



The Practice and Challenges of Distributed Leadership at Some Selected Primary Schools of Debarq District: Ethiopia

Asrat Dagnew^{1*}

¹College of Education and Behavioral Science, Bahir Dar University, Post Box No: 79, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

Author's contribution

The sole author designed, analyzed and interpreted and prepared the manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/BJESBS/2017/32436

Editor(s):

(1) Tsung Hung Lee, Graduate School of Leisure and Exercise Studies, National Yunlin University of Science & Technology, Taiwan.

Reviewers:

(1) Barry Chametzky, Pennsylvania, United States.
(2) Solehah Yaacob, Kulliyah Islamic Revealed Knowledge & Human Sciences, International Islamic University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

(3) Young Lee, Texas A&M University, Kingsville, USA.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history/18885>

Received 25th February 2017

Accepted 20th April 2017

Published 3rd May 2017

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the extent to which leadership was distributed among employees in the five primary schools in Debarq District. In order to achieve this purpose, survey research design was employed. Questionnaire were employed to gather quantitative data from teachers and school leadership. And qualitative data were collected from cluster supervisors and informal leaders through the use of interview and focused group discussion. To analyze the data both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed in the study. In addition, the interview and focused group discussion data were analyzed, sorted and created themes in order to fill the gaps that were not filled by the quantitative approach. The findings demonstrate: the schools were different on distributed leadership practice specifically, the study found that schools had vision but the vision and mission statement were not communicated among employees, students and parents. The principals were not encouraging teachers to participate in the decision making process of their school affairs. The study also came up with problems related to school factors that hinder distributed leadership practice which include employees' reliance on part time, lack of capacity of the

*Corresponding author: E-mail: asratboza@yahoo.com;

formal leaders and teachers; School leaders' attitude to teachers' participation in their school affair and social stereotype that disadvantaged groups were not participating in the leadership practice. Non-school factors include inadequate follow up by the district, Regional and Ministry level; The school infrastructures were not favorable to promote distributed leadership approach. The study concluded that the schools were not effectively practicing the distributed leadership approach. The study, therefore, recommended that the schools should try to effectively communicate the vision and mission through designing strategies such as through streaming the school vision and the major actors in the schools should be trained about theories of leadership and distributed leadership practice.

Keywords: Practice; challenges; distributed leadership; primary school.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 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 Wart [1]. Historically, the conceptions of leadership have passed different phases that extend from the classical notion of heroic leaders to the new leadership approach called distributed leadership Harris [2]. Contemporary leadership theories such transformational, servant, and distributed leadership, however, believed that leadership occurs when leaders and followers raise one another to a higher level of motivation to shape organizational form and processes in order to attain greater effectiveness Pawar & Eastman [3].

Most recently, leadership approach that best fit to the school system has emerged with the concept of distributed leadership (as opposed to the traditional leadership approach- heroic leadership) is suggesting that leadership is a property of many constituents rather than the few individuals in an organization Elmore [4]; Gedney [5]; Gronn [6]; Harris [7]; Spillane [8]. The major assumption of distributed leadership is that leadership is an emergent collective property determined by the interaction of all individuals in the organization Harris [9]. In other words, this form of leadership allows other people to have some influence over the leaders prescribed power. Distributed leadership was characterized and evolved from the basic limitations of traditional leadership approach that gave undue emphasis to the formal authority delegated from above based on formal position. Teacher leadership is the leadership concept which currently has due emphasis in distributed leadership literature. To make students' learning more meaningful, teachers as instructional

leaders need to respond to the dynamic nature of school environment.

More than any other achievements of this era, theory and research in the field have come up to support the view leadership is a distributed practice of many constituents in the work group and/ or organization at large as opposed to the leader centric view. Some other studies were engaged to explore the critical problems that made formal leaders not to create open leadership environment, or hinder the involvement of school constituents in leadership in the school system. Still some other studies reveal that the deep rooted school culture of non-participation in nature may significantly hinder for distributed leadership to flourish in the school system. Some leaders often distribute their leadership, because of some push factors from the external environment. Supporting this, Gedney [10] discovered that distributed leadership may arise due to external pressures to increase achievement and implement new policies and programs, typically originating as a response to formal leadership's intervention. Some other thinkers had also tried to see if there is a link between distributed leadership and organizational performance. Meanwhile, some have explored that distributed leadership may contribute to higher levels of performance and school effectiveness.

