

Mentoring School Leaders

FOUNDATIONS OF MENTORING AS A DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS

In recent years, mentoring relationships have become increasingly popular in teacher education and school administrator development. Their

application has generally been viewed as a kind of panacea for dealing with many of the limitations often felt to exist in education as well as in many other fields.

Using mentoring relationships to enhance professional development is not a new idea. The concept of the mentor serving as a wise guide to a younger or less experienced protege dates back to Homer's *Odyssey*. Mentor was the teacher entrusted by Odysseus to tutor his son, Telemachus. On the basis of this literary description, we have been provided with a lasting image of the wise and patient counselor serving to guide and shape the lives of colleagues.

This image of mentoring persists in many definitions of the practice. Ashburn, Mann, and Purdue (1987) defined mentoring as "the establishment of a personal relationship for the purpose of professional instruction and guidance" (p. 2). Lester (1981) noted that this activity is an important part of adult learning because of its holistic and individualized approach to learning in an experiential fashion, defined by Bova and Phillips (1984) as "learning resulting from or associated with experience" (p. 196).

Other definitions exist. Sheehy (1976) described a mentor as "one who takes an active interest in the career development of another person ... a nonparental role model who actively provides guidance, support, and opportunities for the protege" (p. 34). The Woodlands Group (1980) called mentors "guides who support a person's dreams and help put [the dream] into effect in the world" (p. 57). Levinson (1978), in his analysis of the socialization of young men to professional roles, noted that a mentor, as a critical actor in the developmental process, is

one defined not in terms of the formal role, but in terms of the character of the relationship and the function it serves ... a mixture of parent and peer. A mentor may act as host and guide. (p. 73)

Another definition (Wasden, 1988) is directly related to mentoring for educational administrators:

The mentor is a master at providing opportunities for the growth of others, by identifying situations and events which contribute knowledge and experience to the life of the steward. Opportunities are not happenstance; they must be thoughtfully designed and organized into logical sequence. Sometimes hazards are attached to opportunity. The mentor takes great pains to help the steward recognize and negotiate dangerous situations. In doing all this, the mentor has an opportunity for growth through service, which is the highest form of leadership. (p. 17)

The element that serves as the foundation for any conceptualization of mentoring is the fact that this activity must be part of the true developmental relationship that is tied to an appreciation of life and career stages. Kram (1985) examined mentoring in private industry and observed that different types of relationships are appropriate at various times in a person's career. She divided these times into early, middle, and late career years and suggested that people tend to have vastly different mentoring needs in each of these time frames.

Research on adult development (Gould, 1978; Levinson, 1978) and career development (Hall, 1976; Schein, 1976) has established that, at each stage of life and a career, individuals face a predictable set of needs and careers which are characteristic of their particular age and career history. (Kram, 1985, p. 37)

In education, mentors usually retain the same titles and responsibilities without regard for the different needs and interests of people who are the recipients of mentoring activity. The only recognition of varying support is found in the recent emphases on mentoring for 1st-year teachers and school principals, a practice now seen in 35 states.

Embedded with the notion of the mentor serving as a guide to adult development is the expectation that this person is to engage in the midlife task of generativity, or "concern and interest in guiding the next generation" (Merriam, 1983). This practice includes "everything that is generated from generation to generation: children, product, ideas, and works of art" (Evans, 1967). This function of mentoring is a form of torch passing from the experienced to the less experienced.

There are some recognized harmful consequences of mentoring as a developmental process. For example, mentoring can be detrimental to growth if and when those being mentored develop too great a reliance on mentors, who are often expected to provide all possible answers to all possible questions. In such cases, mentoring no longer exists; rather, a form of dependent relationship is formed, and growth by the person being mentored is frequently stifled.

Most current definitions place great emphasis on the ways that the mentor provides support and guidance to the one mentored. However, such one-way relationships are not the only characteristic of mentoring. In fact, this relationship needs to be described as "mutually-enhancing" (Kram, 1985), whereby the career enhancement and personal development of each partner is addressed. This view emphasizes that mentoring may be as beneficial to the mentor as it is to one receiving the focus of the mentoring.

