

# The Concept of 'Agency' in Leadership for Learning

DAVID FROST

*The University of Cambridge, The United Kingdom*

*dcf20@cam.ac.uk*

*Abstract: This article explores the concept of human 'agency' as central to the relationship between leadership and learning. This relationship was the primary focus of the Leadership for Learning (LfL) Project, an international research undertaking involving researchers and school practitioners in seven countries. The key questions driving the research process concentrated on gaining an understanding of learning, leadership and the relationship between the two. During the project, it became clear that the meaning of 'agency' was not shared as well as it could have been by the participants. The article discusses human 'agency' and how it provides a 'bridge' between leadership and learning concluding that understanding 'agency' is the key to effective school communities' abilities to influence themselves and others.*

## Introduction

At the Carpe Vitam Leadership for Learning (LfL) Project's final international conference in October 2005, the Cambridge research team put forward a conceptual framework in which the concept of 'agency' was central to the concepts of leadership and learning. Our project had been based on a model in which democratic values underpin a discursive process that is inspired by the moral purpose of education and leads to principles for 'leadership for learning' practice. In addition the concepts of both leadership and learning are constructed as agential activities: interdependent yet contingent upon one another.

While most of the concepts and principles presented at the conference were intelligible and resonated well with the lived experience of the practitioners participating in the conference, the concept of 'agency' stood out as problematic. In discussions and in the written feedback at the end of the conference, a number of people said that they found the word 'unhelpful' and its meaning 'unclear'. This raised for us a key issue, one which is likely to arise in any project which rests on university and school collaboration. It was clear to the research team that we were using a term that, although quite familiar to those who use resources from social theory in their academic work, has not yet penetrated the practical discourse of the teaching profession as a whole. This article is therefore an attempt to make a bridge; to explore and clarify the concept of 'agency' and explain why it is of central importance to the pursuit of leadership for learning. Necessarily it draws to some extent on the literature of social theory, but it also rests on the more familiar educational literature. In addition, it is intended that the style of the discussion is one which elevates the function of explanation over the function of academic critique.

## Agency as ‘Making a Difference’

The term ‘agency’ has begun to appear relatively recently in the school improvement literature where it is taken to mean simply – ‘the capacity to make a difference’ (see for example Durrant & Holden, 2006). Here the assumption is that making a difference can extend far beyond the practice of classroom teaching. Of course it is true to say that teachers and other practitioners in schools make a difference by enabling children to learn and develop, but the question is about the extent to which practitioners can make a difference more widely. Can they make a difference for example, to the way that the school operates as a whole, to the practice of their colleagues, or to the part that parents play in their children’s learning? Can they make a difference to policy? These questions are at the heart of the way we conceptualise teacher professionalism. In the 1970s, Eric Hoyle compared the idea of the restricted professional with that of the extended professional (Hoyle, 1972). The focus of the restricted professional was on the classroom, whereas the extended professional took a wider view of schooling and curriculum, having a theoretical perspective and being active beyond the school. Hoyle talked of extended professionals as teachers who were potential ‘champions’ of innovations – a term recycled more recently by David Hargreaves in his Demos pamphlet about innovation (Hargreaves, 2003). Lawrence Stenhouse’s (1975) critique of Hoyle’s notion centred on the idea of the ‘teacher as researcher’; he argued that professionalism should involve inquiry integrated with teaching. However, neither Hoyle nor Stenhouse seemed to recognise the importance of the concept of leadership.

Since the 1970s the debate about teacher professionalism has moved on, but while it may have become more complex, it nevertheless continues to orbit around the simple question of whether the role of the teacher is that of some kind of technician who merely ‘delivers’ the curriculum or as a professional who helps to create it. Hoyle returned to the question of professionalism in the mid-1990s (Hoyle, 1995), and in the US, the question was taken up by writers such as Milberry McLaughlin (1997) who argued for ‘a new professionalism’ and Andy Hargreaves who talked about teachers being at the leading edge of change (Hargreaves & Evans, 1997; Bascia & Hargreaves, 2000). Teachers were called upon to participate in a process that is creative, critical and active. In Australia, Judyth Sachs argued that it is a matter of teachers belonging to ‘an activist profession’ (Sachs, 2003). The more contemporary debate about professionalism then implies leadership, or at least the idea of teachers having influence, and in the Carpe Vitam project, the idea of shared leadership has been a cornerstone. Shared leadership is incompatible with the belief that effective school leadership depends on the ‘exaggerated sense of agency’ (Gronn, 2000) of the individual at the apex of the organisation – the Headteacher or Principal. Shared leadership assumes that all members of a learning community have the capacity to influence because being an agent is what being a human being is all about. Being an agent or having agency involves having a sense of self encompassing particular values and a cultural identity, and being able to pursue self-determined purposes and goals through self-conscious strategic action.

