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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to ascertain, describe, and compare the components of existing leadership preparation programs in the USA and other countries; and to understand the policy-based processes, challenges, and needs of support for program development for conceptualizing globally minded school leadership.

Design/methodology/approach – The purpose of this paper is to ascertain, describe, and compare the components of existing leadership preparation programs in the USA and other countries; and to understand the policy-based processes, challenges, and needs of support for program development for conceptualizing globally minded school leadership.

Findings – Limited growth regarding globally minded school leader research and development can be accounted for. Furthermore the increasing internationalization of university programming to include expanded course offerings and greater opportunities of international exchanges that bring students face-to-face with perspectives different from those indigenous to their home cultures speaks directly to the need for a shift in leadership preparation to better address the impact of globalization and intercultural exchange on youth learning in schools.

Originality/value – An intercultural analysis of leadership preparation programs with a focus on globally minded leadership is a new endeavor. The findings can be used to inform the next generation of policy formation for twenty-first century leadership preparation program development.
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Introduction

The study of educational leadership is a relatively new undertaking within the profession when compared to the study of teacher preparation. The University Council for Educational Administration, for example, was founded as recently as 1959. International research on school leadership, however, is even younger. The rise of lines of inquiry that focus on international issues is due largely to globalization. The investment of organizations such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and The World Bank have nurtured growing attention to the importance of school leadership in many nations. Yet, their investments have also framed international research in a particular manner, one that is mired by a market...
ideology. More specifically, international research on school leader development and effectiveness is prominently defined by an interest in comparative measures.

Hodgkinson (1991) identifies three universally recognized purposes of education, one being the economic purpose of learning to earn a living. It is through this purpose that educational effectiveness is commonly gauged, particularly in developed countries of the west. Standardized test scores represent the normative fulcrum of this measure. The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), for example, are two such exams used to compare the merit of a nation’s educational system(s). The churn of comparative analysis, emanating from economic competition among nation states has both shifted the narrative of school effectiveness in recent years toward a focus on student learning (i.e. instructional leadership and leadership for learning, see also MacBeath and Townsend, 2011), or rather the comparative measure of students’ learning while simultaneously holding fixed the old paradigm and structural analysis of international education research.

By and large, international educational research on leadership preparation is derived from case study designs that compare the approaches of one context with another. The boundaries of location shape the juxtapositions of “the way we do things” with “the way they do things.” Rosenberg (2000) refers to this practice as a tradition of dichotomized studies. These dichotomies, defined by contrasting geographical, historical, and cultural boundaries, function like most polarities: while they may add to the body of knowledge for the individual, localized preparation methods, the potential for symbiotic and convergent benefits is limited. Such is the nature of one concept of international educational research on leadership preparation. For example, Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development (OECD) (2006) research on approaches to school leadership asserts that countries are provided “opportunities [...] to learn about themselves by comparing their experiences with those of other countries” (p. 6). Yet, Crow et al. (2008) explain that the concept of “international” remains contested within the profession and is in need of further refinement.

This paper seeks to flesh out the major conditions and approaches for understanding and supporting school leader development within the international context. This work does not propose a prescriptive agenda but seeks to describe and challenge current practices and ideological underpinnings. More specifically, this work aims to add to the literature by exposing intersections and gaps in the research on school leader development for globally minded/twenty-first century school leaders.

As authors, we take a cue from Crow et al. (2008) and explore the contested concept of “international” school leadership development. In doing so, we examine the merits and limits of common research practices in the field along with findings of common issues affecting leadership development around the globe. Taken together, these considerations will help to operationalize a working definition for globally minded or twenty-first century school leadership. We understand that this approach adds to an even newer concept within the profession, the impact of globalization in educational research (Brooks and Normore, 2010) to which Paige and Mestenhauser (1999) explain “educational administration is highly resistant to internationalization” (p. 500).