Mentoring is an accepted and vital part of the developmental process in many professional fields. As Schein (1976) noted, the concept has long been used in business organizations to connote such diverse images as "teacher, coach, trainer, positive role model, developer of talent, opener of doors, protector, sponsor, or successful leader" (p. 88). The literature also suggests that mentoring needs to be understood as a combination of most, if not all, of these individual role descriptors (Galvez-Hjomevik, 1986). Thus, mentoring must be included in any experiential professional development program. Guides, counselors, or coaches are needed to help professionals negotiate their way through a field and make sense out of what is happening around them in an organization and also what is going on in their personal lives. As a result, there is considerable potential to be found in applying the concept of mentoring to the professional development of school administrators (Daresh, 1988).

Mentors are different from the role models who work with aspiring, beginning, or experienced administrators in conventional field-based learning activities. Kram (1985) noted that other terms might include *sponsorship*, *coaching*, *role modeling*, *counseling*, or *evenfriendship*. Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe (1978) suggested that there is a continuum of advisory relationships that facilitate access to positions of leadership in organizations. At one extreme is a peer pal relationship, and at the other end of the continuum is the true mentor relationship:

- Peer Pal: Someone at the same level as yourself, with whom you share information, strategies, and mutual support for mutual benefit.
- Guide: Someone who can explain the system but is usually not in a position to champion a particular protege.
- Sponsor: Someone less powerful than a patron in promoting and shaping the career of a protege.
- Patron: An influential person who uses his or her own power to help a protege advance in his or her career.
- Mentor: An intensive, paternalistic relationship in which an individual assumes the role of both teacher and advocate.

The developmental relationships described here tend to be more business oriented; they are designed largely to foster career development and advancement. Similar perspectives are offered by Dalton, Thompson, and Price (1977), Anderson and Devanne (1981), Van Vorst (1980), and Clutterbuck (1987). In the field of education, however, this motivation is typically not the primary, or even important, focus of most mentoring programs. Instead, the objective of the majority of mentoring programs now directed at teachers and

school administrators tends to be on immediate survivorship and skills needed to ensure personal enhancement.

The potential value of mentoring for educational personnel has become increasingly appreciated and understood in recent years (Krupp, 1985, 1987; Zimpher & Reiger, 1988). It is now generally accepted that wise, mature mentors have always been around to help many new teachers and others to learn their craft in ways that are not usually covered in traditional preservice university-based education programs (Gehrke, 1988; Gehrke & Fay, 1984). What is now taking place is the development of formal, contrived, and institutionally mandated (if not always sufficiently supported) mentoring programs. Studies by Krupp (1985); Little, Gallagher, and O'Neal (1984); Showers (1984); and Huling-Austin, Barnes, and Smith (1985) have described the nature of mentoring relationships as a way of helping classroom teachers become more effective and have suggested that mentoring programs must be deliberately started as a way to enhance the quality of induction for teachers new to classrooms. Eagen and Walter (1982) studied a group of elementary school teachers early in their careers and found that those individuals who had mentors credited them with helping the proteges to gain self-confidence, learn technical aspects of their jobs, understand the expectations of administrators, develop creativity, and work effectively with others. Other studies of the value of mentoring for teachers have led many states to mandate mentoring programs for beginning teachers. Based on the self-described success of the majority of these programs, it has become popular to create similar mentoring programs for beginning school principals across the nation as well.

MENTORING AS SOCIALIZATION: BEGINNING PRINCIPALS

The job of the mentor appears to be one that will continue to play a visible role in future schemes designed to improve the quality of educational personnel in general. For the most part, these efforts have been directed toward assisting classroom teachers to become more effectively socialized to the world of schools during the earliest phases of their professional careers. During the past 10 years, 32 states have also enacted laws and policies that now call for support programs designed to assist school administrators as well. Although there is value to providing mentoring, or peer coaching, for veteran principals, all of the mandated administrator mentoring programs are designed for individuals in the earliest stages of their work lives. As emphasis

has been placed on efforts to find strategies for preparing school leaders that go beyond traditional university-based programs, there is a corresponding awareness that mentoring is an important practice with implications for the ways in which aspiring and beginning principals and other administrators might enjoy more successful socialization and transitions from the world of teaching to the world of administration.

Mentoring has at least two potential applications to improve the ways in which people become effective school administrators. The first of these is related to the identification of individuals who would serve as appropriate role models and guides for beginning administrators. Frequently, the term *mentor* is assigned to the experienced administrator who happens to be available to answer the questions of novice colleagues. It would be desirable for such individuals to become true mentors to the beginning administrators with whom they work, and such a relationship may evolve. Being a sponsor, patron, or role model, however, is by no means the same thing as being a true mentor in the ways beginning administrators need as part of their professional formation. It is crucial for someone to work with the new administrator to describe policies, procedures, and normal practices in a school district. It is also critical that someone would be able to provide feedback to beginners concerning the extent to which they have been able to master the traditional skills associated with effective performance in administrative roles.

