for one who was motivated, who already was committed to studying, and still has an open mind. Otherwise, I think that it is that former system which helped student to improve... (L_3).

They say also that at the end, students will be devoid of knowledge they used to acquire from former system and the ability they are expected to achieve with MBTL:

> I'm afraid that with this one, students leave the institution devoid of knowledge as well as ability because I told you that practices are not well conducted and readings are not done according to module requirements. Because formerly students memorized courses but tried also to understand, but now on one hand you didn't provide with full notes and they don't have sufficient documentation. On the other hand those practical exercises are not properly supervised and you can have some of them who don't work. You know in a group of 5 students there is only one or two who work (L_4).

b. MBTL innovations are positively perceived

Another category of NUR academics find that there are significant positive changes brought by MBTL. Some of them say that knowledge has been improved because in designing modules MBTL harmonized courses offered by the former system and filled gaps that often appeared and student "have opportunity to achieve wide culture than before" (H_2). Furthermore, students are now required to be more responsible and take on their own education and get capability to build their life skills (H_4). Consequently they have to work further (D_1).

> In fact, the module system equips student to give them capability of building their skills not rough learning given by lecturer and who ask them: '*rendez-moi mes notes* (= give me back my notes)'. But 'to what did you use my notes?' because besides now there are not notes, they are indications, instructions (H_4).

c. Scepticism towards MBTL innovations

But there are academics who are sceptical towards MBTL approach. They say that the approach develops good principles but is demanding and consequently difficult to apply in the Rwandan context, and cannot reach expected students' achievement. In terms of sacrifice on lecturers' side, "the decreasing teaching time has limited lecturers in course delivering" says L_6. This view is echoed by H_3 who finds that on students' side the system

should be helpful, but these ones waste their time instead of working in their auto-directed learning:

> You know most of students are young people who are easily digressed by a lot of things. So instead of spending a lot of time in libraries or in internet café, they prefer go dancing, sleeping or playing … (H_3).

Other academics think that MBTL cannot succeed because all requirements are not met such as "supportive environment" (L5) and lecturers' lack of MBTL and instructional language skills as pointed by this participant:

> I wanted to draw the conclusion that in my opinion the quality of 1st cohorts will not be the one planned because all these conditions are not met and there is no for hope improvement. So there many reasons: lecturers have not yet mastered the MBTL methodology, they have not yet mastered English which is the instructional language and third, the educational material is not sufficient... (D_2).

The view is completed by L_7 who asserts that MBTL needs good lecturers used to work closely with students.

4.4.3.2. Influence of the NUR former teaching and learning culture

NUR academics confess that the former teaching and learning culture continues to exist. Surely its continued existence has an influence on the success of MBTL because not only is change not easy but also implementers have not been prepared enough to adjust to the new methodology. But this is understandable because, as pointed out by Carnall (2003) in every introduction of innovation there is a problem of resistance to change.

a. Influence due to lack of training on new methodology

Respondents in this study are convinced that the former NUR teaching and learning culture continues to be applied despite the implementation of MBTL innovations. They argue that it is because implementers have not been properly prepared to use the new method and do not have regular trainings on the new functioning approach. Therefore when they try to apply it they encounter many problems because some of them lack that spirit of centring teaching on students which constitutes the basis of innovation as well as other requirements and consequently are unable to adjust to MBTL.

They "have never been trained to use the new system" (L_7) and consider a module as a collection of short courses to be taught separately especially when they are convinced that "the combination was arbitrarily conducted" (L_3). It is what reveals this respondent:

> Most of lecturers have that spirit of considering the unit they have to teach as their former courses. Which is not the case. They don't see the link which should be clearly shown to student between the unit they teach and other units which should follow or came at the beginning if they have to come at the beginning (H_3).

There are also those old lecturers who "think that change is not important and apply the law of less effort" (H_4). So they continue to apply their old teacher centred method.
But on the other hand, lecturers are hampered by the very crucial problem of English. Those who cannot prepare their teaching in this language "simply use French to deliver their teaching" (H_1) or translate their former courses in English as pointed by (D_2).

