

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF DISTRIBUTIVE LEADERSHIP  
IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF EAST HARARGHE ZONE,  
OROMIA REGIONAL STATE**

**MA THESIS**

**BAYISA ISHETU**

**APRIL, 2019**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**Practices and Challenges of Distributive Leadership in Public Secondary  
Schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Educational Planning and  
Management**

**Postgraduate program directorate**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND  
MANAGEMENT**

**Bayisa Ishetu**

**April, 2019**

**Haramaya University, Haramaya**

# HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

## POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

We here by certify that, we have read and evaluated this thesis entitled “*Practices and Challenges of Distributive Leadership in Public Secondary Schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State*” prepared under our guidance by **Bayisa Ishetu Gemed**. We recommended that it be submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement.

**Bahar Adem (PhD)**

Major advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Gemechu Abera (Asso. Prof)**

Co-advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

As members of the board of examiners of the MA Thesis open Defense Examination, we certify that we have read, evaluated the thesis prepared by **Mr. Bayisa Ishetu Gemed** and examined the candidate. We recommended that the Thesis be accepted as fulfilling the Thesis requirement for the degree of *Master of Arts in Educational Leadership and Management*.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Final approval and acceptance of the Thesis is contingent upon the submission of its final copy to the council of graduate studies (SGC) through the candidate’s department or school graduate committee (DGC or SGC).

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicated this thesis to my loved parents for their very wish and encouragement in all dimensions of my future career.

## STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

By my signature below, I declare and affirm that this thesis is my own work. I have followed all ethical and technical principles of scholarship in the preparation, data collection, data analysis and completion of this thesis. Any scholar matter that included in the thesis has been given recognition through citation.

This Thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for MA degree at Haramaya University and deposited at university library to be made available to borrowers under rules of library. I seriously declared that this thesis must not be submitted to another institute anywhere for the award of any academic degree, diploma and certificate.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowed without special permission provided that accurate acknowledgement of source is made. Request for permission for extended quotations from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the post graduate program directorate or the head of department of Educational Planning and Management when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interest of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

Name of the author: Bayisa Ishetu Gemedu

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Place : Haramaya University, Haramaya

Department: Educational Planning and Management

Date of submission: \_\_\_\_\_

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

The author was born on June 10, 1994 in East Arsi Zone, Munesaa District, Oromia Regional State. When he was eight, he joined konche primary school in 2002 and attends primary school for 6 years and completed primary Education in kersa primary school in 2009. As he completed primary Education, he joined Kersa Secondary School from 2010-2011 and completed secondary school in kersa in 2014. In 2015, he joined Haramaya University, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Department of Educational Planning and Management at regular program and graduated in Bachelor of Arts Degree in Educational Planning and Management in 2017. After graduation, he directly joined MA program in Educational Leadership and Management at Haramaya University in regular program.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and for most, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my major advisor Dr. Bahar Adem and co-advisor Gemechu Abera (Associate Professor) for their unreserved guidance, patience, diligence and understanding that made this study possible. Their advice, commitment, unfailing encouragement, tremendous support, professional expertise and constrictive comment really appreciated. Without their guidance and professional expertise, the completion of this work would not have been possible.

My deep appreciation also goes to secondary schools of East Hararghe Zone, sampled schools leaders, teachers, supervisors, parents, teachers and students associations heads who devoted a substantial part of their time in completing the survey instruments and in providing me with the necessary information. Without their generous participation, this study would not have been realized.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Haramaya University, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Department of Educational Planning and Management under minister of education, for providing me this overwhelming and priceless chance. Moreover, my special thanks are to all instructors of Department of Educational Planning and Management.

Last but not the least, my heartfelt thanks and appreciation extends to my beloved family, my mother W/ro Gelene Desta, and my father Ato Ishetu Gemeda and all my brothers and sister for their continual and moral encouragement throughout the whole work.

Finally, I owe a lot to all who did their best to provide the data and information required to conduct the study and bring it to its end.

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

CSA	Central Statistical Agency
DL	Distributive Leadership
EHZ	East Hararghe Zone
MoE	Minster of Education
NCSL	National College of School Leadership

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURE</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1. Background of the Study</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2. Statement of the Problem</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3. Research Questions</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.4. Objectives of the Study</b>	<b>6</b>
1.4.1. General objective	6
1.4.2. Specific objectives	6
<b>1.5. Significance of the Study</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.6. Delimitations of the Study</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.7. Limitation of the Study</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.8. Operational Definition of key Terms</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.1. Notion of Distributive Leadership</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.2. Theoretical Origin of Distributive Leadership</b>	<b>10</b>

*continues ...*

<b>2.3. Features of Distributive Leadership</b>	<b>11</b>
2.3.1. Form of collective leadership	11
2.3.2. Recognizing other people’s expertise	12
2.3.3. Openness of the boundaries	12
2.3.4. Interactions among leaders, followers and situations	13
<b>2.4. Approaches of Distributive Leadership</b>	<b>13</b>
2.4.1. Top down approach	13
2.4.2. Bottom up approach	14
<b>2.5. Aspects of Distributive Leadership</b>	<b>14</b>
2.5.1. Leader plus aspect	14
2.5.2. Practice aspect	15
<b>2.6. Practices of Distributive Leadership in Schools</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2.7. Distributive Leadership in Secondary Schools</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.8. Major Challenges of Distrbutive Leadership Practices</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.9. The Role of School Leaders in Practicing Distrbutive Leadership</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2.10. Possible Strategies in Practicing Distrbutive leadership</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>2.11. Conceptual Framework</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>2.12. Summary of Review of Related Literature</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.1. Description of the Study Area</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.2. Research Design</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.3. Sources of Data</b>	<b>23</b>
3.3.1. Primary sources	23
3.3.2. Secondary sources	23

*continues ...*

<b>3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.5. Data Collection Instruments</b>	<b>26</b>
3.5.1. Questionnaire	26
3.5.2. Interview guide	27
<b>3.6. Data Collection Procedures</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.7. Methods of Data Analysis</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.8. Ethical Considerations</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.1. Background of the Respondents</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>4.2. Extent of Practicing of Distributive Leadership</b>	<b>33</b>
4.2.1. Extent of DL practices regarding its openness of the boundaries	33
4.2.2. Extent of DL practices regarding its form of collective leadership	37
4.2.3. Extent of DL practice in relation to recognizing other people’s expertise	39
<b>4.3. Perception of School Leaders and Teachers towards DL</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>4.4. Major Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership</b>	<b>47</b>
4.4.1. Major challenges of DL practices related with school leaders	47
4.4.2. Major challenges of DL practices related with teachers	50
4.4.3. Major challenges of DL related to school leaders and teachers	53
<b>4.5. Possible Strategies to overcoming the Challenges in Practicing DL</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>5.1. Summary</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>5.2. Conclusions</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>5.3. Recommendations</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>6. REFERENCES</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>74</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Tables'</b>	<b>pages</b>
1: Distribution of Populations, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	25
2: Respondents Backgrounds	31
3: Distributive Leadership Practices in Relation to its Openness of the Boundaries	34
4: Regression Analysis on DL Practices Regarding its Openness of the Boundaries	35
5: Distributive Leadership Practices in Relation to its Form of Collective Leadership	37
6: Regression Analysis on DL Practices Regarding its Form of Collective Leadership	38
7: Distributive Leadership Practices in Relation to Recognizing other People Expertise	39
8: Regression Analysis on DL Practices in Relation to Recognizing other People Expertise	41
9: Responses of Respondents about the Perceptions of DL Practices	44
10: Regression Analysis of Teachers and School Leaders Perception on DL Practices	46
11: Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership Related with School Leaders	48
12: Regression Analysis on the Major Challenges in Practicing DL Related With School Leaders	49
13: Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership Related with Teachers	50
14: Regression Analysis on the Major Challenges in Practicing DL Related with Teachers	52
15: Challenges in Practicing DL Related with School Leaders and Teachers	53
16: Regression Analysis on the Major Challenges in Practicing DL Related with School Leaders and Teachers	54
17: Possible Strategies to overcoming the Challenges in Practicing DL	56
18: Regression Analysis on the Possible Strategies to overcoming the Challenges in Practicing DL	60

## LIST OF FIGURE

<b>Figure</b>	<b>pages</b>
1: Conceptual Frame work of the study developed by the researcher	20
2: Map of study area	21

# **Practices and Challenges of Distributive Leadership in Public Secondary Schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State**

**Bayisa Ishetu**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The main purpose of this study was to examine Practices and Challenges of Distributive Leadership in Public Secondary Schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State. To conduct this study, descriptive survey research design was employed. A total of 155 respondents (120 teachers, 6 principals, 6 vice principals, 12 unit leaders, 5 supervisors and 6 PTSA heads) was included in the study. The principals, vice-principals, unit leaders, supervisors and PTSA heads were selected using availability sampling while the teachers respondents were selected using stratified random sampling technique. The data were gathered through questionnaire and interview. Data gathered through questionnaire were analyzed using percentage, frequency, mean, weighted mean, standard deviation and stepwise regression. Data obtained through interview and open-ended questionnaire were analyzed qualitatively. Findings from the data analysis revealed that teacher's participation, roles and involvement in decision-making in distributive leadership practices was low. The study showed that, respondents were disagreed regarding the issue school leaders and teachers are familiar with their colleagues for taking leadership role and have concepts about distributive leadership under study area. Unwillingness to work in a team, lack of smooth communication, lack of trust among school stakeholders and reluctance of teachers to delegate were some of the major challenges that deterred distributive leadership practices under study area. In addition, the study showed that sharing of responsibility, creating favorable condition and facilitating smooth communication amongst school leaders and teachers were some of the possible strategies for the challenges in practicing distributive leadership. On the basis of these major findings and conclusion, the following recommendations were made. ZEO, in collaboration with WEO, should provide short and long term training regarding leadership practices to schools leaders in the form of workshops and seminars. School leaders should work more on empower, capacitate and create opportunity for all teachers, so that teachers will be fully involved in leadership practices.*

**Key words:** - challenges, distributive leadership, secondary schools, practices.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, basic research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and definition of key terms.

## 1.1. Background of the Study

Leadership is a complex phenomenon that exists in any organization where the need of inspiring and influencing members of the given organization. Gronn (2002) states leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal in the organization. Secondary schools adapt and apply different types of leadership approach that fits the existing context to achieve their own mission and goals. However the old way of leading people in this very flux and turbulent world become the risky job for the secondary schools leaders. Besides, very swift global trends and local demands of education make the size and complexity of secondary schools too big to lead.

The concept and understanding of distributive leadership vary widely. There are competing and sometimes conflicting interpretations of what distributed leadership means (Leithwood, Mascall, Strauss, Sacks, Memon, and Yashkina, 2007). The diverse concepts mean that distributive leadership is frequently used to describe any form of devolved, shared or distributed leadership practice in schools (Harris, 2008). Theoretically, the perspective of distributive leadership acknowledges that multiple individuals are involved in the leading and managing of schools and shifts the focus from formal leaders to a web of leaders in schools (Gronn, 2003; Spillane, 2006; Spillane and Diamond, 2007).

Deem (2001) states that the concept of distributive leadership has been recommended as a response to new challenges posed towards educational institutions based on the understanding that mere hierarchical leadership practices are not well suited to global complexity. Recent distributive leadership approach can be said to fully change even ignore the traditional leadership and leader definitions since leadership in distributive leadership approach has a

more complex structure than leadership behaviors (Harris and Lambert, 2003; Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Hopkins, and Harris, 2006).

According to Spillane (2006) distributive leadership is a system of practices comprise a collection of interacting components of leaders, followers and situation. These interacting components should be understood together because the system is more than the sum of the component parts. Besides, distributive leadership goes beyond acknowledging that multiple individuals are involved in leadership practice and exploring the interactions between individuals and investigating the situation in which leadership is enacted. A distributed perspective on leadership is not a prescription for leadership but instead a lens or tool that we can use to examines leadership.

Distributive leadership has become a popular representation of leadership which has encouraged a shift in focus from the attributes and behaviors of individual leaders as promoted within traditional trait, behavioral, situational, and transformational theories of leadership to a more systemic perspective, whereby leadership's conceived as a collective social process emerging through the interactions of multiple actors (Uhl-Bien, 2006).

From this point of view, Bennett, Wise, Woods, and Harvey (2003), argued that:

*Distributive leadership is not something done by an individual to others, or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization; it is a group of activity what works through and within relationship, rather than individual action.*

Thus, in the researcher view, distributive leadership is a result of reflecting the cognizance organizational management regarding the view that leadership roles and positions should be shared. That is to say, distributive leadership addresses the entirety of human resources in organizations, especially the academic staff in educational organizations as leaders rather than relied on individual leaders because a shared vision can be attained more efficiently through shared responsibility.

Successful leaders have to work inside and outside the boundaries of their school context. As there are ambiguities about the activities which may actually be considered leadership, it is

difficult to sketch the boundaries of a leaders work (Mayrowetz, 2008). Duignan (2006) stated, many educational leaders leave themselves, isolated and alone, taking primary responsibility for the leadership of their school which constitutes a very narrow view of leadership and ignores the leadership talents of teachers, students and other community stakeholders. But an educational institution in general and secondary schools in particular are expected to create knowledge, culture of sharing of energy and commitment to respond students' needs, and societal expectations. These problems coupled with their unique features, such as academic freedom; collegial relationship; specialized and qualified academic staff and its relative open boundary to stimulate education policy makers and leaders to look in to distributive leadership approach to disperse and share leadership among the various members.

Middlehurst (1993) states leadership should be distributed across the institution. Despite this, the actual processes and practices by which leadership is distributed and the implications for leadership practice and development in the secondary schools have received relatively little attention. The researcher goal in this study is to examine the practices and challenges of distributive leadership in public secondary schools of East Hararghe Zone.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

In educational organizations, effective leadership provides higher quality of work, more efficient goods and services and it brings about higher level of satisfaction to both service employees and external service recipients. Historically, the conceptions of leadership have passed different phases that extend from the classical notion of heroic leaders to the new leadership approach called distributive leadership (Harris, 2004). Recently, leadership approach that best fit to the school system has emerged with the concept of distributive leadership as opposed to traditional leadership approach (Elmor, 1999-2000).

Secondary schools have impact and are impacted by the supra environment. In order to respond the changing environment, they are expected to involve actively in teaching-learning and creating a culture of the schools that provides coherence, to respond student's needs and exercising leadership practices more than ever. On time and proportional response to the ever changing environment requires new way of leadership approach that encompasses member of

the academic staff in decision making in various degree and size. However, despite these continuous and progressive changes of the global aspects, the leadership style of most secondary schools are traditional top-down approach where a decision making power significantly in the hand of top leaders. Harris (2005) points out that ignoring the major structural, cultural, and micro political challenges operating in schools makes distributive forms of leadership difficult to implement. Hence, applying leadership style that fit and outdone the unsympathetic and turbulent milieu is not a matter of option, rather it is an issue of survival.

Spillane (2004) state that, the studies on distributed forms of leadership is still at its early stages and the accessible empirical evidence about it is not abundant. However, the features and application of distributive leadership in secondary schools have not been adequately explored. Nevertheless, Hulpia and Devos (2009) explored the linkage between distributed leadership and teacher's organizational commitment through semi-structured interviews with teachers. They found that teachers were no more committed to the school when school leaders were highly accessible and encouraged their participation in decision making. In another study, Leithwood, Mascall, and Strauss (2009) examined the relationship between distributed leadership and teacher's academic optimism. According to their findings, there was significant association between planned approaches to the distribution of leadership and high levels of academic optimism.

Regarding Ethiopia, there are some evidences that verify distributive leadership practice was not effective. Studies by Misgana (2017) in secondary schools of Hadiya Zone related to principal distributive leadership, studies by Dejene (2014) in Addis Abeba Unuversity, studies by Shimelis (2018) in Secondary Schools of Aksum Town and Asrat (2017) in primary schools of Deberk District have conducted on issues related to practice and challenges of distributed leadership. However, most of them are different in numerous ways from the current study. Based on their finding the above researchers identified the following problems, namely principal performances of practicing distributive leadership is inadequate, principals spending much of their time on administrative than academic issues and lack of collective responsibility for the goal attainment. However, they are different from this study in different ways. Firstly, they focused only on the role of principals on the practices of distributive

leadership but they did not say anything about the role of school leaders (vice principals, unit leaders, supervisors) and teachers in practicing distributive leadership played by all school stakeholders. Secondly, the researcher could not find the study conducted regarding distributive leadership in the area under study. Finally, empirical research investigation in relation to distributive leadership in secondary schools in Ethiopia is very rare.

Regarding the practices the researcher himself has been conducted his senior easy research entitled on Factors Affecting Academic Achievement of students in some secondary schools of Haramaya Woreda for the Requirement of Bachelor of Arts of Degree in Educational Planning and Management, He faced a lot of challenges, such as, school leaders were unable to organize the teachers and work with them collaboratively, there were weak sharing of ideas among the school leaders and teachers, and teachers also consider classroom teaching as their sole responsibility rather than working together collaboratively. To the best of the researcher knowledge, no more studies were conducted in this area in relation to distributive leadership; this by itself initiates the researcher to undertake this study in order to identify practices and challenges of distributive leadership in public secondary schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State.

### **1.3. Research Questions**

In the process of the study, the researcher attempted to answer the following basic research questions:

1. To what extent do secondary schools leaders and teachers participate in practicing distributive leadership in public secondary schools of EHZ?
2. How do teachers and school leaders perceive the concepts of distributive leadership under study area?
3. What are the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership under study area?
4. What are the possible strategies to be taken in order to practices distributive leadership in secondary schools of EHZ?

## **1.4. Objectives of the Study**

This section provides the objectives of the study. It comprises general objective and specific objectives.

