

Leading Educational improvement in Trinidad and Tobago

Freddy James

Warwick Institute of Education, University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom.

Email: Freddyleejames@gmail.com

Abstract

This Trinidad and Tobago (T&T) is currently undergoing major educational reforms and improvement at all levels of the system. Schools have been given responsibility for implementing changes through the establishment of school-based management. School leaders now have the important role of initiating and implementing school improvement, which necessitate new forms of leadership. This raises the question of the leadership capacity and competencies that are required for school leaders to fulfill this role. This article focuses on educational improvement in T&T and its implications for school leadership. The study presented in this article utilized a qualitative interpretive research design employing a range of data collection methods, including questionnaires and interviews. The results of the study confirm a need for developing a new type of school leader who is: better trained, more research oriented; more of a risk taker and more autonomous.

Keywords: educational leadership; educational change; school improvement; Trinidad and Tobago

Introduction

The government of Trinidad and Tobago is committed to educational improvement and reform as a means toward further economic growth and transformation and realizing its goal of developed status by 2020. This article reports on research into school improvement in Trinidad and Tobago and its implications for leadership. The twin island state of Trinidad and Tobago is one of the most southerly islands in the Caribbean chain. It is a democratic state, with a bicameral political system based on the Westminster Model of government. It is considered as one of the wealthier nations in this part of the region because of its oil and natural gas resources. It is a multi-ethnic, multi-religious society that has emerged from an historical background of slavery and colonialism.

Education in the context of Trinidad and Tobago

Trinidad and Tobago realized universal primary education in the 1950s. It achieved universal secondary education in 2000, (Manning, undated). Remnants of a colonial past are still evident in the education system, in the various categorizes of schools that exist. There are now two main categories of schools with sub-divisions within. One category is called 'traditional' and is sub-divided into secondary assisted and government. This category refers to schools which were built in the post emancipation and early independence era: 1850-1970. The second category is called the 'new sector' schools, which refers on the one hand to a renaming and re-classification of all non-traditional government and secondary assisted schools built after 1970 in T&T and on the other, a classification of schools built under a World Bank funded program (in response to fulfilling the UNESCO Education for All targets) called The

Secondary Modernization Program. These are more modern schools which offer a varied curriculum, including academic and non-academic subjects. Some of the 'new sector' schools are 'magnet' schools, which mean that they are supposed to be specialist schools (this concept of specialist schools is still being fleshed out within the education system). New sector schools are sub-divided into seven categories as follows: assisted, (which would be schools built after 1970 by religious organizations which are now part funded by the government); secondary; junior secondary; senior secondary; senior comprehensive, composite and secondary comprehensive.

School improvement in T&T, though less concerned with issues of access, continues to be concerned with issues of quality, equality and equity. The current school improvement initiative in the secondary school sector is based on the Secondary Education Modernization Programme (SEMP). According to the Ministry of Education the initiatives derive from 'international best practices' and is underscored by the philosophy that 'Every Child Can Learn.' The main school improvement initiatives are:

- to introduce school-based management, including the establishment of local school boards
- reconfiguration of the Ministry's structure and services at the levels of school, local school boards, education districts/offices and the ministry's head office
- institutional strengthening of the ministry's head offices to improve capacity and human resources to enable delivery of an improved service
- making the reform process more systemic by creating alliances with other public services
- integrating information and communication technology
- establishing a team to coordinate the school improvement implementation process.

Overview of the literature

Writers within the school improvement field, (Hopkins, & Reynolds, 2001; Hopkins, 2001; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000; Stoll & Fink, 1996; Joyce et al, 1999; and Gray et al, 1996) have identified context-specificity; focus on the learning level; capacity development and evaluation of SI approaches as the four critical areas for development. Harris and Chrispeels (2006), acknowledged that the field has paid more attention to these particular areas. Still, they note that the pace of 'real' improvement is lagging, almost as if the SI movement has reached a cul-de-sac. The approach taken in reviewing the literature for this article, was not to focus on the critical factors to make SI work, since these have been adequately articulated in the literature, but, to focus on why reforms fail. This approach serves the dual purpose of highlighting the pitfalls to avoid in implementing educational reform and lessons to learn in making school improvement more successful.

