

TEACHER LEADERSHIP IN LITHUANIA: ARE TEACHERS PREPARED TO COOPERATE?*

*Agne Brandisauskiene***

*Jurate Cesnaviciene****

*Ramute Bruzgeleviciene*****

Received: 27. 6. 2018

Accepted: 10. 12. 2018

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi.24.si.8>

Review
UDC 371.1(474.5)

Abstract. *Over the past 25 years, Lithuania has established a system of education based on humanistic and democratic relationships. In this system, teacher leadership is highly important, as it serves as the basis for school community “reculturation” and improvement. The aim of the current article is to overview the situation of teacher leadership in Lithuania, emphasising the aspect of teacher cooperation. The three characteristics of Lithuanian teacher leadership that we present demonstrate that teacher cooperation remains a*

challenge in the country. Teachers are reluctant to discuss and render improvement proposals, and lack experience of teamwork. Nevertheless, it is to be expected that the ongoing project “Time for Leaders,” will produce the necessary cultural change required to create a learning network of teachers and establish genuine, open and professional dialogue.

Keywords: *teacher leadership; Lithuania; cooperation; collaboration.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The past few decades have been marked by huge changes in education that have been stimulated by processes occurring all over the world. Globalisation, mobility, cultural diversity and, especially, rapid technological advancement are just a few of the factors that have impacted education and provoked change. In addition to

some global factors, the challenges facing the exceptional historical circumstances are still felt in Lithuania. The country, which restored its independence in the last decade of the previous century, is still experiencing the consequences of the former authoritarian rule, although it intends to reform the education system by adopting a new paradigm, focusing on personal development

* This study was funded by the Research Foundation of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences. The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

** Agne Brandisauskiene, PhD, associate professor. Vytautas Magnus University, Education Academy. Sevcenkos str. 31, 03111 Vilnius, Lithuania. E-mail: agne.brandisauskiene@vdu.lt

*** Jurate Cesnaviciene, PhD, associate professor. Vytautas Magnus University, Education Academy. Sevcenkos str. 31, 03111 Vilnius, Lithuania. E-mail: jurate.cesnaviciene@vdu.lt

**** Ramute Bruzgeleviciene, PhD, associate professor. Vytautas Magnus University, Education Academy. Sevcenkos str. 31, 03111 Vilnius, Lithuania. E-mail: ramute.bruzgeleviciene@vdu.lt

of freedom and democracy. Since the last decade of the 20th century, education system in Lithuania has been in a constant state of change, and due to the new challenges which are constantly emerging, the situation in Lithuania's education system is becoming more complicated. This change has prompted (indeed, compelled) revision of education policy, as well as inspired a search for solutions to meet the new challenges. As has it become increasingly obvious, not only in education, but also in other spheres of social life, leadership is a possible solution.

Attention has been paid to leadership in education for over twenty years (Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins, 2008). It is seen as being a particularly important factor in an efficient organisation (Marzano, Waters, and McNulty, 2005). At the political level, it is agreed that leadership competence is one of the nine main principles of education policy, so that school communities become learning organisations (ET 2020 Working Group Schools, 2016-18). Quality of school leadership is also seen as one of the main factors contributory to the achievement of the best learning results (Council of the European Union, 2006). The importance of leadership is confirmed by research: the ideas of Leithwood and his co-authors have become well-known (Leithwood et al., 2004; Leithwood et al., 2006; Leithwood, Patten and Jantzi, 2010). They claim that the impact of leadership on students' results is minute, yet significant from the educational point of view. This idea is addressed in a number of other studies (e.g. Hairon, 2017; Harris, 2008; Poekert, Alexandrou and Darbianne, 2016; Wenner and Campbell, 2017) that analyse different aspects of leadership in education.

Teacher leadership is recognised as an important part of education policy. According to Wenner and Campbell,

“teacher leadership has of late become an increasingly popular topic among educational policymakers and influential educational organizations as an important component of school reform” (2017, p. 135). Teacher leadership receives considerable attention researchers seek to understand how teachers become leaders (Poekert, Alexandrou and Darbianne, 2016), look for connections between teacher leadership and the capacity of schools to improve (Hairon, 2017), analyse leadership for learning (Swaffield, 2014), as well as explore expressions of teacher leadership in the professional learning community (Wilson, 2016) or in professional development (Whitworth and Chiu, 2015). Finally, the importance of leadership is plainly a key element of teaching practise: “leadership, along with pedagogical and content knowledge as a professional responsibility, is an emerging requirement for effective teachers” (Rogers and Scales, 2013, p. 30).

