



# ПЕДАГОГІКА ВИЩОЇ ШКОЛИ: МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ, ТЕОРІЯ, ТЕХНОЛОГІЇ

ТОМ II

Київ 2011

**Рекомендовано до друку Рішенням Вченої ради  
Інституту вищої освіти НАПН України  
Протокол №7/7 від 5 вересня 2011 року**

**Редакційна колегія випуску:**

*Андрущенко В. П., Луговий В. І., Коцур В. П., Гошченко І. М., Степко М. Ф.,  
Левшин М. М., Євтух М. Б., Дем'яненко Н. М., Козлакова Г. О., Корольов Б. І.,  
Корсак К. В., Мазоха Д. С., Маноха І. П., Михальченко М. І., Онкович Г. В.,  
Рук С. М., Уваркіна О. В., Ярошовець В. І.*

**Відповідальний редактор випуску:**

*Левшин М. М., Мазоха Д. С.*

**Підготовка до друку:**

*Титаренко Н. Ю., Яковина А. В.*

Вища освіта України №3 (додаток 1) – 2011 р. – Тематичний випуск «Педагогіка вищої школи: методологія, теорія, технології». – Т. 1. – 636 с.

*У тематичному випуску часопису «Вища освіта України» вміщені наукові статті фахівців з питань методології, теорії та технологій педагогіки вищої школи.*

*Співвідношення філософії освіти та педагогіки вищої школи, напрямки уточнення предмету, обґрунтування змісту, умов здійснення компетентнісного підходу, виокремлення інноваційних чинників її розвитку; конструювання моделей «ідеально випускника» та «ідеального викладача» вищих навчальних закладів; результати досліджень по реалізації технологічного підходу у вищій освіті та надання їй особистісно зорієнтованої спрямованості – ось далеко не повний спектр проблем та питань, до висвітлення та спроби розв'язання яких звертаються автори випуску.*

*Особлива увага загострюється обґрунтуванню філософії освіти як духовній падагмі модернізації вищих навчальних закладів, методологічній основі педагогіки вищої школи.*

*Публікації тематичного збірника адресовані науковцям, дослідникам психолого-педагогічних та управлінських проблем розвитку освітньої справи в Україні та за її межами.*

**Видавництво не несе відповідальності  
за орфографічні та стилістичні помилки авторів**

Підп. до друку 10.10.2011 р. Формат 60x80<sup>1/16</sup>  
Папір офісний. №1. Друк оперативний. Гарнітура ArialСур.  
Ум. друк. арк. 41,86. Обл.-вид. арк. 40,69.