Second, we report on common features of leadership preparation programs derived from international research. These features are important as they speak to the levers that either impede or support the potential for globally minded school leadership preparation and development. The examples that we offer do not represent an exhaustive study of international programs, but highlight prominent properties shared by leadership preparation programs from multiple contexts.
Lastly, the intersections and variants among programs are taken up and examined in an explorative manner. We recognize that the proposed structure of our work is mired in what Heck (1996) has defined as a limitation of traditional international research, or in this case, the comparative analysis of leadership preparation programs and approaches from multiple locals, from around the globe. He explains that, “Some leadership concepts may be common of several cultures, while others may be more culturally specific.” As such, we cannot “expect perfect equivalence of concepts across cultures because of the tendency for at least some cultural specific behavior. Making comparisons more difficult is that different behaviors may serve similar purposes within each culture” (Heck, 1996, p. 80). When certain assumptions about the meaning and structure of leadership indicative of one culture or context are used to analyze others, the inherent nature of the latter are often obfuscated by the former.

 Though we are cognizant of this dilemma, we are also aware of the fact that meaning is inevitably made through the lens of existing frames. It is through comparative explorations that we the challenge, verify, refine, and in some cases, discard existing ways of knowing. It is through the examination of current research on international leadership preparation that we seek to expand on contemporary methods for understating school leadership preparation.

**Defining globally minded school leadership: troubling the waters of international research**

As previously established, the common approach to international research on school leadership and preparation has been to juxtapose the design and elements of programs across national contexts. Several authors remind us that the various terms used to define research in the area are often problematic (Friedman, 1999; Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999; Crow et al., 2008). Yet, one fact remains uncontested: globalization has had a grave impact on the spread of policy and practices across national geographies, including the influence on educational leadership and leadership development, albeit relatively nascent in nature. Studies comparing leadership preparation across international boundaries have found both similarities and paradoxes among the conceptualizations, approaches, and even challenges that programs undertake (see Huber, 2004; Møller and Schratz, 2008). In its simplest form, the comparative study of educational contexts allows each system or entity to reflect on and improve itself as a result of comparison (Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999; OECD, 2006).

Perhaps the one readily observable impact of globalization on the profession has been the act of policy copying, adopting, or borrowing. Yet, research consistently reports that policy borrowing has been largely ethnocentric or western orientated (Dimmock and Walker, 2000), with a primary focus on the US and European contexts (Ball, 1998). The centralization of education and leadership preparation, in countries like the UK, for example, has led to certain government-based accountability mechanisms aimed at holding school employees responsible for declining effectiveness (Møller and Schratz, 2008), namely student achievement. In the UK, the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) has guided the government's establishment of the National College for School Leadership (Southworth, 2008) and has influenced the development of the subsequent National Professional Qualifications for Headship (NPQH) and the National Professional Qualifications for Serving Headteachers (NPQSH). These standards define the credential characteristics for prospective school headmasters and the continued development of experienced ones, respectively. In the USA, similar developments have begun to unfold. The Obama
administration's Race to the Top Fund (RTTP), in an effort to leverage large-scale school effectiveness, has incentivized educational reform by redefining teacher and principal effectiveness based on student learning outcomes (Easley, 2011). States, including their leadership preparation programs, have begun to rethink their practices in accordance with the emergent accountability structure of the administration. The centralization of education is just one illustration of policy borrowing that can now been seen across national contexts.

Much of the 1990s were characterized by comparisons between the east and the west (Dimmock and Walker, 2000). Dimmock and Walker (1998) explain that while historically developing countries have looked toward developed ones, the 1990s also ushered in a reverse glance with countries like the USA and the UK taking greater interest in the educational developments of the east. The steady rise of PISA scores for countries like China, Singapore, Japan, and Korea has been a significant impetus for this shift. Not to mention, the rising strength of eastern markets in contrast to the contemporary financial troubles in the US and Euro zone has had a significant impact on political and economic relations in the face of growing globalization. Even with this shift, policy adoption can still yield negative isomorphisms, in which borrowed changes may be inappropriate for the new environment. Occurring either by force, competition, or unconsciously, negative isomorphisms most likely result from a lack of deep understanding of the socio-cultural and political milieu from which policies are lifted. Moreover, a lack of understanding of the history of one's own cultural and political milieu can likewise result in the failed aims of policy borrowing.

Hargreaves (2010) argues, for example, that policy copying is in most cases doomed to fail as it is often carried out selectively or with an insufficient understanding of the relevant socio-cultural contexts or both. Other common pitfalls include insufficient development, timing, or implementation for the borrowed policies. The author suggests that for better chances of success one should learn “intelligently in relation to clear principles and multiple examples, sensitively in relation to differences in context, and interactively through dialogue among educators at all levels within and across the respective systems” (Hargreaves, 2010, p. 109).

