

IRSTI 14.35.07

<https://doi.org/10.51889/2960-1649.2026.68.3.002>SAGINTAYEVA AIDA^{1*}¹Nazarbayev University (Astana, Kazakhstan)

*Address of correspondence: Aida Sagintayeva, Graduate School of Education, Nazarbayev University, Kabanbay Batyr Street, 53, Astana, 010000, Republic of Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6249-0840>,
E-mail address: asagintayeva@nu.edu.kz / Tel.: +77017776780

Sensemaking, Sensegiving, and Rectoral Leadership: Evidence From Kazakhstan

Abstract

Introduction. University autonomy reforms in Kazakhstan have expanded the formal authority of higher education institutions, yet public universities remain shaped by state priorities, funding rules, accountability mechanisms, and performance indicators. This article examines what this tension means for organizational change in a state-steered system with historically centralized administrative traditions: *Methodology and Methods.* Drawing on Kezar's change macro framework, it uses conceptual analysis informed by a multiple-case study of three regional public universities implementing international dual degree programs. *Results.* The article argues that external forces should be treated as a primary domain of change, not merely as contextual background. *Scientific novelty.* It develops a dual sensemaking and sensegiving model of rectoral leadership, showing how university rectors interpret ministerial priorities upward and translate them downward into institutional narratives. Finally, it introduces compliant transformationalism to describe leaders who use the language of transformation while operating within constrained autonomy - *practical significance.* The article contributes to scholarship on higher education change, leadership, and governance.

Keywords: organizational change, sensemaking; sensegiving, rectoral leadership, higher education, university autonomy, dual degree programs.

Introduction. University autonomy has become a central reform idea in Kazakhstan's higher education policy. The 2018 Law on Institutional Self-Governance expanded university authority over academic programs, organizational structures, financial management, staffing, and internal governance (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2018). Yet formal autonomy has not removed ministerial steering. The Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2023) continues to define national priorities, monitor performance, and evaluate institutional progress through policy concepts, state programs, funding mechanisms, and key performance indicators.

This creates a central tension for organizational change. Universities are expected to act as strategic and autonomous institutions, but many major reforms are still defined through national policy. They are encouraged to innovate, yet often within boundaries set

elsewhere. This tension is especially visible in regional public universities, which must respond to demographic, economic, and competitive pressures while also demonstrating alignment with national priorities.

Recent international literature confirms that institutional autonomy is often shaped not only by law, but also by government steering, performance agreements, external evaluation, and centralized accountability systems (Couck, 2026; Kohtamäki & Poutanen, 2025; Lackner, 2024; Yasa & Aksoy, 2025). This is particularly relevant for Kazakhstan, where earlier research has shown that the transition toward institutional autonomy has been accompanied by continued state influence over university behavior (Sagintayeva & Kurakbayev, 2015). In this context, autonomy is not simply a legal category. It is a negotiated governance condition shaped by policy instruments, institutional capacity, and leadership interpretation.

The issue is also linked to internationalization. Kazakhstan has used internationalization as a policy tool for modernization, global alignment, and institutional competitiveness (Akkari et al., 2023). In the post-pandemic context, internationalization policies have become more closely connected to institutional strategy, quality assurance, and global positioning (Gao & Liu, 2023). International dual degree programs are one visible example of this trend. They promise international visibility and curricular modernization, but they also require language capacity, academic coordination, partner management, and institutional readiness.

Kezar's (2018) change macro framework is useful for analyzing this process because it connects the type of change, context, leadership and agency, and change strategies. It also foregrounds culture, shared leadership, sensemaking, and the distinction between incremental and transformational change. However, the framework was developed mainly in Western, particularly United States, higher education contexts, where institutions usually have greater formal autonomy. In state-steered systems such as Kazakhstan, external forces are not simply environmental pressures. They often define what change should be, how it should be reported, and how leadership performance will be judged.

This article adapts Kezar's change macro framework to analyze organizational change in state-steered higher education systems and explains the role of rectoral sensemaking and sensegiving in this process. The article draws on conceptual analysis informed by a qualitative multiple-case study of three regional public universities in Kazakhstan, referred to as Iris, Tulip, and Clover. These universities implemented international dual degree programs as part of a broader national transformation agenda. The cases are used illustratively to refine how organizational change and rectoral leadership are theorized in strongly steered systems.

