

# A Study on the Practice of Distributive Leadership in Debre Markos Town Government Secondary Schools, Amhara Region, Ethiopia

Belayneh Ayalew Bitew

Lecturer and Researcher, Debre Markos University, Ethiopia

---

## ARTICLE DETAILS

### Article History

Published Online: 15 June 2020

### Keywords

Distributive Leadership; shard function in leadership practice.

### \*Corresponding Author

Email: [ayalewbelayneh350\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:ayalewbelayneh350[at]gmail.com)

---

## ABSTRACT

*The purpose of this study was to assess the practice of distributive leadership in case of Debre Markos Town government secondary schools, Amhara Region. The study carried out using descriptive survey research design employing both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Data was collected from 3 government secondary schools in Debre Markos Town using questionnaire, interview and documentary analysis. The participants included 106 teachers and 3 school principals. The 106 teacher respondents were selected using simple random technique and 3 school principals' were selected using purposive sampling technique. Structured questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data from 106 participants. Interview and documentary analysis was also used to obtain in-depth (qualitative) information on a number of selected issues. The quantitative data analyzed using a relevant statistical package SPSS version 20. One sample t-test computed for dual purpose to detect the significance difference between mean scores and the acceptance or rejection of hypothesis. The finding of the study revealed that, the perception of teachers and school principals was high towards the practice of distributive leadership in the schools and the leadership task is distributed to the staff members to the extent that staff members set directions, develop people, redesign the organization and manage instructional programs. Despite their practice the leadership role that teachers and school principals played were clearly defined but not communicated. The school principals have used both group and individual empowerment techniques to strengthen distributive leadership. Finally, the researcher recommends as the school principals should have to: distribute the leadership tasks informally (i.e informal distributive leadership), should have to communicate the leadership roles that principals and teachers play in the school to the whole staff members, should have to use reward to strengthen distributive leadership and build instructional knowledge and skills, create opportunities for collaboration, involve teachers in School Decision Making, interpret Results and Provide Feedback to sustain the development of distributive leadership practice in the school.*

---

## 1. Background of the Study

Distributed leadership is a concept which is very much "in vogue" with researchers, policy makers, educational reformers and leadership practitioners alike (Hamersley-Fletcher & Brundrett, 2005; Storey, 2004), and there is a growing confidence that this contributes to the effectiveness of the organization. However, yet there seems to be little, if any, empirical data which links this to improved influence on pupil outcomes. Moreover, while there seems to be widespread interest in the idea of "distributing leadership", there are competing and sometimes conflicting interpretations of what distributed leadership actually means. The definitions and understandings vary from the normative to the theoretical and, by implication; the literature supporting the concept of distributed leadership remains diverse and broad based (Bennett, Harvey, Wise, & Woods, 2003). Therefore, prior to an examination of the literature relating to distributed leadership, its meaning and definition will be explored.

The work by Spillane et al. (2001; 2004) provides the most recent empirical study of distributed leadership practice. This work suggests that distributed leadership is best understood as "practice distributed over leaders, followers and their situation and incorporates the activities of multiple groups of individuals" (2001, p. 20). It implies a social distribution of leadership where the leadership function is "stretched over the work of a number of individuals and the task is accomplished through the interaction of multiple leaders" (p. 20). The evidence from this study highlights linkages between distributed leadership practice in elementary schools and improvements in the quality of teaching and learning in particular subject areas. However, it was intended primarily to illuminate distributed leadership practice rather than to look for direct relationships with student learning outcomes. Links have also been made between distributed leadership and democratic leadership (Woods, 2004) and, most recently, connections have been made to the literature on teacher leadership (Harris, 2004b). Bennett et al. (2003) write about "distributed or devolved leadership" while Kets de Vries (1990) defines distributed leadership as "team-

working”, linking it to social activity theory. Distributed leadership assumes a set of direction-setting and influence practices potentially “enacted by people at all levels rather than a set of personal characteristics and attributes located in people at the top” (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003, p. 22). Non-person sources of influence also may be included in this concept as, for example, Jermier and Kerr’s (1997) “substitutes for leadership”, moving us toward a view of leadership as an organization-wide phenomenon (Pounder, Ogawa, & Adams, 1995).

Through decentralization, in most African countries such as Ghana, Mali, Zambia, Malawi, Lesotho Etc parents and communities have shown greater commitment in education for their children. They have formed school committees in order to address the needs of the schools. Community involvement in above and other African countries has shown improved access, quality, relevance and effectiveness of education (II CBA 2000).

In Ethiopia, the organization and management of education was highly centralized in the past (Ayalew, 2000). Since 1992 the government has pursued decentralization policy by shifting authority and responsibilities to regional state. Decentralization of education to lower level of the government has been undertaken in the context of more general decentralization (Prawda, 1993). In the process of decentralization significant change have been made in the areas of provision of educational service and the management of education system and its foundation was based on the proclamation issued and the 1994 education and training policy promulgated. The decentralization reform as well as the education and training policy (TGE, 1994) seek to improve access, equality, quality and efficiency of education system. This is the local management level concerning the governance of schools and in the fight against ineffectiveness in schooling is seen as necessity and the main sources of policy for distributive leadership by the least level of the organizational hierarchy.