## **Agency and Learning**

It is perhaps relatively easy to see how human agency is a necessary condition for the exercise of leadership and how it can be enhanced by leadership. However it may be more of a stretch to appreciate how the concept relates to learning. As the Carpe Vitam project matured so the discussion increasingly centred on the importance of volition and purposefulness in learning. The structures and tools used in discussion activities during our project conferences modelled this: participants were provided with the spaces and the support structures that enabled them to reflect on their own purposes as learners and to link this to the learning of young people in their schools (see Sue Swaffield's article in this issue). In our discussions the agential nature of learning became clear: real learning enables human beings to make a difference not just to themselves but to the world around them and opportunities to make a difference stimulate and drive learning forward. These ideas were eventually expressed in two of the principles for practice already mentioned in John MacBeath's article in this issue:

the capacity for leadership arises out of powerful learning experiences  
and  
opportunities to exercise leadership enhance learning.

It may be reasonably assumed that the point is to maximise students' motivation to learn. Motivation is a key concept in educational discourse and most accounts tend to offer a distinction between that which is instrumental or external to the learner and that which is internal to the learner: for example extrinsic versus intrinsic (Ausubel, 1968; Entwistle, 1987), and exogenous versus endogenous (Brophy, 1983). The view that students' acquiescence is better achieved through the use of intrinsic rewards is a popular one, but in our project this was seen to be inadequate. In the Carpe Vitam project we aligned ourselves with those who argue that deep learning is agential. Chris Watkins for example discusses human agency as a powerful factor in shaping motivation.

The exercise of human agency is about intentional action, exercising choice, making a difference and monitoring effects (Watkins, 2005, p. 47, after Burns & Dietz, 1992).

There is a fundamental difficulty of course, in that going to school is largely compulsory and there are many reluctant scholars. We know that compliance and even acceptable levels of performance can be achieved, but true learning requires genuine volition and purposefulness. The significance of volition and purposefulness comes more readily into view if we conceive of learning as 'becoming' in an Aristotelian sense (see MacIntyre, 1981). Jon Nixon and colleagues explained this rather well.

Thus the deeper significance of learning lies, through its forming of our powers and capacities, in our unfolding agency. The purpose and outcome of active learning may be particular 'competence' which alters our capacity to intervene in experience. But the central purpose of learning is to enable such skills to develop our distinctive agency as a human being. Learning is becoming. It is an unfolding through which we learn not only what makes us unique – what individuates us – but how we can learn to make that distinctive agency work in the world (Nixon et al., 1996).

So, in the Carpe Vitam LfL Project we came to accept that the concept of agency is relevant

both to the concept of leadership and to the concept of learning. We were faced with a major challenge however, in that the democratic values we subscribed to at the start of the project were at odds with the context in which many of the participating schools operated. Evidence from the contextual analysis conducted in each of the participating countries made visible the effects of globalisation and the managerialism that accompanies it (Moos & Møller, 2003). It is clear that increasingly in the Australian, American and European contexts, we inhabit a climate where the agency of both teachers and pupils is seriously compromised by the narrowing of curriculum, pedagogy and the external imposition of targets for measured attainment. It is perhaps unsurprising that the concept of agency remained challenging to some participants even in the final stages of the project.

At the conclusion of the project the research team resolved to take a more systematic look at the concept of agency to try to clarify the concept and illuminate some of its key components.

## **Agency and Free Will**

One of the most obvious defining aspects of the concept of agency is the idea of having free will, although throughout history this has waxed and waned in the degree of importance attached to it. Those who watched the Scorsese documentary about Bob Dylan may recall that, when asked about the meaning of his songs and what he was trying to protest about in his early career, Dylan claimed that he was merely a channel or a conduit; that ideas came through him rather than from him (BBC, 2005). Van Morrison has made similar claims, much to the irritation of music journalists. This explanation seems to echo pre-enlightenment religious beliefs in which human beings are mere instruments of God rather than being the authors of their own actions.

