

Analysis of the Relationship between Shared Leadership and Distributed Leadership

Suleyman GOKSOY*

Suggested Citation:

Goksoy, S. (2016). Analysis of the relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 65, 295-312
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.65.17>

Abstract

Problem Statement: The current study's purpose is: First, to examine the relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership, which, despite having many similar aspects in theory and practice, are defined as separate concepts. Second, to compare the two approaches and dissipate the theoretical contradictions. In this sense, the main aim of the study is to examine administrators' shared leadership and distributed leadership levels, the relationships between shared leadership and distributed leadership, and the predictive power of shared leadership over distributed leadership.

Purpose of Study: The aim of the study is to examine, compare, and remove the specified conceptual contradictions between the distributed leadership and shared leadership, many similar aspects of which are highlighted despite their different nominations.

Method: The study utilized a relational survey model and causal design to examine the relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership and the predictive power of shared leadership over distributed leadership. In the current study, shared leadership and its sub dimensions were regarded as the independent variable, whereas distributed leadership was used as the dependent variable in the context of causal research design.

Findings and Results: The findings of the study show that according to participant views, administrators have high levels of shared leadership and distributed leadership; however, the levels are not very high. Based on the perception of participants, there is a positive, medium-level, and

* Assoc. Prof. Dr. Duzce University, Faculty of Education, goksoys@hotmail.com.

significant relationship between the Shared Leadership Scale and the Distributed Leadership Scale. Therefore, we can argue that there is a relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership, but this relationship is not very distinctive. It is observed that all these leadership concepts are close to one another in meaning and can be used interchangeably. The results of this study suggest using the term “collective leadership” instead to bridge the gap between distributed leadership and shared leadership and prevent cognitive complexity. According to participant views, administrators have high levels of shared leadership and distributed leadership; however, the levels are not very high. There is a relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership, but this relationship is not very distinctive.

Recommendations: Therefore, it can be argued that shared leadership and distributed leadership approaches are separate leadership approaches and that it is not suitable to use them interchangeably, although they share many common points.

Keywords: Leadership, distributed leadership, shared leadership

Introduction

Today situational leadership and more recent leadership theories explain the concept of sharing leadership functions with the help of concepts like “*distributed leadership*,” (Spillane and Diamond, 2007; Gronn, 2002; Baloglu, 2011; Korkmaz & Gunduz, 2011; Ozer & Beycioglu, 2013; Hulpia, Devos & Rosseel, 2009; Ozdemir, 2012; Elmore, 2000; Halverson & Clifford, 2013; Brown, 1989) and “*shared leadership*,” (Kocolowski, 2010; Judge & Ryman, 2001; Sergiovanni, 1995; Yilmaz, 2013; Bakir, 2013; Bostanci, 2012; Ozer & Beycioglu, 2013) and they regard the notion of leadership as something bigger than the sum of the knowledge and abilities of one individual.

Sharing leadership roles is not a new concept (Hoy & Miskel, 2012), and it is a leadership approach used since the 1950s (Gibb 1954; Gronn, 2002). Scientists especially in the field of education have focused on shared leadership since the 1990s and have started to undertake numerous studies (Gronn, 2002). However, the concept and approaches of distributed leadership has still been explained with notions such as “self-leadership/super leadership/shared leadership” (Bostanci, 2012). A relatively new approach of sharing the functions of leadership—especially in Turkey—has brought conceptual confusion in various regards. When recent studies undertaken in Turkey in this field are investigated, it is observed that the shared leadership concept is preferred in place of distributed leadership (Bakir, 2013; Yilmaz, 2013; Bostanci, 2012) and sharing leadership functions is examined under the heading of distributed leadership (Oguz, 2010; Baloglu, 2011; Ozdemir, 2012).

Ozer and Beycioglu (2013) developed a scale regarding shared leadership in primary schools. Also, Bostanci (2012) adapted the “Shared Leadership Perception Scale” to Turkish. Baloglu’s (2011) study, titled “Distributed Leadership: A

Leadership Approach that Needs to be Taken into Consideration at Schools," addresses the distributed leadership theory based on its relationship with other theories. Baloglu analyzes the theory in the framework of the staunchest pioneers of the approach, such as Gronn (2000), Spillane (2005), and Elmore (2000). Korkmaz and Gunduz (2011) aimed to present teacher views regarding the distributed leadership behaviors of primary school administrators in their study, "Primary School Administrators' Distributed Leadership Representation Levels." Study results show that teachers believed that primary school administrators displayed high levels of distributed leadership behaviors. In his study, Yilmaz (2013) aimed to identify primary school administrators' shared leadership behavior levels. Research results presented that primary school teachers found primary school administrators' distributed leadership behavior levels to be high. According to Bakir's (2013) analysis between teachers' shared leadership and organizational commitment perceptions, it was found that there was a positive, high, and significant relationship between private and state primary school teachers' perceptions of shared leadership in general as a whole and their organizational commitment perceptions.

International studies regarding the use of shared and distributed leadership concepts show that distributed leadership (Bolden, 2011; Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2000, 2002a, 2002b; Harris, 2004; Harris & Spillane, 2008; Bennett et al., 2003) and shared leadership (Carson et al., 2007; Pearce & Sims, 2001; Small & Rentsch, 2010) concepts are different from each other and are utilized according to different theoretical foundations. Details are provided below regarding both types of leadership.