Within the existing literature it is clear that the idea of distributed leadership overlaps substantially with shared (Pearce & Conger, 2003), collaborative (Wallace, 2002), democratic (Gastil, 1997) and participative (Vroom & Yago, 1998) leadership concepts. This accumulation of allied concepts means that distributed leadership has sometimes been used as a shorthand way to describe any form of devolved, shared or dispersed leadership practice in schools. It is this catch all use of the term that has resulted in both the misrepresentation of the idea and the common misunderstanding that distributed leadership means that everyone leads (Bennett et al., 2003). While distributed leadership is a powerful concept that cannot be ignored it remains the case that empirical studies of distributed leadership are limited. Part of the reason resides in the fact that it is a fairly new addition to the leadership field and although studies are underway the current evidential base is far from extensive. Also, there remains an adherence to understanding leadership as role or function within the leadership field in spite of a recognition that as schools become more complex organizations more extended models of leadership will be required (Gronn, 2003). For schools to become effective the task of leadership should not have to be a monopoly of single

individuals rather should have to become a shared function of multiple individuals.

Hence, this research was designed to assess the practice of distributive leadership in Debre Markose Town government secondary schools.

## 2. Statement of the Problem

The issues of leadership for school improvement is now high on the research and policy agenda of many countries (Alma Harris, 2005) and effective education leadership makes a difference in improving learning (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom, 2004). There is nothing new or especially controversial about that idea. What’s far less clear, even after several decades of school renewal efforts, is just how leadership matters, how important those effects are in promoting the learning of all children, and what the essential ingredients of successful leadership are. Lacking solid evidence to answer these questions, those who have sought to make the case for greater attention and investment in leadership as a pathway for large-scale education improvement have had to rely more on faith than fact.

Earlier theorists conceptualized distributed leadership in a variety of different ways. For example, Shelley (1960) and Melnick (1982) used the term to describe a difference of opinion among team members about the role of the leader; here the term served as a contrast to “focused leadership” in which there is clear consensus regarding the leadership hierarchy. From this perspective, it could be posited that distributed leadership is something to be avoided in organizations because it leads to a lack of stability, predictability and security among members. However the evidence to support this position is rather limited. In the field of organizational dynamics the term has been used as a synonym for a “bossless team” or a “self-managed team” (Barry, 1991). This use of the term resonates, in part, with current conceptualizations of distributed leadership, particularly in its recognition of leadership as an emergent property. However, current conceptions of distributed leadership do not imply that the formal leadership structures within organizations are removed or redundant. Instead, it is assumed that there is a relationship between vertical and lateral leadership processes and that attention is paid to the leadership as interaction rather than leadership as action. In his work Gronn (2000) sees distributed leadership as an emergent property of a group or a network of interacting individuals.

In the case of Ethiopia, since 1992 the government has pursued decentralization policy by shifting authority and responsibilities to regional state. In the process of decentralization, significant change have been made in the areas of provision of educational service and the management of education system whose foundation was based on the proclamation issued and the 1994 education and training policy promulgated. This is the local management level concerning the governance of schools and in the fight against ineffectiveness in schooling is seen as necessity and the main sources of policy for distributive leadership by the least level of the organizational hierarchy. For this matter power is devolved from the federal government to the regions and lastly down sized to the school levels and the schools are autonomous for the leadership of themselves. Each school as an educational organization have school principals who hold the highest

leadership position and the power has to be distributed to the vice principals, unit leaders, department heads, teachers and other educational stake holders who have formal position in the school which is called formal distributed leadership. On the other hand, there are individuals who have no position in the school but have an influence on the schools decision-making process considered as informal distributed leadership. Here, the researcher is interested to see how much schools are practicing distributive leadership in the same way as suggested by experts in the field. In the real leadership practice in Debre Markose Town government secondary schools as this is the working area of the researcher, the school principals have their own problems in sharing the leadership roles either formally in hierarchy of the school or informally without the hierarchical structure of the school based on the researchers experience. As a result the researcher as an educational expert is interested to study how much school principals share the leadership tasks of the school to staff members and other stakeholders, clearly define and communicate the leadership roles that staff members and principals should play as well as the effort of school leaders in designing the different empowerment strategies to strengthen distributed leadership.

Here, this study which was designed to assess the practice of distributed leadership in Debre Markos Town government secondary schools was answered the following basic questions.

1. To what extent the leadership task of the school is distributed to the staff members?
2. Did the leadership role that the school principals and teachers play in the school clearly defined and communicated?
3. What empowerment strategy the school principals use for strengthening distributive leadership?

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Approach and Study Design

The approach to this study was mixed research approach, which combines both qualitative and quantitative features. The purpose of using the mixed methods is to maximize the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of both single research approaches. In addition to this, it is the best appropriate approach for research problems, purpose of the study already discussed and it is necessary to use both quantitative, and qualitative data has to better explore basic questions stated. In the study, specifically descriptive survey design were employed. The researcher use descriptive survey research design in this study because the main purpose of the study is to assess the practice of distributive leadership. With respect to this, Creswell (2003) stated that survey research is useful for assessment and to generalize from a sample to a population, so that inferences can be made about some characteristics or practices. The survey design is the preferred type of data collection procedure for the study as it is advantageous in terms of the economy of the design and the rapid turnaround in data collection.