The aim of the present article is therefore to review the situation of teacher leadership in Lithuania, emphasising the aspect of teacher cooperation. The first part of the article focuses on the definition of teacher leadership (TL) and discusses TL from its beginning to the present-day period of education reform in Lithuania. The second part details the results of research in Lithuania and interprets them employing the methodology of narrative review.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. In search of a definition of teacher leadership: What does “Teacher Leadership” mean?

It seems that the theory of teacher leadership is still in search of an identity. In their comprehensive review of teacher leadership, York-Barr and Duke (2004)

maintain that “the literature on teacher leadership to be ‘largely theoretical’” (p. 291). This view is largely confirmed by a more recent commentator: “A common understanding of what teacher leadership is and how it should be operationally defined in the field is still in an early phase of conceptual development” (Poekert, Alexandrou and Darbianne, 2016, p. 309). It is obvious that it is difficult to develop a single all-inclusive definition of teacher leadership, since there are different conceptions based on different leadership theories.

In trying to define ‘teacher leadership’, attention should be paid to the linguistic meaning of this term. Etymologically, the word ‘leadership’ is derived from the Anglo-Saxon root ‘lead’, which means ‘a path, a way’, and the verb ‘leaden’ means ‘to travel’. Hence, ‘leadership’ carries the meaning, ‘to travel in a particular direction,’ as a means to the end of a particular behaviour or action. Generally, the term ‘leadership’ is perceived to have two components: *management* and *guidance*. We find this distinction important. If we identify ‘leadership’ with the phrase ‘to manage’ (which is often associated with a certain manifestation of power, status or formal authority), the phrase loses its broader meaning. Analysing the word morphologically, the Lithuanian root of the word ‘*lyderyste*’ (Eng. *Leadership*) is ‘*lydi*’ (Eng. *Guide*), which means ‘*to go together to a particular place*’. The word ‘*together*’ is an important element that discloses a certain paradox – a certain connectivity of two subjects, despite their possibly different statuses, different abilities, etc. We believe that the conception of teacher leadership should not eliminate this element and that leadership is a mutual, not always symmetrical process, where one subject grows, and the other helps and encourage him/her. This should be acknowledged.

However, it should be noted that the use of a word ‘lead’ or ‘leadership’ is contextual. The definition of leadership can change depending on the circumstances in which it becomes a question. This can be illustrated by the teacher leadership ‘waves’ identified by Silva, Gimbert and Nolan (2000): in the first wave teachers serve in formal roles, typically as managers; in the second wave teachers capitalized on instructional expertise – they are instructional leaders, staff developers or mentors for new pedagogues – and in the third wave teachers are the leaders of the process of ‘reculturing’ the school to improve instructional expertise for enhanced student learning. We believe that the latter can be considered a particular stage of teacher leadership, in which a clear change of the conception from management to connectivity and cooperation is apparent. Silva, Gimbert and Nolan (2000) refer to this phenomenon of cooperation as the essence of the third wave of teacher leadership: “teacher leaders would ‘slide the door open’ to collaborate with other teachers, discuss common problems, share approaches to various learning situations” (p. 781). Collaboration and connectivity are emphasised by York-Barr and Duke as *competencies* of teacher leadership (2004, p. 288). Moreover, Harris and Muijs (2003) define cooperation as the main difference between teacher leadership and the traditional conception of leadership, since teachers’ professional experience is accumulated only in cooperation with learners. It is noteworthy that Wenner and Campbell (2017), having conducted an overview of studies of teacher leadership, claim that the most commonly cited of all theories of teacher leadership is ‘distributed leadership’, which incorporates the concept of cooperation. They also state that this theory has “already taken a somewhat prominent position as a theoretical lens for examining teacher leadership” (p. 161). Arguably, there should be more

studies of the central features of distributed theory. Finally, with respect to this matter, it appears that teachers themselves view their informal and collaborative work as having greater impact on school improvement than formal efforts directed by school administrators (Fairman and Mackenzie, 2014).

In conclusion, we agree with the definition of teacher leadership provided by York-Barr and Duke: “teacher leadership is the process by which teachers individually or collectively influence their colleagues, principals, and other members of school communities to improve teaching and learning practices with the aim of increased student achievement” (2004, p. 288). Nevertheless, we would like to emphasise that this process should be viewed as the one including the indispensable dimension of teacher cooperation manifested as “going together”. In stating this, we claim that teacher leadership, similarly to the process of teaching and learning, alongside the transfer of knowledge and skills, should include the dimension of interaction (i.e. communication / cooperation), the nature of which (e.g. directive teaching of colleagues, providing support, listening to others’ opinions) should determine the conception of teacher leadership, its content and results.