A second potential value of mentoring for beginning school administrators is found in its application to personal and professional formation, defined as "effort to enable an individual to become more aware of his or her own personal values and assumptions regarding the ... role of a school administrator" (Daresh & Playko, 1992a, pp. 54-55). It is a time to consider one's personal commitment to the role of educational leader, and to decide the extent to which one is willing to make the changes that may be necessary to become an effective administrator. It is a time to reflect on one's personal definitions, sense of self, and moral and ethical stances regarding important educational issues.

Mentoring is an absolutely essential part of socialization and professional formation, whether at the preservice, induction, or in-service phases of the professional development of school administrators. In the induction of beginning school principals, there are distinct differences between the duties of a role model and those of a mentor. A role model may be seen as a person who is consulted periodically by the novice as a way to learn how to construct a master schedule for a school, observe teachers, conduct student-parent conferences, or perform many other daily activities, in much the same way that an apprentice may learn practical skills from a master electrician or some other tradesman. On the other hand, a mentor goes significantly beyond this

modeling function by serving as a person who is inclined to prod the beginner to learn how to do something according to his or her own personal skills and talents. In short, mentors are likely to raise more questions than provide answers to the people with whom they interact.

Mentoring as part of the socialization of aspiring and beginning school principals is a critical responsibility. Consequently, a person who would serve as a mentor must possess a serious desire to act in this capacity. An ideal arrangement for mentoring would involve the careful matching of mentors and those who are to be mentored. There would be a one-to-one matching based on analyses of professional goals, interpersonal styles, learning needs, and perhaps many other variables that might be explored prior to placing beginning principals with their mentors. In the real world of schools, it is nearly impossible to engage in such perfect matching practices. Most mentoring relationships that are formed to comply with recently mandated state policies related to support for beginning school administrators are formed as marriages of convenience and not as ideal, naturally developed relationships. Nevertheless, there is an awareness of the potential value of mentoring, as well as a review of some of the basic issues to be addressed in conceptualizing such programs. This will no doubt be helpful to those who are expected to provide leadership to entry year and induction programs for school administrators across the nation.

FULFILLING THE PROMISE OF MENTORING

With the initiation of mentoring programs designed to provide support for beginning principals and other educational leaders in the majority of states, there is a clear assumption that such programs are likely to yield many benefits to those being mentored, schools and school systems, and also to those who serve as mentors. In fact, there have been identified a great many benefits to be derived from well-designed mentoring programs for beginning school principals.

Benefits to Proteges

Daresh (2003b) suggests that individuals who have been proteges in formal mentoring programs have identified at least five major benefits derived from their involvement. The first of these is that proteges report that they feel more confident about their professional competence. Too often, organizational newcomers are consumed with a sense that they need to spend all of their time developing skills needed for survival in their new settings. When

experienced colleagues begin to invest their limited time and attention in trying to ensure long-term success by inexperienced colleagues, a strong message is sent that organizations truly see great potential in beginners; they are worth it.

Second, mentoring programs assist newly appointed school principals to begin to see daily translations of educational theory into daily practice. Although the majority of 1st-year principals have had university-based preparation prior to entering their new profession, and though this preparation has had some attention directed toward field-based learning, there is no absolute preparation for an individual assuming the hot seat of the principalship in advance. Thus, having a guide and mentor who already speaks the language of school administration as an ally ready to interpret real-world problems allows the novice to begin to understand subtle relationships between what was learned in books with what now must be learned through daily interactions with parents, teachers, staff, and students.

Communication skills by beginning principals are often said to be increased through mentoring schemes. Regular interactions between experienced and inexperienced administrators bring about a sharing of views often not seen in settings where principals work in isolation from their colleagues (Forret, Turban, & Dougherty, 1996). Mentoring programs bring about discussions not limited to concerns of beginners alone. Instead, discussions take place concerning a wide array of issues of concern to mentors and proteges, Collegiality begins to develop.

Mentoring provides beginning administrators with opportunities to learn some of the tricks of the trade from colleagues. Often, this benefit is described as the only benefit of mentoring programs; young administrators learn how to lead from senior administrators. As noted throughout this review, there are numerous other values to be found in mentoring arrangements. However, learning the ropes will always be a benefit in a coaching or mentoring scheme.

