New Principalship for Globalization, Localization and Individualization: Paradigm Shift

Yin Cheong CHENG

Centre Director, Professor
Centre for Research and International Collaboration
Asia Pacific Centre for Education Leadership and School Quality
Hong Kong Institute of Education

Lo Ping Road, Tai Po, NT, HONG KONG
Fax: (852) 2948-7721
Tel: (852) 2948-7722
Email: yccheng@ied.edu.hk
Web-site: http://www.ied.edu.hk/cric/
Web-site: http://www.ied.edu.hk/cric/apcelsq/

Keynote Address
At the International Conference on
Principalship and School Management Practice in the Era of Globalization:
Issues and Challenges

At The University of Malaya City Campus,
Kuala Lumpur,

22-24 April, 2003

New Principalship for Globalization, Localization and Individualization: Paradigm Shift

Yin Cheong CHENG
Hong Kong Institute of Education

(Abstract)

This keynote speech aims to report how principalship is challenged by the three waves of education reform and development in different parts of the world. Since the 1970s, the principals in the first wave were mainly concerned with achievement of the planned goals through internal improvement of teaching and learning. In the 1990s, the principals of second wave often focused on interface improvement through various types of quality inspection and assurance. In facing the challenges in the new century, the third wave of changes is moving towards future effectiveness and new paradigm of education. New principalship is needed for globalization, localization and individualization in education with aims at development of students' contextualized multiple intelligence and their future. This address will illustrate the paradigm shift in principalship and discuss how the new paradigm is completely different from the traditional thinking. Implications are drawn for principals, educational leaders, policy-makers, and scholars in different parts of the world to face up the challenges in practice and development.

Introduction

In response to the fast global transformations, serious international competitions, and demanding local developments, there are various education reforms ongoing in different part of the world. According to Cheng (2001a; 2002a), the world-wide education reforms are experiencing three waves since the 1970s. These waves of reforms are mainly based on different paradigms and theories of education effectiveness, and they result in employing different strategies and approaches to changing schools and education. In general, the first wave emphasizes on *internal effectiveness* with the focus on internal process improvement through external intervention or input approach. The second wave pursues the *interface effectiveness* in terms of school-based management, quality assurance, accountability and stakeholders' satisfaction. In facing the challenges of globalization, information technology, and knowledge-driven economy in the new century, the third wave is moving towards pursuit of *future effectiveness*.

The school principals as the key actors in education are playing a crucial role to the implementation of educational reform and development. How principalship can be effectively responsive to these waves of education reforms inevitably becomes an important concern in the policy formulation, public debate and research in both local and global communities. In particular, how the conception, role, and practice of principalship should be changed to meet the challenges of these waves of reforms is a crucial issue. This speech aims to analyse the paradigm shift in principalship and draw implications for leadership development and research in local and international communities.

Principalship of the First Wave: Internal Leadership

The first wave of educational changes and developments had its root in the assumption that the policy-makers have clear education aims and could find out the best

practices to enhance effectiveness or the optimal solutions to solve major problems for all schools at the school-site level. They were generally characterized by a top-down approach with an emphasis on external intervention or increasing resources input and with a focus on merely certain aspects of internal educational practice. Improvement of teacher and student performance{ XE "student performance" } up to identified standards{ XE "standards" } obviously had been a popular and important target for educational reform{ XE "educational reform" }. As principals, how principals can improve and ensure the performance of teachers and students is a key concern in their role.

Traditionally principalship of the first wave inevitably focuses heavily on the effectiveness of internal education processes particularly technical aspects of teaching and learning in classroom. To principalship, the achievement of planned education goals particularly in terms of students' education outcomes or public examination results is the core concern. The higher achievement in planned education goals implies the better principalship in education. Therefore, principals put their major effort for improving the internal environment and processes such that the internal effectiveness of learning and teaching can be improved and ensured to achieve the planned goals. This type of principalship may be named as "**Internal leadership**".

The Roles of the Internal Leadership

According to Cheng (1996a) and Cheng (2002c,d), there are eight models of education effectiveness assurance that can be used to understand the roles of principalship responding to the different waves of education reform. As shown in Table 1, the goal and specification model, the process model and the absence of problem model are concerned with the first wave reform focusing on internal goal achievement, internal process improvement, and internal problem avoidance. By these models, the associated roles of principals with internal leadership can be discussed as follows:

Table 1.   First Wave Models & Principalship: Internal Leadership

First Wave Models	Conception of Effectiveness Assurance	Roles of Internal Leadership	Key Tasks of Internal Leadership
Goal and Specification Model	• Ensuring achievement of stated institutional goals and conformance to given specifications	• Goal achievement leader • Goal monitor	• Develop appropriate strategies to achieve planned school goals particularly the public examination results • Lead members to achieve goals, implement plans and programs, and meet standards
Process Model	• Ensuring smooth internal process and fruitful learning experiences	• Internal process manager • Internal process facilitator	• Facilitate smooth and healthy internal school process including learning and teaching • Encourage participation and promote social interactions and positive school climate
Absence of Problems Model	• Ensuring absence of problems and troubles in the institution	• Supervisor • Dysfunction detector • Problem shooter	• Lead members to avoid and solve conflicts and problems successfully • Identify and prevent structural and organizational defects in school

