School Leader Preparation: a short review of the knowledge base

Gary M. Crow, Ph.D.
Visiting Professor, University of Reading (UK)
Professor, University of Utah (USA)

The importance of leadership for school improvement and student attainment has been recognized for several years in research, governmental initiative, and practice. However, until recently leadership preparation had not received comparable attention. Fortunately, there are some indications that this is changing and that educators and community and government leaders recognize that how leaders are prepared has implications for what happens in schools to enhance the teaching and learning of students. Certainly the establishment of the National College for School Leaders is a significant recognition that leader preparation is critical for school improvement (National College for School Leadership, 2001).

This paper is part of a longer report that highlights an important attempt to intensively prepare future leaders of schools facing challenging circumstances. The project has the potential to impact these schools and to foster a promising direction for new school leader preparation. The full report serves as an interim evaluation of the Trainee Head Scheme, currently being implemented by the Department for Education and Skills. The full report provides a description of the establishment and early development of the project, an assessment of the strengths and areas for improvement, and recommendations for future design and implementation of the project for the remainder of the first year and during the second year. This part of the report is written for project administrators, trainees, and mentors as a resource for understanding the research and practice of leader preparation. Such a resource may provide a tool for these participants to critically analyze and reflect on the process of becoming innovative leaders.

Knowledge Base of School Leader Preparation

This section considers how work roles, including school leadership, are changing in the 21st century; the general knowledge base of school leader preparation theory, research, and practice; and the specific literature focusing on internship and mentoring methods.

School Leadership as a Work Role in the 21st Century

The nature of work in post-industrial society is changing significantly and this change affects the specific role of headteacher. Understanding the nature of preparation for this role must be based on recognition of how work is being defined and organized in the 21st century.

School leadership has been conceived in large part from management conceptions originating during the Industrial Revolution. These conceptions focused primarily on a scientific management role designed to control labor and create social order (Callahan, 1962). Managerial roles, such as school leadership, were focused on routinization and the attempt to limit the discretion of workers, e.g. teachers (Hage & Powers, 1992). Various methods were used to increase this routinization and decrease uncertainty in the workplace. For example, the development and use of policy manuals were designed to ensure that managers implemented rules and policies in the same way throughout the

system. School leaders were instructed to follow the "standard operating procedures" or use the policy manual to make decisions regarding personnel, curriculum, assessment, etc. A considerable amount of literature and even more advice were available to school leaders to aid them in becoming effective managers who enforced policy and encouraged uniformity.

In post-industrial society, the nature of work in general, and in education, in particular, is changing. Work in the 21st century emphasizes complexity rather than routinization (Hage & Powers, 1992). The dynamic nature of organizations, such as schools, where numerous individuals without close supervision make multiple decisions working directly with children, requires a different kind of leader. The acknowledgement of the changing demographics of schools, the explosion of technology, and the rapid growth and change in knowledge require individuals who can live with ambiguity, work flexibly, encourage creativity, and handle complexity. For example, the ability to collect, analyze, and use relevant information in a rapid manner to understand complex learning environments and address student needs has become more important than strict adherence to policy manuals. Furthermore, facilitating the work of learning communities rather than separate teachers has become essential to increasing the learning capacity of schools (Bryk, Camburn, & Louis, 1999; Fullan, 2000; Hopkins, 2001).

The understanding of leadership has changed from a focus exclusively on one person who alone turns schools around to an organizational quality distributed among numerous individuals (Elmore, 2000; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). In this conception, headteachers become responsible for not only sharing leadership and delegating authority, but also increasing leadership capacity in the school.

Preparation programs that encourage industrial models of leadership and management that focus on control are no longer appropriate for creating effective school leaders for professional learning communities in the 21st century. Effective leaders in contemporary schools must be prepared to deal with complexity and facilitate the learning and leadership of others.

General knowledge base of school leader socialization

Socialization is the process of learning a new role. The literature identifies two types of socialization: professional and organizational. Professional socialization occurs when the individual is preparing to take on an occupational role, such as headship. In some instances, this involves university preparation and/or some qualification, e.g., the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH). Professional socialization provides the knowledge, skills, and values that an individual will need to carry out the headship regardless of the school.

Organizational socialization focuses on the specific context where the role is being performed. This learning emphasizes "how things are done here" and includes the particular values and norms of the school where the individual becomes a headteacher. Providers of professional socialization socialize their students or trainees to a conception of the profession, while organizations socialize their newcomers to be effective members of the organization (Schein, 1988). Sometimes the two forms of socialization emphasize values and conceptions of the role that conflict. For example, the professional socialization may emphasize change, innovation, and reform, while the organization encourages stability, maintenance of the status quo, and tradition.

