Nations International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 2026, 1(2), 63–77
https://research.nations.gy/index.php/nijms
ISSN Print: 3005-656X
ISSN Online: 3104-7246

Optimal Conditions for Effective Leadership and Management Training and Development to Support Organisational Change: A Critical Synthesis of Theory, Praxis, and Sustainability

Mischka White-Griffith

Ministry of Education, Planning and Budget Office, Guyana
Emai: chief.planner@moe.gov.gy

How to cite this paper: White-Griffith, M. (2026). Optimal conditions for effective leadership and management training and development to support organisational change: A critical synthesis of theory, praxis, and sustainability. *Nations International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 1*(2), 63–77.
https://doi.org/10.59607/nuijms.v1i2.21

Received: March 29, 2026
Accepted: May 28, 2026
Published: June 30, 2026

Abstract

Leadership and Management Training and Development (LMTD) is frequently positioned as a strategic mechanism for organisational change, yet its impact is often limited when treated as a discrete training intervention rather than an embedded developmental process. This paper critically examines the optimal conditions required for LMTD to support sustainable organisational change, with particular attention to educational contexts. Drawing on adult learning theory, complexity leadership, implementation science, socio-constructivist perspectives, and critical leadership studies, the paper argues that effective leadership development depends less on curriculum content or delivery mode than on the relational, structural, cultural, and temporal conditions that enable learning transfer and organisational sensemaking. The analysis foregrounds the role of mission, vision, and goals as living strategic texts that shape leadership practice, accountability, and collective agency. Five interrelated conditions are examined: systemic diagnosis and adaptive capacity; active sponsorship and reciprocal accountability; job-embedded application with teams; sustained professional learning infrastructures; and productive disequilibrium that provokes critical reflection and innovation. The paper proposes an ecological model of leadership development in which participant agency is supported by contextual adaptation, team praxis, temporal rhythms, leader reciprocity, and critical provocation. It concludes that sustainable LMTD requires not merely better training, but intelligent system design.

Keywords

Leadership development; Organisational change; Learning transfer; Adaptive capacity; Job-embedded learning

1. Introduction

Organisational change is increasingly complex, volatile, and contested, particularly within educational contexts where leadership must navigate competing imperatives of accountability, equity, and pedagogical innovation. Leadership and Management Training and Development (LMTD) is widely championed as a catalyst for successful change. However empirical evaluations reveal highly variable outcomes, with many interventions failing to translate into sustained practice or systemic impact.

The relationship between a school's mission, vision, and goals (MVG) and the optimal conditions for effective leadership/management training especially in the context of organisational change is critical to sustainable educational reform. A school's mission articulates its core purpose, the vision outlines its aspirational future state, and the goals operationalise steps toward that vision. These elements collectively form the unique strategic identity of the organisation and directly shape the contextual conditions for leadership or management training and development.

This paper critically examines the optimal conditions that mediate the efficacy of LMTD in supporting organisational change. Synthesising insights from adult learning theory, complexity leadership, communities of practice, implementation science, and socio-constructivist epistemologies, the analysis argues that effective LMTD is not primarily a function of curriculum design or delivery modality, but of relational, structural, and temporal ecosystems that scaffold learning transfer, critical sensemaking, and collective agency. Further, when MVG are clearly articulated, communicated, and embedded in daily practice, they create coherence, direction, and shared meaning critical antecedents to successful leadership training and organizational change (Fullan, 2007; Leithwood et al., 2020).

This paper challenges technocratic assumptions in LMTD design and advocates for a shift toward ecological leadership development, one that positions leaders as co-authors of adaptive change rather than recipients of competencies.

