
Mindsapes

A strong heartbeat is a school's best defense against the obstacles leaders face as they work to change schools for the better. But strengthening the heartbeat of a school requires that we rethink what leadership is, how leadership works, what leadership's relationship to learning is, and why we need to practice both leadership and learning together.

When leaders are able to strengthen the heartbeat, their schools become stronger and more resilient. These qualities help leaders to share the burdens of leadership with others, to create collaborative cultures, and to be continuous learners. Leadership inevitably involves change and change inevitably involves learning. Both are easier to do the better we understand the mindsapes we bring to our practice, examine them in light of what we want to do, and change them. Change begins with us—with our heart, our head, and our hands that drive our leadership practice.

Lots of words could be used to capture the meaning of *heartbeat*. Three cousins—*social capital*, *community*, and *relational trust*—are good examples. Each of the cousins is a little different. Social capital provides the support students and teachers need (Coleman, 1988). Community provides the caring that students and teachers need (Sergiovanni, 1994). And relational trust provides the basis for developing deep reciprocal roles and role relationships with strong moral overtones (Bryk and Schneider, 2002). Reciprocal

roles and role relationships can transform schools from ordinary to sacred places. They are essential, for example, in building community in schools. Taken together the three cousins enrich leadership and show how a strengthened school heartbeat can provide support for deep learning for both teachers and students.

Conventional wisdom tells us that leadership is about finding solutions to the problems that people face. But in reality leadership is more about helping people gain an understanding of problems they face and about helping them manage these problems and even learn to live with them. Even in the best of circumstances leadership is not easy. Community is a good example. Few leaders find their efforts at community building to be models of perfect harmony. Important differences exist among any faculty that is alive and well. But the wise leader knows that schools need centers of harmony that contain enough of what is important and shared to hold things together. At the same time they encourage differences in how this center of ideas is embodied in practice. Community for them is like a mosaic (see, for example, Etzioni 1996/1997) composed of many different elements held together by a common frame and glue.

Few leaders have all the competence, all the time, and all the information needed at any one time to get the job done. The wise among them try hard to rely on others and to build up the leadership capacity in others. Leaders have funds of knowledge and funds of skills that need constant replenishment. An important part of their job is to cultivate and amass the intellectual capital needed for the school's organizational I.Q. to increase. No doubt smart leaders help, but it is smart schools that will make the difference over time. That is why leadership and learning together are so important. We can have leadership and we can have learning. We can focus on individuals and we can focus on the school. We can view learning as a private good that serves individual interests but has little to do with pursuing school goals. And we can view learning as something individuals feel compelled to do because it is a public good that helps schools achieve their goals (Elmore, 2002). In each case effects multiply when these dimensions are brought together.

Head, Heart, and Hand

When we talk about and write about leadership, we usually emphasize the hand of leadership—the actions and behaviors that leaders use. Sometimes we include the problems that leaders face as they practice and the obstacles that keep them from behaving the way they want to. A popular theme of researchers is to gauge the success or failure of leaders and then to identify the behaviors and actions that seem to be causing these effects. These are important concerns and important issues that make describing and understanding the hand of leadership valuable. But we can't stop here. The hand alone is not powerful enough to account for what leadership is; indeed, the hand may not represent leadership at all. If we want to understand a leader's behavior, we have to examine the heart and the head of leadership too.

Both the heart and head of leadership function as mindscales. The heart has to do with what a person believes, values, hopes for, and is committed to—a person's personal vision, to use the popular term. But it is more than vision. It is a whole interior world, which becomes the foundation of that person's reality. At the school level, the heart of leadership is much like a school's repository of values, assumptions, and beliefs that are widely shared and that serve as a source of authority for what people do. The values, assumptions, and beliefs of the heart also create realities and define truths as they become an important part of a school's shared mindscape—the ever important center that holds things together. “The center . . . is a phenomenon of the realm of values and beliefs . . . which govern the society. . . . In a sense, society has an official ‘religion’. . . . The center is also a phenomenon of the realm of action. It is a structure of activities, of roles and persons, within the network of institutions. It is in these that the values and beliefs which are central are embodied and propounded” (Shils, 1961, p. 119).