**Друк та поліграфія СПД Ятченко А.Д.**

<b>Н.В. Гузій.</b> Науково-методичні засади формування основ професіоналізму майбутніх педагогів у системі багатоступеневої дидактичної підготовки .....	320
<b>О.С. Ісак.</b> Академічна мобільність студентів і викладачів у педагогічній освіті України в контексті євроінтеграційних процесів .....	326
<b>І.О. Ковпак.</b> Поняття «міждисциплінарність»: термінологічний дискурс .....	334
<b>Є.О. Лодатко.</b> Педагогічні моделі, педагогічне моделювання і педагогічнівимірювання: that is that? .....	339
<b>Д.С. Мазоха.</b> Професіоналізм педагогічної діяльності соціального педагога .....	344
<b>О.А. Невмержицький.</b> Виховний потенціал сучасного вищого навчального закладу .....	351
<b>К.І. Неговська.</b> Аналіз психолого-педагогічного аспекту формування професійної етики майбутнього інженера-педагога .....	358
<b>Н.П. Онищенко.</b> Удосконалення управління виховною роботою на кафедрі в сучасних умовах функціонування ВНЗ .....	364
<b>Г.І. Остапенко.</b> Застосування інноваційних методів навчання для самостійної роботи студентів вузу .....	371
<b>Ю.Г. Підборський.</b> Тестування як форма оцінки навчальної діяльності та моніторингу знань, умінь та навичок студентів .....	377
<b>М.А. Пригодій.</b> Педагогічні умови підготовки майбутніх учителів технологій до профільного навчання учнів .....	388
<b>М.Ю. Прокоф'єва.</b> Формування професійного досвіду студентів в умовах модернізації вищої освіти .....	395
<b>Л.М. Різняк.</b> Діагностика освітніх результатів у педагогічних вищих навчальних закладах .....	401
<b>С.А. Свіжевська.</b> Акредитація: дамоклів меч чи modus vivendi? .....	408
<b>О. М. Сергійчук.</b> Концептуальні проблеми підготовки майбутнього педагога у вищих навчальних закладах України .....	415
<b>Л.А. Соколовська.</b> Персоніфікація діяльності колегіумів України XVIII ст. ....	423
<b>Н.Ю. Титаренко.</b> Технологія формування проєктивних вмінь у майбутніх викладачів вищих навчальних закладів .....	432
<b>Л.С. Токарук.</b> Розвиток інклюзивної освіти: особлива система навчання в Україні .....	439
<b>О.С. Третяк.</b> Формування готовності пенітенціарного персоналу до педагогічної діяльності .....	445
<b>К.Г. Трибулькевич.</b> Проблема студентського самоврядування в історико-педагогічних та соціолого-психологічних дослідженнях .....	452
<b>Г.М. Черненко.</b> Науково-дослідна діяльність студентів як одна із основних чинників підготовки майбутніх учителів початкової школи .....	460
<b>М.Г. Чобітько.</b> Визначення професіоналізму майбутнього вчителя в процесі особистісно орієнтованої професійної підготовки .....	465
<b>T.I. Shalimova.</b> Distributed leadership: conceptual principles and the peculiarities of its realization in the system of secondary education in the USA .....	476



## DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP: CONCEPTUAL PRINCIPLES AND THE PECULIARITIES OF ITS REALIZATION IN THE SYSTEM OF SECONDARY EDUCATION IN THE USA

**Summary.** The article focuses on distributed leadership and its main aspects in school management: school leaders collaboration and team work. The analysis and results of the empirical study in general educational institutions of the USA are explored. Peculiarities of its realization in the system of secondary education in the USA are researched.

**Keywords:** distributed leadership, school, team work, involvement.

**Резюме.** Стаття зосереджує увагу на дистрибутивному шкільному лідерстві та найважливіших аспектах освітнього менеджменту: співробітництві та роботі шкільних лідерів у команді. Розглядаються концептуальні принципи дистрибутивного лідерства та особливості його реалізації в системі середньої освіти США.

**Ключові слова:** дистрибутивне лідерство, школа, робота у команді, залучення.

**Резюме.** Статья сосредотачивает внимание на дистрибутивном школьном лидерстве и наиболее важных аспектах образовательного менеджмента: сотрудничестве и работе школьных лидеров в команде. Рассматриваются концептуальные принципы дистрибутивного лидерства и особенности его реализации в системе среднего образования США.

**Ключевые слова:** дистрибутивное лидерство, школа, работа в команде, вовлечение.

**Problem Stating.** School leadership is now an education policy priority around the world. Increased school autonomy and a greater focus on schooling and school results have made it essential to reconsider the role of school leaders. There is much room for improvement to professionalise school leadership, to support current school leaders and to make school leadership an attractive career for future candidates. The ageing of current principals and the widespread shortage of qualified candidates to replace them after retirement make it imperative to take action.

In the current climate of No Child Left Behind and other policy pressures to improve student achievement in our nation's public schools, much of the accountability falls on school leaders. In addition to management tasks, school leaders are increasingly called upon to act as instructional leaders. Districts take a variety of approaches to addressing this challenge, ranging from efforts to improve the content knowledge of their leaders to setting up formal structures to distribute the instructional leadership in the form of instructional coaches and lead teachers. Because it is impossible for principals to meet all of the instructional needs of a school, principals often distribute leadership across people, routines, and tools. If the power in a school typically lies with the principal, how then does this distribution impact the power relationships in a school? This paper is part of a symposium that addresses this question.

Contemporary educational reform places a great premium upon the relationship between leadership and school improvement. The dominant message from the research base is unequivocal – effective leaders exercise an indirect but powerful influence on the effectiveness of the school and on the achievement of students.