Fullan (1991), states that when considering educational reform, "we have to know what change looks like from the point of view of the teacher, parent, student, and administrator if we are to understand the reactions of individuals and if we are to understand the big picture..." (p. xi). This statement points to the fact that successful change is essentially about peoples' understanding, or sense making of the change and their concomitant responses to it, (Spillane, Reiser & Reimer, 2002). Part of the big

picture of change according to Fullan (1991), is the need to reform structures, content and processes. However, although these organizational changes are important, structures and content cannot shift and adjust themselves; this requires the human input, (Shakeshaft, 2004). Thus, one reason why reforms fail is if stakeholders are not consulted and have not bought into the reform prior to its implementation, (Elmore, 2000; Hallsall, 1998 and Fullan, 1991).

Additionally, the motivation for the reform, or according to Fullan (1991), the authenticity of the effort affects stakeholders' commitment to implementing it. Innovations and reforms which are adopted prematurely and which prove to be questionable on the grounds of need, feasibility or technical soundness tend to fail, (Harris, 2009; Schmidt & White, 2004 and Fullan, 1991).

A second reason why reforms fail is when the reform effort does not take on a systemic perspective. A holistic approach to change should be adopted where all levels within the internal system are developed and connected to the external systems with which they interact, (Hopkins, 2001; Elmore, 1993 and Fullan, 1991). Hopkins (2001, p. 5), suggests that reform policies need to be "system wide", which relates to the overall coherence of the reform policy structure and 'system deep,' which refers to clarity and consistency at both the top and bottom of the system; at the level of policy and in the hearts and minds of teachers.

Restructuring the education sector as a systemic approach to improvement may not necessarily lead to improvements in student achievement, particularly if they focus on the wrong variables, (Datnow, 2005; Harris, 2003; Elmore, 2000; Elmore, Peterson & McCarthy, 1996; Wang et al, 1993 and Fullan, 1991). Wang et al (1993), refer to two sets of variables, first, 'distal variables', which relate to external government bodies, local management of schools, external inspection, organizational development and teacher appraisal. The second set of variables, they term 'proximal variables', relate to psychological, instructional and home environment issues. According to Wang et al (1993), the former set of variables, have little impact on student outcomes, because of the distance of these variables from the day to day teaching and learning in schools. However, they contend that the second set of variables tends to have more impact on student outcomes. Therefore, if reform efforts focus almost singularly on 'distal' rather than 'proximal' variables, they will tend to fail.

A third reason, why reforms fail, is when the implementation process is problematic. The implementation phase of reform determines whether change occurs or not, and hence whether improvement occurs or not. Implementation refers to putting the innovations into practice, if the ideas and innovations are not implementable, or do not get implemented, change will not occur, (Fullan, 1991). Regardless of the nature of the variables, that is, whether they are 'distal' or 'proximal', structural or not, curriculum development, restructuring, standardization, site-based management and teacher professional development, whatever the innovations may be, they need to be put into practice before any change takes place, (Datnow, 2005).

A fourth reason why reforms fail is when the change agents lack the capacity to initiate, sustain and/or manage the change, (Spillane et al, 2002). According to Fullan (2005), capacity building is: "developing the collective ability dispositions and skills, knowledge, motivation and resources to act together to bring about positive change"

(p. 4). Schlechty (2001), suggests that innovations which begin in systems that do not have the capacity to sustain them are not likely to survive the tenure of the change agent. Capacity building is essentially about relationship building, (Day 2004). Professional development and teacher training though necessary in engendering SI are not sufficient, because teachers can gain the knowledge and instructional capacity to deliver the curriculum, but can still lack the care, will, passion and confidence to use this knowledge, (Day, 2004; Harris, 2002; Fullan, 2001 and Halsall, 1998). Within the school environment developing collegiality and providing support for the change agents are crucial. Hence, to avoid failure, educational reforms should focus on making change a collaborative process between the schools and their wider communities, (Ainscow & West, 2006; Jackson, 2006; Harris & Lambert, 2003; Sergiovanni, 2001; Wenger, 1998 and Dalin et al, 1994).

