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Scope
The series, *Educational Leadership and Leaders in Contexts*, emphasizes how historical and contextual assumptions shape the meanings and values assigned to the term leadership. The series includes books along four distinct threads:

- Reconsidering the role of social justice within the contexts of educational leadership
- Promoting a community of leadership: Reaching out and involving stakeholders and the public
- Connecting the professional and personal dimensions of educational leadership
- Reconceptualizing educational leadership as a global profession

Perhaps to a greater extent than ever before, today's educational leaders find themselves living in a world that is substantially different from what it was just a decade ago. The threads of social justice, community leadership, professional and personal dimensions, and globalism have added contextual dimensions to educational leaders that are often not reflected in their local job descriptions. This book series will focus on how these changing contexts affect the theory and practice of educational leaders.

Similarly, the professional lives of educational leaders has increasingly impinged upon their personal well-being, such that it now takes a certain type of individual to be able to put others before self for extended periods of their working life. This series will explore the dynamic relationship between the personal and the professional lives of school leaders.

With respect to communities, recent educational reforms have created a need for communities to know more about what is happening inside of classrooms and schools. While education is blamed for many of the ills identified in societies, school leaders and school communities are generally ignored or excluded from the processes related to social development. The challenge facing school leaders is to work with and build community support through the notion of community leadership. Thus, leadership itself involves working with teachers, students, parents and the wider community in order to improve schools.

As for the fourth thread, globalism, school leaders must now work with multiple languages, cultures, and perspectives reflecting the rapid shift of people from one part of the world to another. Educational leaders now need to be educated to understand global perspectives and react to a world where a single way of thinking and doing no longer applies.
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The impact of globalization is being felt in numerous spheres of educational policy and practice, in rapid growth of information and communication technologies, in economic transformation, and international market competition, all of which conspire to create new demands and place new pressures on school leadership. With greater fluidity across national borders the character of local communities is changing and traditional curricula appear less appropriate to a changing clientele. Research, in neuroscience, genetics, environmental health and other scientific fields bring new insights and challenges to conventional views of learning, effecting a paradigm shift in both the nature of leadership and its role in promoting learning – individual, professional and organisational.

Expectations of heroic leaders turning schools around are no longer tenable and distributed leadership is now a term of common usage, raising the questions of who leads, in what direction and in what way is leadership expressed?

Progress in reform is more advanced in some countries while others come new to many of these issues. Yet, within countries there are wide variations as well as a now well documented in-school variation. In some places school leaders express confusion, concern, and even frustration with a plethora of initiatives that appear differentially effective or irrelevant to the new learning for the future. Nonetheless, there are inspiring examples of school leadership playing a critical role in creating learning schools and fostering multi-level leadership.

Europe, North America, the Asia-Pacific region and other parts of the world are now closer in time and involved in a much greater information exchange, sharing experiences at classroom, school, community and system levels. They increasingly live within similar policy environments and experience similar tensions in reconciling an educational mission with politicized agendas. Leadership for learning takes differing forms and is expressed in different language but is essentially concerned with making schools learning organisations with greater outreach to the communities they serve.

In such a fast changing global environment the need for deeper understanding of emerging issues of reform, policy and practice becomes increasingly apparent. The nature of school leadership for enhancing student learning, professional learning and organizational learning assumes more of a policy imperative. The converging trend in policy environments across countries give renewed urgency to the case for better international
understanding and improved access to learning-focused practice in different parts of the world.

This book aims to address the issues and needs outlined above, drawing on examples from 12 countries in different parts of the world. We have brought together 28 renowned scholars in Europe, Australia, North America, and Asia-Pacific countries to contribute to this book. The first six chapters address key themes and provide the framework for the 12 country reports which follow. With the aim of increasing international understanding and teasing out issues of transfer and application across cultural and linguistic boundaries, we have chosen national reports which cover a range of countries representing a diversity of culture and contextual backgrounds. We believe these chapters and the book as a whole, can provide important theoretical, policy and practical implications that will inform the debate about the future of education and of schooling. While each of these country narratives underscore the importance of context, at the same time there are insights and values held in common.

We hope that the international perspectives and challenging ideas presented will be of benefit to a wide readership - educators, school leaders, policy makers, educational officers and advisers, change agents, and researchers who are concerned with educational reform, school leadership and paradigm shifts in learning wherever you are in the world.

John MacBeath (University of Cambridge)
Yin Cheong Cheng (Hong Kong Institute of Education)
October 2007
We are united as much by our differences as by our similarities. In these pages we travel deep into very different cultural territories, surprising us by turns in what we encounter and by the all-too-familiar dilemmas of leading for learning. In China Feng describes leadership as more concerned with keeping order than learning. In Norway Moller describes the embrace of managerialism as squeezing the life and vitality out of learning, while in Canada Sackney and Mitchell report:

We have found school leaders to be more concerned with accounting than with learning, with control than with teaching, with compliance than with risk-taking, and with public relations than with student experiences.

In Neil Dempster’s chapter we find Australian principals struggling to tease their way through the moral maze, their counterparts in Taiwan, Malaysia, England and Italy also experiencing the weight and loneliness of individual leadership. Brotto and Barzano quote Ribolzi, a critic of the current Italian scene, who portrays the position of Italian heads as living a paradox similar to that of the “man supposed to find a black cat in a dark room on a moonless night”, having to “guarantee system outcomes that have yet to be defined, in the absence of parameters to measure them and being clueless as to how to act to change them”.

Cluelessness might be an apt summary for what George Oduro describes in Ghana where headteachers arrive in their job through seniority but without guidance or preparation of any kind for the complex tasks which face them in running a school. As well as teaching classes they are solely responsible for supervising cleaning and tidying of the school campus, ensuring that vendors of food on the school compound are maintaining hygienic practices as well as overseeing food preparation in the school, taking care of health and safety measures, dealing with injuries and first aid,
inspecting building projects, supervising teaching while attending to office work without secretarial support.

These varying and highly contextualised accounts of heroic and lonesome leadership find an echo in the loneliness of teachers in their own classrooms, locked in both by tradition but also by their own sense of professional autonomy. While everywhere the winds of change are requiring greater transparency and accountability many teachers remain reluctant to admit external challenge or critique, content to close their doors to the world, wary of parental ‘interference’ and afraid to expose themselves to their colleagues as ‘frauds’, write Liebermann and Friedrich.

The challenge is, as Portin and colleagues write, is both complex and multi-layered:

[The challenge is] to conceptualize how to connect leadership practice with student learning, and then mobilize others’ energies and commitment accordingly. This challenge implicates not only individual leaders, operating from their respective vantage points in a complicated system, but all of them together. How are they to bring their collective efforts to bear on the task of improving learning for all students? And it also implicates a larger set of actors whose actions guide or support leadership practice. How do they create conditions that prompt and enable leaders to constructively influence learning outcomes?

To achieve this means recognising that any change to ‘the way we do things round here’ pushes people out of their comfort zone and inevitably creates both discomfort and resistance. Resistance is, however, reinforced rather than attenuated, argues Jorunn Møller, by ill-conceived accountability measures in which public trust has to be secured by specifying performance compliance. In this way accountability is located in hierarchical practices of bureaucracy, in place of the professional obligations teachers and school leaders have to one another, ‘answering questions about what has happened within one’s area of responsibility and providing a reliable story of practice - what has happened and why it has taken place’.

This is close to what Ben Jaafar (2006) describes as inquiry-based accountability in which all measures, including large-scale and classroom-based assessments, are seen as entry points into professional dialogue about learning experiences, serving to inform practice so as to achieve the greatest learning benefits for all students. This approach to accountability, write Sackney and Mitchell, is consistent with the goals of learning-centred leadership, but is not one commonly acknowledged or valued in the accountability literature.
In Lieberman and Friedrich’s words this internal accountability is realised by ‘helping teachers own the work, letting go so others can reshape ideas as their own, overcoming teachers’ fear of exposure’. They describe a summer writing school for teachers through which participating staff began to grasp their own potential as leaders of learning, not just of their pupils but of their colleagues too. Back in their schools these teacher leaders work to develop a collegial culture where it hasn’t existed previously, drawing on their writing project experience to set about changing the norms of the school from isolation to collaboration. Their roles in the summer project afforded them opportunities not only to continue honing their own teaching practice but also to strengthen their capacities for working with their peers. They learned to recognize the fear that accompanies sharing practice publicly and came to understand more acutely that what underlies the reticence to expose practice to one’s peers. They developed a wide range of strategies for building community, for drawing expertise from teachers’ participating in professional development, for sharing knowledge and for sharing leadership with others. It encouraged them to work collaboratively and to go public with both their successes and their questions.