2.2. Teacher leadership at the beginning of education reform in Lithuania: Unnamed but real

If we consider leadership as a process, the importance of process contextuality comes into focus, i.e. the historical time, situations and conditions, under which persons come to act as leaders. The reform of Lithuanian education was started on the eve of Lithuania’s regaining of statehood (the last decade of the past century), when many post-communist East European countries experienced a huge change – the restoration of their independence. The majority of

countries, including Lithuania, underwent an in-depth change, i.e. a change from one state ideological paradigm to another: countries with authoritarian structure became countries with democratic ones. As one of the fundamentals of an independent state, education had to be reorganised. The Soviet conception of education, based on unified norms had to be eliminated and a new education philosophy and system created. In other words, the prevailing education paradigm had to be replaced, to address the social and national need for an education system compatible with freedom and democracy. Speaking about leadership, Drucker (2008) associates the effectivity of leadership with context: *effectivity means a correct choice of aims, i.e. the aims that conform to the historical time.*

The initiator and main developer of the vision of Lithuanian education reform was Dr. Habil. Meile Luksiene, a person with exceptional intelligence and with a particularly mature system of values (Bruzgeleviciene and Pusciene, 2013), as well as a developed capacity for forecasting and taking responsibility. Luksiene belongs to the circle of scientists who raised the fundamental ideas of Lithuanian education reform, as they appeared in the light of the development of education in an independent country. It might be overstating the case to state that she and her followers created these ideas, since the ideas of humanist education and free education, which served as the basis for Lithuanian independent education, have a long history. However, under the leadership of Luksiene, these ideas were revived in Lithuania from the world’s heritage of educational philosophy, the pedagogical thought of national educators and the experience of educational science and education of the democratic countries, and then adapted and systematised those in the Lithuanian context.

The scientists created an educational basis for the country's new era, taking into account historical experience (the lessons of the past) and future vision (how education would affect Lithuania's future). It is noteworthy that Luksiene's contribution to the development of the modern system of education is recognised not only in Lithuania, but also across the globe: in 2004, Luksiene was awarded the Comenius Medal established by UNESCO and in 2013 – the 100th anniversary of her birth – her achievement was commemorated by UNESCO. According to Bruzgeleviciene and Puscienė (2013), a strong sense of duty, social sensitivity, as well as sense of history and her place in history laid the foundations for the authentic leadership of Meile Luksiene. Luksiene's rich array of attributes had one goal: the creation of an open, democratic educational system, the cornerstone of which was the human being. Luksiene should therefore not only be regarded as a charismatic leader, but also as the creator of the Lithuanian state with highest humanistic culture.

In 1992, Luksiene, her followers and other educational policy makers of independent Lithuania developed the "Conception of Lithuanian Education", in which, though indirectly, attention was paid to the teacher-leader concept, emphasising the teacher's personality and the desired qualities of a teacher i.e., tolerance, respect for others, fairness, perfectionism, creativity, and the ability to establish a teaching/learning interaction between the teacher and students, in addition to being an inspiration for change (Nedzinskaite and Barkauskaite, 2017). The discussions and documentation associated with the reform stressed that the teacher was the main factor of the reform and the initiator of change. The philosophy of Lithuanian education (as well as the established system) therefore encouraged

dialogue among teachers, strived for the creation of a learning 'network' through the organisation of discussions of teaching content, methods and assessment, the sharing of good experience, discussion of difficulties and of areas for improvement and the rendering of support to colleagues, etc. It was assumed that teachers would lead, i.e. they would master the educational paradigm, modelled for them by the reform leaders based upon humanistic principles, and be ready to put it into practice in Lithuanian schools.

However, reflecting on the legacy of the Soviet school, Luksiene envisaged certain obstacles to teacher leadership: "we often do not notice its [the Soviet school's] traces: we cannot hear a different opinion, discuss avoiding demagogy, collect objective information, and stay genuine" (Luksiene, 2013, p. 288). These words pointed to the dead weight of the Soviet education heritage (e.g. hypocrisy, shattered connectivity) and implied the need for a new basis, upon which to build an education system, including the aspect of teacher leadership. The Soviet legacy notwithstanding, an appeal was made to teacher leadership: "School – where a teacher is the main factor – should perform the historical role today" (Luksiene, 2013, p. 236).