The article makes three arguments. First, external forces should be treated as a primary domain of change because national legislation, ministerial concepts, supranational reform agendas, performance indicators, and funding

rules shape not only the context of change, but also its content and legitimacy. Second, rectoral leadership in such systems involves dual sensemaking and sensegiving: rectors interpret national priorities upward and translate them downward into institutional narratives (Kezar, 2013; Weick, 1995). Third, the article introduces compliant transformationalism as a leadership pattern in which rectors use transformational language and promote visible reform projects while operating within strong external constraints.

Context of Higher Education Reform in Kazakhstan

Since independence in 1991, Kazakhstan's higher education system has moved through several reform phases, including marketization, Bologna alignment, internationalization, and, more recently, autonomy and transformation. These reforms have changed universities' formal position, but they have not removed the state's central role in shaping institutional priorities.

The 2018 Law on Institutional Self-Governance expanded university authority over academic programs, organizational structures, staffing, and financial management (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2018). In policy language, universities were expected to become more strategic, entrepreneurial, and accountable. Boards of directors also gained greater prominence in institutional governance. However, autonomy did not mean the withdrawal of ministerial steering. National concepts, state programs, accreditation expectations, funding rules, and performance indicators continued to shape what universities were expected to prioritize (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2023).

Regional universities experience this tension sharply because they face demographic pressure, uneven research capacity, competition from larger institutions, and expectations to contribute to regional development. They must respond to local needs while also demonstrating international competitiveness and alignment with national reform priorities.

International dual degree programs have become one visible policy instrument within

this environment. They are promoted as tools for internationalization, institutional transformation, and regional university development. For policymakers, they offer a visible sign of modernization and global alignment. For universities, they can create opportunities but also risks. Collaborative and dual degree programs depend not only on external partnerships, but also on the salience of internal university stakeholders and the sustainability of institutional commitment (Shenderova, 2023).

The three universities discussed in this article, Iris, Tulip, and Clover, operate within this policy environment. They differ in size, location, disciplinary profile, and organizational culture. Yet all three are regional public universities facing expectations to demonstrate transformation. All three have used international dual degree programs as part of their institutional strategies. This makes them useful cases for examining how external policy forces interact with rectoral leadership and internal sensemaking.

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

Kezar's (2018) change macro framework offers a useful lens for analyzing organizational change in higher education because it brings together four areas that are often treated separately: the type of change, the context for change, leadership and agency, and change strategies. Its strength lies in recognizing that university change is not only technical. It is also cultural, political, cognitive, and relational.

The framework distinguishes between first-order and second-order change. This distinction is useful because many reforms look ambitious in policy documents but remain limited in institutional practice. A reform may expand activity without changing the institution's deeper logic. Transformational change requires shifts in values, identities, practices, and culture. In this respect, the framework helps distinguish between visible reform and bigger institutional change.

Kezar also emphasizes context. Universities are shaped by history, governance arrangements, institutional culture, stakeholder expectations, and their relationship with the state and

society. Culture is especially important. Kezar and Eckel's (2002b) work shows that change strategies are more likely to succeed when they connect with institutional values and local meanings. When reforms are perceived as imposed or culturally disconnected, they may produce new documents and structures without changing everyday practice.

Leadership and agency are also central to the framework. Kezar moves beyond heroic models of rectoral leadership and highlights shared leadership, stakeholder engagement, and the social construction of meaning. Rectors matter, but they are not the only actors. Deans, faculty, students, professional staff, and external stakeholders all shape how change is interpreted and enacted. Research on institutional transformation similarly shows that sustainable change depends on sensemaking, interrelated strategies, and balance between external demands and internal culture (Kezar & Eckel, 2002a).

This article extends Kezar's framework through the concepts of sensemaking and sensegiving. Weick's (1995) sensemaking framework is useful because it shows how actors interpret ambiguous situations through identity, experience, social interaction, extracted cues, and plausible narratives. Sensemaking is therefore not a purely individual or technical process. It is social, ongoing, and closely connected to action.