#### 3.2 Population, Sample and Sampling Technique

This study was conducted in Debre Markos Town government secondary schools i.e. Teklehaimanot, Dibza and Menkorer secondary schools, which are selected using available sampling technique. From these schools the total

number of the population for the study is 243. Out of this number ``182`` of them (``160`` male and ``22`` females) are for Teklehaimanot secondary schools, ``34`` of them (``28`` male and ``6`` females) are for Dibza Preparatory schools and ``27`` of them (``23`` male and ``4``) are for Menkorer secondary schools. From the total population ``243`` participants in each research school 79 participants (43%) of the population 182 from Teklehaimanot secondary school, 15 participants (43%) of the population 34 from Dibza Preparatory school, and 12 participants (43%) of the population 27 from Menkorer secondary school a sum total of 106 participants was selected as a sample using simple random sampling technique followed by lottery system in order to give equal chance for all staff members and was participate in the questionnaire survey. The principals of the three secondary schools were selected using purposive sampling technique for interview. The purpose of using the purposive sampling technique is to ensure the researcher can get access to the knowledgeable people who hold a professional role, expertise and experience to fulfill the research inquiry (Cohen et al., 2007).

**Source of data:** the sources of data for this study were both primary sources (teachers, unit leaders, school principals) and secondary sources (school community participation and financial arrangement guide book, menus, different school management record books).

#### 3.3 Data Gathering Instruments

The tools that were used to gather data was questionnaire which consists of both closed and open ended questions, interview and documentary analysis.

**3.3.1 Questionnaire:** in order to collect a better relevant data the questionnaire containing both closed ended and open ended items were cited for teachers with the intention to secure pertinent information with less consumption of time. Open ended questionnaire items were forwarded to respondents demanding them to write answers and possible suggestions. The questionnaire consists of two parts. The first part deal with personal data of all respondents whereas, the rest part two (distributive leadership) deals with the main part of the study distributive leadership. One set of questionnaire which comprises 19 closed ended and 4 open ended a sum total of 23 items were prepared for teachers in order to explore their opinions and perceptions about the practice of distributive leadership. The questionnaires were developed by the researcher himself. The questionnaire was structured in the form five rating scale which was 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree to some extent, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree. All the items were designed by the researcher himself. Before dissemination the questionnaires was tested by the researcher himself through pilot test to ensure its internal reliability and validity.

**Reliability:** according to McMillan and Schumacher (1993), reliability refers to the consistency of measurement, which is the extent to which results are similar over different forms of the same instrument or occasions of data collecting. To ensure consistency of measurement in the current investigation, the questionnaires were tested by the researcher himself for its internal reliability based on the result of the pilot test. The reliability estimates of Cronbach's alpha were

calculated from the pilot test result scored. To pre-test the questionnaire 26 respondents who are out of the sample of the main study were selected randomly from Teklehaimanot secondary school. Accordingly the reliability coefficients for each variable were computed by cronbach's alpha as follows. The Cronbach alpha for Distributive leadership practice was .963. All Cronbach's alpha ranges above .70. There for it implies the instruments were strongly reliable enough to gather data for this study. This can be supported by yalew (2005) stating that an acceptable range of reliability coefficients for most instruments were .70 to .90.

**Validity:** validity is the degree to which scientific explanation of phenomena match the realities of the world (McMillan and Schumacher, 1993). A measurement instrument is valid if it measure or represent what it claims to measure or represent. In the case of this investigation, the validity of the questionnaire was checked by other experts from graduates of MA in educational planning and management, one cluster supervisor of general secondary school in Debre Markos and the other one from Amhara regional states education bureau.

**3.3.2 Interview:** unstructured interview was administered to collect data from the principals of the school under study. The interview was organized by the researcher to get depth information about the practice of distributive leadership for the triangulation of teacher's responses on the questionnaire items. The interview was held in their office. Documentary analyses were also used by the researcher to gather in depth information on the issue of distributive leadership practice in the school under study.

**3.5 Procedure for Data collection**

Questionnaire with closed ended and open-ended items were prepared in English without no need of translating it to Amharic, because as the media of instruction in secondary schools is English the researcher does not believe it will create language barrier to the respondents. Before the questionnaires were disseminated to the respondents, to ensure validity and reliability the questionnaire was pilot tested, by the selected 26 participants who was not participated in the main study questionnaire dissemination time. The necessary corrections and modifications were taken before the actual use in the selected area. Then after the pilot test was conduct and questionnaires were checked, the researcher made contact to the participants of the sample school in order to get the necessary cooperation and support. After getting their willingness, orientation was given for the participants by the researcher himself on how to respond to the questionnaire. Finally, the questionnaire was distributed to participants from each of the sample schools. Distribution and collection was occurred each on separate day. It was taken about a week to distribute and collect data from the sample schools. Participants were encouraged to answer their questions during break or lunch period to avoid encroachment in to the regular school program. The researcher himself with the school principal using field notes during the interview process to ensure the accuracy of the data collected, conducted the interview and documentary analysis.

**3.6 Data Analysis and Interpretation**

The findings were reported and organized in to the essence of research questions. To analyze the data, both quantitative and qualitative techniques were employed. The necessary data collected through close-ended questionnaires were tabulated and analyzed using quantitative method to answer the research questions and achieve the purpose of the study. The data were screened, coded in to computer and rescreened to ascertain accuracy of the data.

To carry out analysis of quantitative data statistical package for social science (SPSS version 20) software was used. The descriptive statistics was employed according to the nature of the proposed research questions. Mean score, standard deviation were calculated to determine the practice of distributive leadership. One sample t-test was also computed for dual purpose to see whether there was statistical significance difference between the observed and expected mean scores on distributive leadership practices and to see whether the hypothesis is accepted or rejected. The data gathered through open-ended items, interviews and documentary analysis were analyzed qualitatively in the form of explanation and description using words.

**4. Presentations, Analysis and Discussion of the Results**

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and discussion of the data collected on distributive leadership practices and collective efficacy. The chapter comprises two parts. The first part presents the background of the respondents. Part two deals with the analysis and discussion of the results to look for different findings. The purpose of this study was to assess the practice of distributive leadership practices.