The head of leadership is a source of mindscales themed to the theories of teaching and learning, the theories of organization and management, and the theories of people that are adopted and then

govern the collective behavior of teachers, students, and others. Once these mindscapes from the head are shared, they begin to program the minds of people in such a way that a collective image of reality is created. This reality can provide the instructional coherence, the organizational coherence, and the leadership coherence that schools need to succeed.

From Mindscapes to Action

Shared mindscapes also provide the context for the expression of leadership:

- The heart of leadership: What do we value?
- The head of leadership: What are our theories?
- The hand of leadership: How do we behave?

Differences are always a part of this sharing. But to qualify as a shared mindscape, differences must be muted by core purposes, values, and ideas. I've written on this at length in the past:

Mindscapes are implicit mental frames through which . . . reality and our place in this reality are envisioned. Mindscapes provide us with intellectual and psychological images of the real world and the boundaries and parameters of rationality that help us to make sense of this world. In a very special way, mindscapes are intellectual security blankets on the one hand and road maps through an uncertain world on the other. As road maps they provide the rules, assumptions, images, and practice exemplars that define for us what . . . is [Sergiovanni, 1985, p. 6].

And further,

So complete is the programming of a mindscape that its assumptions and practices are automatically accepted and articulated. Mindscales are not thought about very much, for they are assumed to be true. Thus when a . . . mindscape does not fit the world of practice, the problem is assumed to be *in that world*. Rarely is the world accepted for what it is and the prevailing mindscales challenged or indeed abandoned in favor of others [Sergiovanni, 1985, p. 6].

How Mindscales Work

Normally what we do makes sense to us. Our thoughts and behaviors seem to fit the mindscales that we have as individuals and that we hold collectively as a school. The school across the street may not understand why we do the things we do. And we are equally mystified by some of their assumptions and practices. This is because our shared mindscales may differ. But we can't just shrug our shoulders and say that's okay. We can't just adopt an "anything goes" mentality. Not all mindscales are equally good and not all of the resulting practices are equally right or effective.

All this is complicated by the reality that frequently individuals and schools adopt mindscales without realizing it. Complicated or not, if we are going to get anywhere in improving schools, individual and collective mindscales have to be exposed and discussed. And their goodness and effectiveness need to be debated. Researchers seeking "best practices" need to take shared mindscales into account. Further, both individual and collective mindscales need to be made explicit. Tacitly held mindscales at either the individual level or the school level undermine change, make learning difficult, and make the building of collegiality among teachers virtually impossible. If we are going to talk about something in a meaningful way, we have to get our ideas, our values, and our hopes out on the table—and so do others. Once on the table and agreed to, mindscales can

be used as sources of authority for what we do and as benchmarks for evaluating how well we are doing it.

Effective mindscapes are those that include agreed-upon solutions to the core problems a school faces. Agreed-upon solutions lead to predictable behavior. An important caveat is to view these mindscapes as frameworks and statements of values rather than as templates that script everything people must do. A school, for example, might be trying to close the achievement gap among different groups of students. This school is committed to the idea that it must strive to become a culture of learning for students and adults alike. As a result the members of this school believe, “We can close the gap if we pull together and learn together and share what we have learned.” One strategy that they adopt is focusing relentlessly on examining student work and on examining the assignments teachers give in light of the standards that they are pursuing. They decide to adopt this strategy because of their firm commitment to underlying values, including the importance of collaboration and the importance of hope, themes I will discuss in Chapter Four. Further, they find validating research that shows that when teachers organize learning around assignments requiring higher-level thinking, understanding, elaborative communications, and the application to student lives, student learning reflects more intellectually complex work. Newmann and his colleagues’ studies of the assignments that Chicago teachers give bear out this finding. Students who received assignments requiring more challenging work achieved greater than average gains on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Newmann, Bryk, and Nagaoka, 2001).

The key questions members of this school ask are: Is the work that students do up to standards? Do assignments we give require that students work to standards? They hope that this investigation will lead teachers to write lessons that are more on target. Lessons might then be swapped, critiqued, and practice-taught as a way to test their usefulness and their accuracy with respect to the standards. These lessons might then be stored in public files so that all teachers have access to

them. These files would contain, as well, comments, evaluations, and suggestions for improvement written by teachers who have used the lesson. Sometimes samples of student work would be clipped to the lessons to show the kind of learning the lessons produced. From time to time the lessons would be reviewed, revised, and even overhauled. This strategy for pulling together and learning together is predictable given the mindsapes that are at the heart of the culture that this school is trying to create.