**Recent Researches.** It is for this reason that «leadership» has generated an enormous amount of interest among researchers and practitioners. A vast literature on school leadership and leadership theory exists [7; p.12]. Yet, despite a substantial research base, a singular, overarching theory of leadership has proved to be elusive.

While researchers in many countries continue to produce a steady stream of empirical evidence about school leadership, this endless accumulation of findings still has not produced a consensus around effective leadership practice. The sheer proliferation of leadership theories, styles or approaches presented in the literature undoubtedly contributes to the confusion. There appear to be as many perspectives on school leadership as those who research and write about it. Furthermore, it is difficult to discern exactly how alternative theoretical positions differ.

For example, the differences between «instructional leadership», «learner-centred leadership» and 'pedagogical leadership' are not entirely self-evident. They embrace similar concepts and endorse a model of leadership chiefly concerned with improving teaching and learning. But how far they adequately reflect the reality of contemporary leadership practice is also debatable, as there is a significant lack of contemporary empirical evidence supporting these particular leadership perspectives. It has been suggested that much of the literature fails to accurately reflect leadership practices in schools and has over-relied upon the accounts of head teachers to define effective leadership in action [15; 54].

Anyone who looks at the leadership literature will find that, with a few exceptions, empirical studies of leadership practice at other levels, or from other perspectives, remain somewhat rare. It is for this reason that models of leadership derived from, and premised upon, the leadership practice of one person are currently under scrutiny.

A powerful force in the quest for alternative and authentic perspectives on leadership practice is the notion of 'distributed leadership', which is currently receiving much attention and growing empirical support. In their recent review of successful school improvement efforts, Glickman et al. construct a composite list of the characteristics of what they term the «improving school», a school that continues to improve student learning outcomes for all students over time. At the top of this list appears varied sources of leadership, including distributed leadership.

Similarly, research by Silns and Mulford has shown that student outcomes are more likely to improve where leadership sources are distributed throughout the school community, and where teachers are empowered in areas of importance to them [18; 90].

In contrast to traditional notions of leadership premised upon an individual managing hierarchical systems and structures, distributed leadership is

characterised as a form of collective leadership, in which teachers develop expertise by working collaboratively. This distributed view of leadership requires schools to «de-centre» the leader [6; 330] and to subscribe to the view that leadership resides «not solely in the individual at the top, but in every person at every level who in one way or another, acts as a leader» [5; 52]. Distributed leadership therefore means multiple sources of guidance and direction, following the contours of expertise in an organisation, made coherent through a common culture. It is the «glue» of a common task or goal- improvement of instruction-and a common frame of values for how to approach that task.

The Aim of the article is to research the term distributed school leadership and the methods of its realization in the system of Secondary education in the USA.

**The Main Material.** This is not to suggest that no one is ultimately responsible for the overall performance of the organisation or to render those in formal leadership roles redundant. Instead, the job of those in formal leadership positions is primarily to hold the pieces of the organisation together in a productive relationship. Their central task is to create a common culture of expectations around the use of individual skills and abilities. In short, distributing leadership equates with maximising the human capacity within the organisation.

The ability to use data to improve student learning is one of the contentious aims of current education policy. This paper uses a distributed leadership framework and social network analysis to introduce two approaches to the design of school information systems: Prescriptive data systems designed to give teachers answers to instructional questions; and discretionary data systems are designed to help teachers ask the right questions about instruction. While each of these approaches has been used for using data to improve student learning, each approach is built on radically different assumptions about who should make decisions about assessment, teaching and learning.

A distributed leadership perspective can be used to reveal how leaders create and assemble artifacts to influence patterns of professional interaction in schools [19; 47]. In each of these case-based examples, the intentional relation of structures to action implies that power must be used to compel, either through mandate or persuasion, school professionals to interact in intended ways. Discussion of how school leaders use power have tended to focus on how power is misused – from creating coercive institutional systems to outright interpersonal oppression and aggression. This emphasis on the negative consequences of power can miss the showing how leaders must necessarily use power and authority to successfully lead schools.