1.1. Background

Contemporary organisations, especially schools, universities, and public-sector institutions, operate in environments characterised by perpetual flux: policy volatility, technological disruption, demographic shifts, and heightened demands for equity and accountability (Fullan, 2021; Heifetz et al., 2009). In response, leadership and management training and development (LMTD) has proliferated as a strategic lever to build change capacity. Evidence indicates a persistent implementation gap in securing sustained organisational change. Meta-analyses indicate that fewer than 30% of leadership development initiatives yield measurable, sustained improvements in organisational performance (Avolio et al., 2009; Gegenfurtner & Vauras, 2012). Focusing on

the question, why do so many well-intentioned LMTD programmes fail to catalyse meaningful change?

The dominant discourse often frames this failure as a deficit in individual readiness or programme quality (e.g., lack of engagement or rigour). Such attributions obscure deeper structural and epistemological issues. LMTD is frequently conceived as a discrete event, a workshop, course, or certification, rather than as an embedded social process situated within complex adaptive systems (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). This paper contends that the conditions of possibility for effective LMTD lie not in the training itself, but in the ecosystem that enables learning to be interpreted, contested, applied, and institutionalised. Guided by foundational theory (e.g., Kolb, 1984; Wenger, 1998), critical leadership studies (e.g., Bolden et al., 2011), and implementation science (Fixsen et al., 2005) a critical analysis of the optimal conditions required for LMTD to meaningfully support organisational change will be discussed.

The five interrelated assignment questions structured the paper as follows:

1. What is needed to develop the required change as an outcome of engaging with leadership or management training and development?
2. What measures are needed to include the participant's leaders in supporting training and development?
3. How should participants be supported in applying what they have learned with their teams?
4. How can professional learning be sustained over time?
5. What conditions provoke new ideas and critical thinking to improve educational practice and support initiation and transition during organisational change?

Assumptions about leadership, change theory, and learning examined to determine for instance, whether optimal conditions can be universally prescribed, or whether context-specific relational affordances (Gherardi, 2019) are more decisive. Further the role of institutional Mission, Vision, and Goals (MVG) is examined, not as static, feel-good slogans, but as living texts, sites of ideological contestation, sensemaking, and accountability that can either constrain LMTD within a framework of compliance or unleash its potential for adaptive reinvention. The analysis ultimately proposes a reconceptualisation of LMTD, from training for leadership to cultivating leadership ecologies.

1.2. Beyond Competency Models: Embracing Complexity and Adaptive Work

LMTD remains anchored in trait and behavioural competency models (e.g., Kouzes & Posner, 2017), which assume leadership can be codified into transferable skills. These frameworks offer heuristic value, they risk oversimplifying leadership as technical that is, solvable through application of known procedures (Heifetz et al., 2009). Organisational change however, is predominantly adaptive. It involves confronting conflicting values,

redistributing power, and learning new ways of working in the absence of clear solutions (Heifetz, 1994). Training that focuses on best practices without cultivating adaptive capacity based on the schools mission, vison and goals may inadvertently reinforce defensive routines (Argyris, 1993), where leaders apply tools mechanically while avoiding the emotional and political work of change.

Optimal LMTD therefore, begins not with skill transfer, but with a mission, values and goals based systemic diagnosis. Senge's (2006) systems thinking posits that leaders must learn to map interdependencies, feedback loops, and mental models that sustain the school's vision and mission. A school leadership programme aiming to reduce achievement gaps must first support participants in diagnosing how curriculum pacing, assessment practices, and staff mindsets co-constitute inequity, and not merely training teachers in data analysis techniques. Without such diagnostic grounding, LMTD risks becoming what Argyris (1993) termed single-loop learning, adjusting actions without questioning governing variables. Timperley (2011, p. 23) posited that "Leadership development is most powerful when it helps leaders see the system they are in, and their role in reproducing or transforming it." Thus, the required change emerges not from training in isolation, but from LMTD that positions the schools' mission, vision and goals (MVG) as living texts to be continually re-read, contested, and re-authored through praxis.