Reforms fail when the school leadership is ineffective, unsustainable and not focused on capacity building and empowerment. While the debate continues on the type of leadership best suited to engender improvement in schools, there is agreement that effective leadership is critical to school improvement. Effective leadership is necessary to facilitate mediating variables such as teacher motivation, classroom activities, school culture and organizational direction, all of which impact on teaching and learning and influences student outcomes, (Harris, 2008 and 2002; Day et al, 2008 and Chapman, 2003). There is also agreement that high quality leadership is essential for sustainable and successful SI, (Fullan, 2005; Spillane, 2004 and Bush & Jackson, 2002). Moreover, Chrispeels and Harris (2006), point out that not only is effective internal leadership in the school important for improvement, but equally as important is the relationship between the external and internal leadership when both are engaged in the reform process. Leithwood et al (2006), offer seven strong claims about successful leadership cited below.

- 1) *School leadership is second only to classroom teaching as an influence on pupil learning.*
- 2) *Almost all successful leaders draw on the same repertoire of basic leadership practices.*
- 3) *The ways in which leaders apply these basic leadership practices – not the practices themselves – demonstrate responsiveness to, rather than dictation by, the contexts in which they work.*
- 4) *School leaders improve teaching and learning indirectly and most powerfully through their influence on staff motivation, commitment and working conditions.*
- 5) *School leadership has a greater influence on schools and students when it is widely distributed.*
- 6) *Some patterns of distribution are more effective than others.*
- 7) *A small handful of personal traits explains a high proportion of the variation in leadership effectiveness.*

These claims suggest that, in order to be effective, school leaders require: training in basic leadership practices; acumen to be responsive to the contexts within which they work; the ability to distribute leadership and the capacity to motivate and gain staff commitment. Leadership is about ensuring that schools have the capacity to improve and sustain the improvement, (Hargreaves, 2007 and Harris & Lambert, 2003). The literature suggests that leaders build this capacity by empowering all members within

the organisation to lead and develop. This occurs through establishing professional learning communities based on trust and meaningful relationships, with the concomitant organisational arrangements, (Hargreaves, 2008; Harris & Lambert, 2003; Goleman, 2002 and Fullan, 2000). Autocratic style leadership is the least likely to build capacity in schools.

Reforms can fail when the locus of control resides outside the school, whereby those who have to lead, implement and manage change lack the autonomy and authority to make the necessary adjustments for the reform to be successful. This is why externally imposed reform tends not to work, (Chapman, 2005; Giroux and Schmidt, 2004; Elmore 2000 and Fullan, 1991). However, externally generated reform can work, if it acknowledges that the change process must be owned, developed and managed at the instructional core and allows the change to emanate from within, with support from without, (Hopkins, 2007 and Dalin et al, 1994).

Finally, as stated before, reforms fail when policy makers fail to recognise that SI is context-specific, (Harris, 2009; Datnow et al, 2002; Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001; Elmore, 2000; Joyce et al, 1999 and Fullan, 1991) and cultural in nature, (James, 2008; Dimmock, 2000; Stoll, 1999 and Prosser, 1999). Schools should not be viewed as a homogeneous group, (Thrupp & Lupton, 2006 and Chapman, 2005). Instead, in recognition of the singularity of each school, the focus of improvement efforts should relate to the contextual factors existing within a particular school at a particular point in time, (Ainscow & West, 2006 and Harris & Chrispeels, 2006). To do otherwise is to court failure of the reform effort.

Methodology

The study explored school improvement in the secondary sector in Trinidad and Tobago, by analyzing the Ministry of Education's policy documents and examining perspectives on the impact of the current reform agenda from the point of view of practitioners: school supervisors, principals and teachers. A qualitative interpretive research design employing a range of data collection methods including questionnaires and interviews was used.

There are eight educational districts in T&T and one hundred and thirty four public secondary schools. The study presented in this article draws on data from: interviews with fourteen secondary schools' principals across the range of secondary school types that exist in T&T; six schools' supervisors across various educational districts and responses from one hundred secondary school teachers from twelve schools that participated in a survey.

Findings

The research aimed to find out what school improvement initiatives are being implemented in the non- private secondary school sector in T&T and what are the implications of these initiatives for school leadership and realizing improvement in student outcomes and organizational conditions at schools. The aims of the research were realized by analyzing the Ministry of Education's documents on school

improvement in the secondary sector and by garnering perceptions of the impact of implementing the initiatives on student outcomes and organizational conditions at schools from practitioners, specifically, schools supervisors, principals and teachers.