Since it is often viewed that leadership and power are synonymous, a safe assumption would be that the formal leaders in a school have the power – the principal, assistant principals, etc. Traditional views of leadership tend to support this assumption by focusing attention on the individual leader. Distributed leadership theory extends beyond characteristics of the leader to consider the activity of leadership [16; 38]. If leadership extends beyond the one leader with power, does this mean that power extends beyond the designated leader as well? And if so, how?

Schools are made up of a variety of individuals who act out different roles within organizational routines. These roles are sometimes formally defined



(principal, coach) and also informally defined (a lead math teacher who arises from the first grade team).

Regardless of whether defined by formal title or informal authority, all individuals in schools have agency. This paper takes a distributed perspective to examine issues of power and instructional leadership practice in one K-8 public inner city school. Through a case study approach, this paper seeks to understand how agency plays a part in the power dynamic of leadership practice in math and language arts. I argue that instructional leadership practice is influenced not only by school leaders and teacher leaders, but also by followers. Leaders create the conditions for improved teaching and learning in their schools.

When considering issues of power in schools, one place to look is at the direct interactions between leaders and teachers by asking questions such as do teachers have power in the school? Is that genuine power? If the leaders build the structures that enable teacher leadership, the people in the school have to enact those routines, use those tools, and participate. An examination into the ways in which teachers choose to participate (or not) offers us one window into this power dynamic.

Schools are hungry for leaders who can transform the school culture for the better. The distributed leadership theory holds that educational leadership is often not held in one person, but is instead distributed among multiple individuals. A body of leadership has multiple individuals who have the tools and skills to contribute to the success of the organization.

Distributed leadership is also called team leadership, shared leadership or democratic leadership. In some situations, a school has multiple leaders. In other situations, leadership is not a specific position but is instead an attribute that arises in different individuals throughout the organization. Distributed leadership focuses on leadership practice rather than specific leadership roles. These leadership practices occur when those in authoritative and subordinate positions interact with each other.

With distributed leadership, responsibilities are distributed among multiple staff members. For example, an upper-level administrator might periodically visit an organization to evaluate and provide feedback to a teacher. However, other administrators in the organization might not view this evaluation period as enough to effectively develop the staff member under review and might arrange for lower-level administrator to also evaluate the staff member more frequently.

Helen S. Timperley argued in Curriculum Studies that schools should not rely on one leader to solve all the problems in a particular school because few individuals have these abilities. Also, any policy modifications made by the leader will fall apart when the leader is not available to maintain these modifications. However, if the changes are implemented by several leaders who agree to the changes, these leaders can all work together to maintain them. Also, instead of managing these modifications, leaders can change the norms, principals and beliefs held by the members of the school so that all the staff members will maintain the changes. But to change these beliefs, the leadership must change the overall school culture, which can only occur through face-to-face interactions.

Leithwood, et al. viewed distributed leadership as a subset of transformational leadership. Spillane, et al., on the other hand, argued that all forms of leadership are distributed. Transformational leadership refers to leadership that stands in contrast to the more traditional transactional leadership, where the leader delegates tasks to subordinates. With transformational leadership, the leader is instead focused on bringing about positive changes within the staff members.

The concept of leadership with «multiple sources», in which leadership authority does not lie with one single individual but can be transferred to others, can apply to teachers, parents and community members, and district leadership [7; 12]. Assigning elements of shared leadership to the relationship between districts and schools has shown to have benefits in creating a collaborative relationship between district and school leaders and, in turn, transforming schools. Although certain goals, standards, and assessments can be determined at the district level, removing the top-down approach in supporting schools to meet the goals and standards can promote the same type of self-motivation and autonomy on the part of schools. Therefore, we propose that the distributed, inclusive leadership model also can be applied at the district level.

The Southern Regional Education Board (2009) surveyed school principals in both high- and low-performing schools regarding the relationship between the district office and the school leadership. They found a more collaborative relationship existed for the principals in high-performing schools; the school principal was allowed more flexibility and control over decisions made for the school. Yet, the district office's responsibilities to these schools also expanded. In other words, in high-performing schools, the district office gave up some control but also took on more tasks to support their schools. In the low-performing schools, the principals complained of a very centralized district office; the school principals felt the district did not empower or develop their leadership capacity.