As they return to their schools, their own context helps them determine their initial leadership strategy: Where should I begin? Who will I work with? What should I focus on? How public should I be? How forceful, how gentle should I be with my approach? As Liebermann and Friedrich’s relate it, these teachers continue the leadership learning that began with the writing project as they address daily leadership challenges. Behind them all is their community, the writing project, that renewed their excitement for learning, teaching them that they are always involved in their own improvement as well as that of others, while at the same time offering a constant source of support.

There are compelling resonances with teacher activity in a cultural and political context half a planet away. In the Italian summer schools described by Brotto and Barzano something very similar took place. As they describe it, these teachers experienced a new sense of their own professional identity, determined to return to their schools with a new élan, vigour and insight. They point to an abundance of research and theoretical texts which lay emphasis on sharing experiences “in depth” with colleagues, and they provide detailed vignettes of participants in their summer retreats as discovering richness and hidden treasure (Marta, Rossella), learning how to listen (Valeria), reflecting on one’s learning (Michele). The authors add: ‘It is striking to think that Michele, an experienced fully qualified teacher who proves to be open to reflection, has finally met the opportunity to become...
aware of how his own learning works. How can he deal with children’s learning every day if he himself is not aware of his own learning?’

As these two stories from two continents unravel we see through a glass less darkly the nature of the struggles which teachers experience in their journeys between the relaxed and open space of the summer school and the enclosed space of the school classroom with its impatient agendas and the weight of political pressure. As the Italians say: *una rondine non fa primavera* (‘one swallow doesn’t make it summer’). Individual events may be successful in themselves, but producing a real culture of learning among teachers is a different story altogether, the ordinary life of most practitioners still being far removed from the intensive and reflective opportunities to learn. In addition, lament Brotto and Barzano, several teachers appear to stay anchored to the hierarchical learning patterns they experienced as students.

What these examples underline is the need to nurture, through continuous monitoring and feeding, those broad arenas where discussions, reflections and experiences may cross each other and grow. The potential for leadership grasped by teachers opportunistically may not always sit easily within an Italian culture. Nor elsewhere. Power sharing, writes Pan, has also to be highly sensitive to cultural tradition, so deeply embedded in the Taiwanese society about which she writes, that it may take a generation or more, indeed if that is desirable or feasible within a Western mould. Pan refers to Hofstede’s 1997 studies of cultural differences which depict Asian cultures as characterised by a collective rather individual ethic and by a significantly larger power distance than found in North America, Europe or Australasia. If it is desirable and feasible to shrink the power distance, leadership for learning requires a continuous process of revisiting and reinvention while alert and mindful to the cultural inhibitions and sensitivities, and careful not to fall into what Hayton and Spillane describe as ‘structural holes’.

‘Structural holes’, spaces or lacunae within organisations, may present both a problem and an opportunity. The opportunity they present is for them to be filled with a change-friendly catalyst. This may be as individual or groups which connect two otherwise disconnected groups and act as a potentially powerful conduit for the transfer of new knowledge about learning and leadership. These ‘cutpoints’, suggest Hayton and Spillane, may be crucial in cross-fertilizing different groups, injecting new ideas, encouraging colleagues to come at issues as a collective, rather than at an isolated, privatized and individual level. The potential for undermining professional community occurs, however, when people in cutpoint roles use their positions primarily in the interest of personal power, manipulating the distance between groups for individual gain or to push against the direction of change.
Commenting on professional learning communities in Canadian schools, Larry Sackney and Coral Mitchell locate the problem in three separate but inter-related phenomena. One is that such professional conversations represent too marked a departure from the traditional isolationist character of teaching. Second, many of the existing models and practices have been developed outside Canada and imported into Canadian schools with uncertain results. Third, the learning community literature itself offers little to help school leaders attempting to introduce the model into their schools.

These issues present school leaders with serious challenges as they attempt to create learning community models and practices that are informed by local contexts, realities, capacities, and values.

Page Hayton and Jim Spillane add their own cautionary tale. “Collegiality”, they write, is often limited to sharing complaints and war stories and strong ties between teachers can too easily serve to justify and defend mediocre practice, rather than challenge it. This is characteristic of weak professional communities in which there is little or no professional growth. In McLaughlin & Talbert’s words (2001:30) ‘without opportunities to acquire new knowledge, to reflect on practice, and to share successes and failures with colleagues, teachers are not likely to develop a sense of professional control and responsibility”. By contrast, professional community is optimized when teachers feel empowered and see their work as meaningful; report more of an affiliation with the school; and have higher job satisfaction than do teachers working in weak professional communities. Seashore Louis, Kruse, and Bryk, (1995) found a positive correlation between student achievement and teachers’ sense of professional community which they attributed to the sharing of expertise but also to a modelling by teachers of what it means to be a learner.

The link between leadership, professional community and student achievement has been the focus of Bill Mulford’s work in Australia over a decade of research. It is a complex link which demonstrates that leaders are not the architects of achievement but rather it is the product of teachers, working together in an environment which senior leaders create and nurture a learning culture. He cites the Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (2001) of 24 schools over a three-year period which found that enhanced classroom pedagogies were associated with the development of professional learning communities. More specifically, the data demonstrated strong links between three key variables - the degree of teachers’ collective responsibility for student learning; the overall level of professional learning
community operating within a school; and the strength of leadership on pedagogy. ‘

Productive school leadership was also found to include a high focus on a culture of care, a strong commitment to a dispersal of leadership and involved relationships amongst the school community, and a high focus on supporting professional development and learning community.

Drawing on the Seashore Louis, Kruse, Bryk study, Hayton and Spillane outline five dimensions of professional community:

- The extent to which teachers’ classroom practice is deprivatized, that is, made available for peer observation and critique;
- The extent to which dialogue between colleagues occurs and is deeply reflective on their practice;
- The degree of focus on student learning;
- The amount of collaboration that goes beyond superficial support or assistance, to facilitate improvement of teaching practice at fundamental levels; and
- The degree to which norms and values are shared.

In communities rating high on these dimensions, write Hayton and Spillane, there is a flow of knowledge. Teachers engage in conversations that target deep rather than surface level aspects of their practice. They work together to develop and refine collective norms of practice and values guiding day-to-day decisions. Having a say gives teachers a sense of efficacy and develops social trust, a belief in your colleagues as ‘competent, concerned, reliable, honest, and open’.

These five statements of principle apply in equal measure at the level of senior leadership as Walker and Kwong report in a Hong Kong context. As they argue throughout their chapter, learning is more likely to result if school leaders are members of learning and support networks. They point out that most school principals belong to many different kinds of network but these may not necessarily further either the cause of their own professional learning, that of their staff or that of students. It is important, therefore, write Walker and Kwong, that their key networks are shaped or expanded to incorporate a stronger emphasis on learning and the conditions which make learning more likely to happen. As they suggest, networks can develop at different levels, from neighbourhood to international, from educative to industrial, from principal colleagues to other leaders and educators. These must, however, have organic roots rather than being tightly structured or imposed. Informal, self-driven networks within and beyond
educational and hierarchical divides. This is the real key; the major adjustment needed in Hong Kong is to work with principals so that they value learning together”.

LEARNING TOGETHER

The theme of learning together, whether as senior leaders, teachers or students is one that runs as a common thread through all of these accounts. In Malaysia it was a feature of Quality Circles, a movement whose impetus was, however, lost, writes Bajunid, in new waves of legislation which failed to spot the inherent professional capital. In its rush to modernize and bureaucratize political leaders failed to build on the cultural legacy in which teachers learned ‘in the Socratic tradition of asking questions, in the Prophetic tradition of emphasizing self knowledge, in the community tradition of learning by doing, and in the story telling tradition by listening’. Life long learning, writes Bajunid, had indigenous roots in Malaysian culture but was displaced by modern schooling. His account of one-off initiatives seminars and workshops which are “implementation” driven at the expense of continuing learning conversations will strike a chord with teachers in many other countries in which governments direct by mandate rather than engaging the creative potential of teachers.