Kezar's (2013) work on sensemaking and sensegiving in higher education is especially important for this article because it shows that change becomes meaningful through social interpretation, not only through formal plans. Recent work on leadership communication during organizational transformation also emphasizes that leadership involves constructing, communicating, and negotiating meaning during institutional change (Frølich et al., 2025). This is directly relevant to rectoral leadership in state-steered systems, where rectors must interpret external priorities and then translate them into institutional language.

Birnbaum's (1992) distinction between instrumental and interpretive leadership is also useful for analyzing rectoral roles in this context.

Instrumental leadership focuses on structures, systems, goals, performance, and compliance. Interpretive leadership focuses on meaning, identity, values, and shared understanding. Rectors in Kazakhstan need both. They must manage indicators, budgets, reporting, staffing, accreditation, and risk. But they must also explain why reforms matter, connect external mandates to institutional purpose, and help stakeholders see change as meaningful rather than merely imposed.

Traditional distinctions between transactional and transformational leadership remain relevant (Bass, 1997; Bass & Avolio, 1994). Transactional leadership focuses on targets, compliance, monitoring, and risk management. Transformational leadership focuses on vision, culture, motivation, and shared purpose. Yet these categories do not fully capture leadership in systems with constrained autonomy. Rectors may use transformational language and pursue visible reform projects, while the direction and pace of change remain closely tied to state-defined priorities. This article calls this pattern compliant transformationalism.

Materials and Methods. This article is conceptually oriented but empirically informed by a qualitative multiple-case study of three regional public universities in Kazakhstan. The cases are anonymized as Iris, Tulip, and Clover. They were selected because each institution implemented international dual-degree programs within the broader national agenda of university transformation and internationalization. The empirical material is used illustratively rather than statistically. The purpose is not to claim that these three cases represent all public universities in Kazakhstan. Rather, the cases ground the conceptual argument and show how the same national policy instrument can take on different meanings across institutions.

The underlying study drew on qualitative data from institutional documents and stakeholder accounts related to the implementation of international dual degree programs. Documents included strategic materials, policy texts, institutional plans, and materials related to program implementation. Stakeholder accounts helped illuminate how leaders, administrators,

and academic actors interpreted reform priorities, institutional risks, and internal capacity. The analysis followed an interpretive logic. It focused on how external policy priorities were translated into institutional narratives, how rectors framed dual degree programs, and how internal stakeholders made sense of these reforms. The cases were compared to identify differences in rectoral framing, institutional capacity, stakeholder engagement, and perceived risk. This approach is consistent with the article's theoretical interest in sensemaking, sensegiving, and organizational change.

Results. *Extending Kezar's Framework for State-Steered Systems*

Kezar's framework remains useful for analyzing change in Kazakhstan. It helps identify the type of change, the importance of culture, the role of leadership, and the strategies used to implement reform. However, it needs extension when applied to systems where the state strongly defines reform priorities. This article proposes three adaptations. First, treat external forces as a primary domain of change. Second, understand rectoral leadership through dual sensemaking and sensegiving. Third, leadership typologies should include compliant transformationalism as a distinct pattern in constrained autonomy settings.

External Forces as a Primary Domain

In Kezar's (2018) original framework, external forces appear mainly as context or as one source of change. This works well in systems where institutions have substantial discretion to respond to their environments. In Kazakhstan, however, external forces often do more than create pressure. They define the reform agenda. National legislation, ministerial concepts, funding priorities, accreditation expectations, and KPIs shape what universities are expected to do and how success is judged. International dual degree programs, for example, have been promoted as national instruments of transformation, internationalization, and regional university development (Akkari et al., 2023; Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2023). For regional universities, this can therefore become a matter of legitimacy, not only academic innovation.

This argument aligns with recent international research showing that government steering, state–institution agreements, and external autonomy evaluations can limit institutional autonomy (Couck, 2026; Kohtamäki & Poutanen, 2025; Lackner, 2024). Comparative research on centralized higher education systems also shows that institutional actors can experience formal autonomy and academic freedom differently, depending on governance arrangements and state control (Yasa & Aksoy, 2025).

External forces interact with all parts of Kezar’s framework. They shape the type of change by defining reform content and pace. They shape context through funding, regulation, and accountability. They shape leadership by narrowing or widening rectors’ room for maneuver. They shape strategy by encouraging visible projects, rapid implementation, formal compliance, or selective adaptation. For this reason, external forces should be placed at the center of the analysis. In state-steered systems, they are not background conditions. They drive organizational change.