Relatedly, Dimmock and Walker (2000) contend that the influence of societal culture has been largely ignored within debates on the effects of globalization on educational leadership and policy. The authors conclude that attention to societal culture as a mediator for the adoption or rejection of ideas and practices across the globe is imperative for the future development of the field as issues of curriculum, teaching, learning, and school leadership are investigated. It is in this vein that the study of globalization becomes critical, thereby allowing educational leaders to move beyond policy shadowboxing – the shallow act of jumping on the bandwagon by seeking implementation purity of borrowed polices in the absence of excavating cultural sensitivities that define both the divergent and convergent geopolitical landscapes across contexts; the means by which borrowed policies and practices are readily absorbed, manipulated, or even rejected within/by their new environments. It is in this vein that the globalization of school leadership recognizes societal cultures as dynamic and amorphous, simultaneously shaped by deep histories and emergent realities of an ever-changing world.

Paige and Mestenhauser (1999) further trouble the conceptualization of globalization by purporting that the concept is often confounded with that of internationalization. Drawing on their research over 60-plus combined years of experience with international education, the authors explain the internationalization is a mindset of learning, one that is intercultural, interdisciplinary, and integrative; one that embodies the “transfer
of knowledge-technology, contextual, and global dimension of knowledge construction” (Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999, p. 504). It is through this lens that we acknowledge the ontological and epistemological dimensions of school leadership that at its core is a human endeavor, an active process of meaning making. School leadership is concerned with the interrelationships among peoples and cultures, their derivative innovations and technologies, and one’s mediation of these and social conditions as well their effect on both the operations and outcomes of schooling. Not to dismiss the smart work of Paige and Mestenhauser (1999) employed to define internationalization, we draw upon the knowledge generated from the aforementioned debates as well as emergent curricular markers used to conceptualize twenty-first century learning for children and youth (e.g. life-long learning; a focus on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), greater attention to culturally relevant pedagogy, etc.) to define twenty-first century/globally minded school leadership. Given the nature of school leadership, we understand this definition as a working heuristic – a frame for the work presented within this paper as well as an invitation for further dialogue and development within the profession.

Taking direction from these previously mentioned debates, in particular the phenomenon of globalization and its impact on education, we consider twenty-first century/globally minded school leadership as a dynamic, systemic, and anthropologically oriented enterprise that attends to the relationships among the global and local contexts, while recognizing the reciprocal function of these relationships within the profession. Globally minded school leadership is integrative, recognizing glocalization (i.e. the interrelationships among the local, national, and global contexts, Robertson, 1995; Brooks and Normore, 2010) as well as internationalization (Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999), the generative act of learning that bridges theory, policy, and practice. Globally minded school leadership extends beyond mere international comparisons or the lifting of policy and practices form one context to be used in another. Accordingly, the development of globally minded school leadership is more than a matter of adding curricular topics from multiple regions; rather, it is the pursuit of understanding how conditions from the local and global affect one another and engages analytical meaning making for the purpose of developing and sustaining twenty-first century learning environments, i.e. teaching and learning in an increasingly flat world defined as an information and knowledge society. And while we understand twenty-first century and globally minded leadership to be synonymous, we use the latter in this paper for consistency.

Methods
The authors conducted a comparative analysis of existing research on educational leadership preparation from around the globe. Cross-national research of this kind is often referred to as the “safari” or “helicopter” approach (Hantrais, 1995) in which a researcher or research team carries out a study in more than one country using a replicated design.

In order to conceptualize globally minded school leader preparation, we combined two lenses by focussing on common features of leadership preparation programs found around the globe – features that are often governed by policy and accreditation demands; in addition, we sought out existing international and global centric leadership preparation programs. Much of the existing research in this area is derived from the case study approach. And while there are debates within the field as to where or not there exist “distinct cross-national methods per se” (Hantrais and Mangen, 1999, p. 91), we understood our work to be a conceptual, emergent design intended to inform future research.