Goal Achievement Leader. The goal and specification model assumes that there are clear, enduring, normative and well accepted goals and specifications as indicators and standards for schools to pursue or conform. Internal effectiveness assurance by this model aims at ensuring achievement of stated school goals and conformance to given specifications such as students' academic achievements, attendance rate, dropout rate, and personal developments, number of graduates enrolled in universities or graduate schools, staff's professional qualifications, etc. Therefore, principals are expected to play the role as goal leader and monitor. Whether they can help school members to develop appropriate school strategies to achieve the expected school goals particularly the achievements in the public examinations in a common and key concern. If they can facilitate school and program planning and direct and monitor all school members' attention and effort to the achievement of school goals, they are often perceived as effective leaders.

Internal Process Manager. The process model assumes that nature and quality of school process often determine the quality of output and the degree to which the planned goals can be achieved. Internal effectiveness assurance by this model is to ensure smooth healthy internal process and fruitful learning experiences. Therefore principals are often perceived as school process managers and facilitators who lead efforts for improving and maintaining the school process including learning, teaching and managing for better educational outcomes. The effectiveness of their principalship depends on whether they can facilitate participation and involvement of members in decision making and planning, communication between multiple school constituencies, coordination between different units, social interactions and relationships among members, development of school climate, and key learning and teaching activities.

Supervisor. The absence of problem model assumes that if there is absence of problems, troubles, defects, weaknesses, difficulties, and dysfunctions in functioning, this school is of high education effectiveness. The role of principals should be considered as supervisor, dysfunction detector, and problem solver. How can they successfully supervise school activities, identify weaknesses, conflicts, dysfunctions, difficulties and defects in teaching and learning, and help school members to eliminate and solve the problems? How can they lead members to set up the necessary procedures or systems that can monitor and evaluate the performance, troubles and problems in the process and outcome of learning, teaching, managing? Particularly among members, how can they reduce defensive mechanism and develop an open culture to encourage the use of feedback or findings from monitoring and evaluation to improve school and educational practice? These are some concerns related to the effectiveness and development of principalship in this area. In response to these concerns, leadership development for school self-evaluation has been strongly promoted in the past few years in different areas of the world (Education Department, 2002; Task Group on Training and Development of School Heads, 1999).

Principalship of the Second Wave: Interface Leadership

In the past decades, numerous initiatives and research projects of the first wave have been conducted to pursue internal school effectiveness in various countries (Cheng & Townsend, 2000). Some focused on improvement of school management and classroom environment (Cheng, 1996b); some on curriculum development and change (Cheng, Chow, & Tsui, 2000); some on teacher qualifications and competencies (Fidler & Atton, 1999); some on improvement of teaching and learning processes (Morgan & Morris, 1999; Bubb, 2001); and some on evaluation and assessment (Macbeath, 1999, 2000; Leithwood, Aithen &

Jantzi, 2001; Sunstein, & Lovell, 2000; Headington, 2000). But, unfortunately the results of these efforts were very limited and could not satisfy the increasing needs and expectations of the public. Many people began to doubt how effective are these internal improvement initiatives to meet the diverse needs and expectations of parents, students, employers, policy-makers, and those concerned in the community (Cheng, 2002a, b). How education can be ensured accountable to the public? How are the education practices and outcomes relevant to the changing demands of the local community? All these challenges are in nature concerned with the interface between schools and the community. It means that effectiveness assurance is not only an issue of internal process improvement but also the interface issue of meeting the stakeholders' satisfaction and ensuring accountability to the community. Therefore, the education reforms move towards the second wave with emphasis on the interface effectiveness in terms of stakeholders' satisfaction and accountability to the public.

In such a context of the second wave reforms, the role of principalship has to change and adapt to the new conception and related initiatives of interface school effectiveness (or the commonly used term, *school quality*). Principalship of the second wave may be named as *interface leadership* that aims to ensure education services satisfying the needs of internal and external stakeholders and accountable to the public. It is completely different from the traditional internal leadership.

The practice of interface leadership for education effectiveness and or education quality may involve institutional monitoring, institutional self-evaluation, quality inspection, use of quality indicators and benchmarks, survey of key stakeholders' satisfaction, accountability reporting to the community, parental and community involvement in governance, institutional development planning, school charter, and performance-based funding (Jackson & Lund, 2000; Smith Armstrong, & Brown, 1999; Glickman, 2001; Macbeath, 1999, 2000; Leithwood, Aithen & Jantzi, 2001; Sunstein, & Lovell, 2000; Headington, 2000; Cheng, 1997b).

The Roles of Interface Leadership

As previously, the discussion of the roles of interface leadership can be in terms of the models of school effectiveness assurance (Cheng, 1996a; Cheng, 2002c,d). In Table 2, the resource-input model, the satisfaction model, the legitimacy model, the organizational learning model and the total quality management model focus mainly on the interface effectiveness assurance concerning resource input from the interface, satisfaction of strategic stakeholders, legitimacy and accountability in the local community, adaptation to the changing interface environment through continuous learning, and total management of internal people and process to meet the strategic stakeholders' needs.