1.3. Psychological Safety and Critical Reflective Space

A safe environment is an essential prerequisite for this qualitative change journey. Systemic diagnosis is emotionally and politically risky. It demands surfacing contradictions e.g., between a mission of inclusion and tracking practices that segregate learners, exposing leaders to vulnerability, cognitive dissonance, and potential administrative actions. Psychological safety is defined as a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking (Edmondson, 1999). In contexts where failure is punished or dissent discouraged, leaders will avoid surfacing contradictions or power imbalances, rendering LMTD superficial. Google's Project Aristotle (Duhigg, 2016) identified psychological safety as the strongest predictor of team effectiveness, more so than individual expertise. Applied to LMTD, this implies that optimal conditions include intentional design of reflective containers: spaces where participants can voice uncertainties, admit failures, and deconstruct assumptions without fear of sanction (Boud & Walker, 1998).

Psychological safety alone is insufficient. Brookfield (2017) warned that uncritical safe spaces can devolve into comfort zones that reproduce dominant ideologies. Optimal LMTD must therefore combine safety with critical reflectivity structured opportunities to interrogate power, privilege, and historical inequities embedded in organisational structures (Mezirow, 1991). For instance, a leadership programme in a post-colonial education system that avoids

discussing legacies of epistemic injustice will fail to provoke transformative change, regardless of its methodological sophistication (Tuck & Yang, 2012).

This invokes a critical question, 'Can psychological safety be institutionalised, or is it inherently fragile and co-constructed moment-by-moment?' Recent critiques suggest that mandated safe spaces may paradoxically silence marginalised voices if they prioritise harmony over justice (Ahmed, 2012). Brave spaces integrate:

a) Critical reflectivity: Structured protocols (e.g., Brookfield's, 2017, critical incident analysis) to interrogate how power, privilege, and positionality shape interpretations of the schools mission, vision and goals.
b) Epistemic justice: Centering marginalised knowledges (e.g., Indigenous, community-based) in MVG co-construction (Penetito, 2010; Tuck & Yang, 2012).
c) Relational accountability: Moving beyond individual reflection to collective responsibility for institutional harm (Drago-Severson, 2022).

1.4. Leadership Selection as Ideological Gatekeeping: A Critical Intervention

This paper reconceptualises school leadership selection as a site of ideological gatekeeping that profoundly shapes the capacity of schools' mission, vision, and goals to drive equitable organisational change. Bourdieu's (1991) concept of symbolic violence argues that ostensibly neutral selection mechanisms, such as Standardised assessments, portfolio reviews, and promotion panels systematically privilege dominant epistemologies (e.g., Western, managerialist, masculinised leadership) while marginalising relational, communal, and resistance-oriented practices (Blackmore, 2006; Griffin, 2012). This misalignment between espoused mission, vision and goals (e.g., "equity for all") and enacted selection criteria undermines leadership development, training leaders to merely manage change rather than reimagine it based on the needs of their schools (Theoharis, 2009). Empirical cases confirm this, post-apartheid South Africa retained colonial logics in leadership appointments, ignoring Ubuntu centred, relational leadership despite transformative policy rhetoric (Jansen, 2002); England's National Professional Qualifications (NPQs) prioritise technical competencies (e.g., resource management), implicitly devaluing care work and community brokerage (Courtney, 2019). To resolve this tension, mission, values and goals, must function not as aspirational slogans but as operational accountability tools for decolonising selection. Three evidence based interventions are proposed:

a) Mission, Vision and Goals should be anchored rubrics that assess candidates on observable enactments of equity e.g., evidence of co-designing restorative practices with students as opposed to abstract commitments (Robinson, 2011),

b) counter-hegemonic assessment designs, such as narrative portfolios co-reviewed by students, families, and community elders, as practised in Aotearoa New Zealand's kura to ensure alignment with Indigenous worldviews (Penetito, 2010),

c) structural accountability, where promotion requires demonstrable progress toward school-specific MVG targets (e.g., reducing racialised discipline disparities).