> But since they have not been involved and don't understand the language of instruction, because all the documentation on this system is in English, it also hampers the understanding because there are many lecturers who had not yet read all these documents. They simply prefer to translate their courses in English instead of losing much time to read the documents in which they don't understand anything (D_2).

b. It is not easy to change

Another category of influence of the former system on the new one is due to the fact that it is difficult to change. Respondents note that the modules or at least the content used in MBTL methodology comes straight from the former course system especially regarding the theory. It is only the teaching and learning methodology that has changed not the content. So lecturers who have difficulties in understanding the structure of a module are tempted to consider this one as a collection of short courses as pointed herein above and "deliver them and assess as such" (H_4). Other old lecturers who have problems with the new learner-centred system and its requirements (e.g. ICT) continue to use the former system which is didactic:

> They are still in the didactic teaching. You see him coming in class, and because he cannot use PPT, he teaches as he used to teach before. If ever he gives an assignment, he gives only one when they might be many. So, that problem exists. An old lecturer who studied in France or in Belgium comes and sits or stands in front of students, he talks and after he leaves (L_7).

And L_4 concludes saying that "it will take time: things don't happen immediately".
Another issue in this category is related to external visitors coming from institutions that do not apply MBTL. They use the former system because on one hand they are not informed about MBTL, and on the other hand NUR timetable is organised in the manner that they cannot enter the MBTL system as claimed by this respondent:

> In MBTL we have to teach 1 or 2 hours per week. When it is a visitor, he has to finish at least in 2 or 3 weeks; then it is impossible to follow the new system... Because they don't give student time to read. They are teaching almost every day. This is a problem. Because if he is coming for one month, he cannot teach a course of for example 10 credits in 2 or 3 weeks using the new system. It is impossible. Almost all of them have one month maximum. With one month you cannot teach a course, I mean a module of 20 credits using this method (H_1).

c. Resistance to change

Participants in these interviews maintain that among NUR academics there is a kind of resistance to change with respect to MBTL. They argue that they do so because they have not been sensitised about the change programme and thus they lack ownership. Actually as respondents assert, implementers have not been involved in the programme process, and don't feel comfortable with it. They stand away from it and call it "those things of Roger":

> …but since lecturers haven't been involved, it is why even lecturers say 'those things of Roger, those things of Pamela…' they stand out of the system; they refuse to imply in it (D_2).

Secondly, they say that lecturers resist because they feel that MBTL "disowns them of their courses" (H_3) for which they spent many time and energy. Consequently they continue to apply their former teacher centred method:

> They say: 'I teach like this because I used to do so'. And you tell them: 'no, you can no longer use your old notes. It is not possible'. You see when we had to reduce modules from 400 hours to 200 we had problems. However, little by little, through discussions they are changing… Generally, they want to use the law of lesser effort, saying that the change is not important and continue with their old methods (H_4).

And finally, there is a category of lecturers who apply MBTL badly because they find it as a dictation imposed upon them from above and confess clearly that they did not adopt it.

> On my side, when I talk about the module system, I have not yet adopted it. I apply it because I have to. I cannot change anything about it... it is a policy introduced by NCHE which must be applied in the whole country. That's all (H_2).

Kenny (2003) underlines the importance of lecturers' adaptation to change and the development of professional expertise for the success of educational change and innovative projects. However, the lack of a thorough preparation led NUR academic staff to negatively appreciate the changes proposed by MBTL approach. This concurs with Garrisson & Kanuka (2004) findings. Furthermore Van Vught (1989) concurs in this regards that an innovative idea may be accepted by academics only when they judge it worthwhile for their usual activities.

Definitely even if it is not easy to change, the lack of smooth introduction of MBTL coupled with the change of instructional language contributed to this academic staff reluctance and scepticism especially those who could not easily adapt to the new method requirements such as the new instructional language or information technology facilities. An extremely important recommendation made by Van Vught (1989) suggests initiation of a framework of dialogue for an open debate on such project. Thus the existing culture should be correctly analyzed, and cultural attributes needed to achieve strategic action plans should be brought out. And finally they should move forward towards a successful implementation of change.

4.5. Discussion of findings

As seen throughout this chapter, the analysis of data reveals the way in which MBTL is being managed at NUR, the NUR academic staffs' leadership towards the programme change introduction and their attitudes towards the innovation with respect to their former academic practice.

4.5.1. Management of educational change

Though the literature on education change (Scott, 2000; Van Driel et al., 1997; Levin, 1993) points to the extreme importance of the involvement of constituents in the process of change, especially in higher education institutions, the introduction of MBTL at NUR

was a top-down decision of educational policy makers specifically MINEDUC through NCHE. It was made without considering the educational culture already shaped in the institution, and without considering NUR lecturers' professionalism who were going to play a great role in implementing this innovation in their practices.

