
Title	The challenges of adopting the learning organisation philosophy in a Singapore school
Author(s)	Kala S. Retna and Ng Pak Tee
Source	<i>International Journal of Educational Management</i> , 20(2), 140-152
Published by	Emerald (www.emeraldinsight.com/)

This document may be used for private study or research purpose only. This document or any part of it may not be duplicated and/or distributed without permission of the copyright owner.

The Singapore Copyright Act applies to the use of this document.



The challenges of adopting the learning organisation philosophy in a Singapore school

Kala S. Retna

*University Teaching Development Centre, Victoria University of Wellington,
Wellington, New Zealand, and*

Ng Pak Tee

*National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University,
Singapore*

Abstract

Purpose – To report on a case study that examines how the Learning Organisation (LO) concept can be applied in a Singapore school and the challenges that the school faces in the process.

Design/methodology/approach – A qualitative research inquiry was adopted using ethnographic methods. Data includes in-depth face-to-face interviews, observation of meetings, informal conversations with students and parents. The study adopted an interpretive paradigm based on post-positivist theories.

Findings – While the LO concept can be applied in the school context to its benefit, there can be potential cultural conflicts, ambiguities and paradoxes, as highlighted in the paper. The wider societal culture has a profound influence on how the structures, authority and relationship between subordinates and superiors in a school.

Research limitations/implications – Empirical data is limited to only one school in Singapore. A longitudinal study involving more schools in Singapore will generate a better sense of the benefits and challenges of LO in schools.

Practical implications – Singapore schools need to address the cultural norms of hierarchy and conformity in order to fully embrace the LO concept.

Originality/value – There is a lack of empirical research on how the LO model can be applied in an Asian school context. This paper represents a first attempt to fill this gap and also offers some practical recommendations to schools that are aspiring to be learning schools.

Keywords Learning organizations, Singapore, Culture, Schools

Paper type Case study

The learning organisation

Over recent years, there have been a succession of management theories and approaches to organisational learning, all of which claim to offer organisations the secret of success (Argyris and Schon, 1996; Miner and Mezias, 1996). Organisational learning is claimed to be indispensable to cope with change (Garratt, 1987) and it is considered to be the “only sustainable competitive advantage” (DeGeus, 1988).

Although the concept is neither original nor novel (Jackson, 2001; Coulson-Thomas, 1996; the idea of the learning organisation (LO) has been made popular, especially by the work of Senge (1990), and has gained a foothold in the corporate leadership and management literature. Since then, LO was regarded as the solution to the problems faced by organisations due to increased competition and changes in their environment



(Pedler and Aspinwall, 1998). Companies are increasingly inviting LO gurus to train their senior executives and deepen their learning capabilities. Though different people have different versions of what the learning organisation is, the philosophy is to help the organisation deepen its internal capacity for organisational effectiveness in a changing world.

According to Senge (1990, p. 3), a learning organisation is one in which “people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together.” The development of a learning organisation depends on the practice of the five LO disciplines of:

- (1) personal mastery;
- (2) mental models;
- (3) shared vision;
- (4) team learning; and
- (5) systems thinking.

Garvin (1993) defines a learning organisation as one that is skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behaviour to reflect new knowledge and insights.

According to Ng (2004a, 2005), a learning organisation is one in which its leaders and members are efficient and effective at learning and learning how to learn together by the consistent and holistic practice of the five LO disciplines. Members of a learning organisation are individually and collectively willing in heart and in mind to go deeper and broader in their learning process. Members of the organisation learn, both to create the results they truly desire and as a fulfilment in itself. The fundamental premise of the learning organisation approach is that at the individual, team and organisational level, if we truly learn, we shall truly change because of what we learn. If we truly change and if we are true learners, we will reflect on our changes and we shall truly learn again. In other words, learning fuels change and change fuels more learning, forming a virtuous cycle.