In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the philosopher Descartes argued that ‘reason is the noblest thing we have because it makes us in a certain manner equal to God and exempts us from being his subjects’ (Descartes, 1970, p. 228). This statement can be seen as representing a significant plank of Enlightenment thinking which allowed a degree of emancipation from the god-given and forces of nature. This liberation brings with it a range of problems of course. If we have free will, we have to make our own moral choices and, as our technological mastery develops, we are liable to disagree over the choices we make in relation to our use of the natural world. For example, should a poor farmer in Afghanistan be able to exercise free will in planting the poppies that are used for heroin production? Should an enterprising peasant in the Amazon basin be free to enter the logging business in spite of a global concern about deforestation? Agency then involves the exercise of will, but also moral choice.

Major thinkers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century provided us with at least two alternative ways of thinking about this. Marxism de-emphasised the individual and provided a foundation for a more deterministic perspective. In the 1970s, it was argued that the pursuit of equality in educational provision was merely performing the function of legitimisation which enabled the process of the reproduction of a stratified society to carry on unhindered (see Bowles & Gintis, 1976 for example). While Marxists waited for the revolution to bring about change, others relied on a more comfortable view of change – evolution. Evolutionism helped to shape deterministic thinking but in a more gentle way. Nevertheless Darwin’s biological breakthroughs suggested the idea of

change as a process of unfolding. These ways of thinking share in common a lack of conviction about the power of individuals to bring about change.

## **Agency and Structure**

Around the time that Margaret Thatcher declared that there was no such thing as society, the prolific sociologist Anthony Giddens offered a more optimistic 'take' on the question of the scope that individuals have to make a difference. His structuration theory does not deny the importance of social structures in shaping human action, but instead, he sees them as being less deterministic (Giddens, 1984). His sociological imagination had been built on strands of thinking that can be traced back to the philosophy of G. H. Mead via Garfinkel's ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967). In this perspective the self is more centre stage than it is in the structural-functionalist theories of Talcott Parsons (1951) and Radcliffe-Brown (1952). Giddens sought to reconcile structuralism with the more interpretative theories of action. He argued that functionalists have naively seen structures as 'patterning' social relations in the way that girders do for a building or a skeleton does for a body. He talks instead of a dualism in which social structures are not fixed sets of rules and resources but are features of social systems that have to be recreated by individuals in the specific moment of action. Such recreation can only take place when human agents act in this way or that, and a powerful influence at this point is the reflexivity and knowledgeability peculiar to the human species.

Human actors are not only able to monitor their activities and those of others in the regularity of day-to-day conduct; they are also able to 'monitor that monitoring' in discursive consciousness (Giddens, 1984, p. 29).

To put this another way, we might say that we humans do not simply act according to some predetermined pattern but rather each action is influenced by a range of norms, traditions, overt formalised rules and so on. There are other contingencies such as emotional states, beliefs and behavioural habits that may play their part. We make choices which have moral dimensions. The key point however, is that we are accountable for our actions and are called upon to explain our actions to each other. One important implication of Giddens' theory of action is that social (or organisational) structures can be modified by the agency of individuals.

This is not to say that agency always involves intentional acts. Giddens sees agency as a capacity to act and reflect on the consequences of that action. For example, I may eat eggs for breakfast because I have been brought up to believe that they are wholesome and good for me. My intentions are largely focussed on my own nutrition and enjoyment. Subsequently I may learn that hens are being kept in cruel conditions, and my buying these eggs makes it possible for this farming practice to occur. I had not intended my action to have this effect but it is arguably a consequence nevertheless. This new information about farming approaches presents me with a dilemma. I have choices. I can ignore the news about hens' conditions; I can switch to free range eggs; I can join an association dedicated to changing the laws governing agriculture and so on. I also have a choice about whether to learn more about the subject. Of course, the supermarket chain may seek to influence my choices by telling me that the eggs are good for me and the hens are happy in their little cages. They may try to influence me in ways that are less direct by artificially

lowering the price of the eggs. However, as we know, even supermarket chains have to respond to the desire on the part of their customers for ethical eggs and now it is common place to find free range eggs at reasonable prices. So, in Giddens' terms I am an agent, witting or not, but I have the capacity for knowledgeability; I can monitor my own behaviour in the future and decide not only how to act, but also what attitude to strike about the moral claims of free range enthusiasts.