One way to think about how individuals learn a new role, such as headteacher, is to identify the content, sources of influence, methods, and outcomes of this learning. The remainder of this section uses these categories to briefly focus attention on how learning a new role develops.

Content. Socialization includes three types of content (Feldman, 1976). A new headteacher has to learn:

- Skills to perform the job, e.g., how to conduct classroom observations;
- Adjustment to the specific work environment, e.g., who to trust for information;
- Internalization of values, e.g., importance of collaboration and collegiality.

Learning to be a headteacher also includes the two content areas of technical and cultural elements of the job (Greenfield, 1985). The role certainly includes technical skills, such as budgeting and marketing. But the role also includes skills and dispositions related to the culture or moral context of the school. These may include creating or maintaining norms of experimentation and collegiality. The role of school leader includes more than simply learning management skills. Leadership also includes values and dispositions to move the school forward and encourage the development of norms, e.g., contributing to a learning community. Thus, preparation programs must go beyond simply competency-based strategies for teaching management skills. They must contribute to the leadership sensitivities and dispositions that contribute to a culture of reform, improvement, and success for all students.

Sources of influence. An interesting feature of headship socialization is the variety and richness of socialization sources. Current headteachers, LEA administrators, teachers, students, parents, family members and friends socialize aspiring heads. This variety provides a rich texture for the socialization process but it also may produce conflict and the new or aspiring head may receive conflicting messages from different sources. For example, training providers may encourage innovation and reform, while teachers or other administrators may encourage maintaining the status quo. Or one group of teachers may encourage professional growth while another discourages the head from being involved in professional development. Aspiring heads need to examine the influences on their learning and the messages they receive regarding what is important. Only then can they understand how to deal with the potential role conflict.

Another important source of socialization is the individual who is learning the role. Although the word "socialization" tends to emphasize a passive process in which others socialize the individual, socialization is a reciprocal process (Crow & Matthews, 1998) (Wentworth, 1980). Individuals play an active role in their own learning to become headteachers. One of the most potent ways this occurs for aspiring and new heads is through their previous teaching and deputy experiences. These experiences can vary according to the school level (primary or secondary), the type of community, and other characteristics of the school. For example, individuals who have spent their entire teaching and deputy careers in the same LEA will have a different understanding of alternative strategies for management and leadership than those whose careers spanned several LEAs. The deputy experience is a critical source of socialization that the individual brings to a learning project such as the Trainee Head Scheme. The type of head with whom the deputy worked can provide variety in learning, e.g., the breadth of skills and knowledge that the deputy had the opportunity to learn. The type of school(s)—inner-city urban schools versus leafy suburban schools; special measures

versus high attaining schools—provides different experiences that give the aspiring head a range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Rather than arriving as blank tablets, these individuals bring this learning with them to the Trainee Head Scheme.

Methods. These sources of influence use a variety of methods to facilitate headship socialization. Some of the methods are formal and others are informal. Taking classes or completing modules are formal mechanisms, while impromptu conversations with a mentor are informal. Some methods are collective, where everyone in the specific program or all those aspiring to a role experience the same preparation. Other methods are unique to each individual. Southworth (1994) described the solitary and ad hoc nature of traditional headship development, which leads to heads making sense of their work experience by themselves. Although various recent initiatives have instituted more collective mechanisms for new or aspiring heads to learn with others, learning to be a headteacher is still primarily an individual endeavor.

Two other socialization methods are relevant to the Trainee Head Scheme: serial and divestiture. Serial socialization occurs when role incumbents are the primary training agents for newcomers. Mentoring is one of the most common forms of this method of socialization. An interesting feature of serial socialization methods is that they tend to emphasize maintaining the status quo. The most powerful way of reproducing what currently exists is to use current incumbents of the role to train newcomers. However, as we will discuss later, mentoring can be a powerful method for innovation if other learning processes are combined with it.

Divestiture is a method used in various occupations to erase the potency of the previous learning and encourage the acceptance of the new learning. For example, military "boot camps" use divestiture methods to rid the recruit of civilian identities and instill the military identity. Divestiture is contrasted with investiture where the individual's previous learning and identity are used to build the new learning. Some socialization agents may use divestiture methods to encourage heads to distance themselves from teachers, creating a culture of separation. Other socialization processes, which are emphasized in the word "headteacher," encourage the use of previous experience and identity. Recent reforms emphasizing leading for learning communities suggests the importance of building on previous teaching experience and identity to create relationships among administrators and teachers.