**Table1: background information of respondents**

Variables	Category of characteristics	Respondents	
		NO=106	%
Sex	Male	84	79.24%
	Female	22	20.75%
Responsibility	Teacher	71	66.98%
	Department head	19	17.92%
	Unit leader	16	15.09%
Age	<21 years	-	-
	21-30 years	33	31.13%
	31-40 years	45	42.45%
	41-50 years	28	26.41%
	Above 50 years	-	
Experience /service year/	1-5	9	8.49%
	6-10	36	33.96%
	10-15	45	42.45%
	Above 15	16	15.09%
Qualification	Certificate	-	
	Diploma	-	
	First degree	103	97.16%
	MA degree	3	2.83%

**4.1 characteristics of the respondents**

The questionnaire was distributed to 106 participants in Debre Markos government secondary schools. Of the total number of the questionnaire administered 106 (100 %) were appropriately filled in and collected by the researcher. The interview made with three school principals was also included. Accordingly, following the responses obtained from the respondents the characteristics of the study group were examined in terms of their sex, responsibility, age, work experience and qualification. The presentation, analysis and discussion of the results were as follows;

As depicted by items, on the table above, of the total respondents the majority 84(79.24%) were male, while 22(20.75%) of the participants were females. This implies that the majority of teachers in secondary schools are males. The low proportion of females might be their due to their low engagement in secondary schools. Regarding their position or responsibility of the respondents 71(66.98%) were teachers, 19(17.92%) were department heads and 16(15.09%) were unit leaders. The school principals regarding the assignment of responsibility in their school said that department heads as well as unit leaders in the schools is being selected by the participation of the whole staff members. With regard to the education level of the participants majority 103(97.16%) of them were first degree holders.

Concerning the service year, it is possible to suggest that most of the respondents 45(42.45%) are well experienced. Hence, taking in to consideration maturity age and long experience in teaching profession, it is presumed that, they have better understanding about the variables related to the topic under study, and any responses from these respondents were assist in acquiring more dependable information that could support the study to come up with real conclusion.

**4.2 Analysis and Discussion of the Results**

The following discussion have been focusing on to what extent distributive leadership is practiced in the targeted areas of the study by exploring the perception of the respondents. As a result, some of the functions of distributed leadership were listed to be responded by the respondents in the Town schools under study. To analyze the data, the five point likert scale was used. The data were interpreted by using mean scores obtained as follows; 0.5-1.49 strongly disagrees, 1.5-2.49 disagrees, 2.5-3.49 partially agreed, 3.5-4.49 agreed, 4.5-5.00 strongly agreed. Thus, this classification was used from table 2 to table 5 in the course of all discussions throughout the thesis writing process. Besides, one sample t-test was also computed to see the existence of significance difference between means and to see whether the hypothesis is accepted or rejected.

**Table2: Distributive leadership functions**

no	Items	Respondents			t-value	Sig(2-tailed)
		N=106				
		Actual Mean	Expected mean	Std		
1	The leadership of your school incorporates the activity of multiple groups of individuals	3.85	3	.714	12.23	.000
2	The inter-relationship of teachers in your school is an integral part of the leadership activity of your school	3.81	3	.794	10.51	.000
3	You are participating in the decision making process of your school	3.85	3	.701	12.47	.000
4	You are participating in conflict resolution process in your school	3.75	3	.701	11.08	.000
5	You are autonomous in managing instructional programs	3.73	3	.750	9.97	.000
6	You are participating in the plan preparation process of your school	3.67	3	.727	9.49	.000
7	The leadership role of the school be generalized as distributed to the staff members	3.69	3	.722	9.82	.000
8	There are individuals who have no formal position in the school but have an influence on decision making process of your school	2.36	3	.830	-6.60	.000
9	Sum Total of Distributive leadership function practices	28.90	24	3.98	12.68	.000

NB. The significance level at P<0.05 has been used to the whole discussion in this thesis writing process:

STD= standard deviation, Df= degree of freedom

As shown in the table 2, on item one, that requested the respondents degree of their agreement on the leadership of the school incorporates the activity of multiple groups of individuals, the mean score of the respondents were (m=3.85 with, SD .714) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested (t=12.23, at df=105, p<0.05) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. The result shows that, the respondents agreed the leadership of the school incorporates the activity of multiple groups of individuals. Additionally, one sample t-test was also computed

to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (12.23) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the "p" value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, the school leadership doesn't incorporate the activity of multiple groups of individuals, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, the leadership of the school incorporates the activity of multiple groups of individuals. Literature supports this finding by Spillane et al. (2001; 2004) provides the most recent empirical study of distributed leadership practice. This work suggests

that distributed leadership is best understood as “practice distributed over leaders, followers and their situation and incorporates the activities of multiple groups of individuals” (2001, p. 20). It implies a social distribution of leadership where the leadership function is “stretched over the work of a number of individuals and the task is accomplished through the interaction of multiple leaders.

As illustrated in table 2, item 2, regarding the inter relationships of teachers as an integral part of the leadership activity of the school, it was rated high in their agreement as indicated by the mean score of the participants were ( $m=3.81$  with,  $SD .794$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t=10.51$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. As revealed on the result of the study, the respondents agreed that the interrelationship of teachers is the integral part of the leadership activity of the school. To see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected, again one sample t-test was also computed. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (10.51) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the “p” value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, the inter relationships of teachers is not an integral part of the leadership activity of the school, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, the inter relationships of teachers is an integral part of the leadership activity of the school. According to the interview questions held with school principals they said that great attention is given by the school administrators on the interrelationship of teachers in the school and even they have organized the school social committee formally which follow the cool interrelationship of staff members in the school.