Finally, mentoring makes people feel as if they belong in their new settings. The fact that another, more experienced school administrator engages in behavior that signals care about another's personal and professional wellbeing is a powerful statement that suggests that a newcomer will be taken care of in the school or school district.

Benefits to Mentors

Clutterbuck (1987) noted that the greatest number of rewards for mentors are found in the area of increased job satisfaction. Here, mentors find that grooming a promising new administrator is a challenging and stimulating

personal experience, particularly if the mentor has reached a point in his or her own career where a lot of the earlier excitement is disappearing. Mentors often find that their service in this capacity is rewarding in other ways. One example of this is found when proteges are successful and perform their jobs well. Mentors also report a sense of satisfaction in seeing the values and culture of a school system handed over to a new generation.

Mentors have also indicated that the mentoring experience is worth it because they get increased recognition from their peers (Daresh & Playko, 1993). In the private, corporate sector, mentors who identify promising employees likely to serve in future key managerial posts often acquire reputations for having the type of insights into the needs of their company, and that should be rewarded. Such a benefit is not likely to occur in educational administration mentoring programs designed to support novices. However, it is likely that some past mentors have identified and tapped talented teachers and other staff members in their schools to consider careers as school administrators. Such practices are likely to continue in the future.

Finally, mentors also indicate that they find satisfaction in their role because it gives them opportunities for personal career advancement. In this regard, a major payoff is found in the way mentors benefit from the energy and enthusiasm of their proteges. Mentors receive new ideas and perspectives by allowing proteges to add their own insights into the ways that organizational problems are addressed. Mentors who are attentive to the potential of those with whom they interact are able to capitalize on a new source of knowledge, insight, and talent, and they may be able to translate this into their own professional growth and advancement.

Benefits to Districts

School systems also gain from the implementation of mentoring programs for beginning school administrators. Among the stated values are developing more capable staff, the creation of lifelong learning norms, higher levels of employee motivation, improved self-esteem, and greater productivity.

School systems' administrators note that that they have more capable staff as the result of mentoring programs for beginning principals (Donaldson, 1987). When new leaders join an organization, they have two basic choices to make. One involves simply trying to follow the past leader by doing essentially whatever he or she did on the job. The other choice involves taking the organization in a very different direction than the previous administration. If one assumes that a major motivation for some districts to hire rookies as principals is because they will bring new insights that replace past practices, it is

important that a new principal choose a direction that differs from their predecessors. Such a path may lead a school (and school district) in a very positive direction, but it is not likely to occur if new principals do not have support. Mentors can provide that support by enabling beginners to feel a sense of comfort in moving in new directions. As a result, having mentoring programs for novice administrators does not guarantee that school districts and individual schools are more successful. However, having an advocate and supportive colleague may enable a new principal to take risks that might otherwise be ignored.

In a similar vein, having a mentoring program for beginning principals certainly does not absolutely guarantee that this practice will ensure lifelong learning to become a part of a district's culture. However, if one can imagine that, as novices gain experience largely because they have received the support of mentors, they volunteer to serve as mentors in the future, a climate of collegial support will begin to develop in a school district. And this climate will result in a culture of lifelong learning existing in a system.

The same is true of the ways that professional motivation levels may be enhanced as a result of having programs to support the work of organizational newcomers. Wanous (1983) noted that this was a frequent outcome of efforts to enhance the transition to the workplace of employees in business organizations. Simply stated, people become more satisfied with their choice of employer and are motivated to serve their organizations more vigorously in cases where they feel as if the organization has gone beyond the call of duty to meet their needs. Mentoring programs are viewed as one of the ways that school districts try to ensure new principal success, and as a result, the motivation of these beginning administrators becomes stronger to succeed and return the favor to the employing school district.

A fourth benefit to school districts from mentoring programs is that beginning administrators tend to have considerably more success when they are able to receive ongoing support from experienced mentors. As a result of that feeling of success and accomplishment, there is a corresponding sense of increased self-esteem. In short, mentored beginning principals have a sense that they have a successful start in their profession more often than beginning principals who are left to fend for themselves in the first few years of a new career.

Finally, although it is the hardest outcome to determine precisely, beginning principals who were mentored in the first years of their jobs report feeling that they were more productive because of the support that they received (Daresh, 2003b). Whether that was based on increased student achievement test data, higher job satisfaction on the part of teachers, lower student dropout

rates, or on other possible measures of school productivity, mentoring seems to have received credit for positive outcomes.