In addition to these more overt methods, new or aspiring heads need to be sensitive to subtle methods (Crow & Matthews, 1998). For example, a standard method for preparing school administrators to handle the pace of the job is "bombardment," where the intern or trainee is swamped by a variety of tasks. Although this method emphasizes for the aspiring head that the work is not a "sit behind the desk" type of job, it discourages reflection and purposive action. Another subtle method involves how the aspiring head is introduced to faculty and students. Introductions that diminish the significance of the intern's role decrease the potency of the socialization experience. In contrast, introductions that affirm the intern's expertise and authority provide strong learning experiences. The title given to the trainee can be a subtle but forceful indication of role expectations, authority, and role assignment.

Outcomes. The standard way to distinguish socialization outcomes involves two categories: custodial and innovative (Schein, 1971). Custodial outcomes emphasize the maintenance of the status quo, while innovation is directed toward reform and

improvement. Traditional socialization techniques have tended to encourage custodial outcomes that emphasize management skills; values, such as stability; and norms, such as routinization. More contemporary conceptions of the school leader's role require an innovative outcome to socialization that encourages leadership experimentation, collaboration, and learning communities.

Because headship involves both management and leadership some aspects of both outcomes are necessary. Heads are responsible for keeping the managerial aspects of the school operating smoothly, "keeping the trains running on time." Teachers have difficulty successfully doing their jobs if resources, facilities, and procedures are chaotic. However, successful management is not leadership. Schools in the 21st century require constant assessment, capacity building, persistent experimentation, and a host of other features that depend on innovative leadership (Hopkins, 2001).

Specific knowledge base: internship and mentoring

This section moves from a general understanding of headship socialization to the literature on the specific techniques of internship and mentoring. Although the literature is much smaller, there are important ideas and strategies that are relevant to Trainee Head Schemes and their participants.

Internship

The literature on internships suggests program variety based on several characteristics: duration, characteristics and location of host school, and balance of outside/inside influence. Many internships involve a short-term experience when the trainee spends a limited time in the host school. Others are yearlong experiences when the trainee is able to witness both the beginning and ending of the school year. For teachers aspiring to be administrators, who have had no prior administrative experience, a yearlong internship that provides a more complete picture of the administrator's role throughout the year is more worthwhile than a short-term experience. For experienced administrators, such as those with deputy experience, a longer internship is probably less important.

Internships also vary according to the type of host school to which trainees are assigned. Some internship programs provide experience at different school levels and contextual circumstances, such as community type. For example, interns who have only taught at primary schools in leafy suburbs might intern at inner city secondaries. Such experiences provide breadth to the intern's understanding of leadership and its effects on students. However, this kind of experience may also decrease trainees' experiences in the kinds of schools to which they are likely to be appointed.

Internships can also vary according to the influences of host school and training agencies, e.g. DfES. Some internships may include monitoring visits and training seminars from outside supervisors to help trainees critically reflect on their experiences and reduce the limitations of a single, host school experience. Others emphasize almost exclusively the influence of the host school head/mentor on the trainees' experiences. The balance of inside/outside influences may affect the congruence or incongruence of professional vs. organizational socialization. For example, the outside supervisor can

help the trainee reflect on the leadership style of the host school head/mentor and thereby help the trainees to develop their own conception of headship.

In the remainder of this section on the internship, we focus on several socialization factors that are specific to the internship: stages, sources of influence, content, methods and outcomes.

Stages. The socialization inherent in the internship is a dynamic evolving process by which the intern and the intern/mentor relationship develop. Cordeiro and Smith-Sloan (1995) identified five normative stages in the internship transition process.

- Initial contact stage.
    - Intern uses perspective of home school and role (e.g. teacher or deputy)
    - Intern/mentor relationship is more formal
    - Role assignments are being worked out
- Liminal stage
    - Intern feels apprehension about his/her ability to perform new functions
    - Intern/mentor relationship is cautious
    - Intern may feel grief at "abandoning" home school.
- Settling in stage
    - Intern feels more comfortable, more control of time, more accepted
    - Intern/mentor relationship is more open
- Efficacy stage
    - Intern feels more confident and autonomous
    - Intern/mentor relationship involves greater sharing and mutual respect
    - Intern feels more creative in responding to assignments
- Independence stage
    - Intern realizes there is little more to learn in this setting
    - Intern feels a sense of loss at anticipated leaving
    - Intern/mentor relate as co-learners

These stages emphasize that both the intern and mentor/intern relationship change as the internship progresses. This developmental process is also affected by the strong socializing influence of the host school. However, it is extremely important to note that while these stages are based on an empirical study of interns' experiences, they do not pretend to describe all interns. Depending on a variety of contextual and personal influences, interns may not progress through all these stages or progress in the same way. Some interns, for example, may never develop a co-learner relationship or mutual respect with their mentors. Other interns may hold on to the previous home school context and try to fashion their new experience to be like the previous one. How interns develop is partly a result of the role that various agents play in this process, as well as the content and methods used by these agents.