Resource Developer. This resource-input model assumes that scarce and quality resources are necessary for schools to achieve diverse objectives and provide quality services in a short time. Therefore, principals are expected to play the role as resource developer and resource allocator particularly in a context of implementing school-based management. Given the larger flexibility and autonomy in managing school resources, how principals can have the new set of leadership competencies to maximize the use of resources for education quality and school effectiveness is really a key issue. The following are some common concerns about principalship in resource management:

- How can they clarify the connections between school inputs and outputs, and determine what resources are critical to the school's survival and development?
- How can they develop and utilize the scarce resources from outside and allocate these resources to support effective internal functioning and produce high quality school outcomes?
- How can they help internal members to broaden the concepts of human and physical

resources, enhance their professional competence to use and manage scarce resources in teaching and learning for quality outcomes?

- How can they reduce the internal political conflicts and struggles for resources but generate more synergy among school members?

Social Leader and Satisfier. The satisfaction model assumes that the satisfaction of strategic constituencies of a school is critical to its survival in the local community. Inevitably, principals should play the role as social leader and social satisfier. They need to develop a new set of political and social skills to deal with the external strategic stakeholders, maintain good social relationships and satisfy their expectations. In particular, they need to facilitate the internal and external school constituencies communicate their expectations, convince them to accept the strengths and weaknesses of the school, and negotiate appropriate targets for the school to satisfy their needs and expectations. If there is serious conflict between different strategic school constituencies, they can skillfully help them to resolve the problem and sustain good social relationship.

Table 2.   Second Wave Models and Principalship: Interface Leadership

Second Wave Models	Conception of Effectiveness Assurance	Roles of Interface Leadership	Key Tasks of Interface Leadership
Resource-Input Model	• Ensuring achievement of needed quality resources & inputs for the school	• Resource developer • Resource manager	• Procure needed resources & inputs • Allocate resources to support effective teaching, learning, and functioning
Satisfaction Model	• Ensuring satisfaction of all powerful constituencies	• Social leader • Social satisfier	• Create opportunities to satisfy the diverse expectations of all powerful constituencies • Lead members to satisfy the needs of key stakeholders in teaching and all other school activities
Legitimacy Model	• Ensuring achievement of the school's legitimate position and reputation	• Environmental Leader • Public relations manager • Accountability builder	• Establish good public relationship with the community • Market the school's strengths and image • Build up the school accountability
Organizational Learning Model	• Ensuring adaptation to environmental changes & internal barriers • Continuous improvement	• Organizational developer • Environmental analyzer • Learning promoter	• Lead members to have a full awareness and analysis of environmental changes and internal barriers • Promote organizational learning • Establish a strategic plan for school development

Environmental Leader. Since the education environment is very demanding and competitive, schools have to face external challenges and demands for accountability and "value for money". According to the legitimacy model, schools have to win support of the community, build up good public image and show evidence of accountability in order to gain legitimacy for survival and development. Therefore, the role of principalship should focus on the achievement of a school's legitimate position or reputation in the community and often rely on the interface activities and achievements such as building up public relations, marketing institutional strengths, ensuring institutional accountability to the public, and

promoting institutional image, reputation and status in the community. Also, principals should ensure the operation of educational programs which conform to the ethical and moral norms of the community. In sum, principals play the role as public relations manager, environmental leader, and school accountability builder.

Organizational Developer. The changing global environment and the economic downturn since 1997 in the Region are producing great impacts on nearly every aspect of functioning schools. The organizational learning model emphasizes the importance of continuous organizational learning, improvement and adaptation to ensuring education effectiveness in a changing environment. Therefore, principals should play the role as environmental analyzer, learning promoter, and organizational developer. Different from the internal leadership in the first wave, they need to help school members to be sensitive to environmental changes and internal barriers, analyze them, reflect on findings, draw implications, establish strategies, plan actions, and develop the school organization (Yuen & Cheng, 2000). Leadership in strategic management or development planning becomes necessary to promote organizational learning and continuous improvement and development among school members (Cheng, 2000b).

Principalship of the Third Wave: Future Leadership

At the turn of the new century, people begin to doubt whether the second wave of education reforms can meet the challenges in a new era of globalization, information technology, and new economy. Even if the existing stakeholders may be satisfied with the quality of education services and the schools are accountable to the community, education may be still ineffective or "useless" for our new generations in the new millennium as the aims and outcomes of education are once found nothing to do with the future needs in such a rapidly changing environment. Particularly when knowledge-driven economy and information technology are strongly emphasized in the new millennium, many people urge paradigm shift in learning and teaching and demand reforming the aims, content, practice, and management of education at different levels to ensure their relevance to the future (Cheng, 2000a, b; Daun, 2001; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). The emerging third wave of education reforms emphasizes strongly *future effectiveness* in terms of relevance to the new education functions in the new century as well as relevance to the new paradigm of education concerning contextualized multiple intelligences, globalization, localization and individualization (Cheng, 2002a). The pursuit of new vision and aims at different levels of education, life-long learning, global networking, international outlook, and use of information and technological are just some emerging evidences of the third wave (Cheng, 2001c).