### **1.4.1. General objective**

The general objective of this study is to examine practices and challenges of distributive leadership in public secondary schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State.

### **1.4.2. Specific objectives**

Specifically, the specific objective of this study was able to:-

1. Examine the extent to which secondary schools leaders and teachers participate in practicing distributive leadership under study area.
2. Identify how teachers and school leaders perceive the concepts of distributive leadership in public secondary schools of EHZ.
3. Identify the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership in public secondary schools of EHZ.
4. Suggest possible strategies in practicing distributive leadership under study area.

## **1.5. Significance of the Study**

The results of this study may help create awareness among the secondary schools teachers, principals, vice principals, unit leaders, PTSA heads and supervisors by revealing what sort of distributive leadership competences do they lack while they were leading, progressing teaching-learning and sharing of experiences in their schools and how they fill these gaps in order to bring changes in their respective secondary schools. Therefore, the researcher strongly believes that the findings of this study report and recommendations have the following contributions.

The results of the study may help solve practical challenges of distributive leadership in secondary schools under study area. It may provide a clear insight into the existing practices

and pitfalls of distributive leadership for secondary schools education leadership police makers. It may also use as career development to the researcher. It may also be used as stepping-stone for those who want to engage further study on similar issue. The findings of the study may benefit EHZ secondary schools staff by giving soft copies and publishing it on international journals and it may serve as an input for different level of experts, that is, District Education Office, Zonal Education Office and Regional Education office.

### **1.6. Delimitations of the Study**

The study was delimited to public secondary schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State. It was delimited to four selected Districts and one administrative town in the zone. They are, Kombolcha, Haramaya, Kersa and Gela Oda meyo Districts and Awaday administrative town. In the selected Districts, there were ten secondary schools. It was unaffordable and unmanageable to consider all schools for the study due to the reason of finance and time constraint. To make the study more manageable and consistent, six public secondary schools were selected by the researcher through using simple random sampling techniques. These schools are Adele, Kombolcha, keransa, kersa, Burqa and Awaday secondary schools.

The subject of the study were principals, vice principals, supervisors, PTSA heads, unit leaders and teachers. Because, the researcher consider them as they have more information about the distributive leadership practices in their school. The study merely focused on variables such as, practices, perception, challenges and possible strategies of distributive leadership. To make the study more manageable, frequency, percentage, mean, weighted mean, standard deviation and stepwise regression analysis was used. Questionnaire and interview were used as an instrument of data collection. In relation to sampling techniques, availability sampling techniques was employed for principals, vice principals, unit leaders, PTSA heads and supervisors whereas stratified random sampling techniques was employed for teachers.

## 1.7. Limitation of the Study

This study did not come to end without drawback. Some of the limitation that faced the researcher in conducting this study was lack of experiences, shortage of reference materials related to the study in Ethiopia and shortage of current literature in area of distributive leadership that could enrich the study. Another limitation was some of the teacher's respondents lack interest and being reluctant when they filled and returned the questionnaires. In addition, some of the supervisors were busy and had not enough time to respond interview and they were creating delaying tactics by giving appointment for different reasons. Due to this condition, the researcher consumed more time than previously allocated for data collection.

## 1.8. Operational Definition of key Terms

**Distributive leadership** is a leadership approach that emphasize on how the work of leadership takes place among the school stakeholders in the context of schools.

**Perception** is a belief or an image that school leaders and teachers sees or understands practices of distributive leadership.

**Practices** refer to the extent in which distributive leadership is exhibited.

**Secondary school** is refers to school level encompassing grades 9-10.

**Challenges** refer to the extent that school leaders and teachers faced while practicing distributive leadership in schools.

## **2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

The focus of this chapter is to review literatures that are relevant to the topic, distributive leadership practices and challenges in public secondary schools of East Hararghe zone, oromia regional state. Therefore, different type of books, journals and other related materials was reviewed and presented in the following part.

### **2.1. Notion of Distributive Leadership**

The term distributed leadership means different things to different people. Distributed leadership is believed to have been used for the first time by Gibb (1954), an Australian psychologist, who draw consideration to the dynamics of influence processes as they impact on the work of different groups. Gibb states that leadership should not be viewed as the domination of the individual but rather as communal functions among individuals. Harris, Leithwood, Sammons and Hopkinson (2007) refer distributed leadership as the leadership idea of the moment. A review of the educational administration literature suggests that the concept of distributed leadership has been embraced with enthusiasm by educational researchers and scholars.

The notion of distributive leadership has also been used sometimes, collective leadership (Denis, Lamothe, and Langley,2001), collaborative leadership (Rosenthal,1998), co-leadership (Henan and Bennis, 1999). However, one Common across all these accounts is the idea that leadership is not the domination or responsibility of just one person, rather its collective and systemic understanding of leadership as a social process (Barker, 2001).

*Distributive leadership basically involves both vertical and lateral dimensions of leadership practices. Distributed leadership encompasses both formal and informal forms of leadership practices within its framing, analysis and interpretation. It is mainly concerned with the co-performance of leadership and the reciprocal interdependencies that shape leadership practices (Harris, 2009).*

From this statement, one can conclude that distributed leadership in any organization can fit all leadership dimensions with the intent of ensuring learning among schools leader in particular and organizational learning in general.

Distributive leadership is not something done by an individual to others or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization; it is a group activity that works through and within relationships rather than individual action (Bennett *et al.*, 2003). According to Gronn (2002a) distributive leadership offered to promise a new unit of analysis through which leadership could be understood in a holistic sense rather than simply aggregation of individual contributions. Some authors use the term shared leadership (Pearce and Sims, 2002 and Pearce, 2004) while others use the term distributive leadership (Gronn, 2002). At this point, there seems to be no clear conceptual differences between these approaches and different authors employ them interchangeably (Day, Gronn, and Salas, 2004).

Besides the different terms employed, different authors depart in their conceptualizations of distributive leadership on different grounds, including the scope of participating agents in the leadership process. Some authors have paying attention on a single team or group of people as their unit of analysis (Brown and Hosking Pearce, 2004), while others have taken a more open-systems approach taking the whole organization and even constituencies beyond the organizational boundaries as their unit of analysis (Spillane, 2004). However, regardless of these differences, most authors agree upon two principles as a basis concept of distributive leadership; first, leadership is a collective influence process to which several individuals contribute and secondly, leadership arises from the interactions of diverse individuals by which helps to form a group or a systems in which essential expertise is dispersed quality.

## **2.2. Theoretical Origin of Distributive Leadership**

Distributive leadership is not a new concept at all (Hoy and Miskel, 2012). It is a leadership approach used since the 50s (Gibb, 1954; and Gronn, 2002). While it is only really in the turn of the millennium that the concept of distributive leadership has been broadly embraced by scholars and practitioners, the origins of the concept go back quite a bit further. Oduro (2004) suggests that distributive leadership date back 1250 BC, which is one of the most ancient leadership concepts recommended for fulfilling organizational goals through people. In terms of its theorization, Harris (2009) proposes that it is an idea that can be traced back as far as the mid of twentieth and possibly earlier.

In educational sciences, researchers have started to focus on shared leadership since 1990 (Gronn, 2002). However, distributive leadership concept and approaches still continued to be explained under concepts such as self-leadership or super leadership or shared leadership (Bostancı, 2012). According to Harris and Lambert (2003) conceptual and functional discussions related to distributive leadership are still continuing in spite of organizational learning studies for more than twenty years. Still there are no clear identifications about how to familiarize distributive leadership positions, roles, practices and pictures in schools (Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond, 2001).

The inexistence task of distribution by the leader is myth in distributed leadership (Harris and Lambert, 2003). Since distributing tasks and duties as well as delegating positions is the most important power element in the leadership process. The most important and striking element that separate distributive leadership form the other leadership concepts is the fact that distributive leadership includes many elements related to education and is almost fed by educational environments. In this sense, Halverson and Clifford (2013) calls distributive leadership as distributed instructional leadership and define the concepts as generation of an effective leaning climate by the leaders for teachers and others.

## **2.3. Features of Distributive Leadership**

In reviewing related literature, the following distinctive features of distributive Leadership can be discerned (Gronn, 2000; Macbeath, and Timperley, 2005; Spillane, 2006).

### **2.3.1. Form of collective leadership**

In a feature of distributive leadership, Silins and Mulford (2002) describe as a sharing learning through teams of staff working together to argument the range of knowledge and skills available for the organization to change and participating future developments. The notion of distributive leadership is characterized as a form of collective leadership in which staff develops expertise by working collaboratively which incorporates the activities of various individuals in the organization who work together in the process of organizational change. A distributive outlook of leadership recognizes that leading organization engages multiple school

leaders who share responsibilities and operate for a common goal. The basic perspective distributive leadership moves outlined by Yukl (2002) as follow:

*An alternative perspective to the heroic single leader, that is slowly gaining more adherents is to define leadership as a shared process of enhancing the individual and collective capacity of people to accomplish their work effectively instead of a heroic leader who can perform all essential leadership functions, the functions are distributed among different members of the team or organization (Yukl, 2002).*

### **2.3.2. Recognizing other people's expertise**

Distributive leadership highlights leadership as an emergent property of a group or system of interacting individuals (Gronn, 2002). He identified the notion of distributive leadership as an emergent property of a group or network of individuals in which group members pool their expertise. It is not something done by an individual to others or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization. When people work together in such a way; they pull together their abilities and expertise. The result is greater than the sum of their individual actions. Distributive leadership perspectives focuses on how leaders encourage and sustain conditions for successful schooling in interaction with others, rather than on what structures are necessary for success (Spillane, 2004). Generally, distributive leadership is about more than accounting for all leaders in an organization and adding up their actions to arrive at more wide-ranging account of leadership (Spillane, 2006). Therefore, by distributing responsibilities among staff, it is believed that every member of the organization has the capability to work as a leader (Lambert, 1998).

### **2.3.3. Openness of the boundaries**

Distributive leadership suggests openness of the boundaries of leadership. This idea suggests that leadership should be accessible to organizational members who demonstrate their expertise in different aspects with leadership delivered to them (Woods, 2004). Leadership is not restricted to a traditional definition that espouses only one person in charge of the organization (Spillane, 2004). Moreover, distributive leadership supports the idea that varieties of expertise are distributed across many ways. Various perspectives and capabilities found in individuals through the organization can concentrate a dynamic which represents more than the sum of the individual contributors. It is possible that people other than those experts will

then adopt, adapt and improve them within a mutually trusting and supportive culture that expertise are distributed throughout the organization.

#### **2.3.4. Interactions among leaders, followers and situations**

A distributive leadership perception focuses on interactions among leaders, followers and their situations. Many scholars agreed that distributive leadership is not the same as dividing tasks among personnel who perform, defined and separate organizational roles; they believe that distributive leadership consists of dynamic interactions between multiple leaders, followers and situations (Timperley, 2005). Distributive perspective in schools frames leadership practice as a product of interaction among leaders, followers and the situations (Spillane 2006). It tries to find out the interrelations of people and their situation through a wider lens where the individual knowledge and skill is measured as a matter of practice.

### **2.4. Approaches of Distributive Leadership**

Distributive leadership approaches address leadership along with teams, groups and organizational characteristics. As a result, distributive leadership approach claims that leadership at schools is a complex process (Deal and Peterson, 1994) and includes many elements (Hoy and Miskel, 2012). In this context, tasks and duties at schools are courses of duties that are too multi-dimensional and complex to be handled by a single person or school principal.

#### **2.4.1. Top down approach**

A number of studies summarized by Bennett *et al.*, (2003) which stated that, an important starting point towards the development of distributive leadership may be found in top down initiative from a strong leadership model where senior and formal leaders demonstrate significant influence on the school's culture. Many staff do not wish to be given leadership roles or have taken on responsibility beyond their own class teaching (NCSL, 2004). To distribute leadership, a strong leader is required to provide guidance and direction to make people feel confident (Elmore, 2000; and NCSL, 2004).

Formal leaders need to avoid overly controlling behavior and actively encourage and value innovative ideas from all members of the school. This means providing time, space and opportunities and knowing when to step back, enable staff members, to contribute and participate in decision making and establish concerted action. Distributive leadership does not mean that everybody leads, but that everybody has the potential to lead at some time. The degree to which informal leaders are involved in the process of distributive leadership may vary. A top down initiative may acknowledge and incorporate the existing informal power of leadership relationships into more formal leadership structures in ways seen as appropriate by the senior staffs that are creating the distributive structure or culture.

#### **2.4.2. Bottom up approach**

The initiative can also come from the bottom instead of top down. A bottom up approach is more likely to derive from individuals or groups within the organization who already are seen by colleagues as having a leadership role or when there is a lack of strong leadership (Bennett *et al.*, 2003). According to NCSL (2004) opportunistic and cultural distribution can be more characterized as bottom up forms of distribution. In opportunistic distribution, leadership is taken rather than given or planned. The success of such a bottom up approach may depend upon an attempt to bring into line formal and informal leaders within the organization. Cultural distribution is a form of distribution where leadership is not formally nor explicitly delegated, but a reflection of the entire school culture. This type of leadership is more intuitive, organic and spontaneous and is expressed in activities rather than in roles (NCSL, 2004).

### **2.5. Aspects of Distributive Leadership**

According to Spillane and Diamond (2007) distributive leadership perception involves two aspects- the leader plus aspect and the practice aspect.

#### **2.5.1. Leader plus aspect**

Distributive perspective acknowledges that the work of leading and managing schools involves multiple individuals. Leadership and management work involves more than what

individuals in formal leadership positions do. People in formally designated leadership and management positions and those without any such designations can and do take responsibility for leading and managing the schools (Spillane and Diamond, 2007). The leader-plus aspect recognizes that leading and running an organization involves multiple leaders. Leader-plus aspect alone is vital but not sufficient for explaining the complexity of leadership. The conceptual framework of distributed leadership developed by Spillane (2006) moves beyond the leader-plus aspect. Distributive leadership means more than shared leadership. As leadership moves away from a command and control model to a more cultivate and coordinate model, the way that leadership is taught must change too.

### **2.5.2. Practice aspect**

The leadership practice aspect moves the focus from traditional leadership beyond an individual's actions to the interactions among leaders, followers and their situations (Spillane, 2006). A distributive leadership perception frames the practice aspect in a particular way; it frames as a product of school leaders interactions, followers and aspect of their situations. This distributive view of leadership shifts focus from leaders and other formal and informal leaders to the web of leaders, followers, and their situations that gives leadership practice (Spillane and Diamond, 2007).

## **2.6. Practices of Distributive Leadership in Schools**

To study leadership practices, one has study the interplay between leaders, followers and situations. Ultimately, when distributive leadership becomes a part of the schools operating practices, school leaders have a clear understanding of which tasks should be distributed, who should be participate in distribution and the use of artifacts will guide the schools instructional program (Fullan, 2003).

Leadership practices takes shape in the interactions of people and their situations, rather than from the actions of an individual leader (Spillane, 2005). A network of leaders should be created in order to create successful change (Watson and Scribners, 2007). They contend the leaders are both formal and informal in their roles, and they perform a variety of functions that are spread across the organization. With such a network, all members offer a unique

perspective and serve as experts in their own rights. According to Gronn (2000), Distributive leadership theory suggests the leaders should build leadership throughout the organization to include individuals and teams. Leaders set the tone to foster practices within the school that collaboration is paramount. With distributive leadership, the leadership is no longer central and supports the notion that everyone can demonstrate leadership with the organization (Gronn, 2003).

Leithwood (2006) determined that a school leader who actually uses the distributive leadership approaches engage staff in behaviors such things as: setting the school direction, establishing professional development initiatives, redesigning the organization, and managing instruction. Such leadership functions are an important part of the success of the school. In addition, Moller and Eggen (2005) reported that the local and historical contexts of the schools influenced the methods and tools of distributed leadership that leaders employed. A few core practices that were used by school leaders who used distributed leadership included setting direction, developing people, and redesigning the organization to strengthen culture and build collaborative processes that facilitated distributive leadership.

## **2.7. Distributive Leadership in Secondary Schools**

Secondary schools are subjected to a growing list of demands and expectations, which have an active interest in education for globalized work and informed citizenship. The key consumers in schools are students who are becoming more diverse and demanding in terms of their requirements and demands for services which fit their circumstances. These diverse needs and expectations of the society need sound leadership approaches that comply with these changes and expectations. According to Simkins (2005) the role of leadership in secondary schools claims that the idea of leadership as being context-related and dispersed among people represents a more constructive framework to understand such organizations.

## **2.8. Major Challenges of Distributed Leadership Practices**

Contemporary literature points some difficulties, barriers, challenges and obstacles associated with distributive leadership in schools. Most researchers engaged with distributive leadership were worry of its efficiency in producing effective solutions to issues of distributive leadership

in schools, since it was not a new idea that lacked clarity (Harris, 2004; Leithwood *et al.*, 2009), was a risky approach when leadership were designated to unskilled teachers (Timperley, 2009; Bell, 2007) and for some teachers, it is perceived as increased workloads and responsibilities (Torrance, 2012).

Liljenberg (2015) also argued that the usage and application of distributive leadership in the school context is not an easy task for school leaders to implement. Hence, practicing distributive leadership is considered as the major challenges for head teachers since it is a new approach that needed much study, especially on its effectiveness and the ways in which it constructed new leadership roles within each school. Empirically speaking, challenges and issues of distributive leadership within the educational context can be divided according to challenges in the school hierarchical structure, teacher competencies, the willingness to assume leadership roles, the concept of power sharing between head teachers with teachers in understanding of the practice of distributive leadership.

Fullan (2006) stated that an external environmental force creating many challenges for secondary schools, these challenges require secondary schools to develop capable change cultures, and the broad base of leaders and leadership capabilities. The problems cover the need for greater access to educational institution, changing patterns of participation, changing expectations of students and growing diversity and consequent pressures on maintaining academic standards (Fullan and Scott, 2009).