In the many discussions over the life of the Carpe Vitam project we confronted the dilemma that faced the participating practitioners who experience directly the social and political forces that place limits on their freedom to act according to their professional judgement and consciences. The desire to realise the values with which we began involved enabling participants to push at the boundaries of their influence. The values of shared leadership for example were promoted through workshops focussing on 'leadership density' (Sergiovanni, 1987, 1992, 2001) in which we explored ways that those without formal positions of authority could exercise influence within their schools.

## **Agency and Self-regulation**

Bandura, a psychologist and major voice in the field of social cognitive theory, also rejects the idea that humans act mechanically in response to their environment and argues instead for the idea of 'emergent interactive agency' (Bandura, 1989). This resonates well with Giddens' sociological account and, in addition, provides some detail about how the process of self-regulation actually works. Bandura (1986) claims that human agency and determinism are in fact quite compatible. He explains this in outline as follows.

The exercise of personal agency is achieved through reflective and regulative thought, the skills at one's command, and other tools of self-influence that affect choice and support selected courses of action. Self-generated influences operate deterministically on behavior (in) the same way as external sources of influence do... It is because self-influence operates deterministically on action that some measure of self-directedness and freedom is possible (Bandura, 1989, p. 1182).

Bandura's account seems to correspond well with the sociological account outlined above. Intentionality is a 'core feature of human agency' (Bandura, 2001) although, like Giddens, Bandura emphasises that intentionality does not necessarily determine specific consequences. This was expressed in the school improvement literature some years ago by Michael Fullan in such slogans as 'You can't mandate what matters' and 'Change is a journey not a blueprint' (Fullan, 1993).

Another core feature of agency for Bandura is 'self-reactiveness' which again corresponds with Giddens' account in as much as it is about self-monitoring, self-regulation and the capacity for self-evaluation.

Jerome Bruner, another major contributor to the development of educational psychology, has focused our attention on self-hood and its central features of agency and self-evaluation. Crucial to the concepts of both leadership and learning is the idea that to be human is continuously to be telling stories about our 'agentive encounters with the world' (Bruner, 1996, p. 36) and it is through these stories that we evaluate our own efficacy. With every story we tell about our day in school, we evaluate ourselves both morally and in terms of our competence. This can be applied

equally well to the 5 year old child recounting the pain of being remonstrated with for not being able to sit still and to the Head of the Science Department who has not been able to persuade his colleagues of the value of comment only assessment techniques.

## **Agency and Self-belief in Efficacy**

Efficacy means having an effect, and our capacity to have an effect is shaped by the extent to which we believe we can. This simple point will be easily recognisable to anyone involved in the enterprise of learning, but Bandura draws on empirical research to support this (1989). The experimental research he cites focused on memory performance and found that people with stronger beliefs in their own memory capacity devoted more effort and time to 'cognitive processing of memory tasks' which had the effect of enhancing their ability to memorise (Berry, 1987).

Another important variable is the extent to which humans can exercise control over their own responses to difficulties. Of course we cannot avoid difficulties such as failure, criticism or inequity; nor can we dispense with the usual responses which might include anxiety, fear and disappointment, but we can regulate these emotions. Our ability to do this might depend on the extent of our emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1996), or perhaps more usefully, our emotional literacy (Weare, 2004), but perhaps the most powerful influence here may be our previous experience of dealing with these emotions. Those who have been able to rise above setbacks in the past will be able to imagine doing so again. A lack of belief in the ability to recover from a feeling of failure or disappointment can lead to depression and ill health.

There is a growing body of evidence that human attainments and positive well-being require an optimistic sense of personal efficacy (Bandura, 1986). ...Self-doubts can set in quickly after some failures or reverses. The important matter is not that difficulties arouse self-doubt, which is a natural immediate reaction, but the speed of recovery of perceived self-efficacy from difficulties (Bandura, 1989, p. 1176).