Culture

Spindler (1984) writes, "Culture . . . refers to shared designs for living. It is not the people or things or behavior themselves. Culture can be equated with the *shared models* people carry in their minds for perceiving, relating to, and interpreting the world around them" (pp. 4–5). James March (1984) puts it this way:

We live by the interpretations we make, become better or worse through the meanings we impute to events and institutions. Our lives change when our beliefs change. Administrators manage the way the sentiments, expectations, commitments, and faiths of individuals concerned with the organization fit into a structure of social beliefs about organizational life. Administrative theory probably underestimates the significance of this belief structure for effective organizations. As a result, it probably underestimates the extent to which the management of symbols is a part of effective administration [p. 32].

One way to examine prevailing and competing mindsapes is by using metaphors. Metaphors are shortcuts to understanding and are particularly useful for comparing different understandings of the same thing. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explain, in the world of metaphors truth is both subjective and objective. Truth is always

subjective between conceptual systems and only objective within them. In the section that follows I will use metaphors to show how mindscapes work and to gauge views of important teaching, learning, and school issues—views that will affect how we will lead, why we will lead, and where our leadership will take us.

Exposing Mindscapes

There are risks in exposing mindscapes. Most of us have a great deal invested in the ways we presently do things. The large high school is a good example. Despite the overwhelming amount of research that tells us that by and large small schools are good for students, there is still much resistance. It would be unfair to characterize all high schools the same way or to impute the same motivations to their leaders. Still, principals of large high schools do enjoy considerable prestige—prestige that many find worth protecting. The large middle management teams usually found in large high schools have worked hard to get their jobs and no doubt want to keep them. Some career-bound assistant principals, for example, view their jobs as stepping stones to getting their own principalships. Rarely do they pay attention to the research on school size. Instead, those who want to protect the large high school point to the array of offerings that such a school can provide students, to the belief that large high schools are cost-effective (Gregory, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1996), to the community politics that may arise if changes are made, and to other alleged advantages. Perhaps the words of Carlina Rinaldi can help us think differently:

Often in our work, and in our lives, we tend to look for confirmation of what we think and what we believe. We identify our selves with our ideas and our theories. To change our minds, to reconsider our basic theories and beliefs so as to see their limitations, is often perceived as a personal defeat. Often the ensuing crisis is experienced as a loss rather than as the beginning of something new.

The fact is that we are too firmly attached to our theories and to our ideas and thus we often close the door to new ways of seeing and understanding [Rinaldi, 2003, p. x].

Marching Bands and Soccer Teams

In some ways we take the value of building community in schools for granted. Everyone seems to say they are for community and the literature is full of references to schools as communities. Is community worth all the attention it is getting? Do schools really need the benefits of community to be effective? The answers to these questions depend on your view of the school. Picture, for example, two metaphors for the school—the marching band and the soccer team. Within the marching band, school personnel march in unison—even lockstep—following a carefully prescribed script. The play of individual players is hidden by the band itself. Once the band begins its march, changing the route is difficult if not impossible. As it passes in review the band is judged good or bad according to a formula that examines the precision of the marching and the way notes are played. But it is hard for viewers to know why a rating is assigned. As accomplished musicians know, good music is played in between the lines rather than with the notes themselves.

Still, marching bands that play well have a number of advantages. When everyone plays the same way at the same time they often create an impressive, even thrilling, performance and make the bandleader a hero. Given today's school improvement policies, schools are beginning to look more and more like marching bands—and as a result, the principal as hero bandleader is becoming the dominant image for leadership—an image, by the way, that some principals find attractive. In the past they weren't quite sure of what to do in the classroom. They weren't quite sure of what this instructional leadership business was all about and they felt threatened as a result. Now, having been trained to read the band music in the same way and to read the marching script as well, our hero

bandleaders are able to tell what “good instruction” looks like and, to make things easier, it pretty much looks the same everywhere. They are trained to monitor and evaluate the band to be sure it is doing what it is supposed to do. All they have to do now is to figure out how to get people to follow the right directions and to teach the same things in pretty much the same ways. But scripting the band’s performance has its downside too.