Except for the one-off professional meetings in workshops, seminars or conferences for the fortunate few nominated and sponsored to attend such meetings, there is no continuous dialogue, no protocol and procedure of examination of practice, no recording of best practices, no examination or exploration of implicit principles and theories behind effective teaching-learning practices.

Bajunid refers to a ‘reclamation of the intellect’, a graphic metaphor for a process in which a terrain has fallen into disuse and needs to be rebuilt from the ground up and with teachers in the forefront of change. This carries with it the implication that leaders at all levels will be more interested in learning than in measured outcomes, that they trust teachers and students to work their magic in the classrooms, that see leadership as being distributed, arising from many different sources and that they are comfortable with ambiguity and a diminution of executive power.

The failure in large school reform in Taiwan was because top down strategies bypassed teachers, writes Pan, arguing that the deep flaw lies on conceptions of power and power sharing, as if power were an individual commodity which could be delegated through trickle down structural reform. As Binney and Williams put it:
You can disempower somebody but you cannot empower them. They will really begin to change, take initiatives, take risks, provide real feedback, learn from mistakes and accept responsibility for what they’re doing when they feel sufficiently confident to do so and are provided with a clear framework... Achieving this type of relationship is not easy. It requires much effort, openness and willingness to learn - and some humility. It feels uncomfortable, particularly for leaders in organisations where this style is not the norm. It requires a high degree of self-belief and a willingness to try. (Binney & Williams, Leaning into the Future, 1997, p.69)

Willingness to learn and to learn together does not come about without structural as well as cultural change, both mutually inseparable. It requires time to meet, interdependence, trust, respect and, argue Sackney and Mitchell, a relinquishing by teachers of their sole attachments to classroom teaching. ‘Many teachers come to see themselves as school teachers rather than as classroom teachers, with an attendant shift in focus from one group of students to all students’. This implies, however, a shift in identity and a broadening of commitment, creating anxiety among some teachers who fear losing the closeness of touch which they enjoy with the students in their classrooms. Successful school leaders understand that the profound changes in professional identity bring losses as well as opportunities, but they find creative ways of helping educators to acknowledge, articulate, and deal with the losses (Bridges, 1997).

Just as teachers need to move from a singular to a pluralistic view, so, suggest Sackney and Mitchell, parents and school council members need to move beyond the interests of their own children to embrace the interests of all children in the school. Most parents, they contend, become involved in school councils and school activities in order to enhance the experiences of their own children, but as part of the school council they are asked to focus on the collective good. In strong learning communities school leaders may rotate parent volunteers through a host of different school activities, classrooms, grade levels, groups, and events so that they become familiar with a range of students and gain an understanding of the array of learning opportunities and challenges which the school offers. These Canadian academics’ work with schools as learning communities schools centres on the creation of cultures in which teaching and learning ‘are at the centre of every discussion, every decision, every plan, and every initiative’.

This is the essence of the first three of the five Carpe Vitam principles elaborated by David Frost and Sue Swaffield. Derived from close collaborative work with teachers, principals and School Board members these three principles – a focus on learning, conditions for learning and learning
dialogue – are interwoven conceptually and in practice and tested by participating teachers in the seven countries of the study.

This first principle, one which underwrites all others, rests on the idea of learning as an activity, not the purely cognitive activity of individual students but as a social and emotional activity involving all members of the school community, flowing over the boundaries of place and status. The word ‘focus’ in the expression of this first principle is key because regardless of the national context and policy pressures maintaining the focus on learning has to be worked at and be the paramount concern of leadership.

The second principle follows naturally from the first. If there is to be a focus on learning as activity, there is a need to work on the conditions that nurture this fragile entity and provide opportunities for the learning capacity to grow. This is as much about culture building as it is about the design of the physical environment and the use of appropriate pedagogic strategies. The development of cultures of trust and tolerance of difference were what enabled participants within and between the 24 schools of the Carpe Vitam project to open up their practice to the scrutiny of others without feeling defensive or threatened. Deep learning conversations in an open, critically friendly environment was what made it possible for collaboration to grow organically and for a learning cultures to be built from the bottom up.

The third principle is about dialogue. Its Greek roots (dia logos) is a reminder that dialogue in its purest sense is a particular kind of conversation – a search for shared meaning and common understanding. This is arrived at, however imperfectly, when teachers, and students, go beyond the tacit, taken-for-granted assumptions about both leadership and learning and make their perceptions and beliefs about them visible and explicit. Frost and Swaffield describe this as ‘a powerful strategy [in] which staff and students raise questions about pedagogy and gather data to fuel collective reflection’.

These principles taken together describe a quality of school culture which develops and matures over time and may be challenging for teachers moving from one school to another or for newly qualified teachers emerging from college with expectations as to their role. How new teachers are inducted into the profession is an issue dealt with in a comparative Scottish and English context by O’Brien and Draper, raising questions about the nature and quality of preparation for a rapidly changing policy context. As they point out, new staff need to be socially integrated into the work of a professional community, able to adjust to their new environment and responsibilities and to ‘learn the ropes’. They have professional development needs to be met including needs associated with their long term development as potential school leaders. O’Brien and Draper’s description of leadership ‘fast tracking’ of new recruits in England brings sharply to the surface the tensions between
the leading of student learners and leading the learning of one’s peers and colleagues. As O’Brien and Draper found, Fast Track trainees encountered misunderstandings and, in some cases, hostility, with concerns expressed that teaching competence was being simply assumed and ‘that their management and leadership skills were being seen as more important than the core teaching role, that they were destined for elite status without having proved their strengths at “the chalk face”.’ There is, implicit in leadership for learning, an empathic and experiential understanding of learning as individual, collective, and organisational.

STUDENTS LEARNING

Collective reflection is returned to persistently throughout this volume as at the very heart of the learning school. It is about a focus on learning, at the centre of every discussion, every decision, every plan, and every initiative. It is the centrepiece of Tan’s discussion of learning in Singapore. There, for a decade and more academics and policy makers have provoked a learning conversation, challenging the performivity culture of schools. The 2007 document *Teach Less, Learn More* published by The Ministry of Education contains these words:

Teach Less, Learn More is about teaching better, to engage our learners and prepare them for life, rather than teaching more, for tests and examinations. TLLM aims to touch the hearts and engage the minds of learners, to prepare them for life. It reaches into the core of education – why we teach, what we teach and how we teach.

It calls for “more: for the learner, to excite passion, for understanding, for the test of life” and “less: to rush through the syllabus, out of fear of failure, to dispense information only and for a life of tests; “more: the whole child, values-centric, process and searching questions” and “less: of the subject, grades-centric, product and textbook answers.”; more: engaged learning, differentiated teaching, guiding, facilitating and modelling, formative and qualitative assessing, spirit of innovation and enterprise” and “less of drill and practice, one-size-fits-all instruction, telling and set formulae standard answers”.

The problem-based curriculum advocated by the Ministry rests on a number of precepts about a form of learning that is lifelong and lifewide. It posits that:

- The *problem* is the starting point of learning.
- The problem is usually a *real-world* problem that appears unstructured. If it is a simulated problem, it should be as authentic as possible.
• The problem calls for multiple perspectives. Cross-disciplinary knowledge encourages the solution of the problem by making use of knowledge from various subjects and topics.

• The problem challenges students’ current knowledge, attitudes, and competencies, calling for identification of learning needs and new areas of learning.

• As self-directed learning is primary students assume major responsibility for the acquisition of knowledge by harnessing of a variety of knowledge sources, in which evaluating of information resources is an integral component.

• Learning is collaborative, communicative and cooperative. Students work in small groups with a high level of interaction in peer learning, peer teaching, and group presentations.

• Development of inquiry and problem-solving skills is as important as content knowledge which a Tutor facilitates through questioning and cognitive coaching.

• Problem solving episodes conclude with synthesis and integration of what has been learned, an evaluation and review of the learner’s experience and the learning process.

This is a bold vision and couched in high rhetoric which, as Tan argues, should not underestimate the challenge that this presents to teachers and to school leaders, faced with large classes and students schooled with the mindset of dependence on digested information and didactics. There are close parallels with Hong Kong where there is similar drive from the Education Bureau to prepare for life beyond the school walls but at the same time has to accommodate a highly competitive and short term achievement orientation. The division of ED which is inaptly titled Other Learning Experiences is aimed not only at complementing the mainstream curriculum but infiltrating it with more active and experiential learning in and out of the classroom.