There are limitations in conducting any type of research and this proved true for the study that is being reported on. The policy documents analyzed for this study serve a dual purpose. On the one hand they reflect the policy and direction of the school improvement reform in secondary schools in T&T, in other words, they represent what should be taking place in terms of school improvement. On the other hand, they represent the voice of the policy makers and unfortunately this voice is a passive one, since policy-makers declined being interviewed, stating that the policy documents represented their views. However, when the findings of the policy-makers' passive voice and the active voice of practitioners, are presented alongside each other, the results reflect an apparent bias against policy-makers. It should be noted that this apparent bias against policy-makers has not been inflicted by the researcher. It is simply due to the fact that the interviews and semi-structured questionnaires used to collect data from practitioners provided richer and deeper explanations and understandings from their experience, and the analysis of the policy documents could not provide experiential understandings from the policy-makers point of view.

Whether inspired by pressure from external donor agencies like the Inter-American Development Bank to fulfill its commitment to the 'education for all' initiative, or/and the need to enhance the skills and knowledge of its human resource base to meet its goal for developed status by 2020, the evidence in the research study shows that the government of Trinidad and Tobago through its Ministry of Education is committed to improving the provision of education in secondary schools. The Ministry's policy documents outline a vision of education that is student-centered, school focused, systemic, inclusive and bottom-up in its approach. The findings of this study revealed that there is no specified model of school improvement in use in the current reform. However, according the Ministry, the initiatives are based on 'international best practices,' implying that the strategies are derived from research and methods which may have worked in different foreign contexts.

The documentary data analysed for this study showed the following main school improvement initiatives for operationalizing this vision as:

- 1) Curriculum development, including the creation of instructional materials, new subjects and delivery mechanisms and making curriculum more relevant and based on student needs.
- 2) Institutional strengthening and reconfiguration of the Ministry of Education involving a measure of decentralization and augmenting educational district offices to increase capacity to monitor, evaluate and support the implementation of school improvement policies at schools.
- 3) Improving teaching and learning, especially via training and continuous professional development of staff.
- 4) Building and upgrading schools.
- 5) Increasing capacity and participation at schools through school based-management and provision of resources.
- 6) Development of educational standards for assessment, testing and evaluation and providing mechanisms for producing and disseminating examination and evaluation data through publications.

- 7) Developing information technology and information and communication technology systems at schools to facilitate effective delivery of curriculum and to facilitate the dissemination of information system-wide.

The Ministry's stated vision, approach and initiatives have the potential to engender improvement in schools. This is nevertheless contingent on whether these initiatives meet the criteria of stakeholder commitment, local capacity building and linkage with other systems, in a configuration that makes sense for the country and the individual schools. Additionally, the success of this reform is also contingent on whether school leaders are equipped and have the capacity to lead the change.

The evidence from the views of practitioners, (schools principals, supervisors and teachers) within the study shows that the Ministry has initiated the implementation of the initiatives espoused in the policy documents. However, the majority of practitioners indicated that the vision was not being implemented effectively for a number of reasons which are elaborated on in the ensuing paragraphs.

Schools supervisors and principals argued that the Ministry's approach to school improvement remains essentially centralized and top-down despite the introduction of school-based management because:

- schools do not have the autonomy to implement policies without first getting the approval, funding and resources from the Ministry which is a laborious bureaucratic process.
- the Ministry requires districts and schools to take more responsibility but it is not devolving authority to them that is necessary to fulfil these responsibilities.
- legislation remains which limits the powers of principals, for example, they do not have the authority to recruit or fire staff.

The evidence from practitioners in the study indicates that there is need for greater collaboration and communication between the Ministry and the schools about the policies to be implemented; the strategies to be used to maximise implementation success and determination of the schools' capacity in terms of resources and training to enact policies. The implementation of the 'technology education curriculum,' which participants' state has the potential to improve student achievement, particularly in schools with an intake of the lowest achieving students exemplifies this point. Evidence in the study shows that some schools that had technology education laboratories did not have the trained staff to teach the curriculum and schools that had trained staff did not have the laboratories, making it impossible to implement the initiative and also allowing resources to remain idle.

Additionally, the evidence from the majority of participants in this study shows that these groups of stakeholders feel alienated from the decision making process because of what they characterize as superficial consultations which the Ministry conducts with them that elicits their opinions but does not act on them. They pointed out that this lack of meaningful engagement with stakeholders is inhibiting school improvement in the context of Trinidad and Tobago, as it does not facilitate the dialogue that can sufficiently allow for adaptation and implementation of policies more appropriately suited to the differentiated school contexts and cultures.