Fullan (2016) contends, sustainable change hinges on leaders who see meaning in the work, meaning derived from mission vision and goal's moral imperative (e.g., "Every child known and valued"). Selection, therefore, must identify not only skill but moral imagination and epistemic courage (Ladson-Billings, 2006), ensuring leadership pipelines cultivate those capable of enacting transformation, not merely administering it (Drago-Severson, 2022). Only when selection is restructured as a practice of epistemic justice can mission, vision and goals become engines and not ornament of systemic change as they currently are within schools. Leithwood et al. (2020, p. 114) asserted that "The most powerful leadership development occurs when leaders engage in authentic, high-stakes work that matters to their community, and when that work is guided by a clear, shared purpose." The purpose of LMTD is improved outcomes for every child in every class and school.

2. Including Participants' Leaders: Co-Investment and Reciprocal Accountability

Leadership does not exist in isolation. Leadership management training and development will only catalyse to systemic change when it activates vertical and horizontal support structures, ensuring that the participants' own leaders (e.g., principals, district supervisors) function as enablers, not obstacles to the learning process.

2.1. The Sponsorship Gap

A well-documented barrier to LMTD impact is the sponsorship gap, when senior leaders endorse training in principle but fail to model, resource, or reinforce its application (Salas et al., 2012). Research by the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) shows that programmes with active, visible involvement from participants' direct supervisors yield 4x greater transfer than those without (McCall et al., 1988). Yet inclusion is often reduced to token gestures, e.g., a principal delivering opening remarks rather than substantive engagement.

Optimal conditions demand reciprocal accountability, not only are participants accountable for applying learning, but their leaders are accountable for creating conditions that enable application. This includes:

A. Pre-programme alignment: Leaders and participants jointly define change goals and success metrics (Kegan & Lahey, 2009),

B. Mid-programme dialogue: Leaders engage in parallel development (e.g., shadowing, reflection groups) to confront their on assumptions (Drago-Severson, 2004);
C. Post-programme coaching: Leaders act as learning coaches, not just evaluators—asking generative questions ("What are you noticing?") rather than directive ones ("Why didn't you implement X?") (Whitmore, 2009).

The sponsorship gap (Salas et al., 2012) persists not due to leader apathy, but because LMTD often positions supervisors as enforcers of compliance, not co-learners. Optimal inclusion requires reciprocal accountability; leaders must be accountable for creating conditions of possibility not just for monitoring fidelity. Ontario's Leadership Development Framework (Fullan et al., 2009) exemplifies this, principals and aspiring leaders jointly construct Leadership Learning Plans, shifting from hierarchical oversight to relational co-inquiry.

Caution is warranted; mandated co-investment can reinscribe control. As Harris (2020) notes, distributed leadership rhetoric often masks relational intensification increasing workload for middle leaders without redistributing authority. True structural empowerment requires revising formal decision rights (Spillane, 2006), not just inviting participation.

2.2. Distributed Leadership and Structural Empowerment

Inclusion must extend beyond hierarchical supervisors to distributed leadership networks (Spillane, 2006). In schools, for example, middle leaders (department heads, instructional coaches) often wield more influence over daily practice than principals (Harris, 2020). Optimal LMTD embeds structural empowerment redesigning roles and decision-making protocols to enable participants to act on learning. Sergiovanni (1992) strongly argued that leadership is less about positional authority and more about moral purpose enacted through communities of practice.

Mandating leader involvement risks reinforcing hierarchical control, contradicting the collaborative ethos of modern LMTD. To avoid this, inclusion must be relational, not transactional. Ontario's Leadership Development Framework (Fullan et al., 2009) required principals to co-create Leadership Learning Plans with aspiring leaders, transforming sponsorship from compliance to co-inquiry.

3. Supporting Participants in Applying Learning with Their Teams

The persistent transfer problem in leadership development where insights gained in training fail to materialise in practice is not primarily a deficit of individual capability, but of collective infrastructure. Sustainable implementation requires moving beyond the paradigm of individual mastery toward collective praxis: the iterative, context-responsive co- construction of meaning and action within

professional teams (Freire, 1970; Wenger, 1998). This necessitates structured implementation scaffolds at the micro-system level, such as job-embedded coaching cycles, collaborative inquiry protocols, and protected time for team reflection that transform learning into shared organisational routines.