YC Cheng illustrates the challenge of living in these new and different worlds as requiring ‘contextualised multiple intelligences’, that is, awareness and skill to move seamlessly among sites – the site of home, community and tradition, the site of the fast changing global economy, and the school site in which learning strives to reconcile its individualised nature within a social context. The site-bound nature of the school has, he argues, to give way to a more fluid, complex and diverse conception of learning. The concurrence of localization and globalization he sees as offering multiple avenues for learning, not simply limited to a small number of teachers in their own schools but drawing on the range of sources in the local
community and in the wider world, progressively opened up through technology and affordable travel.

As in Weiss and Fines’ dissertation on Construction Sites (2000) which illuminates the individual construction of intelligence, the authors in this volume shed light on the intricate architecture by which values and attitudes are built, often a conflicted process in which children and young people struggle with their emerging identity as lifelong learners. Cheng’s recasting of multiple intelligences portrays these as contextualised and adaptive to the various identities learners assume as a technological person, a social person, an economic person, a political person, and a cultural person.

CONTEXTS OF GROWING UP

George Oduro injects a sobering note of reality in his description of what it means to grow up and go to school (or not) in Ghana. He depicts life in congested urban slums in which due to lack of proper drainage and sanitation children are prone to multiplicity of health problems. Malnutrition is the norm. He cites a study of children living in Kenyan slums similar to those in the capital of Ghana which found that 86.2% of school children were stunted. In Ghana, like other African countries, children become orphans as a result of AIDS. A study of orphan children in the Eastern Region of Ghana, found that children orphaned by AIDS often do not get quality care from their extended family. Without this they are vulnerable to exploitation, compelled to engage in sex either for money or for emotional comfort. For example, a 2004 study of 20 primary schools and 12 junior Secondary Schools in the Bawku East District of the Upper east Region of Ghana showed that almost 30% of AIDS orphans had had sex more than once.

Oduro quotes studies by the Ghana Education Service which confirm that poverty—resulting in parental inability to support their child’s education—is the single greatest cause of school drop-out, and that many parents, particularly poor parents working in subsistence agriculture in rural setting, require their children to stay home to work on the family farm. This is compounded by parents’ over-protectiveness of their children, discouraging them from the kind of play that would be exploratory and adventurous and would help to broaden their understanding of the world.

There are close parallels in Feng’s description of schools in rural China. He identifies access to an effective education as being inhibited by parental lack of education and aspiration, children’s low self-esteem and low motivation due to repeated experiences of failure in school; and teachers’ low expectations and lack of knowledge and skill in teaching. Together with leadership focused on keeping order rather than improving pedagogy, allied
to inadequate resource provision, learning-centred leadership assumes a low priority in the hierarchy of needs.

These depictions of what it means to grow up in Africa and China seem at first sight far removed from the challenges facing schools in Seattle, London or Oslo, yet one doesn’t have to dig too deep to recognise the essential affinity between the lives of children in rural or urban poverty wherever they are in the world and how badly served they are by schools which simply fail to touch the reality of their needs and desires.

Stevenson and Stigler’s 1992 studies which compared American classrooms with their counterparts in China and Japan arrived at broad categorical differences between teacher and student attitudes in those differing cultures. However, in an increasingly globalised world it is doubtful how far or for how long these crisp cultural distinctions hold up. Young people growing up in China, Taiwan, Malaysia and Hong Kong are caught between two worlds in which the influence of Western movies, television, video games and internet sites becomes increasingly ubiquitous, powerful and seductive while the gap between those who have and those who don’t grows wider, driving children and adolescents to seek social acceptance through other avenues, what Castells (1999) terms ‘perverse integration’.

In their studies of seven cultures of capitalism Hampden Turner and Trompenaars (1993) refer to ‘the universal product’, the growing uniformity of public services, broadcasting, cult figures, drawing young people’s priorities and aspirations closer and closer. The new world of growing up is symbolised by Nintendo, Levi Jeans, McDonalds, David Beckham and Conrad Hilton’s dream that wherever you were in the world you could always be at home in familiar surroundings.

LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING: QUO VADIS?

The richness of these stories which take us into different worlds of growing up and all-too-similar worlds of schooling require us to put into a new and broader frame what we understand by leadership, by learning and by their inter connections. How well do our conceptions and prescriptions travel? How well do our principles hold up in different political, social and economic circumstances?

In virtually all of the chapters in this volume there are precepts and principles of leadership which are learning-centred. A critical reading of these will raise questions as to their applicability and feasibility in the differing contexts portrayed here. For example, Mulford offers an extensive repertoire from his research, and that of others, nationally and internationally. Those
to be tested in school and classroom practice in Kuala Lumpur, Taipei, Shanghai, and Accra as well as Hobart and Saskatoon include the following:

- much less emphasis on the organisational or managerial than has previously been the case;
- a rebalancing of the relationship between the political and bureaucratic and professional that gives greater weight to the professional;
- avoidance of ‘the great man or woman’ theory of leadership;
- ongoing, relevant supportive professional learning;
- data and other sources of information that provide schools with valid, reliable and easily administered ways of monitoring performance, diagnosing student learning difficulties, and implementing appropriate strategies.

Acknowledging the wide variety of contextual application Mulford adds:

- leadership that enhances staff and student learning takes account of a combination of contextual, individual (self and others), organisational, outcome, and evaluative/accountability factors over time.
- a great deal depends on which of these areas the leader chooses to spend time and attention. As a single input by a leader can have multiple outcomes, they need to be able to see the whole as well as the individual factors and the relationships among them over time.

For Portin and colleagues it means those who lead having an acute grasp on three environments which ‘invite or command the attention of educational leaders’. They describe these as, a) the authorizing environment - generated by governance arrangements (at all levels), collective bargaining and the contractual agreements it produces, and the interaction among educational stakeholders within and around these arrangements, b) the resource environment, including the sources of funds and human resources, and also the infrastructure for gathering information on and for the schools, as well as rules governing the use of these resources, c) the reform policy environment, comprising the forces and conditions created by state and federal policies aimed at enhancing the quality of schooling, such as standards-based reform policies.

Portin and colleagues argue that while particular policies that come to the fore reflect many interests, ‘a concern for the quality of learning may be infused into the debate and interplay that produces these policies. ‘At a minimum, it implies taking a hard look at what these policies might mean for leaders’ ability to focus their energies on learning improvement; at best,
participants in policy environments can coalesce around actions that will make leaders’ job easier’.

Adopting a focus on learning in a changing global environment means, argues Y.C. Cheng, taking a harder critical look at prior, and deeply embedded, models of school effectiveness which have reached the end of their shelf life. We need, he argues, a new paradigm of education which embraces, globalization, localization, and individualization and works at resolving the tension among these three often irreconcilable movements. ‘Future effectiveness’ is attuned to what is critical to the future development of individuals and the society in which they live, work and learn.

No matter how much has been learned about successful leadership, however well developed the programmes, however comprehensive the list of competencies, no matter how skilfully grand narratives are tailored to local contexts, decision-making is often a perilous process and cannot be prescribed, and is very often unforeseen. Putting aside the personal preference or ‘first impulse’, suggests Neil Dempster, is often necessary allowing all voices to be heard. How a leader is able to draw on a repertoire of strategies and tactics is a mark of the mature leader and how a decision is reached by an ethically mature leader, argues Dempster, is almost as important as the decision itself. Ethical decision-making is highly culturally sensitive and culturally dependent, but are there some universal truths as to the process by which decision-making is examined and verified? Neil Dempster suggests three:

First they need access to a mentor for conversations about personal and professional values, as it is through disclosure in the company of a respected colleague that positions are challenged, reinforced or forged anew. Without this kind of access, it is difficult for school leaders to develop the necessary understanding of their own values, the source of their ‘first impulses’ or their intuition about what is ethical.

Secondly, they need to have options for immediate support when urgent ethical issues arise. This leadership support does not come in a package on appointment. It has to be deliberately acquired, because without it, principals, as a group, more so than most, are susceptible to the debilitating effects of emotional stress.