Most of the school principals and supervisors interviewed in the study insisted that the Ministry is constantly injecting change strategies, often hurried and without ample forethought and resources for schools to implement. They contend that this is progressively putting schools into crisis/change mode as opposed to recovery and growth mode and this is inhibiting rather than facilitating improvement. Arguably, a more effective practice might be to implement fewer policies, thereby giving schools sufficient opportunity for workable strategies to take root and for the deepening of values and practices that bring about and sustain change to occur.

The consensus across the participant data groups is that the implementation of school improvement initiatives had limited or no impact on improving student outcomes and organizational conditions at schools. The evidence from schools supervisors and principals in the study highlighted a number of factors that were inhibiting school improvement. These factors are listed below:

- The Ministry's top-down approach to SI.
- Individual schools' contexts not taken into consideration when designing SI policy.
- Poor monitoring and supervision of implementation of SI policies.
- Culture of superficial stakeholder consultations.
- Lack of stakeholder involvement: stakeholders' opinions not taken on board.
- Problematic implementation process.
- Limited capacity building support for implementing policies.
- MOE not providing resources in a timely fashion.
- SI policies not clearly communicated by MOE to implementers.
- Externally driven SI policies at variance with the national culture.
- Inadequate, unstructured, unclear and untimely training programs to implement SI policies.

Conversely, the factors that participants in this study believe are mostly facilitating school improvement are:

- the school driven improvement policies and
- principals who are risk takers.

This evidence emphasizes the need for strong, effective school leadership to manage and sustain change. It also leads to the conclusion that for the current school improvement initiatives to raise student achievement and improve organizational conditions at schools there is need for a model that unites policy makers and implementers in a way that facilitates meaningful understandings, practical goal setting and the formulation of contextually and culturally relevant initiatives for secondary schools in T&T. The next section examines more deeply what the implications of these findings are for leadership.

Implications for Leadership

This section focuses on the type of leadership in secondary schools in Trinidad and Tobago; the leadership practices in schools and the function of leadership in bringing about change and improvement in schools.

In terms of the type of leadership in schools, all schools supervisors felt that there were measures of authoritarian/autocratic and dictatorship types of leadership prevalent in schools. Nevertheless, most of them indicated that this could be changing and moving toward a more participatory type of leadership as more principals are being trained through a Masters in Educational Leadership programme provided by the Ministry of Education. Provision of this training was documented as one of the Ministry's priorities for school improvement. Schools supervisors acknowledged that this training was crucial and necessary, because many of the principals needed retooling and retraining to keep abreast with current educational strategies and pedagogy. Evidence from the principals also suggested that they were pleased to do the training. Nevertheless, because principals have been acquiring leadership skills does not necessarily mean that effective leadership is in practiced in schools.

School leadership is culture-related, context-associated and context specific, (Harris, 2008). Part of the leadership function is to develop a productive professional culture, produce structures to support this culture, create productive school-community relationships, and connect the school to the wider environment, (Day et al, 2008 and Hargreaves, 2008). Indeed, schools supervisors linked the prevalence of autocratic leadership to issues related to culture and context. Both schools supervisors and principals noted that traditionally leadership in Trinidad and Tobago was autocratic and the former indicated that many principals who came from within those environments tend to maintain the status quo and therefore perpetuate this type of leadership. This suggests that the educational leadership training principals have been receiving may not as yet be impacting on their practice in a way that shows their capacity for creating productive learning communities. Leithwood et al (2006), third claim about leadership, states that the way in which leaders apply basic leadership practices should reflect responsiveness to and not dictation by the contexts in which they work. The evidence suggests that in the Trinidad and Tobago context with regard to ways school leaders apply basic leadership practices, the latter rather than the former is taking place.

Principals did comment that, because of its top down, centralized orientation the Ministry of Education was structurally engineered to perpetuate autocratic leadership and they felt that the Ministry gave them very little autonomy. Nevertheless, a few schools principals and supervisors insisted that principals can get things done if they are risk takers and are committed to improving their schools. They believed that principals had some control over the direction of their schools and creating a working environment that makes the most of the human and physical resources in the school and community. One school supervisor emphasized that principals need to reach out to their communities and enlist the help of professionals to support initiatives within their schools.