Furthermore, the decision to reform the NUR teaching and learning system by the introduction of MBTL methodology was taken at the same time as the medium of instruction shifted from French to English. In this year, the Rwandan government instituted a change in the language of instruction at all education levels from French to English. The concurrent introductions of these two program innovations created further problems due to the fact that there was little prior preparation of the implementers for either initiative. Some of them said that MBTL would have been efficiently applied if it had been introduced in French. This lack of thorough introduction of the change contributed to a great confusion amongst NUR academics and led to critical consequences in their ownership of the innovation and commitment to its successful implementation.

4.5.2. Educational leadership

The data analysis revealed that some lecturers were convinced that the reform of the system of teaching and learning was needed because some components of the former one were obsolete or needed to be updated to meet international standards. These lecturers were happy to adopt and apply the new methodology. They argued that the innovation would be helpful around student achievement given the learner centeredness and how the MBTL philosophy required students to take charge of their own education. In spite of the critical lack of means to achieve the ends, they tried to cope with the learning environment.

But on the other hand, the analysis revealed another category of NUR academics who were reluctant to adopt MBTL because they judge it as "a fashionable system" imported by "funders from abroad" in a general movement of change occurring in the country and imposed upon them by educational policy makers i.e. National Council of Higher Education. In their responses, they claimed that its introduction was apparently not planned because they had not been involved in the process of preparation, and had the

effect of disowning them of their own courses. They stand away from it saying that "it belongs to Roger". Moreover, given the means provided, they do not see any student improvement despite the stress put on self directed learning activities.

This divergence of views among lecturers and managers on the necessity to reform of the teaching and learning method shows a lack of shared understanding of the innovation. This could have been the foundation for their shared leadership of a successful implementation. Therefore, as the programme change was a top-down decision, they would like to see the MBTL approach reintroduced by further explanations of its rationale drawn from a prior study of the former system, its principles and functioning.

Another key element of academic staff' leadership emerged from participants' views was their adaptation to MBTL implementation management. From participants' responses, it appears that lecturers were "groping in the dark" implementing the MBTL approach because they had not been adequately prepared and had been excluded from the process. Furthermore, their managers did not provide the required resources needed for the new approach.

4.5.3. The influence of the former academic practice

First of all, enlightened by Van Driel et al (1997), the data analysis shows that NUR academic staff needed to have a voice in what happens to their institution and to themselves in order to feel more responsible for what they were requested to implement. Secondly, the inappropriate preparation for implementation resulted in disorganized procedures, which as Kenny (2003) suggests results from a lack of common understanding and ownership by academic staff members. At the beginning, in spite of NCHE recommendation to involve lecturers in devising the new methodology, lecturers felt excluded from policy formulation; and not prepared to adjust to and implement the innovation appropriately. They were asked to prepare modules when they did not understand the new system. This was coupled with the change of instructional language in which they lacked skills.

On the side of managers, the data analysis revealed that in some departments and faculties, managers try to cope with the current environment and follow the lecturers'

and students' activities. But in others, not only were managers disappointed by the lack of preparation for the programme change, but also were discouraged by the lack of lecturers' commitment. This is further complicated by some managers who seem confined to their offices where they manage documents and don't come to lecture rooms to see what is actually happening.

As suggested by the literature (Celinšek and Markič, 2008), the importance of empowering the staff to ensure their capability to advance the ongoing programme of innovation was clearly shown to be a great priority. The research showed that empowerment involves providing the lecturers, students and the institution with learning material. The adequate implementation of MBTL at NUR required an appropriate material such as a full access to internet, ICT equipment, enriched library, large subscription to journals, equipped classrooms and labs, and lecturers' offices. The lack of these basic requirements seemed to disappoint NUR academics and deterred their commitment to implement MBTL. And some were attempted to continue apply the former system of content/lecturer focused instead.

Furthermore, the research showed that the empowerment of NUR academic staff by NUR leadership would have provided them with skills and knowledge of the new approach and made them feel integrated in the system of NUR improvement. In the interviews, lecturers noted that clearly empowering academic staff can help address the multiple challenges of such an implementation of an innovation. They assumed that by the introduction of a framework for open collaboration between managers and lecturers, policies and procedures should reflect and take the main implementers into consideration when it is to make decisions. But also the staff development office at NUR should organize for every member of NUR community compulsory meetings and seminars aimed to provide them with further explanations allowing them to share how to engage in what they understand and why. It should also provide lecturers with training on principles and functioning of the new methodology.