Shared Leadership

As presented in literature, shared leadership practice is not related to the knowledge and skills of only one leader, but a participative perspective in which individuals and situations interact with each other. Leadership process and its success is a product of leaders, observers, and the situations that these individuals take part in (Spillane, 2005). Shared leadership is defined as a modern leadership approach internalized through voluntary cooperation and interaction based on the competencies of all stakeholders and a sense of responsibility. The important part in shared leadership is not the formal position or role of individuals, but their knowledge and competencies regarding the topic. Shared leadership reflects the culture of working in unity presented by shared leadership behaviors by all stakeholders (Bakir, 2013). Such an organization is composed of individuals who trust each other's knowledge and experiences, are active in the participatory process, open to change and innovation, productive, and inclined to exchange ideas (Gronn, 2000; Harris, 2003).

Therefore, the shared leadership approach is related to the participation of many individuals in leadership activities. It is more than one leader's knowledge and experiences; it is rather the product of many individuals and the relationships among them by combining all the leaders in a school and taking their activities into account (Harris, 2005; Spillane, 2005). Compared to an orchestra that is always led by a maestro, Schlechty (2005) likens this type of leadership to a jazz group led by one of the musicians based on the rhythm of the moment. This type of leadership requires paying attention to the process of shared commitments, beliefs, and values. The Table below summarizes the structure of shared leadership:

Table 1.*Shared Leadership*

The oldest reference regarding this subject is Gibb's "Leadership" article which was published in 1954 (Bakir, 2013).
It contributes to the increased quality of schools and allows schools to transform into learning organizations (Bakir, 2013).
The need for distributed leadership arises from the fact that the approach of a "hero leader," who can solve all of the problems by himself/herself and who has unlimited competencies, has started to collapse. Therefore the high level and complex demands from management cannot be met anymore (Hartley, 2007; Bakir, 2013).
Organizational initiatives cannot be directed by only one leader, and all activities, actions and power in the organization should be shared (Harris, 2003)
The important thing in shared leadership is not the individual's formal position or role, but his/her knowledge and skills. Shared leadership reflects the culture of working in unity presented by shared leadership behaviors by all stakeholders (Bakir, 2013).
The idea of shared decisions and democratization of schools is dominant.
It is stated that parents, students, teachers, administrators, and even the public should participate in the process for successful educational leadership (Bolden, Petrov and Gosling, 2009).
The number of studies showing a strong relationship between this approach and positive organizational change is increasing day by day (Harris et al., 2008).
Since the organization is bigger than the sum of its parts, it has to be regarded together with all the stakeholders involved (Gronn, 2000).
The thesis that sharing leadership functions will increase the effectiveness of the organization under all conditions (Katz & Kahn, 1966) has been accepted.
Decisions taken with the help of distributed leadership practices may be more effective than decisions taken by individual leadership practices (Yukl, 1999).
Distributed leadership provides teachers with the opportunities to become leaders in different scales, times, and formats (Frost & Harris, 2003).

Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership is distributing leadership practices (Malloy, 2012). In this leadership style, the leader and his/her followers interact (Spillane, 2006). Compared to centering on position, individual expertise is the central concept in distributed leadership (Anderson, et al., 2008; Bennet et al., 2003; Heller & Firestone, 1995; Malloy, 2012). Hence, distributed leadership is not simply assigning individuals to specific tasks and sharing duties (Penlington et al., 2008). In this type of leadership, collective work as well as collective learning by working on goals through communication and interaction is prominent, rather than individual work (Halverson, 2007). For instance, capacity building of one teacher by another teacher is an example of this process (Copeland, 2003). Distributed leadership style has completely changed the traditional leadership model, in which one individual has been the hero, mentor, and responsible party (Gronn, 2002) and distributed the leadership positions among the members of the organization (Malloy, 2012).

The distributed leadership approach addresses leadership together with teams, groups, and organizational characteristics. In practice, this approach opposes the supposition that change requires the leadership and guidance of some specific individuals (Heller & Firestone, 1995; Hoy & Miskel, 2012). Proponents of this idea argue that this type of leadership is imperative since educational organizations are too complex for one individual to cope with (Heller and Firestone, 1995). The responsibility of managing various complex tasks in organizations is distributed among many individuals and roles (Hoy & Miskel, 2012). The basic principle is the impossibility of discovering a single series of best leader characteristics and single best leader behavior standards. Researchers and school administrators believe that leadership practices are too complex to be represented by a single series of behaviors (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2013).

In their study, "Building Leadership Capacity for School," and in the references they used, Harris and Lambert (2003) propose that conceptual and functional discussions regarding distributed leadership are still continuing and that despite organizational learning studies of more than 20 years, it is still not completely defined as to how distributed leadership positions and roles can be adapted to school activities and how the distributed leadership image should be at schools (Senge, 1990; Louis & Kruse, 1995; Spillane et al., 2001). The table below summarizes the structure of distributed leadership:

Table 2.

Distributed Leadership

It is a leadership approach used since the 1950s (Gibb, 1954; Gronn, 2002)

The focus of distributed leadership is on student achievement and progress towards development in teaching (Chen et al., 2007).