Paradigm Shift in Schooling

The discussion of principalship for the third wave can be based on the following questions:

(1) What paradigm shift in schooling is being pursued in the new century particularly in the context of globalization?

(2) What implications can be drawn for the roles of principalship in implementing the third wave reforms and the new paradigm of schooling?

According to Cheng (2002a, b), the paradigm of education should be shifted from the *Traditional Site-bounded Paradigm* to *a New Triplization Paradigm.* The new paradigm emphasizes the development of students' contextualized multiple intelligences (CMI)

(including technological, economic, social, political, cultural, and learning intelligences) and the processes of triplization (including globalization, localization and individualization) in education. As shown in Table 3, the characteristics of schooling of new paradigm are completely different from the traditional paradigm and summarized as follows: (Cheng, 2001b)

Individualized Schooling. In the new paradigm, school is perceived as a facilitating place to support students' learning. School itself should be a contextualized multiple intelligence environment for supporting students to develop their multiple intelligences. Each school has its own strengths, potential, and characteristics. Based on their strengths, different schools can conduct and manage schooling in different styles to maximize their own contributions to students' learning. The focus of schooling is to arouse curiosity and motivation of both students and teachers to think, act, and learn in a multiple intelligence way. Schooling is also an open process to initiate, facilitate, and sustain self-learning and self-actualization of students and teachers. It provides opportunities to share the joy of learning and teaching among teachers and students**.** To face up the challenges in the new century and pursue contextualized multiple intelligences, school is a continuously learning and developing organization, involving institutional continuous discovery, experimenting, actualization, reflection, and development.

Table 3: New and Traditional Paradigms of Schooling

New Triplization Paradigm	Traditional Site-Bounded Paradigm
Individualized Schooling • As a Facilitating Place for Students' learning and Development • Multiple Intelligence School • Individualized Schooling Style • Place for Curiosity in Learning • Open Process • Sharing Joy • As a Learning Organization	**Reproduced Schooling** • As a Centre of Education • Source of Knowledge and Qualifications • Standard Schooling Style • Place for Transfer of Knowledge • Qualifying Process • Achieving Standards • As a Bureaucracy
Localized and Globalized Schooling: • Coupled with Multiple Sources • Community and Parental Involvement • Networked Schooling • World-Class Schooling • Unlimited Opportunities for Learning • Local and International Outlook • As a World-Class and Networked School	**Bounded Schooling:** • Isolated School • Weak Community Linkage • Separated Schooling • Site-Bounded Schooling • Limited Opportunities for Learning • Alienated Experiences • As a Bounded and Separated School

Localized and Globalized Schooling. In the new paradigm, schooling should be localized and globalized. It is managed and facilitated in such a way such that all types of transfer, adaptation, and development of related values, knowledge, technology, and norms can bring in local and global resources, supports, and networks to maximize the opportunities for their developments and their contributions to students' learning and teachers' teaching. In addition to the school itself, there are multiple sources of teaching and learning – self-learning programs and packages, web-based learning, outside experts, community experiential programs, etc. - inside and outside the school, locally and globally. Parents and communities, including social services, business, and industry, are actively involved in schooling. The partnership with them is necessary to support effective networked

schooling and multiple sources of learning. Locally and globally networked schooling can provide a wide spectrum of learning experiences and maximize opportunities for teachers and students to benefit from various settings and cultures. With the help of globalized schooling, students can learn the world-class experiences from different parts of the world. Schools can maximize the opportunities for teachers and students to enhance the quality of teaching and learning from local and global networking and exposure. Schools in the new century paradigm are conceptualized as world-class and networked schools.

Implications for Future Principalship

Different from the first and second waves, principalship of the third wave should be a type of "*future leadership*" that aims at leading and ensuring the direction and practice of school education effective and relevant to the future of new generations in an era of globalization, transformation and intelligence-based economy. With the above paradigm shift in schooling, the major implications for the roles of principalship of the third wave can be discussed as follows: (Table 4)

Leadership for Globalization in Education. Globalization refers to the transfer, adaptation, and development of values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms across countries and societies in different parts of the world (Brown, 1999; Brown & Lauder, 1996; Waters, 1995). Some examples of globalization in education are Web-based learning; use of the Internet in learning and teaching; international immersion programs; international exchange and visit programs; international partnership in teaching and learning at the group, class, and individual levels; interactions and sharing through video-conferencing across countries, communities, institutions, and individuals; and new curriculum content on globalization in technological, economic, social, political, cultural, and learning aspects.

The most profound implication of globalization for future leadership schools is the critical need to maximize the global relevance and achieve intellectual assets, resources, and initiatives from different parts of the world for schooling, teaching, and learning (Caldwell & Spinks, 1998; Daun, 1997). Principals need to have a global outlook and international communication skills for expanding the scope of their leadership influence to a wide variety of stakeholders beyond their school sites and local communities to a global context. To maximize global networking and cope with the complexity and ambiguity in globalizing education, it inevitably becomes necessary for principals to expand their internal and interface leadership to future leadership in terms of five key dimensions including structural leadership, social leadership, cultural leadership, political leadership and educational leadership (Cheng, in press). Clearly, up to now there is still lack of literature and research to show what specific roles of future leadership should be expected in these five key dimensions of leadership.