4.6. Conclusion

This chapter dealt with findings from data interviews. It provided themes reflecting the respondents' answers towards the questions underpinning this research. The interview

questions served to give information about the subjects' attitudes, beliefs and views on the way the management of the implementation of change introduced in their institution is being conducted and their own engagement to its success.

In general, the data analysis showed the attitudes of NUR academics about the introduction of MBTL as an innovation in their institution. Also it indicates their views on the way it is being managed by both sides of leaders and lecturers. Their thoughts on the issue of the implementation of education change at NUR where a certain culture of teaching and learning was shaped for a long time ago.

Chapter 5. GENERAL CONCLUSION

This research concerns a question of leadership and management of programme change in education. It attempts to analyse the leadership shown by NUR academic staff in the management of the implementation of a Module-Based Teaching and Learning (MBTL) methodology at the university. It aims to understand to what extent the NUR managers and lecturers are committed in implementing this programme change introduced for the improvement of education at NUR and its students' outcome achievement.

The literature reviewed provided a framework for understanding one such management of change in education at a tertiary level, and for understanding different actors' leadership in a teaching and learning innovation. It discussed issues related to educational leadership, management of change and higher educational institutions' culture. Its review served also to explain and match the data with established theories on educational leadership and management of education change in order to enable the researcher to come up with reliable results. The analysis of data from the field interviews revealed the beliefs and attitudes characteristic of different actors towards the implementation of educational change in a Higher Education Institution which had shaped a certain culture of teaching and learning for a long time.

The research was carried out as a case study and subjects were members of NUR academia. The nature of the data for the present study was personal stories elicited from interviews. I recorded the data by interviewing 12 members of the NUR academic staff who have been teaching for at least 3 years and are familiar with both the former and new method of teaching and learning at NUR.

The findings from the interview's data reveal that NUR lecturers and managers have to some extent been surprised by the introduction of MBTL and by the lack of strong academic leadership in its application. This is especially due to the fact that as pointed out by Scott (2000), in Higher Education Institution, for a change programme to be successful, management needs the involvement of the main actors i.e. lecturers in the whole process. This reason is given by Van Vught (1989) when he claims that HEI's are known to cherish traditional norms and values so that when decisions have not been deliberated and diffused properly, they cannot be easily applied. Apparently the

introduction of MBTL at NUR was a top down decision made at NCHE and brought by NUR authorities without considering NUR lecturers' knowledge and expertise. Furthermore, lecturers have not been appropriately prepared to adequately implement the innovation that was introduced. This lack of full participation of the academic staff was further complicated by the lack of adequate resources and the change in the language of instruction.

Moreover the NUR academic authorities were criticized for staying in their offices, to carry out routine administrative activities instead of promoting an environment that supports an adequate application of MBTL by establishing and nurturing strategic activities to ensure that lecturers in the field develop and apply the new methodology as required. Lecturers discussed that managers were needed not to undermine the traditional role of the lecturer who feels disowned of his former academic practices, but rather to provide lecturers with support and guidance.

With regard to academic staff leadership, the research reveals that the inappropriate management of innovation introduction coupled with the change of instructional language, contributed to a great confusion amongst NUR academics. Furthermore, this led to critical consequences on their ownership of the innovation and on their commitment to its successful implementation. The research shows also that Deans and HoDs who were caught unaware seem not to have had a clear vision for their departments. Some of them try to cope with current environment and actively engage with lecturers, but others disappointed by the lecturers' lack of enthusiasm, have adopted a laisser-faire management style.

About the culture of teaching and learning in Higher Education, the findings show that not involving the lecturers in the initial adoption process inhibited NUR lecturers and led some of them to react negatively to the changes proposed by MBTL. Disappointed by the lack of required material, or the inability to adapt to the new requirements, such as instructional language or information technology, these lecturers are reluctant to adopt the innovation and they continue to apply the former method.

To conclude, Kenny (2003) builds on Lines (2000) and claims that a one-way process from the top down is characteristic of "organisations that are over managed but under led".

Assuming that leadership in any organisation is a system of interaction that pulls people towards becoming committed to goals achievement, the statement is that leadership is not just for those in power position but qualifies everyone who can endeavour towards the right achievement of the institution mission.