Sources. In an internship program where a group of interns progress together, peers can have a powerful socializing influence. Mortimer and Simmons (1978) found that peers could form a cohesive group with norms in direct opposition to the training experts. Crow and Glascock (1995) also found that interns in a program where university professors emphasized shared decision making developed norms within the cohort that emphasized a more "take charge" approach.

One of the strongest influences in an internship program is the mentor. Although we will have more to say about mentoring as a socialization tool later, it is appropriate at this point to acknowledge that the mentor in an internship program typically assigns or negotiates the intern's responsibilities, clarifies concerns, answers questions, checks perceptions, and acquaints the intern with the new school culture (Falcione & Wilson, 1988). But mentors do far more as they protect interns from mistakes that will harm their careers, sponsor interns into new career opportunities, and expose interns to new experiences (Crow & Matthews, 1998).

Other administrators, e.g., deputies, and teachers in the host school also act as socializing influences during the internship. A new intern, especially one with previous administrative experience, joins a senior management team already in the school. Negotiating such work issues as division of labor, supervisory responsibilities, and confidential information creates socialization experiences for a new intern working with other administrators in the school. In addition, teachers in the host school act as socializing agents as they test interns' student management competencies, instructional orientation, and alliances. How interns negotiate their relationship with teachers in the host school is critical because this relationship is central to subsequent head experience with teachers. Various studies demonstrate that interns learn the importance of this relationship early as they do things for teachers to develop good working relationships (Crow & Pounder, 1996; Cordeiro & Smith-Sloan, 1995).

Family members and friends as well as the intern are critical socialization sources during the internship. If the time demands of the internship are more extensive than in previous roles, families may feel that the intern's loyalties are divided. Also as interns move into more administrative perspectives, friends who are teachers may believe the intern is disloyal. Moreover, the internship process, like socialization in general, is not a passive process done to the intern. Rather this process involves the active negotiation, response, and information processing of interns themselves. Whether an internship is an effective experience certainly is in part determined by the content, methods, and goals of the program administrators, mentors, teachers, and other administrators, but the intern's experience, commitment, creativity, and values also influence the learning process.

Content. Content may vary in internship experiences according to whether the internship is designed to acquaint aspiring school leaders to the basic tasks and rhythm of the job or to intensively prepare these aspirants to develop special skills for unique school settings.

There are two categories of content identified in the literature that are useful in evaluating and understanding the internship experience: technical and cultural content (Greenfield, 1985). The technical content of the internship involves the more instrumental side of the role, i.e., acquiring and appropriately using the knowledge and skills of the role. Cordeiro and Smith-Sloan (1995) identified four major areas of learning:
1. Basic knowledge about day-to-day building operation.
2. Strategies for information collection and problem solving
3. Effective ways to work with a variety of adults
4. Ways to manage time given multiple tasks.

Although these researchers were focused on new interns moving from teaching to administration, the areas are relevant to more experienced interns who are learning how

things are done in the host school and how, for example, heads in challenging schools perform their roles. The critical point for internship program administrators, as well as interns and mentors, is to distinguish generic from specific content, i.e., the knowledge and skills necessary regardless of the setting versus those that are context specific. For example, to assume that one mentor's autocratic approach—even if it appears to be successful in one setting—is appropriate for all settings, is a limited and highly ineffective way to develop a new head's approach to motivating faculty for school reform.

Greenfield (1985) argued that the second type of internship content, which is frequently ignored, is cultural or moral learning. This type of learning includes the sentiments, beliefs, standards of practice, and value orientation of the role. Given the focus on reform and instructional improvement in the contemporary educational context, this cultural learning content is equally if not more important for interns

Methods. The effectiveness of any internship program depends on the methods used; the techniques affect the outcomes. In addition to the general methods of socializing school leaders, there are specific internship methods. Methods to learn the technical or instrumental side of the job can vary from trial and error and bombardment to more structured ways of exposing interns to the techniques of the role. Cordeiro and Smith-Sloan (1995) found that the typical method involved scaffolding in which interns observe, talk through, reflect, and do. In the early internship stages, mentors are more directive, "staggering" or "chunking" activities and paperwork. Bolam and McMahon (1995) found that typically the mentors began with an emphasis on technical advice regarding short-term tasks and then moved to more basic issues of developing a collective vision and building a senior management team. In this way, instead of exposing interns to everything at once, mentors cluster responsibilities in ways that give interns a sense of the variety of role activities. Currently there is insufficient research to determine which technical methods are effective.