Thus, it is difficult to accept this view without looking at various explanations of different theories of leadership effectiveness in general and identifying the performance determinants as the relative importance of these performance determinants may differ across schools and over time for the same schools Yukl [11]. Hence, some studies recommend that the link between distributed leadership and performance should be investigated in accordance to the prevailing situation with caution Gordon [12]. The theoretical and research result gap discussed

above perhaps would be partly resolved by the findings of the proposed research. School leadership, according to Transitional Government of Ethiopia [13], is aimed at ensuring participatory and proper professional relations in their activities. Another study by Harris and Chapman [14] shows that distributed leadership has the power to develop and maintain relationships well and builds fair, committed, open, honest and self-critical school community. This study further asserts that distributed leadership raised staff morale, and encouraged staff to take risks and expecting high standards in return.

This study perhaps sheds light for researchers to frame their scope of leadership that helps them to look for any other conceptions beyond an ego-centric leadership approach. In a distributed leadership, one may find roles become more dynamic than the formal one and collegial, but this does not mean that formal leadership disappears Elmore [15]; Harris [16]. School leadership according to the Ethiopian Education and Training Policy [17], does not support the view that the “hero” or the one man constitutes effective leadership rather it supports the participative leadership in order the teachers, students, and parents to participate in the school decision making process.

From the outset, the country’s education and training policy has promised to prepare clear guidelines to ensure participatory school management and prosper professional relations in their activities through stating the rights and duties of all involved in education TGE [18]. This shows that school leadership and management are not vested to the principal only rather the policy also supports the involvement of school constituents to exercise leadership in the school system. Clearly, due to the unique nature of the school setting, today Ethiopian schools are expected to manage their activities through distributed leadership approach for maintenance and developmental purposes. Hence, the purpose of the study is to evaluate the leadership practice of some selected schools in Debark district, through the use of distributed leadership perspectives. To this end, the study posed the following basic questions:

1. To what extent is distributed leadership practice existed in the primary schools?
2. Is there any significance difference among the primary schools in the practice of distributed leadership? If difference exists,

what are the main reasons for this difference?

3. Do teachers’ perceptions on distributed leadership practice significantly differ by their demographic characteristics in the schools?
4. Is there any significance difference between the perception of teachers and these in the formal leadership position on the distributed leadership practice in the schools?
5. What are the major problems that are challenging the distributed leadership practice in the schools?

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the leadership practice of some selected primary schools in Debark district, so as to see whether these schools’ leadership was distributed or not. More specifically, the study intended to examine the status of distributed leadership practice in the primary schools; verify the difference across the primary schools in the practice of distribution (if there was); Examine if distributed leadership practice significantly differ by their difference on demographic characteristics in the schools; See if perception of teachers and these in the formal leadership position differed on the distributed leadership practice in the schools; And identify the major problems and challenges that are challenging the distributed leadership practice and further see whether these problems and challenges differ across these schools under study.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was employed the survey research design through the use of mixed research approaches. Mixed methods research is a research design with philosophical assumptions as well as methods of inquiry. The philosophical assumptions of mixed method of research are reliable knowledge is not only based on direct observation or manipulation of natural phenomena through empirical means, but also constructed, interpreted, and experienced by people in their interactions with each other and with wider social systems.

2.1 Sources of Data

The primary sources of data for this study were teachers and school leaders of primary schools in Debark district. They were selected as they are the main actors in the practice of distributed leadership.