At the end of this research, the general observation is the presence of a very weak commitment of academic staff for a successful implementation of MBTL at NUR. This was the effect of the mismanagement of the process of change where the introduction of the innovation was a top-down decision of educational policy makers made without considering the educational culture already shaped at NUR, and without considering lecturers' professionalism and expertise. Moreover it was introduced without any technical empowerment of either the institution or the implementers.

However many in the NUR community judge the approach very helpful for student improvement and have no wish to stop the process of full implementation of the MBTL approach. Therefore, NUR managers should demonstrate flexibility and get out of their offices to approach lecturers for a thorough monitoring of the MBTL method implementation. Moreover they should mind the professionalism of NUR lecturers and introduce a structure of collaboration and dialogue since as Van Vught (1989) asserts, academics are not conformists. They adopt an innovation once it fits with their own activities.

Integrity and commitment to excellence in education and community service suggests a first but gigantic step towards creating a supportive environment conducive to the professional well-being of academic staff. As staff development is fundamental to nurturing change and reinforcing effective educational leadership, the organisation of new seminars would trigger NUR academic staff's ownership of MBTL and strengthen their knowledge and skills in its application. By doing so, NUR lecturers should choose to consider MBTL not as "a fashionable approach", belonging to "foreigners such as Roger", but as a methodology introduced at NUR for educational effectiveness with the purpose of improving students' achievement. Therefore they should reach a shared understanding and ownership of this programme change and totally engage in and cope with the NUR facilities for its successful implementation.

As suggested by Kenny (2003) there is little research available about how the process of change in higher education affects academic staff, particularly in developing countries or countries in transition. This study attempts to fill the gap in change management literature. The Rwandan Government has set high learning standards for its higher education system by the adoption of MBTL approach. Students are expected to acquire the knowledge and skills that will help them achieve success at university and in subsequent life. As Scott (2000) asserts, just to have good idea does not make it happen. Implementing change in higher education creates a high level of uncertainty for implementers. It is not just a question of adopting innovation, the particular characteristics of HEI needs to be taken in account for a smooth management of the process of change. An educational innovation has implications for professional practices and needs to thoroughly adjust the new approaches to teaching and learning culture already shaped by the institutions.

The introduction of change must involve lecturers in the whole process and should therefore insure their total engagement in a successful implementation. The final outcome of educational innovation will emerge as the lecturers come to understand, adopt and apply it appropriately. Linking to broader organizational management, HEI leadership must function to support and value learning as a key outcome and provide the environment for this to occur.

References

Andrews, L., Aungles, P., Baker, S., Sarris, A. (1998). *Characteristics and Performance of Higher Education Institutions (A Preliminary Investigation).* Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Astin, A.W. and Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change*. Battle Creek: W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Berman, P., McLaughlin, M. (1974). Federal Programmes Supporting Educational Change. *Model of Educational change*. , vol. 1A . Santa Monica: Rand.

Best, J. W. and Khan, J.V. (1998). *Research in Education*, 8th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, vol. 35(3).

Bolden, R., Petrov, G. & Gosling, J. (2008). *Developing Collective Leadership in Higher Education: Final report*. Centre for Leadership Studies: University of Exeter.

Briggs, A. & Coleman, M. (2007). *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management*. London: Sage Publications

Bush, T., Joubert, L., Kiggundu, E., Van Rooyen, J. (2009). Managing teaching and learning in South African schools. *International journal of Educational development*.

Bush, T. & Glover, D. (2009). *Managing teaching and learning*: a concept paper.

Bush, T. (2008). From Management to Leadership; Semantic or meaningful change? *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*. SAGE Publications vol.32 (2), London, Los Angeles, New Delhi and Singapore.

Bush,T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of education*. Vol.27(3).

Bush, T. and Glover, D. (2003) *School leadership: Concept and evidence, Reading*. NCSL.

Campbell, C. & Levin, B. (2008) Using data to support educational improvement. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*. N^0 21.

Carnall, C.A. (2003) *Managing change in Organisations* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Carter and Alfred (1998) *Making Change Happen*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Consortium for Community College Development.

Celinšek, D. and Markič, M. (2008) Implementing problem-based learning in a higher education institution**.** *International Journal of Management in Education***.** 2(1).