Learning gives organisations the cutting edge. Learning organisations can, according to Senge (1999, p. 35), “continually expand their ability to shape their future”. Learning organisations are also believed to empower employees (Evans, 1998, p. 203) enhancing their commitment to the organisation and reducing the need for bureaucratic controls (indeed, it is often argued that managerial controls inhibit the performance of learning organisations). This, in turn, should reduce the impact of bureaucratic dysfunctions on the organisation’s operations. Senge (1996, p. 413) has neatly summarised the predominant view of the proponents of learning organisations by commenting that “over the long run superior performance depends on superior learning”. According to Ng (2004b), LO is the foundation of an innovative organisation.

The five LO disciplines

The development of learning organisations depends on the mastery of the five LO disciplines (Senge, 1990). Each discipline is a deeply personal one which relates to the way we think, what we want, how we interact and learn with one another. For learning organisations to function properly, all five disciplines must be practised as an

ensemble. As these learning disciplines converge, they will create a new trend of learning and advancement to new levels of accomplishment. The five disciplines are:

- (1) *Personal mastery*. Personal mastery is the discipline of continually clarifying and deepening one's personal vision, of focusing one's energy, of developing patience and seeing reality objectively (Senge, 1990). An individual with high personal mastery is a self-motivated person, who knows where he is going and where he starts (Ng, 2004a, 2005).
- (2) *Mental model*. Mental models are the deeply ingrained assumptions, generalisations and images that influence how an individual understands the world and how he takes action. This discipline starts with him learning to bring out onto the surface his internal pictures of the world and hold them rigorously to scrutiny (Senge, 1990). Mental models are not necessarily evil. They can be good because they allow an individual to process information and make decisions quickly. However, very entrenched mental models can hinder active thinking and creativity because they act as filters that screen incoming information. Thus, an individual tends to hear what already supports his existing beliefs and ways of operating, while any new information that is incongruent to what he believes he discards as inapplicable (Ng, 2004b).
- (3) *Shared vision*. Building a shared vision is to develop and hold a shared picture of the future to be created. With a genuine vision, people are galvanised to action, not because they have to, but because they want to. Organisations cannot be ordered to change, but a powerful vision can pull people in a desired direction (Senge, 1990).
- (4) *Team learning*. Whether in sports, performing arts, science or business, team learning is vital because teams, not individuals, are the fundamental units in modern organisations. The modern organisation is so complex that no individual, by himself, has the breadth of knowledge of the organisation and its external environment to be able to make revolutions. When teams really learn to innovate together, they are capable of producing extraordinary results (Senge, 1990).
- (5) *Systems thinking*. Systems thinking is a body of knowledge and tools that enables people to manage complexity. A system is not the sum of its parts. It is the product of the interaction of the parts. The essence of systems thinking lies in a shift of the mind to see interrelationships rather than linear cause-effect chains and see processes of change rather than snapshots. It advocates looking beyond the symptoms to see the underlying interaction among different parts of a system, so as to find the root causes of the problems. These root causes are points of high leverage, system parts that can be changed with limited effort to bring about maximum benefits. Solving the root causes eradicate a host of problem symptoms in one stroke (Senge, 1990).

The learning school: LO in school context

In Singapore, education is a key lever in preparing the youth today to meet the challenges of tomorrow. The official vision of "Thinking Schools Learning Nation" (TSLN), emerged from a strategic review of education, motivated by a pre-occupation with the future. The challenge was not just to be forward looking and prepare the

children to be in step with the future, but to prepare them so that they could be continually prepared for the future (Tan, 2000). Mr Goh Chok Tong, then Prime Minister, said that TSLN “is a vision for a total learning environment, including students, teachers, parents, workers, companies, community organisations and the government” (Goh, 1997).

He looked to the Americans as a good example of people who were able to produce highly creative and entrepreneurial individuals.