3.1. The Transfer Problem and Job-Embedded Learning

The transfer problem, the failure to apply training to daily work remains LMTD's Achilles' heel. Mission, vision and goals aligned feedback tools provide useful rubrics and or protocols that evaluate implementation against the school's stated goals not external benchmarks alone (e.g., "To what extent does this initiative advance our goal of 90% student engagement in authentic inquiry?"). This supports Baldwin and Ford's (1988) meta-model which identified three transfer conditions: trainee characteristics, training design, and work environment that influences the change. Notably, the latter (especially supervisor support and opportunity to use skills) explains more variance in transfer than individual motivation or programme quality.

Job-embedded learning (e.g., action learning sets, PDSA cycles) succeeds only when teams possess relational equity norms of mutual respect, shared power, and epistemic trust (Cobb et al., 2021). In racially stratified schools, peer coaching may reinforce bias if unexamined (e.g., white coaches pathologising Black teachers' pedagogy). Optimal application support thus requires critical team protocols, structured reflection on positionality, power, and microaggressions (Singleton, 2015). This can be achieved through:

a. Action learning sets: Small groups working on real organisational challenges with facilitated reflection (Revans, 1982),
b. Peer coaching cycles: Structured protocols for observation, feedback, and co-planning (Knight, 2007),
c. Improvement science sprints: Using Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles to test change ideas iteratively (Bryk et al., 2015).

These methods shift focus from individual competence to collective capability. As Wenger (1998) posits, learning is a social negotiation of meaning within communities of practice. A leader learning about restorative practices, for instance, will struggle to implement them alone, success requires team-based norming, shared language, and collaborative problem-solving.

3.2. Psychological and Structural Enablers

Beyond methodology, successful application hinges on two enablers:

1. Protected time and space: Organisations must reallocate resources to create implementation windows e.g., releasing teams from routine duties for inquiry cycles (Timperley, 2011).
2. Formative feedback cultures: Moving from evaluation as judgment to evaluation as learning (Stobart, 2008). Leaders need non-punitive

mechanisms to surface implementation challenges e.g., anonymous team surveys, appreciative inquiry interviews.

Job-embedded approaches demand significant organisational fluency, scarce in austerity-driven contexts. Is optimal even attainable in under-resourced settings? Evidence from low-income schools suggests yes but only when LMT is co-created with frontline staff, ensuring relevance and reducing cognitive load (Robinson et al., 2008).

4. Sustaining Professional Learning Over Time

Sustainability requires shifting from event-based training to ecosystems of continuous learning, temporal scaffolding. Mission, vision and goals provide the narrative continuity that binds short-term efforts to long-term transformation. A critical perspective, however, questions the very notion of a linear, pre-determined desired outcome in complex change. In complex adaptive systems, the end state is often emergent and unknowable at the outset (Plowman et al., 2007). In such contexts, the primary outcome of leadership training may not be a specific skill set but the development of adaptive capacity—the ability to learn, unlearn, and relearn in the face of uncertainty (Senge, 1990). This reframes the purpose of training from delivering a solution to building a capability for ongoing sense-making and experimentation. Thus, the optimal condition is not just alignment with a fixed outcome, but the creation of a learning architecture that is flexible and responsive to the emergent nature of the change process itself.

4.1. The Myth of the "One-Off" Intervention

LMTD is too often conceived as a discrete event a week-long institute, a semester-long course. L ongitudinal studies (e.g., Timperley, 2011; Desimone, 2009) confirm that sustained change requires temporal scaffolding: phased support that mirrors the learning curve of complex skill acquisition. Guskey's (2002) model of teacher change outlines five levels, from participants' reactions to student outcomes each requiring distinct support mechanisms over time. Optimal sustainability includes:

- Phase 1 (0–3 months): Intensive coaching to navigate early implementation struggles (Joyce & Showers, 2002),
- Phase 2 (3–12 months): Peer networks for troubleshooting and adaptation (Louis et al., 2010),
- Phase 3 (12+ months): Institutionalisation through policy integration (e.g., embedding leadership standards into appraisal frameworks) (Penuel et al., 2007).