ChangingMind.org. (2011) *Dealing with resistance*. [On-line] , Available:*http://changingminds.org/disciplines/change_management/resistance_change/dealing_resistance.htm*

Creemers, B.P.M. and Reezigt, G. J. (1997). School Effectiveness and School Improvement: Sustaining Links. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 8(4). Groningen: GION.

Crump, S., Ryan, C. (2001). Managing Educational Change: Issues, actions, and examples. *Change, Transformations in Education*. 4(2).

Davidoff, S. & Lazarus, S. (1997). Organizing Framework for Understanding Schools, ch.2, in *The learning school, an organization development approach*. Cape Town: Juta.

Dheram, P. K. (1995). Feedback as a two-bullock cart: a case study of teaching writing. *ELT Journal*. Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 160-168.

Elmore, R. (2000). Building a new structure for school leadership. *American Educator, Winter* , 1999-2000.

Everard, K. B. and Morris, G. (1990). *Effective school management*. London: P. Chapman, 1990. 2nd ed.

Everard, K. B. and Morris, G. (1996). Strategic management in Education. *Management of education*. Oxford: Institute of Education

Fidler, B. (1997). Organisational structure and organisational effectiveness. In A. Harris, et al. *Organisational Effectiveness and Improvement in Education*. Buckingham: The Open University Press.

Fleisch, B. (2002*). Managing Educational Change: State and School Reform in South Africa*, ch. 5. Johannesburg: Heinemann

Ford, P.; Goodyear, P.; Heseltine, R.; Lewis, R.; Darby, J.; Graves, J.; et al. (1996) *Managing Change in Higher Education: A Learning Environment Architecture*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press

Freeman, D. (Ed.) (1999). *Doing Teacher-Research: From Inquiry to Understanding*. Toronto: ITP An International Publishing Company.

French, W. L., & Bell, C. H., Jr. (1999). *Organization development: Behavioural science interventions for organization improvement* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Fullan, M. (2005). The Meaning of Educational Change: a quarter of a century of learning. In Lieberman, A. (ed.) *The Roots of Educational Change*. NY: Springer.

Fullan, M. (2003). *The Moral Imperative of School Leadership*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Fullan, M. (2002). The role of leadership in the promotion of knowledge management in schools. *Teachers and teaching: theory and practice*. Vol. 8(3/4).

Fullan, M. & Ballew. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Citeseer.

Garrison, D. & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The internet and higher education*. 7(2).

Gillham, B. (2000). Case study research methods. London: Continuum.

Gosling, J. and Mintzberg, H. (2004). The education of practising managers. *MIT Sloane Management Review*, 45(4).

Handy, C. Aitken, R. (1984). Taken for Granted? Understanding schools as organisations. In *Purpose and Planning in Schools*. London: Longman.

Hargreaves, D. (2002). Helping Practitioners Explore their School's Culture. In Preedy, M. Glatter, R. & C. Wise, (eds.) (2003). *Strategic leadership and educational improvement***.** London: Sage.

Hargreaves, A. (Ed.). (2005). *Extending educational change: International handbook of educational change*. New York: Springer.

Harris, A. & Muijs, D. (2003) *Teacher leadership: Principles and practice*. Coventry: Warwick Institute of Education.

Hopkins, D. (2006). *Every School a Great School: Meeting the change of large scale, long term educational reform*. London. SSAT.

Hopkins, D. West, M. and Ainscow, M. (1996) *Improving the quality of education for all*. London: David Fulton.

Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M. and West, M. (1994). *School improvement in era of change*. London: Cassell.

Jansen, J. (1995). Effective Schools? *Comparative education* , 31(2).

Kelly, K. & Murphy, M. (2007). Academic change in higher education in Europe. *American Society or Engineering Education*, 2007. On line http://www.icee.usm.edu/ICEE/conferences/asee2007/papers/2335,\

Kenny, J. (2003). *A research-based model for managing strategic educational change and innovation projects*. Melbourne: HERDSA, Citeseer.

Kenny, J. (2002). Managing innovation in educational institutions. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*. 18(3).

Kenny, J. (2001). *Where academia meets management: a model for the effective development of quality learning materials using new technologies*. Melbourne: RMIT.

Kerr, C. (1987). A critical age in the university world: accumulated heritage versus modern imperatives. *European Journal of Education*, 22(2).

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston : Harvard Business School Press.

Kotter, J. P. *Kotter's eight steps Change Model: Implementing Change Powerfully and Successfully*. On line http://www.mindtools.com/pages/articles/new PPM-87.htm. Retrieved on 31/07/2009.