This perspective regards leadership as the shared contribution of all leaders to total leadership and distinguishes it from other theories (Harris 2005a; Printy, 2008).

The leader cannot be composed of only one person, and leadership should be shared (Gibb, 1954).

Creation of an environment that regards learning as the "common good" is very important in distributed leadership (Elmore 2000).

It is a participatory or cooperative decision-making process in which administrators, teachers, students, and parents also take part (Smylie, Lazarus & Conyers, 1996).

Distributed leadership is the guide and moderator of educational development (Elmore, 2000).

It has a much larger effect than the sum of all leaders in a school and their efforts to reach a larger scale leadership behavior (Spillane, 2006).

There is the belief that it is always better to distribute leadership among too many individuals than to allow one leader act solely (Kempster, Cope, & Parry, 2010).

There is a positive relationship between distribution of leadership and capacity development (Baloglu, 2011).

By respecting and accepting different expertise areas, distributed leadership makes all kinds of products the shared capital of the organization, including the knowledge arising from interactions (Gunduz & Korkmaz, 2011).

As can be seen from the Table above, there are many common points between shared leadership and distributed leadership as revealed by theoretical, practical, and field studies. Common points between the two leadership approaches are so close that the concepts of distributed leadership and shared leadership are used interchangeably in some studies. Although there are many parallels between shared leadership and distributed leadership, these approaches are addressed as two separate leadership models, and various scales are developed to assess the leadership levels of administrators and staff in organizations.

Purpose of the Study

The current study aimed to examine the relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership, which have many different and similar aspects in theory and practice, but are defined as separate concepts. It also aimed to compare the two approaches and dissipate the theoretical contradictions. In this sense, the main purpose of the study was to examine administrators' shared leadership and distributed leadership levels, the relationships between shared leadership and distributed leadership, and the predictive power of shared leadership over distributed leadership.

Method

Research Design

The study utilized a relational survey model and causal design to examine the relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership as well as the predictive power of shared leadership over distributed leadership. A relational survey model aims to present whether there is a relationship between two or more variables and, in the case of a relationship, the direction of the relationship. In the current study shared leadership and its sub-dimensions were regarded as the independent variable, whereas distributed leadership was used as the dependent variable in the context of a causal research design.

Universe and Sample of the Study

The sample universe of the study was composed of a total of 3,707 teachers employed in 331 schools (21 pre-schools, 154 primary schools, 101 secondary schools, and 36 high schools) in the province of Duzce in the 2013–2014 academic year. The sample of the study consisted of 402 teachers selected through simple random sampling. Table 3 presents the demographical characteristics of the sample.

The study was conducted on a total of 402 teachers. 182 of the participants were females, and 220 were males. The majority of the participants (362) graduated from four-year faculties. It can be argued that the participants formed a young group in terms of service years and age distributions.

Table 3.*Personal Information*

Variable		f	%
Gender	Female	182	45
	Male	220	55
Age	21-30	100	24
	31-40	216	54
	41-50	69	18
	51 and higher	17	4
Graduation	2.3 years College	14	4
	4 years Faculty	362	90
	Master's degree	26	6
	Ph.D	-	-
Seniority/Years of Service	1-5 years	100	25
	6-10 years	112	27
	11-15 years	145	37
	16-20 years	29	7
	21 and higher	16	4

Data Collection Tools

"Shared Leadership Perception Scale," developed by Wood (2005) and adapted to Turkish by Bostanci (2012), was utilized as the data collection tool in the study. Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α), calculated to show the reliability of the scale, was found to be $\alpha = .91$ for the whole scale and changed between $\alpha = .74$ and $\alpha = .88$ for its sub-dimensions. Item-total correlations were calculated to be between .40 and .73. The reliability coefficient of the scale was recalculated for the current study, and the value was found to be .92. The scale is a four-point Likert type scale with answers: 1 (definitely not true), 2 (generally not true), 3 (generally true), and 4 (definitely true). The scale is composed of four dimensions with a total of 18 items.

"Distributed Leadership Scale," developed by Hulpia, Devos, and Rosseel (2009), was utilized to collect data regarding distributed leadership. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Ozdemir (2012). "Distributed Leadership Scale" is composed of two separate subscales. The first subscale focuses on the leadership functions of all members included in the leadership team (13 items), and the second sub-dimension addresses the general characteristics (accord) of the leadership team (10 items).

Cronbach's alpha coefficient, split-half correlations, and Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient values of the "Distributed Leadership Inventory" were found to be between .83 and .96. Similarly, Cronbach's alpha coefficient, split-half correlations

and Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient values of the leadership team accord subscale were found to be between .96 and .98. The reliability coefficient of the current study was recalculated, and the value was found to be .96. The scale has a total of 23 items. The scale is a five-point Likert type scale with answers and scores as follows: 1= Completely Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Undecided, 4= Agree, and 5= Completely Agree.

Data Analysis

In the data analysis, the means and standard deviation values of the scales related to the shared and distributed leadership levels of administrators were calculated, and Spearman's correlation analysis was undertaken to determine the relationship between the scores obtained from the scales. Then Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was utilized to identify the Shared Leadership Scale scores' predictive level in predicting the scores obtained through Distributed Leadership Scale. The shared leadership scale and its sub-dimensions were used as independent variables, and the distributed leadership scale was used as a dependent variable.