We move in cycles in our understanding of school leadership. In the 1980s principals were supposed to be strong instructional leaders who were good at leading the band. During the 1990s principals were thought of as leaders of leaders who were supposed to develop the capacity and will of teachers so that they (the teachers) could be instructional leaders. This was a decade of teacher leadership and teacher quality. Here we are in another decade down the road writing standards for principals and providing principals with training so that they can once again be more effective instructional leaders, able to bring the bands that they lead to new heights of quality.

In the soccer team metaphor schools move more fluidly, making their way toward scoring goals by developing their practice as they go along, and in light of constantly changing streams of action. The game is governed by a few rules and a common framework, but no scripts. Players make lots of decisions on the spot as they evaluate the situations they face. The play of each player is public and accountability is built into the game itself (you can see who is doing what).

In marching bands community doesn’t matter all that much. Sure, we can use the language of community to be in vogue—but we don’t need community to make our schools work well. Sure, community can help build the band’s morale and esprit, but benefits are limited since virtually everything important is decided beforehand. Playing well requires following directions and being in step with those around you.

The soccer team, by contrast, can’t play successfully without the benefits of community that reach beyond esprit—benefits that bond players together as they are bound to common commitments so that

mentally and physically their play is both flexible and coordinated at the same time. Success depends on the development of communities of learners, communities of practice, and communities of responsibility. These are real communities—not the communities of cheerleaders that march on the sidelines urging the band along.

Community as a Theory of Practice

When we live in a soccer team world we have no choice but to use community as our theory of practice. Why is this the case? Because community provides the glue that holds everything together. In the marching band, by contrast, things are held together by the official script and by the skilled supervision of the bandleader. Community serves the soccer team as a substitute for marching orders, for patterns to produce, and once play is under way even for the bandleader. Community provides the connections that players need for both individual and team play. Leadership from the sidelines counts, but its focus is on helping players become more self-learning, self-managing, and helpful to other players. Rare is the soccer team that does not depend on leadership from its players. Soccer coaches are quick to point out that leadership on the field as the game is actually being played wins games, not leadership on the sidelines or in the locker room.¹

¹ Jerald Hage and Charles Powers (1992) also use soccer as a metaphor but contrast it with baseball as follows: “Baseball is a highly scripted game. Adjusted responses to unfolding conditions are quite predictable. A person paying attention to the game can confidently predict what every player on the field will do if, for example, a fly ball is hit. Baseball emphasizes learning rules, not being creative. By contrast, it is far more difficult to predict what will happen as the ball goes into play in a game of basketball or soccer. Both are faster moving games that not only allow for more scenarios but also constrain players less in their selection of scenarios. These games require more complex imaginative rehearsal and more fluid adjusted response, and players need better interaction skills in order to accurately read opponents. They are games that offer more room for innovative responses and creativity. Consequently, they more accurately reflect the kinds of lives adults now lead” (pp. 69–70).

Communities share many characteristics (see, for example, Sergiovanni, 1994, 2001). They spring from common understandings that provide members with a sense of identity and involvement that results in the creation of a web of meaningful relationships with moral overtones. Community has many meanings but at root is the Latin *communis* and *communitas*. *Communis* means common, and *communitas* means fellowship. Thus say Carey and Frohnen (1998): “A true community . . . is one in which members share something in common—something important enough to give rise to fellowship . . . and to sustain it. There may be many kinds of communities with varying ends or goals. But each must form around characteristics, experiences, practices, and beliefs that are important enough to bind the members to one another, such that they are willing to sacrifice for one another as ‘fellows’ or sharers of a common fate” (p. 1–2).

Here is the picture: When people gather together to share ideas and commit themselves to these ideas their relationships change—they have made promises to each other and are likely to feel morally obliged to keep their promises. Communities embody civic virtue—the willingness of people to sacrifice their self-interest on behalf of the common good. And this virtue is the reason why communities can be so powerful in uniting parents, teachers, and students in common purpose. And, if researchers are to be believed, this common purpose provides the focus and the moral commitment that contributes to school effectiveness (see, for example, Bryk and Driscoll, 1988; Hill, Foster, and Gendler, 1990; Hill and Celio, 1998). But none of this community business makes sense if our mindscape is that of the marching band rather than the soccer team.