Third, they need opportunities for reflection in the company of others who face similar circumstances so that experiences can be shared, insights gained and future practice enhanced - professional learning opportunities which bring ethical theory and practical resolution together. Understanding what is theoretically possible acts as a helpful predictor of future action and, concludes Dempster, providing a strong platform for the kind of informed decision-making essential to long-term leadership.
The last word, a plea for re-education of school leaders, is premised on a belief that however acute the dilemmas and however challenging the circumstances leadership is re-invigorated by learning about learning, in all its manifestations and by the essential bonds between leading to learn and learning to lead.

From our perspective, the best way to create schools with vibrant learning climates is to re-educate school leaders, to bring them to a deep engagement with and appreciation for the excitement of true learning. Professional development for leaders needs to take them into new, interesting, and challenging territory, to push them to consider the effects of their own practice on the educational experiences of others, and to engender in them a sense of excitement as they learn something of value. If leaders do not feel this excitement, if they do not personally experience the transforming power of learning, they are ill-prepared to bring forth school cultures that fully engage the learning potential of teachers and students (Sackney and Mitchell).
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INTRODUCTION

In facing up to challenges of a fast changing environment, there have been numerous educational reforms and initiatives in many countries of the world. In the past decades, these reforms have experienced three waves of movements including the effective school movement, quality school movements and world-class school movements (Cheng, 2001b, 2005a).

Each wave of reforms works within its own paradigm in conceptualizing the nature of education and formulating related initiatives for improvement at system, site, and operational levels. When there is a transition from one wave to the other, there is paradigm shift in learning, teaching and schooling and the implications for school leadership may then undergo significant change. This chapter discusses how paradigm shifts in learning relate to changes in school leadership when educational reforms move from the first or second waves towards the third wave. In particular, a new paradigm of school leadership for new learning in the third wave is explored.

FIRST WAVE: KNOWLEDGE DELIVERY AND INTERNAL LEADERSHIP

Since the 1980s, there have been effective school movements in different parts of the world including the UK, US, Australia as well as in many Asian and European countries or cities (Townsend, et al., 2007). The assumption that education is knowledge delivery and that learning is mainly a process of students receiving knowledge, skills and cultural values from teachers and the curriculum, led to the first wave of educational reforms. These were aimed at enhancing the internal effectiveness of schools in achieving pre-planned educational aims and curriculum targets (see Table 1).
For example, in Hong Kong, India, South Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, Malaysia, and mainland China, numerous initiatives were targeted at improving key features of internal school processes, examples of which are changes in school management, teacher quality, curriculum design, teaching methods, approaches to evaluation, resourcing and environment for teaching and learning (Gopinathan & Ho, 2000; Kim, 2000; Cheng, 2001a; Abdullah, 2001; Rajput, 2001; Tang & Wu, 2000, MacBeath, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Movements and Reforms</th>
<th>First Wave Paradigm</th>
<th>Second Wave Paradigm</th>
<th>Third Wave Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective School Movements:</td>
<td>To improve the internal process and performance of a school in order to enhance the achievements of planned goals of education and school</td>
<td>Quality/ Competitive School Movements: To ensure the quality and accountability of educational services provided by school meeting the multiple stakeholders’ expectations and needs</td>
<td>World-Class School Movements: To ensure the relevance and world-class standards of education to the multiple and sustainable developments of students and the society for the future in globalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conception of School Education</td>
<td>Delivery of the planned knowledge, skills and cultural values from teachers and curriculum to students in a comparably stable society</td>
<td>Provision of a service to satisfy the needs and expectations of stakeholders in a competitive market</td>
<td>Facilitating of multiple and sustainable developments of students and the society in a context of globalization and change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conception of Learning in School**

- A process of student receiving knowledge, skills and cultural values from teachers and curriculum
- A process of student receiving a service provided by the school and teachers
- A process of student developing contextualized multiple intelligence for multiple and sustainable developments

**Conception of School Effectiveness**

- Internal Effectiveness: As achievement of planned goals and tasks of delivery of knowledge, skills and values in learning, teaching and schooling
- Interface Effectiveness: As satisfaction of stakeholders with the educational services including education process and outcomes; and as accountability to the public
- Future Effectiveness: As relevance to the multiple and sustainable developments of individuals, the community, and the society for the future

**Key Role of School Leadership**

- Internal Leadership with focus on internal improvements for achieving planned goals
- Interface Leadership with focus on satisfaction of internal and external stakeholders and accountability
- Future Leadership with focus on facilitating multiple and sustainable developments of students, teachers and the school

**Related Leadership Concepts**

- Traditional Concepts
  - Instructional Leadership
  - Curriculum Leadership
  - Structural Leadership
  - Human Leadership
  - Micro-Political Leadership
  - Strategic Leadership
  - Environmental Leadership
  - Public Relations Leadership
  - Brand Leadership
- Traditional Concepts
- A New Paradigm
  - Triplization Leadership
  - Multi-level Learning Leadership
  - Sustainable Development Leadership
  - Multiple Thinking Leadership
  - Multiple Creativity Leadership
### Main Concerns in School Leadership for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How can learning, teaching, and schooling be well organized to deliver knowledge, skills and values?</th>
<th>How can the performance of teaching and the outcomes of learning meet the stakeholders’ expectations and needs well?</th>
<th>How can the delivery of knowledge and skills from teachers and curriculum to students be ensured through the improvement of schooling, teaching, and learning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can teachers’ teaching be well improved and developed in a given time period?</td>
<td>How can the education services be ensured accountable to the public and stakeholders through various types of monitoring, reporting and benchmarking?</td>
<td>How can the school become competitive to provide quality services in the education market?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can students achieve well at a given standard in the public examinations?</td>
<td>How can students’ self-learning be well facilitated and sustained as potentially lifelong?</td>
<td>How can students’ contextualized multiple intelligence be continuously well developed by themselves?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first wave, the role of school leadership was mainly a form of *internal leadership* with a focus on assuring internal school effectiveness. Leadership was primarily concerned with improvement, ensuring school performance in general and methods and processes of teaching and learning.
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in particular. It aimed at achieving planned goals and standards of delivery of knowledge, skills and values to students. There was frequent reference to concepts such as instructional leadership, curriculum leadership, structural leadership, human leadership, and micro-political leadership (Cheng, 2003, 2005a).

SECOND WAVE: SERVICE TO STAKEHOLDERS AND INTERFACE LEADERSHIP

In the 1990s, in response to concerns about educational accountability to the public and the quality of education as satisfying stakeholders’ expectations, the second wave of educational reforms emerged internationally. Education was seen as a provision of service to multiple stakeholders and the nature of learning cast students as recipients of a service, the quality of which should satisfy the expectations and needs of key stakeholders—parents, employers and other social constituencies as well as students themselves. This wave emphasized interface effectiveness between a school and the community, typically defined by educational quality, stakeholders’ satisfaction, and market competition. Most reform efforts were directed at ensuring the quality and accountability of schools to the internal and external stakeholders (see, e.g., Coulson, 1999; Evans, 1999; Goertz & Duffy, 2001; Headington, 2000; Heller, 2001; Mahony & Hextall, 2000) (see Table 1).

In some areas of the world, such as Hong Kong, India, Singapore, Taiwan, UK and USA, there was a growing trend to quality education or competitive school movements emphasizing quality assurance, school monitoring and review, parental choice, student coupons, marketization, parental and community involvement in governance, school charter, and performance-based funding (Mukhopadhyay, 2001; Mok, et al., 2003; Cheng & Townsend, 2000; Mohandas, Meng & Keeves, 2003; Pang, et al., 2003).

School leadership in the second wave was a form of interface leadership with a focus on ensuring interface school effectiveness. Implicitly or explicitly the role of school leadership within this paradigm was to ensure accountability to the public, to add value to educational services, enhance the marketability of educational provision, and ensure that learning, teaching, and schooling met stakeholders’ expectations. How to manage the interface between schools and the local community successfully in a competitive and fast changing environment proved to be a crucial challenge to school leaders. The commonly used concepts of school leadership were substantively different from those in the first wave, including strategic leadership, environmental leadership, public relations leadership and brand leadership (Cheng, 2003, 2005a).
THIRD WAVE: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS & FUTURE LEADERSHIP

At the turn of new millennium, the impact of rapid globalization, far reaching influences of information technology (IT) and urgent demands for economic and social developments in international competition stimulated deep reflection on educational reform. To ensure that the younger generation could meet future challenges and needs of rapid transformations in an era of globalization and IT, researchers, policy-makers, and stakeholders in many countries argued for a paradigm shift in learning and teaching. They advocated reform of the aims, content, practice, and management of education, in order to ensure relevance of students’ learning for the future (see, e.g., Ramirez & Chan-Tiberghien, 2003; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Cheng, 2000a, 2000b, 2003; Daun, 2001; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000).