2.2 Population, Sample size and Sampling Techniques

To select sample schools from the primary schools of the study area, cluster sampling technique was employed. In cluster sampling, the total population was divided into a number of clusters (relatively small sub-divisions or groups), and then some of these clusters were randomly selected for inclusion in the sample. The reason was that, the schools in the study area were geographically scattered and many in number. Furthermore, to select samples from teachers and formally assigned school leaders such as principals, vice principals, unit leaders and department heads, stratified sampling method was used. The basic idea of stratified sampling was to divide the target population into homogenous strata (groups) based on characteristics that the researcher thought were important. Hence, 108 (58%) sample of teachers, and 52 (80%) school leaders were selected from the samples of public primary schools in Debarik district. A summary of the sample of the study is presented in Table 1.

2.3 Data Gathering Instruments

A wide variety of data collection methods were used in the present study. These include questionnaire, interview and focused group discussion, because two or more data collection instruments could add to the credibility of the research through improving the quality and validity of the research. In other words, the data collected through one instrument may complement to the data collected by another instrument through an approach called triangulation. Interview was held with key cluster supervisors of district education office experts. Because, qualitative data related to expert opinion could be best collected through both structured and unstructured interview which may help to triangulate the findings drawn from the

analysis of questionnaire data collected from both teachers and school leaders.

2.4 Method of Data Analysis

The study employed both descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze it. Firstly, using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation to see if there were differences in the characteristics of respondents' in the area under study. Secondly, to see whether teachers' perceptions on distributed leadership practice significantly differ by their difference in demographic characteristics or not, an independent sample t-test was administered. The reason is that independent sample t-test was an appropriate statistical tool to analyze the effect of two variables. Thirdly, one-way ANOVA was employed to see if difference existed in the practice of distributed leadership across the five sample primary schools. For this basic question, the data in the form of percentage of both teachers and school leadership in the five schools was presented. And these were tested if there was significance difference existed. In here, since the view (in the form of ratio) of the two groups of respondents had been seen across the five schools, one-way ANOVA was an appropriate tool to analyze.

Fourth, to see the difference in perception between teachers and school management on the distributed leadership practice in the schools existed, independent sample t-test was employed. This is because; the response of both groups of respondents for the four dimensions of distributed leadership was appropriately analyzed through the use of independent sample t-test.

Finally, the problems and challenges of the distributed leadership were identified through focused group discussion. The qualitative data that was gathered through FGD was further sorted and come up with themes.

Table 1. Sample of school leaders and teachers from the study area

S/N	Name of primary schools	No schools in the cluster	Sample of school leaders		Sample of teachers	
			No	%	No	%
1	Adigagira	Cluster 1	10	80	22	58
2	Tirhayna	Cluster 2	12	80	18	58
3	Adagat	Cluster 3	12	80	28	58
4	Abrham	Cluster 4	10	80	18	58
5	Adizanday	Cluster 5	8	80	22	58
	Total	Five Clusters	52	80	108	58

Source: School survey

3. RESULTS

3.1 Teachers and School Leaders Perception by Demographic Characteristics

To see if there was perception difference significantly existed by demographic characteristics of teachers existed or not, independent t-test was conducted. The statistical output regarding the perception of respondents by demographic characteristic particularly of gender (male and female), and year of services of teachers (more experienced and less experienced) on four dimensions namely vision, mission, goal; School culture, shared responsibility and leadership practice were presented as follows:

Table 2, presents statistical output about the independent sample t-test to see if difference existed between male and female in terms of their perception on school vision, mission and goals, school culture, shared responsibilities, and leadership practice. For vision, mission and goal, the Levine's test for equality of means indicated males scored 3.47 (SD .07), and females scored 3.39 (SD.13) respectively with p -value of .13. This can, therefore, be interpreted that there was no significance difference between the perception of males and females about the school vision, mission and goals. With regard to school culture, the same statistical test indicated p -value of .016 at $p=.05$. For this, both males and females scored mean of 3.42 (SD .09) and 3.77 (SD .17) respectively. The result revealed that there was significance difference between the perceptions of teachers about the extent to which school culture shows school leadership is distributed in the schools.