The study showed that within the Trinidad and Tobago context, some principals may get leadership positions because of the geographic location of the schools and not necessarily because they are best suited for the position. This occurs when the school is located in a remote area where people prefer not to work, therefore, whoever applies for the position may get the job, even if he/she is not best suited for it. This is

indicative of recruitment by proxy, with negative implications for principals recruited in this way being committed to vision building, setting a direction for the school and developing individuals in the schools. This in turn can create and/or widen tensions among staff in schools which can lead to apathy and resistance from both principals and teachers.

The findings show that the powerlessness that some principals express may be a result of them not enacting leadership practices that respond to their particular culture and contexts. There is also a suggestion that principals may need to take greater responsibility for setting the direction of their schools and creating networks which can assist improvement initiatives within their schools. Comments from the majority of teachers in the survey that they got the opportunity to be leaders in their schools is evidence that there are systems in the schools that allow for the distribution of and participation in leadership. This is probably the result of the Ministry's programme of establishing management teams in schools by appointing Heads of Departments and Head of Year Deans. There is therefore some evidence that systems for change are present in some schools. However, structures and systems cannot move and adjust themselves to engender change; it is people who can do this. Thus, the findings suggest that school leadership should focus on building strong relationships among the people in the learning environment based on commitment, will, trust, shared values and high expectations to help schools and students improve.

Conclusions

The results of this study confirm that the leadership function is critical in providing the impetus for educational change, interpreting the effect changes would have on the people in the organization, anticipating their responses and devising a plan of action. The evidence from this study suggests that in the T&T context there is need for school leadership and leaders that: buck trends; think and operate outside the box and go beyond maintaining status quo. In other words, the educational system requires leadership that is innovative and school leaders who are willing to take risks to improve their schools and students.

In view of these findings, it is recommended that the Ministry of Education should engage with district school supervisors and school staff to perform a comprehensive review of the school improvement reform; to reconsider the current approach and strategies in use and to produce strategies that can enhance the outcomes of the reform effort. Such a review should consider and address the following:

- Ways to make school-based management more effective, by the Ministry empowering and authorizing schools to make decisions for their benefit.
- Finding ways to encourage engagement between schools that may allow more collaborative partnerships and networking for both school leaders and teachers that can develop and augment 'best practices' within the Trinidad and Tobago context.
- The Ministry needs to put greater forethought into its planning for change particularly to ensure that schools have the necessary resources for implementation.
- Develop strategies to build capacity within schools to manage and sustain change by providing more effective supervision and monitoring of the

- implementation process, not simply by increasing the number of schools supervisors, but the amount of time they actually spend in supporting schools.
- Strengthening the capacity of school leaders by facilitating further professional development and activities that may enable them to lead and support school improvement at their individual schools, by being free to implement only the policies that are seen as beneficial for their schools.

Finally the Ministry of Education needs to review the impact of policy borrowing and strive to make policies more contextually and culturally relevant both at the school and national levels. There is disconnectedness between the policy makers and implementers and this needs to be addressed through deeper and more meaningful engagement with district schools supervisors and school staff.

References

Ainscow, M., & West, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Improving Urban Schools: Leadership and Collaboration*. Open University Press.

Bush, T & Jackson, D, (2002). A preparation for school leadership: International perspectives. *Educational Management and Administration*, 30 (4) 417-429.

Chapman, C. (2003). Building the leadership capacity for school improvement a case study. In *Effective leadership for school improvement* (pp. 137-153). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Chapman, C. (2005). *Improving schools through external intervention*. London: Continuum.

Dalin, P., Ayono, T., Brazen, A., Dibaba, B., Jahan, M., Miles, M., et al. (1994). *How schools improve an international report*. London: Cassell.

Datnow, A. (2005). Happy marriage or uneasy alliance? The relationship between comprehensive school reform and state accountability systems. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 10, 113–128.

Datnow, A., Hubbard, L., & Mehan, A. (2002). *Extending educational reform: From one school to many*. London: RoutledgeFalmer Press.

Day, C. (2004). *A passion for teaching*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Day. C., Leithwood, K., & Sammons, P. (2008). What have we learned, what we need to know more about. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1), 83-96.

Dimmock, C. (2000). *Designing the learning centred school: A cross-cultural perspective*. London: Falmer Press.