This integrates LMTD outcomes into core operational structures e.g., if mission, vision, goals alignment checks are a mandatory step in curriculum review or budget planning (Schein, 2017) the practices become the way we do things here, which outlives individual leaders.

4.2. Digital and Social Infrastructures

Technology can extend temporal reach. Virtual communities of practice (e.g., Slack channels, video reflection logs) enable just-in-time support (Dede, 2010). However, digital tools alone are insufficient without social infrastructure norms of reciprocity, trust, and shared purpose (Ito et al., 2013). The New Zealand Ministry of Education's Leadership Sprints programme sustained learning through bi-monthly reconnection days where cohorts shared progress and revised goals creating rhythms of renewal (Timperley et al., 2020). This connects school leaders to regional/national communities of practice grounded in similar Mission, vision and goals (e.g., EL Education schools, New Leaders network). Communities of Practice prevents isolation and accelerate innovation diffusion (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2020).

Sustainability is often framed as persistence of initial practices. But in complex systems, rigid fidelity may be maladaptive. Optimal conditions support adaptive fidelity: maintaining core principles while allowing contextual tailoring (O'Donnell, 2008).

5. Conditions That Provoke New Ideas and Critical Thinking

Innovation and critical praxis flourish under productive tension the dynamic interplay between mission vision and goals as aspiration and current reality as critique. Education is about relationships and people.

5.1. Productive Disequilibrium and Cognitive Conflict

Mezirow's (1991) transformative learning theory posits that deep change requires disorienting dilemmas experiences that disrupt habitual frames of reference. Similarly, Piaget (1977) emphasised disequilibrium as essential for cognitive growth. Optimal LMT intentionally engineers productive disequilibrium through:

a) Contradictory evidence: Presenting data that challenges participants' mental models (e.g., equity audits revealing hidden disparities);
b) Cross-boundary dialogue: Engaging stakeholders with opposing perspectives (e.g., students, parents, community members in design sessions);
c) Provocative simulations: Immersive scenarios exposing systemic contradictions (e.g., role-plays of budget allocation under austerity).

For example, the Harvard Graduate School of Education's Authentic Challenges curriculum requires leaders to present real dilemmas to peers, sparking collective sensemaking that surfaces tacit assumptions (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2020).

5.2. Critical Praxis and the Role of Critical Friends

Disequilibrium without support risks defensive withdrawal. Optimal conditions pair challenge with critical friendship, trusted peers who ask probing questions

while affirming agency (Costa & Kallick, 2000). Referring to Freire (1970), this constitutes critical praxis, the iterative cycle of reflection and action aimed at emancipation. In South African schools' post-apartheid, LMT programmes that integrated critical pedagogy enabled leaders to interrogate how "neutrality" in curriculum perpetuated racial hierarchies, leading to transformative policy shifts (Jansen, 2002).

Disequilibrium must be culturally attuned. In collectivist cultures, public contradiction may cause shame rather than insight. Optimal conditions require contextual intelligence adapting provocation to local norms of discourse (Spencer-Oatey, 2008).

6. Synthesis: Toward an Ecology of Leadership Development

The five elucidated conditions are not a checklist but interdependent, dynamic elements of a Leadership Development Ecology (see Figure 1). This model visualises a non- linear, reinforcing system where:

1. Core Engine Mission. Vision and Goals are living text. The organisation's mission, vision, and goals are not a static backdrop but the core dynamic text, constantly being interpreted, contested, and rewritten through praxis.
2. Relational & Structural Enablers. Reciprocal accountability (vertical) and collective praxis infrastructures (horizontal) form the essential relational lattice that supports action.
3. Dynamic Catalysts. Productive disequilibrium injects the necessary energy and challenge into the system, preventing stagnation.
4. Temporal Dimension. The phased scaffolding provides the enduring structure that allows learning to accumulate and embed over time, resisting entropy.