Another significant challenges faced by school leaders while practicing distributed leadership perspectives is the difficulties in finding teachers that manage to implement the relevant tasks that were delegated. For example, a study by Abu (2011) in Bangladesh reveals that school leaders encountering difficulties in delegating their tasks to the right teachers suitable for the job. Apart from that, there were possibilities that teachers may take advantage of distributive leadership to challenge and resist the dominant policy agenda. To minimize the challenges of distributive leadership, operations were restricted to a small group of senior teachers; this led to separation among teachers, between leaders and followers.

Furthermore, Torrance (2012) performed that some of the challenges of distributive leadership in schools were, most teachers and school leaders did not possess the talent and personality of

a leader, Workloads of teachers and staff and the issue of perception towards legitimate appointments confuses the issue of leadership among their colleagues. In addition to this, some of the challenges of distributive leadership in schools were lack of communication, team work, and shared responsibilities, poor leadership ability, lack of commitment, lack of motivational skills and task overload is another major challenge.

## **2.9. The Role of School Leaders in Practicing Distributive Leadership**

The role of the school leaders has been evolving during the last twenty years. In the late 1980s school leaders were expected to be the head instructional leaders in the buildings as well as be good managers by attending to all the details and completing paperwork on time, good supervisors of teachers and instructional staff and good bosses who kept the school faculty motivated, compliant, and cooperative (Kratzenmerer and Moller, 2001). The emergence of shared decision making resulted in the 1990s and school leaders who were open to sharing this responsibility were able to empower teachers. Currently there is a shift toward school administration focusing on developing a shared vision, improving school culture, increasing teacher leadership, transforming schools, and creating professional learning communities (Kratzenmeyer and Moller, 2001).

The role of school leaders is crucial in practicing distributive leadership, building leadership capacity and sharing leadership in the school. In schools where school leaders encourage traditional practices, emerging teacher leaders are snuffed out because of the positional challenges between teachers and administrators. In order for the school leaders to be an effective leader, school leaders must be first grounded in his values and then must share these with others (Lambert, 2003). For leadership to be distributed among many leaders, school leaders must build leadership capacity in teachers and provide support.

Blase and Blase (2001) stated that, to empower teachers, school leaders must be model, build, and support a trusting environment, structure the school to allow for collaboration, use professional development and resources to support shared decision making, focus on teaching and learning, model professional behavior, praise teachers, and set up effective ways of communication.

## **2.10. Possible Strategies in Practicing Distributive Leadership**

Because of dynamic environment, the vision, mission and core values of many secondary schools are under continuous challenges. Therefore, today school leaders must be skilled not only in motivating change, but also powerfully articulating for a diverse audience. Mulatu (2015) in his study recommended that school leaders should have to build trust among school teachers and other stakeholders, primarily focus on developing people through empowering and encouraging them.

Some of the possible strategies to enhance the challenges of distributive leadership were promote and facilitate collaboration, by which school leaders should have a responsibility to structure the school day and teachers' schedules so that teachers have time to collaborate, sharing and expressing their ideas, creating favorable condition to create team leadership, initiating individuals or groups to make decisions on issues important for schools success in practicing distributive leadership strategies, develop lesson plans together, and determine curricular goals (Knapp, Copland, Plecki, and Portin, 2006). Thus, in the researcher view encouraging other school stakeholders including teachers in their professional network, that helps to improve distributive leadership practices, develop collegial relationship, gain and share new ideas were some of the possible strategies in practicing of distributive leadership.

## **2.11. Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework is referred to as a set of broad ideas and principles taken from relevant fields of enquiry and used to structure a subsequent presentation (Kombo, and Tromp, 2008). It is used to clarify variables, concepts and to propose relationships among the concepts in this study. Distributive leadership practices might be affected by several challenges in schools such as challenges related with school leaders, teachers and both teachers and school leaders, absences of good practices and perception of teachers and school leaders on issues of distributive leadership. If the preceding factors are not adequately attended to, they can lead to unrealistic future plans which could result into too many consequences to the practices of distributive leadership such as lack of interaction among school leaders, followers and situations. These factors happened in the public secondary schools of East Hararghe Zone still a challenge as the findings in my studies.




Figure 1: Conceptual Frame work of the study developed by the researcher

## 2.12. Summary of Review of Related Literature

In the review of related literature, notion of distributive leadership, theoretical origin of distributive leadership, features of distributive leadership, approaches of distributive leadership, aspects of distributive leadership, practices of distributive leadership in schools, distributive leadership in secondary schools, challenges in practicing distributive leadership, the role of school leaders in practicing distributive leadership and possible strategies to overcoming in practicing distributive leadership were discussed.

### 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This section of study deals with description of the study area, research design and method, sources of data, population, samples size and sampling technique, data collection instruments, data collection procedures, methods of data analysis and Ethical consideration.

#### 3.1. Description of the Study Area

This study was conducted in East Hararghe zone, Oromia Regional State, which is geographically located in eastern part of Ethiopia and it is one of the 19 zones in the Oromia Regional State. In the zone, there are twenty Districts and four administrative towns. Out of them four Districts and one administrative town was selected for the study; Kombolcha, Haramaya, Gola Oda and kersa Districts and Awaday administrative town. It lies between 8° 29' to 59.99" north latitudes and 40° 39' to 59.99" east longitudes. It shares boundaries to the southwest by Shebelle River which separates from Bale, to the West by West Hararghe, to the North by Dire Dawa and to the North and East by Somali region. Harari Regional State is entirely surrounded by East Hararghe zone. The zone capital is Harar, which is 526 km far away from the Ethiopian capital, Addis Abeba (CSA, 2007).




Figure 2: Map of study area

Based on the census conducted by the central statistical agency of Ethiopia 2007 (CSA), East Hararghe zone has a total population of 2,723,850, of whom 1,383,198 are men and 1,340,652 women with an area of 17,935.40km<sup>2</sup>. In the zone there were three largest ethnic groups, Oromo (93.69%), Amhara (4.16%), and Somali (1.84%); all other ethnic groups made up 0.31% of the population. Afan Oromo was spoken as a first language by 92.57%, 4.02% spoke Amharic, and 3.05% spoke Somali; the remaining 0.36% spoke all other primary languages. The majority of the inhabitants were Muslim, with 95.28% of the population, while 4.51% professed Ethiopian Orthodox Christianity. In terms of weather conditions, the zone contains three agro-ecological zones, Dega (highlands—elevations above 2,300m), woina Dega (midlands – elevations between 1,500 and 2,300m) and kolla (lowlands – below 1,500m).

According to a May 24, 2004 World Bank memorandum, concerning education 53% of all eligible children are enrolled in primary school and only 10% of children were enrolled in secondary schools in east hararghe zone. In terms of their major crops grown in the area were sorghum, maize, ground nut, potato, onion, Khat and other vegetable crops. Livestock are important components of the farming system for consumption and source of income. The livestock rearing is mostly not greater than four herd per household because of shortage of grazing land, the Animal feeding method is most commonly have experienced cut and carry system (CSA, 2007).

### **3.2. Research Design**

The descriptive survey research design was employed in this study, because the intention of the study was to examine the existing situation and describe opinions that are held on practices and challenges of distributive leadership under study area. According to Best and Kahn (2006) descriptive research design helps describe and interpret the existing condition. In addition, Mouton (2001) states that a descriptive survey is used to collect and describe data at a large. By using this type of research design, the researcher attempted to describe the insight, practice, challenges and possible strategies of distributive leadership under the study area.

For this study, mixed method (with both quantitative and qualitative approach) was employed, because, both quantitative and qualitative approach is suitable for social and behavioral

sciences as a distinct research which is used to cover a basic deficiencies and discrepancies of the study (Creswell, 2009). In addition, this approach considered as a tool to triangulate the result of single approach through multiple methods (Johnston, 2010). Quantitative approach is selected because it is viewed as an effective to gather large data and comprehensive issues at a specified period of time (Ngwenya, 2010). While the qualitative approach is selected based on the assumption that it enables the researcher generate meanings and phenomena within the real context of the research participants and to fill the gap left by the quantitative one (Kothari, 2004). Therefore, both quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed for this study in order to make the study more reliable.

### **3.3. Sources of Data**

In this study both primary and secondary sources of data were employed to get valid and reliable information about the practices and challenges of distributive leadership in public secondary schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State.

#### **3.3.1. Primary sources**

A primary source was used to get first-hand information concerning the practices and challenges of distributive leadership in the study area. Accordingly, the primary data were collected from schools leaders (principals, vice-principals, PTSA heads, supervisors and unit leaders) and teachers.

#### **3.3.2. Secondary sources**

The secondary sources of data was used to strengthen the primary sources, which is obtained from written minutes that show what leadership decision made, discussed documents, and annual reports available in schools.

### **3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques**

According to East Hararghe Zone Education Departments first quarter report of 2018, there were twenty Districts, four Administrative Town and fifty eight secondary schools in the Zone. Since the scope of the research and number of the population is wide and large in numbers.

Therefore, the researcher selected four Districts and one administrative town by using simple random sampling techniques. Accordingly, the selected districts and administrative town were, Gola Oda, Kombolcha, Kersa and Haramaya districts and Awaday Administrative Town. In the selected districts and administrative town, there were ten secondary schools of which six schools were selected using simple random sampling techniques, because the area of the study is very wide and number of population is large. Therefore, Adele, Kombolcha, keransa, kersa, Burqa and Awaday secondary schools were selected. In the selected schools, there are 224 teachers, 5 supervisors, 6 principals, 6 vice-principals, 12 unit leaders and 6 PTSA heads.

In order to decide upon sample size of respective subjects, Yamane (1967) formula of sample size was used. Accordingly,

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where N=population n=sample size,  $e^2 \leq (.05)^2$ . Accordingly, sample size for teachers was decided as;

$$n = \frac{N}{1+Ne^2} = \frac{224}{1+224(.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{224}{1+224(.0025)} , \quad n = \frac{224}{1+0.56} , \quad n = \frac{224}{1.56} = 144$$

n= 144 teachers

In this way, the respondents were selected from respective schools through different sampling methods. Accordingly, data was collected from six categories of respondents including five supervisors, six principals, six vice-principals, twelve unit leaders, six PTSA heads and one hundred forty four teachers. As a result, availability sampling technique was employed for supervisors, principals, vice principals, PTSA heads and unit leaders from the sampled schools due to their being few in number and their direct involvement in the practices of school leadership. In addition, a stratified random sampling technique was used to select teachers from each school on the basis of their experiences in their school. This is because; teachers are very close to the overall instructional activities of schools.

Table 1: Distribution of Populations, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

No	School Name	Principals			Vice principals			Supervisors			Unit leaders			PTSA			Teachers		
		Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%
1.	Adele	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	29	19	64
2.	Kombolcha	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	60	38	64
3.	Keransa	1	1	100	1	1	100	-	-	-	2	2	100	1	1	100	31	20	64
4.	Kersa	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	29	19	64
5.	Burqa	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	23	15	64
6.	Awaday	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	52	33	64
Total		6	6	100	6	6	100	5	5	100	12	12	100	6	6	100	224	144	64
sampling	SRS	Availability sampling			Availability sampling			Availability sampling			Availability sampling			Availability sampling			Stratified random sampling		

SRS= Simple Random Sampling, %= Percentage

### **3.5. Data Collection Instruments**

To obtain the data, which answers the stated research questions and achieve the objective of the study, questionnaires and interview was used by the researcher as an instrument of data collection. So, using different types of instruments, the researcher was get reliable and suitable data to minimize error.

#### **3.5.1. Questionnaire**

Questionnaires is a valuable tool for gathering data which helps save time, encourage objectivity, provide rapid analysis, obtain information about certain conditions, practice inquiry in to opinion and attitude of individuals, groups and feedback to the researcher (Best and Kahn, 2004). The questionnaire has contained two parts that designed to address the basic question of the study. The first part was background of the respondents which includes, sex, age, work experiences, academic qualification and their position in school; part two encompasses a closed-ended and open-ended question which contains 39 items regarding distributive leadership practices, perception, major challenges and possible strategies for effective practices of distributive leadership under study area.

In order to get relevant information about the practices and challenges of distributive leadership under study area, the researcher used both open-ended and closed-ended questionnaires for 144(64%) teachers and 30 (100%) school leaders (principals, vice principals, PTSA heads and unit leaders) of the sampled schools. This closed-ended questionnaire were in five point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree and very low to very high while open ended questionnaire was designed for respondents to gather valuable additional information about the research problem. Kumar (2006) suggested that, using open-ended and closed-ended questionnaire minimizes the risk instead of using one of them depending up on the type of question items.

Pilot study was conducted for all data collection instruments to test their validity and reliability before the real field work is undertaken. It was conducted on 30 teachers in the water secondary school which were selected purposively out of the sample schools. The

reliability was checked by using Cronbach Alpha. A reliability coefficient (alpha) of 0.70 and above is considered acceptable reliability. Therefore, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was obtained to check for internal consistency for all items. Accordingly, the calculated Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for this study was 0.74, 0.78, 0.76 and 0.75 for the first; second, third and fourth sections of the questionnaire (see appendix IV). In addition to this, face, content and language validity was checked by major advisor and co-advisor. As a result of pilot study minor modification was made in terms of language, format or style and content.

### **3.5.2. Interview guide**

The other instrument to be used for the collection of primary data for the study is an interview. It is helpful to supplement the information gathered through other instruments, as well as for the clarification of some unforeseen information. It is also being used to cross-check the responses obtained through questionnaire and it let the interviewee to express his or her feeling freely and knowledge of people in a program in depth (Best and Kahn, 2003).

In order to obtain deeper information related to the practices and challenges of distributive leadership, Semi-structured interview was prepared and employed to 5(100%) supervisors to collect factual and detail information from study area. From each sampled schools one supervisor was selected. Thus, a total of five supervisors were involved in the interview at different times and places. Seven interview questions were prepared for all participants of the sample schools. Regarding the process of interview, it was conducted by Afan Oromo language in order to make the interview questions easy to understand for the respondents and to obtain more reliable and valid information regarding the study and supported by Audio (tape recorders). For each interviewee, 30 minutes was given. The recorded data was categorized based on similarities of responses and then transcribed into English language.

### **3.6. Data Collection Procedures**

In order to get better picture of the study, first, the researcher visited the zonal education office to discuss the purpose of research and showing the letter of cooperation from Haramaya University and asked the zonal education office to write a letter to the study area. Then the

researcher visited the school principal and vice-principal to discuss the purpose of the research with them via showing the letter of permission from the university and the zonal education office. Then, in order to make sure the suitability of the instruments, pilot test was conducted for instructors in the study area who were not included in the sample of the study. Second, after improving the data gathering instruments on the basis of the results of the pilot test, the final questionnaires was administered to sample teachers in the selected schools.

The participants were allowed to give their own answers to each item independently and the data collectors was closely assist and supervise them to solve any confusion regarding to the instrument. Finally, the questionnaire was collected and data analysis was made by the researcher.

### **3.7. Methods of Data Analysis**

The data was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The analysis of data was based on the responses collected through closed-ended questionnaires, interview and open-ended questionnaire. The data collected through closed-ended questionnaire were organized, tabulated, tallied, and filled in to SPSS version 20 to assess the practices and challenges of distributive leadership. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. From descriptive statistics, frequency count and percentages were employed to analyze the demographic characteristics of the respondents whereas the mean scores, weighted mean and standard deviation were computed for quantitative variables against each item score so as to describe dispersion or variability and to identify the extent of school leaders and teachers in practicing distributive leadership. In addition, Regression analysis was conducted to know by how much the independent variable explains the dependent variable.

The stepwise regression analysis is an analysis of association in which the effects of two or more independent variables on a single interval scaled dependent variable are investigated simultaneously (Zikmund *et al.*, 2010). The result of this analysis indicates how well a set of variables is able to predict the dependent variable. Furthermore, it shows how much unique variance in the dependent variable is explained by each of independent variables (Pallant, 2010).

The interpretation is made for all five point scale measurements based on the following mean score results: [1.00-1.50) as strongly disagree/very low, [1.50-2.50) as Disagree/ low, [2.50-3.50) as undecided/ medium, [3.50-4.50) as Agree / high and [4.50-5.00] as strongly agree/ very high (Rosemay, 2003). In addition to the above methods of data analysis, data obtained through interview and open-ended questionnaire was analyzed and interpreted qualitatively by narrating the ideas provided by the respondents based on ideas raised and the result were triangulated with quantitative findings. Finally, the findings were summarized; concluded and suggested recommendations were forwarded.

### **3.8. Ethical Considerations**

To make the research process professional, ethical consideration was made. The researcher informed the respondents about the purpose of the study i.e. purely for academic; the purpose of the study were also introduced in the introduction part of the questionnaire and interview guide to the respondents and confirm that subject's confidentiality was protected. In addition to this, the anonymity of the participants of the study is protected and was inform that their participation in the study is based on their consent. From very beginning the researcher was inform the respondent about the purpose of the study via considering research ethics in data collection, analysis and recommendations. Furthermore, all the materials used for this research have been acknowledged. Finally, a copy of the final report could be given to the organization if necessary.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter attempts to present the analysis and interpretation of data collected from sample population, East Hararghe Zone public secondary schools through questionnaires and interviews. It consists of two major parts. The first part indicates general characteristics of the respondents in relation to their age, sex, qualification and work experience were tabulated and analyzed as indicated under table 2 through frequency and percentage and the second part deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data through mean score, weighted mean, standard deviation and stepwise regression analysis. The quantitative as well as qualitative data were integrated in this chapter. The qualitative data were used as complementary to the quantitative data. Therefore, the qualitative data includes the data collected through interviews and open-ended questions whereas, the quantitative data includes the data which were collected through closed- ended questionnaires.