Their best schools produced well-rounded, innovative students by putting them through a diverse and challenging curriculum. Their academic institution and research laboratories are at the forefront of ideas and scientific breakthroughs, infused with entrepreneurial spirit. And they have developed strong links between academia and industry, society and government. We in Singapore should learn from these strengths of the American system (Goh, 1997).

Thinking schools aims to develop creative thinking skills, lifelong learning passion and nationalistic commitment in the young. Learning Nation aims to make learning a national culture, encouraging creativity and innovation at every level of society, which goes beyond schools and educational institutions. Comprehensive mechanisms to continually retrain the Singaporean workforce are set up to encourage every individual to engage in learning and improving as a matter of necessity. Generous funding is made available to industries through the Skills Development Fund and the Lifelong Learning Endowment Fund to encourage companies to continuously train their employees and people to continuously upgrade themselves. At the end of the day, all these efforts are meant to bring about not only a higher competency level in the workforce but also a mindset change among Singaporeans. Singaporeans have to get away from the idea that it is only the people at the top who should be thinking and the job of everyone else is to do as told.

This effort starts with the school. On thinking schools, he said:

Thinking Schools will be sites of learning for everyone, including those who shape our educational policies. Schools will provide lessons on how policies are working out on the ground, and give feedback on whether policies need to be changed. This process, of knowledge spiralling up and down the system, will be a defining feature of education for the future (Goh, 1997).

Current Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong, then Deputy Prime Minister, said:

Looking ahead, whether Singapore survives and prospers will depend firstly on our making a successful transition to a knowledge-based society, and secondly on achieving a strong sense of social cohesion and rooted-ness among its people. Education is not by itself the complete answer to these twin challenges, but it must be a major part of the answer. Education does not set the agenda for the future, but it moulds the people who will determine the future of the nation (Lee, 1997).

To support the achievement of Thinking Schools Learning Nation, the desired outcomes of the education system were re-examined. Lee (1997) said:

Our schools and tertiary institutions must become learning organisations, not teaching factories. Teachers and lecturers should continually seek to improve, to pick up best practices elsewhere, and to challenge students to find better solutions. These changes in our education system need to be supported by a national environment that promotes a learning mindset,

and a society that upholds the fundamental values of equal opportunities and meritocracy. This is the way to become a learning nation (Lee, 1997).

What the education system is now supposed to develop in a student was summarised in a statement called *The Desired Outcomes of Education* (Wee, 1998). Briefly, the students who have gone through the education system have to be creative, entrepreneurial, and have a lifelong habit of learning. They must be proficient in IT and able to learn independently. They must be able to think global and yet stay local. They have to be morally upright, culturally rooted, and yet understanding and respecting differences. They have to be responsible to the family, community and country. They have to believe in the principles of multiracialism and meritocracy, appreciate the national constraints and yet be able to see the opportunities.

To support the goals of *The Desired Outcomes of Education*, many initiatives were introduced into the education system, for example, the IT Masterplan, emphasis on thinking skills and creativity, National Education and changes in the entrance criteria of universities. In particular, an ability-driven paradigm was adopted for the education system.

The way schools were managed was also changed in preparation to support the new education initiatives. MOE had found the system overly rigid, resulting in schools waiting for edicts to be issued from HQ. The ministry also realised that one size could not fit all. More autonomy was therefore given to the schools so that they could be more flexible and responsive to their own needs.

Principals are now encouraged to think of themselves as CEO of their schools, and to manage their schools like companies – by leading people, producing results and answering to “shareholders” and “customers”, and talking about service, marketing, getting results, bottom-line and vision statements. MOE HQ is given the role of the guardian of standards, ensuring that overall curriculum needs are met and professional training is given to staff. To keep their ears to the ground, senior ministry officials make visits regularly to schools island-wide, explaining policies and gathering feedback from school staff. Under a new School Excellence model, schools are also appraised differently, giving more emphasis on value-addedness, leadership, staff management and strategic planning, rather than just on academic results (Ng, 2003).