Item 3, of table 2, indicate that the mean score of the respondents were ( $m=3.85$  with,  $SD .701$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t=12.47$ , at  $df= 105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores which marked agreement of respondents in their responses on their participation in decision making process of the school. In addition to this, one sample t-test was also computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (12.47) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the “p” value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, teachers don’t participate in decision making process of the school, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, teachers participate in decision making process of the school. This was complimented by the principals saying in the interview “though difficult to make the whole staff members participant of the decision making process, school principals are not the only decision makers and it never been in the school”. They said that department heads, unit leaders, vice principals and principals generally school management is the decision maker of the school. As those listed are the representative of the whole teachers it assures teachers participation in decision making process of the school indirectly. Distributed leadership proponents suggest that teachers’ participation is sustained because of the personally relevancy they enjoy through personal implementation of ideas rather than responding to the schemes of others.

On the same table in item 4, the mean score of respondents were ( $m=3.75$  with,  $SD .701$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t=11.08$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores, that indicates the agreement of respondents in their participation in conflict resolution process of the school. On the other direction, one sample t-test was again computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (11.08) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the “p” value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, teachers don’t participate in conflict resolution process of the school, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, teachers participate in conflict resolution process of the school.

As indicated in item 5, of table 2, which states that, teachers are autonomous in managing instructional programs, the mean score value of the respondents were ( $m=3.73$  with,  $SD .750$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t=9.97$ , at  $df= 105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores that showed the agreement of the respondents on the issue raised. Again one sample t-test was computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (9.97) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the “p” value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, teachers have no autonomy in managing instructional programs, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, teachers have autonomy in managing instructional programs.

As to the responses to table 3, of item 6, the mean scores of the respondents were ( $m= 3.67$  with,  $SD .727$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t=9.49$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores, shows agreed as staff members are participating in the plan preparation process of the school. One sample t-test was also computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (9.49) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the “p” value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; staff members are not participating in the plan preparation process of the school, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, staff members are participating in the plan preparation process of the school. Principals in the interview session said that all staff members engage in the preparation, approval, monitoring as well as evaluation of the plan of the school.

Item 7, of table 2, which states the leadership role of the school be generalized as distributed to the staff members, participants agreed on the issue raised as shown by the mean score value of ( $m=3.69$  with,  $SD .722$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t=9.82$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. To see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected one sample t-test was computed. Here,

the absolute value of t-calculated (9.82) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the ``p`` value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; the leadership roles of the school doesn't distributed to the staff members, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, the leadership roles of the school is distributed to the staff members. As the data collected from principals by the interview session organized by the researcher, the principals said that the leadership of the school is already distributed to the staff members by sharing leadership functions such as setting direction together in the school including the development of school mission, development of people by staff members, changing the school culture by the whole staff member, as well as managing instructional programs by teachers.

As depicted in item 8, of table 2, respondents were requested as there are individuals who have no formal position in the school but have an influence on decision making process of your school. Accordingly, the mean score value of respondents were (m= 2.36 with, SD .830) almost less than the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested (t= -6.60, at df=105, p<0.05) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores, that indicated disagreement of respondents with the presence of individuals who influence decision making process of the school with no having formal position in the school. As the data obtained by interview, The perception of school principals about leadership distribution is distribution only in terms of roles performed by those in formal leadership positions such as school leadership management team members, subject leaders, department heads or teachers as having the strength of preparing teachers for leadership. One sample t-test was again computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (-6.6) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the ``p`` value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough

evidence to reject the null hypothesis; no individuals who influence decision making process of the school with no having formal position in the school, and to accept the second alternative hypothesis though becomes the null hypothesis itself, no individuals who influence decision making process of the school with no having formal position in the school. From the above view the researcher can conclude that the informal distribution of leadership in the school is low.

Item 9, of table 2, the total sum of items in distributive leadership functions practice was included on analysis part and computed as, participants on average agreed on the practice of distributive leadership functions in reality as shown by the mean score value of (m= 28.90 with, SD 3.98) almost above to the expected mean score of 24. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested (t= 12.68, at df=105, p<0.05) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. To see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected one sample t-test was again computed. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (12.68) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the ``p`` value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; no practice of distributive leadership functions by staff members in the school, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, there is the practice of distributive leadership functions by staff members in the school.

In the open ended questions the respondents were reported that the leadership functions of the school is a shared function of multiple individuals and distributed to staff members to the extent of developing and managing school vision and mission, developing shared understanding about organizational goals, enhancing professional development of staff members, changing school culture, building collaboration, selection of instructional materials, resources and teaching techniques, setting grading and student assessments. The school principals during the interview also replied the above leadership functions as distributed to the staff members.