We employed a descriptive analysis of existing literature of primary and secondary research on leadership preparation programs. The selection of sources was guided by
minimally established criteria, to include: peer-reviewed research (though this was not always possible, allowing us to include relevant evaluation reports, for example); currency of programs derived from studies published between 2006 and 2012; and the global scope of twenty-first century leadership by seeking out representative, globally minded programs to include both western and non-western perspectives and cultural contexts.

**Exploring current practices of international leadership preparation**

While we have identified shortcomings among the traditional models of international leadership research and development for the purpose of defining globally minded leadership, there is still much to be learned from contemporary approaches to school leader development. In addition, our working definition for globally minded leadership is instructive, revealing both the limitations of traditional international comparison as well as the potential benefits, yet complexities, of considering the notion of interrelationships among the global and local contexts. Gleaned from existing research, we explore not only the approaches and content of school leader development but also the socio-political contexts that shape these practices. In particular, we draw from key features of leadership program development noted in international research (i.e. policy governance, candidate selection, curriculum, and clinical experiences). To be certain, these elements are not exhaustive. They alone do not fully address the process or content of program development. Rather, they offer a snapshot of the field. It is through this method that we offer a critique while making inroads toward globally minded school leadership development.

**Policy borrowing: standards, centralization, and decentralization**

While school leader preparation and development practices have taken different approaches across national contexts, largely due to the geo-social, political, and intellectual factors, it is clear that globalization, in particular the growing economic interdependence among nation states within the marketplace, has had a grave impact on policy convergence (Drezner, 2001; Villaverde and Maza, 2011). The education profession has not been immune and has experienced its own share of policy convergence, the phenomenon whereby national policies begin to closely resemble one another. Yet, the impact of globalization on policy convergence does not occur evenly. As nations and their organizational entities seek to maintain their stability or to improve their standing on the global stage, their actions are simultaneously shaped by two critical conditions: the innate anthropological force of defense and access to the necessary means for participating as desired, which is largely an economically based issue of equity.

Edward Hall (1959), noted anthropologist, explains: “Human beings have elaborated their defensive techniques with astounding ingenuity not only in warfare, but also in religion, medicine, and law enforcement. They must defend themselves not only against potentially hostile forces in nature but against those within human society” (p. 52). Similarly, within the global policy arena, nations and their institutions seek to maintain their identities while mediating their adoption of or resistance to policy convergence through these identities. Moreover, the means for defense depends on social, political, and moral capital, and intellectual leadership that provide access to critical resources and know how for managing change. These conditions, and others, influence the magnitude of policy conversion across contexts.

Literature on international leadership preparation is replete with cases of policy conversion, brought on by globalization (Bush and Jackson, 2002; Rusch, 2008; Huber et al., 2010). Such convergence is typically described as either the structure/process of
school leader preparation and development or the content (i.e. standards and curriculum) that characterize these programs and their pedagogical approaches. Policy convergence at this level is commonly identified as the degree of (de)regulation or (de)centralization of leadership preparation within a national context. However, we should remain mindful of the clear distinctions between these concepts as they each convey some level of autonomy. Karstanje and Webber (2008) explain:

> Decentralisation is not equivalent to deregulation and does not necessarily lead to greater autonomy. When the regulating power changes from the state to the municipality, for example, it is even possible that schools lose part of their autonomy. The main characteristic of decentralisation is that the power is located more in the neighbourhood of the school rather than far away in the ministerial offices. (p. 740)

Rusch (2008) notes that for countries like Singapore and the USA, national or state standards have long been a factor for the development of formal school leader preparation programs whereas the UK, South Africa, and Hong Kong began to develop centralized standards during the 1990s. These standards are typically government driven and are set by ministries or departments of education. Often, such programs are university based and represent the primary means for entry into the profession. Government supported programs such as the National College for School Leadership (UK) and even private, entrepreneurial programs have emerged in other countries, thereby offering a level of competition for traditionally, university-based programs. Even still, for countries like Switzerland and Austria there are no centralized programs for school leadership preparation. Conversely, their focus lies with post-appointment leadership development (Huber, 2008).

While contemporary, comparative research on the characteristics of leadership preparation programs stretching across national boundaries is well established, and may offer options for exchange of ideas that lead to copying, adopting, or borrowing of policies and practices, this line of inquiry tells us little about program development as a dynamic endeavor. It falls short regarding program responsiveness to globalization, namely the impact of policy convergence, centralization, or decentralization on program effectiveness and improvement. Furthermore, this line of inquiry offers little information about the impact of these issues on programs’ capacity and approaches for preparing globally minded leaders.