Management Mindscapes

Traditional management theory is based on a view of how schools operate that does not fit the real world very well. When leadership practices are based on this view they don’t work the way they are

supposed to. Traditional management assumes that by and large schools are “managerially tight and culturally loose.” According to this theory, what counts in improving schools is management of connections, not people. When this is the case, the operation of schools resembles the mechanical workings of a clock—cogs and gears, wheels, drives, and pins, all tightly connected in an orderly and predictable manner. This is the “Clockwork I” theory of management.

Clockwork I school leaders believe that the purpose of leadership is to gain control over what people do and how they do it by regulating the master wheel and the master pin of their clockwork organization. This is sometimes done by introducing such ideas as a highly sequenced curriculum prescribed in excruciating detail, a testing program that narrows what is taught to such an extent that the test alone becomes the curriculum, a supervisory system for monitoring in detail what teachers do and for evaluating their teaching behaviors in a standard way, or a program that trains teachers to implement a specific teaching model thought to represent the “one best way.” Such highly refined and hyper-rational management systems are introduced to ensure that teachers will teach the way they are supposed to and students will be taught what they are supposed to learn. Unfortunately this rarely happens—at least not on a sustained and continuous basis and not without excessive monitoring and other enforcement efforts. When such a system does work, it gets people to do what they are supposed to but not more.

In 1976, the noted social psychologist Karl Weick wrote a seminal article for the *Administrative Science Quarterly* describing educational organizations as “loosely coupled systems.” His metaphor complements the work of Stanford University’s James G. March, who is recognized as one of America’s most eminent organizational scientists. March and a number of his colleagues have written extensively on the extent to which educational organizations resemble organized anarchies and on the link between

ambiguity and leadership (March and Olsen, 1976). These are concepts similar to loose coupling. Weick pointed out that in schools each of the parts that make up the whole are only loosely connected. What happens in one place seems to have little effect on what happens elsewhere. For example, a good deal of time and effort is spent in schools on developing curriculum. The curriculum that gets taught, however, tends not to be this official curriculum but the one that is in the minds and hearts of teachers. Administrators spend a good deal of time writing memos that are not read or that when read are often ignored. Models of teaching are adopted but don't find their way into the classroom on a sustained basis without constant monitoring.

Weick's observations and those of March provide an image of schools that function like a clockwork gone awry. We might refer to this image as the "Clockwork II" theory of management—a theory of cogs, gears, and pins all spinning independently of each other. The question is, of course, How does a leader bring about the needed coherence for schools to function in a sensible way? Using such control techniques as going for the main gear and pin as a management strategy just doesn't work, since the gears and pins are not tightly connected to each other or to any of the other parts. Instead the leader must rely on "cultural cement" to provide the necessary connections for coordination and control. The ingredients for cultural cement are the norms, values, beliefs, and purposes of people. Weick (1982) advises school leaders to "be attentive to the 'glue' that holds loosely coupled systems together because such forms are just barely systems" (p. 675). March (1984) similarly advises, "If we want to identify one single way in which administrators can affect organizations, it is through their effect on the worldviews that surround organizational life; those effects are managed through attention to the ritual and symbolic characteristics of organizations and their administration. Whether we wish to sustain the system or change it, management is a way of making a symbolic statement" (p. 32).

Instructional Coherence

No doubt a certain amount of standardization is unavoidable and even desirable. Newmann, Smith, Allensworth, and Bryk (2001), for example, found “a strong positive relationship between improving coherence and improving student achievement” (p. 305). They define instructional coherence as “a set of interrelated programs for students and staff that are guided by a common framework for curriculum, instruction, assessment, and learning climate and that are pursued over a sustained period” (p. 297). But there are vast differences between standardizing strategies that seek instructional and other kinds of coherence and hyper-rationality. State-mandated teacher evaluation systems that rely on lengthy lists of teaching behaviors that must be demonstrated by the teacher under observation are an example. By and large teachers willingly showboat required behaviors when they are being observed. However, the question for anyone concerned with wise use of taxpayers’ dollars and genuine school improvement is what happens when the evaluators are not there. As you can imagine, when no one is looking teachers teach in ways that make sense to them. Unfortunately for the Clockwork I thinkers the average elementary school teacher teaches about sixteen hundred lessons a year. Spending millions of dollars to be sure at least two or three of those lessons were done in a particular way just doesn’t make sense.