2.3. A sketch of the modern teacher leadership in Lithuania: Attempts to promote leadership and the challenges of reality

In other strategic documents of Lithuanian education, which drew on Luksiene's systematised ideas and guidelines for education change, there is a clear emphasis on the demand for and significance of leadership. For example, professional and efficient pedagogical communities, characterised by leadership, are referred to as one of the main goals (National

Education Strategy for 2013–2022, 2013), and creativity, citizenship and leadership education are defined as the fundamentals to be addressed in the education of a young person in the general education school (Lithuania's Progress Strategy "Lithuania 2030", 2012). Hence, the development of leadership skills among education community members, including teachers, is a priority aim of Lithuanian education policy.

On the practical level, a great contribution to the process of the dissemination of the concept of leadership was made by the project "Time for Leaders", initiated by the Ministry of Education and Science. It officially began in 2005, but was only implemented in 2009. The project aimed to develop infrastructure of support for independent leaders to develop managerial competences, to open new career possibilities through the improvement, support of and autonomy of the school, as well as to empower the education community. The project was implemented in three stages. The basis of the project and the results of stage one is comprehensively presented in a study by Jackson, Blandford, Pranckuniene and Vildziuniene (2011). Stage two of the project (2011-2015) involved 15 municipalities of Lithuania: a community of education leaders assembled in national and regional forums; a virtual environment was created and the foundations of leader education and competence development were built; furthermore, education leaders at all levels (national, municipal and school) were encouraged to assume responsibility for the success of all learners, and to strive for greater school independence and own professional autonomy.

Finally, stage three (2017-2020) project activities are currently being implemented in the remaining 45 municipalities of Lithuania. Taking into account the conception of *professional capital* of Hargreaves

and Fullan (2012), attempts are being made to develop: (1) education progress projects in municipalities (*decisional capital*); (2) a network of collaborative school communities (*social capital*) and (3) a master's degree education leadership program (*human capital*). We can assume that the question of teacher leadership has been highly important since the beginning of the education reform in Lithuania (1988-1990), when state ideological paradigm replacement occurred. However, as Luksiene pointed out at the outset, the generation of a culture of leadership is not an easy process: there have been and there are challenges to respond to. The following chapters will focus on the characteristics of the experience of development of teacher leadership in Lithuania.

3. METHODOLOGY

The narrative review of research was accomplished in the following steps: identification of the research question (how is the principle of cooperation expressed in Lithuanian teacher leadership?); collection of the research evidence; evaluation of evidential agreements among studies; analysis of the (collated) evidence derived from individual studies; interpretation of the evidence; presentation of results.

In order to analyse the most recent literature on teacher leadership in Lithuania and collect the research evidence on how teachers collaborate with each other, we searched for evidence from two sources. The first source was research conducted within the framework of the project "Time for Leaders", which focused on the assessment of the expressions of education community (including teacher) leadership. It was determined that the situation analysis (Jonusaite and Valuckiene, 2007) and three longitudinal studies (Beresneviciute et al., 2011; Katiliute et al., 2013, Valuckiene et

Table 1: Compliance of research evidence with established criteria

Amount of evidence	Criteria				
	Empirical research	Modern theories of leadership	Clear and detailed research methodology	Representative Lithuanian sample	Teacher cooperation
3	+	+	+	+	-
5	+	+	+	-	+
6	+	+	+	+	+
3	+	+	+	-	-
2	-	+	+-	-	-

al., 2015) were performed during the project. It is noteworthy that the analysis included only scientific articles published in scientific journals and international conference proceedings, rejecting chapters in books, methodological publications, or the proceedings of practical conferences, on the basis that they possibly lacked scientific criteria. Thirty-one articles were retrieved (published in the period of 2002-2017) on the theme of school leadership (11 in Lithuanian, 19 in English and 1 in the Russian language, respectively). Fifteen of them dealt with teacher leadership.

The next step of the research review – evaluation of evidential agreements among studies – was highly important. Should we fail to evaluate the main components of the scientific works – their conceptual and/or theoretical bases, sampling size, research scheme, and analytic methods, we might attribute equal weight to unequal studies, which might lead to incorrect interpretation of research results and produce misleading analysis. Therefore, particular criteria were distinguished to select works as appropriate or inappropriate for our analysis. The selection criteria were: 1) does the article contain empirical research?; 2) is the conceptual basis of the research linked to modern theories of leadership?; 3) does the research have a clear and detailed research methodology?;

4) does the research have a representative Lithuanian sample?; 5) is teacher cooperation a variable of the research? The compliance of the research evidence (19 items) with the aforesaid criteria with both sources – Lithuanian Academic Electronic Library (eLABa) and “Time for Leaders” – is presented in Table 1.