**Curriculum and globally minded leadership preparation**

Related to the notion of policy conversion and the comparative mining of descriptive characteristics that define similarities and differences among the structures of programs, the content of leadership preparation is also well noted in a similar fashion, by comparing the diverse range of curricular topics of programs. While this approach may help to define common and divergent considerations for the knowledge, skills, and dispositional development of school leaders, it has done little to inform what is known about school leaders’ preparation for leading schools within a global society.

Rusch’s (2008) international research on leadership preparation programs reveals that their curricular systems hold general commonalities, including “10-15 separately designed course, sporadically interrelated or connected” (p. 203). These are often offered in a structure of time and space and delivered through the use of a variety of pedagogical approaches. While the author adds that the curricular design of some programs may be more sophisticated, coherent, and deliberative than others, programs seem to ascribe to similar theories about adult learning. Another common feature of
programs is the exploration of leadership theories (e.g., instructional leadership, transactional leadership, steward leadership, distributed leadership, and transformational leadership, to name a few). Other features typically define the uniqueness among programs. Brookes and Normore (2010) suggest that, given the findings from existing research on leadership curriculum, "educational leaders are oblivious to the way that local and global forces interact to shape the context of the lives of those responsible for delivering quality instruction for student learning and the school and communities in which they lead" (p. 54). As expressed in our working definition of globally minded leadership, knowledge of the interrelationship between the global and the local is paramount for globally situated leadership. Furthermore, functional knowledge of the interplay between global-localization (e.g., notions of policy convergence and societal culture) and the development of leadership preparation is equally necessary for shaping the field of globally minded leadership preparation and development.

Though little is known in the area of curricular and pedagogical practices for globally minded leadership preparation, a brief description of the international curriculum landscape offers a starting point for future curricular developments across the profession. The US context of leadership curriculum is highly centralized due largely to accreditation and accountability mechanisms. This is particularly true of university-based preparation programs. While programs design their curricula, the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) provide common frameworks for programs to organize their course offerings.

A meta-analysis of the research by Rusch (2008) and Orr and Easley (2009) reveals commonalities among US leadership preparation programs' curricula. While several of the authors' organizing categories vary, clear associations can be made to the ISLLC standards. A comparative analysis of course offerings indicates the knowledge domains shared among university-based programs by frequency of course offerings or credit hours or both (see Table I). The outcome of this level of analysis challenges Orr's (as cited by Young and Grogan, 2008) findings explaining that contemporary leadership preparation curriculum emphasizes school improvement, social justice, and democracy. Rather, programs tend to focus on issues of school management and leadership theory/foundations (when coupled), as these domains reflect a natural lattice across program comparisons. Such topics tend to occur at the expense of others like curriculum (teaching and learning), for example. Yet this comparison is a cautionary tale as topics such as school improvement, social justice, and democracy may very well manifest in theoretical terms associated with leadership foundations and theory-based courses in which these topics are not readily apparent in course titles or descriptions (Table I).

Like the USA school leadership in the UK is shaped by national standards – the National Standards for Headteachers (NSH). According to the Department for Education Skills (2004), these standards reflect "the evolving role of leadership in the early 21st century and incorporates current government thinking and guidance" (p. 2). The standards are designed in recognition of headteachers' role in upholding government policy (i.e. the standards themselves). The standards recognize the key role that headteachers play in engaging in the development and delivery of government policy and in raising and maintaining levels of academic attainment in schools in order to meet the needs of every child (Department for Education Skills, 2004, p. 2). Similar to the ISLLC standards, these are organized around six non-hierarchical domains: shaping the future; leading learning, and teaching; developing self and working with others; managing the organization; securing accountability; and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge domain</th>
<th>Society and cultural influences</th>
<th>Curriculum (teaching and learning)</th>
<th>Leadership foundations</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Legal, policy and politics, ethical dimensions</th>
<th>Economics and financial dimensions</th>
<th>Clinical experience</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC standards</td>
<td>Collaborations</td>
<td>School culture and instruction</td>
<td>Vision and stewardship</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Political, social, economic, legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Community and family relations</td>
<td>Instructional leadership, curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>Leadership foundations organizational change</td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>School law, ethics, policy</td>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>Educational research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of courses or credit hours**