In terms of cultural learning, Greenfield (1985) found that interns learn the sentiments, norms, and values of the role by observing and interacting with the immediate supervisor or mentor regarding,

-what is acceptable?
-what is important and what may be ignored?
-what requires attention and what does not?
-what is viewed as problematic and what is not?
-what action alternatives are/are not acceptable?

Crow and Pounders (1996) found specific internship methods that were used to teach various cultural norms and values of the role. Artifacts, such as having keys to the building or one's own office space, communicated norms regarding what the intern was expected to learn and do and the intern's authority. Rituals, such as early bombardment of responsibilities and shadowing the mentor, taught what was considered important. Rites, such as the intern selection process and intern testing by faculty members, taught administrator/teacher relationships and values. Ceremonies, such as the way the intern was introduced to the faculty, provided the intern with strong messages about what was viewed as important in this context and what role the intern would play. Internship methods teach not only the obvious or manifest requirements of the job, for example,

how to assess teacher performance, but also the more latent or subtle assumptions and beliefs, for example, the appropriate social distance between teachers and administrators.

Outcomes. The outcomes of the internship, like administrator socialization in general, can focus on custodial or innovative aims. Greenfield (1985) found that internships tended to focus on maintaining organizational stability. If the internship is designed specifically for new interns moving from teaching to administration, obviously some concern with maintaining organizational stability is critical. However, if the internship is designed to train experienced administrators to "turn around" schools in trouble, such a goal seems ineffective and wasteful.

In addition to the custodial vs. innovative outcomes, it is important to acknowledge that some internships are ineffective. Crow and Pounders (1996) found that not all interns experienced the same rites, rituals, and ceremonies and thus their socialization outcomes varied. For example, some interns were provided no keys or office space to emphasize their role to school constituents and were introduced in dis-empowering ways that diminished their learning and authority in the school. Methods influence outcomes!

Mentoring

Mentoring is a specific socialization tool, typically used in internship programs. It has a long history and is currently undergoing a resurgence of interest in the educational arena. Unfortunately it is fraught with misunderstanding about what it is and what it can accomplish.

Functions of mentoring. The term "mentor" goes back to Homer's classic, the *Odyssey*, in which Odysseus left the training of his son, Telemachus, to his trusted friend, Mentor, when Odysseus left on his long voyage. The term has typically referred to an expert guiding a novice. However, the term is also used in the context of co-learners acting as mentors for each other at different times (Mullen & Cox, 1997; Mullen & Lick, 1999). Moreover, instead of the typical focus on knowledge-transfer as the primary purpose of mentoring, Gehrke (1988) emphasized mentoring as "gift giving" or "awakening." The mentor as "door opener, information giver, supporter; (is) no doubt important…. The greatest gift the mentor offers is a new and whole way of seeing things…. It is a way of thinking and living that is given" (p. 192). Gehrke's focus has the advantage of avoiding a classic pitfall of mentoring as perpetuating the status quo and of encouraging innovation.

Crow and Matthews (1998), based on the work of Kram and Isabella (1985), identified three functions that mentors perform for aspiring school leaders: professional, career, and psychosocial development. The professional development function refers to helping others learn the knowledge, skills, behaviors and values of the leader's role. This includes the technical and cultural learning we discussed earlier. The career development function includes issues of career satisfaction, career awareness, and career advancement. Mentors perform this function by helping interns understand the career opportunities, know how advancement works, and develop networks to support advancement. The psychosocial development function focuses on personal and emotional well-being, as well as role expectations, conflict, and clarification. Mentors help interns develop a role identity and understand their relationships with others in the school and profession. In an internship program, mentors can play all three of these roles. However, experienced

interns, have likely developed additional mentors who guide them in professional, career, and psychosocial areas.

Processes of mentoring. Although mentoring can use a variety of methods, some of which we identified in earlier sections of this report, several primary processes are inherent in mentoring. McIntyre and Hagger (1996), in their research on mentoring in British schools, suggested three processes of mentoring. The first and most basic process of mentoring is a personal relationship "…where a relative novice is supported by a more experienced peer in coming to terms with a new role" (p. 147).