The same table also presented the result of independent t-test regarding both males' and females' perception about the extent to which leadership was shared among members of the school system. The Levine's test for equality of means indicated p -value of .53 at $p=.05$. This showed that there was no significant difference between male (M.3.5, SD.35) and female (M3.47, SD.37) in their perception regarding the degree to which school leadership was shared among all school constituents. Regarding the fourth dimension, leadership practice, the same test reported p -value of .35 at $p=.05$. Therefore, there was no significance difference between males (M3.4, SD.14) and females (M3.4, SD.17) in their perception about leadership practices in

the distributed approach. To sum up, the study revealed that there was no significance difference between the perception of males and females about the school vision, mission and goals, shared leadership and leadership practice. However, there was significant difference between male and female in their perception about the school culture dimension.

In Table 3, the statistical result of independent t-test was presented to indicate whether teachers' years of experience were source of difference on the extent to which school vision, mission and goals were indicating distributed leadership among school members or not. The result revealed that more experienced teachers and less experienced teachers scored M3.4(SD.25) and M3.5(SD.42) respectively with p -value of .023 at $p=.05$. This showed that there was significance difference between teachers that possessed more years of experience and less years of experience on their perception about school vision, mission and goals. The same table also showed, whether more experienced and less experienced teachers differed in terms of their response to school culture. The same test indicated that p -value of .517 at $p=0.05$. Thus, both more experienced (M 3.4, SD .12) and less experienced (M3.4, SD .14) had not significance difference on their perception about school culture. In addition, the perception of more experienced and less experienced were also sought to see if difference existed between them about shared leadership. The result of independent sample t- test indicated p -value of 0.00 at $p=0.05$. This showed that there was significance difference between more experienced (M 3.4, SD.36) and less experienced teachers (M 3.6 SD.42) about the extent to which school leadership was shared among the school constituents. Finally, both categories of teachers were also tested to see if perception difference existed between more experienced (M 3.4, SD.16) and less experienced (M 3.4, SD.15) about leadership practice in the schools. The same statistical test reported p -value of .50 at $p=0.05$ to indicate there was no significance difference between them.

3.2 Perception of the Teachers and School Leaders

To see if there is significance difference on the view of teachers and school leaders in terms of the four dimensions independent t -test were employed and analyzed as follows (Table 1).

Table 2. Independent t-Test about Perception on Distributed Leadership by Gender

Dimensions	M		SD		T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference
	Male	Female	Male	Female					
Vision, mission & goal	3.47	3.39	.07	.13	-1.517	151	.131	-.02529	.01667
school culture	3.42	3.77	.09	.17	-2.435	151	.016	-.05382	.02211
Shared leadership	3.50	3.47	.35	.37	-2.023	65.09	.047	-.05382	.02661
Leadership practice	3.4	3.4	.14	.17	-.625	151	.533	-.03922	.06272
					-.637	105.15	.526	-.03922	.06158
					.934	151	.352	.02510	.02687
					.879	85.75	.382	.02510	.02854

Source: Survey data from schools

Table 3. Independent t- test about perception on distributed leadership by years of experience

Dimensions	M	F	SD		t	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Diff.
	Expi	Less expi	Expi	Less expi					
Vision , mission & goal	3.4	3.5	.25	.42	2.291	150	.023	.13250	.05783
school culture	3.4	3.4	.12	.14	2.348	131.817	.020	.13250	.05642
Shared leadership	3.4	3.6	.36	.42	.649	151	.517	.01639	.02526
Leadership practice	3.4	3.4	.16	.15	.664	140.560	.508	.01639	.02469
					4.317	151	.000	.28935	.06702
					4.338	150.782	.000	.28935	.06670
					-.668	151	.505	-.01698	.02542
					-.665	145.416	.507	-.01698	.02553

Source: school survey

In Table 4, the result of independent sample t-test was presented to see the extent to which teachers and school leaders were different in vision, mission and goal, school culture, shared leadership and leadership practice. For vision, mission and goal, teachers scored mean of 3.4 (SD.04), and school leaders scored mean of 3.4 (SD.11) with *p*-value of 0.791. This showed that there was no significance difference between teachers and school leaders on their perception about school vision, mission and goals. Similarly, for school culture, both teachers and school leaders scored mean of 3.4 (SD.11) and 3.38 (SD.13) respectively and the *p*-value is 0.014 to mean there was significance difference between teachers and school leaders with respect to school culture. In other words, teachers scored less on school culture dimensions of distributed leadership compared to school leaders.