| Knowledge domain | 17 | 13 | 46 | 17 | 5 |

**Sources:** Source institutions: Trinity University (TX); University of Texas (TX); Ashland University (OH); Miami University of Ohio (OH); Lewis and Clark (OR); Portland State University (OR); 5 University and School District-University Partnership programs
strengthening community. Though the current NPQH will no longer be a mandatory qualification for first-time headteachers beginning in 2012, taken together with the NSH these measures represent a centralization of policy and practice for leadership preparation in the UK. In a push toward more decentralization, the redesigned NPQH is scheduled to provide increased flexibility among schools and those who lead them, while recognizing the tenets of the current program. The new program will depend on a diverse range of organizations outside of higher education, including schools, for leadership preparation (Department for Education, 2012a, b). Even still, there remains a content-gap for global centric proficiencies among the commonly shared standards for leadership preparation in both the USA and UK and as represented by ELCC, ISLLC, and NSH.

In contrast, Singapore is considered one of the “liveliest” players in the field of educational leadership program development (Rusch, 2008), though beginning formal preparation as recent as the late 1980s. Programs are centrally developed by the National Institute of Education (NIE) which continually scans local and global issues with anticipation of how they will impact educational leadership development (see NIE web site). While the institute offers various programs for school leadership, all focus on the development and sustainability of innovation within the profession and most boast of an articulated attention to international contexts. In this regard, the aims held toward educational leadership preparation are anchored in the larger institutional mission and values that promote global thinking. Unlike the organizing standards of the USA and the UK for leadership preparation, NIE has embarked upon programming that more accurately aligns with globally minded leadership development.

Selection of candidates

Program selection of candidates is perhaps the first step and an important one toward formal leadership preparation and development. Because of the noted significance of the role of the school leader for educational effectiveness and improvement, it goes without saying that leadership preparation and development of the “right” individuals is a critical investment. Huber and Hiltmann (2010) summate the gravity of the issue of candidate selection, and for the purpose of our work, we provide insertions relevant to the notion of globally minded leadership preparation:

Since schools are embedded in their communities and in the particular national educational system, and these in turn are embedded in the particular [global] society, schools and their leaders have to cope with, and respond to the social, economic and cultural changes and developments taking place. Schools, and consequently the expectations on school leaders, also change as a result of more subtle and indirect forces in [global] society – social, political and economic changes – that are gathering pace across the world [due to increasing interactions among the local and global contexts]. Moreover, direct changes in the educational system have a particularly strong impact on the school leader’s role. (p. 304)

The authors note that for many educational systems around the world, the process of removing ineffective leaders is extremely arduous, if not impossible. Furthermore, as many nations seek to tighten the reigns of evaluation and accountability for school leaders, the importance of front loaded investment for candidate selection is magnified. Even still, there is limited research on candidate selection for program participation within the field of international leadership preparation.

Job recruitment, selection, and even induction are further developed areas of research. Although the selection criteria and procedures for new school leaders vary, several commonalities have been identified. In general, school leaders are expected to
have teaching experience. This is a common qualification shared across national contexts. Usually, formal, professional credentials such as a teaching degree and government recognized certification are prerequisites to a school leadership profession. These requirements are not without exception, however. In Sweden for example, aspiring principals are recruited predominantly among teachers. However, being a teacher is not a formal condition to be eligible; previous educational experience coupled with “pedagogical insight” is required instead (Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development (OECD), 2008, p. 161).

Related to the notion of professional eligibility, there appears divergence between expectations held for school leaders when compared to teachers. While most countries require formal credentialing for teachers, the same may not hold true for aspiring school leaders. Austria, for example, does not offer preparatory degree programs specifically for school leadership readiness. Moreover, in countries like Germany and the USA the selection process and criteria may vary by municipality reflecting a loose coupling with broader, rudimentary guidelines within the country (Huber and Hiltmann, 2010).