The second process is "active guidance, teaching, and challenging of the protégé by the mentor, who accordingly needs to claim some expertise, wisdom and authority" (p. 147). The third process involves the "management and implementation of a planned curriculum tailored of course to the needs of the individual, and including collaboration with other contributors in one's own and other institutions" (p. 147). Although some would disagree with McIntyre and Hagger's view that mentoring is a one-way expert to novice process, these authors' identification of mentoring processes highlights some critical issues that are pertinent to program administrators of the Trainee Head Scheme in evaluating and designing the mentoring element of the program. The personal relationship and active guidance processes involve an intentionality that is critical to the success of mentoring. Dembele (1996) referred to the mentor as an "educational companion" who is constantly concerned with what the intern needs in this context, at this time, to meet the demands of the role. The specific content of mentoring, whether it addresses career, psychosocial or professional development, must be considered in light of how the mentor *intends* it to meet the intern's needs.

The third process of mentoring, identified by McIntyre and Hagger (1996), includes the active collaboration of others in the school. Instead of viewing mentoring as only a one-on-one personal relationship between the headteacher and the intern, a more systemic view is needed. Mentors are responsible for creating a climate of mentoring where learning is valued and mentoring is a community responsibility, e.g., including teachers and deputies in the intern's mentoring.

Crow and Matthews (1998) identified four other categories of mentoring methods that are specific to internship programs: teaching/coaching, reflective mentoring, and sponsorship. Mentors engage in teaching/coaching when they plan, inform, suggest, prompt, challenge, protect, support, and advise. Leaving intern experiences to chance runs the risk of ignoring critical aspects of the role and assuming that experienced interns already know how to be innovative school leaders. However direct informing of the intern runs counter to effective adult learning principles. Adult learners respond best to learning-by-doing rather than informing. When informing is necessary, adult learners respond more to demonstration and modeling approaches.

Mentors also need to challenge mentees to try on new roles and new responsibilities. They also should encourage the mentees to challenge even the mentor's strategies and choices. The difficult problems of administration seldom have one solution or one way of understanding the problem. In the 21st century, the complexity of leadership requires the ability to tolerate ambiguity. Helping the mentee to deal with the ambiguity of leadership means acknowledging the limitations of the leader's knowledge and power. Southworth (1995) maintained that if mentoring is all about supporting and not about challenging, there will be no development of critical, educative leaders.

Protecting the mentee often creates a difficult dilemma for the mentor. If mentors constantly shield mentees from difficult or embarrassing situations, they reduce learning opportunities for them. But if mentees are not protected from mistakes that could potentially damage their careers, the mentor is failing to perform the critical career development role. Mentors must use their best judgment in knowing when to intervene and when to allow learning from mistakes to occur.

One of the greatest dangers of mentoring is "mindlessness" (Langer, 1989). When we have performed a job for so long that it becomes almost second nature to us, we are often not conscious of the process. Mindless mentoring occurs when mentors become insensitive to the nature of the role in such a way that they are unable to help mentees understand and appreciate the nuances of the role. One method that helps both mentor and mentee to avoid mindlessness is reflective mentoring. But this method does not occur naturally in all mentoring relationships. Mentors must intend to be reflective and to encourage reflection with their mentees. The most obvious way reflective mentoring occurs is through the use of questions that mentors ask e.g. What did you think about the fight outside during lunch today? What would you have done differently than I did? Are there other approaches we both could consider? This type of reflection requires openness and encouragement by the mentor. Mentors have also used such techniques such as keeping journals, shadowing, modeling, storytelling, and visioning to encourage reflection. But the most effective means is for mentors to model open and honest reflection with the mentee.

Effective mentors use sponsoring as a mentoring technique to support career development. Sponsoring involves not only nominating mentees for desirable positions and promotions, but also creating opportunities to allow the mentee's skills to be seen by others. Using the mentor's own network to increase the mentee's visibility is a strong means for supporting career development. Providing visible responsibilities that give mentees the opportunity to demonstrate their expertise to others and actively introducing interns to those in the educational system who can help advance their careers are critical functions that effective mentors play.

Mentor selection, matching, and training. Mentor selection is a critical part of any mentoring program. Yet the research on selecting mentors is sparse. Crow and Matthews (1998) identified four characteristics of effective mentors that those who develop mentoring programs should consider in selecting mentors.