Kruger, A.G. (2003). Instructional leadership: The impact on the culture of teaching and learning in two effective secondary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, Vol. 23(3).

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lacey, A. & Luff, D. (2001). Qualitative data analysis: Trent focus for research and development in primary health care. *An introduction to Qualitative analysis*. London: Trent Focus.

Lashway, L. (2000). Who's in charge? The accountability challenge. *Principal Leadership*, 1(3).[On line] www.nassp.org/news/pl-acntblt-chlng1100.htm.

Levin, H. (1993). Accelerated schools in the United States: do they have relevance for developing countries. In H., Levin and M. Lockheed (eds) *Effective schools in developing countries*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Littledyke, M. (1997). Managerial style, the National Curriculum and teachers' culture: responses to educational change in a primary school. *Educational Research*, 39(3).

Lumby, J. and Foskett, N. (2008). *Leadership and culture*. Southampton: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

MacCoun, R. J. (1998). Biases in the interpretation and use of research results. *Annual Research of Psychology*, Berkley, n0 49.

McCroskey, S. (2008). Leadership challenges for educational administration. *Academic Leadership*. Vol.6(3).

McLaughlin, M. W. (1976). Implementation as mutual adaptation: Change in classroom organization. *Teacher College Records* 77(3).

McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: evidence-based inquiry*, 6th ed**.** Boston: Pearson Education.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. 4th ed. USA: Sage Publication, Inc.

Middlehurst, R. and Elton, L. (1992). Leadership and management in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 17(3).

Miles, MB. & Huberman, AM. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miles, M. (1964). Education Innovation: The Nature of the Problem. In Miles, M. *Education Innovation in Education*. NY: teachers college Press.

National Council of Higher Education. (2007). *Destruction and restoration: the organisation of higher education in Rwanda*. Kigali

Neuman, W.L. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Pearson Education

OECD. (2003). *Changing patterns of governance in higher education*. London

Owen, **P., S**. **Demb, A**. (2004). Change dynamics and leadership in technology implementation. *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 75(6).

Patton, R. & McCalman, J. (2000). *Change management: A guide to effective implementation*. London: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods,* 3rd . Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Paulsson, A. (2008). *Towards good and effective management in a museum: The importance to understand understanding*. Lunds Universitet, Thesis

Ramsden, P. (1998). Managing the Effective University. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 17: 3.

Rayner, S.G. (2008). Complexity, diversity and management; some reflections on folklore and learning leadership in education. *Management in Education*, 22(2), 40-46.

Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative research practice*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Robson, C. (1993). *Real world research*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Rwandan Higher Education. (2007). *National Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy*. Kigali, MINEDUC.

Rwandan Higher Education. (2007). *Rwandan National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education*. Kigali, MINEDUC.

Sarason, S. (1994). *The culture of the school and the problem of change*, Allyn & Bacon, Ch.4

Scheerens, **J**. (2005). The School Effectiveness Knowledge Base as a Guide to School Improvement. In Hopkins, D. (ed). *The Practice and Theory of School Improvement*. New York: Springer.

Scott, G. (2004). *Assuring Quality & Effective Change Management in International Higher Education*. NAFSA Conference, Baltimore.

Scott, G. (2003). Effective Change Management in Higher Education. *Education Review Magazine*. 8(6).

Scott, G. (2000). *Change matters: Making a difference in higher education*. St Leonards, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.

Seidel, J.V. (1998). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. On line: ftp://ftp.qualisresearch.com/pub/qda.pdf. Retrieved on 22nd May, 2010.

Senge, P. (1996). Leading learning organizations: The bold, the powerful, and the invisible. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, R. Beckhard (Eds.), *The Leader of the Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Slavin, R. (2005). Sand, bricks and seeds: School change strategies and readiness for reform. In Hargreaves, A. (ed.) *Extending educational change*. New York: Springer.

Spillane, J.P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *The Education Forum*. Vol.69.

Stoll, L. and Fink, D. (1996). *Changing our schools: Linking school effectiveness and school improvement*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Stoll, L. & Fink, D. (2007). Strategic management in education. *Management of education*. Oxford: Institute of Education.

Taylor, E. & Renner, P. (2003). Analysing qualitative data. *Programme development and evaluation*. Madison: UW Extension.