Such fast-paced changes in the system spell deep challenges to the schools. Schools need to respond to new realities and this has forced many school leaders and teachers to grapple with new challenges on a continual basis. How well a school rises up to the challenge will depend very much on its learning capacity. Schools therefore need to be learning organisations. Ng (2005) calls this a “Learning School”, a school with a deep capacity for learning, thus fuelling its transformation and leading to change and innovation. The learning school is a school for the present and the future. In such a learning school, everyone is a learner. The students, teachers, leaders and administrators are all learners. The ethos of the school is an aspiration for everyone to be efficient and effective at learning and learning how to learn together. Members of the school really want to learn and find joy and satisfaction in learning. Such a school always seeks ways to change for the better. It does so through the active learning of its members.

What are the implications and challenges of adopting the LO philosophy in a Singapore school? Alavi and McCormick (2004) have suggested that the effectiveness of the LO model in school is highly influenced by societal culture. However, there has

been little empirical research on the LO model in an Asian school context. This article attempts to fill this gap and now describes a research in a Singapore school that could shed some light on this issue.

Methodology

A qualitative research was conducted, using ethnographic methods, in a Singapore school that aspired to be a learning organisation. Face to face interviews lasting approximately 60 to 100 minutes were conducted with 16 staff members of the school. An interview guide derived from the literature and from the feedback acquired from a pilot study was used to gather information about their opinions on two key issues.

First, they were asked about their understanding of the phrase “learning organisation” and the importance of learning in an organisation. These questions included: How important is learning and why? Does your organisation have a defined learning agenda? Why do organisations have to learn? These were followed by questions relating to the practice of LO concepts: the advantages, disadvantages and barriers to the application of LO in the school.

Other data sources include observation of staff meetings, informal conversations with students and parents, and school documents such as the school’s newsletter, CD-ROM, brochures, organisational and public documents. These were used in the triangulation process to verify organisational events and practices. The study adopted a constructionist approach with the view that the LO concept is an interactive process between a group of individuals and environment, and the focus is on how members of the school construct meanings in their workplace on the practice of LO concepts. The analysis of the data in this inquiry was based on the process of category development as introduced by Constat (1992). The implications of the findings are summarised in the next section.

Implications and challenges of the learning school paradigm on school leadership and management

Distributing leadership

Leadership is a major aspect of any organisation. A learning school requires a new paradigm of leadership different from the traditional authoritarian style. According to Heenan and Bennis (1999), leaders of a new era demonstrate an entirely new set of competencies:

- the new leader understands and practices the power of appreciation;
- the new leader keeps reminding people of what is important;
- the new leader generates and sustains trust; and
- the new leader and the members are intimate allies.

According to Ng (2005), leaders have to be the first believing and practising member of the learning school. They have to walk their talk. They have to empower their staff members and build a community of leaders in the different school domains. The operations of a school are becoming more and more complex. Tasks are undertaken by networks, cross-functional teams, temporary systems, *ad hoc* committees – almost everything but pyramids with their obsolete top-down leadership. In a learning school

where aspirations are set free, the implication is that leadership has to be distributed, so that different people can take leadership roles in their different domains of expertise.

The findings strongly suggested that the school principal has adopted a distributive leadership style and most of the respondents appreciated the move away from the conventional top-down controlling leadership style. The distributive style promoted an egalitarian relationship between the principal and teachers, and “walking the talk” convinced the staff about the genuineness of LO. For example, a teacher commented:

My principal has a strong passion for LO and LO is very real in the school because of her. We have passion for her and her type of leadership. After one and a half years with her, we now totally believe in LO because of her.

This also helped to develop a very good atmosphere in the school. Another teacher commented:

I feel very comfortable in this school because more and more teachers are into LO, so we get to know how to adjust and learn from each other. We support and help each other and very happy to come to school to teach. Teaching is demanding but the school environment makes a difference. Teaching is the same everywhere, but you can see the difference and will be happy if you are in a LO school like ours.