Results

Findings Regarding Administrators' Level of Shared and Distributed Leadership

Descriptive statistics regarding the views of teachers on administrators' shared and distributed leadership levels is provided in Table 4.

Table 4.
Descriptive Statistics Regarding Shared and Distributed Leadership

	N	\bar{X}	S
Leadership functions	402	3.98	0.74
General accord in the leadership team	402	3.93	0.76
Completion of tasks together	402	2.98	0.62
Mutual skills development	402	2.96	0.71
Decentralized interaction among staff	402	2.81	0.61
Emotional Support	402	3.17	0.59
Distributed Leadership	402	3.96	0.71
Shared Leadership	402	2.98	0.51

As Table 4 displays, participants had positive views regarding the school administrators' shared and distributed leadership behaviors. Participants' shared leadership scores (=2.98) corresponded with the "generally true" option, and their distributed leadership scores (=3.96) corresponded with the "Agree" option. According to this result, it can be argued that the perceptions of teachers participating in the study of the shared and distributed leadership behaviors of

administrators were high, but not very high, and they regarded the administrators as leaders who share and distribute responsibility and authority.

Correlation Findings Regarding the Relationship between Shared and Distributed Leadership

Spearman's correlation analysis was undertaken to identify the relationship between shared and distributed leadership, and the results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.

Correlation Matrix between Shared and Distributed Leadership

		Completion of tasks together	Mutual skills development	Decentralized interaction among staff	Emotional Support	Shared Leadership
Leadership functions	r	.598(*)	.510(*)	.322(*)	.452(*)	.587(*)
General accord in the leadership team	r	.653(*)	.532(*)	.325(*)	.545(*)	.636(*)
Distributed Leadership	r	.665(*)	.554(*)	.342(*)	.532(*)	.652(*)

*($p < 0.01$)

Correlation values between 0 and 0.30 show that no relationships exist between variables, values between 0.31 and 0.49 point to weak relationships, values between 0.50 and 0.69 point to medium level relationships and values between 0.70 and 1.00 show high-level (strong) relationships (Sonmez and Alacapinar, 2011: 141; Buyukozturk, 2010). According to Table 5, a positive and medium level significant relationship ($r = .652$, $p < 0.01$) existed between participant perceptions towards shared leadership in general and their perceptions towards distributed leadership.

In the analysis of the Table above, a positive, medium level, and significant relationship ($r = .598$; $p < 0.01$) was observed between "leadership functions" (a sub-dimension of shared leadership) and "completion of tasks together" (a sub-dimension of distributed leadership); a positive, medium level, and significant relationship ($r = .510$; $p < 0.01$) was observed between "leadership functions" (a sub-dimension of shared leadership) and "mutual skills development" (a sub-dimension of distributed leadership); a positive, weak and significant relationship ($r = .322$; $p < 0.01$) was found between "leadership functions" (a sub-dimension of shared leadership) and "decentralized interaction among staff" (a sub-dimension of distributed leadership); and a positive, weak, and significant relationship ($r = .452$; $p < 0.01$) was identified between "leadership functions" (a sub-dimension of shared leadership) and "emotional support" (a sub-dimension of distributed leadership).

A positive, medium level, and significant relationship ($r = .653$; $p < 0.01$) was detected between general accord in the leadership team (a sub-dimension of shared leadership) and "completion of tasks together" (a sub-dimension of distributed leadership); a positive, medium level, and significant relationship ($r = .532$; $p < 0.01$) was obtained between general accord in the leadership team (a sub-dimension of shared leadership) and "mutual skills development" (a sub-dimension of distributed leadership); a positive, weak, and significant relationship ($r = .325$; $p < 0.01$) was found between general accord in the leadership team (a sub-dimension of shared leadership) and "decentralized interaction among staff" (a sub-dimension of distributed leadership); and a positive, weak, and significant relationship ($r = .545$; $p < 0.01$) was observed between general accord in the leadership team (a sub-dimension of shared leadership) and "emotional support" (a sub-dimension of distributed leadership).

Multiple Regression Findings for Shared Leadership and Distributed Leadership Scores

The current study focused on the predictive power of shared leadership over distributed leadership. The prediction of the value of a dependent variable based on the value of an independent variable is called "Regression Analysis." The determination coefficient obtained through regression analysis is represented by "R," and it defines the percentage of changes that can be explained by the other variable, which is a value between 0 and 1 (Balci, 2009; Fox, 2008).

Table 6 presents the results of linear regression analysis undertaken in order to explain to what extent the participants' shared leadership perceptions can explain their distributed leadership perceptions.

Table 6.