As evident from the presented analysis, the theme of teacher leadership has not been extensively analysed in Lithuania. Nevertheless, to the end of our attempt to answer the research question – *How is cooperation in teacher leadership expressed in Lithuania?* – we present the results we obtained as characteristics of teacher leadership in Lithuania.

4. RESULTS: THREE CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHER LEADERSHIP

4.1. Provisional characteristic of teacher leadership: Teacher leaders as heads of methodological circles

The situation analysis of school leadership was accomplished within the framework laid down in “Time for Leaders” (Jonusaite and Valuckiene, 2007), which

highlights manifestations of teacher leadership (although these cannot be generalised for all Lithuanian teachers). The analysis aimed to identify the recorded expressions of leadership in the reports detailing external evaluation of school activity quality. The research sample included 50 such reports, obtained through the method of content analysis. According to the report, the most influential body in schools is the school council. School councils are composed of those who have the competency to assume responsibility, to act autonomously and to influence the quality of the process of education directly, in one-third of the investigated schools. The teachers of the methodological circles render methodological support to colleagues and promote the sharing of good subject-specific and pedagogical experience. However, it is noted that the success of these methodological circles is frequently associated with the leading members. Besides, in one-third of the analysed schools, subject teachers (16 reports) are competent disseminators of their own practical experience, deliver seminars, share good experience and are willing to cooperate. The same tendency is observed in a study published three years later (Rupsiene and Skarbaliene, 2010), also based on modern theories of leadership and representative of Lithuania (394 teachers). In this paper, leadership is related to a particular status of a teacher leader: “comparing teachers who occupy / do not occupy leading positions it was designated that features of the leadership are more common to leaders” (p. 74).

It is difficult to overstate how much cooperation – how much “going together” – this type of teacher leadership involves. On the one hand, it is obvious that particular kinds of teachers are identified as leaders. This can be attributed to the ‘second wave’ of teacher leadership, in which teacher

leadership is associated with a particular improvement in the process of teacher training. On the other hand, although it is stated that teachers share and cooperate, the fact is that this occurs in only a small number of schools; teacher cooperation is therefore only marginally a characteristic of teacher leadership.

4.2. Second characteristic of teacher leadership: Reluctance to work with others

The second characteristic of teacher leadership derives from the results of the first and second “Time for Leaders” research projects, consisting of “longitudinal research in the changes of the manifestation of leadership in Lithuanian education” (Beresnevičiute et al., 2011; Katiliute et al., 2013). It is assumed that this picture is very accurate, as the research methodology complies with the modern concept of teacher leadership, and the sample is representative of Lithuania.

The studies are based on the systemic concept of leadership, which emphasises successful learning organisations and communities, distribution and assignment of leadership responsibilities and verticality and horizontality (relationships within the community). The data of the first research project (Beresnevičiute et al., 2011) was collected in 2011, via internet surveys. The research sample included 300 general education schools. A total of 1886 respondents were surveyed, among them 380 teachers. The data of the second research project (Katiliute et al., 2013) were collected at the end of 2012. The research sample involved 80 schools (15 municipalities). 4438 respondents (226 teachers) participated in the second survey. The questionnaires were prepared in the paper form, and the data collected at the end of 2012.

The first research project (Beresneviciute et al., 2011) determined that teachers who have less experience of teamwork than other teaching and non-teaching staff, are more likely to fear appearing incompetent in discussions. It seems they fear they may not have the 'right' answers. However, the findings of these studies presuppose the idea that an inability to work in teacher teams should lead to adoption of the directive teaching method in the classroom, rather than to cooperation with students.

The second research project concluded that, "as compared to the results of 2011 study, teachers in 2012 tend to value the personal traits more strongly, such as openness and initiative in discussions, the ability to listen and give support to other people" (Katiliute et al., 2013, p. 7). The results obtained explain that teachers had more relevant knowledge at their disposal at the onset of the project. However, it should be noted that teachers still evaluated teamwork rather critically. It seems that, given the lack of experience, a reluctance to engage in teamwork remains. They feel that they work in competitive environments in which teaching is still perceived to be a highly individualistic activity.