However, distributive leadership in school can also prove to be a great challenge in the Singapore culture. While the principal was hailed by most staff members for her distributive leadership style, few teachers offered a very different view. To these teachers, the current style of “leadership” was “unreal”. The “authoritarian style” was what they had been used to and was much more the “Singapore style”. They expressed fear of the “cultural discontinuity” in the event that the principal was posted to another school.

Another finding was that although many teachers preferred the distributive style of leadership to the traditional authoritarian one, many others indicated that they would accept any style of leadership from the superiors. They feared a loss of face or promotion if they were to be seen as challenging their superiors. They had accepted as a social norm the accordance of special respect to hierarchy and position. In fact, paradoxically, most of the teachers felt that LO was a soft approach and the general culture has consistently reinforced “hierarchy and control” in schools. These teachers doubted that the practice of LO in school could fundamentally alter the cultural behaviour of Singaporeans who have been used to working under “disciplined and controlled” work conditions.

Therefore, the challenge to distributing school leadership in a learning school is to address the cultural norms of “hierarchy and control”. In order that LO is not a “soft” approach, theory and practice must be brought closer. Relevant questions to address include how teachers can really demonstrate leadership in practice without necessarily having a position in the hierarchy. What does a teacher-leader really look like? What is the scope and sphere of that leadership? How do all these contribute synergistically to the effectiveness of the school?

Seeing the need to learn and learn collectively

One of the important implications of implementing a learning school is that people have to see the need to learn. Many teachers have been teaching the same things year after year and they may not actually see a need to learn. They have been used to

“teaching” instead of “learning”. Seeing the need to learn is a problematic yet important part of the LO philosophy. Even Senge (1990) claims that “learning” has lost its real meaning in organisations. Taking in information has been perceived to be synonymous with learning. He cited an example of people’s reaction to the question of learning as “Yes, I learned all about that at the course yesterday”. The research findings suggest that the staff in the school seemed to understand the difference between training and learning. For example, a teacher explained:

Training repeats information that you ought to know to work better. But learning is internalising what you have to learn in, what you receive from your training and practising it and reflecting on it so that information received in training is being used in our daily school life.

But learning individually is not sufficient. It is in team learning that synergy is unleashed. While the school has a culture where learning is done willingly rather than by coercion, learning on a collective basis was not so forthcoming. The idea and practice of sharing was not prevalent among staff and students. One junior teacher commented:

I feel personally, in the past, most Singaporeans are the type that they prefer to learn and not share. It is to do with our education. We need to study, study, and pass better than others, so we learn for ourselves. So when they go to work, sometimes they are not used to learning and sharing as a team.

A barrier to collective learning was therefore the emphasis on individual excellence, cultivated through an education system that has been measuring individuals’ examination results. The challenge for the learning school is develop a platform in which collective learning is valued.

Recognising the need for dialogue

In order to have collective learning, there has to be dialogue. According to Isaacs (1999), dialogue can be understood as a sustained collective inquiry into everyday experiences that we take for granted. The practice of dialogue helps us to understand the context of daily interaction and experience and become aware of the processes of thought and feeling that created that experience (Senge *et al.*, 1994). Dialogue surfaces different points of view and allows communication at deep levels. It is important to an organisation in its journey to realise the vision of a learning organisation (Senge, 1990; Schein, 1993; Kofman and Senge, 1994).

In a school context, teachers have been operating in an environment where discussions have been the dominant mode of communication. But in order to have a productive exchange of professional competence, knowledge and skills, dialogue has to be promoted at all levels to achieve collective thinking and effective communication (Isaacs, 1999).