This ecology directly challenges three pervasive myths. Firstly, the Heroic Leader Myth. Leadership is an emergent property of the system, not the virtue of individuals. Secondly, the Fidelity Myth. Success is measured by adaptive fidelity, staying true to core principles while creatively adapting practice not robotic adherence to a manual. Lastly, the Training Transfer Myth. Learning is not "transferred" but co-created in context through social interaction and sensemaking.

Figure 1

The Reinforcing cycle

One key strategy is the establishment of professional learning communities (PLCs) or communities of practice (CoPs) (Wenger, 1998). These are groups of practitioners who come together regularly to share challenges, reflect on practice, and co-construct new knowledge.

In a CoP, learning is not an event, but an ongoing social process embedded in the daily work of the organisation. This provides a powerful mechanism for reinforcing new ideas, troubleshooting implementation problems, and preventing the regression to old habits.

Another critical element is the integration of learning into performance management and career development systems. When the application of new leadership competencies is explicitly linked to performance reviews, promotion criteria, and succession planning, it sends a powerful message about their importance and provides a structural incentive for sustained engagement. Furthermore, creating a culture of feedback, where giving and receiving constructive feedback is a norm, provides a continuous stream of data for leaders to reflect on and refine their practice.

7. Conclusion

This paper has argued that the quest for optimal conditions in LMTD is ultimately a quest for intelligent system design. It is a move away from investing primarily in the content of what leaders learn, toward investing in the contexts that allow that learning to meaningfully alter practice and systems. The proposed ecological model reframes leadership development from a discrete, consumable intervention into a continuous, embedded process of organisational sensemaking and adaptation.

However, a truly critical analysis must conclude with a sobering code: the realisation of such ecologies is a profound political endeavour. It requires wresting resources from operational budgets for protected time, challenging the hegemony of standardised accountability that undermines adaptive work, and redistributing power in ways that threaten established hierarchies. In the neoliberal audit culture dominating education (Ball, 2003), the conditions for optimal LMTD are often systematically disincentivised.

Therefore, the final implication is not a utopian blueprint but a praxis of tempered radicalism (Meyerson, 2003). It involves strategically leveraging existing mission, vision and goals rhetoric to create pockets of ecological practice, building coalitions around small wins, and using the language of "efficiency" and "impact" to argue for the deep, sustained investment that authentic development requires. The optimal condition, in the end, may be a form of critical pragmatism, the relentless, savvy, and courageous work of cultivating fertile ground for leadership to grow, even within soils that are often engineered to produce only compliant management. The goal is not a perfect ecosystem, but a resilient and generative one, capable of nurturing the adaptive capacity essential for navigating the perpetual uncertainty of educational change.

References

Ahmed, S. (2012). On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life. Duke University Press.

Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From safe spaces to brave spaces. In L. M. Landreman (Ed.), The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators (pp. 135–150). Stylus Publishing.

Argyris, C. (1993). Knowledge for action: A guide to overcoming barriers to organizational change. Jossey-Bass.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. Annual Review of Psychology, 60, 421–449. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621

Baldwin, T. T., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. Personnel Psychology, 41(1), 63–105. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00632.x

Bolden, R., Hawkins, B., Gosling, J., & Taylor, S. (2011). Exploring leadership: Individual, relational and contextual perspectives. Open University Press.

Boud, D., & Walker, D. (1998). Promoting reflection in professional courses: The challenge of context. Studies in Higher Education, 23(2), 191–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380384

Brookfield, S. D. (2017). Becoming a critically reflective teacher (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better. Harvard Education Press.

Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (2000). Habits of mind: A developmental series. Critical Thinking Press.

Dede, C. (2010). Comparing frameworks for 21st century skills. In J. Bellanca & R. Brandt (Eds.), 21st century skills: Rethinking how students learn (pp. 51–76). Solution Tree Press.

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. Educational Researcher, 38(3), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140

Drago-Severson, E. (2004). Helping teachers learn: Principal leadership for adult growth and development. Corwin Press.

Drago-Severson, E. (2022). Helping educators learn and lead: A constructivist-developmental approach. Harvard Education Press.

Duhigg, C. (2016, February 25). What Google learned from its quest to build the perfect team. The New York Times Magazine. https://www.nytimes.com

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature. University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Herder and Herder.

Fullan, M. (2021). The new meaning of educational change (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., Hill, P., & Crévola, C. (2009). Breakthrough. Corwin Press.

Gegenfurtner, A., & Vauras, M. (2012). Age-related differences in the relation between motivation to learn and transfer of training in adult continuing education. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 37(1), 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.09.003

Gherardi, S. (2019). If we practise ontology, which ontology do we practise? Organization, 26(2), 238–253. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508418783353

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. Teachers and Teaching, 8(3), 381–391. https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512

Harris, A. (2020). Distributed leadership in schools: Developing the leaders of tomorrow (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). Leadership without easy answers. Harvard University Press.

Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world. Harvard Business Press.

Ito, M., Gutiérrez, K., Livingstone, S., Penuel, B., Rhodes, J., Salen, K., Schor, J., Sefton-Green, J., & Watkins, S. C. (2013). Connected learning: An agenda for research and design. Digital Media and Learning Research Hub.

Jansen, J. D. (2002). Political symbolism as policy craft: Explaining non-reform in South African education after apartheid. Journal of Education Policy, 17(2), 199–215. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930110110111

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). Student achievement through staff development (3rd ed.). ASCD.

Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2009). Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization. Harvard Business Press.

Knight, J. (2007). Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction. Corwin Press.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice Hall.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2017). The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations (6th ed.). Wiley.

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings. University of Minnesota, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.

McCall, M. W., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison, A. M. (1988). The lessons of experience: How successful executives develop on the job. Lexington Books.

Mezirow, J. (1991). Transformative dimensions of adult learning. Jossey-Bass.

O'Donnell, C. L. (2008). Defining, conceptualizing, and measuring fidelity of implementation and its relationship to outcomes in K–12 curriculum intervention

research. Review of Educational Research, 78(1), 33–84. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313793

Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. American Educational Research Journal, 44(4), 921–958. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207308243

Piaget, J. (1977). The development of thought: Equilibration of cognitive structures. Viking Press.

Revans, R. W. (1982). The ABC of action learning. Chartwell-Bratt.

Robinson, V., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. (2008). School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why. New Zealand Ministry of Education.

Salas, E., Tannenbaum, S. I., Kraiger, K., & Smith-Jentsch, K. A. (2012). The science of training and development in organizations: What matters in practice. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 13(2), 74–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100612436661

Senge, P. M. (2006). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization (Rev. ed.). Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement. Jossey-Bass.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2020). Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas (5th ed.). Routledge.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory (2nd ed.). Continuum.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). Distributed leadership. Jossey-Bass.

Stobart, G. (2008). Testing times: The uses and abuses of assessment. Routledge.

Timperley, H. (2011). Realizing the power of professional learning. Open University Press.

Timperley, H., Kaser, L., & Halbert, J. (2020). Leading professional learning: Practical strategies for impact in schools. ACER Press.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1(1), 1–40.

Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. The Leadership Quarterly, 18(4), 298–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002

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

Wenger-Trayner, E., & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2020). Learning in landscapes of practice: Boundaries, identity, and knowledgeability in practice-based learning. Routledge.

Whitmore, J. (2009). Coaching for performance: GROWing human potential and purpose (4th ed.). Nicholas Brealey Publishing.