4.3. Third characteristic of teacher leadership: Beginning to cooperate

The third characteristic of teacher leadership is derived from the results of the third study, "Time of Leaders". The third study "Leadership for Learning: Theory and Practice in School Change" (Valuckiene et al., 2015) continued the research on educational leadership and focused on learning for leadership (LfL) as the essential feature of leadership at school. The model of the first and second "Time for Leaders" studies (Beresneviciute et al., 2011; Katiliute et al.,

2013) – was complemented with the addition of the dimension of common goals and responsibilities, as well as the elements of transformational and shared leadership and leadership for learning. School communities from 30 municipalities were selected for the research survey: 15 municipalities were involved in the project "Time for Leaders", excluding 15. 1934 teachers participated in of the survey.

The research results reveal the aspect of cooperation in teacher leadership. The results of the research on the dimension of teacher mutual support concluded that "joint work in improving the quality of lessons, support for colleagues attaining lower results and facing class management problems, as well as encouragement of such colleagues to participate in training courses, have not yet become a part of every school's culture: the evaluation of this dimension discloses considerable differences in schools" (Valuckiene et al., 2015, p. 167). The research also demonstrates that although education is discussed in schools, dialogue about learning is most often focused on more general topics and rarely gives time for teachers to reflect on personal experience. Teachers claim that collegial analysis of lessons and learning, as well as discussion of learning difficulties and planning of their elimination only occurs randomly. According to some researchers, "what happens in the classroom still contains features of mystery and does not make the basis for discussion that could contribute to the improvement of overall school activity" (Valuckiene et al., 2015, p. 167). Hence, it is no wonder that the highlighted tendency of collaborative work is hardly positive: teachers maintain that they hardly ever gather into teams on their own initiative to discuss relevant learning issues, consider means of school improvement, to discuss, let alone render and

implement proposals. Researchers refer to the provisions of the *collegial maintenance of teacher leadership* as a cause of relatively low expression of teacher leadership (Valuckiene et al., 2015). They claim that “teachers give a relatively low evaluation to the ideas and proposals of colleagues, hardly ever recognise and maintain collegial support in implementing these initiatives” (p.168). Nevertheless, it should be noted that “the research findings provide evidence that there are significant differences in evaluating the manifestation of leadership for learning between the teachers of the project and those not involved into the project” (p. 177). Hence, the project “Time for Leaders” can be said to create preconditions for the development of leadership competences of education community leaders, including teachers, as well as empowering them for cooperation.

5. DISCUSSION: THE POSSIBILITY OF THE THIRD WAVE OF TEACHER LEADERSHIP

The collected data suggests that we have made progress towards teacher collaboration in recent years, yet this progress is not as rapid as expected, for several reasons.

Firstly, one reason is the key fundamentals of the previous education system that existed for over half a century. The Soviet authoritarian education paradigm predisposed education culture to a conception of autocratic leadership, which manifested in school management. This involved a combination of power, justice and single-mindedness. We believe therefore that attainment of a qualitative, rather than merely apparent change in the conception of leadership will take time. Research on school culture in Lithuania (Duobliene, 2017) demonstrates

that teachers remain characteristically ‘colourless’ individuals, unwilling to assume responsibility, willing to flatter official policy and live according to rules, and very concerned with how they appear to others.

Secondly, the old education paradigm presupposed the teacher as a powerful, highly individual and all-knowing presence in the classroom. We continue to live with this legacy, and it affects the way we communicate with colleagues, our willingness to acknowledge own mistakes, the degree to which we will ask for advice or help.

The influence of the former education regime also explains cooperation difficulties. The sense of superiority passed down from Soviet times encourages competition and the desire not only to be ‘above’ the children, but also above colleagues. For this mindset it is imperative that *my children*, do the best and that *my children* conform to standards. Such an attitude kills any sprouts of cooperation and connectivity that might start to grow. Competition is the enemy of equality and good will among teachers, and confounds attempts to establish good relations between people and respect for others. According to Muijs and Harris (2007), teacher leadership, to the contrary, is premised on the cultivation of trust and collaboration.

Environment is the key to the question of teacher leadership, as it is to all other phenomena in the field of education. In one way or another, environment affects – promotes or inhibits – the phenomenon under investigation. It appears that teacher leadership and cooperation – “going together” – in Lithuania is still held back by the legacy of power, assumed universal knowledge and rivalry. Only if we acknowledge these unpleasant truths can we *go forward*. We believe that we will have to work to realise the third wave of teacher leadership, which,

according to Silva, Gimbert and Nolan (2000), will allow us to navigate the structure of the school and elicit change through teacher cooperation, connectivity and professionalism. We think that the “Time for Leaders” project, as it continues, embracing all municipalities of Lithuania, should emphasise the idea that teacher leadership is cooperative leadership. When they cooperate – when they “go together” – teachers share ideas, are not reluctant to ask or appear ignorant, listen to each other and respect each other’s opinions.