Multivariate Regression Matrix between Shared Leadership and Distributed Leadership

Predicted Variable	Predictor Variable (Shared Leadership Sub Dimensions)					
	B	SHB	β	t	p	
Distributed Leadership	Completion of tasks together	.519	.067	.452	7.726	.000
	Mutual skills development	.096	.058	.096	1.639	.102
	Decentralized interaction among staff	.056	.050	.048	1.114	.266
	Emotional Support	.156	.064	.132	2.431	.016
$n = 402, R = .644, R^2 = .415, F = 70.355, p < 0.01$						

According to Table 6, a positive, medium level, and significant relationship ($r = .644$) exists between shared leadership (independent variable) and distributed leadership (dependent variable). Sub-dimensions of shared leadership (completion of

tasks together, mutual skills development, decentralized interaction among staff, and emotional support) can explain 42.5% of the 0.415 variance of distributed leadership. In other words, 41.55 of distributed leadership behaviors can be explained by shared leadership behaviors; however, a large ratio of distributed leadership cannot be explained by the shared leadership scale.

When analysis results were examined for each explanatory variable, it was observed that "Completion of Tasks Together" had the highest impact ($\beta = 0.452$) on the distributed leadership variable, followed by "Emotional Support" ($\beta = 0.132$). However, the "Mutual Skills development" and "Decentralized Interaction among Staff" variables were found to have no impact on the distributed leadership variable.

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings of the study that aimed to examine the relationship between shared and distributed leadership and the level of prediction of shared leadership over distributed leadership show that according to participant views, administrators have high levels of shared leadership and distributed leadership. However, the levels are not very high. Yilmaz (2013) found that primary school teachers' shared leadership behaviors corresponded to the "mostly" option. A similar result was obtained in Christy's (2008) and Smith's (2007) studies. A study by Korkmaz (2011) showed that teachers similarly think that primary school administrators' distributed leadership behaviors are at a high level.

Based on the perception of participants, there is a positive, medium level, and significant relationship ($r = .652$, $p < 0.01$) between the Shared Leadership Scale and the Distributed Leadership Scale. Therefore, we can argue that there is a relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership, but this relationship is not very distinctive. Shared Leadership (independent variable) and distributed leadership (dependent variable) can explain 41.5% of the total variance when the total determination coefficient (R-square) was taken as 0.415. In other words, while 41.5% of the distributed leadership behaviors can be explained by shared leadership behaviors, 59.5% of administrators' distributed leadership behaviors can be explained by other variables.

Burke's (2010) study, "Distributed Leadership and Shared Governance in Post-Secondary Education," found a high level of relationship between distributed leadership and shared management in higher education. Mendez's (2009) study, titled "A Closer Look Into Collective Leadership: Is Leadership Shared Or Distributed?" identified that leadership is based on teamwork rather than individual activities, and several concepts such as distributed leadership, shared leadership, democratic leadership, collective leadership, relational leadership, and team leadership are used for team leadership. It is observed that all these leadership concepts are close to one another in meaning and can be used interchangeably. The results of this study suggest using the term "collective leadership" in order to bridge the gap between distributed leadership and shared leadership to prevent cognitive complexity.

Fitzsimons, James, and Denyer's (2011) study, titled "An Alternative Approach to Shared and Distributed Leadership Approaches," addressed the historical process of shared and distributed leadership approaches. The results confirm that although there are many concepts that define shared and distributed leadership in literature, these approaches are generally used interchangeably and to substitute for each other, even though these two leadership styles are different from one another.

As a result, we can argue that Bakir (2013), Yilmaz (2013), Bostanci (2012), Oguz (2010), Baloglu (2012), and Ozdemir (2012) generally use shared leadership and distributed leadership interchangeably in recent studies in Turkey, but these two leadership concepts are accepted as separate approaches both in literature and in other countries. As a matter of fact, the results of the current study also identified a positive, medium level, significant relationship between these two leadership approaches; however, a one-on-one relationship that will allow the interchangeable use of these concepts is not apparent. Therefore, it can be argued that shared leadership and distributed leadership approaches are separate leadership approaches, and it is not suitable to use them interchangeably, though they share many common points.

References

- Anderson, S. E., Moore, S., & Sun, J. (2008). Positioning the principals in patterns of school leadership distribution. In K. Leithwood, B. Mascall & T. Strauss (Eds.), *Distributed leadership according to the evidence*. New York: Routledge.
- Bakir, A., A. (2013). *Ogretmenlerin paylasilan liderlik ve orgutsal baglilik algilari arasindaki iliskinin analizi*. [Analysis of the relationship between teachers' perception of shared leadership and organizational adherence]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Inonu University, Institute of Educational Sciences., Malatya, Turkey
- Balci, A. (2009). *Sosyal bilimlerde arastirma: Yontem, teknik ve ilkeler* [Research in social sciences: methods, techniques and principles]. Ankara, Turkey: Pegem Akademi.
- Baloglu, N. (2011). Dagitimci liderlik: Okullarda dikkate alınması gereken bir liderlik yaklasimi. [Distributed Leadership: A leadership approach that should be taken into account in schools]. *Ahi Evran Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 12 (3), 127-148.
- Baloglu, N. (2012). Relations between value-based leadership and distributed leadership: a casual research on school principles behaviors. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice (ESTP)*, Values Education Symposium Supplementary Special Issue, 12(2), Spring.
- Bennett, N., Harvey, J., Wise, C., & Woods, P. (2003). Distributed leadership. Retrieved 10 December 2013, from www.ncsl.org.uk/literaturereviews.
- Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2009). Distributed leadership in higher education. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 37(2), 257-277.

- Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2009). Distributed leadership in higher education: rhetoric and reality. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37, 257.
- Bostanci, A. B. (2012). Paylasilan liderlik algisi olceginin Turkce uyarlamasi. [Turkish version of shared leadership perception scale]. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, (9)2, 1619-1632.
- Brown, M. H. (1989). *Organizing activity in the women's movement: An example of distributed leadership, international social movement research*. Greenwich CT: JAI Press.
- Burke, K., M. (2010). Distributed leadership and shared governance in post-secondary education. *Management in Education*, 24 (2), 51-54. Retrieved 09 January 2014, From <http://ehis.ebscohost.com>.
- Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D. & Rosen, B. (2007). A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (2), 331-346.
- Copeland, M. A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4), 375-395.
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Fitzsimons, D., James , K. T., & Denyer, D. (2011). Alternative approaches for studying shared and distributed leadership. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13, 313-328. Retrieved 09 January 2014, from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com>.
- Fox, J. (2008). *Applied regression analysis, linear models, and related methods*. Sage Publications.
- Frost, D. & Harris, A (2003). Teacher leadership: Towards a research agenda. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33 (3), 479-498.
- Gibb, C. A. (1954). Leadership. In G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* 2 (pp. 877-917). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gronn , P. (2000). Distributed leadership. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration*. Dordrecht, Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 423-45.
- Halverson, R. (2007). Systems of practice and professional community: The adams case. In J. P. Spillane (Ed.), *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Halverson, R., & Clifford, M. (2013). Distributed instructional leadership in high schools. Retrieved 20 November 2013 from <http://website.education.wisc.edu>.
- Harris A., & Lambert L. (2003). Building leadership capacity for school improvement. Buckingham: Open University Press. Web: <http://www.actedu.in/pdf/leadership.pdf>.
- Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: Heresy, fantasy or possibility? *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation*, 23(3), 313-324.
- Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading? *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 32, 11-24
- Harris, A. (2005). Leading or misleading? Distributed leadership and school improvement. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(3), 255-265.
- Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: According to the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(2), 172-188.
- Harris, A., & Muijs, D. (2005). *Improving schools through teacher leadership*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Harris, A., & Spillane, J. (2008). Distributed leadership through the looking glass. *Management in Education*, 22(1), 31-34.
- Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Sammons, P., & Hopkins, D. (2007). Distributed leadership and organizational change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8(4), 337-347.
- Harris, A., & Lambert, L. (2003). *Building leadership capacity for school*. Open University Press Maidenhead · Philadelphia, USA.
- Heller, M. F., & Firestone, W. A. (1995). Who's in charge here? Sources of leadership for change in eight schools. *Elementary school Journal*, 96(1), 65-86.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, G. C. (2012). *Educational administration, theory, research and practice* (Ceviri Editoru: Selahattin Turan). Ankara, Nobel Yayinlari.
- Hulpia, H., & Devos, G. (2009). Exploring the link between distributed leadership and job satisfaction of school leaders. *Educational Studies*, 35(2), 153-171.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). Development and validation of scores on the distributed leadership inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69(6), 1013-1034.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., Rosseel, Y. & Vlerick, P. (2012). Dimensions of distributed leadership and the impact on teachers' organizational commitment: a study in secondary education. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42 (7), 1745-1784.
- Judge, W. Q. & Ryman J. A. (2001). The shared leadership challenged in strategic alliances Lessons from the U.S. healthcare industry. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 15(2), 71-79.

- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavior Science*, 9, 131-133.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Kempster S., Cope J. & Parry, K. (2010). *Dimensions of distributed leadership in the same context*. Retrieved 08 April 2011, from <http://www.strath.ac.uk>.
- Kocolowski, M.D. (2010). Shared leadership: Is it time for a change? *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 3(1), 22-32.
- Korkmaz, E. (2011). İlkogretim okulu yoneticilerinin dagitimci liderlik davranislarini gosterme duzeyleri. [Primary school managers' levels of showing distributed leadership manners]. *Kalem Egitim ve Insan Bilimleri Dergisi* 1(1), 123-153.
- Korkmaz, E., & Gunduz, H. B. (2011). *Ilkogretim okulu yoneticilerinin dagitimci liderlik daoranislarini gosterme duzeyleri*. [Primary school managers' levels of showing distributed leadership manners]. Kalem Egitim ve Saglik Hizmetleri A.S.
- Lunenburg F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2013). *Educational administration* (Educational Management Translation Editor: Gokhan Arastaman). Ankara: Nobel Yayinlari.
- Malloy, J., P. (2012). *Effects of distributed leadership on teachers'academic optimism and student achievement*. Doctorate in Education, Department of Theory and Policy Studies Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto.
- Mendez, M., J. (2009). *A closer look into collective leadership: is leadership shared or distributed?* New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Retrieved 08.04.2013, from <http://search.proquest.com>.
- Ozdemir, M. (2012). Dagitimci liderlik envanterinin Turkce uyarlamasi: Gecerlik ve guvenirlik calismalari. [Turkish version of distributed leadership inventory: Validity and reliability studies]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi*, 18(4), 575-598.
- Ozer, N., & Beycioglu, K. (2013). Paylasilan liderlik olceginin gelistirilmesi: Gecerlik ve guvenirlik calismalari. [The development of shared leadership scale: Validity and reliability studies]. *Ilkogretim Online*, 12(1), 77-86. Retrieved 08.04.2013, from <http://ilkogretimonline.org.tr>.
- Ozgur U. (2010). Kendi kendine liderlik stratejileri uzerine bir arastirma [A research on self-leadership strategies]. *Ataturk Universitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 24(1), 176-177.
- Penlington, C., Kington, A., & Day, C. (2008). Leadership in improving schools: A qualitative perspective. *School Leadership & Management*, 28(1), 65 - 82.
- Printy S. (2008). Distributed leadership: A Quick Tour of Theory and Practice. Michigan Principal's Fellowship. Michigan Principals Fellowship Summer Institute.