Elmore, R. (1993). School decentralization: Who gains? who loses? *Decentralization and School Improvement*, 207-39. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.

Elmore, R., Peterson, P., & McCarthy, S. (1996). *Restructuring in the classroom: Teaching, learning and school organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. London: Cassell Educational Limited.

Fullan, M. (2000). The return of large-scale reform. *Journal of Educational Change*, 1, 5-28.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and sustainability system thinkers in action*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Giroux, H., & Schmidt, M. (2004). Closing the achievement gap: a metaphor for children left behind. *Journal of Educational Change*, 5 (3), 213-228.

Goleman, D. (2002) *The new leaders: Transforming the art of leadership into the science of results*. London: Little Brown.

Gray, J., Reynolds, D., Fitz-Gibbon, C., & Jesson, D. (Eds). (1996). *Merging traditions: the future of research on school effectiveness and school improvement*. London: Cassell.

Halsall, R. (1998). *Teacher research and school improvement*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2007). Sustainable leadership and development in education: Creating the future, conserving the past. *European Journal of Education*, 42(2), 223-233

Hargreaves, A. (2008). Leading professional learning communities: Moral choices amid murky realities. In A. Blankstein; P. Houston & R. Cole, *Sustaining Professional Learning Communities* (pp. 175-198). Thousand Oakes, CA: Corwin Press.

Harris, A. & Chrispeels, J (Eds.). (2006). *Improving schools and educational systems international perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Harris, A. & Lambert, L. (2003). *Building leadership capacity for school improvement*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Harris, A. (2002). *School improvement what's in it for schools?* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Harris, A. (2003). Behind the classroom door: The challenge of organizational and pedagogical change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 4(4), 369-382.

Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: What do we know? *Journal of Educational Administration* 46 (2), 172 – 188.

Harris, A. (2009). Big change question does politics help or hinder change? *Journal of Educational Change*. 10(1), 63-67.

Hopkins, D. & Reynolds, D. (2001). The past, present and future of school improvement towards the thirds age. *British Educational Research Journal*, 27, 459 - 475.

Hopkins, D. (2001). *School improvement for real*. London: RoutledgeFalmer

Hopkins, D. (2007). Sustaining leaders for system change. In D. Brent, (Ed.) *Developing sustainable leadership* (pp. 154-174). London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Jackson, D. (2006). The creation of knowledge networks: Collaborative enquiry for school and system improvement. In A. Harris & J. Chrispeels, (Eds). *Improving schools and educational systems international perspectives* (pp.274-292). London: Routledge.

James, F. (2008). Putting policy into practice: Is the hubris of the change agent the nemesis of the implementers? *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, 8(3), 69-76.

Joyce, B., Calhoun, E., & Hopkins, D. (1999). *The new structure of school improvement inquiring schools and achieving students*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Joyce, B., Calhoun, E., & Hopkins, D. (1999). *The new structure of school improvement inquiring schools and achieving students*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Seven strong claims about successful leadership*. DfES/NCSL.

Manning, M. (undated). *Quality education for all young people challenges, trends and priorities*. Retrieved October 18, 2004.
http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/ICE47/English/MesMOE/messages/trinidad_tobago.html

Prosser, J. (1999). *School culture*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Schlechty, P. (2001). *Shaking up the school house: How to support and sustain educational innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Schmidt, M. & White, R. (2004). Educational change: Putting reform into practice. *Journal of Educational Change*.5, 207-211. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. (2001). *Leadership what's in it for schools?* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Shakeshaft, C. (2004). Big change what is needed to resolve the social and critical issues affecting large scale reform? Macro change demands micro involvement. *Journal of Educational Change*, 5(3), 289-302. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Spillane, J. (2004). *Distributed leadership: What's all the hoopla?* Northwestern University: Institute for Policy Research.

Spillane, J., Reiser, B., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 87-431.

Stoll, L. (1999). School culture: Black hole or fertile garden for school improvement? In J. Prosser (Ed.). *School culture* (pp. 30-47). London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

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

Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (2000). *The international handbook of school effectiveness research*. London: Falmer Press.

Thrupp, M., & Lupton, R. (2006). Taking school contexts more seriously: The social justice challenge. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54(3), 308-28.

Wang, M., Haertel, G., & Walberg, H. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(3), 249-294.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.