However, the importance of self-belief as described by Bandura is not just a matter of well-being. For schools in the Carpe Vitam project, this emerged as an important issue that bears on the question of learning. In a number of schools the focus of development was concerned with the way teachers provide students with feedback. The development of assessment for learning techniques (Assessment Reform Group, 2002) has included a focus on feedback and the extent to which this enables students to reflect realistically and productively on their progress. One of the key aims here is to enable students to attribute any shortfall in their achievement to something that they can do something about – an unhelpful learning strategy for example – rather than an underlying lack of capacity to learn. The whole point is to put the learner in the driving seat and thereby enhance their agency. This is a part of the wider business of facilitating meta-cognition whereby students develop the tools to think about how they learn.

Learners' beliefs about their efficacy will be shaped by their experience in classrooms. When they are continuously confronted with learning tasks that match the learning preferences of only a minority of students, they experience failure. This is why many schools in the Carpe Vitam project and elsewhere experiment with processes to identify different learning preferences and to draw students into dialogue about how they prefer to learn (Frost, 2005; Johnson, 2006). We found that,

when students experience learning tasks that are well matched to their preferences, they experience success and consequently develop a stronger belief in their capacity to learn.

People's self-efficacy beliefs determine their level of motivation, as reflected in how much effort they will exert in an endeavor and how long they will persevere in the face of obstacles. The stronger the belief in their capabilities, the greater and more persistent are their efforts (Bandura, 1989).

Enabling students to experience success is likely to nurture their agency. There is a far greater possibility that they will take up the challenge of learning voluntarily if they expect to experience the thrill of success. However, what is perhaps even more important is that the students' engagement in dialogue about learning strategies provides an opportunity to exercise some measure of control over the learning process. Being able to express a view about the process of their own learning is in itself agential.

## **Agency and the Curriculum**

A common assumption is that enabling students to take responsibility for the learning process is the key to motivation. The assumption being that learners will be more positively disposed towards learning because: they will not be demoralised by the challenge; they will have better self-awareness of themselves as learners; and they will have command over a wider repertoire of learning strategies. They will have been successfully incorporated into the enterprise of learning. However, if the question of *what* they learn remains none of their business, their agency will not be nourished as much as it could be. As national governments have tried to exercise greater control over educational matters, the question of the content of the curriculum has been largely taken out of the hands of teachers and students. At our final conference in Athens, the project's critical friend David Perkins reflected back to us the view that the question of *what* is learnt has been neglected in our project. This comment brought into sharp focus the solidity of the boundaries that we have bumped up against in our pursuit of shared responsibility for leadership and learning.

The development of shared leadership has been central to the Carpe Vitam project, and a number of project schools have focussed on 'student voice' strategies as a dimension of that. We have celebrated the way students and teachers have been able, quite successfully, to develop a dialogue about the way classrooms are arranged, the way teachers teach and even the way that school buildings and environments are designed, but in the final stages of the project we had to face the realisation that little progress has been made in securing significant influence over the content of the curriculum. Bruner's account of agency is helpful in that it sheds light on the question of the extent to which schools, subject to the constraints of globalisation, can enable both students and teachers to maximise human agency (Bruner, 1996). Schools are arenas in which both teachers and students can become more or less human depending on the extent to which their agency can find expression.



## Conclusion

Arguably our selves, our identities as human agents, are forged through the interpersonal connections that constitute the communities we inhabit (Nixon et al., 1996). We are all engaged in an ongoing process of recreating ourselves and becoming human. In Gadamer's terms, this is about achieving 'bildung' in which we learn to inhabit an ever widening community through the power of dialogue. Schools lay the foundations for this in the sense that they can be learning communities in which all members (students, teachers, support staff, parents etc) are able to have influence over themselves and others. The key to this lies with our understanding of the concept of agency. In the Carpe Vitam project we began with a set of values about what is necessary for human flourishing and to a great extent these values have been realised in practice, but we have also become more sharply aware of the factors that threaten to diminish human agency. We emerge with greater conceptual clarity, the shared experience of breakthrough practice and some tools that will help us in the future pursuit of agential leadership for learning.