AND NOW ... PITFALLS AND PROBLEMS WITH MENTORING

Although numerous advantages and benefits have been identified in relation to the use of mentoring programs designed to assist school principals and other educational leaders, there are some shortcomings to this practice. The road to more effective practice has witnessed numerous detours along the way. Most reviewers of the use of mentoring to assist leaders have noted great value in providing one-to-one support. However, there are several problems encountered in the past that have served to limit mentoring. Among these have been difficulties with sustaining focus, availability of resources to enable continuing program development, restriction of programs to limited populations, inadequate preparation of mentors and those who are mentored, and perhaps most significantly, a tendency among administrators to lose sight of mentoring as an important support system.

Difficulties With Sustaining Focus

The history of school administrator mentoring (and indeed, mentoring for educators in all roles) has been one that has followed a familiar cycle in recent years. In the 1980s, there appeared to be a general recognition that, within a fairly short period of time, the so-called baby boomer principals at work in the United States (and elsewhere around the world) would be ready to retire. The National Associations of Elementary and Secondary School Principals (Clark, 1999; Educational Research Service, 1998, 2000) both began campaigns to recruit people to the principalship. The concern of the time was largely one of ensuring that, as veterans left their positions in the field, a large number of novices would be taking their places. It was noted that newcomers need assistance from more experienced practitioners to help them as they encounter the complex problems of daily practice. As an example of responses made around the nation at the time, Leadership in Educational Administration Development (LEAD) projects in numerous states began vigorous programs designed to provide support for beginning school principals (Anderson, 1990). Individual state departments of education launched special efforts to assist beginning administrators and other educators with socialization to their new roles (Anderson, 1990). For example, the Ohio

Department of Education, with endorsement from the state legislature, initiated a comprehensive Entry Year Program required in all school districts in the state in 1987 (Daresh & Playko, 1989a). This program was designed to ensure successful practice by not only beginning school principals but also classroom teachers, counselors, school psychologists, social workers, and superintendents. The state made at least a paper commitment to the idea that, as educational personnel reached retirement age, schools would not suffer because of a major influx of rookies. School districts that employed people using a new certificate (i.e., teachers, principals, assistant superintendents, counselors, superintendents, etc.) for the first time were required to provide 1 year of on-the-job professional support in the form of a mentor drawn from the ranks of experienced local personnel (Daresh & Playko, 1989b). Programs of this nature were well intended, but they lasted for a relatively brief period of time (Daresh & Sorenson, 2003). They often suffered from a lack of resources needed to ensure maintenance over time.

Another issue emerged. Using Ohio as an example once again, local school districts were required to assume all costs for the support made available to beginning personnel. Districts often saw this as an unreasonable financial demand, and a common strategy in smaller districts was the avoidance of the entry year mandate by hiring only new personnel with previous experience in other Ohio school systems. What was first described as a visionary program to support newcomers soon became an unwelcome liability for districts in need of new educators. It became far more cost-effective for systems to simply find as many individuals who had already finished at least 1 year in another district. Clearly, such a strategy was not fail-safe. School districts could not completely avoid hiring a number of teachers directly out of university preservice programs. On the other hand, opportunities for beginning assistant principals and principals became less plentiful. Districts often found it more cost-effective to entice more experienced principals to remain on the job for another year or 2 to avoid the need to hire (and later support) too many rookies.

The first wave of interest in administrative mentoring disappeared early in the 1990s (Lashway, 1998). Programs and initiatives appeared to collapse under their own weight as well as under the tendency on the part of many school systems to apply loop holes such as the one noted earlier. Toward the end of the 1990s, and continuing to the present, mentor programs have again become more fashionable as a way to support beginning school principals. The dire predictions of professional associations and others concerning future shortages of school principals started to be realized (Maine Leadership Consortium, 1999; McMinn & Van Meter, 2000; New England School Development Council, 1988).