Despite the fact that policies and practices based on Clockwork I theory are costly and ineffectual, they persist because they provide the illusion of success. Too often politicians and bureaucrats settle for this illusion. If teachers are being vigorously evaluated, then presumably teaching must be getting better. Rarely, however, does one hear of a teacher getting fired as a result of being evaluated by a Clockwork I system. As Newmann, Smith, Allensworth, and Bryk (2001) point out, “Strong school-level leadership is central to the development of stronger instructional program coherence, but coherence achieved by administrative fiat is of questionable value

when it suppresses the development of equally essential supports for learning, such as teachers' professional community and shared ownership of an instructional program" (p. 311). Perhaps the answer is finding the right balance between a bureaucratic version of coherence that relies on *control* and a more professional version of coherence that relies on *commitment* (Rowan, 1990). But this balance cannot be an arbitrary cut of a deck of cards. A school's coherence strategy needs to have a clear identity and must be implemented with gusto if it is to work. The heartbeat of a school is strongest when commitment strategies are at the center and control strategies are at the periphery. Control strategies help ensure that the routines of learning get deliberate and systematic attention, while commitment strategies help ensure that authentic learning content and processes are mastered.

In sum, advocates of the Clockwork II theory argue that schools should not be viewed as managerially tight and culturally loose but as managerially loose and culturally tight. What matters most, they say, is not management connections but the beliefs, values, and norms that hold people together. Failure to recognize this inverse rule leads to the development of policies and school improvement strategies that are costly, inefficient, and ineffective.

Theories of Rationality

The mindscapes we hold about rationality are seminal to the development of our worldviews and foundational to our leadership practice. More often than not when competing views of educational issues and practices are debated it is because of different mindscapes that are creating differing realities, which in turn lead to different policies and to different practices.

When a school leader chooses a theory from which to practice, a particular image of rationality is assumed—whether or not it fits the real world. A better fit between theory and practice will occur by starting the other way around. Choose the image of rationality

that fits the real world first and then find a theory that fits that image of rationality.

Lee Shulman (1989, p. 171) provides three mindscapes of human rationality, each described briefly here. The following descriptions are slightly edited but essentially in Shulman's words. All three are true to a certain extent, but some are more true than others. It makes a difference which of the three or which combination of the three provides the strategic basis for one's leadership practice. Using a maximum of ten points, distribute the points across the three to reflect the extent to which you think each is true. If you think that #2 is not true but #1 and #3 are equally true, assign five points to 1 and 3 and no points to 2. Divide your points equally if you feel that each of the three is equally true.

1. *Humans are rational*; they think and act in a manner consistent with their goals, their self-interest, and what they have been rewarded for. If you wish them to behave in a given way, make the desired behavior clear to them and make it worth their while to engage in it.
2. *Humans are limited in their rationality*; they can make sense of only a small piece of the world at a time and they strive to act reasonably with respect to their limited grasp of facts and alternatives. They must, therefore, construct conceptions or definitions of situations rather than passively accept what is presented to them. If you wish them to change, engage them in active problem solving and judgment, don't just tell them what to do.
3. *Humans are rational only when acting together*; since individual reason is so limited, men and women find opportunities to work jointly on important problems, achieving through joint effort what individual reason and capacity could never accomplish. If you want them to change, develop ways in which they can engage in the change process jointly with peers.

The first mindscape of human rationality fits traditional management theories very well. The second and third mindscapes, by contrast, are better accommodated by the Clockwork II theory of management and a value-added approach to leadership. Within the second and third, rationality is achieved by helping people make sense of their world. As making sense builds, limits on rationality are overcome. The ability to make sense builds when people are able to construct their own definitions of situations and are involved with the leader in active problem solving. The limits, however, are too great for anyone to do it alone. Thus one key strategy for sense building is the pooling of human resources and the fostering of collegial values in an effort that expands individual reason and capacity to function. Linda Lambert's definition of constructivist leadership fits well here. To her, leadership is a reciprocal process that enables people to construct meanings that lead to shared purposes of schools (Lambert and others, 2002, p. 42).