1. Successful and well-regarded school leaders who have strong character reputations. Someone who does not have the respect of other leaders is not likely to be able to advance the intern's careers.
2. Commitment to mentoring and their own development as a mentor. Success as a headteacher is not automatically a guarantee of success as a mentor.
3. Commitment to being learners themselves. The ability to encourage reflection among mentees involves mentors modeling reflection in their own actions.
4. Time to mentor. The specific requirements and tensions of some leaders in difficult circumstances may reduce their time, energy and commitment for providing effective mentoring. Bolam and McMahon (1995) found that finding sufficient time for mentoring was cited by both mentors and

their protégées as one of the major problems of a mentoring scheme for new heads. This does not mean that only school leaders who have everything under control should be mentors. It does mean that the mentor must be able and willing to spend quality time with the intern.

Matching mentees with the right mentor is unfortunately for project administrators not a science (Southworth, 1995). No foolproof process exists for ensuring the perfect mentor/mentee match. In fact, some evidence suggests that the most effective matches are those in which the mentee and the mentor choose each other rather than through some administrative matching process (Zey, 1984). However, this informal process is not always possible, practical or even desirable. If the process is totally left up to choice, some mentees may be left out and some mentees and mentors may choose each other simply because they like each other not because they can learn from each other. The most effective matching process probably occurs when both choice and developmental needs are balanced.

Mentoring, as was emphasized before, is not a passive process but an active one in which the mentee and mentor are actively engaged with each other in learning. But this process does not occur by accident and effective leaders do not automatically possess effective mentoring skills. Not only should the selecting and matching be intentional processes, but also the preparation of mentors should be planned and emphasized. Walker and Stott (1993) emphasized that mentor training is probably more important to the success of the mentoring relationship than selection. Cohn and Sweeney (1992) found that mentors who had received training in mentoring had a higher level of mentoring activity and their protégés rated the relationship with their mentors significantly higher.

Mentor training should include the content, methods, and assessment of mentoring (Crow & Matthews, 1998). The content of the training should be focused on the purpose and nature of the scheme. The methods of mentoring should focus on the types of techniques identified previously, e.g., teaching, coaching, reflecting, and sponsoring. In addition, mentor training should prepare mentors to assess the quality of the mentee's experience and to use that assessment to create more effective learning opportunities.

Benefits and pitfalls of mentoring. Mentoring is a powerful socialization tool that benefits both mentees and mentors. Crow and Matthews (1998, pp. 10-11) identified six major benefits to interns: (1) exposure to new ideas and creativity; (2) visibility with key personnel; (3) protection from damaging situations; (4) opportunities for challenging and risk-taking activities; (5) increased confidence and competence; and (6) improved reflection. Obviously helping to develop leaders who can be creative risk-takers with confidence, competence, and reflective skills can be a major source of influence on struggling schools.

Because mentoring is an active, reciprocal learning process, mentoring has benefits for mentors as well. Several authors (Bolam & McMahon, 1995; Megginson & Clutterbuck, 1995) suggested that mentoring could help mentors learn new skills and critically evaluate their own processes. Daresh and Playko (1990, 1993) also emphasized that mentors renew their interest in teaching as they help interns learn. Mentors also increase their own career networks and their importance to the larger educational system.

Roche (1979) also argued that mentors gain long-lasting friendships that can support them throughout their careers.

Although mentoring can be an effective, strong socialization tool, it has pitfalls that any scheme must acknowledge and develop strategies to reduce. First, mentors may have their own agendas that do not include the best interests of their protégée (Muse, Wasden, & Thomas, 1988).

Second, mentoring relationships can create intern dependency on the mentor. Over-reliance on the mentor creates dysfunctional relationships and reduces learning. Both the mentor and the mentee can encourage the dependency relationship and project administrators must be alert to this condition.

Third, some mentors attempt to clone mentees (Hay, 1995). Some headteachers who have heroic images of leadership and who have been successful in reversing failure in schools may assume there is one way to lead and one person to lead and that the mentee should end up looking like the mentor. Such cloning is unprofessional and certainly ineffective in developing leaders of learning communities. Mentoring runs the risk of perpetuating the idea that leaders are heroes and ignoring the leadership of others in the school.

Fourth, mentoring also runs the risk of perpetuating the status quo instead of creating reflective leaders (Southworth, 1995). This pitfall reflects the earlier discussion of the importance of not only supporting mentees but challenging them and the emphasis on reflective mentoring as a strong strategy. Mentoring can be a powerful tool in developing critically reflective leaders who challenge others to exert leadership and build cultures that support school-wide learning. But, as Southworth suggested, it can become overly cozy and comfortable and thereby reinforce instrumental and conservative views of school administrators. "We need to be careful that we are not 'supporting' our new school leaders by encouraging them to face the future by walking into the 21st century looking backward" (Southworth, 1995, p. 27).