Dual Sensemaking and Sensegiving

The second extension is the dual sensemaking and sensegiving model. Kezar’s (2013) framework recognizes sensemaking inside institutions. The proposed adaptation adds the vertical relationship between ministry and university.

The model can be summarized as follows: *Ministry sensemaking → rectoral sensemaking → rectoral sensegiving → institutional sense-making → enactment/adaptation/resistance.*

Ministries construct policy meanings by defining priorities, identifying problems, and selecting reform instruments. Rectors then interpret these instruments through the lens of institutional capacity, political risk, and accountability expectations. They then translate reform into institutional narratives. Faculty, students, deans, and staff interpret these narratives through their own interests and experiences. The reform is then enacted, adapted, resisted, or decoupled. This model shows why leadership matters even in strongly steered systems. Rectors are not fully autonomous actors, but they are not powerless. Their interpretations and narratives shape how external mandates enter institutional life.

Leadership Typology in Constrained Autonomy

The third extension concerns leadership. Transactional leadership focuses on targets, compliance, monitoring, and risk management. It can support delivery, but it may produce broad yet shallow change. Transformational leadership focuses on vision, culture, motivation, and shared purpose. It has greater potential for second-order change, but it requires enough autonomy to reshape institutional direction (Bass, 1997; Bass & Avolio, 1994). Compliant transformationalism sits between these two patterns (Table 1). It combines transformational language with strong alignment to external mandates. Rectors who practice compliant transformationalism speak about transformation, competitiveness, internationalization, and modernization. Yet the content and timing of their reforms closely track national policy priorities.

Table 1

Leadership Typology in Constrained Autonomy

Leadership pattern	Core orientation	Likely change outcome
Transactional leadership	Compliance, KPIs, risk management	Adjustments or broad but shallow change
Transformational leadership	Vision, culture, shared purpose	Potential for deep second-order change
Compliant transformationalism	Transformational rhetoric within external constraints	Mixed change: visible reform, symbolic alignment, selective deeper shifts

Compliant transformationalism captures a real leadership response to a specific governance condition. Rectors must satisfy external expectations while maintaining internal

legitimacy. They must show progress to the state and Board of Directors, while persuading faculty and students that reforms are meaningful. This concept helps explain why reforms in Kazakhstan may look ambitious and constrained at the same time. Institutions may launch international partnerships, revise strategies, and speak the language of transformation. Yet bigger change depends on whether these projects alter academic culture, internal governance, teaching practices, research capacity, and stakeholder trust.

Empirical Illustration: Three Institutional Vignettes

Iris University: Transformation through a Ministerial Project

At Iris University, the international dual degree initiative was closely linked to national reform priorities. It arrived with ministerial attention, external expectations, and strong symbolic value. The newly appointed rector interpreted the initiative as an opportunity to reposition a regional university facing geographical and reputational constraints. This reflects the sensemaking process described by Weick (1995), where leaders construct plausible meanings from external cues and use them to guide action.

The rector framed the dual degree initiative as part of a broader transformation agenda. Strategic documents connected the partnership to curriculum renewal, English-language capacity, assessment practices, infrastructure, and academic culture. The reform was therefore not presented as a narrow program-level arrangement. It was presented as evidence of institutional renewal. This framing aligns with Kezar's (2013) argument that sensegiving helps institutional actors understand change and locate it within a broader organizational narrative.

Iris also shows how external forces shape the type and scope of change. In Kezar's (2018) framework, external pressures form part of the context for change. In this case, however, they did more than create context. They shaped the reform's urgency, legitimacy, and indicators of success. Internally, the reform generated mixed responses. Some actors saw it as a meaningful opportunity to modernize academic practice.

Others viewed it as another top-down project. This confirms Kezar and Eckel's (2002b) argument that change strategies must connect with institutional culture to move beyond formal adoption. Iris therefore illustrates compliant transformationalism. The rector used transformational language and a visible national project to mobilize institutional change. Yet the reform remained closely tied to external indicators, Board of Directors oversight, and ministerial expectations. The case shows both the potential and the fragility of transformation under constrained autonomy.