Questionnaires were prepared and administered for 30 school leaders (6 school principals, 6 vice principals, 6 PTSA heads and 12 unit leaders) and 144 teachers. Therefore, the total number of questionnaires distributed to school leaders and teachers were 35 closed ended and 4 open ended questions. Out 144 sample teachers and 30 school leaders, 120(83.3%) of teachers and 30 (100%) of school leaders were filled and returned the questionnaires to the researcher. In addition, to supplement the information gathered through questionnaire, interviews were held with 5(100%) supervisors.

Finally, in analyzing the data, different statistical techniques and procedures were used. Initially, the data collected through questionnaire were coded and inserted in to SPSS for analysis. Then the means for the two groups of respondents (teachers and school leaders) were identified and analysis was done using mean, weighted mean and standard deviation of the two groups of respondents.

## 4.1. Background of the Respondents

Under this sub topic, sex, age, academic qualification and work experiences of the respondents were presented. The following table 2 shows the distribution of respondents' characteristics to be discussed in details.

Table 2: Respondents Backgrounds

No	Variables	Principals		Vice principals		Supervisors		Unit leaders		PTSA		Teachers		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
1.	M	6	100	6	100	5	100	12	100	6	100	103	85.83	
	F											17	14.17	
	Total	6	100	6	100	5	100	12	100	6	100	120	100	
2	< 25			1	16.7			1	8.4			12	10	
	25-30	1	16.7			3	60	4	33.3			36	30	
Age	30-35	3	50	4	66.6	1	20	4	33.3	3	50	53	44.16	
	35-40	2	33.3			1	20	3	25	2	33.3	13	10.84	
	40 above			1	16.7					1	16.7	6	5	
	Total	6	100	6	100	5	100	12	100	6	100	120	100	
	3. Qualification	Diploma									6	100		
		Degree	2	33.3	5	83.3	4	80	12	100			108	90
Masters		4	66.7	1	16.7	1	20					12	10	
4. Work Experiences	Total	6	100	6	100	5	100	12	100	6	100	120	100	
	<5	1	16.7	1	16.7					6	100	17	14	
	5-10	2	33.3	4	66.6	2	40	2	16.7			44	36.7	
	10-15	3	50	1	16.7	2	40	5	41.6			26	21.7	
	15-20							2	16.7			21	17.5	
Total	Above 20					1	20	3	25			12	10	
	Total	6	100	6	100	5	100	12	100	6	100	120	100	

As presented on the above table 2 item 1, 6(100%) of principals, 6(100%) of vice principals, 5(100%) of supervisors, 12(100%) of unit leaders and 6(100%) of PTSA were male

respondents. Regarding teachers respondents, 103 (85.83%) and 17 (14.17%) of teacher respondents were males and females respectively. From this, one can realize that the number of females in the teaching profession is much lower than males in the sampled schools and the leadership position and supervisory position of secondary schools were controlled by males in the sampled schools.

As can be seen in table 2 item 2, which shows the age distribution of principals, vice principals, supervisors, unit leaders, PTSA heads and teachers. As the data indicates the majority of principal respondents 3(50%) were in the age range of 30-35 and 2(33.3%) were in the age range of 35-40 and 1(16.7%) were in the age range of 25-30 and there were no principal respondents in the age range of less than 25 and above 40 years in the sample schools under study area. Regarding vice principal respondents, the distribution of age range is 1(16.7%), 4 (66.6%) and 1 (16.7%), is between the age range of less than 25, 30-35 and above 40 years respectively. And there were no vice principal's respondents in the age range of 25-30 and 35-40. In relation to supervisors, the age range 25-30 is the highest which is 3(60%) and followed by the age range 30-35 and 35-40 that is 1(20%) and 1(20%) respectively and there were no supervisors in the age range of less than 25 and above 40 years in the sample schools. In relation to unit leaders respondents the distribution of age range is 1(8.4%), 4(33.3%), 4(33.3 %) and 3(25%) is between the age range of less than 25, 25-30, 30-35 and 35-40 respectively. Regarding PTSA heads the highest age respondents were between the age range of 30-35, 35-40 and above 40, which is 3(50%), 2(33.3%) and 1(16.7%) respectively. Regarding the teachers respondents 12 (10%), 36 (30%), 53 (44.16 %), 13(10.84%) and 6(5%) of the teacher respondents were found to be between the age ranges of less than 25, 25-30, 30-35, 35-40 and above 40 respectively. Thus, there would no barriers that the age differences might have challenges in practicing distributive leadership.

As indicated in table 2 item 3, which shows the academic qualification of respondents, about 2(33.3%) of principals, 5(83.3%) of vice principals, 4(80%) of supervisors, 12(100%) of unit leaders and 108(90%) of teachers were first degree holders respectively, while the rest relatively 4(66.7%) of principals, 1(16.7%) of vice principals, 1(20%) of supervisors and 12(10%) of teachers were have masters holders respectively in the sampled schools. In relation to PTSA heads, 6(100%) of respondents were has diploma holders. This indicates that there

was much variation in qualification between teachers and school leaders under study area. According to guidelines of MoE (2009) the requirement criteria to be secondary schools principals, vice principals and supervisors they required to have second degree holders in the required field study like educational administration, educational management and leadership.

As can be seen from table 2 item 4, which shows work experiences of respondents, 1(16.7%) of principals, 1(16.7%) of vice principals, 6(100%) of PTSA heads and 17(14%) of teachers were ranged in the service year of less than 5 year and there were no supervisors and unit leaders in the age range of less than 5 year services. In the same table of the above, 2(33.3%) of principals, 4(66.6%) of vice principals, 2(40%) of supervisors, 2(16.7%) of unit leaders and 44(36.7%) of teachers were in the age range of 5-10 year of experiences and in this year services there were no PTSA heads respondents. In addition to this, in the year services of 10-15, there were 3(50%) of principals, 1(16.7%) of vice principals, 2(40%) of supervisors, 5(41.6%) of unit leaders and 26(21.7%) of teachers were there. Relatively few of the respondents 2(16.7%) of unit leaders and 21(17.5%) of teachers were in the average year services of 15-20 and there were no principal, vice principals, supervisors and PTSA heads in the age range of 15-20. Lastly 1(20%) of supervisors, 3(25%) of unit leaders and 12(10%) teachers were in the age year services of above 20. Similarly, there were no principals, vice principals and PTSA heads above the year services of 20 in the sample schools under study area. From this one can conclude that, most of the respondents were young and some of them were elders. So, in researcher's view, most of the respondents were in the active age ranges and have the ability to participate in practicing distributive leadership.

## **4.2. Extent of Practicing of Distributive Leadership**

Teachers and school leaders were asked to rate their extent of practicing distributive leadership in their respective schools.

### **4.2.1. Extent of DL practices regarding its openness of the boundaries**

For the respondents questionnaire which had five rating scale and stepwise regression analysis was analyzed and the result was summarized and discussed in the following table 3 and 4.

Table 3: Distributive Leadership Practices in Relation to its Openness of the Boundaries

No	Items	Teachers N =120		School leader N =30		Total N= 150
		M	SD <sub>1</sub>	M	SD <sub>2</sub>	WM
1.	Teachers are significantly involved in decision that affects best practice of distributive leadership in school freely.	1.59	0.69	2.30	1.36	1.73
2.	Teachers have a chance to participate in decision making activities in their respective school to exercise best practices freely without any restriction.	2.18	0.60	2.26	0.58	2.19
3.	Teachers play a major role to practice distributive leadership in their school freely.	1.90	0.73	2.83	0.74	2.08

*Key: N= number of respondents, M= mean score, SD= standard deviation, WM= weighted mean, sd<sub>1</sub>= standard deviation for teachers, sd<sub>2</sub>=standard deviation for school leaders.*

As indicated in table 3 item 1, the mean score (1.59) for teachers and (2.30) for school leaders were identified that there were at low level on the issue of teachers are significantly involved in decisions that affect best practices of distributive leadership in school freely. Generally, the weighted mean score (1.73) indicated that both teachers and school leaders were at low level on the issue of teachers are significantly involved in decisions that affect best practices of distributive leadership in school freely. In addition to this, the standard deviation (sd<sub>1</sub>=0.69 and sd<sub>2</sub>=1.36) for teachers and school leaders indicated that there were little variability among respondents on their reply. This implies that teacher's involvement in decision making activities regarding distributive leadership practices was low.

As expressed in table 3 item 2, the mean score (2.18 and 2.26) for teachers and school leaders were identified that, there were at low level regarding the issues of teachers have a chance to participate in decision making activities in their respective schools to exercise best practices freely without any restriction. Generally, with the weighted mean scores (2.19) implies that both teachers and school leaders respondents were score low on the area of teachers have a chance to participate in decision making activities in their respective schools to exercise best practices freely without any restriction. Besides to this, the standard deviation (sd<sub>1</sub>= 0.60 and sd<sub>2</sub>=0.58) for teachers and school leaders indicated that there were no variability among

respondents in their reply. This expresses that teachers in the schools have less opportunity to participate in decision making activities in their respective schools in relation to distributive leadership best practices beyond their own class room under study area.

As can be seen from table 3 item 3, the mean score (1.90) and (2.83) for teachers and school leaders were at low and medium level on the issues of teachers play a major role in practicing distributive leadership in their schools freely. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.08) for both group of respondents were recognized at low level regarding the issue stated that, teachers play a major role in practicing distributive leadership in their schools freely. In addition to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.73$  and  $sd_2=0.74$ ) for teachers and school leaders indicated that, there were no variability among the respondents regarding the issues of teachers play a major role to practice distributive leadership in their schools. Therefore, one can understand that, the roles of teachers in school were progressing teaching and learning process rather practicing distributive leadership under study area. In contradicts to this ideas, The days of the school leaders as the only actors to practices different activities in the schools are over, everyone in the school has the right, responsibility and ability to be a leader and practices and influence every activities (Lambert, 2002). With regard to the above descriptive analysis, the stepwise regression analysis was discussed as follows.

Table 4: Regression Analysis ( $n_i=150$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) on DL Practices Regarding its Openness of the Boundaries

Model	Coefficients				
	R	R <sup>2</sup>	USC	SC	
1. Constant	0.49	0.24	B	SE	Beta
			0.56	0.18	
			0.60	0.09	0.39
Teachers have a chance to participate in decision making activities in their respective school to exercise best practices freely without any restriction.			0.54	0.08	0.49
Teachers play a major role to practice distributive leadership in their schools freely.					
Dependent Variable : Distributive Leadership					

Key:  $R$ = coefficient of correlation,  $R^2$ = coefficient of determination,  $USC$ = unstandardized coefficient,  $SC$ =standardized coefficient,  $SE$ =standardized error,  $n_i$ = sample seize,  $B$ =slope

As per table 4 reveals, the regression analysis on the extent of distributive leadership practices regarding its openness of the boundaries in providing teachers chance to participate in decision making activities in their respective schools to exercise best practices freely without any restriction and Teachers play a major role to practice distributive leadership in their schools freely measured by regression coefficient (0.56) was contributing 24% to deteriorating distributive leadership practices as measured by the stepwise regression analysis coefficient  $(R^2)*100$ . The result means that 24% of the variation on the dependent variable is accounted for the variation in the independent variable whereas the rest unexplained variable  $(1 - R^2)*100$  were contributing 76% to deteriorating to distributive leadership practices. This means the rest of variation 76% is unexplained. The accompanying computer printout shows a regression equation that predicts the extent to which teachers have a chance to participate in decision making activities in their respective schools to exercise best practices freely without any restriction( $x_1$ ) and Teachers play a major role to practice distributive leadership in their schools freely( $x_2$ ) that affect distributive leadership practices were expressed by statistically significant independent variables were  $Y = 0.56 + 0.60x_1 + 0.54x_2$  where 0.56 is constant. The positive slopes of the two variable respectively were (0.60 and 0.54) which used to indicate that as per a unit increase of the independent variable would tends to increase distributive leadership practices.

Similarly, in supporting the above finding an interview was conducted with schools supervisors. During the interview session, the researcher asked the secondary schools supervisors how the teachers are engaged in decision-making activities beyond their own class-room activities in their school. Some of respondents' responses were similar. One of the interviewee supervisors said:

*Teachers in schools are involved in decision making activities at department level, specially when there is problem between teachers and students during class room teaching and learning process and sometimes when there is discussion of the departments on the common issue.*

Another interviewee supervisor stated;

*Participation of teachers in decision making activities beyond their own class room was low. Because school leaders consider making decision and practicing each and every activity of the schools as his or her own responsibility and sometimes teachers*

*in schools have no interest to participate in decision making activities. To me school leaders should open the boundaries to teachers and initiate them to participate in different schools activities.*

From the interview conducted with supervisors, the researcher summarized that, teachers' interest to participate in decision making activities was low. This is due to the absences of significant and well-built support among school leaders, absences of great concern for team work and creating sense of oneness among teachers in the schools under study area. This contradicts with the research by (Harris and Muijs, 2005) stated, distributed leadership results are widely shared decision-making process viewed as the responsibilities of group rather than the individual.

#### **4.2.2. Extent of DL practices regarding its form of collective leadership**

For the respondents questionnaire which had five rating scale and stepwise regression analysis were discussed and the result was summarized in the following table 5 and 6.

**Table 5: Distributive Leadership Practices in Relation to its Form of Collective Leadership**

No	Items	Teachers N =120		School leader N =30		Total N= 150
		M	SD <sub>1</sub>	M	SD <sub>2</sub>	WM
1.	Teachers help one another in their respective school to practice distributive leadership.	2.50	0.68	2.70	0.59	2.54
2.	Teachers are provided with enough time to work together with school leaders on the work related to their school.	2.00	0.73	2.50	0.90	2.10
3.	Teachers in the school have common sense to exercises best practices.	2.08	0.68	2.40	0.93	2.14

As per table 5 item 1, indicated that, the mean scores (2.50 and 2.70) for teachers and school leaders were identified that there were at low and medium level regarding the issue of teachers help one another in their respective schools to practices distributive leadership. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.54) shows that there were at medium level regarding the issue of teachers help one another in their respective schools to practices distributive leadership. In

relation to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.68$  and  $sd_2=0.59$ ) for teachers and school leaders indicated that, there were little variability among respondents on the area of teachers help one another in their respective schools in relation to distributive leadership practices. From this one can conclude that, teachers in schools are help one another on the issues of practicing distributive leadership to some extent.

As expressed in the same table item 2, the mean score for teachers and school leaders were (2.00 and 2.50) with the weighted mean score of (2.10) were identified that there were at low level about the issues of teachers are provided with enough time to work together with school leaders on the work related to their schools. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.73$  and  $sd_2= 0.90$ ) for teachers and school leaders respondents also shows that there is a little variability among the respondents. From this one can understand that, teachers provided with enough time to work with school leaders were low.

As depicted in table 5 item 3, the mean score for teachers and school leaders respondents were (2.08 and 2.40) were indicated there were at low level on the issues of teachers in the schools have common sense to exercises best practices. Generally, the weighted mean (2.14) indicated that there were at low level on the issues of teachers in the schools are common sense to exercises best practices. Besides to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1= 0.68$  and  $sd_2= 0.93$ ) for teachers and school leaders also shows that there were little variability among respondents on the issues of teachers in the school are a common sense to exercises distributive leadership best practices. From this one can understand that a teacher's common understanding to exercise distributive leadership best practices was low. In addition to the above descriptive analysis, the stepwise regression analysis was discussed as follows.

Table 6: Regression Analysis (ni=150,  $P < 0.05$ ) on DL Practices Regarding its Form of Collective Leadership

Model	Coefficients			
	R	R <sup>2</sup>	USC	SC
1. Constant	0.36	0.13	B	SE
			1.29	0.19
Teachers in the school have a common Sense to exercises best practices.			0.38	0 .08
				0.36

Dependent Variable: Distributive Leadership

As per table 6 reveals, the regression analysis on the extent of distributive leadership practices regarding its form of collective leadership in providing teachers common sense to exercises best practices in their respective schools measured by regression correlation coefficient (1.29) was contributing 13% to deteriorating to distributive leadership practices as measured by the stepwise regression analysis coefficient ( $R^2$ )\*100. The result means that 13% of the variation on the dependent variable is accounted for the variation in the independent variable whereas the rest unexplained variable  $(1-R^2)*100$  were contributing 87% to deteriorating to distributive leadership practices. This means the rest of variation 87% is unexplained. The accompanying computer printout shows a regression equation that predicts on the areas teachers in the schools are a common sense to exercises best practices ( $x_1$ ) that affect distributive leadership practices were expressed by statistically significant independent variables were  $Y=1.29+0.38x_1$  where 1.29 is constant. The positive slopes of a variable were 0.38 which used to indicate that as per a unit increase of the independent variable would tends to increase distributive leadership practices.

#### 4.2.3. Extent of DL practice in relation to recognizing other people's expertise

For the respondents questionnaire which had five rating scale and stepwise regression analysis were discussed and the result was summarized in the following table 7 and 8.

Table 7: Distributive Leadership Practices in Relation to Recognizing other People Expertise

No	Items	Teachers N =120		School leader N =30		Total N=150
		M	SD <sub>1</sub>	M	SD <sub>2</sub>	WM
1.	School leaders shares their experience to others to exercises best practices.	2.05	0.75	3.16	0.83	2.27
2.	School leaders encourage teachers to engage in professional development related to whole school issues (e.g. school development planning, special needs, health and safety care etc).	2.07	0.74	3.00	0.78	2.25
3.	School leaders encourage teachers to participate in leading activities in their school in addition to teaching and learning process.	2.18	0.78	3.06	0.94	2.35
4.	School leaders' review others polices and new ideas to practice distributive leadership in their school.	2.03	0.87	2.90	0.80	2.20

As indicated in table 7 item 1, the mean score (2.05 and 3.16) for teachers and school leaders were identified that, there were at low and medium level on the issues of school leaders shares their experiences to others to exercise distributive leadership best practices. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.27) indicated that, there were low score on the issues of school leaders share his or her experiences has from others to exercise best practices. Besides to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.75$  and  $sd_2=0.83$ ) for teachers and school leaders shows, there is little variability among respondents on the areas of school leaders share his or her experiences has from others to exercise best practices. From this one can concluded that, the extent that school leaders share his or her experiences has from others to exercise distributive leadership best practices was low.