For shared leadership, the mean value of the teachers and school leaders accounted for 3.5(SD .36) and 3.4(SD .36) with *p*-value of .63 to mean there was no significance difference between teachers and school leaders on shared leadership dimensions. Finally, for leadership practice, both teachers and school leaders scored mean of 3.4(SD.16) and 3.4 (SD.14) with

p-value of .16 to mean there was no significance difference between teachers and school leaders on their response to leadership practice dimensions.

3.3 The Difference on Distributed Leadership Practice Across Schools

The purpose of this sub topic was to see whether there was significance difference across school about teachers' and school leaders' engagement on the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model.

As planned, One One way ANOVA was used to determine if there were any significant differences (*p*=.05) across the primary schools on the distributed leadership dimensions such as mission, vision, and goals, school culture, leadership practices, and shared responsibility. As indicated in Table 5, since the *p*-value for mission, vision, and goals, school culture and leadership practices were .00, .028 and .015 respectively. The five schools were significantly different on distributed leadership practice particularly of the mission, vision, and goals, school culture and leadership practices dimensions. Conversely, *p*-value for shared

Table 4. Independent t- Test about Perception on Distributed Leadership by the Respondents Type (teachers& leaders)

Dimensions	M		SD		T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Diff.
	Teacher	leader	Teacher	leader					
Vision , mission & goal	3.4	3.4	.04	.11	-2.265	150	.791	-.00452	.01704
					-.348	145.68	.729	-.00452	.01301
school culture	3.4	3.38	.11	.13	-2.483	150	.014	-.05527	.02226
					-2.616	108.09	.010	-.05527	.02113
Shared leadership	3.5	3.4	.36	.36	-.476	150	.635	-.03012	.06332
					-.474	93.60	.637	-.03012	.06355
Leadership practice	3.4	3.4	.16	.14	-1.384	150	.168	-.03662	.02646
					-1.305	81.94	.195	-.03662	.02806

Table 5. The Extent to which leadership is distributed across the school

		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Vision Mission and goals	Between Groups	3.792	4	.948	8.773	.000
	Within Groups	15.884	147	.108		
	Total	19.676	151			
School culture	Between Groups	.259	4	.065	2.795	.028
	Within Groups	3.424	148	.023		
	Total	3.683	152			
Shared leadership	Between Groups	.830	4	.207	1.088	.365
	Within Groups	28.217	148	.191		
	Total	29.047	152			
leadership Practice	Between Groups	.297	4	.074	3.197	.015
	Within Groups	3.433	148	.023		
	Total	3.729	152			

leadership was .365. This showed that the five schools were not significantly different on the extent to which responsibility was shared among school constituent. The result of one-way ANOVA asserted schools were different in the practice of distributed leadership particularly on vision, mission, and goals, school culture and leadership practice.

3.4 Challenges and Problems that hinder Distributed Leadership

Leadership practice was not the product of a leader's knowledge and skill, but it was product of the interactions of school leaders, followers, and their situation. Thus, the challenges and problems could be better identified through the interaction of people in the natural setting through qualitative analysis. To do this, focused group participants at the three centers were asked what challenges and problems were bottlenecking the distributed leadership practice.

The view of focused group participant could be summarized and analyzed further in terms of two broad themes. These were school factors and non- school factors that hindered distributed leadership practices across the schools. School related problems that hindered the practice of distributed leadership included reliance on par dime, lack of capacity of the formal leaders and teachers, school leaders' attitude to teachers' participation in their school affair, and social stereotype that disadvantaged groups were not encouraged in participating in the leadership practice. Non- School related factors included inadequate follow up by the district, regional and Ministry level, the school infrastructures were not favorable to promote distributed leadership approach.