In such a global context, there is an emerging third wave of educational reform, with heavy emphasis on future effectiveness, often defined by the relevance of education to the future developments of individuals and their society. In particular, this has been seen as meeting changed purposes and functions of education in the new Millennium. It has been viewed as a new paradigm of education embracing contextualized multiple intelligences, globalization, localization, and individualization (Maclean, 2003; Baker & Begg, 2003; Cheng, 2005a). Different from the first and second waves, the nature of learning in the third wave is to develop contextualized multiple intelligences (CMI) of learners which are relevant to multiple and sustainable developments (including technological, economic, social, political, cultural and learning developments) in both local and global contexts (Cheng, 2005c) (see Table 1).

As a consequence of globalization and international competition, this third wave of educational reforms is driven by the notion of world-class education movements. Effectiveness and improvement of education are thus defined by world-class standards and global comparability so as to ensure that the future of both student, and social, development is sustainable in such a challenging era.

In the third wave, school leadership assumes the character of future leadership with focus on the pursuit of a new vision and new aims for education. It implies a paradigm shift in learning, teaching and curriculum, lifelong learning, sustainable development, global networking, an international outlook, and integration of IT in education (Pefianco, Curtis & Keeves, 2003; Peterson, 2003; Cheng, 2001a). How to maximize learning opportunities for students through “triplization in education” (i.e. as an integrative process of globalization, localization and individualization in education) is a key challenge inviting a new paradigm of school leadership for the third wave.
of educational reforms (Cheng, 2005a). So, new concepts of school leadership are emerging in the third wave, including triplization leadership, multi-level learning leadership, sustainable development leadership, and multiple thinking leadership (Cheng, 2003, in press).

What is the paradigm shift in learning when school education moves from the first and second waves towards the third wave? What implications does this paradigm shift imply for school leadership for learning? This chapter addresses these two important issues.

A PARADIGM SHIFT IN LEARNING: TOWARDS THE THIRD WAVE

In an era of globalization, there are rapid and complex developments including technological, economic, social, political and cultural development in both local and international communities. These developments have a profound and lasting impact on the future life of individuals, challenging them to re-assess their abilities to adapt to the fast changing contexts for sustainable developments in the future (Ayyar, 1996; Brown & Lauder, 1996; Green, 1999).

Given the complexity of societal and global contexts, diverse, multiple, fluid, and challenging in nature, it is quite reasonable to expect that human nature should be also be contextualized so that people can assume multiple identities as a technological person, social person, economic person, political person, cultural person, and learning person. To survive with sustainable and multiple developments intelligence also needs to be contextualized. So, Contextualized Multiple Intelligences (CMI), include technological intelligence, economic intelligence, social intelligence, political intelligence, cultural intelligence, and learning intelligence (Cheng, 2000a). Developing CMI thus becomes the primary goal of learning in the third wave.

Rapid globalization is one of the most salient aspects of the new millennium particularly in light of the rapid development of information technology in the last two decades (Brown, 1999). Inevitably, how education responds to the trends and challenges of globalization has become a major concern in policy making during these years (Ayyar, 1996; Brown & Lauder, 1996; Green, 1999; Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, & Taylor, 1999; Jones, 1999; Pratt & Poole, 2000; Curriculum Development Council, 1999). Not only globalization but also localization and individualization assume an important place in ongoing educational reforms. All of these processes as a whole may be described as a Triplization Process (i.e., triple + izations), a way of seeing and analysing educational reforms, formulating new pedagogies and re-creating environment for students’ learning.
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With the concepts of triplization and contextualized multiple intelligences (CMI), a paradigm shift in learning takes place, away from the traditional site-bounded paradigm of the first and second waves to the new CMI-triplization paradigm of education of the third wave as shown in Table 2 (Cheng, 2000a).

THE TRADITIONAL PARADIGM OF SITE-BOUNDED LEARNING

In the traditional thinking of the first wave and second wave, students’ learning is part of the reproduction and perpetuation process of existing knowledge and manpower structures, sustaining developments in society, particularly its social and economic aspects (Cheng, Ng & Mok, 2002; Blackledge & Hunt, 1985; Hinchliffe, 1987; McMahon, 1987). Education is perceived as a process for knowledge delivery and reproduction to meet the needs of manpower structure in the society and as satisfying the expectations of multiple stakeholders.

Reproduced Learning: In traditional education, students are the followers of their teachers. They go through standard programs of education, in which students are taught in the same way and same pace even though their ability may be different. Individualized programs appear not to be feasible. The learning process is characterized by students absorbing certain types of knowledge, skills and cultural values. Students are “students” of their teachers, and they absorb knowledge and skills from their teachers. Learning is a disciplinary, receiving and socializing process such that close supervision and control of the learning process is necessary. The focus of learning is on how to gain some professional or academic knowledge and skills and learning is perceived as hard work in order to achieve external rewards and avoid punishment.

Site-Bounded Learning: In the traditional paradigm, all learning activities in school are site-bounded and teacher-based. Students learn from a limited numbers of school teachers and from pre-prepared materials. Therefore, teachers are the major sources of knowledge and learning. Students learn the standard curriculum from their textbooks and related materials assigned by their teachers. Students are often separated and so made responsible for their individual learning outcomes. They have few opportunities for mutual support or shared learning. Their learning experiences are mainly school experiences disconnected from the fast changing local and global communities around them. Learning happens only in school within a given time frame. Graduation tends to be seen as the end of students’ learning.
Table 2: Paradigm Shift in Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Paradigm of CMI-Triplized Learning (Third Wave)</th>
<th>Traditional Paradigm of Site-Bounded Learning (First &amp; Second Waves)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Learning: Student is the centre of education</td>
<td>Reproduced Learning: Student is the follower of teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Programs</td>
<td>Standard Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Learning and developing CMI</td>
<td>Absorbing Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Process</td>
<td>Receiving Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on How to Learn</td>
<td>Focus on How to Gain good grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Rewarding</td>
<td>External Rewarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localized and Globalized Learning: Multiple Sources of Learning</td>
<td>School Site-Bounded Learning: Teacher-Based Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networked Learning</td>
<td>Separated Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-long and Everywhere</td>
<td>Fixed Period and Within Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited Opportunities</td>
<td>Limited Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World-Class learning</td>
<td>Site-Bounded Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and International Outlook</td>
<td>Mainly Institution-based Experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE NEW PARADIGM OF CMI-TRIPLIZED LEARNING

In the new paradigm aiming at CMI development, learning should be borderless and characterized by individualization, localization, and globalization with the support of ICT and networked environment. This new learning is a CMI-triplized (i.e. globalized, localized, and individualized) learning.

Individualized Learning: The student is the centre of education. Students’ learning should be to optimize contextualized multiple intelligences (CMI) through individualized and tailor-made programs (including targets, content, methods, and schedules), as learning is a self-actualizing, discovery-led reflective process. Since knowledge accumulates at an unbelievable speed but becomes outdated very quickly, sense making is nearly impossible if education is construed as ‘delivery’ of knowledge, particularly given that the same knowledge can be easily accessed through the use of information technology and the Internet. This places a premium, therefore, on learning how to learn, both enjoyable and self-rewarding and laying the foundation of lifelong learning (Mok & Cheng, 2001).

Localized and Globalized Learning: Together, localization and globalization offer multiple avenues for learning. In this changing world learning
is seen as happening everywhere and is life-long so that the key purpose of school education is preparation for high level life-long learning and continuing discovery, in which learning opportunities are unlimited (Mok & Cheng, 2001). Students can learn from a range of sources inside and outside their schools, locally and globally, not simply limited to a small number of teachers in their own schools. Participation in local and international learning programs (for example, learning activities conducted in the local community; overseas study visits or language immersion) can help them achieve the related local and global outlook and experience beyond the school walls.