## References

- ASSESSMENT REFORM GROUP (2002) *Assessment for learning: Research-based principles to guide classroom practice - 10 principles*, (Assessment Reform Group, available online at <http://www.qca.org.uk/4031.html>).
- AUSUBEL, D. P. (1968) *Educational Psychology: a Cognitive View* (New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston).
- BBC (2005) *No Direction Home: Bob Dylan*, a documentary by Martin Scorsese broadcast on BBC 2 in September 2005.
- BANDURA, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).
- BANDURA, A. (1989) Human Agency in Social Cognitive Theory, *American Psychologist*, 44(9), pp. 1175-1184.
- BANDURA, A. (2001) Social cognitive theory: an agentic perspective, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, pp. 1-26
- BASCIA, N. & HARGREAVES, A. (2000) Teaching and leading on the sharp edge of change, in N. BASCIA & A. HARGREAVES (Eds), *The sharp edge of educational change, teaching, leading and the realities of reform*, (New York: RoutledgeFalmer), pp. 3-26.
- BERRY, J. M. (1987) *A self-efficacy model of memory performance*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, September, New York.
- BOWLES, S. & GINTIS, H. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America* (London: Routledge Kegan Paul).
- BROPHY, J. (1983) Conceptualizing Student Motivation, *Educational Psychologist*, 18 (3), pp. 200-215.
- BRUNER, J. (1996) *The Culture of Education* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- BURNS, T. R. & DIETZ, T. (1992) Cultural evolution: Social rule systems, selection, and human agency. *International Sociology*, 7(3), pp. 259-283.
- DESCARTES, R. (1970) *Philosophical Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- DURRANT, J. & HOLDEN, G. (2006) *Teachers Leading Change* (London: Paul Chapman).
- ENTWISTLE, N. J. (1987) Motivation to learn: conceptualisations and practicalities, *British Journal of Educational Studies* 35(2) pp. 129-148.
- FROST, D. (2005) Resisting the juggernaut: building capacity through teacher leadership in spite of it all, *Leading & Managing* 10(2), pp. 70-87.
- FULLAN, M. (1993) *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform* (London: Falmer Press).
- GARFINKEL, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall).
- GIDDENS, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- GOLEMAN, D. (1996) *Emotional Intelligence* (London: Bloomsbury).

- GRONN, P. (2000) Distributed Properties: A New Architecture for Leadership, *Educational Management and Administration*, 28(3), pp. 317-38.
- HARGREAVES, A. and Evans, R. (Eds) (1997) *Beyond Educational Reform: Bringing Teachers Back In* (Buckingham: Open University Press).
- HARGREAVES, D. (2003) *Working Laterally: How innovation networks make an educational epidemic* (London: DEMOS).
- HOYLE, E. (1972) Educational innovation and the role of the teacher. *Forum*, 14, pp. 42-44.
- HOYLE, E (1995) Changing Conceptions of a Profession, in H. BUSHER & R. SARAN (Eds), *Managing Teachers as Professionals in Schools* (London: Kogan Page), pp. 59-70.
- JOHNSON, J. (2006) Using 'Learning Preference Profiling' to develop teaching and learning across the school, *Teacher Leadership* 1(1), pp. 33-40.
- MACBEATH, J. (2006) Leadership for Learning: A Quest for Meaning, *Leading & Managing*, 12(2), pp. 1-9.
- MACINTYRE, A. (1981) *After Virtue: a study in moral theory* (London: Duckworth).
- MCLAUGHLIN, M. (1997), Rebuilding Teacher Professionalism in the United States, in A. HARGREAVES & R. EVANS (Eds), *Beyond Educational Reform: bringing teachers back in* (Buckingham: Open University Press), pp. 77-93.
- MOOS, L. & MØLLER, J. (2003) Schools and leadership in transition: the case of Scandinavia, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), pp. 353-370.
- NIXON, J., MARTIN, J., MCKEOWN, P. & RANSON, S. (1996) *Encouraging Learning: towards a theory of the learning school* (Buckingham: Open University Press).
- PARSONS, T. (1951) *The Social System* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- RADCLIFFE-BROWN, A. R. (1952) *Structure and Function in Primitive Society* (London: Cohen & West).
- SACHS, J. (2003) *The Activist Teaching Profession* (Buckingham: Open University Press).
- SERGIOVANNI, T. (1987) *The Principalship: a reflective practice perspective* (Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon).
- SERGIOVANNI, T. (1992) *Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass).
- SERGIOVANNI, T. (2001) *Leadership: What's In It For Schools* (London: RoutledgeFalmer).
- STENHOUSE, L. (1975) *Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development* (London: Heineman).
- WATKINS, C. (2005) *Classrooms as Learning Communities* (London: RoutledgeFalmer).
- WEARE, K. (2004) *Developing the Emotionally Literate School* (London: Paul Chapman).