Table3: Division of labor

no	Items	Respondents			t-value	Sig(2-tailed)
		N=106				
		Actual Mean	Expected mean	Std		
2.1	The leadership role of your school principal is defined	3.74	3	.694	10.9	.000
2.2	The leadership role of vice principal in your school is defined	3.65	3	.769	8.71	.000
2.3	The leadership role of unit leaders in your school is defined	3.66	3	.742	9.16	.000
2.4	Staffs know what leadership roles the principal has in the school	3.65	3	.731	9.17	.000
2.5	Teachers play leadership role in the school	3.73	3	.670	11.1	.000
2.6	Teachers leadership role is defined	3.64	3	.693	9.53	.000
2.7	Means Sum total of items in division of labor	22.06	18	3.86	10.82	.000

As it can be seen from table 3, item 1, the mean score of respondents were (m= 3.74 with, SD .694) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested (t= 10.9, at df=105, p<0.05) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores and the result reveals agreement of respondents in the defined leadership role of school principals. One sample t-test was also computed to see whether the null

hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (10.91) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the ``p`` value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; the leadership role of the school principal is not defined, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, the leadership role of the school principal is defined. Principals during the interview says that though roles

has clearly stated, there were the failure to clearly communicate the already defined leadership roles of principals to the whole staff members and other educational stakeholders comprehensively.

As it can also be seen from table 3, item 2, the mean score of respondents were ( $m=3.65$  with,  $SD .769$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t= 8.71$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. So, the result shows the agreement of respondents in the defined leadership role of vice principals of the school. One sample t-test was again computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated ( $8.71$ ) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated ( $.000$ ) as well as the ``p`` value ( $.000$ ) is less than alpha value of  $0.05$ . This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; the leadership role of vice principal of the school is not defined, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, the leadership role of the school vice principals is defined. Here the school principals during the interview says that the failure with the issue raised is not the definition of roles rather the clearly communicating of roles to the staff members and other educational stakeholders.

As depicted in item 3, of table 3, respondents were requested as the leadership role of unit leaders in the school is defined. Accordingly, the mean score value of respondents were ( $m= 3.66$  with,  $SD .742$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t=9.16$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores which indicated agreed with having the defined leadership role of unit leaders in the school. Additionally, one sample t-test was computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated ( $9.16$ ) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated ( $.000$ ) as well as the ``p`` value ( $.000$ ) is less than alpha value of  $0.05$ . This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; the leadership role of unit leaders of the school is not defined, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, the leadership role of unit leaders of the school is defined.

Item 4, of table 3, which states staffs know what leadership roles the principal has in the school, participants agreed on the issue raised as shown by the mean score value of ( $m=3.65$  with,  $SD .731$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t=9.17$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. One sample t-test was also computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated ( $9.17$ ) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated ( $.000$ ) as well as the ``p`` value ( $.000$ ) is less than alpha value of  $0.05$ . This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; staffs don't know what leadership roles the principal has in the school, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, staffs know what leadership roles the principal has in the school. Principals during the interview session say staff members know the leadership role of us not by the effort we made to communicate our leadership roles

rather through their long experience as being staff members or teaching experiences they have in the school.

With regard to item 5, of table 3, respondents were asked as teachers play leadership role in the school. Accordingly the mean score of respondents were ( $m= 3.73$  with,  $SD .670$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t= 11.1$ , at  $df= 105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores, that showed participants agree with the issue raised. To see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected one sample t-test was computed. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated ( $11.17$ ) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated ( $.000$ ) as well as the ``p`` value ( $.000$ ) is less than alpha value of  $0.05$ . This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; teachers don't play leadership role in the school, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, teachers play leadership role in the school.

As shown in item 6, of table 3, respondents were asked as the leadership role of teachers in the school is defined. Accordingly, the mean score value of respondents were ( $3.64$  with,  $SD .693$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t= 9.53$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. The result marked the agreement of respondents with the issue raised. One sample t-test was also computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated ( $11.17$ ) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated ( $.000$ ) as well as the ``p`` value ( $.000$ ) is less than alpha value of  $0.05$ . This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; the leadership role of teachers in the school is not defined, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, the leadership role of teachers in the school is defined.

Item 7, in table 3, the sum total of items listed in division of labor as a distributive leadership practice index were included in analysis part and computed as, participants in each items on average agreed as shown by the mean score value of ( $m=22.06$  with,  $SD 3.86$ ) almost above to the expected mean score of 18. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t= 10.82$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. Hence, the result reveals as there is division of labor in the school under study. In addition, one sample t-test was also computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated ( $10.82$ ) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated ( $.000$ ) as well as the ``p`` value ( $.000$ ) is less than alpha value of  $0.05$ . This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; there is no division of labor in the school, and to accept the alternative hypothesis, there is division of labor in the school. This shows that the leadership roles principals, vice principals, unit leaders and teachers play in the school is clearly demarcated. However, the principals assure as they fail in communicating those demarcated roles to the whole staff members.

Table 4: Empowerment

no	Items	Respondents			t-value	Sig(2-tailed)
		N=106				
		Actual Mean	Expected mean	Std		
1	The school principal uses group empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership	3.64	3	.693	9.53	.000
2	The school principal uses individual empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership	3.64	3	.733	9.01	.000
3	There is a provision of professional development as an encouragement activity for distributed leadership in your school	3.65	3	.691	9.70	.000
4	There is facilitation as an encouragement activity for distributed leadership in your school	3.64	3	.706	9.35	.000
5	Reward is used as an encouragement activity for distributed leadership in your school	2.32	3	.469	-14.9	.002
6	Sum total of items in empowerment	16.89	15	2.54	7.68	.000

As illustrated in table 4, of item 1, regarding school principals uses group empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership; it was rated high in their agreement as indicated by the mean scores of respondents ( $m= 3.64$  with,  $SD .693$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t= 9.53$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. As revealed on the result of the study, the respondents agreed that the school principals use group empowerment strategies to strengthen distributed leadership. One sample t-test was computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (9.53) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the ``p`` value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; school principals don't use group empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership; and to accept the alternative hypothesis, school principals uses group empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership.