The authority of decision making for school leader selection manifests along the centralization-decentralization spectrum that we saw regarding policy borrowing. There appears to be two predominant models regarding the authority to select new principals: on one side a centralized body makes the decision to recruit and select eligible candidates for school leadership (see Singapore); on the other end, the decision-making authority is more localized. The decision is made at the school level, sometimes in conjunction with the respective school district. Often, aspiring school principals apply for a position at a school of their choosing. This seems to be the predominant case in the USA and the UK. Variations and even combinations exist along the spectrum that reflect greater coupling between local and national authorities.

Regarding the application process, interviews remain the most popular way to assess a candidate. Still, exact selection procedures and criteria differ from country to country, yet again, with shared commonalities. For example, management and leadership experience are sought preferences among prospective candidates as well as (inter-)personal skills and additional qualifications that might be of relevance for the educational and administrative field. In some countries, candidates’ express leadership visions (typically occurring during the interview) or work proposals for the school as part of the employment assessment for hiring (OECD, 2008, p. 163, see Table II).

Mentorship, coaching, internships, and apprenticeships

It is well established that the lexicon and complexity for school leadership varies greatly by national and cultural contexts (e.g. principal, headteacher, school leader, etc.). Similarly, the terminology and structure of coaching and mentorship-related activities for school leaders as part of their preparation or development processes are applied with great variability (see also Bush and Coleman, 1995, p. 61). The breadth of this concept within the profession makes a precise use of the terms difficult. The issue becomes even more problematic when working on an international and intercultural level. For clarity, we shall base our understanding of apprenticeship/mentorship/internship/coaching on the work of the Welsh Consortium (as cited in Bolam et al., 1995, p. 32) that regards mentoring/coaching as a process of support that is intended to help prospective school leaders to manage the transition into their leadership position. The mentor is usually but not inevitably an experienced leader who shares her experience and helps prospective principals gain insight into their new jobs. We understand the system of support as occurring in tandem with “hands-on” experiences...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level of decision making</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Level of decision making for hire</td>
<td>Autonomy of decision making</td>
<td>Minimal eligibility criteria for application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State government or provincial</td>
<td>Within a framework set by the central</td>
<td>Minimal criteria for employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>Teaching licensure; teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (Hong Kong)</td>
<td>Civil Service Bureau</td>
<td>Civil Service Bureau</td>
<td>Managerial skills; communication skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Service Bureau</td>
<td>Civil Service Bureau</td>
<td>credence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>School, school board or committee</td>
<td>Consultation with local authorities</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Ministry of Education (MOE)</td>
<td>Based on recommendations of senior school</td>
<td>Working towards certification (NPQH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>principals</td>
<td>Score on the Enhanced Performance Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Local authorities school; teacher</td>
<td>In full autonomy</td>
<td>School discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unions; superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td>School discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>School board</td>
<td>District’s superintendent and school board</td>
<td>Local discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) will become optional starting 2012 (Department for Education, 2012a, b)

**Sources:** Darling-Hammond and Rothman (2011, p. 38ff) (Singapore); Fink (2011) (USA); Kwan and Walker (2009, p. 54ff) (Hong Kong); Department for Education (2012a, b) (England); Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development (OECD) (2008, p. 183ff) (other countries)
in which fledgling leaders are provided opportunities to test out theory and practice in authentic schools settings, to engage in problem solving and to develop their skills across the noted knowledge domains of school leadership (e.g. ELCC, ISLLC, and NSH standards).

Reflection is widely recognized as an essential process by which mentors support the development of their protegés. Building on the work of Lieberman and Miller (1992) who identify three types of knowledge: knowledge for practice, knowledge in practice, and knowledge of practice, Barnett and O’Mahony (2008) explain that the latter two are developed through reflection. As it stands, reflection is the core mechanism by which aspiring and novice school leaders systematically and deliberately engage in meaning making to enhance their future practice. Barnett and O’Mahony (2008) add that reflection is typically conceptualized as a rational linear approach steeped in (Anglo) western perspectives with little recognition of other worldviews.

In the USA an increasingly popular term for mentorship-related supports for aspiring school leaders is the “clinical experience/training.” The concept of the clinical experience is borrowed from the medical profession and seeks to pattern medical residency programs. However, the design of these experiences varies greatly by program, and is often developed in recognition of the resource constraints endured by both programs and their candidates (e.g. personnel, time, and cost). More highly developed clinical experiences consist of year-long mentorship and coaching while others resemble traditional, 12-15-week approaches.