Leadership and Rationality

When exercising leadership in accordance with the first view of rationality the leader emphasizes, in order, ends, ways, and means. First establish your objectives. Then, given your objectives, develop a plan that includes the proper management protocols for obtaining goals. These protocols should help figure out the best ways, the clearest paths that will logically and effectively lead to your ends. Next marshal your human resources. Figure out how you're going to orient, direct, train, motivate, and monitor them so that they follow the right paths. Provide the necessary expectations and the psychological support that will allow them to undertake their assigned responsibilities with ease. Ends-ways-means assumes a certain predictability, stability, and rationality that often does not exist in the real world. It fits, for example, a world that is always managerially tight and culturally loose; but when the world is managerially loose and culturally tight, ends-ways-means does not work

well. Furthermore, this view of planning places too much of the burden for school success on the principal or the designated leader. It becomes the leader's job to set the system up, to command compliance, and to provide the necessary controls to ensure compliance.

In a managerially loose and culturally tight world one needs to plan in reverse. Ends-ways-means must become means-ways-ends. Planning in reverse is consistent with the second and third mindscapes of rationality. Without losing sight of the overall vision the leader first emphasizes means, then moves to ways, and finally to ends. As Harvard Business School professor Robert H. Hayes (1985) points out, "An organization that takes a means-ways-ends approach to strategic planning assumes everybody is responsible for its prosperity. Its success rests on its ability to exploit opportunities as they arise, on its ingenuity and on its capacity to learn, on its determination and persistence" (p. 118). When planning in reverse the emphasis is on development of people, on building their talents and commitments, on linking them to colleagues so that together they are able to accomplish more, on encouraging their minds and hearts, and helping their hands. Once human resources are built up in both skill and heart, then the school is better able to acquire and develop new and better ways to function, to create opportunities, and to exploit circumstances in a manner that results in more effective school performance. Because of the unpredictability of the world and the limits of human rationality, it makes sense to emphasize building capabilities of people and then to encourage *them* to develop the ways and means for using their capabilities. Developing detailed plans first and then seeking the know-how and commitment from people to implement these plans will not work as well.

Planning in reverse is consistent with the second and third mindscapes of rationality. In my experience, both second and third views come close to the heartbeat of leadership and to the heartbeat of a school, and both provide an important source of authority for principals, teachers, and others to lead and learn together. What about

you? How did you distribute your points across the three? What are the reasons for your distribution? Can you recall instances from your experience that matched your distribution of points?

Know Thyself

You get what you see, you see what you expect, and you expect what you believe to be true. Karl Weick tells the story (cited in Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, and Lampel, 1998, pp. 159–160) of a military unit on maneuvers in the Alps that failed to return to base after two days in a snowstorm. On the third day the soldiers appeared. “Yes, they said, we considered ourselves lost and waited for the end. And one of us found a map in his pocket. That calmed us down. We pitched camp, lasted out the snowstorm, and through the map we discovered our bearings. And here we are. The lieutenant [who had dispatched the unit] borrowed this remarkable map and had a good look at it. He discovered to his astonishment that it was not a map of the Alps, but a map of the Pyrenees.” As Weick explains, “With the map in hand, no matter how crude it is, people encode what they see to conform as closely as possible to what is on the map. The map prefigures their perceptions, and they see what they expect to see. But, as discrepancies accumulate, they pay closer attention to what is in their immediate experience, look for patterns in it, and pay less attention to the map.”

Mindscapes operate a lot like maps. They shape our perceptions and we see what we expect to see. Mindscapes also have a stealth quality to them. Unnoticed, they frame the way we think and then provide us with a rationale for legitimizing our thoughts and actions. They work unknowingly and are difficult to escape from. Figuring out ways to help leaders break out is an important step in bringing about change. By paying attention to mindscapes and by knowing ourselves better we can free ourselves from their influence, thus seeing reality for what it really is. Consider this as an invitation for you to do the same as you read this book and as you reflect on your practice.