The responses from the interviews have offered support for the practice of dialogue in the school. Also, observations at several meetings showed that the practice of dialogue was exhibited through teachers’ receptivity to one another’s ideas and through active participation and listening. A teacher commented:

We try our best to use the dialogue technique to look at problems from different sides. We have learnt the power of dialogue in our course. It’s fun actually to find how people think so differently, see differently. I like it because it is also different type of group thinking.

Despite the receptiveness towards the practice of dialogue, the findings also showed that occasionally the participants resisted this technique as they found it very time consuming and required extra energy and lots of patience among staff. They explained that “we need to do things fast”, “we don’t have the whole year to solve problems” and “we have no time to think”. Preference for the traditional way of discussions was evident among the participants as they felt that the traditional types of discussions helped them to converge to an action plan fast. This was another example of how the wider societal culture has influenced the practice of LO in school.

Therefore, though the findings suggested that the school promoted the use of dialogue, there were cultural constraints in realising the full potential of dialogue. The challenge is cultural and therefore subtle. Important issues to address include:

- How to encourage teachers to suspend their positions, authority or power so that they can generate productive dialogue among themselves during meetings.
- How to exchange ideas without the risk of offending those who held high positions in the school.
- How to resist the temptation of rushing into action.

Moving out of comfort zone

Learning that is not put into action comes to no avail (Ng, 2005). According to Nevis *et al.* (1995, p. 80), “if learning comes through experience, it follows that the more one participates in guided experiences, the more one learns”. But putting into practice may mean moving out of the comfort zone in order to experiment new things. Experimentation is an important element of a learning organisation. This is important for schools, particularly in Singapore, as they operate in a fast changing society that requires ongoing experimentation to remain flexible and innovative in learning and teaching. In a learning school, leaders and teachers have to understand that experimentation is important and necessary as it creates “a mind set that enables companies to recognize the value of productive failure as contrasted with unproductive success” (Garvin, 1993, p. 86). Just as companies have to accept the risk of “productive failure”, so do schools. Experimentation, with its failures as well as its successes, enhances the ability of people to be creative and innovative. People have to be aware that risks or mistakes are a necessary part of learning (Marquardt, 2002).

The findings showed that the school placed much emphasis on experimentation and the need to learn from mistakes. The “courage” to accept and learn from mistakes is confirmed by the numerous stories and examples provided by the participants. Most of the participants were highly enthusiastic to the idea of experimentation and of its importance to school effectiveness:

I am surprised that we can make mistakes and people don’t think that I am stupid but they take it as lesson and don’t throw blame on me. I have no fear to come up with new things because if it doesn’t turn to be good, for sure we all can learn from it and find even better, new ideas.

Similarly, a senior teacher explained:

This is a LO school. We encourage lots of experimentation because there is a lot of value from it. It’s very different from my past experiences. I have made mistakes in my previous school before and “oh my god” it’s a terrible feeling because you are considered no good if you can make mistakes.

The responses showed what the teachers dislike about the past. Mistakes were not allowed and people were condemned for them. Failure was always associated with embarrassment, low self-esteem, loss of respect from subordinates and superiors. Some said that making mistakes could even result in the loss of promotion to senior positions or not getting the end of the year bonus. The staff members were conscious that if a mistake was made in the process of experimentation, it would be met with ridicule and reprimand.

There is a strong tendency in Singapore to use hierarchy and status in making socially evaluative judgments about an individual (Bond *et al.*, 1985), which results in self-preservation becoming the ultimate goal. Therefore, although the school has done well to begin to foster a culture of experimentation, the challenge is to continue the journey to change the traditional mindset in a culture of self-preservation.

Building trust

Schools in Singapore operate in a competitive and meritocratic environment. Students compete with one another in their results. Teachers also compete with one another in their performance. But a school requires a high level of trust among its members to promote a collaborative learning culture. One characteristic of a learning organisation is that it is built on trust (Handy, 1995). Trust is a critical factor in developing a learning organisation because its presence is crucial to arrive at productive co-operation between individuals or teams (Jones and George, 1998). Trust lays the foundation for good working relationships and effective communication in organisations. Trust is a requisite for any institutional change (Coopey, 1998).