- Schlechty, P.C. (2005). *Shaking up the school house, reestablishing schools* (Translation: Yuksel Ozden). Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Yayincilik
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organisation*. New York: Doubleday.
- Smylie, M. A., Lazarus, V., & Conyers, J. B. (1996). Instructional outcomes of school-based participated decision-making. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(3), 181-198.
- Sonmez, V., & Alacapinar, F. (2011). *Bilimsel arastirma yontemleri*. [Scientific research methods]. Ankara, Turkey: Ani Yayincilik.
- Spillane, J. (2005). Distributed leadership. *The Educational Forum*, 69(2), 143-150.
- Spillane, J. P. & Diamond, J. B. (Eds.). (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R. & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23-28.
- Wood, M. S. (2005). Determinants of shared leadership in management teams. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(1), 64-85.
- Yilmaz, A. I. (2013). *Ilkogretim okulu ogretmenlerinin paylasilan liderlik davranislari*. [Shared leadership behaviors of primary school teachers]. Unpublished master thesis. Dokuz Eylul University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Izmir, Turkey.
- Yilmaz, E. (2006). *Okullardaki orgutsal guven duzeyinin okul yoneticilerinin etik liderlik ozellikleri ve bazi degiskenler acisindan incelenmesi*. [Examination of level of organizational trust in schools in terms of ethical leadership characteristics of school administrators and some variables]. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Selcuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Konya, Turkey.
- Yukl G. A. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly* 10(2), 285-305.

Paylaşılan Liderlik ile Dağıtımçı Liderlik Arasındaki İlişkinin Analizi

Atf:

Goksoy, S. (2016). Analysis of the relationship between shared leadership and distributed leadership. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 65, 295-312
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.65.17>

Özet

Problem Durumu: Liderlik sürecinin paylaşılması konusu ile ilgili son yıllarda bir çok araştırma yapılmaktadır. Paylaşılan liderlik anlayışı; liderlik etkinliklerine birçok kişinin katılmasıyla ilgilidir. Bir okuldaki bütün liderlerden oluşan ve onların çeşitli etkinliklerini de hesaba katan, bir liderin bilgi ve becerisinin bir ürünü olmaktan ziyade birçok kişinin ve onların arasındaki ilişkinin ürünüdür bu tür liderliği, sürekli bir şefin yönettiği orkestradan çok, müziğe ve o andaki ritme göre çalgıcılardan herhangi birinin liderlik ettiği bir caz grubuna benzetmektedir. Bu çeşit liderliği gerçekleşmesi ortak başlıkların, inançların ve değerlerin seyrine önem vermeyi gerektirir. Dağıtımçı liderlik yaklaşımı; liderliği takımlar, gruplar ve örgütsel özellikleri ile birlikte ele almaktadır. Pratikte bu yaklaşımlar, bir değişimi gerçekleştirmek için birilerinin başta olması gerektiği varsayımına karşı çıkar. Bu fikrin savunucuları, liderliğin gerekli olduğunu çünkü eğitim örgütlerinin tek bir kişinin baş edemeyeceği kadar karmaşık olduğunu iddia ederler. Örgütlerde birçok karmaşık işleri yönetmenin sorumluluğu birçok birey ve roller arasında dağıtılmaktadır. Temel olarak savunulan ilke, tüm durumlarda tek bir en iyi lider özellikleri dizisi ve tek bir en iyi lider davranışları standartlarını keşfetme çabaları başarısızla sonuçlanmıştır. Çağdaş araştırmacılar ve okul yöneticileri liderlik uygulamalarının tek bir davranış dizisi tarafından temsil edilmesi için çok karmaşık olduğunu düşünmektedirler. Paylaşılan liderlik ve dağıtımçı liderlik kavramlarının kullanılması ile ilgili olarak yurt dışında yapılan araştırmalara bakıldığında ise, dağıtımçı liderlik/distributed leadership” paylaşılan liderlik/shared leadership” kavramlarının farklı olduğu ve farklı kuramsal temeller doğrultusunda kullanıldığı görülmektedir. Paylaşılan liderlik ile dağıtımçı liderliğin kuramsal, uygulamaya yönelik ve alan araştırmacıları açılarından bir çok ortak yönü bulunmaktadır. Her iki liderlik yaklaşımı açısından ortak yönler o kadar ileriye gitmiştir ki bazı araştırmalar da paylaşılan ve dağıtımçı liderlik kavramları bir birinin yerine kullanılabilir olmuştur. Alan yazında paylaşılan ve dağıtımçı liderlik arasında bu denli paralellik olmasına rağmen yine literatürde her iki liderlik yaklaşımı farklı birer liderlik modeli olarak ele alınmakta ve bu yönde örgüt yöneticisi ve çalışanlarının liderlik düzeylerini ölçen, açığa çıkaran çeşitli ölçekler geliştirilmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Mevcut araştırma ile teori ve uygulamada birçok benzer yönlerinin olduğu vurgulanan ancak farklı adlar altında dile getirilen paylaşılan liderlik ile dağıtımçı liderlik arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek, karşılaştırmak ve belirtilen kavramsal çelişkileri gidermeye çalışmak amaçlanmıştır. Bu bağlamda eğitimcilerin algılarına dayalı olarak, yöneticilerin paylaşılan liderlik ve dağıtımçı liderlik