Item 2, of table 4, which states that, school principals uses individual empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership; was rated high in their agreement as indicated by the mean scores of respondents ( $m=3.64$  with,  $SD .733$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t= 9.01$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. As revealed in the result of the study, the respondents agreed that the school principals use individual empowerment strategies to strengthen distributed leadership. One sample t-test was computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (9.01) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the ``p`` value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; school principals don't use individual empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership; and to accept the alternative hypothesis, school principals uses individual empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership.

As to responses given by respondents in item 3, of table 4, the mean score were ( $m= 3.65$  with,  $SD .691$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t= 9.70$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which

indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores, that indicates agreement of respondents as there is provision of professional development as an encouragement activity for distributed leadership in the school. One sample t-test was computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (9.70) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the ``p`` value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; school principals don't use professional development to strengthen distributive leadership; and to accept the alternative hypothesis, school principals' uses professional development to strengthen distributive leadership.

As can be seen in item 4, of table 4, regarding the presence of facilitation as an encouragement activity for distributive leadership, the mean score of the participants were ( $m= 3.64$  with,  $SD .706$ ) almost above to the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t= 9.35$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores, that showed respondents agreed that facilitation is there to strengthen distributed leadership. One sample t-test was computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (9.35) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the ``p`` value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; school principals don't use facilitation to strengthen distributive leadership; and to accept the alternative hypothesis, school principals' uses facilitation to strengthen distributive leadership.

As can be observed from the result in table 4, of item 5, participants were asked regarding the presence of reward as an encouragement activity for distributive leadership, the mean score of the participants were (2.32 with,  $SD .469$ ) less than the expected mean score 3. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t= -14.9$ , at  $df=105$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistical significant difference between mean scores, which showed respondents disagreed with the reward provided in the school to strengthen distributive leadership, that indicates the participant's believed that no reward is there to strengthen distributed leadership. One sample t-test was computed to see whether the null hypothesis

is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (-14.91) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the "p" value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; school principals don't use reward to strengthen distributive leadership; and to accept the second alternative hypothesis though becomes similar with the null hypothesis itself, school principals' doesn't use reward to strengthen distributive leadership.

As can be seen in table 4, item 6, was added in analysis part regarding the sum total of items under the sub-category of empowerment. It was rated high on average of items by respondents in their agreement as indicated by the mean scores of respondents ( $m = 16.89$  with,  $SD 2.54$ ) almost above to the expected mean score of 15. Using one sample t-test the level of significant was tested ( $t = 7.68$ , at  $df = 105$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) which indicated that there was statistically significant difference between mean scores. As revealed on the result of the study, the respondents agreed that the school principals use group empowerment strategies, individual empowerment strategies; professional development and facilitation to strengthen distributed leadership but no reward to strengthen distributed leadership. One sample t-test was also computed to see whether the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Here, the absolute value of t-calculated (7.68) is greater than the absolute value of t-tabulated (.000) as well as the "p" value (.000) is less than alpha value of 0.05. This implies that we have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis; school principals don't use empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership; and to accept the alternative hypothesis, school principals uses empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership except reward.

In the open ended questions the respondents were asked to respond the group and individual empowerment techniques to strengthen distributed leadership and they reported that organizing departments, organizing committees like curriculum committee and CPD continues professional development committee, development team and 1 to 5 arrangement is used by school principals as group empowerment technique to strengthen distributed leadership, whereas, assigning teachers as homeroom teacher with full autonomy in the class room, assigning teachers as the head of clubs in the school, assigning teachers with responsibility as unit leader in the school etc are the individual empowerment techniques used by school principals to strengthen distributed leadership in the schools under study.

## 5. Summery, Conclusion and Recommendation

### 5.1 Summery

The major purpose of this study was to assess the practice of distributed leadership in Debre Markos Town government secondary schools with the following specific objectives.

- To know the extent to which the leadership task of the school is distributed to the staff members.
- To understand whether the leadership roles that principals and teachers play in the school leadership are clearly defined and communicated.
- To identify the empowerment strategies that the school principals use for strengthening distributed leadership.

In order to achieve these purposes, the study was guided by the following basic questions.

- To what extent the leadership functions of the school is distributed to the staff members.
- Did the leadership role that the school principals and teachers play in the school clearly defined and communicated?
- What empowerment strategy the school principals use for strengthening distributed leadership?

Regarding participant of the study, 3 general secondary schools which accounted for about 100% of the Town secondary schools were included in the study using available sampling technique. a sample size of 106 (43%) of the population(243), teacher participants including unit leaders were selected using simple random sampling technique guided by lottery system and 3(100%) school principals were selected using purposive sampling technique.

The study was designed and employed descriptive survey research method. To deal with the research questions raised, the researcher reviewed the relevant literature, prepared a set of questionnaire for teachers, provide unstructured interview questionnaire for school principals and conduct documentary analysis in order to collect data as required.

As has been said to collect the required data, questionnaire, interview and documentary analysis were used. The data obtained were organized, analyzed and interpreted using statistical tools such as mean score, standard deviation and one sample t-test by using SPSS software version 20 for quantitative data and statements for qualitative data's. Then from the analysis carried out the following major findings were drawn by each subcategory.