As revealed in table 7 item 2, the mean score (2.07 and 3.00) for teachers and school leaders indicated there were at low and medium level on the issues stated that, school leaders encourage teachers to engage in professional development related to the whole school issue like school development planning, special needs, health and safety care. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.25) indicated as low score regarding the issues of school leaders encourage teachers to engage in professional development related to the whole school issue like school development planning, special needs, health and safety care. Besides to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.74$  and  $sd_2=0.78$ ) for teachers and school leaders shows there is a little variability among respondents on similar issues. This implies that teacher encouragement in different activities like school development planning, special needs and others were low. In contradicts to this idea, Leithwood (2006) determined that school leaders who actually uses the distributive leadership approach engage staff in behaviors such things as; setting the school direction, establishing professional development planning, redesigning the organization, and managing instruction.

With regard to table 7 item 3, the mean score (2.18 and 3.06) for teachers and school leaders were indicated that there were at low and medium level on the idea of school leaders encourage teachers to participate in leading activities in their schools in addition to teaching learning process. Generally, the weighted mean score of the respondents were at low level. i.e., (2.35). In addition to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.78$  and  $sd_2=0.94$ ) for teachers and school leaders indicates there were little variability among respondents on the issues of school

leaders encourage teachers to participate in leading activities in their schools in addition to teaching learning process. From this one can realize that, the extent that school leaders encourage teachers to participate in leading activities in addition to teaching and learning process was low. In contradicts this idea, Visionary school leaders should encourage others to appeal to their higher and sometimes unrealistic ideals-translate their dreams into reality by articulating the vision, explaining the vision to others and developing the vision to others to achieve the desired goals (Ward, 2002).

According to table 7 item 4, the mean score (2.03 and 2.90) for teachers and school leaders were indicated that there were at low and medium level regarding the idea stated that, school leaders review other practices, polices and generate new ideas to practices distributive leadership in their school. Generally, the weighted mean score of the respondents was (2.20) i.e., low score on similar issue. In addition, the standard deviation, ( $sd_1=0.87$  and  $sd_2=0.80$ ) for teachers and school leaders also shows there were little variability among the respondents on the issues provided in the above table. From this one can understand that, the extent that school leader review other practices, polices and generate new ideas in order to practices distributive leadership under study area was low. In addition to the above descriptive analysis, the stepwise regression analysis was discussed as follows.

Table 8: Regression Analysis (ni= 150,  $P < 0.05$ ) on DL Practices in Relation to Recognizing o ther People Expertise

Model	Coefficients			
	R	R <sup>2</sup>	USC	SC
1. Constant	0.56	0.32	B	SE
			0.93	0.17
School leaders encourage teachers to engage in professional development related to whole school issues (e.g. school development planning, special needs, health and safety care.			0.56	0.07
School leaders encourage teachers to participate in leading activities in their school in addition to teaching and learning process.			0.23	0.07
School leaders' review others polices and new ideas to practice distributive leadership in their school.			0.16	0.07
Dependent Variable: Distributive Leadership				

As per table 8 reveals, the regression analysis on the extent of distributive leadership practices in relation to recognizing other people expertise measured by regression correlation coefficient (0.93) was contributing 32% to deteriorating the distributive leadership practices as measured by the stepwise regression analysis coefficient ( $R^2$ )\*100. The result means that 32% of the variation on the dependent variable is accounted for the variation in the independent variable whereas the rest unexplained variables  $(1 - R^2)*100$  were contributing 68% to deteriorating to distributive leadership practices. This means the rest of variation 68% is unexplained. The accompanying computer printout shows a regression equation that predicts School leaders encourage teachers to engage in professional development related to whole school issues (e.g. school development planning, special needs, health and safety care ( $x_1$ ), school leaders encourage teachers to participate in leading activities in their schools in addition to teaching and learning process ( $x_2$ ) and School leaders' review others polices and new ideas to practice distributive leadership in their school( $x_3$ ) that affect distributive leadership practices were expressed by statistically significant independent vairables were  $Y=0.93+0.56x_1+0.23x_2+0.16x_3$  where 0.93 is constant. The positive slopes of three variables respectively 0.56, 0.23 and 0.16 which used to indicate that as per a unit increase of the independent variables would tends to increases distributive leadership practices.

With regard to this an open ended question were asked both school leaders and teachers respondents how they participating in practicing distributive leadership in their school. All most all of the teachers and school leaders' response similar ideas but one of the teacher respondents stated that,

*Distributive leadership is practiced by sharing of responsibility in managing student's behavior, class-room management, monitoring teaching-learning process, per-supervision and keeping school safety and etc. but there is no any participation regarding practices of distributive leadership in my school. In addition to this, both school leaders and teachers were unable to identify his or her area of participation regarding leadership practices.*

The interview was conducted with schools supervisors that says is there any practice of distributive leadership in your schools so far? If yes, what it looks like? If no, what are the reasons for the absences? One of the interviewee supervisor response no answer, he said that,

*The reason why i answer no is, in my school there were no practices regarding the issue of leadership, its impotence's and how they practice. This is due to lack of awareness about the concepts of distributive leadership. However, some of the teachers were believed that practicing distributive leadership is only the role and responsibility of school leaders while the teachers' role is only class-room teaching.*

Another interviewee supervisor also says that, one of the reasons why the distributive leadership is not practiced in my schools so far is:

*The school principal considered him or herself as the only actor of the schools to make important decision that affect the performance of school. Other supervisor also added that even if an attempt was made to empower stakeholders participating in schooling activities, still their role become minimal in making important decision that will improve learning outcome. Thus, still they are dominating with traditional leadership perspectives in which only those individuals formally appointed to leadership position empowered to leadership practices.*

From the interview conducted with supervisors about the practices of distributive leadership, the researcher concluded that, some of the teachers in the sampled schools believe that, practicing distributive leadership is the role and responsibility of school leaders and school leaders are also unable to encourage teachers and recognize them in order to work with them collaboratively under study area. On contrary to this idea, Distributed leadership does not mean that no one besides the school leaders is responsible for the overall performance of the organization. All individuals are responsible and accountable for their contributions to the collective result (Elmore, 2000).

### **4.3. Perception of School Leaders and Teachers towards DL**

Teachers and school leaders were asked to rate the perception of distributive leadership practices. For the respondent's questionnaire which had five rating scale and stepwise regression analysis were dispatched and the result was summarized and to be discussed in details in the following table 9 and 10.

Table 9: Responses of Respondents about the Perceptions of Distributive Leadership Practices

No	Items	Teachers N =120		School leader N =30		Total N= 150
		M	SD <sub>1</sub>	M	SD <sub>2</sub>	WM
1.	The school leader considers him or her self as knowledgeable about distributive leadership practice	3.83	1.23	2.03	0.96	3.47
2.	School leaders have knowledge about distributed leadership concepts	2.11	0.84	3.43	1.04	2.37
3.	School leaders and teachers consider themselves as a decision maker in your school	3.70	0.94	2.20	0.76	3.40
4.	School leaders and teachers are familiar with their colleagues for taking leadership roles in the school	1.93	0.76	3.33	0.80	2.21
5.	School leaders are sharing their experiences with others in schools	1.93	0.90	3.13	0.86	2.17

As expressed in table 9 item 1, on the issues of the school leader considers him or herself as knowledgeable about distributive leadership practices, the mean score (3.83) for teachers and (2.03) for school leaders were identified that there were between agree and disagree score. Generally, the weighted mean score (3.47) were indicated undecided score regarding the issues of the school leader considers him or herself as knowledgeable about distributive leadership practices. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=1.23$  and  $sd_2=0.96$ ) for teachers and school leaders expressed there were a little variability among respondents regarding the issues of the school leader considers him or herself as a knowledgeable about distributive leadership practices. From this one can conclude that respondents were not sure with knowledge that school leaders have in relation to distributive leadership practices under study area.

As indicated in table 9 item 2, with regard to the issues of school leaders have knowledge about distributive leadership concepts, the mean score for teachers and school leaders were between disagree and undecided score i.e.(2.11 and 3.43) respectively. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.37) indicated that both teachers and school leaders respondents were disagree score on the area of school leaders have knowledge about distributive leadership

concepts. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.84$ , and  $sd_2=1.04$ ) for teachers and school leaders also shows there were a little variability among respondents on the area of school leaders have knowledge about distributive leadership concepts.

As it can be seen from table 9 item 3, the mean score (3.70 and 2.20) for teachers and school leaders were at agree and disagree score regarding the issues of school leaders and teachers consider themselves as a decision maker in their schools. Generally, the weighted mean score (3.40) identified that there were undecided score regarding the issues of the school leaders and teachers consider themselves as a decision maker in their school. In addition to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.94$  and  $sd_2=0.76$ ) for teachers and school leaders also shows there is little variability among respondents on the area of school leaders and teachers are taken into consideration themselves as decision maker in their school.

As revealed in table 9 item 4, regarding the issue of school leaders and teachers are familiar with their colleagues for taking leadership role in the school, the mean score for teachers and school leaders were (1.93 and 3.33) were felled under disagree and undecided score respectively. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.21) for teachers and school leaders were disagree score in the area of school leaders and teachers are familiar with their colleagues for taking leadership role in the school. In addition, The standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.76$ ,  $sd_2=0.80$ ) for teachers and school leaders shows that, there were little variability among respondents regarding the issue of school leaders and teachers are familiar with their colleagues for taking leadership role in their school. From this one can conclude that, both teachers and school leaders were not familiar with their colleagues for taking leadership role with others in their school.

As revealed in table 9 item 5, in the area of school leaders sharing their experiences with others in schools, the mean score (1.93) and (3.13) for teachers and school leaders were identified disagree and undecided score. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.17) indicated that both teachers and school leader respondents were at disagree score regarding the issues of school leaders sharing his or her experiences with others in school. In addition, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.90$ ,  $sd_2=0.86$ ) for teachers and school leaders shows that, there is little variability among respondents regarding the issue of school leaders share his or her

experiences with others in school. In addition to the above descriptive analysis, the stepwise regression analysis was discussed as follows.

Table 10: Regression Analysis (ni= 150, P< 0.05) Teachers and School Leaders Perception on DL practices

Model	Coefficients				
	R	R <sup>2</sup>	USC		SC
	0.52	0.28	B	SE	Beta
1. Constant			2.47	0.46	
School leaders and teachers are taken into consideration themselves as a decision maker in your school			0.53	0.09	0.42
School leaders are sharing his or her experiences with others in school			-0.37	0.10	-0.27

Dependent variable: Distributive Leadership

As indicates in table 10, the regression analysis in the area of teachers and school leaders perception on practicing distributive leadership measured by regression correlation coefficient (2.47) was contributing 28% to deteriorating distributive leadership practices as measured by the stepwise regression analysis correlation coefficient (R<sup>2</sup>)\*100. The result means that 28% of the variation on the dependent variable is accounted for the variation in the independent variable whereas the rest unexplained variables (1-R<sup>2</sup>)\*100 were contributing 72% to deteriorating to distributive leadership practices. This means the rest of variation 72% is unexplained. The accompanying computer printout shows a regression equation that predicts school leaders and teachers are taken into consideration themselves as a decision maker in your school (x<sub>1</sub>) and school leaders are sharing his or her experiences with others in school(x<sub>2</sub>) that affect the teachers and school leaders perception in practicing distributive leadership were expressed by statistically significant independent variables were  $Y=2.47+ 0.53x_1-0.37x_2$  where 2.47 is constant. The positive slope of the first variables and the negative slope of the second variable respectively 0.53 and -0.37 are used to indicate that as per a unit increase of the first independent variable would tends to decrease and as per a unit decrease of the second variables would tends increases distributive leadership practices.

Similarly, in open ended question which says what is distributive leadership to you in your schools? How do you define? And what is the importance of practicing distributive leadership in your school?

One of the teacher respondents says that:

*To me distributive leadership is sharing of the organizations responsibilities and decisions with the whole staffs willingly to achieve the common goal and its importance's is employee empowerment, sharing of responsibility, develop self-confidence, commitment and create awareness among schools staffs.*

In relation to this, an interview was conducted with supervisors to supports the above findings, which says, what does distributive leadership mean for you? One of the interviewee supervisors uttered:

*...to me distributive leadership is about sharing or distribution of activities or tasks among each other's equal to achieve common goal without discriminating others while task distribution.*

Supporting to the above interview, Harris and Spillane (2008) and Spillane (2005) point out that leadership is no longer viewed solely on the principal's skill and knowledge, but it is viewed as the interactions between people and their situations.

#### **4.4. Major Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership**

Teachers and school leaders were asked to rate the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership. For the respondent's questionnaires which had five rating scale and stepwise regression analysis was dispatched and the result was summarized and to be discussed in details in the following table.

##### **4.4.1. Major challenges of distributive leadership practices related with school leaders**

For the respondents questionnaire which had five rating scale and stepwise regression analysis were discussed and the result was summarized in the following table 11 and 12.

Table 11: Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership related with School Leaders

No	Items	Teachers N =120		School leader N =30		Total N=150
		M	SD <sub>1</sub>	M	SD <sub>2</sub>	WM
1.	School leaders feel that practicing distributive leadership is the responsibility of principals not the responsibility of teachers.	3.59	1.15	1.86	0.93	3.24
2.	School leaders have knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers in their school	2.10	0.82	3.10	0.80	2.30
3.	School leaders have the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction	2.15	0.82	3.13	1.13	2.34

As revealed in table 11 item 1, the mean score (3.59) and (1.86) for teachers and school leaders were identified that there were agree and disagree score on the issues of school leaders fell that practicing distributive leadership is the responsibility of principal rather responsibility of teachers. Generally, the weighted mean score (3.24) indicated that, both school leaders and teachers respondents were rate undecided score in the area of school leaders fell that practicing distributive leadership is the responsibility of principal rather responsibility of teachers. In addition, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=1.15$  and  $sd_2=0.93$ ) for teachers and school leaders expressed that there were little variability among respondents regarding the area of practicing distributive leadership is responsibility of principals rather than the responsibility of teachers. This shows both school leaders and teachers respondents were not sure whether school leader fell practicing distributive leadership is the responsibility of principals or not. Supporting this idea, Torrance (2012) performed that some of the challenges of distributed leadership in schools were, school leaders did not possess the talent and personality of teachers, Workloads of teachers and the issue of perception towards legitimate appointments confuses the issue of leadership among their colleagues.

In the above table 11 item 2, it was analyzed response about the issues of school leaders have knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers in their schools. Accordingly the mean score (2.10 and 3.10) for teachers and school leaders were rate disagree and undecided score with the weighted mean score of (2.30), i.e. disagree score on the issues of School leaders have knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers in their

school. In addition, the standard deviation ( $sd_1 = 0.82$  and  $sd_2 = 0.80$ ) for teachers and school leaders also expresses, there were no variability among respondents on the issues of school leaders have knowledge on what kind of tasks to be distributed to teachers in their schools. This implies that, lack of ability to distribute tasks to teachers on the area of leadership activities was one of the challenges in practicing distributive leadership under study area.

As it can be seen from table 11 item 3, the mean score (2.15 and 3.13) for teachers and school leaders were indicated disagree and undecided score about the areas of school leaders have ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.34) also shows there were disagree score among the respondents on the issues of school leaders have ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction. Besides to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1 = 0.82$ , and  $sd_2 = 1.13$ ) for teachers and school leaders shows there is little variability among respondents on similar issue. This indicates that lack of ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction is one of the challenges in practicing distributive leadership. Supporting this ideas, Another significant challenges faced by school leaders while implementing distributive leadership is the difficulties in finding teachers that manage to implement the relevant tasks that were delegated. For example, a study by Abu (2011) in Bangladesh reveals that school leaders encountering difficulties in delegating their tasks to the right teachers suitable for the job. In addition to the above descriptive analysis, the stepwise regression analysis was discussed as follows.

Table12: Regression Analysis ( $n_i = 150$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) on the Major Challenges in Practicing DL related with school leaders

Model	Coefficients				
	R	R <sup>2</sup>	USC		SC
	0.42	0.17	B	SE	Beta
1. Constant			0.77	0.24	
School leaders have knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers in their school			0.38	0.08	0.35
School leaders have the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction			0.22	0.08	0.21
Dependent Variable: Distributive Leadership					

As table 12 reveals, the regression analysis in the area of the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership related with school leaders measured by regression correlation coefficient (0.77) was contributing 17% deteriorating to distributive leadership practices as measured by the stepwise regression analysis coefficient ( $R^2$ )\*100. The result means that 17 % of the variation on the dependent variable is accounted for the variation in the independent variable whereas the rest unexplained variables ( $1-R^2$ )\*100 were contributing 83% to deteriorating to distributive leadership practices. This means the rest of variation 83% is unexplained. The accompanying computer printout shows a regression equation that predicts school leaders have knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers in their school ( $x_1$ ) and school leaders have the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction ( $x_2$ ) that affects distributive leadership practices were expressed by statistically significant independent variables were  $Y=0.77+0.38x_1+0.22x_2$  where 0.77 is constant. The positive slopes of two independent variables respectively were 0.38 and 0.22 which used to indicate that as per a unit increase of independent variables would tends to increase distributive leadership practices.