düzeyleri, paylaşılan liderlik ve dağıtımçı liderlik arasındaki ilişki ve paylaşılan liderliğin dağıtımçı liderliği yordama gücü araştırmanın temel amacını oluşturmuştur.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Araştırma paylaşılan liderlik ve dağıtımçı liderlik arasındaki ilişki ve paylaşılan liderliğin dağıtımçı liderliği yordama gücünü incelemek amacıyla ilişkisel tarama ve nedensel bir desende tasarlanmıştır. İlişkisel tarama modelinde, iki veya daha fazla değişken arasında bir ilişki olup olmadığı ve ilişkinin varlığı durumunda bunun yönü ortaya koyulmaya çalışılır. Nedensel araştırma deseni bağlamında, bu çalışmada, paylaşılan liderlik ve alt boyutları bağımsız değişken, dağıtımçı liderlik ise bağımlı değişken olarak ele alınmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Araştırmaya katılanlar, okul yöneticilerinin; paylaşılan ve dağıtımçı liderlik davranışları ile ilgili olarak olumlu görüşe sahiptirler. Paylaşılan liderlik alt boyutu olan liderlik fonksiyonları ile dağıtımçı liderlik alt boyutlarından "görevlerin ortak tamamlanması" arasında pozitif yönde ve orta derecede anlamlı bir ilişki ($r=.598$; $p<0.01$), "karşılıklı beceri geliştirme" arasında pozitif yönde ve orta derecede anlamlı bir ilişki ($r=.510$; $p<0.01$), "çalışanlar arasında merkezi olmayan etkileşim" arasında pozitif yönde ve zayıf derecede anlamlı bir ilişki ($r=.322$; $p<0.01$), "duygusal destek" arasında pozitif yönde ve zayıf derecede anlamlı bir ilişki ($r=.452$; $p<0.01$) vardır. paylaşılan liderlik (bağımsız değişken) ve dağıtımçı liderlik (bağımlı değişken) arasında pozitif yönde ve orta derecede anlamlı bir ilişki ($r=.644$) vardır. Paylaşılan liderlik alt boyutlarının (görevlerin ortak tamamlanması, karşılıklı beceri geliştirme, çalışanlar arasında merkezi olmayan etkileşim, duygusal destek) dağıtımçı liderliğe ait 0,415 varyansın % 41,5'i açıklamaktadır. Dağıtımçı liderlik değişkeni üzerinde en büyük etkiye "Görevlerin Ortak Tamamlanması'nın sahip olduğu ($\beta=0.452$), bunu "Duygusal Destegin" takip ettiği ($\beta=0.132$) görülmektedir. Fakat paylaşılan liderlik alt boyutlarını oluşturan "Karşılıklı Beceri Geliştirme" ve "Çalışanlar Arasında Merkezi Olmayan Etkileşim" değişkenlerinin ise dağıtımçı liderlik değişkeni üzerinde bir etkiye sahip olmadığı söylenebilir.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Katılımcıların görüşlerine göre yöneticilerin paylaşılan liderlik ve dağıtımçı liderlik düzeyinin yüksek olduğu, ancak çok yüksek olmadığı söylenebilir. Paylaşılan liderlik ile dağıtımçı liderlik arasında bir ilişkinin olduğu ancak bu ilişkinin çok yüksek olmadığıdır. Türkiye'de son yıllarda yapılan araştırmalarda; paylaşılan liderlik (shared leadership) ve dağıtımçı liderlik (distributed leadership) kavramlarını çoğunlukla birbirinin yerine kullandıkları halde; gerek alan yazında gerek diğer ülkelerde bu iki liderlik kavramı (dağıtımçı liderlik/distributed leadership, paylaşılan liderlik/shared leadership) farklı yaklaşımlar olarak kabul edilmektedir. Nitekim bu araştırma sonucunda da bu iki liderlik yaklaşımı arasında pozitif ve orta derecede anlamlı bir ilişkinin olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Ancak bir birinin yerine kullanılacak kadar aralarında bire bir ilişkinin olduğu söylenemez. Dolayısıyla ortak bir çok yönleri olsa bile paylaşılan liderlik (shared leadership) ve dağıtımçı liderlik (distributed leadership) farklı birer liderlik yaklaşımları olduğu ve bir birinin yerine kullanılmasının uygun olmadığı söylenebilir.

Anahtar Kavramlar: Liderlik, paylaşılan liderlik, dağıtımçı liderlik.