Increasingly examples of such kind of programs can be found in France, Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore and USA. Students are typically grouped and networked locally and internationally with the support of varying forms of IT networks. Tan, So, and Hung (2003) of Singapore and Yuen (2003) of Hong Kong provide two typical examples of using IT to network learners and create collaborative learning communities. Learning groups and networks will become a major driving force to sustain the learning culture and multiply learning effects through mutual sharing and inspiration. We may envisage every student as having a group of life-long partner students in different corners of the world, sharing their learning experiences (see for example, MacBeath and Sugimine, 2002).

TRIPLIZATION LEADERSHIP FOR NEW LEARNING

To facilitate paradigm shift towards the third wave in learning, school leadership needs to be seen as a form of triplization. In a context where learning is exploratory, global in character involving international immersion and exchange programs, the implications for leadership are to ensure global relevance in learning objectives and content. School leaders themselves need to have a global outlook, to develop international communication skills, expanding the scope of their leadership network and influence to a wide variety of stakeholders beyond their school sites and local communities.

Localization in learning may cover a wide range of activities: (1) To ensure the aims, content and process of learning relevant to the local context so that students’ learning and development can benefit socially and intellectually from local application; (2) To bring in local resources including physical, financial, cultural, social and intellectual assets to support students’ learning activities; (3) To increase parental involvement, community partnership, and collaboration with various social agents or
business sectors in creating opportunities for students’ learning and teachers’ teaching; and (4) To ensure the curriculum and students’ learning meeting the future needs of multiple developments of the local community.

Given the limited resources for school education and the complexity and multiplicity in human nature and educational expectations, how school leaders can lead their schools to implement these measures successfully to meet the diverse needs of so many individuals and develop their CMI is often a core issue of future leadership.

MULTI-LEVEL LEARNING LEADERSHIP/SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT LEADERSHIP

In a shift towards the third wave, how can school leaders support students so that they become genuinely life-long action learners able to continuously develop their multiple thinking ability and creativity in facing future challenges? Numerous authorities advocate action learning as the medium for development of creativity and intelligence in a rapidly changing environment (Wald & Castleberry, 2000; West-Burnham & O’Sullivan, 1998; Argyris & Schön, 1978, 1996; Senge, 1990). Action learning in school is a form of learning which takes place at individual level, group level or at organizational level. At the individual level, it may take the form of student action projects or teacher’s learning from professional practices (Stevenson, 2002; Argyris, Putman, & Smith, 1985). At the organizational level or group level, action learning may be a form of learning generated by daily or ad hoc activities or from short-term or long-term actions (or projects) of the school organization or group (Argyris & Schön, 1974; Senge, 1990).

In order to support students’ continuous learning at the individual and group levels, it is also necessary to support teachers’ professional learning at both individual and group levels, a process integral to organizational learning. This is a process of multi-level learning which not only sustains continuous student learning but benefits teacher learning, and feeds into wider school development (Cheng, 1996; Cheng & Cheung, 2003, 2004). It follows that school leadership has to operate at multiple levels. Multi-level learning leadership then characterises the third wave in which school heads lead the action learning of their students, teachers and all other members of the community. Within this model school leadership itself is also a process of action learning, in which a leader or a group of leaders draw on the wisdom and the knowledge-in-action of their colleagues.
MULTIPLE THINKING LEADERSHIP FOR NEW LEARNING

There is a complexity and multiplicity of contexts in which school leaders perform multiple functions, so as to create and sustain multi-level learning. This multiplicity of tasks and roles may be described in terms of a typology which includes Technological leadership, Economic leadership, Social leadership, Political leadership, Cultural leadership, and Learning leadership. Each of these forms of leadership is matched by six types of thinking which may described as technological thinking, economic thinking, social thinking, political thinking, cultural thinking and learning thinking (Table 3).

TECHNOLOGICAL LEADERSHIP AND THINKING

Given the scale of impact of technology in different aspects of the society and the global community, technological leadership is a growing priority (Gates, 1999; Education and Manpower Bureau, 1998; Holmes, 1999). It is characterised by technological rationality in thinking that places emphasis on the achievement of planned goals and targets through objective and scientific methodology and structure. Technological engineering, methodological effectiveness, and technical optimization are the key components of thinking in this expression of leadership. The question this raises for multi-level learning, or new learning, address the following questions:

- What methods, procedures, techniques, and structures can be used to achieve the planned goals and targets in order to facilitate multi-level learning?
- How can the aims and related tasks of student learning be achieved more effectively through changes in structure, methodology or technology of a school? And why?
- Can any technical innovations and improvements be made, or can the process of school functioning be re-engineered to ensure sustainable development and effectiveness?

In technological thinking, the basic objective of school action is to use scientific knowledge and technology to solve existing problems and achieve planned aims. Therefore, school effectiveness is a predictable product of applying appropriate technology and methodology. If school outcomes are unsatisfactory, it may be explained by inadequate or flawed structures, procedures, or implementation of technology.
Table 3: Multiple Thinking Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Typology of Multiple Thinking Leadership</th>
<th>Type of thinking</th>
<th>Rationality in leadership</th>
<th>Ideology in leadership</th>
<th>Key concerns/questions in leadership for learning</th>
<th>Beliefs about school action</th>
<th>Beliefs about school effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technological Leadership</td>
<td>Economic Thinking</td>
<td>Social Leadership</td>
<td>Methodological effectiveness</td>
<td>What methods and techniques can be used in facilitating multi-level learning? How can the aims of students' learning be achieved more effectively? Why? Can any technical innovation and improvement be made and the process of learning be reengineered?</td>
<td>Use of scientific and technological knowledge to solve problems and achieve aims</td>
<td>A predictable product of good technology and methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Leadership</td>
<td>Social Thinking</td>
<td>Political Leadership</td>
<td>Goal achievement; Technological engineering and optimization</td>
<td>What resources and costs are needed and what benefits can be generated in enhancing learning? How can the aims of students' learning be achieved with minimal cost? Why? How to innovatively maximize the marginal benefits?</td>
<td>To procure resources and use to plan and implement resources</td>
<td>An output from the calculated use of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic rationality</td>
<td>Political Thinking</td>
<td>Cultural Leadership</td>
<td>Technological rationality</td>
<td>What the social relationship between the involved key actors in promoting learning? How can they affect the aims, processes and outcomes of multi-level learning? How can their human needs be satisfied and the synergy be maximized? Why?</td>
<td>To establish social networks to support members and implement planning</td>
<td>A product of social action; Social satisfaction is also an outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social rationality</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Ideology in leadership</td>
<td>What diversities, interests, and powers are involved in multi-level learning? How can the conflicts and struggles be minimized or managed through negotiation, democracy and other? Why? How can innovatively “win-win” strategies promote learning?</td>
<td>To negotiate and struggle among parties to manage or solve conflicts</td>
<td>A result of bargaining, compromise, and interplay among interest parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political rationality</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Rationality in leadership</td>
<td>What values, beliefs and ethics are crucial and shared in multi-level learning? How do they influence the aims and nature of learning and development? How can integration, coherence or morality in values and beliefs be maximized in learning? Why?</td>
<td>To clarify ambiguities and realize the vision including key values and beliefs shared</td>
<td>A symbolic product of meaning making or cultural actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural rationality</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Methodological effectiveness</td>
<td>What values, beliefs and knowledge can be used? What are thinking gaps in changing realities? How can the nature of multi-level learning be conceptualized more adaptive to change? How can new thinking modes and understanding be achieved?</td>
<td>To discover new ideas and approaches to achieving aims</td>
<td>Discovery of new knowledge and approaches to enhance of intelligence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Cheng (2005c, in press)
ECONOMIC LEADERSHIP AND THINKING

Economic growth is often seen as the rationale and driving force of individual and national developments and as the cutting edge in international competition, particularly in a global context (Ohame, 2000; Burton-Jones, 1999). Economic thinking infuses action at both individual and organizational levels (Cavalcanti, 2002; Fontana, 2001) while economic leadership is based on a form of economic rationality concerned with maximizing benefits and achieving planned aims and targets of the school through optimal use of resources. Efficiency, cost-benefits, cost-effectiveness, resources, financial management and economic optimization are key to economic thinking in pursuit of school effectiveness (Levin, 1994a, 1994b). From an economic rationality viewpoint, questions for multi-level learning are:

• What resources and costs are needed and what benefits can be generated in the multi-level learning cycles?
• How can the planned aims of student learning be achieved with minimal costs or resources in action process? Why?
• In what way the marginal benefits can be innovatively maximized from the action process of students and teachers?