Although the focus of this new generation of mentoring programs is again placed on assisting, supporting, and socializing newly hired school principals, there is an even more important theme accompanying support at this time. In recent years, the adoption of mentoring programs for new school principals has been seen as an incentive to educators to think about following careers as school administrators. In research conducted by Daresh and Capasso (2002), it was discovered that one of the features of principalship that often served as a disincentive to people considering it as a career option centered on the fact that people were avoiding the job because they did not wish to take on a job in which they would be isolated and left unsupported by professional colleagues. As a result, several states, including Mississippi (Mississippi Department of Education, 1999, 2003; Mississippi State Legislature, 1999), Ohio (Lindley, 2003; Ohio Department of Education, 2003), Texas (Texas Principals Leadership Initiative, 2003), and Arkansas (Arkansas Department of Education, 2003), have moved toward the adoption of mentoring programs to assist beginning principals, thus removing a major impediment to people taking a principalship. Whether this strategy will be effective will be discovered only in the future. But it can be said that it is another rationale for the adoption of mentoring that may cloud the ability of researchers to determine the effectiveness of a practice again widely promoted as an important tool for administrator professional development.

Inadequate Preparation of Mentors and Proteges

Stating that a school district or state department of education has a mentoring program for new principals has not been a difficult claim to make. On the other hand, ensuring that the program is well designed and effective is another matter. As programs have been started, ended, restarted, and in many cases, ended again, one of the problems has been the fact that there may never have been a serious commitment to a thoughtful mentoring program in the first place. In many cases, this may have been indicated by programs that took little time to prepare those selected to serve as mentors. As several states have mandated mentoring programs for beginning principals, little has been stated about who shall be designated as mentors (an ongoing concession to the sanctity of local control, no doubt) and even what mentors should be expected to do. In no case has any form of training for mentors been required, and no minimal qualifications (other than previous experience as a school principal in some cases) have been identified. The result has often been selection based on availability rather than quality. When faced with the requirement to provide a mentor to each newly hired principal, school districts have often simply identified mentors based on seniority ("he or she has been a principal here for so many years that they can undoubtedly help rookies").

The same lack of preparation has plagued those being mentored. As principal preparation programs are reviewed across the nation, curricula continue to include such staples as school law, finance, supervision, personnel and other traditional courses. There is little research suggesting that knowledge about such content is not needed by those charged with leading schools. On the other hand, there are no examples of efforts to prepare future school principals to learn on the job. There are, of course, internship requirements in the majority of states to help people learn how to do the job. What is suggested here is that there is also a value in assisting people in learning how to learn. It can be argued that learning by being mentored may not be a skill that can be

acquired through a required course at a university. However, expecting that future leaders demonstrate a predisposition to learning may not be a wholly impossible expectation (Forret et al., 1996). Future principals might be made more ready to carry out their important duties if they assume their jobs with a sense that they will always have more to learn. If such an attitude is not cultivated, it is not likely that any mentoring will have an effect on beginning or experienced school principals.

Lack of Insight Into the Value of Mentoring

If mentoring is not respected as a legitimate approach to learning, it will not be successful and effective. No matter how many mentoring programs are started, there persists a strong value shared by school administrators suggesting that there is weakness associated with seeking special help to do one's job. "I learned how to be a principal on my own, so why do the new people need mentors?" is a sentiment expressed by many who firmly believe that a certain amount of on-the-job training must involve mistakes requiring beginners to muddle through on their own, without any formal assistance or support.

There is a strong suggestion that learning how to be a principal must be viewed as a personal journey for each person as that person learns by making mistakes and then by learning how not to repeat the mistakes in the future. In this sense, there persists a view that initial service as an assistant principal or principal is a bit like military boot camp, where mistakes are expected but always a part of the learning experience. In that view, the notion of school systems expending time and other resources in efforts to ensure that beginners are guided through the early stages of their careers is unacceptable (Barth, 1991). This would not be surprising if it were a view held only by outsiders to the field of educational administration. But there exists, within the culture of principals and other school leaders, a belief that learning through making false starts (so-called hard knocks) is not only inevitable but also beneficial (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000). Clearly, this perspective makes the adoption of mentoring for novice principals problematic. If principals themselves do not support special assistance, why would anyone else jump on this bandwagon?

Mentoring as a Limitation on Diversity

Finally, if mentoring schemes are used largely as a way to assist organizational newcomers to fit in and do things the way they have been done in the past, a huge potential problem needs to be recognized. In short, as schools

and other organizations respond to societal change, they must find ways to adapt to new expectations, responsibilities, and sensitivities. Mentors take on a different role when they are committed to helping others learn the ways that things should or might be in the future, not simply how to duplicate past practices. As schools adopt the enhancement of diversity as a clear and consistent goal, mentors cannot simply pass a torch that is no longer consistent with the inclusion of new expectations for ethnic, gender, cultural, and racial diversity. Mentoring takes on a much different character when it is used to promote an enhancement or expansion of traditional visions of leadership and not simply a reinforcement of past practices (Gardiner, Enomoto, & Grogan, 2000; Goldsmith, Kaye, & Shelton, 2000; Murrell, Crosby, & Ely, 1999).