A comparative analysis of select countries demonstrates that coaching/mentoring plays a definite role in school leadership preparation and development. However, there are significant differences when it comes to the extent and codification of methods (see Table III). For example, coaching/mentoring is a formal part of the preparatory training in Singapore as well as the in-service training. In Austria, as there is no formal preparatory training, consequently there is also no coaching/mentoring system available neither for aspiring nor beginning school leaders. Some new principals have access to ad hoc mentoring communities. These can usually be traced back to individual, non-formalized efforts (i.e. finding an informal mentor through personal contacts). While there have been discussions regarding the coaching of school principals, a formal state-wide program does not currently exist (Table III).

The importance of informal mentoring/coaching for school leaders should not be overlooked, however. Due to the complexity of leadership development and professional growth, it is common for neophytes to seek the assistance of more than one person depending on the diverse nature of needs. Furthermore, research has shown that the mentorship of members from underrepresented cultural, linguistic, racial, and gender groups who seek to work within majority communities may require unique sensitivities (see also Kring, 1992; Young and Brooks, 2008; Malone et al., 2010; Sperandio, 2010; McNae, 2010). While formal mentorship and coaching may be helpful, members of these groups may need to seek supports beyond traditional approaches that both affirm and offer tools for mediating difference(s). These and other considerations are vital to the success of mentorship for globally minded school leadership preparation.

Discussion and implications
Much progress has been made in the area of international research on leadership preparation and development. The comparative analyses of approaches taken from around the world afford the profession vast insights regarding the contexts, processes, and challenges of program design and management. Yet, unlike the preparation for leaders in other fields such as international business and non-government organization
NGO management, limited growth regarding globally minded school leader research and development can be accounted for. Furthermore, the increasing internationalization of university programming to include expanded course offerings and greater opportunities of international exchanges that bring students face-to-face with perspectives different from those indigenous to their home cultures speaks directly to the need for a shift in traditional grammar and secondary school curricula to better prepare them for the expanding dimensions of higher education. It goes without saying that these advancements toward twenty-first century learning require a certain kind of school leadership, one that is globally minded.

One of the first steps for globally minded school leadership development is to promote an awareness of globalization, its impact on twenty-first century learning, educational policy and practice, and school leadership, in general. As it stands, the preparation of school leaders is mostly restrictive to a specific paradigm, model, or “leadership ideology” that focuses almost exclusively on leadership within a particular cultural, regional, or national context. School leaders will, however, increasingly need to consider the significance of societal cultures, the interactions and interdependence among the local and global, and the resulting shift in leadership knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Current international research offers an emergent roadmap for the future of globally minded school leadership preparation and development. While the commonalities (e.g. standards and curriculum, clinical experience and mentorship) among approaches provide a framework for best practices, the anomalies, in particular gaps in preparation for innovation and rapid changes in societal culture, serve as a compass for reshaping leadership preparation globally. Current research draws our attention to the need for further inquiry for the advancements of globally minded leadership preparation.

The questions raised address both the content and process of globally minded school leadership development. The questions raised concomitantly speak to a needed shift in the purpose that guides international research by which programs seek to learn more about and to improve themselves largely void of considerations of interdependence, void of (inter)systems thinking required for school change and improvement. The questions raised underscore the significance of symbiosis between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Preparatory mentoring/internship Availability</th>
<th>Preparatory mentoring/internship Mandatory</th>
<th>In-service mentoring/internship Availability</th>
<th>In-service mentoring/internship Mandatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (Hong Kong)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Cheung and Walker (2006) (Hong Kong); Darling-Hammond and Rothman (2011) (Singapore); Darling-Hammond et al., 2007(USA); Duncan and Stock, 2010(USA), Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development (OECD) (2008); Schratz and Petzold (2007) (Austria); Stoll et al. (2007) (Austria); Swedish National Agency for School Improvement (2007) (Sweden); Walker and Dimmock (2006, p. 139) (Hong Kong)
research and leadership preparation challenged by expanding globalization, its effect on learning communities around the world, and the need for globally minded leaders for twenty-first century schools.
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