6. FINAL THOUGHTS

The democratic school system of Lithuania was created out of the ruins of the

Soviet regime over 25 years ago; and yet a culture of teacher leadership based on co-operation continues to elude us. Needless to say, to develop teacher leadership is not easy. It is, however, highly important, since it can help us to lay foundations for the positive transformation of the school community. It is assumed that the decade-long and ongoing “Time for Leaders” project is promoting the aforesaid cultural change. Professional, autonomous and responsible teachers are leaders able to create a dynamic system, in which all participants cooperate and learn from each other. Hence, we hope that, in the spirit of the ideas of Meile Luksiene, the Lithuanian school will shift from being the object to being the subject of education.

References

1. Beresneviciute, V., Dageyte, V., Dapkus, G., Katiliute, E. and Saviciute, D. (2011). Longitudinis lyderystes raiskos svietime tyrimas [Longitudinal Research on Leadership Expression in Education]. https://www.sac.smm.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/438_LONGITUDINIS-LYDERYSTES-RAISKOS-SVIETIME-TYRIMAS.pdf
2. Bruzgeleviciene, R. and Pusciene, J. (2013). Meiles Luksienes lyderyste Lietuvos svietimo reformoje [M. Luksiene’s Leadership during the Lithuanian Education Reform]. *Pedagogika*, *111*, 81-94. Retrieved from <http://pedagogika.leu.lt/index.php/Pedagogika/article/view/157>
3. Council of the European Union (2006). Conclusions of Efficiency and Quality in Education and Training. *Office Journal of the European Union*, 2006/C 298/03.
4. Drucker, P. F. (2008). *The Essential Drucker. The Best of sixty Years of Peter Drucker’s Essential Writings on Management*. New York: Collins Business Essentials.
5. Duobliene, L. (2017). Sizoidine mokytoju situacija: pavojus tapatybei ir kurybiskumo prielaida [The Schizoid Teacher Situation: a Danger for Identity and a Precondition for Creativity]. *Acta Paedagogica Vilnensia*, *38*, 11-24. <https://doi.org/10.15388/ActPaed.2017.38.10788>
6. Fairman, J. C. and Mackenzie, S. V. (2014). How Teacher Leaders Influence Others and Understand their Leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, *18*(1), 1-27.
7. Hairon, S. (2017). Teacher Leadership in Singapore: the Next Wave of Effective Leadership. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, *2*(2), 170-194.
8. Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional Capital: Transforming*

- Teaching in Every School*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
9. Harris, A. and Muijs, D. (2003). *Teacher Leadership: Principles and Practice*. Coventry, UK: Institute of Education, University of Warwick.
 10. Harris, A. (2008). *Distributed School Leadership: Developing Tomorrow's Leaders*. Oxon: Routledge.
 11. York-Barr, A. J., and Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about Teacher Leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 255-316.
 12. Jackson, C., Blandford, S., Pranckuniene, E. and Vildziuniene, M. (2011). Lyderiu laikas (Time for Leaders): Lithuania's Response to Changing Leadership and Learning in their Schools. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(5), 701-719.
 13. Jonusaite S. and Valuckiene J. (2007). Lyderystes charakteristikos bendrojo lavinimo mokykloje: isores audito ataskaitu kokybine analize [The Characteristics of the Leadership in the Secondary School: the Qualitative Diagnostics of the School Assessment Reports]. *Ekonomika ir vadyba: aktualijos ir perspektyvos*, 2(9), 102-107.
 14. Katiliute, D., Malciauskiene, A., Simonaitiene, B., Stanikuniene, B., Jezerskyte, E. and Cibulskas, G. (2013). *Longitudinio lyderystes raiskos svietime tyrimas* [Longitudinal Research on Leadership Expression in Education]. https://www.sac.smm.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Longitudinis_ataskaita_2013-02-27_GALUTINIS.pdf
 15. Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S. and Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of Research: How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.
 16. Leithwood, K., Mascal, B., Strauss, T., Sacks, R., Memon, N. and Yashkina, A. (2006). Distributing Leadership to make Schools Smarter. *Leadership and Policy*. 61(1): 37-67.
 17. Leithwood, K., Harris, A. and Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven Strong Claims about Successful School Leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 28, 27-42.
 18. Leithwood, K., Patten, S. and Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a Conception of how Leadership influences Student Learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), 671-706.
 19. *Lithuania's Progress Strategy "Lithuania 2030"*. Retrieved from <https://www.lietuva2030.lt/en/about>
 20. Luksiene, M. (2013). Jungtys [Linkages]. Vilnius: Alma littera.
 21. Marzano, R., Waters, T. and McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria: ASCD.
 22. Muijs, D. and Harris, A. (2007). Teacher Leadership in (In)action. Three Case Studies of Contrasting Schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(1), 111-133.
 23. *National Education Strategy for 2013–2022*. Resolution of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania No XII745, Official Gazette, 2013, No 140-7095. Retrieved from <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.463390>
 24. Nedzinskaite, R. and Barkauskaite, M. (2017). Mokytoju profesionaluma lemiantys transformacines lyderystes kompetencijos gebėjimai: mokytoju praktiku pozivuris [Abilities of Transformational Leadership Conditioning Teacher