Taylor, J. and Machado, M. de L. (2006). Higher education leadership and management: From conflict to interdependence through strategic planning. *Tertiary education and management.* 12.

Taylor, J. S., Machado, M de L. and Peterson M. W. (2008). Leadership and Strategic Management: keys to institutional priorities and planning. *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 43, No. 3.

Tobin, K. and Dawson, G. (1992). Constraints to curriculum reform: Teachers and the myths of schooling. *Education Technology Research & Development*, Vol.40.

Tyler. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. In D, Flinders & Thornton (Eds) (2004). *The curriculum reader*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Van Driel, J.H., Verloop, N., Van Werven H. I. & Dekkers, H. (1997). Teachers' craft knowledge and curriculum innovation in higher education. *Higher Education*. 34.

Van Vught, F. A. (Ed). (1989). Governmental Strategies and Innovation in Higher Education**.** *Higher Education Policies Series***,** n0 7.

Van Vught, F.A. (1989). Creating Innovations in Higher Education. *European Journal of Education*. 24(3).

Appendix

Interview guide

A. Interview guide for lecturers

Introduction

- Presentation of the researcher;
- Presentation of the research project Purpose;
- Structure of the interview, confirmation procedure;
- Agreement on voice recording, confidentiality, and voluntary participation.
- Signature of consent form.

Key Questions

Background:

1. How long have you worked at the NUR?
2. Have you held any management positions within this institution?

Change management:

3. Was the reform of NUR teaching and learning system needed?

4. How was the introduction of the Module-Based Teaching and Learning (MBTL) approached?

5. How was the preparation of staff to that endeavour?

6. What is your view of the way the process is being managed?

Educational leadership

7. What qualities would be needed from various actors (lecturers, HoDs, Deans) for a successful implementation of a programme change of this kind?

8. Do you think NUR faculty managers (Deans, HoDs) showing commitment to manage successfully the Module-Based Teaching and Learning (MBTL) approach? (Is it easy to be a leader in this institution, in what way?)

9. In relation to the responsibilities you have as a lecturer, what is your commitment to successful implementation of the MBTL?

HEI teaching and learning culture

10. What do you think about changes proposed in the MBTL approach with respect to the former system?

11. Do you think there is any influence of the former NUR teaching and learning system on the MBTL?

12. Do you think all staff are empowered enough to implement the MBTL programme? (What do they know, what do they do, how do they act?)

13. How do you think managers and students perceive your impact as a lecturer on the MBTL? (Why do you think so?)

14. What do you think is the best way for this organisation to develop a shared understanding of what the implementation of the programme change may be?

15. Have you regular meetings with colleagues to talk about issues related to the implementation of the MBTL (Dpt, Prg, module)? To whom do you report?

16. What do you think should be the best way for this institution to develop an accurate implementation of a programme change?

B. Interview for Deans and HoDs

Introduction

- Presentation of the researcher;
- Presentation of the research project Purpose;
- Structure of the interview, confirmation procedure;
- Agreement on voice recording, confidentiality, and voluntary participation.
- Signature of consent form.

Key Questions

Background:

1. How long have you worked at the NUR?
2. How long have you been appointed to this position?
3. Have you held any other management positions within this institution?

Change management:

4. Was the reform of the NUR teaching and learning system needed?

5. How was the introduction of the Module-Based Teaching and Learning (MBTL) approached?

6. How was the preparation of staff to that endeavour?

7. What is your view of the way the process is being managed?

Educational leadership

8. What qualities do you think would be needed from various actors for a successful implementation of a programme change of this kind?

9. What are your main responsibilities in your current position regarding the management of MBTL? (For example, communicating goals, setting objectives, identifying the learning and development of staff, motivating people, teambuilding, monitoring teaching and learning, timetabling, etc.)

HEI teaching and learning culture

10. What do you think about changes proposed in the MBTL approach with respect to the former system?

11. Do you think there is any influence of the former NUR teaching and learning system on the MBTL?

12. Do you think all staff are empowered enough to implement the MBTL programme? (What do they know, what do they do, how do they act?)

13. How do you think others perceive your impact as a manager on the MBTL? (Why do you think so?)

14. What do you think is the best way for this organisation to develop a shared understanding of what the implementation of a programme change may be?

15. Have you regular meetings with your staff to talk about issues related to the implementation of the MBTL? To whom do you report?

16. What do you think should be the best way for this institution to develop an accurate implementation of a programme change is?