#### 4.4.2. Major challenges of distributive leadership practices related with teachers

For the respondents questionnaire which had five rating scale and stepwise regression analysis were discussed and the result was summarized in the following table 13 and 14.

Table 13: Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership related with Teachers

No	Items	Teachers N =120		School leader N =30		Total N= 150
		M	SD <sub>1</sub>	M	SD <sub>2</sub>	WM
1.	Teachers have interest to participate in distributive leadership activities in their school	2.54	1.01	2.53	0.50	2.53
2.	Teachers are willing to work in a team in their school	2.51	0.92	2.50	0.68	2.50
3.	There is shared responsibility among school teachers	2.21	0.73	2.60	0.77	2.28
4.	Teachers are willing to assume leadership role	2.34	0.87	2.63	0.71	2.39

As indicated in table 13 item 1, the mean score for teachers and school leaders were (2.54 and 2.53) indicated that there were undecided score regarding the issue of teachers have interest to participate in distributive leadership activities in their school. Generally, the weighted mean scores (2.53) for both respondents reveals undecided score about the issue of teachers have interest to participate in distributive leadership activities in their school. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=1.01$  and  $sd_2=0.50$ ) for teachers and school leaders indicated that, there is a variability among respondents in the area of teachers have interest to participate in distributive leadership activities. Therefore, one can understand that teachers in the schools may or may not have interest to participate in distributive leadership activities under study area.

As it can be seen from table 13 item 2, the mean score for teachers and school leaders were (2.51 and 2.50) i.e. undecided and disagree score with the weighted mean score of (2.50) i.e. disagree score about the issue of teachers are willing to work in a team in their school. In addition to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.92$  and  $sd_2=0.68$ ) for teachers and school leaders expresses there were a little variability among respondents regarding the issue of teachers are willing to work in a team in their schools. From this one can concluded that lack of team work among teachers in school were one of the major challenges that hinder the practices of distributive leadership under study area.

In the above table 13 item 3, it was analyzed the response about the issues of shared responsibility among school teachers. Accordingly, the mean scores (2.21 and 2.60) for teachers and school leaders were at disagree and undecided score. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.28) indicated that both teachers and school leaders were at disagree score in relation to the issues of shared responsibility among school teachers. The standard deviation of the item is also expresses ( $sd_1=0.73$  and  $sd_2=0.77$ ) for teachers and school leaders were indicated that there were no variability among respondents. From this one can easily conclude that, lack of shared responsibility amongst teachers in schools was the major challenges that hinder the practice of distributed leadership under study area, because one of the major aspects of distributive leadership practice is shared responsibility.

As shown in table 13 item 4, the mean score (2.34 and 2.63) for teachers and school leaders were indicated that, there were disagree and undecided score on the issues of teachers are

willing to assume leadership role. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.39) indicated that both teachers and school leaders were at disagree score on the issues of teachers are willing to assume leadership role. In addition to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.87$  and  $sd_2=0.71$ ) for teachers and school leaders also shows there is little variability among respondents. From this one can easily concludes, lack of willingness to assume leadership role amongst teachers in schools was the major challenges that hinder the practice of distributed leadership under study area. With regard to descriptive analysis, stepwise regression analysis was discussed as follows.

Table 14: Regression Analysis ( $n_i= 150$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) on the Major Challenges in Practicing DL related with Teachers

Model	Coefficients				
	R	R <sup>2</sup>	USC		SC
1. Constant	0.46	0.21	B	SE	Beta
			1.31	0.21	
Teachers are willing to work in a team in their school			0.49	0.08	0.46

Dependent variable: Distributive Leadership

As indicated in table 14, the regression analysis in the area of the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership related with teachers in providing teachers unwillingness to work in a team in their school measured by regression correlation coefficient (1.31) was contributing 21% to deteriorating distributive leadership practices as measured by the stepwise regression analysis coefficient ( $R^2$ )\*100. The result means that 21% of the variation on the dependent variable is accounted for the variation in the independent variable whereas the rest unexplained variable  $(1-R^2)*100$  were contributing 79% to deteriorating to distributive leadership practices. This means the rest of variation 79% is unexplained. The accompanying computer printout shows a regression equation that predicts teachers willingness to work in a team in their school( $x_1$ ) that affects distributive leadership practices were expressed by statistically significant independent variables were  $Y= 1.31+ 0.49x_1$  where 1.31 is constant. The positive slope of a variable 0.49 which used to indicate that as per a unit increase of independent variable would tends to increase distributive leadership practices.

#### 4.4.3. Major challenges of distributive leadership related to school leaders and teachers

For the respondents questionnaire which had five rating scale and stepwise regression analysis were discussed and the result was summarized in the following table 15 and 16.

Table 15: Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership related with School Leaders and Teachers

No	Items	Teachers N =120		School leader N =30		Total N =150
		M	SD <sub>1</sub>	M	SD <sub>2</sub>	WM
1.	There is collegial relationship between school leaders and teachers in setting school direction	2.01	0.76	2.96	0.92	2.20
2.	There is smooth communication between school leader and teachers	1.95	0.79	3.03	0.71	2.16
3.	There is trust between teachers and school leaders in school	1.80	0.70	2.96	0.88	2.03

In the above table 15 item 1, it was analyzed response about the issues of collegial relationship between school leaders and teachers in setting school direction. Accordingly, the mean score (2.01) for teachers and (2.96) for school leaders shows there were disagree and undecided score among the respondent. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.20) shows disagree score. In addition the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.76$  and  $sd_2=0.92$ ) for teachers and school leaders shows there was little variability among respondents on the issues of collegial relationship between school leaders and teachers in setting school direction. This indicates that, absences of collegial relationship among school leaders and teachers were one of the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership under study area.

As depicted in table 15 item 2, the mean score (1.95) and (3.03) for teachers and school leaders shows there were disagree and undecided score in relation to the issues of there is smooth communication between school leaders and teachers. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.16) also shows there were disagree score regarding the issues of smooth communication between school leaders and teachers. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.79$  and  $sd_2=0.71$ ) for teachers and school leaders reveals there were little variability among respondents on similar issue. This implies that, absences of smoothly communication between

school leaders and teachers were one of the major challenges of distributive leadership practices under study area.

As the data shows in table 15 item 3, the mean score for teachers and school leaders were (1.80 and 2.96), and this mean score were ranged at disagree and undecided score regarding the issues of there is trust between teachers and school leaders in school. Generally, the weighted mean score (2.03) indicated disagree score on the issues of there is trust between teachers and school leaders in school. In addition to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.70$  and  $sd_2=0.88$ ) for teachers and school leaders shows there were little variability among respondents on the issues of there is trust between teachers and school leaders. From this one can realize that, lack of trust between teachers and school leaders were one of the major challenges of distributive leadership practices under study area. With regard to the above descriptive analysis, the stepwise regression analysis was discussed as follows.

Table 16: Regression Analysis ( $n=150$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) on the Major Challenges in Practicing DL related with School Leaders and Teachers

Model	Coefficients			
	R	R <sup>2</sup>	USC	SC
1. Constant	0.47	0.23	B	SE
			0.99	0.18
There is smooth communication between school leader and teachers			0.34	0.08
There is trust between teachers and school leaders in school			0.23	0.09
				Beta
				0.35
				0.23

Dependent variable: Distributive Leadership

As indicated in table 16, the regression analysis in the area of the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership related with school leaders and teachers in providing there is smooth communication and trust between school leaders and teachers measured by regression correlation coefficient (0.99) was contributing 23% to deteriorating distributive leadership practices as measured by the stepwise regression analysis coefficient ( $R^2$ )\*100. The result means that 23% of the variation on the dependent variable is accounted for the variation in the independent variable whereas the rest unexplained variable  $(1-R^2)*100$  were contributing 77% to deteriorating to distributive leadership practices. This means the rest of variation 77% is unexplained. The accompanying computer printout shows a regression equation that predicts

there is smooth communication between school leader and teachers( $x_1$ ) and there is trust between teachers and school leaders in school( $x_2$ ) that affects distributive leadership practices were expressed by statistically significant independent variables were  $Y=0.99+0.34x_1+0.23x_2$  where 0.99 is constant. The positive slopes of two independent variables respectively 0.34 and 0.23 which used to indicate that as per a unit increase of independent variables would tends to increase distributive leadership practices in schools.

The open ended question dispatched to teachers and school leaders to identify the challenges in practicing distributive leadership. The substance of their responses and comments were organized as follows. They said that, Some of the challenges of distributive leadership is reluctance of teachers to delegate, saying it is not concerned me, lack of finance, shortage of materials, fear of burden or work load, lack of ability and self-confidence, lack of experiences and deep understanding.

In addition, an interview was also conducted with supervisors, with regard to some of major challenges that they observed in their school during practicing distributive leadership.

One of the interviewee supervisor said that;

*There are many challenges that hinder distributive leadership practices in my school, some of them are; lack of collaboration between teachers and school leaders in practicing best trends, absences of sharing each and every activities and work within, lack of commitment, lack of motivational skills and time were some of the major challenges.*

Similar the other interviewee supervisor stated that;

*As I think distributive leadership is a new concepts which should be practiced in every organization, special in educational institutions, but there are many challenges that hinders the practices of distributive leadership, those are; absences of supportive school structure, lack of trust in working environment on behalf of stakeholders to address significant issue, lack of support from ZEO and WEO, lack of confidence as well as necessary awareness regarding the area of leadership practices were some of the major challenges.*

Supporting the above interview, Harris (2004) suggested that structural, cultural and political challenges operating in the schools that make distributive form of leadership difficult to

implement. In relation to this, Spillane and Danielson (2006) also viewed that distributive leadership failed to practices in the schools due to time limitation on the parts of stakeholders.

#### 4.5. Possible Strategies to overcoming the Challenges in Practicing DL

For the respondents questionnaire which had five rating scale and stepwise regression analysis were discussed and result was summarized in table 17 and 18.

Table 17: Possible Strategies to overcoming the Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership

No	Items	Teachers N =120		School leader N =30		Total N =150
		M	SD <sub>1</sub>	M	SD <sub>2</sub>	WM
1.	Creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership in their school.	3.95	0.20	3.23	0.93	3.81
2.	Sharing of knowledge, experiences with one another.	4.22	0.50	3.76	0.85	4.12
3.	Working together collaboratively in schools.	4.25	0.66	3.73	1.01	4.14
4.	Being accountable to once own tasks in the school	4.23	0.49	3.80	0.66	4.14
5.	Maintaining atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school setting	3.96	0.18	3.50	0.68	3.86
6.	Facilitating smooth communication among teachers and all school members	3.94	0.43	3.56	0.72	3.86
7.	Initiating others to make decisions on issues important for school success.	3.94	0.43	3.36	1.09	3.82
8.	Encouraging formal, informal groups to contribute for the achievement of schools' objectives.	3.95	0.33	3.76	0.77	3.91
9.	Encouraging staff to feel secure in taking risks to innovative best ideas that contribute to the school's development.	3.91	0.27	3.56	0.62	3.84
10	Establishing supportive feeling in which teachers are encouraged to work as a team member	3.95	0.20	3.63	0.49	3.88

As it can be seen from table 17 item 1, the mean score (3.95 and 3.23) for teachers and school leaders were agree and undecided score in the area of creating favorable condition to facilitate

team leadership in their school. Generally, the weighted mean score (3.81) indicated that there were agree score regarding the issues of creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership in their school. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.20$  and  $sd_2=0.93$ ) for teachers and school leaders also shows there were little variability among respondents. This indicates, creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership in their school is one of the possible strategies for the challenges in practicing distributive leadership.

As indicated in the above table 17 item 2, the mean score (4.22 and 3.76) for teachers and school leaders identified that there were agree score regarding the area of Sharing of knowledge, experiences with one another. Generally, the weighted mean scores (4.12) for teachers and school leaders shows, there were agree score with the issues of Sharing of knowledge, experiences with one another. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.50$  and  $sd_2=0.85$ ) for teachers and school leaders shows there is little variability among respondents on similar issue. This implies that, Sharing of knowledge and experiences with one another among the school stakeholders is one of the possible strategies in practicing distributive leadership under study area.

As depicted in table 17 item 3, the mean score (4.25) and (3.73) for teachers and school leaders shows there were agree score in the area of working together collaboratively in schools. Generally, the weighted mean score (4.14) for teachers and school leaders shows there were agree score in relation to the issues of working together collaboratively in schools. In addition, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.66$  and  $sd_2=1.01$ ) for teachers and school leaders reveals there were little variability among respondents. This implies that, collaboratively working together among school leaders and teachers on the activities of schools were one of the possible strategies for the challenges in practicing distributive leadership.

As indicated in table 17 items 4, both respondents had rated almost similar. The mean score of teachers was (4.23) and that of school leaders was (3.80) with the weighted mean score of (4.14). Both the mean scores and weighted mean scores of respondents felled under the agree score regarding the issues of being accountable to once own tasks in the school. Besides to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.49$  and  $sd_2=0.66$ ) for teachers and school leaders was revealed there were a little variability among respondents on the issues of being accountable to

once own tasks in the school. This indicates that, being accountable to his or her task is one of the possible strategies to solve the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership.

As expressed in table 17 item 5, the mean score (3.96) and (3.50) for teachers and school leaders were identified there were agree and undecided score regarding the issue of Maintaining atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school setting. Generally, the weighted mean score (3.86) for teachers and school leaders respondents indicated that there were agree score in the area of Maintaining atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school setting. Besides, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.18$  and  $sd_2=0.68$ ) for teachers and school leaders shows there were little variability among respondents. From this one concluded that, one of the possible strategies used in practicing distributive leadership were maintaining atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school setting.

As indicated in table 17 item 6, the mean score (3.94) and (3.56) for teachers and school leaders were identified agree score in the area of facilitating smooth communication among teachers and all school members. Generally, the weighted mean score (3.86) also shows there were agree score regarding the issues facilitating smooth communication among teachers and all school members. In addition, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.43$  and  $sd_2= 0.72$ ) for teachers and school leaders expresses there is a little variability among respondents on similar issues. From this one concluded that one of the possible strategies used in practicing distributive leadership were facilitating smooth communication among teachers and all school members.

As depicted in table 17 items 7, both groups of respondents had rated almost similar answer regarding the issues of initiating others to make decisions on issues important for school success. Accordingly, the mean score of teachers and school leaders were (3.94 and 3.36) were felled under agree and undecided score. Generally, the weighted mean scores (3.82) were felled under agree score regarding the issue of Initiating others to make decisions on issues important for school success. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.43$  and  $sd_2=1.09$ ) for teachers and school leaders revealed that, there were little variability among respondents on similar issues. From this one concluded that one of the possible strategies used in practicing distributive leadership were initiating others to make decisions on the issues essentially for the success of school.

As depicted in table 17 item 8, the mean score (3.95 and 3.76) for teachers and school leaders with the weighted mean score of (3.91) were agree score with regard to encouraging formal, informal groups to contribute for the achievement of school objectives. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.33$  and  $sd_2=0.77$ ) for teachers and school leaders implies there was little variability among respondents on similar issues.

As shown in table 17 item 9, regarding the issues of encouraging staff to feel secure in taking risks to innovate best ideas that contribute to the school development, teachers and school leaders were respond agree score i.e. ( 3.91 and 3.56 ) with the weighted mean score of (3.84). Besides to this, the standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.27$  and  $sd_2=0.62$ ) for teachers and school leaders were also shows, there was little variability among respondents on similar issue. This implies that, encouraging school stakeholders to innovate best ideas is one of the possible strategies in practicing distributive leadership.

As per table 17 item 10, the mean score of teachers and school leaders were (3.95 and 3.63) with the weighted mean score of (3.88) i.e. agree score regarding the issues of establishing supportive felling in which teachers are encouraged to work as a team members. The standard deviation ( $sd_1=0.20$  and  $sd_2=0.49$ ) for teachers and school leaders identified that, there is little variability among respondents. This implies that, establishing supportive felling and encouraging teachers to work as a team members in school setting were one of the possible strategies used to solve challenges in practicing distributive leadership. In addition to the above descriptive analysis, the stepwise regression analysis was discussed as follows.

Table 18: Regression Analysis (  $n=150$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) on the Possible Strategies to overcoming the Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership

Model	Coefficients			
	R	R <sup>2</sup>	USC	SC
1. Constant	0.64	0.41	B	Beta
			-0.99	0.35
Sharing of knowledge, experiences with one another.			0.39	0.05
Facilitating smooth communication among teachers and school member.			0.35	0.06
Encouraging staff to feel secure taking risks to innovative best ideas that contribute to school's development.			0.19	0.08
Encouraging formal, informal groups to contribute for the achievement of schools' objectives.			-0.36	0.07
Establishing supportive feeling in which teachers are encouraged to work as a team member.			0.55	0.11
Working together collaboratively in schools.			0.09	0.04

Dependent variable: distributive leadership

As depicted in table 18, the regression analysis in the area of the possible strategies for the challenges in practicing distributive leadership measured by regression correlation coefficient (-0.99 was contributing 41% to deteriorating distributive leadership practices as measured by the stepwise regression analysis coefficient ( $R^2$ )\*100. The result means that 41% of the variation on the dependent variable is accounted for the variation in the independent variable whereas the rest unexplained variable  $(1 - R^2)*100$  were contributing 59 % to deteriorating to distributive leadership practices. This means the rest of variation 59% is unexplained. The accompanying computer printout shows a regression equation that predicts, sharing and expressing of knowledge and experiences with one another ( $x_1$ ), facilitating smooth communication among teachers and all school members ( $x_2$ ), encouraging staff to feel secure in taking risks to innovative best ideas that contribute to the schools development( $x_3$ ), encouraging formal and informal groups to contribute for the achievement of schools' objectives( $x_4$ ), establishing supportive feeling in which teachers are encouraged to work as a team member( $x_5$ ) and working together collaboratively in schools( $x_6$ ) that affects distributive leadership practices were expressed by statistically significant independent variables were  $Y =$

$-0.99+0.39x_1+0.35x_2+0.19x_3-0.36x_4+0.55x_5+0.09x_6$  where  $-0.99$  is constant. The positive slope of the first, second, third variables and the negative slope of the fourth variable and the positive slope of the fifth and six variable respectively (0.39, 0.35, 0.19 and  $-0.36$  and 0.55 and 0.09) which used to indicate that as per a unit increase of the first second, third, fifth and six independent variables would tends to decrease and as per a unit decrease of the fourth variables would tends increases distributive leadership practices.