What this implies is that the mentoring process must involve efforts to help new educational leaders gain insights into trends, issues, and social realities that go beyond existing practices. To ignore this point would no doubt lead to another major pitfall of traditional mentoring programs, namely, the temptation to use mentoring to promote cloning, not growth.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C., & Devanne, M. (1981). Mentors: Can they help women get ahead? *Career Development Activities*, 2(2), 5-8.
- Anderson, M. (1990). *Principals: How to train, recruit, select, induct, and evaluate leaders for America's schools*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service)
- Arkansas Department of Education. (2003). *Licensure and induction for public school teachers and administrators: A reference handbook*. Little Rock, AK: Author.
- Ashburn, E. A., Mann, M., & Purdue, P. A. (1987, April). Teacher mentoring: ERIC clearinghouse on teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Austin, G. R. (1979). Exemplary schools and the search for effectiveness. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 37.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barth, R. (1991). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals make the difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barth, R. (1997). The leader as learner. *Education Week*, 26(23), 42-56.
- Barth, R. (2003). *Lessons learned: Shaping relationships and the culture of the workplace* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Bova, B. M., & Phillips, R. R. (1984). Mentoring as a learning experience for adults. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(3), 196-210.
- Brause, R. (2002, April). Doctoral dissertations: Dilemmas for doctoral students, doctoral courses, and doctoral faculty. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Clark, J. (1999, March). Confronting the educational leader shortage. Paper presented at the Summer Conference of the American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, VA.
- Clutterbuck, R. (1987). *Everybody needs a mentor*. London: Institute Press.
- Crow, G., & Matthews, L. J. (1998). *Finding one's way: How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Crow, G., & Pounders, M. (1996, March). The administrative internship: "Learning the ropes" of an occupational culture. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Daloz, L. (1998). *Mentor: Guiding the journey of adult learners* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dalton, G. W., Thompson, P., & Prince, R. L. (1977). The four stages of professional careers: A new look at performance by professionals. *Career Dynamics*, 6, 19-42.
- Daresh, J. (1988, April). The role of mentors in preparing future principals. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Daresh, J. (2003a). *Leaders helping leaders* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Daresh, J. (2003b). *Teachers mentoring teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Daresh, J., & Capasso, R. (2002, April). Where are the future school principals? Explaining a lack of interest. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Daresh, J., & LaPlant, J. (1985). Developing a research agenda for administrator in-service. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 18(2), 39-43.