The findings revealed that there was a high level of trust in the school and many staff members felt this to be liberating. This can be seen from comments such as:

Colleagues here are close. We can discuss and disagree with each other safely. We communicate at all levels. We have learnt to trust each other with open communication. I have stopped thinking and keeping things inside my heart.

However, paradoxically, the society cultural element again appeared to moderate the positive picture somewhat, as a staff member commented:

No doubt we make a good team – like HODs (heads of department) and the Principal, others in the school, but the bottom line is we are Singaporeans. We just cannot trust higher authority people fully. They are in charge of our rice bowl.

In Singapore there is much obeisance to authority and people subscribe to conformity and security. The staff members' dilemma to "trust and yet not to trust that much" was indicative of a challenge that schools in Singapore need to face in adopting a learning organisation philosophy. While there can be some "superficial" trust, deep trust does not come easily. The challenge is to develop trust in a competitive environment where people are being subject to continuous appraisal.

Resisting the pressure to produce quick results

Developing a learning school is a process (Ng, 2005). The philosophy is to develop the individuals' and organisation's capacities for learning (Senge, 1990). It is a way of life (Ng, 2005). Such a process takes time to bear fruit.

Through the research, it was found that most of the teachers acknowledged that the LO philosophy was worthwhile and would take time. But time was a luxury that many

thought they could ill afford. The concern was precisely that the LO process was very time consuming and might even affect the overall student results. A worried teacher expressed:

After four years of education in the school, they should feel that we did what they want to be. But what will happen if we cannot achieve the results. People will not think good of our school. Keep my fingers crossed for good results and LO to be continued for a long time.

Therefore, a result-oriented mentality was something deeply entrenched among teachers. The following direct comments were especially illuminating:

- good results mean good school;
- for teachers, results mean everything.

Therefore, whether the school adopted a learning organisation philosophy or otherwise was immaterial. What counted was the result, as one teacher articulated:

I think rightly speaking, in Singapore, academic side is what we need to focus as teachers. What is important is results, not whether you use LO or any other management concept.

In a meritocratic society like Singapore, schools are still judged by their students' achievements in examinations. Thus, the pressure exerted by the external environment for quick and tangible results poses a great challenge to a school in its LO journey. Therefore, the implication is that before a school really embarks on an LO journey, the leaders and teachers have to ask themselves whether they are ready for a transformation from a result orientation to a learning orientation? Are their stakeholders ready too?

Conclusion

In this paper, using a case study, we have explored the practice of the LO philosophy in a Singapore school and the implications and challenges that brings. Many of the challenges that we have discussed, such as moving out of comfort zone and resisting the pressure to produce quick results, stemmed from the wider societal culture and are not easily addressed.

Many schools in Singapore have adopted a learning school philosophy. While this paper has contributed some empirical data and analysis in this area, what would be profitable is to have a longitudinal study of this learning school movement across many schools to generate a better sense of the benefits and challenges of LO in school.

References

- Alavi, S.B. and McCormick, J. (2004), "A cross-cultural analysis of the effectiveness of the learning organization model in school contexts", *The International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 18 No. 7, pp. 408-16.
- Argyris, C. and Schon, D.A. (1996), *Organisational Learning II: Theory, Method and Practice*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA.
- Bond, M.H., Wan, K.C., Leung, K. and Giacione, R.A. (1985), "How are responses to verbal insult related to cultural collectivism and power distance?", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 111-27.