Leadership for Localization in Education. Localization refers to the transfer, adaptation, and development of related values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms from and to the local contexts. Some examples for practice of localization in education include community and parental involvement in school education; home-school collaboration; assurance of school accountability; implementation of school-based management, school-based curriculum, and community-related curriculum; and development of new curriculum content related to local developments in technological, economic, social, political, cultural, and learning aspects. To a great extent, the second wave reforms are pursuing localization in education.

The key implication of localization to principalship is the critical need to achieve environmental strength through maximizing the local relevance, community support, and

partnership with local agencies and organizations in schooling, teaching, and learning. Consistent with the interface leadership discussed above, the leadership roles for localization may include resource developer, social leader and satisfier, public relations manager, environmental leader, accountability builder, and organizational developer. The principals need to expand their leadership influence on strategic stakeholders from the site level to the local community and also expand the targeted stakeholders including those explicit (e.g. parents) and hidden (e.g. social service agencies or business companies) in the local community. Particularly the principals need to expand their dimensions of leadership from the structural and social leadership to the political and cultural leadership in order to deal with the complexity and uncertainties during the process of localization in education (Cheng, in press; Cheng, 2000c).

Leadership for Individualization in Education. Individualization refers to the transfer, adaptation, and development of related external values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms to meet the individual needs and characteristics. The major implication of individualization for principalship is the imperative to enhance human initiative in education including the motivation, effort and creativity of students and teachers in teaching and learning through such measures as implementing individualized educational programs; designing and using individualized learning targets, methods, and progress schedules; encouraging students and teachers to be self-learning, self-actualizing, and self-initiating; meeting individual special needs; and developing students' contextualized multiple intelligences. Particularly, how they can exercise their leadership influence to cope with the complexity and multiplicity in human nature, meet the diverse needs of so many school members, and effectively develop their potentials and initiative during the process of individualization in a context of limited resources is often a core issue of future leadership.

Table 4:   Triplization and New Principalship: Future Leadership

Triplization	Implications for New Principalship: Future Leadership
Globalization: Transfer, adaptation, and development of values, knowledge, technology and behavioral norms across countries and societies in different parts of the world	Principalship for ensuring long-term relevance of education through maximizing the global relevance and drawing upon support, intellectual resources, and initiatives from different parts of the world for schooling, teaching, and learning
Localization: Transfer, adaptation, and development of related values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms from/to the local contexts	Principalship for achieving environmental strength through maximizing the local relevance, community support and local partnership & collaboration in schooling, teaching, and learning:
Individualization: Transfer, adaptation, and development of related external values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms to meet the individual needs and characteristics	Principalship for enhancing human initiative through maximizing motivation, effort and creativity of each student and each teacher in learning, teaching, and schooling

Paradigm Shift in Assessing Principalship Effectiveness

Given the paradigm shift in schooling and the change towards new principalship with future leadership, there is also corresponding paradigm shift in researching and assessing the effectiveness or impact of principalship in the third wave.

Since the traditional paradigm emphasizes the delivery of knowledge and skill and the satisfaction of strategic stakeholders, the assessment and research on principalship effectiveness are often focused on the following questions:

1. How well do principals organize learning and teaching to deliver the necessary knowledge and skills to students?
2. How well can principals ensure the delivery of knowledge and skills to students through the improvement of teaching and learning?
3. How well do principals facilitate teachers to improve their teaching in a given time period?
4. How well can principals ensure students arriving at a given standard in the public examinations?
5. How well can principals ensure the performance of teaching and the outcomes of learning satisfying the key stakeholders' expectations and needs?
6. How accountable can be the education services under their principalship to the public and stakeholders?

Clearly, the first four questions are concerned with the effectiveness of internal leadership that focuses on the internal improvement in teaching, learning, and delivery of knowledge and skills. The last two questions come from the concern of the effectiveness of interface leadership that focuses on the stakeholders' satisfaction with the performance and learning outcomes and the education accountability to the public. In other words, the traditional paradigm of principalship reflects the line of thinking of the first and second waves.

But the paradigm shift towards triplization in education induces a new conception of principalship effectiveness because the aims, content, and process of education are completely the traditional thinking. The assessment of new principalship can be based on the following major questions:

1. *How well do principals globalize, localize and individualize learning, teaching, and schooling for their teachers and students*? This question is proposed for investigating how principalship effectively places students' learning, and teachers' teaching in a globalized, localized, and individualized context. Only internal leadership for improvement of teaching, learning, and schooling at the site level is not sufficient to ensure education relevance to the globalization, localization, and individualization for the future development of students. Also interface leadership for satisfaction of stakeholders and accountability at the interface of school may contribute to localization of education but cannot promise globalization and individualization for learning and teaching.

2. *How well do principals maximize students' learning opportunities through establishing the borderless IT environment, local and international networking, and various types of innovative learning programmes?* This question is proposed to study how effective is principalship in maximizing opportunities for students' learning and development in a triplized learning environment. The concern is not on how much internal process can be improved and how much strategic stakeholders are satisfied, but on how large and how many opportunities can be created for students' learning and development of their contextualized

multiple intelligence.