An open-ended question were dispatched to teachers and school leaders to know other possible strategies for the challenges of distributive leadership practices in their school that are not specified under closed ended questionnaire. The substance of their response and comments were organized as following. They said that, creating awareness among school teachers and leaders, sharing of experiences with other schools and staffs, developing common understanding about distributive leadership, preparing long and short term training, allocating resources for different training regarding practices of distributive leadership were some of the possible strategies for the challenges of distributive leadership practices.

In supporting this finding, the interview was also conducted with school supervisors with regard to some possible strategies for effective practices of distributive leadership in their schools. One of the supervisor's respondents stated that, some of the possible strategies in practicing distributive leadership were,

*School leaders must be committed to distributing activities among many individuals, working together toward the same vision and goals of the schools, collaborative culture must be in place in order for distributive leadership to occur and practices of distributive leadership must be embedded in to school.*

Supporting the above idea, Elmore, 2000; 2004 stated that, distributive leadership practices is effective, when school leaders need to understand how individuals vary, how the particular knowledge and skill of one person can be made to complement that of another, and how the competences of someone can be shared with others.

## **5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This chapter deals with summary, conclusions and recommendations. In this section first, a summary of the study and the major findings were made. Second, depending on the findings conclusions were drawn. Lastly recommendations were made on the basis of the findings of the study.

### **5.1. Summary**

The purpose of this study was to examine practices and challenges of distributive leadership in public secondary schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State and to come up with remedial solutions in order to bring the best practices. In order to solve these challenges, the following basic questions were raised in the study.

1. To what extent do secondary schools leaders and teachers participate in practicing distributive leadership in public secondary schools of EHZ?
2. How do teachers and school leaders perceive the concepts of distributive leadership under study area?
3. What are the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership under study area?
4. What are the possible strategies to be taken, in order to practices distributive leadership in secondary schools of EHZ?

In order to answer research question, related literature was reviewed. The study was carried out in 5 secondary schools of 4 Woredas and 1 secondary schools of 1 administrative town that were selected by simple random sampling techniques to the study from 58 secondary schools of 20 Woredas and 4 administrative town in East Hararghe Zone.

In this study descriptive survey research design with (quantitative and qualitative) approaches was employed. Data that are essential for the study was collected by using questionnaire and interview. The subject of the study were 6 schools principals, 6 vice-principals, 12 unit leaders, 5 supervisors, 6 PTSA heads and 120 teachers. The researcher was used stratified random sampling technique to select teachers from each school and available sampling technique for selecting principals, vice principals, unit leaders, supervisors and PTSA heads. Both open ended and closed ended questionnaire was used for teachers respondents and school

leaders (principals, vice principals, PTSA heads and unit leaders) while interview was used for supervisors.

In analyses of data, both quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed and the collected data were analyzed using SPSS software version 20. Specifically, different statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and weighted mean were used as descriptive statistical tools whereas, inferential statistics such as stepwise regression analysis were used to analyze the collected data. The analyses of the data secured from those instruments have revealed the following findings.

### **5.1.1. Respondents background**

The study showed that the numbers of male respondents were much greater than that of female respondents and the teaching-learning process, supervisor and leadership position were dominated by males in the secondary schools under the study. Regarding the ages of the respondents, the majority of them were between the age ranges of 25-30, 30-35 and 35-40 as the study showed.

It was found from the response that, the majority of vice-principals, supervisors, unit leaders and teachers in the secondary schools was degree holders under study area. While some of the principals and all of the PTSA heads were master and diploma holders respectively. Regarding the respondents year of services, the majority of them were between the age range of 5-10 and 10-15.

### **5.1.2. Extent of practicing distributive leadership**

The extent of practicing distributive leadership was seen from three angles, these were, extent in relation to its openness of the boundaries, form of collective leadership and recognize other people's expertise.

With respect to the area of practicing distributive leadership in relation to its openness of the boundaries, most of the respondents shows their agreement as low score. i.e. 1.73, 2.19 and 2.08 weighted mean score on the issues of practicing distributive leadership. Besides to this, the interview made with supervisors indicated that, teacher's participation in decision making

activities beyond their own class-room was low. Because, school leaders consider making decision and practicing each and every activities of the school as his or her responsibility and sometimes teachers in schools have no interest to participate in decision making activities. They further indicated that school leaders should open the boundaries to teachers and initiate them to participate in different schools activities.

With regard to the area of practicing distributive leadership in relation to it is form of collective leadership, some of the respondent's shows their agreement low score. i.e. 2.10 and 2.14 weighted mean score and some of the respondents were shows their agreement as medium level. i.e. 2.54 weighted mean score.

Regarding the area of practicing distributive leadership in relation to recognizing other people expertise all most all respondents shows their agreement as low level score. i.e. 2.27, 2.25, 2.35 and 2.20 weighted mean score.

### **5.1.3. Responses of respondents on the perceptions of distributive leadership**

With regard to the practices of distributive leadership in the area related with perception, some of the teachers and school leaders respondents indicated undecided score with the weighted mean score of (3.47 and 3.40) while most of the respondents identified disagree score with the weighted mean score of (2.37, 2.21 and 2.17) on the issues of teachers and school leaders perception towards distributive leadership practices.

### **5.1.4. Challenges in practicing distributive leadership.**

The major challenges of distributive leadership practices was seen from three angles, these are challenges related with school leaders, teachers and both teachers and school leaders.

With regard to the major challenges of distributive leadership practices in relation to school leaders, most of the respondents showed that, school leaders and teachers found to be disagree score. i.e. 2.30 and 2.34 weighted mean score. While some of the respondents were indicated undecided score. i.e. 3.24.

With respect to the major challenges of distributive leadership practices in relation to teachers, most of the respondents depicted disagree scores. i.e., 2.50, 2.28 and 2.39 weighted mean score. This reveals that, unwillingness to work in team, lack of shared responsibility and lack of willingness to assume leadership role amongst teachers in schools were some of the challenges that hinder the practice of distributed leadership under study area.

Regarding challenges related with school leaders and teachers, most of the respondents reply disagree score. i.e., 2.20, 2.16 and 2.03 weighted mean score respectively. This indicates that absences of collegial relationship, lack of smoothly communication and trust between teachers and schools leaders were some of the major challenges of distributive leadership practices under study area.

#### **5. 1. 5. Possible strategies for the challenges of distributive leadership practices**

Regarding the possible strategies for the challenges of distributive leadership practices, the majority of respondents reveal that, creating favorable condition to create team leadership, sharing of knowledge and experiences, being accountable to once own task, maintaining atmosphere of trust and mutual respect, facilitate smooth communication and involving teachers in decision making activities, among school stakeholders were some of the possible strategies for the challenges in practicing distributive leadership.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

Based on the summary of the major findings, the following major conclusions are derived in relation to basic question of the study.

The extent of practicing distributive leadership was seen from three angles, these were, extent in relation to its openness of the boundaries, form of collective leadership and recognize other people expertise that affect distributive leadership practices was measured by regression correlation coefficient was contributing 24%, 13% and 32% to deteriorating distributive leadership practices respectively and the rest of variables were unexplained variables. This needs more attention to scale up the areas of teachers participation, roles, willingness,

common understanding and involvement in decision making activities in their respective schools in relation to distributive leadership best practices beyond their own class room.

Towards the perception of teachers and school leaders on distributive leadership practices, measured by regression correlation coefficient was contributing 28% to deteriorating distributive leadership practices and the rest of variables were unexplained variables. This needs more attention to solve the multi faced challenges as well as to realize the vision, and goals of the schools.

With regard to the major challenges of distributive leadership practices under study area, it was seen from three angels, these are challenges related with school leaders, teachers and both school leaders and teachers that affect distributive leadership practices measured by regression correlation coefficient was contributing 17%, 21% and 23% were deteriorating distributive leadership practices respectively, the rest of variables were unexplained variables. So, it was concluded that some of the challenges of distributive leadership practices were lack of knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers, lack of interest to participate in practicing distributive leadership and Lack of collegial relationship among school leaders and teachers in setting school direction. Therefore, without addressing these challenges, it is so difficult to implement distributive leadership practices in schools.

Regarding the possible strategies to overcoming the challenges in practicing distributive leadership were measured by regression correlation was contributing 41% were deteriorating distributive leadership practices and the rest of variables were unexplained. From this one can conclude that, ensure well-built relation among school teachers and leaders, persuade team work, shared responsibility and creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership in the school were some of the possible strategies in practicing distributive leadership. Therefore, a distributive leadership practice is effectively improved by applying the remedies forwarded by the respondents.

### **5.3. Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were forwarded.

Zonal Education Office in collaboration with Woreda Education Beruea should Provide short and long term training to schools leaders and teachers regarding the area of leadership practices in the form of workshops and seminars, so as school leaders and teachers in schools become competent, skillful and knowledgeable about distributive leadership practices, how to practices and make the schools efficient and effective in achieving the objectives of the schools.

School leaders should establish collaborative relationship among school teachers in which they can share their experiences, ideas and learn from each other's concerning their profession to bring best practices of distributive leadership.

As shown in the finding of the study, teachers' involvement, willingness and chances to participate in decision in the areas of distributive leadership practices was low, so, school leaders should open the door to all teachers and work with them collaboratively to bring desired changes.

The study revealed that lack of team work, trust among school leaders and teachers, reluctance of teachers to delegate and habit of shared leadership is some of the major challenges in practicing distributive leadership. So, school leader in collaboration with zonal and woreda education Beruea should design possible strategies through preparing different training like; seminars and workshops for the implantations of effective distributive leadership.

It is known that, one of the challenges of schools is to implement the inclusive leadership practices approach. So as to enhance and foster sustainable leadership success, the researcher recommended that, playing the leadership role should not be tied to school leaders' position, but should be distributed among school teachers. Generally, in order to utilize teacher's unexploited potential, school leaders should view teachers as a partner in educational leadership process by stretching leadership roles across all teachers.

Finally, this study focused on limited variables in relation to practices and challenges of distributive leadership, so it recommended that future research investigation should focus on practicing distributive leadership challenges and its impacts on students' academic achievement.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Abu, N. 2011. Distributed Leadership in Secondary Schools: Possibilities and Impediments in Bangladesh. *Arts Faculty Journal*, 19-32.
- Asrat Dagne. 2017. The Practice and Challenges of Distributed Leadership *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioral Science*, 20(3), 1-10.
- Barker, R. A., 2001. The nature of leadership. *Human Relations*, 54(4), 469-494.
- Bell, L. 2007. *Perspectives on Educational management and leadership*, Continuum international publishing group, London.
- Bennett, N., Wise, C., Woods, P. and Harvey, J.A., 2003. Distributed Leadership. Nottingham: National College of School Leadership.
- Bergman, J. Z., Rentsch, J. R., Small, E. E., Davenport, S.W. and Bergman, S. M., 2012. The shared leadership process in decision-making teams, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 152 (1), 17-42.
- Best, J. W. and Kahn, J. V., 2003. *Research in Education, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2004. *Research in Education, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New Delhi; Prentice-Hall.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2006. *Research in Education*: New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- Blase, J., 2001. *Empowering teachers: What successful Principal's do* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bostancı, A. B., 2012. Turkish Adaptation of Shared Leadership Perception Scale. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 2(9), 1619-1632.
- Brown, M.H. and Hosking, D.M., 2004. Distributed leadership and skilled performance as successful organization in social movements. *Human Relations*, 39(1), 65-79.
- Creswell, J. W., 2009. *Research design Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approach* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publication.
- Day, D. V., Gronn, P., and Salas, E., 2004. Leadership capacity in terms. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 857-880.
- Danielson, C., 2006. The many faces of leadership. *Educational leadership*, 65(1), 14-19.
- Deal, T. E., and Peterson, K. D., 1994. *The Leadership Paradox*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Deem, R., 2001. Globalization New Managerilizim, Academic Capitalism, and Enterperiunalis m in Universities, is the Local Dimension Still Important? *Comparative Education*, 37 (1), 7-20.
- Dejane Leta., 2014. Practice and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Abeba University.
- Denis, J. L., Lamothe, L. and Langley, A., 2001. The dynamics of collective leadership and Strategic change in pluralistic organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44 (4), 809-837.
- Duignan, P., 2006. *Educational Leadership: Key Challenges and Ethical Tensions*. New York: Cambridge University press.
- Elmore, R., 1999-2000. Building a new structure for school leadership. *American Educator*, winter, 23(4), 6-13, 42-44.
- Elmore, R. F., 2000. *School Reform from the Inside Out: Policy, Practice, and Performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Fullan, M., 2006. Change theory: A force for school improvement. *Center for Strategic Education*, 157, 3-14.
- Fullan, M. and Scott, G., 2009. *Turn around Leadership for Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibb, C. A., 1954. Leadership. G. Lindzey(Eds.). *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2, 877–917. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gronn, P., 2000. Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Education Manage ment and Administration*, 28(3), 371-388.
- Gronn, P. 2002a. Distributed leadership. *Second International Hand book of Educational Leader- ship and Administration*. K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 653–696.
- Gronn, P., 2002. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 423–451.
- Gronn, P., 2003. Leadership: who needs it? *School Leadership and Management*, 23 (3) 267-290, doi: 10.1080/1363243032000112784.
- Halverson, R., Clifford, M. (2003). Distributive instructional leadership in high schools. <http://website.Education>.
- Harris, A. and Lambert, L., 2003. *Building Leadership Capacity for School*. Open University Press Maidenhead, Philadelphia, USA.

- Harris, A., 2004. Distributed leadership: leading or misleading. *Educational Management and Administration*, 32(1), 11-24.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2005. Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37, 255–265.
- Harris, A., and Muijs, D., 2005. *Improving schools through teacher leadership*. UK: Open University Press.
- Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Sammons, P. and Hopkins, D., 2007. Distributed leadership and organizational change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8 (4), 337- 347.
- Harris, A., 2008. *Distributed Leadership: Different Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2009. Distributed Leadership: What we know'. In: Harris, A. (Eds.) *Distributed School Leadership: Different perspectives*. London: Springer, 11-21.
- Henan, D. and Bennis, W., 1999. *Co-Leaders: The Power of Great Partnerships*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hoy, W. K., and Miskel, G. C., 2012. *Educational Administration, Theory, Research and Practice (7<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. (Translation Editor: Selahattin Turan). Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Hulpia, H. and Devos, G., 2009. Development and validation of scores on the distributed leadership inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 1-22.
- Johnston, A., 2010. Sampling hard-to-reach populations with respondent driven sampling: *Methodological Innovations Online*, 5(2), 38-48.
- Knapp, M., Copland, M. A, Plecki, M. L., and Portin, B., 2006. *Leading, learning and leadership support*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Kombo, K. and Tromp, D. 2008. *Proposal and thesis writing: An introduction*. Nairobi: Publications of Africa.
- Kothari, C.R., 2004. *Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques*, Second Revised.
- Kratzenmeyer, M. and Moller, G., 2001. *A wakening the sleeping giant: Helping teachers develop as leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kumer, Y.S., 2006. *Fundamental of Research Methodology and Statistics*. Published by New Age International Ltd., Publishers.
- Lambert, L., 1998. *Building Leadership Capacity in Schools*. Alexandria, VA, USA ASCD.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2002. A framework for shared leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 37-40.

- 
2003. *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., Strauss, T., Sacks, R., Memon, N. and Yashkina, A., 2007. Distributing leadership to make schools smarter: taking the ego out of the system, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6 (1), 37-67.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D. and Harris, A., 2006. *Successful School Leadership: What it is and how it Influences Pupil Learning*: Department of Education and Skills. Lunenburg.
- Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., Strauss, T., Sacks, R., Memon, N. And Yaskina, A., 2006. Distributing leadership to make schools smarter: Taking the ego out of the system. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(1), 37-67.
- Leithwood, K., Mascall, B. and Strauss, T., 2009. New perspectives on an old idea: a short history of the old idea, in Leithwood, K., Mascall, B. and Strauss, T. (Eds), *Distributed Leadership* Routledge: London, 1-14.
- Liljenberg, M., 2015. Distributing leadership to establish developing and learning school organizations in the Swedish context”, *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 43 (1), 152-170.
- Macbeath, J., 2005. *Leadership as distributed: a matter of practice*. *School Leadership and management*, 25(4), 349-366.
- Mayrowetz, D., 2008. Making sense of distributed leadership: Exploring the multiple usages of the concept in the field. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(3), 424-435.
- Middlehurst, R., 1993. *Leading Academics*. Buckingham: SRHE and OU Press.
- Misgana Tekle. 2017. Principal distributive leadership practices in Hadiya Zone, in Southern Nations Nationalities and Peoples Regional State.
- Moller, J. and Eggen, A. B., 2005. Team leadership in upper secondary education. *School leadership and Management*, 25(4), 331-347.
- Mouton, J., 2001. *How to succeed in your master`s degree and Doctoral Studies*. Pretoria, South Africa: VanSchaik.
- Mulatu Dea Lerra., 2015. Leadership Challenges to Transformative Change for Quality Education in Public University: A case of Wolaita Sodo University. *African Educational research journal* 3(3): 170- 183.
- National College of School Leadership, (NCSL)., 2004. *.Distributed Leadership* (Published Set of Booklets) Nottingham.