- Professionalism: the Perspective of Teachers-Practitioners]. *Pedagogika*, 125(1), 37-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15823/p.2017.03>
25. Poekert, P., Alexandrou, A. and Darbianne, S. (2016). How Teachers become Leaders: an Internationally Validated Theoretical Model of Teacher Leadership Development. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 21(4), 307-329.
 26. Rogers, C. and Scales, R. Q. (2013). Preservice Teachers' Perceptions of Teacher Leadership: is it about Compliance or Understanding? *Issues in Teacher Education*, 22(2), 17-37.
 27. Rupsiene, L. and Skarbaliene, A. (2010). The Characteristics of Teacher Leadership. *Tiltai*, 4, 67-76.
 28. Silva, D., Gimbert, B. and Nolan, J. (2000). Sliding the Doors: Locking and Unlocking Possibilities for Teacher Leadership. *Teachers College Record*, 102(4), 779-804.
 29. Swaffield, S. (2014) *Reflecting on Themes in Teacher Leadership using Principles of Leadership for Learning*. ECER 2014: European Conference on Educational Research "The Past, the Present and the Future of Educational Research", Porto (Portugal), 2-5 September 2014.
 30. *Teachers and School Leaders in Schools as Learning Organisations. Guiding Principles for Policy Development in School Education*. Report from the ET2020 Working Group Schools 2016-18. Retrieved from: https://www.schooleducationgateway.eu/downloads/Governance/2018-wgs4-learning-organisations_en.pdf
 31. Valuckiene, J., Balciunas, S., Katiliute, E., Simonaitiene, B. and Stanikuniene, B. (2015). *Lyderyste mokymuisi: teorija ir praktika mokyklos kaitai* [Leadership for Learning: Theory and Practice for School Change]. Siauliai: Titnagas. Retrieved from <https://www.sac.smm.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Lyderyste-mokymuisi-teorija-ir-praktika-mokyklos-kaitai.pdf>
 32. Wenner, J. A. and Campbell, T. (2017). The theoretical and Empirical Basis of Teacher Leadership: A Review of the Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 134-171.
 33. Whitworth, B. A. and Chiu, J. L. (2015). Professional Development and Teacher Change: The Missing Leadership Link. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 26(2), 121-137
 34. Wilson, A. (2016). From Professional Practice to Practical Leader: Teacher Leadership in Professional Learning Communities. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 7(2), 45-62.

NASTAVNIČKO VOĐENJE U LITVI: JESU LI NASTAVNICI SPREMNI ZA SURADNJU?

Sažetak

Kroz proteklih 25 godina, Litva je kreirala obrazovni sustav, zasnovan na humanističkim i demokratskim vrijednostima. U njemu se veliki značaj pridaje nastavničkom vođenju, koje služi kao temelj za „rekulturizaciju“ i unapređenje školske zajednice. U ovom se radu pruža pregled spoznaja o nastavničkom vođenju u Litvi, pri čemu se naglašava aspekt nastavničke suradnje. Tri karakteristike nastavničke suradnje u Litvi, o kojima se raspravlja u članku, ukazuju da ona i

dalje predstavlja izazov. Naime, nastavnici se opiru raspravi i izradi prijedloga za unapređenje te im nedostaje iskustvo timskog rada. Međutim, treba očekivati da će projekt „Vrijeme za vođenje“, koji se još uvijek provodi, kreirati odgovarajuću promjenu kulture, potrebnu za stvaranje mreže učenja za nastavnike, kao i kreirati izvorni, otvoreni i stručni dijalog.

Ključne riječi: nastavničko vođenje, Litva, suradnja.