3. How well do principals facilitate and ensure students' self-learning to be sustained as potentially life long? This question focuses on investigating how principalship can effectively facilitate and ensure students' self-learning sustainable to life long that is a core part of the new paradigm education. It is assumed that short-term internal improvement and short-term stakeholders' satisfaction may not be so important and relevant to the future of students if students themselves cannot sustain their learning as a life long process.

4. How well do principals ensure and direct the development of students' ability to triplize their self learning? This question is proposed to investigate the influence of principalship on the relevance of students' learning to the development of their ability of triplizing self-learning. It is very important and necessary for students to achieve their own ability for maximizing learning opportunities and sustaining their self-learning through globalization, localization and individualization.

5. How well do principals ensure students' contextualized multiple intelligence that can continuously develop by students themselves? The question focuses on studying how principalship can ensure the outcomes of learning and teaching fundamentally relevant to the development of students' contextualized multiple intelligences including technological, economic, social, political, cultural, and learning intelligences that are crucial for them to meet the challenges in the future. This is one of the main concerns of the new paradigm education.

From the above discussion, the implications for paradigm shift in assessment and research on principal effectiveness are substantial. The effectiveness of principalship depends heavily on whether their schools can be led successfully moving towards development of students' contextualized multiple intelligences and triplization in education including globalization, localization, and individualization. When triplization becomes a strategic trend in the third wave of education reforms for the future, how principals particularly and international communities in general can lead this trend successfully to facilitate paradigm shift in education and create unlimited opportunities for students' effective life-long learning and development to meet the challenges of the future is really an important agenda for research, policy formulation and leadership development.

Conclusion

From the above discussion, we can see that the three waves of education reforms in different parts of the world require different types of principalship including internal leadership, interface leadership and future leadership, that are based on completely different paradigms in education and effectiveness assurance. The major characteristics of these types of principalship can be summarized as shown in Table 5.

Three Paradigms of Principalship

The first wave of education reforms emphasizes internal improvement and effectiveness. Therefore the paradigm of effectiveness assurance in education conceptualizes school effectiveness mainly as the internal effectiveness of management, teaching, and learning to achieve the planned goals. The conception of internal leadership is mainly leadership for improving internal environment and processes such that the effectiveness of learning and teaching can be ensured to achieve the planned goals of the school. In practice, there are three models often used to enhance internal school effectiveness, including the goal and specification model, the process model, and the absence of problem model. Correspondingly, the roles of principals of internal leadership are goal achiever, goal monitor, internal process

manager, and supervisor. The efforts of leadership are often short-term orientation, related to the daily practices and improvement in management, teaching, and learning.

The second wave of education reforms and effectiveness assurance focuses on the interface between the school and the community. School effectiveness is interface effectiveness, mainly defined and assessed by the satisfaction of stakeholders with the education services of the school and by the accountability to the public and stakeholders. Therefore the conception of interface leadership is for ensuring education services satisfying the needs of stakeholders and accountable to the public. Depending on the approaches used to deal with interface issues and achieve interface school effectiveness, there are four models for interface effectiveness assurance, including the resource-input model, the satisfaction model, the legitimacy model, and the organizational learning model. The corresponding roles of principals of interface leadership include resource developer, social leader and satisfier, environmental leader, public relations manager, and organizational developer. Compared with the short-term focus of internal effectiveness assurance, the efforts of interface leadership are middle-term orientation, interacting with the interface and external environment of the school.

Responding to the challenges of globalization, information technology and knowledge-driven economy in the new millennium, the third wave of education reforms urges paradigm shift in school effectiveness assurance. Educational effectiveness is future effectiveness that is defined by the education relevance to the future needs of individuals, the community, and the society. Therefore, the conception of future leadership is for ensuring the relevance of aims, content, practices, and outcomes of school education to the future of new generations in facing up challenges of new millennium. Future leadership is important for leading paradigm shifts in education towards the development of students' contextualized multiple intelligences and triplization in education for creating unlimited opportunities for students' continuous life-long learning and development. Compared with the internal leadership and interface leadership, the efforts of future leadership are mainly long-term orientation no matter for development of individuals, the community and the society.

Total Principalship: Internal, Interface and Future

Although internal leadership, interface leadership, and future leadership are based on different paradigms and they have different strengths and focuses, all of them are important and necessary to provide us a comprehensive framework to lead and manage school education in the new century. They are mutually supplementary to each other, taking internal improvement, interface satisfaction and accountability, and future relevance into consideration. We believe, if principals can ensure internal effectiveness, interface effectiveness, and future effectiveness for their schools, they have *total principalship* including internal, interface and future leadership.

From this line of thinking, the efforts of research, leadership development, and policy formulation in ongoing education reforms should focus not only on internal and interface leadership but also on future leadership if total school effectiveness is pursued (Cheng, 2002a, b). It is hoped that the analysis and discussion in this speech can provide a new comprehensive framework for local and international educators, researchers, and policy-makers to develop new principalship for education effectiveness in the new century.