Tulip University: Co-Oriented Vision and Student-Centred Dialogue

At Tulip University, the dual degree initiative was framed differently. The rector did not treat it mainly as a reputational project. Instead, it was connected to a wider agenda of academic integrity, research development, student engagement, and teaching quality. This reflects an interpretive approach to leadership, where the leader works not only with structures and targets, but also with meaning, values, and institutional identity (Birnbbaum, 1992).

The rector invested heavily in communication. Town halls, open forums, and meetings with students and staff became important sensegiving spaces. The leadership explained why change was needed, invited feedback, and connected internationalization to local concerns. The dual degree initiative was presented as one part of a larger effort to improve academic standards and strengthen the university's culture.

This approach gave the reform stronger internal meaning. It was not only about satisfying a national priority. It also addressed issues that faculty and students recognized in their own environment. By linking internationalization to academic integrity and student experience, the rector made the reform more culturally coherent. This aligns with Kezar and Eckel's (2002b) idea of culturally responsive change, where reform becomes more sustainable when it resonates with local values and practices.

Tulip also reflects the importance of shared vision in organizational change. Doten-Snitker et al. (2021) show that building shared vision can support change by helping stakeholders

understand why the reform matters and how they are connected to it. In Tulip's case, the rector's communicative approach helped position the dual degree initiative as part of a broader institutional conversation rather than as a purely external mandate. At the same time, Tulip remained within the same state-steered policy environment. The rector still had to demonstrate progress, respond to national expectations, and align with transformation discourse. The difference was in the internal translation. Tulip shows that even in constrained autonomy systems, rectors can create more dialogic and locally meaningful approaches to reform.

Clover University: Professional Development amid KPI Anxiety

Clover University faced similar external pressure to implement dual degree programs. However, the leadership interpreted the reform through the lens of institutional capacity and risk. Deans and faculty were anxious about KPIs, deadlines, quality expectations, and the consequences of failure. This illustrates how organizational actors make sense of reform not only through policy language, but also through local histories, available resources, and perceived risks (Weick, 1995). In response, the rector adopted a cautious strategy. Rather than presenting the dual degree initiative as a dramatic transformation, the leadership framed it as gradual capacity building. Professional development became a central sensegiving tool. Training, pedagogical support, staff development, and experimentation helped make the reform feel more manageable.

This approach reflects the distinction between instrumental and interpretive leadership (Birnbaum, 1992). Instrumentally, the rector had to respond to KPIs and external accountability. Interpretively, the rector had to reduce anxiety, build confidence, and give the reform a realistic institutional meaning. The leadership therefore avoided overpromising and focused on credibility, consolidation, and gradual improvement.

Clover also illustrates the difference between visible reform and bigger organizational change. Transformational change requires more than structural adjustment. It requires changes

in beliefs, practices, and institutional culture (Kezar, 2018). Clover's leadership recognized that dual degree programs could not succeed through formal adoption alone. Faculty needed time, support, and professional confidence.

Clover therefore represents a more cautious form of compliant transformationalism. The leadership did not reject the national transformation agenda. It aligned with it but translated it into a slower, more developmental pathway. This reduced the risk of symbolic transformation and showed that cautious leadership can be strategic when institutional capacity is limited.

Together, the three cases show that national policy does not enter universities uniformly. Iris translated the dual degree initiative into a transformation narrative. Tulip connected it to academic culture and student engagement. Clover framed it through capacity building and risk management. These differences confirm the importance of sensemaking and sensegiving in higher education change (Kezar, 2013; Weick, 1995).

Discussion. This article contributes to debates on organizational change in higher education by showing how established change frameworks travel unevenly across governance contexts. Kezar's (2018) change macro framework remains valuable because it brings together context, culture, leadership, agency, and strategy. However, the Kazakhstan cases suggest that the framework needs adjustment when applied to systems where the state remains a powerful architect of institutional change.

The first implication is theoretical. In strongly steered systems, external forces cannot be treated only as part of the environment. They often define the reform itself. National laws, ministerial concepts, Bologna-inspired reform scripts, funding priorities, and KPIs shape what universities are expected to change, how quickly change should happen, and how success will be measured. This builds on earlier work showing that big change depends on interactions among external pressure, institutional culture, leadership, and change strategy (Kezar & Eckel, 2002a).