4. DISCUSSION

As we looked closer into possible plausible explanations about the results of the present study, we needed to see and present these findings in terms of the four dimensions of distributed leadership practice adopted in the study. One of the major findings of the study was that school vision was not clearly articulated and communicated among the major stake holders particularly to students, teachers and parents in the schools under study. This was one of the critical problems these schools faced today the fact that schools in general, and teachers and students in particular lack sense of direction to carry out their tasks effectively. This is because; according to Literature vision was a mental

journey from the known to the unknown, creating the future from a montage of current facts, hopes, dreams, dangers, and opportunities.

The problem, however, was not due to lack of commitment of teachers and school leaders to create an appealing vision, mission and goals, but it was mainly because lack of leaders' skill in creating the vision, communicating the vision, and inspiring followers through the use of the common vision, mission and goals of the organization. Had school leaders been skilled enough, they would create a clear vision that could be accepted by employees as their own. Supporting this, scholars indicated that once the organizational members "buy into" the vision; they joined the leader in turning their shared vision into reality.

Another aspect of distributed leadership practice was the extent to which parents, teachers and students were participating in the decision making of their schools. The study revealed that in the school under study teachers, parents and students and the informal associations (teacher association and student council) were not participating in the decision making of the major school issues. Thus, the schools were not seeking the opportunity from the participatory school ground.

Many area of research described the potential benefits of participatory goal setting and implementation on issues such as the overall organizational plans, professional development schemes, projects etc. According to Yukl, [19], participatory approach brings about decision quality (involving other people in making decision was likely to bring about the quality of a decision), decision acceptance (people who had considerable influence in making a decision tends to identify with it, and perceive it to be their decision), satisfaction with the decision process, and developmental benefits (this can result in the development of more skill, and confidence by participants) for these who were engaged in the participatory school decisions.

Leadership helped members of the school to discover how to build favorable school culture through fundamentally examining the ways schools were carrying responsibilities expected by the teachers, students, parents and the community at large. Among others, the very important dimension that constituted distributed leadership was school culture. School leaders had the responsibility to shape the school through creating an effective school culture by

working closely with members of the school. In this regard, the result of the study revealed that school principals were not most often engaged in their own professional development and both principal and teachers did not develop their annual professional development plan.

In principle, distributed leadership practice was developed through collaborative professional learning and aims at purposeful change in schools. Hence, the role of principals and teachers was not to provide educational services that were relevant to the dynamic nature of customers' needs and wants. In the 21st century, schools are becoming learning environments for employees so as to respond according to the prevailing situations. In this regard, although the quantitative analysis revealed in these school, there were continually mutual respect and trust, from the qualitative data the degree of mutual trust and respect were minimal. A meta-analytic study asserted that trust was associated with important outcomes of job performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover, and counterproductive behavior. With regard the extent to which teachers share accountability to students' performance, availability of resources and effectiveness of the teachers in their time management while played distributed leadership roles were also treated in the study. The result revealed that teachers frequently share accountabilities to students' performance in particular, and school effectiveness in general. Supporting this, studies show that the general school climate, the classroom environment and teacher expectations, the home learning environment and parental expectations, and other supportive resources within the community were accountable for school effectiveness in general and student performance in particular.

Although the view of teachers and school leaders was quite different in the response to the question the extent to which the school's daily and weekly schedules provided time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues, the data from focus group discussion entailed that teachers had high instructional load that included contact hours, time spent to prepare lessons, and time spent to evaluate students due to the increasing student population in primary schools.

In effect, this deterred them from participating in the decision making process. The view of

focused group participants and the interview from cluster supervisors was, therefore, more supportive to the response provided by teachers through the questionnaire. Regarding to school resources both teachers and school leaders responded quite rarely. This was also confirmed by the data from focused group discussion that all groups from the discussions in different schools stated that although the resources were not sufficient to support these primary schools, the government had been allocating resources in annual basis.