Two recent studies of successful school leadership have reinforced the importance of distributed leadership practice in securing and sustaining school improvement. In 1999 the NAHT (National Association of Head Teachers) in England commissioned research to identify, examine successful leadership practice in schools [8; 285]. In 2001 the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) funded research that explored successful leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances. Both studies offer a contemporary view of successful leadership and provide insights into current leadership practices in schools.

The central message emanating from both studies was that successful heads recognised the limitation of a singular leadership approach and saw their leadership role as being primarily concerned with empowering others to lead.

The NAHT research revealed that, although the heads were at different stages in their careers, of different ages, had different experiences and were working in very different situations, their approaches to leadership were remarkably similar. The evidence from this study pointed towards a form of leadership that was distributed through collaborative and joint working. The evidence showed that these successful heads led both the cognitive and the affective lives of the school, combining structural (developing clear goals), political (building alliances) and educational leadership (professional



development and teaching improvement) with symbolic leadership principles (presence, inspiration) and distributed leadership practice (empowering others to lead). They were primarily transformational leaders who built self-esteem, enhanced professional competence and gave their staff the confidence and responsibility to lead development and innovation.

The second contemporary study of successful school leadership also investigated leadership practice within a group of ten schools designated by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) as «facing challenging circumstances». In all ten schools the research found that distributed approaches to leadership prevailed and directly influenced approaches to problem solving and decision-making. While heads' responses to problems varied, depending on the circumstance or situation, their value position remained consistently one of involving and consulting pupils, staff and parents.

Within the study, the heads saw the agency of staff and students as central to achieving the school's purpose. The heads used a number of strategies for distributing leadership. These included involving others in decision-making; allocating important tasks to teachers and rotating leadership responsibilities within the school. They had deliberately chosen to distribute leadership responsibility to others and had put in place systems and incentives to ensure this happened. Their leadership was underpinned by a set of core personal values that included the modelling and promotion of respect (for individuals), fairness and equality, caring for the well-being and the development of students and staff.

In all cases, they remained important gatekeepers to change and development, guiding their schools in a clear and purposeful direction. Their approach to leadership was not one of «delegated headship», where unwanted tasks are handed down to others. In contrast, they distributed leadership activity through a redistribution of power within the organisation, by giving those who did not occupy «formal» leadership positions responsibility for major and important development tasks.

The heads adopted highly creative approaches to tackling the complex demands of implementing multiple changes. The decision to work with, and through, teams, as well as individuals, was a common response to the management of change. From the perspectives of those within the school community, teachers, parents, governors, and pupils, the overarching message was one of the heads leading their schools through primarily developing and involving others.

Both studies point towards an emerging model of leadership that is less concerned with individual capabilities, skills and talents and more preoccupied with creating collective responsibility for leadership action and activity. The focus is less upon the characteristics of «the leader» and more upon creating shared contexts for learning and developing leadership capacity.

But how do schools achieve distributed leadership? What do formal leaders do to promote distributed leadership? It would be naïve to assume that the structural, cultural and micro-political barriers operating in schools would simply fall away to accommodate and support distributed leadership. Consequently, the difficulties of adopting models of distributed leadership in practice should not be underestimated or simply ignored.

The success or otherwise of distributed leadership within a school can be influenced by a number of interpersonal factors, such as relationships with other teachers and school management. The importance of these is evident, both with respect to teachers' ability to influence colleagues and with respect to developing productive relations with school management, who may in some cases feel threatened by teachers taking on leadership roles. There may also, on occasion, be conflicts between groups of teachers, such as those that do, and do not, take on leadership roles, which can lead to estrangement among teachers.

Research has shown that colleagues can, at times, be hostile to distributed leadership because of factors such as inertia, over-cautiousness and insecurity. Overcoming these difficulties will require a combination of strong interpersonal skills on the part of the «teacher leader» and a school culture that encourages change and leadership from teachers.

Clearly, more empirical evidence is required about the ways in which distributed leadership currently operates in schools. We need to know more about how it is developed and promoted. In particular, we need to know if, and how, it contributes to better teaching and learning processes in schools. A new project funded by the General Teaching Council and the National Union of Teachers proposes to address these questions by collecting data from schools where forms of distributed leadership are operating successfully. The project commences in October 2002 and will be primarily concerned with the ways in which teacher leadership contributes to school improvement.