- Daresh, J., & Playko, M. (1989a). The administrative entry-year program in Ohio: A resource guide. Columbus: Ohio LEAD Center and the Ohio Department of Education.
- Daresh, J., & Playko, M. (1989b). Administrative mentoring: A training manual. Greeley, CO: University of Northern Colorado, Center for Educational Leadership.
- Daresh, J., & Playko, M. (1992a). Perceived benefits of a preservice administrative mentoring program. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1, 15-22.
- Daresh, J., & Playko, M. (1992b). The professional development of school administrators. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Daresh, J., & Sorenson, R. (2003, April). Coming on board: Tales of first-year principals on the US-Mexican border. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Donaldson, G. (1987). The Maine Principals' Academy. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71(495), 40-43.
- Eagen, M. M., & Walter, G. (1982). Mentoring among teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 76, 113-118.
- Educational Research Service. (1998). Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship? An exploratory study. Alexandria and Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals and National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Educational Research Service. (2000). The principal: Key to a high-achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leaders we need. Alexandria and Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary Principals and National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Erkut, S., & Mokros, J. (1981). Professor as models and mentors for college students (Working Paper No. 65). Wellesley, MA: Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College.
- Forret, M., Turban, D., & Dougherty, T. (1996). Issues facing organizations when implementing formal mentoring programmes. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 17(3), 27-30.
- Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 6-11.
- Gardiner, M., Enomoto, E., & Grogan, M. (2000). Mentoring outside the lines: Mentoring women into school leadership. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gehrke, N. (1988). Toward a definition of mentoring. *Theory Into Practice*, 27(3), 190-194.
- Gehrke, N., & Fay, R. (1984). The socialization of beginning teachers through mentor-protégé relationships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(3), 21-24.
- Goldsmith, M., Kaye, B., & Shelton, K. (Eds.). (2000). Learning journeys: Top management experts share hard-earned lessons on becoming great mentors and leaders. New York: Davies-Black.
- Gould, R. (1978). Transformations: Growth and change in adult life. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hall, D. (1976). Careers and organizations. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.
- Hopkins-Thompson, P. (2000). Colleagues helping colleagues: Mentoring and coaching. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 29-36.
- Huling-Austin, L., Barnes, S., & Smith, J. (1985, March). A research-based development program for beginning teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Jacobson, S. L., Hickcox, E. S., & Stevenson, R. B. (1996). School administrators: Persistent problems in preparation and practice. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Jonson, K. F. (2002). Being an effective mentor: How to help beginning teachers succeed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kanter, R. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Kram, K. (1985). Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Krupp, J. (1985, March). Mentor and protégé perceptions of mentoring relationships in an elementary school in Connecticut. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Krupp, J. (1987). Mentoring: A means of sparking school personnel. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 64, 154-155.
- Lashway, L. (1998). Trends and issues: Training of school administrators. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service)
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P., & Cousins, B. (1992). Developing expert leadership for future schools. London: Falmer.
- Leithwood, K., & Steinbach, R. (1990). Characteristics of effective secondary school principals' problem solving. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations*, 5(1), 24-42.
- Leithwood, K., & Steinbach, R. (1995). Expert problem solving. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lester, V. (1981). The learning dialogue: Mentoring: Education for Student Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levinson, D. (1978). Seasons of a man's life. New York: Knopf.
- Lindley, F. (2003). The portable mentor. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Lipham, J. M. (1981). Effective principal, effective school. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

512

- Little, J. W., Gallagher, P., & O'Neal, P. (1984). Professional development roles and relationships: Principles and skills of "advising" (Contract No. 400-83-003). San Francisco: National Institute of Education.
- Maine Leadership Consortium. (1999). Administrator supply and demand: Finding solutions. Orono, ME: Author.
- McMinn, C., & Van Meter, E. (2000). Examining the "school principal shortage" crisis in Mississippi: A perspective from Mississippi school superintendents. Jackson: Mississippi Department of Education.
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 161-173.
- Mississippi Department of Education. (1999). Request for proposals: Mentoring programs for beginning school principals in the state of Mississippi. Jackson, MS: Author.
- Mississippi Department of Education. (2003). Request for proposals: Mentoring programs for beginning school principals. Jackson, MS: Author.
- Mississippi State Legislature. (1999). Reform of school principal development. Jackson, MS: Author.
- Murrell, A. J., Crosby, F. J., & Ely, R. J. (1999). Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- New England School Development Council. (1988). School administrator shortages in New England. Bangor, ME: Author.
- Ohio Department of Education. (2003). Entry year program for principals. Columbus, OH: Author.
- Pascale, R. (1984, May 24). Fitting new employees into the company culture. *Fortune*, 40, 28-43.
- Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). Mentors and protégés. New York: Arbor House.
- Portner, H. (1998). Mentoring new teachers. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Roche, G. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review*, 20, 14-28.
- Schein, E. (1976). Career dynamics: Matching individuals and organizational needs. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Shapiro, E., Haseltine, F., & Rowe, M. (1978). Moving up: Role models, mentors, and the patron system. *Sloan Management Review*, 19, 51-58.
- Sheehy, G. (1976, August 12). The mentor connection: The secret link in the successful woman's life. *New York Magazine*, 37, 33-39.
- Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 42(7), 43-48.
- Sinatra, G., Ferrari, M., & Gleher, C. (2002, April). Metacognition and human development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Texas Principals' Leadership Initiative. (2003). Building better principals for Texas schools. Austin, TX: Author.
- Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of work, organization, and society* (pp. 272-273). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Van Vorst, J. R. (1980). Mentors and protégés among hospital chief executives in Indiana. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
- Wanous, J. (1983). Organizational entry: Recruitment, selection, and socialization of newcomers. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Wasden, D. (1988). *The mentoring handbook*. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- Woodlands Group. (1980). Management development roles: Coach, sponsor, and mentor. *Personnel Journal*, 24(6), 57-61.
- Zey, M. (1984). The mentor connection. Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones Irwin. Zimpher, N., & Reiger,