Correspondence: Prof. Yin Cheong CHENG, Centre Director, Centre for Research and International Collaboration, Hong Kong Institute of Education, Lo Ping Road, Tai Po, NT, HONG KONG. Fax: (852) 2948-7721, Tel: (852) 2948-7722, Email: yccheng@ied.edu.hk

Table 5:   Paradigm Shift in Principalship: Three Waves

	First Wave **Internal Leadership**	**Second Wave** **Interface Leadership**	**Third Wave** **Future Leadership**
Conception of School Effectiveness	**Internal Effectiveness:** As achievement of planned goals	**Interface Effectiveness:** As satisfaction of stakeholder with the education services including education process and outcomes; and As accountability to the public	**Future Effectiveness:** As education relevance to the future needs of individuals, the community, and the society
Major Models of Effectiveness Assurance	**Internal Models:** • Goal and specification model • Process model • Absence of problem model	**Interface Models:** • Resource-input model • Satisfaction model • Legitimacy model • Organizational learning model	**Relevance to Paradigm in Education:** • Development of contextualized multiple intelligences • Triplization in education: Globalization, localization and individualization
Conception of Principalship	**Internal Leadership for** Improving the internal environment and processes such that the effectiveness of learning and teaching can be ensured to achieve the planned goals	**Interface Leadership for** Ensuring education services satisfying the needs of stakeholders and accountable to the public	**Future Leadership for** Ensuring the relevance of aims, content, practices, and outcomes of school education to the future of new generations in a new era of globalization, information technology, and knowledge-driven economy
Role of Principalship	• Goal achiever, goal monitor • Internal process manager • Supervisor	• Resource developer • Social leader and satisfier • Environmental leader, public relations manager • Organizational developer	• Leaders for globalization • Leaders for localization • Leader for individualization
Main Questions for Leadership Practice and Research	• How well learning, teaching, and schooling are organized to deliver knowledge and skills? • How well the delivery of knowledge can be ensured through the improvement of schooling, teaching, and learning? • How well teachers' teaching can be improved and developed in a given time period? • How well students can arrive at a given standard in examination?	• How well the performance of teaching and the outcomes of learning can meet the stakeholders' expectations and needs? • How accountable the education services can be to the public and stakeholders?	• How well learning, teaching, and schooling are triplized? • How well students' learning opportunities are maximized through IT environment, networking, and various innovative programmes? • How well students' self-learning is facilitated and sustained as potentially life long? • How well students' ability to triplize their self-learning is developed? • How well students' CMI is continuously developed by themselves?
Time Frame of Principalship	• Mainly short-term orientation	• Mainly middle-term orientation	• Mainly long-term orientation

References

Brown, P., & Lauder, H. (1996). Education, globalization and economic development. *Journal of Education Policy, 11*(1), 1-25.

Brown, T. (1999). Challenging globalization as discourse and phenomenon. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 18*(1), 3-17.

Bubb, S. (2001). *Performance management: monitoring teaching in the primary school*. UK: David Fulton Publishers.

Burbules, N.C. & Torres, C.A. (Eds) (2000). *Globalization and education: critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Caldwell, B.J. & Spinks, J.M. (1998). *Beyond the self-managing school*. London: Falmer Press.

Chan, B., Cheng, Y.C., & Hau, K.T. (1991) *A Technical Report on the Study of Principal-Teachers Relationship Secondary Schools*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Chan, Y.C., & Cheng, Y.C. (1993) A study of principals' instructional leadership in secondary schools. *Educational Research Journal*, 8, 55–67.

Cheng, Y.C. & Cheung, W.M. (1999) Education quality profile: The case of Hong Kong secondary schools. Speech presented at the Annual Conference of the America Educational Research Association, 19-24 April, Montreal, Canada.

Cheng, Y.C. & Townsend, T. (2000). Educational Change and Development in the Asia-Pacific Region: Trends and Issues, In Townsend, T & Cheng, Y.C. (eds), *Educational Change and Development in the Asia-Pacific Region: Challenges for the Future*. (pp.317-344) The Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger Publisher.

Cheng, Y.C. (1991) Leadership style of principals and organizational process   secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 29*(2), 25–37.

Cheng, Y.C. (1994) Principal's leadership as a critical indicator of school performance: Evidence from multi-levels of primary schools. *An International Journal of Research, Policy, and Practice*, 5(3), 299–317.

Cheng, Y.C. (1996a). *School Effectiveness and School-based Improvement: A Mechanism for Development*. London, UK: Falmer Press.

Cheng, Y.C. (1996b). *The improvement of school management: Theory, Change and Practice*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Cheng, Y.C. (1997a). *Monitoring School Effectiveness: Conceptual and Practical Dilemmas in Developing a Framework*. In H. Meng, Y. Zhou, & Y. Fang (eds.) *School Based Indicators of Effectiveness: Experiences and Practices in APEC Members*. (pp.197-206), China: Guangxi Normal University Press)

Cheng, Y.C. (1997b). *A Framework of Indicators of Education Quality   Primary Schools: Development and Application. Eugene,* In H. Meng, Y. Zhou, & Y. Fang (eds.) *School Based Indicators of Effectiveness: Experiences and Practices in APEC Members*. (pp.207-250), China: Guangxi Normal University Press.)

Cheng, Y.C. (2000a). A CMI-Triplization Paradigm for Reforming Education in the New Millennium. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 14(4), 156-174.