The priority for school action is to procure various types of resources from internal and external sources, deploying them to achieve targeted outcomes and other benefits. Thus, school effectiveness results from strategic and discriminating use of resources.

SOCIAL LEADERSHIP AND THINKING

Individual action and organizational action are set in a social context, in which human factors such as human needs and development, social relations, and social expectations can deeply influence and shape the nature, aims and outcomes of action. In education, human development and social relations are often perceived as core values in considering school effectiveness and leadership (Henderson & Cunningham, 1994; Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991; Rosenholtz, 1991; Guskey & Huberman, 1995; Cherniss & Goleman, 2001).

Social leadership is based on social rationality in thinking, emphasizing the importance of social relationships and human initiative in achieving
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school aims. Therefore, social interactions and relations, satisfaction of social needs, human initiative and development are key aspects of leadership thinking (Maslow, 1970; McGregor, 1960). The common questions in social leadership in pursuing new and multi-level learning are:

- What are the social relationships between the involved key actors such as students, teachers and other staff members?
- How can their relationships affect the aims, processes and outcomes of multi-level learning and the sustainability of school development?
- How can the human needs be satisfied and synergy be maximized among actors such as students and teachers to pursue sustainable and multiple learning and development? Why?

From the perspective of social thinking, the major task of school leadership is to establish social networks, to support and motivate members, promoting their initiative and synergy in order to realize the action plan and achieve the aims of the school. School effectiveness is then the product of successful social networking and solidarity in action. Enhanced social satisfaction, personal or staff development, working relationships and morale among school members are often perceived as key conditions for a school to remain sustainable.

POLITICAL LEADERSHIP AND THINKING

Increasing diversity in expectations and demands, competitions for resources, and struggles for power among different parties intensify the political aspects of life at the individual, organizational, community and even international levels. In such a context, political leadership and thinking are attracting more and more attention. (Pfeffer, 1992; Bolman & Deal, 1997; Ball, 1987).

Political leadership is based on the political rationality in thinking, emphasizing diversity of interests and expectations of the various school constituencies. Leadership involves the resolution and management of conflicts and struggles through strategies such as alliance building, negotiation, compromise, participation and other democratic process intrinsic to the achieving the aims of the school. The major themes in political leadership include competition for interest, struggles for power, conflicts among members or parties, negotiation and compromise, participation and democracy in decision-making for school improvement (Pfeffer, 1992; Kotter, 1985; Sarason, 1998; Cloke, 2000). Typical questions in pursuing multi-level learning and sustainable school development are:
What diversities of interest, and power of various constituencies need to be addressed by leadership in order to promote multi-level learning and sustainable school effectiveness?

How can the conflicts and struggles in a school be managed so as to sustain organizational learning and school development through alliance building, partnership, negotiation, democratic process and other strategies or tactics?

How can “win-win” strategies, alliances, and partnerships be built to overcome political obstacles, facilitate the school action and maximize the achievement of the school aims for learning in a long run?

In the political perspective, school leadership in a complex context involving multiple and diverse constituencies inevitably induces a process of negotiation, struggle, and conflict management among various parties. To a great extent, school effectiveness is a result of bargaining, compromise, and interplay among interest parties during school practice.

CULTURAL LEADERSHIP AND THINKING

In facing the challenges of ambiguity and uncertainty emerging from the fast changing internal and external environments, how schools and their members are enabled to remain consistent and confident in their values and beliefs systems is an important concern of cultural leadership (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Schein, 1999; Hofstede, 1997). Cultural leadership in pursuing school development is based on the cultural rationality in thinking that sees the nature, aims, and effectiveness of school action as heavily determined by the values, beliefs, ethics and traditions shared among the school actors and concerned constituencies (Cheng, 2000c; Schein, 1992, 1999). Therefore, sharing of values, beliefs and ethics, integration and coherence among school members, and morality in school practice are often key aspects of cultural leadership and thinking.

In the cultural leadership for new and multi-level learning in school, some typical questions in thinking may include the following:

- What values, beliefs and ethics are crucial and shared among school members for students’ continuous self-directed learning or teachers’ professional development?
- How do they consistently influence the aims, nature and even effects of school action?
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• How can integration, coherence or morality in values and beliefs among school members and related stakeholders be maximized in ways that sustain students’ CMI development?

The objective of leadership action for school development is to clarify ambiguities and uncertainties in and realize the school vision (including the key values and beliefs) shared by members and key constituencies. In a cultural sense, school effectiveness is a symbolic product of meaning making or cultural actualization by school members and other constituencies in an ambiguous context (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

LEARNING LEADERSHIP AND THINKING

Given the impacts of the fast changing context on development and survival of individuals and organizations, learning and adaptation to the challenges are crucial and necessary. The pursuit of a learning society becomes more and more important (Wain, 2004; Gorard & Rees, 2002; Jarvis, 2001; Marsick, Bitterman & van der Veen, 2000; OECD, 2000).

Multi-level learning leadership is a response to this dynamic. Learning leadership for sustainable school development is based on the adaptive rationality in thinking that emphasizes continuous learning and successful adaptation of a school to the changes and challenges in the internal and external environment. These are seen as the key for sustainable school development and effectiveness. Therefore, continuous improvement and development of school actors’ operational and cognitive styles is a key to thinking in learning leadership (Jarvis, 2001; Raven & Stephenson, 2001; OECD, 1997; Silins, Mulford & Zarins, 2002). With the adaptive rationality, some typical concerns in learning leadership (or multi-level learning leadership) are:

• What learning styles, thinking modes and knowledge can be used to sustain student learning, teacher learning, organizational learning and school development? What are gaps between the modes of organizational learning and changing realities?
• How can the aims and nature of school action for learning be re-conceptualized to be more adaptive to the changes and challenges in the context?
• How can cognitive gaps in understanding changing realities be minimized and new understandings of sustainable effectiveness be achieved?
As there is heavy emphasis on values implicit in learning, the basic objective of school action is to engage with new ideas and new approaches to achieving its aims as embedded in ongoing and subsequent action cycles of the school. Thus, school effectiveness includes the discovery of new knowledge and approaches to action implementation and the enhancement of school actors’ intelligence, enabling them to understand and deal with challenges from the changing environment.

CONCLUSION

In the three waves of educational reforms, there is a tangible paradigm shift, from emphases in the first and second waves on ‘delivery’ of knowledge towards the third wave of facilitating multiple and sustainable developments of students recognising the demands of society in the future. In concert with this is a paradigm shift in leadership for learning.

In the first wave, the key concerns in school leadership for learning were typically exemplified by the following questions: (Table 1)

1. How well can school leaders manage the internal environment and processes of learning, teaching and schooling to deliver the necessary knowledge and skills to students?
2. How well can school leaders ensure the delivery of knowledge and skills to students through the improvement of schooling, teaching and learning?
3. How well do school leaders facilitate teachers to improve their teaching in a given time period?
4. How can school leaders ensure that students arriving at a given standard in the public examinations through various internal and interface measures?

Different from the first wave, the key concerns in the second wave school leadership for learning may be illustrated by the following questions:

1. How can school leaders ensure the performance of teaching and the outcomes of learning which satisfy the expectations and needs of key stakeholders?
2. How can the educational services under their leadership be made accountable to the public and stakeholders through various types of monitoring, reporting, and benchmarking?
3. How can their schools become competitive in providing quality services in a fast changing education market?
In the third wave, a new paradigm may be summarized as follows:

1. How can school leaders globalise, localise and individualise learning, teaching, and schooling for teachers and their students?
2. How can school leaders maximize students’ learning opportunities through establishing the borderless IT environment, local and international networking, and various types of innovative learning programs?
3. How can school leaders facilitate and ensure that students’ self-learning is sustained and potentially life long?
4. How can school leaders direct educational practices for the development of students’ ability to triplize their self-learning?
5. How can school leaders ensure that the educational environment promotes students’ continuous development of their contextualized multiple intelligences?

The third wave paradigm provides a new perspective for us to understand the role and effectiveness of school leadership in an era of globalization, creating new understandings and opportunities for life-long learning and CMI development. Meeting these challenges is fast becoming a global agenda embracing research, policy formulation and leadership development.
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