The Kazakhstan case adds an important qualification to this literature. In state-steered

systems, the interaction between external pressure and institutional response is more vertical. The ministry does not simply apply external pressure. It provides the language, instruments, and legitimacy through which change is understood. This is consistent with research on institutional autonomy and state steering in Kazakhstan and other higher education systems (Couck, 2026; Kohtamäki & Poutanen, 2025; Lackner, 2024; Sagintayeva & Kurakbayev, 2015).

The second implication concerns leadership theory. The cases show that rectoral leadership in Kazakhstan is neither purely transactional nor fully transformational. Rectors must deliver KPIs, manage risk, and comply with external expectations. These are transactional and instrumental tasks. At the same time, they are expected to articulate vision, motivate stakeholders, and present their institutions as transforming. This aligns more closely with transformational and interpretive leadership (Bass, 1997; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Birnbaum, 1992).

The concept of compliant transformationalism captures this hybrid condition. It describes leaders who use transformational language while operating within strong external constraints. This concept avoids two overly simple interpretations. It does not reduce rectors to passive policy implementers. At the same time, it does not romanticize them as fully autonomous change agents. Their leadership is real, but bounded.

This argument also extends research on sensemaking and sensegiving. Weick's (1995) sensemaking theory shows that organizational actors interpret ambiguous conditions and construct plausible meanings for action. Kezar's (2013) work shows that change becomes meaningful through social interpretation, not only through formal plans. Recent research on leadership communication during organizational transformation reinforces this point (Frølich et al., 2025). The present article adds a vertical dimension: rectors in state-steered systems first make sense of ministerial priorities and then engage in sensegiving inside the institution.

The three vignettes show that the same national policy can become different institu-

tional projects depending on rectoral framing, institutional culture, and perceived capacity. This supports Kezar and Eckel's (2002b) argument that change strategies must connect with institutional culture to move beyond formal compliance. It also confirms that collaborative and dual degree programs depend on internal stakeholder engagement, not only external partnership agreements (Shenderova, 2023). For policymakers, the findings suggest that steering mechanisms shape not only institutional behavior, but also institutional meaning. The design of KPIs, funding rules, reporting requirements, and policy concepts affects how rectors interpret reform. If policy instruments are too prescriptive, they may encourage formal adoption without deeper organizational learning. If indicators reward only visible outputs, leaders may prioritize projects that look transformative but do not necessarily change academic culture.

External mandates may produce formal structures that signal legitimacy while leaving core practices relatively unchanged, explaining why some reforms become symbolic or decoupled from everyday academic work (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). A more productive approach would combine steering with structured sensemaking. Ministries could create forums where rectors, boards of directors, and academic leaders discuss how to adapt national priorities to institutional contexts. For leadership development, the study highlights the importance of interpretive capacity. Rectors need technical competence in finance, regulation, governance, and quality assurance, but also the ability to read policy environments, construct credible narratives, and create spaces for shared interpretation (Birnbaum, 1992).

The study also points to the importance of distributed leadership. Change cannot depend only on rectors. Deans, department chairs, program directors, faculty leaders, and professional staff also interpret and translate reform. Otherwise, reforms may remain rectoral projects rather than institutional projects. This is consistent with Kezar's (2018) emphasis on shared leadership and with work showing that organizational change is strengthened when stakeholders participate in constructing

a shared vision (Doten-Snitker et al., 2021). Overall, organizational change in Kazakhstan's higher education system is produced through the interaction of state steering, rectoral interpretation, institutional culture, and local capacity. Kezar's framework helps analyze this process, but it needs adaptation. External forces should be treated as a primary domain. Rectoral leadership should be understood as dual sensemaking and sensegiving. Transformational leadership should be seen as constrained, negotiated, and often compliant rather than fully autonomous.