We are currently seeking the involvement of schools in this project and would welcome any suggestions or recommendations about schools to approach.

**Conclusion.** The research bears out that successful school transformation is characterized by strong school leaders who achieve dramatic results by intensely focusing all available resources on improving student learning. Until now, we have not seen such singular focus across the system (federal, state, and local) on the twin components of school transformation: leadership and instruction. The federal investment in turning around chronically low-performing schools signals a commitment to give states, struggling districts, and schools the funding support to reinvent models for building effective leadership and instructional capacity. States and districts, in turn, are urged to marshal all available resources (e.g., time, funding, and human capital) at the district and school levels to support the transformation of our most distressed schools. This mission-driven approach is supported by district leaders and involves teachers in focused, sustained, data-driven, and collaborative work that engages all parties in the school's mission to improve student achievement.

It takes a skilled leader to be able to walk the tightrope of balancing authority with shared leadership. More importantly, school and district leaders must be able to transform processes, practices, and procedures to sustain the vision of high standards for student achievement in a supportive climate long after the leaders are gone. Truly successful leadership is measured by the endurance of improvement efforts. When an inclusive, strategic leadership approach is practiced at both the district and school levels, the possibilities of wide-scale improvements and sustained student achievement are attainable

## References:

1. Barth, P., Haycock, K., Jackson, H., Mora, K., Ruiz, P., Robinson, S., & Wilkins, A. Artist. *Dispelling the Myth. High Poverty Schools Exceeding Expectations.* Day, C. Harris, A. Hadfield M. Tolley, H. Beresford, J. *Leading Schools in Times of Change.* Milton Keynes Open University Press. – 2000. – 194p.
2. Elmore, R. *Building a New Structure for School Leadership.* Washington, The Albert Shanker Institute. – 2000. – P. 12-138.
3. Foster, R. 'Constructivist leadership in the high school', Article presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. – 2001. – P. 73-82.
4. Goleman, D. (2002). *The New Leaders :Transforming the Art of Leadership into the science of results,* London, Little Brown.
5. Gronn, P. (2000). *Distributed Properties: A New Architecture for Leadership,* Educational Management and Administration, Vol. 28, No. 3, p.317-338.
6. Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. (1996). 'Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: a critical review of empirical research'. 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly.* 32 (1) P. – 5-44.
7. Harris, A. Jamieson, I. M. & Russ, J. (1995). 'A Study of effective departments in secondary schools', *School Organisation,* 15, p. 283-299.
8. Harris, A. and Chapman, C. (2002). *Effective Leadership in Schools Facing Challenging Circumstances,* Final Report, NCSL.
9. Harris, A. and Lambert, L. (forthcoming). *Building Leadership Capacity for School Improvement,* Milton Keynes, Open University Press. – 2004. – 295p.
10. Jackson, D. (forthcoming) 'Building Leadership Capacity-Simple, Complex, Paradoxical Necessary' in Harris, A. and Lambert, L., *Building Leadership Capacity for School Improvement,* Bucks, OU Press.
11. Morrison, K. *School Leadership and Complexity Theory,* London Routledge Falmer. – 2002. – 204p.
12. Ovando, M. (1996). 'Teacher Leadership: Opportunities and Challenges', *Planning and Changing* 27(1/2): p – 30-44.
13. Owens, R. (2001). *Organisational Behaviour in Education: Instructional leadership and school reform,* Needham Heights, MA. Allyn and Bacon.
14. Rasik, T. and Swanson, A. (2001). *Fundamental Concepts of Educational Leadership.* Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice Hall Inc.
15. Sammons, P. Thomas, S. and Mortimore, P. (1997). *Forging Links: Effective Schools and Effective Departments.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
16. Sergiovanni, T. ( 2001). *Leadership: What's in it for Schools?* London, Routledge Falmer.
17. Silns, H. and Mulford, B. (2002). 'Leadership and School Results', *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration* (in press).
18. Spillane, J., Halverson, R. and Diamond, J. 'Towards a Theory of Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective', Northwestern University, Institute for Policy Research Working Article. – 2001. – 156p.