Cheng, Y.C. (2000b). Educational Change and Development   : Effectiveness, Quality, and Relevance, In Townsend, T & Cheng, Y.C. (eds), *Educational Change and Development in the Asia-Pacific Region: Challenges for the Future*. (pp.17-56) The Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger Publisher.

Cheng, Y.C. (2000c). The Characteristics of Hong Kong School Principals' Leadership: The Influence of Societal Culture. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*, 20(2), 68-86.

Cheng, Y.C. (2001a). *Educational Relevance, Quality and Effectiveness: Paradigm Shifts*. Invited keynote speech presented at the International Congress for School Effectiveness and School Improvement held in 5-9 January 2001 in Toronto, Canada, with the theme "Equity, Globalization, and Change: Education for the 21st Century".

Cheng, Y.C. (2001b). New Education and New Teacher Education: A Paradigm Shift for the Future.   In Cheng, Y.C., Chow, K.W., & Tsui, K.T. (eds.).   *New Teacher Education for the Future: International Perspectives*, (pp. 33-88). Hong Kong & The Netherlands: Hong Kong Institute of Education & Kluwer Academic Puhlishers.

Cheng, Y.C. (2001c). *Towards the Third Wave of Education Reforms*   . Keynote speech at the International Forum on Education Reforms in the Asia-Pacific Region, held in 14-16 February 2001, Hong Kong.

Cheng, Y.C. (2002a). Paradigm Shift in School Effectiveness: Internal, Interface, and Future. In Griffith, A. & Reynolds, C. (eds.). *Equity and Globalization in Education.*(87-117)   Calgary, Canada: Temeron Press.

Cheng, Y.C. (2002b). *Towards the Third Wave of School Effectiveness and Improvement   : Internal, Interface and Future*. ERIC (EA031899), Eugene OR: Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Cheng, Y.C. (2002c).   Multi-models of Education Quality and Principal Leadership.   In K.H. Mok and D. Chan (eds.). *Globalization and Education: The Quest for Quality Education*   (pp. 69-88). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Cheng, Y.C. (2002d). Leadership and Strategy in Education. In Bush, T. & Bell, L. (eds.). *Educational*

Management: Principles and Practice (pp.51-69). London: Paul Chapman.

Cheng, Y.C. (in press). The Changing Context of Principalship: Implications for Paradigm Shift. In Leithwood, K., Chapman, J., Corson, D., Hallinger, P. & Hart, A. (eds.) *International Handbook of Research in Educational Leadership and Administration*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Cheng, Y.C., Chow, K.W. & Tsui, K.T. (eds.) (2000). *School Curriculum Change and Development* **.** Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education. pp. 1-591.

Curriculum Development Council (2001). *Learning to learn: Life-long learning and whole-person development*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Daun, H. (1997). National forces, globalization and educational restructuring: some European response patterns. *Comapre, 27*(1), 19-41.

Daun, H. (2001). *Educational Restructuring in the Context of Globalization and National Policy*. US: Routledge Falmer.

Fidler, B. & Atton, T. (1999). *Poorly performing staff in schools and how to manage them: capability, competence and motivation*. London: Routledge.

Glickman, C.D. (2001). Holding Sacred Ground: The Impact of Standardization. *Educational Leadership*, 58(4), 46-51.

Headington, R. (2000). *Monitoring, assessment, recording, reporting and accountability: meeting the standards*. London: David Fulton.

Jackson, N. & Lund, H.S. (Eds) (2000). *Benchmarking for higher education.* Buckingham, England: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Kwok, M.L., Lo, S.K., Ng, M.B. & Cheng, Y.C. (1997) New and experienced secondary school principals: Leadership, management difficulties, confidence, efficacy and satisfaction. *Educational Research Journal.* 12(1), 60-72.

Leithwood, K.A., Aitken, R & Jantzi, D. (2001). *Making schools smarter: a system for monitoring school and district progress*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

MacBeath, J.E.C. (1999). *Schools must speak for themselves: the case for school self-evaluation*. London: Routledge.

MacBeath, J.E.C. (2000). *Self-evaluation in European schools: a story of change*. London: Routledge.

Morgan, C. & Morris, G. (1999). *Good teaching and learning: pupils and teachers speak*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Shum, L.C. & Cheng, Y.C. (1997) Perceptions of woman principal's leadership and teacher's work attitudes. *Journal of Educational Administration.* 35(2), 168-188.

Smith, H., Armstrong, M. & Brown, S. (Eds). (1999). *Benchmarking and threshold standards in higher education*. London: Kogan Page.

Sunstein, B.S. & Lovell, J.H. (Eds). (2000). *The portfolio standard: how students can show us what they know and are able to do*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Tam, W.M. & Cheng, Y.C. (1995) School environment and student performance: A multi-level analysis. *Educational Research Journal*, 10(1), 5-21.

Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization.* London: Routledge.

Working Group on Educational Standards (1994). *Quality in school education*. Hong Kong Education Commission, Hong Kong Government.

Yuen, B.Y. & Cheng, Y.C. (2000). Leadership for Teachers' Action Learning. *International Journal of Educational Management.* 14(5), 198-209.