- Ngwenya, V., 2010. Managing parental involvement with education in Zimbabwe. PhD Dissertation Education Management, University of South Africa.
- Northouse, p. G., 2004. *Leadership Theory and Practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Calif.
- Oduro, G.K.T., 2004. Distributed leadership<sup>6</sup> in schools: what English head teachers say about the pull and push factors. *Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference*, University of Manchester.
- Pallant, J., 2010. *SPSS Survival Manual*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, Mcgraw Hill.
- Pearce, C. L. and Sims, H.P., 2002. The relative influence of vertical vs. shared leadership on the longitudinal effectiveness of change management teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 6(2), 172-197.
- Pearce, C. L., 2004. The feature of leadership: combining vertical and shared leadership to transform knowledge work. *Academic of management executive*, 18 (1), 47-57.
- Plunkett, W. R., Attner, R. F. and Allen, G. S., 2008. *Management: Meeting and Exceeding Customer Expectations*, (9<sup>th</sup> Ed.) New York, USA. Thomson South Western Publication.
- Rosemary, R., 2003. Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient for likert-type scales. The Ohio State University, Columbus. OH.
- Rosenthal, C.S., 1998. Determinants of collaborative leadership: civic engagement, gender or Organizational norms? *Political Research Quarterly*, 51(4), 847- 868.
- Scott, P., 2009. *Higher Education Reformed*, London: Falmer.
- Scribner, J.P., Sawyer, R. K., Watson, S.T, and Myers, V.L., 2007. Teacher Teams and Distributed Leadership: A Study of Group Discourse and Collaboration. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 67-100.
- Silins, H. and Mulford, W., 2002. Leadership and school results. In Leithwood, K. and Hallinger, P. (Eds), *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 561–612.
- Simkins, T., 2005. Leadership in Education: What works or what makes sense. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership* 33(1),9-26.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R. and Diamond, J. B., 2001. Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30, 23-28.
- Spillane, J.P., 2004, Educational leadership, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26 (2), 169-172.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2005. *Distributed leadership*. The Educational Forum, 69, 143-150.

- \_\_\_\_\_2006. *Distributed Leadership* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Wiley.
- Spillane, J. and Diamond, J.B., 2007. *Distributed Leadership in Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shimelis Mesfin. 2018. Practices and Challenges of Distributive Leadership *Journal of Education and Practices*, 20(7).
- Timperley, H. S., 2005. Distributed leadership: developing theory from practice, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(4), 395-420.
- Timperley, H., 2009, Distributing leadership to improve outcomes for students, in Leithwood, K., Mascall, B. and Strauss, T. *Distributed Leadership according to the Evidence*, Routledge, London, 197-222.
- Torrance, D., 2012. Distributed leadership in Scottish primary schools: myth or actualities, unpublished doctor of Philosophy thesis, The Moray House School of Education, The University of Edinburgh.
- Uhl-Bien, M., 2006. Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social process of leadership and organizing. *The leadership quarterly*, 17, 654-676.
- Ward, Kelley MS, RN, C., 2002. A Vision for Tomorrow: *Transformational Nursing leaders*. *Nurse outlook*; 50(30), 121-126.
- Woods, P.A., 2004. Democratic leadership: drawing distinctions with distributed leadership, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 7(1), 3-26.
- Yamane, T. 1967. *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., New York: Harper and Row.
- Yenenew, A., 2012. Effectiveness of principal instructional leadership in preparatory schools in south wollo zone, Ethiopia Addis Ababa.
- Yukl, G. A., 2002. *Leadership in Organizations* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Zikmund, W., Babin, B., Carr, J. and Griffin, M., 2010. *Business Research Methods*. 8<sup>th</sup> Edition. South western: Cengage Learning.

## **APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX I**

#### **HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

#### **POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**

#### **College of Education and Behavioral Sciences**

#### **Department of Educational Planning and Management**

#### **Questionnaire to be filled by School Teachers**

#### **Dear Respondent!**

This is an MA research project. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for the study entitled **Practices and Challenges of Distributive Leadership in Public Secondary Schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State**. The objective of this research is only for academic and information gathered through this questionnaire is only for academic purpose. Your careful and honest response to the questionnaire determines the success of the study. Thus, you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully and honestly. Your response was kept confidential. Please read the directions given in each of the items in the questionnaire carefully before you respond to it. If you want to change any of your response, make sure that you have cancelled the unwanted ones.

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation!

**Directions:** please, read and try to understand the following guidelines to fill the questionnaire

- ▶ No need to write your name on the paper.
- ▶ Read the instructions of the questionnaire very carefully.
- ▶ Discussion on the given questionnaire is strictly forbidden as it is an individual work.
- ▶ To give your own answer, put a tick mark (✓) on the space provided under the column.



1.4.2.	Teachers are provided with enough time to work together with school leaders on the work related to their school.					
1.4.3.	Teachers in the school have common sense to exercises best practices.					
1.5.	<b>Recognizing other People's Expertise</b>					
1.5.1.	School leaders shares their experience to others to exercises best practices.					
1.5.2.	School leaders encourage teachers to engage in professional development related to whole school issues (e.g. school development planning, special needs, health and safety care etc).					
1.5.3.	School leaders encourage teachers to participate in leading activities in their school in addition to teaching and learning process.					
1.5.4.	School leaders' review others polices and new ideas to practice distributive leadership in their school.					

1. How do school leaders and teachers are participating in your school in practicing distributive leadership?

---



---



---



---

## 2. Questionnaires Related to Distributive Leadership Perception

Indicate your response about the perception of distributive leadership practices by putting an “√” mark in the box corresponding to your choice as regards the frequency to which you perform the following tasks.

**Note. Strongly disagree (SD) =1, Disagree (DA)=2, undecided (UD)=3, Agree (A)=4, strongly agree (SA) = 5**

No	Variables	Rating scale				
		SD	DA	UD	A	SA
	Items	1	2	3	4	5
2.1.	The school leader considers him or her self as knowledgeable about distributive leadership practice.					
2.2.	School leaders have knowledge about distributed leadership concepts.					
2.3.	School leaders and teachers consider themselves as a decision maker in your school.					
2.4.	School leaders and teachers are familiar with their colleagues for taking leadership roles in the school.					
2.5.	School leaders are sharing their experiences with others in schools.					

2. What is distributive leadership mean to you in your school? How do you define? And what is the importance's of practicing distributive leadership in your school?

---



---



---



---

### 3. Items related with Major Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership

The following items are some of the challenges in practicing distributive leadership in which school leaders and teachers are expected to be practice. Please indicate the extent of your position individually in your school. Indicate your answer by putting a tick “√” under the given scale.

**Note. Strongly disagree (SD) =1, Disagree (DA) =2, undecided (UD) =3, Agree (A) =4, strongly agree (SA) = 5.**

No	Variables	Rating scale				
		SD	DA	UD	A	SA
3	<b>Challenges related with School Leaders</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1.	School leaders feel that practicing distributive leadership is the responsibility of principals not the responsibility of teachers.					
3.2.	School leaders have knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers in their school.					
3.3.	School leaders have the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction.					
<b>3.4.</b>	<b>Challenges related with School Teachers</b>					
3.4.1.	Teachers have interest to participate in distributive leadership activities in their school.					
3.4.2.	Teachers are willing to work in a team in their school.					
3.4.3.	There is shared responsibility among school teachers.					
3.4.4.	Teachers are willing to assume leadership role.					
<b>3.5.</b>	<b>Challenges related with School leaders and Teachers</b>					
3.5.1.	There is collegial relationship between school leaders and teachers in setting school direction.					
3.5.2.	There is smooth communication between school leader and teachers.					
3.5.3.	There is trust between teachers and school leaders in school.					

3. Please mention major challenges in practicing distributed leadership in your school (if any) that are not specified in closed ended questionnaire?

---



---



---



---

#### 4. Items Related with Possible Strategies to overcome for the Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership.

Please indicate the possible strategies used in practicing distributive leadership in your schools.

**Note. Strongly disagree (SD) =1, Disagree (DA) =2, undecided (UD) =3, Agree (A) =4, strongly agree (SA) = 5**

No	Variables Items	Rating scale				
		SD	DA	UD	A	SA
		1	2	3	4	5
4.1.	Creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership in their school.					
4.2.	Sharing of knowledge, experiences with one another.					
4.3.	Working together collaboratively in schools.					
4.4.	Being accountable to once own tasks in the school.					
4.5.	Maintaining atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school setting.					
4.6.	Facilitating smooth communication among teachers and all school members.					
4.7.	Initiating others to make decisions on issues important for school success.					
4.8.	Encouraging formal, informal groups to contribute for the achievement of schools' objectives.					
4.9.	Encouraging staff to feel secure in taking risks to innovative best ideas that contribute to the school's development.					
4.10.	Establishing supportive feeling in which teachers are encouraged to work as a team member.					

4. Please mention other major possible strategies for the challenges in practicing distributive leadership in your school (if any) that are not specified in closed-ended questionnaire?

---



---



---



---

**APPENDIX II**  
**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**  
**College of Education and Behavioral Sciences**  
**Department of Educational Planning and Management**

**Questionnaire to be filled by Schools school leaders (principals, vice principals, PTSA heads and unit leaders)**

**Dear Respondent!**

This is an MA research project. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for the study entitled **Practices and Challenges of Distributive Leadership in Public Secondary Schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State**. The objective of this research is only for academic and information gathered through this questionnaire is only for academic purpose. Your careful and honest response to the questionnaire determines the success of the study. Thus, you are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire carefully and honestly. Your response was kept confidential. Please read the directions given in each of the items in the questionnaire carefully before you respond to it. If you want to change any of your response, make sure that you have cancelled the unwanted ones.

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation!

**Directions:** please, read and try to understand the following guidelines to fill the questionnaire

- ▶ No need to write your name on the paper.
- ▶ Read the instructions of the questionnaire very carefully.
- ▶ Discussion on the given questionnaire is strictly forbidden as it is an individual work.
- ▶ To give your own answer, put a tick mark (√) on the space provided under the column.

## PART I: PERSONAL INFORMATION

**Instruction:** please answer the questions below by putting a tick mark where necessary.

1. Name of your school \_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_
2. Sex:                   A) Male                               B) Female
3. Age in years        A) 20-25       B) 25-30       C) 30-35       D) 35-40       E) 40 or above.
4. Work experience in years   A) 1-5       B) 5-10       C) 10-15       D) 15-20       E) 20 or above
5. Academic qualification   A) Diploma   B) Degree       C) Masters   D) if any other, kindly specify \_\_\_\_\_
6. What is your position in schools? A. Principal B. Vice- Principal's C. Unit Leader  
D. PTSA heads

## PART TWO: Closed-ended Questionnaire

### 1. Items Related With the Practices of Distributive Leadership

The following items are some of the practices of distributive leadership in which teachers and school leaders are expected to participate in the schools. Indicate your answer by putting an “√” mark in the box corresponding to your choice as regards to the frequency to which you perform in the following tasks.

**Note. Very Low (VL) =1, Low (L) = 2, Medium (M) =3, High (H) =4 and Very High (VH) =5**

No	Variables Items	Rating scale				
		VL	L	M	H	VH
		1	2	3	4	5
1	<b>Openness of the Boundaries</b>					
1.1.	Teachers are significantly involved in decision that affects best practice of distributive leadership in school freely.					
1.2.	Teachers have a chance to participate in decision making activities in their respective school to exercise best practices freely without any restriction.					
1.3.	Teachers play a major role to practice distributive leadership in their school freely					
1.4.	<b>Form of Collective Leadership</b>					
1.4.1.	Teachers help one another in their respective school to practice distributive leadership.					
1.4.2.	Teachers are provided with enough time to work together with school leaders on the work related to their school.					

1.4.3.	Teachers in the school have common sense to exercises best practices.					
1.5.	<b>Recognizing other People's Expertise</b>					
1.5.1.	School leaders shares their experience to others to exercises best practices.					
1.5.2.	School leaders encourage teachers to engage in professional development related to whole school issues (e.g. school development planning, special needs, health and safety care etc).					
1.5.3.	School leaders encourage teachers to participate in leading activities in their school in addition to teaching and learning process.					
1.5.4.	School leaders' review others polices and new ideas to practice distributive leadership in their school.					

1. How do school leaders and teachers are participating in your school in practicing distributive leadership?

---



---



---



---

## 2. Questionnaires Related to Distributive Leadership Perception

Indicate your response about the perception of distributive leadership practices by putting an “√” mark in the box corresponding to your choice as regards the frequency to which you perform the following tasks.

**Note. Strongly disagree (SD) =1, Disagree (DA)=2, undecided (UD)=3, Agree (A)=4, strongly agree (SA) = 5**

No	Variables Items	Rating scale				
		SD	DA	UD	A	SA
		1	2	3	4	5
2.1.	The school leader considers him or her self as knowledgeable about distributive leadership practice.					
2.2.	School leaders have knowledge about distributed leadership concepts.					
2.3.	School leaders and teachers consider themselves as a decision maker in your school.					
2.4.	School leaders and teachers are familiar with their colleagues for taking leadership roles in the school.					
2.5.	School leaders are sharing their experiences with others in schools.					

2. What is distributive leadership to you in your school? How do you define? And what is the importance's of practicing distributive leadership in your school?

---



---



---

### 3. Items related with Major Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership

The following items are some of the challenges in practicing distributive leadership in which school leaders and teachers are expected to be practice. Please indicate the extent of your position individually in your school. Indicate your answer by putting a tick “√” under the given scale.

**Note. Strongly disagree (SD) =1, Disagree (DA) =2, undecided (UD) =3, Agree (A) =4, strongly agree (SA) = 5.**

No	Variables	Rating scale				
		SD	DA	UD	A	SA
3	<b>Challenges related with School Leaders</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1.	School leaders feel that practicing distributive leadership is the responsibility of principals not the responsibility of teachers.					
3.2.	School leaders have knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers in their school.					
3.3.	School leaders have the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction.					
<b>3.4.</b>	<b>Challenges related with School Teachers</b>					
3.4.1.	Teachers have interest to participate in distributive leadership activities in their school.					
3.4.2.	Teachers are willing to work in a team in their school.					
3.4.3.	There is shared responsibility among school teachers.					
3.4.4.	Teachers are willing to assume leadership role.					
<b>3.5.</b>	<b>Challenges related with School leaders and Teachers</b>					
3.5.1.	There is collegial relationship between school leaders and teachers in setting school direction.					
3.5.2.	There is smooth communication between school leader and teachers.					
3.5.3.	There is trust between teachers and school leaders in school.					

3. Please mention major challenges in practicing distributed leadership in your school (if any) that are not specified in closed ended questionnaire?

---



---



---

#### 4. Items Related with Possible Strategies for the Challenges in Practicing Distributive Leadership.

Please indicate the possible strategies used in practicing distributive leadership in your schools.

**Note. Strongly disagree (SD) =1, Disagree (DA) =2, undecided (UD) =3, Agree (A) =4, strongly agree (SA) = 5**

No	Variables Items	Rating scale				
		SD	DA	UD	A	SA
		1	2	3	4	5
4.1.	Creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership in their school.					
4.2.	Sharing of knowledge, experiences with one another.					
4.3.	Working together collaboratively in schools.					
4.4.	Being accountable to once own tasks in the school.					
4.5.	Maintaining atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school setting.					
4.6.	Facilitating smooth communication among teachers and all school members.					
4.7.	Initiating others to make decisions on issues important for school success.					
4.8.	Encouraging formal, informal groups to contribute for the achievement of schools' objectives.					
4.9.	Encouraging staff to feel secure in taking risks to innovative best ideas that contribute to the school's development.					
4.10.	Establishing supportive feeling in which teachers are encouraged to work as a team member.					

4. Please mention other major possible strategies for the challenges in practicing distributive leadership in your school (if any) that are not specified in closed-ended questionnaire?

---



---



---



---

## APPENDIX III

### HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

#### POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

#### College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

#### Department of Educational Planning and Management

#### Interview to be filled by supervisors

**Dear respondents!**

The purpose of this interview is to gather primary information about **Practices and Challenges of Distributive Leadership in Public Secondary Schools of East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State**. These interview questions were prepared for secondary schools supervisors selected from sampled schools of East Hararghe Zone. So your responses for all parts of the directions would be kept confidential.

#### **PART I: PERSONAL INFORMATION**

**DIRECTION:** Indicate your response by encircling the letter of your choice or providing answer where blanks are given.

1. Name of your school \_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_
2. Sex:                                    **A)** Male                                    **B)** Female
3. Age in years                        **A)** 20-25        **B)** 25-30        **C)** 30-35        **D)** 35-40        **E)** 40 or above.
4. Work experience in years    **A)** 1-5    **B)** 5-10    **C)** 10-15    **D)** 15-20    **E)** 20 or above
5. Academic qualification        **A)** Diploma    **B)** Degree    **C)** Masters    **D)** if any other, kindly specify \_\_\_\_\_

1. Is there any practice of distributive leadership in your school so far? If yes, what it looks like?  
If no, what are the reasons for the absences?
2. Do you think that teachers are engage in decision-making responsibilities beyond their own classroom teaching- learning process in your school? If yes, in what area they participate? If no, why?
3. What does distributive leadership mean for you?
4. Can you list the major challenges that you observed in your school during practicing distributive leadership in your school?
5. Can you mention some possible strategies for effective practices of distributive leadership in your school?

**Appendix IV****Reliability Statistics**

<b>No</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>No of items</b>	<b>Alpha result</b>
<b>1</b>	Practices of distributive leadership	10	0.74
<b>2</b>	Perception of distributive leadership	5	0.78
<b>3</b>	Challenges in practicing distributive leadership	10	0.76
<b>4</b>	possible strategies to overcoming the challenges in practicing distributive leadership	10	0.75