Conclusion. This article has argued that organizational change in state-steered higher education systems requires closer attention to external policy forces. While Kezar's (2018) change macro framework remains useful for analyzing context, culture, leadership, agency, and strategy, the Kazakhstan cases show that it needs adaptation where the state directly shapes the content, pace, legitimacy, and risks of institutional change. The article makes three

contributions. First, it argues that external forces should be treated as a primary domain of change, as national laws, ministerial concepts, KPI regimes, and funding priorities enter institutional life through strategies, reporting systems, leadership narratives, and performance expectations. Second, it develops a dual sensemaking and sensegiving model of rectoral leadership, showing how rectors interpret ministerial priorities upward and translate them downward into institutional narratives (Kezar, 2013; Weick, 1995). Third, it introduces compliant transformationalism to describe leaders who use the language of transformation while operating within constrained autonomy. The three cases show that the same national policy can take on different institutional meanings. This confirms the importance of sensemaking, institutional culture, and rectoral interpretation in externally steered change. Future research could test the proposed framework through comparative studies of other state-steered higher education systems.

References

- Akkari, A., Seidikenova, A., Bakitov, A., & Minazheva, G. (2023). Internationalization of higher education in Kazakhstan: From political will to implementation. *Ensaio: Avaliação e Políticas Públicas em Educação*, 31(119), 354–380. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362023003103730>
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130–139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.2.130>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. Jossey-Bass.
- Couck, D. (2026). Limitations to the perceived institutional autonomy coming from government steering: A study of the experiences of higher education institutions. *Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-026-01649-7>
- Doten-Snitker, K., Margherio, C., Litzler, E., Ingram, E., & Williams, J. (2021). Developing a shared vision for change: Understanding faculty perspectives on the goals of an institutional transformation. *Research in Higher Education*, 62(2), 206–229. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-020-09594-9>
- Frølich, N., Bleiklie, I., & Stensaker, B. (2025). Leadership communication during organizational transformation. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 15(4), 680–695. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2025.2456871>
- Gao, Y., & Liu, J. (2023). Innovating policies for university internationalisation in the changing post-pandemic global field. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 7(1), 78–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2022.2114531>
- Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2018). *Zakon Respubliki Kazakhstan ot 4 iyulya 2018 goda № 171-VI ZRK “O vnesenii izmeneniy i dopolneniy v nekotoryye zakonodatel’nyye akty Respubliki Kazakhstan po voprosam rasshireniya akademicheskoy i upravlencheskoy samostoyatel’nosti vysshikh uchebnykh zavedeniy”* [Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 171-VI ZRK of 4 July 2018 “On amendments and additions to some legislative acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan on expanding the academic and managerial independence of higher educational institutions”]. <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/Z1800000171> [in Russian].

Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2023). *Postanovleniye Pravitel'stva Respubliki Kazakhstan ot 28 marta 2023 goda № 248 "Ob utverzhdenii Kontseptsii razvitiya vysshego obrazovaniya i nauki v Respublike Kazakhstan na 2023–2029 gody"* [Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 248 of 28 March 2023 "On the approval of the Concept for the development of higher education and science in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2023–2029"]. <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P2300000248> [in Russian].

Kezar, A. (2013). Understanding sensemaking/sensegiving in transformational change processes from the bottom up. *Higher Education*, 65(6), 761–780. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9575-7>

Kezar, A. (2018). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2002a). Examining the institutional transformation process: The importance of sensemaking, interrelated strategies, and balance. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 295–328. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014889001242>

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2002b). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 435–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2002.11777159>

Kohtamäki, V., & Poutanen, M. (2025). External university autonomy evaluations: The new autonomy ecology of Finnish universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2025.2470697>

Lackner, E. J. (2024). Agreements between the state and higher education institutions – how do they matter for institutional autonomy? *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(6), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2258901>

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>

Sagintayeva, A., & Kurakbayev, K. (2015). Understanding the transition of public universities to institutional autonomy in Kazakhstan. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 5(2), 197–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2014.967794>

Shenderova, S. (2023). Collaborative degree programmes in internationalisation policies: The salience of internal university stakeholders. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 13(2), 197–215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2022.2120035>

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage.

Yasa, R., & Aksoy, H. H. (2025). Assessing university autonomy and academic freedom in centralised higher education: Insights from Turkey. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 119, Article 103432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2025.103432>

Information about the author:

Sagintayeva Aida, Candidate of Philological Sciences, EdD, Associate Professor, Dean of the Graduate School of Education, Nazarbayev University, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6249-0840, email: asagintayeva@nu.edu.kz