References

Bolam, R., & McMahon, A. (1995). Mentoring for new headteachers: Recent British experience. *Journal of Educational Administration, 33*(5), 29-44.

Bryk, A., Camburn, E., & Louis, K. S. (1999). Professional community in Chicago elementary schools: Facilitating factors and organizational consequences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(Supplemental), 751-781.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of public schools.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cohn, K. C., & Sweeney, R. C. (1992). *Principal mentoring programs: Are school districts providing the leadership?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Cordeiro, P. A., & Smith-Sloan, E. (1995, April). *Apprenticeships for administrative interns: Learning to talk like a principal.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Crow, G. M., & Glascock, C. (1995). Socialization to a new conception of the principalship. *Journal of Educational Administration, 33*(1), 22-43.

Crow, G. M., & Matthews, L. J. (1998). *Finding one's way. How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Crow, G. M., & Pounders, M. L. (1996, April). *The administrative internship: "Learning the ropes" of an occupational culture.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1990, April). *Preservice administrative mentoring: Reflections of the mentor.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1993). *Leaders helping leaders: A practical guide to administrative mentoring*. New York: Scholastic.

Dembele, M. (1996). *Mentors and mentoring: Frames for action, ways of acting, and consequences for novice teachers' learning (professional development).* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University.

Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*: The Albert Shanker Institute.

Falcione, R. L., & Wilson, C. E. (1988). Socialization processes in organizations. In G. M. Goldhaber & G. A. Barnett (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 151-169). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 433-452.

Fullan, M. (2000). The return of large scale reform. *The Journal of Educational Change, 1*(1), 5-28.

Gehrke, N. (1988). Toward a definition of mentoring. *Theory into Practice, 27*(3), 190-194.

Greenfield, W. D. (1985). The moral socialization of school administrators: Informal role learning outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 21*(4), 99-119.

Hage, J., & Powers, C. H. (1992). *Post-industrial lives. Roles and relationships in the 21st century*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hay, J. (1995). *Transformational mentoring: Creating developmental alliances for changing organizational cultures*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hopkins, D. (2001). *Meeting the challenge: An improvement guide for schools facing challenging circumstances*. London: Department for Education and Employment.

Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*(1), 110-132.

Langer, E. J. (1989). *Mindfulness*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

McIntyre, D., & Hagger, H. (1996). Mentoring: Challenges for the Future. In D. McIntyre & H. Hagger (Ed.), *Mentors in schools. Developing the profession of teaching*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Megginson, D., & Clutterbuck, D. (1995). *Mentoring in action*. London: Kogan Page.

Mullen, C. A., & Cox, M. D. (1997). Breaking the circle of one through mentorship. In C. A. Mullen (Ed.), *Breaking the circle of one. Redefining mentorship in the lives and writings of educators* (pp. xv-xxiii). New York: Peter Lang.

Mullen, C. A., & Lick, D. W. (Eds.). (1999). *New Directions in Mentoring: Creating a Culture of Synergy*. New York: Falmer Press.

Muse, I. D., Wasden, F. D., & Thomas, G. J. (1988). *The mentor principal: Handbook*. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.

National College for School Leadership. (2001). *Leadership Development Framework*. Nottingham, England: National College for School Leadership.

Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review, 57*(1), 14-16, 20, 24-27.

Schein, E. (1988). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. *Sloan Management Review*, 53-65.

Schein, E. H. (1971). Occupational socialization in the professions: The case of the role innovator. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 8*, 521-530.

Southworth, G. (1994). Headteacher mentoring: Insights and ideas about headteacher development. In H. Bradley; C. Conner; & G. Southworth (Eds.). *Developing teachers, developing schools*. London: Fulton Books.

Southworth, G. (1995b). Reflections on mentoring for new school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration, 33*(5), 17-28.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 23-28.

Walker, A., & Stott, K. (1993). Preparing for leadership in schools: The mentoring contribution. In B. J. Caldwell & E. M. A. Carter (Eds.), *The return of the mentor: Strategies for workplace learning* (pp. 77-90). London: Falmer.

Wentworth, W. M. (1980). *Context and understanding: An inquiry into socialization theory*. New York: Elsevier.

Zey, M. G. (1984). *The mentor connection*. Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones Irwin.