-
- Constas, M.A. (1992), "Qualitative analysis as a public event: the documentation of category development procedures", *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 253-66.
- Coopey, J. (1998), "Learning to trust and trusting to learn", *Management Learning*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 365-79.
- Coulson-Thomas, C.J. (1996), "BPR and the learning organization", *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 13 No. 1.
- DeGeus, A.P. (1988), "Planning as learning", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 2, pp. 70-4.
- Evans, S. (1998), "Revisiting the learning organisation", *Work Study*, Vol. 47 No. 6, pp. 201-3.
- Garratt, B. (1987), "Learning is the core of organizational survival: action learning is the key integrating process", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 34-44.
- Garvin, D.A. (1993), "Building a learning organization", *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, pp. 78-91.
- Goh, C.T. (1997), "Shaping our future: thinking schools, learning nation", speech by PM Goh Chok Tong at the Opening of the 7th International Conference on Thinking, Singapore Government press release, 2 June.
- Handy, C. (1995), "Trust and the virtual organization", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 73 No. 3, pp. 40-50.
- Heenan, D.A. and Bennis, W. (1999), *Co-Leaders: The Power of Great Partnerships*, John Wiley Publishing, New York, NY.
- Isaacs, W. (1999), *Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together*, Doubleday, New York, NY.
- Jackson, B. (2001), *Management Gurus and Management Fashions*, Routledge, London.
- Jones, G.R. and George, J.M. (1998), "The experience and evolution of trust: implications for cooperation and teamwork", *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 531-46.
- Kofman, F. and Senge, P.M. (1994), "Communities of commitment: the heart of the learning organization", in Bohl, D.J. (Ed.), *The Learning Organization in Action*, American Management Association, New York, NY, pp. 7-25.
- Lee, H.L. (1997), "Education in Singapore 21", speech by DPM Lee Hsien Loong at the Opening Ceremony of the 2nd Polytechnic Forum on Education in Singapore, Singapore Government press release 21, 24 November.
- Marquardt, M.J. (2002), *Building the Learning Organization: Mastering the 5 Elements for Corporate Learning*, Davies-Black Publishing, Mountain View, CA.
- Miner, A.S. and Mezias, S.J. (1996), "Ugly ducking no more: past and futures of organisational learning research", *Organization Science*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 88-99.
- Nevis, E.C., DiBella, A.J. and Gould, J.M. (1995), "Understanding organisations as learning systems", *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 73-85.
- Ng, P.T. (2003), "The Singapore School and the School Excellence Model", *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 27-39.
- Ng, P.T. (2004a), *GROW ME! Coaching for Schools*, Prentice-Hall, Singapore.
- Ng, P.T. (2004b), "The learning organisation and the innovative organisation", *Human Systems Management*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 93-100.
- Ng, P.T. (2005), *The Learning School: Innovation and Enterprise*, Prentice-Hall, Singapore.
- Pedler, M. and Aspinwall, K. (1998), *A Concise Guide to the Learning Organization*, Doubleday Currency, New York, NY.

- Schein, E. (1993), "On dialogue, culture, and organizational learning", *Organizational Dynamics*, pp. 40-51.
- Senge, P. (1990), *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, Currency Doubleday, New York, NY.
- Senge, P. (1996), "The leader's new work: building learning organisations", in Mintzberg, H. and Quinn, J.B. (Eds), *The Strategy Process: Concepts, Contexts, Cases*, 3rd ed., Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 413-21.
- Senge, P. (1999), "It's the learning: the real lesson of the quality movement", *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, November-December, pp. 34-40.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R.B. and Smith, B.J. (1994), *The Fifth Discipline Fieldwork: Strategies and Tools for Building a Learning Organization*, Nicholas Brealey Publishing, London.
- Tan, S.Y. (2000), "Sharing a vision, nationwide – the thinking school learning nation initiative of Singapore", in Senge, P., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J. and Kleiner, A. (Eds), *Schools That Learn*, Nicholas Brealey Publishing, London, pp. 483-6.
- Wee, H.T. (1998), *The Desired Outcomes of Education*, Ministry of Education, Singapore.

Corresponding author

Kala S. Retna can be contacted at Kala.Retna@vuw.ac.nz