The study revealed that there was no significance difference between the perception of males and females about the school vision, mission and goals, shared leadership and leadership practice. However, there was significant difference between male and female in their perception about the school culture dimension. This finding seems partly consistent to the findings of previous studies that suggest both male and female feel the same way about the distributed leadership (on vision, mission and goal; School culture, shared leadership and leadership practice) in their respective schools.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Teachers' and school leaders' perception on distributed leadership practice differ particularly on the degree to which school leadership was shared among all school constituents. The study revealed that implicitly females feel as if they were incapable either to exercise leadership when assigned as principals or participate in the school leadership. In addition, there was significance difference between teachers those who possess more years of experience, and less years of experience were different on their perception about school vision, mission and goals. In the same token, there was significance difference between the perception of more experienced and less experienced about shared responsibilities. Thus, it is concluded that the perception was signaling some gaps on distributed leadership practice in the schools under study. All schools under study were not the same in all dimensions of the distributed leadership practice. Thus, the schools were different on employee's engagement in distributed leadership practice particularly of the mission, vision, and goals; School culture and leadership practices dimension, but not to share leadership. Therefore it is concluded that the five schools were different on the distributed leadership practice.

Overall, the study found that the majority of teachers could not understand and support a common mission of the school. In other words, they were not using it as guiding principle to coordinate the school leaders', teachers', students' and parents' effort towards their destination; teachers' participation in the major school affairs is quit minimal as the schools that couldn't create conducive environment to seek the golden opportunity of distributed leadership; principals were not actively participating in their own professional development activities; The informal leaders such as leaders from teachers' association and student representative were not playing a pivotal role in the school leadership; the mutual agreements about the role played by parents to the improvement of students learning were not so clear as such. Therefore, it is concluded that the schools were not practicing the distributed leadership approach.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Wart V. Public-sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review*. 2003;63(2):214-228.
2. Harris A. Teacher Leadership and Distributed Leadership: An Exploration of the Literature in Leading and Management. 2004;10(1):1-10.
3. Pawar S, Eastman K. The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: A Conceptual Examination. *The Academy of Management Review*. 1997;22(1):80-109.
4. Elmore R. Building a new structure for school leadership. *American Educator*, Winter. 1999-2000;1-9.
5. Gedney R. Leadership effectiveness and gender. A research report submitted to the faculty. In *Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements*; 1999.
6. Gronn P. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 2002;12:423-451.
7. Harris A. Teacher leadership and distributed leadership: An exploration of the Literature in Leading and Management. 2004;10(1):1-10.
8. Spillane J. *Distributed Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2004.
9. Harris A. Teacher leadership and distributed leadership: An Exploration of the Literature in Leading and Management. 2004;10(1):1-10.
10. Gedney R. Leadership effectiveness and gender. A research report submitted to the faculty. In *Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements*; 1999.
11. Yukl G. *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). New York: Pearson Prentice Hall Inc; 2010.
12. Gordon R. Dispersed leadership: Exploring the impact of antecedent forms of power using A communicative framework. *Management Communication Quarterly*. 2010;24:260-287.
13. Ministry of Education. *Education and training policy*. Addis Ababa: St. George Printing Pres; 1994.
14. Harris A, Chapman C. Democratic leadership for school improvement in challenging contexts. Paper Presented To the International Congress on School Effectiveness and Improvement, Copenhagen; 2002.
15. Elmore R. Building a new structure for school leadership. *American Educator*, Winter. 1999-2000:1-9.
16. Harris A. Teacher leadership and distributed leadership: An Exploration of the Literature in Leading and Management. 2008;10(1):1-10.
17. Ministry of Education. *Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa: St. George Printing Pres; 1994.
18. Transitional Government of Ethiopia. *Education and training policy*. Addis Ababa: St. George Printing Pres; 1994.
19. Yukl G. *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). New York: Pearson Prentice Hall ink; 2010.

© 2017 Dagnew; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/18885>