#### 5.1.1 Distributive Leadership Functions

With regard to distributive leadership functions, the finding of the study revealed that; the leadership of the school incorporates the activity of multiple groups of individuals, the inter-relationship of teachers is an integral part of the leadership activity of the school, teachers participate in the decision making process of the school, teachers involve in conflict resolution process in the school, teachers participate in the selection of instructional materials, teachers participate in selection of resources, participate in the selection of teaching techniques, teachers participate in setting grading and students assessment, teachers participate in the school plan preparation process, teachers involve in professional development activities, leadership of the school be generalized as distributed to staff members were rated agreed by the majority of the respondents and with no difference discussed by principals during interview sessions. On the other hand, there are individuals who have no formal position in the school but have an influence on decision making process of the school were rated disagreed by respondents. The perception of school principals about leadership distribution is distribution only in terms of roles performed by those in formal leadership positions such as school leadership management team members, subject leaders, department heads or teachers as having the strength of preparing teachers for leadership.

#### 5.1.2 Division of Labor

Concerning division of labor that includes; the leadership role of school principal is defined, the leadership role of vice

principal is defined, the leadership role of unit leaders in the school is defined, staffs know what leadership roles the principal has in the school though not communicated by school administrators formally, teachers play leadership role in the school, teachers leadership role is defined were rated agreed by participants of the study. Here, the school principals fail in communicating the leadership roles that stakeholders have and would play in school to the whole staff members. The leadership role teachers and school principals' play in the school is defined but not communicated.

### 5.1.3 Empowerment

Respondents have agreed that the school principals use group empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership; school principals use individual empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership; there is provision of professional development as an encouragement activity for distributed leadership in the school and there is facilitation as an encouragement activity for distributed leadership. Whereas, reward is used as an encouragement activity for distributed leadership were rated as disagree by participants of the study.

## 5.2 Conclusion

From the finding of the study it is possible to conclude that, the perception of teachers and school principals were high towards the practice of distributive leadership. The result of the study shows leadership task of the school distributed to the staff members to the extent that staff members' set directions in the school, develop people, redesign the organization as well as manage instructional programs. But such distribution is to those who have formal position in the school as a result the extent of informal distribution of leadership in the schools is too low as the indication of the study. The researcher can conclude principals are perceiving distribution only in terms of roles performed by those in formal leadership positions such as school leadership management team members, subject leaders, department heads or teachers as having the purpose of preparing teachers for leadership. The finding also revealed that the leadership role that principals and teachers play in the school is clearly defined, but the school administrators fail to communicate the leadership roles that principals and teachers has in the school formally to the whole staff members as well as different educational stakeholders. In addition as the result of the study, the researcher can conclude the school principals use both group and individual empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership. But, no usage of reward for those empowered who perform better in the practice of such a leadership form. Finally, the researcher can conclude that, the study revealed a clear and strong practice of distributive leadership.

## 5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are forwarded.

5.3.1 The result of the study shows leadership task of the school distributed to the staff members to the extent that staff members' set directions in the school, develop people, redesign the organization as well as manage instructional programs within the formal hierarchical structure of the school.

This shows the highest formal distributive leadership practice but the low level of informal distributive leadership practice. Hence the researcher suggested that;

1. The community members and external educational stakeholders out of the formal position of the school can have a lot contribution for the achievement of school mission as of those internals. So, school principals should have to distribute leadership roles like participating the community and resources mobilization roles to those stakeholders out of the formal position in the school informally. The more leadership functions distributed informally, the higher the school gains physical resources, financial resources, and material resources as well as positive and cool school community relationship would be evident.
2. School principals should not only consider distribution in terms of roles performed by those in formal leadership positions such as school leadership management team members, subject leaders or department heads or teachers, rather, they also should have to view leadership as a collective responsibility involving teachers and pupils who do not occupy any formal leadership position (s) and yet exercise leadership in different ways, at different places and at different times within and outside the school.
3. School principals should have to see leadership distribution not only as having the strength of preparing teachers for leadership but more importantly as a means of reducing the pressure of overwhelming workload on them.

5.3.2 The study revealed that, staffs know what leadership roles the principal has in the school not by the effort principals made to communicate their leadership roles rather through teachers' long experience as being staff members or teaching experiences they have in the school. Hence is recommended that;

1. School principals should have to be clear as "defining" and "communicating" in leadership role and responsibility are the different and inseparable tasks. The former one is a matter of role and responsibility demarcation while the latter one is a matter of announcement or making clarity for the role holder. Therefore, the school principals should have to clearly communicate the leadership roles principals and teachers have in the school to the whole staff members' unless and otherwise it creates role conflict between the staff members.

5.3.3 As the study indicated, the school principals use both group and individual empowerment strategies to strengthen distributive leadership, but no usage of reward for those empowered who perform better in the practice of such a leadership form. The researcher recommends the following practical suggestions;

1. As the fire to work is ignited by motivational factors the school principals should have to provide reward for those staff members who perform better in the task he/she has empowered to perform.
2. The woreda education office in cooperation with the school should have to organize and offer workshops

and training program for staffs in secondary schools so as to enhance the effort they have to lead and strengthen distributive leadership in order to facilitate

the advancement of school improvement and enhance students' academic achievement.

## References

- [1]. Barry. (1991). *Teacher leader*. Phi Delta Kappan.
- [2]. Bennet, H, W., & Woods. (2003). *Functional roles of group members*. *Journal of Social Issues*.
- [3]. Cres Well. (2003). *Measures of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- [4]. Gronn . (2003). *Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership*. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 28(3), 317-338.91
- [5]. Harris, A. (2004b). *Leading or misleading?* Distributed leadership and school improvement. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(3), 255-265.
- [7]. Harris, A. (2005). *Distributive leadership: According to the evidence*. *Journal of Education Administration*, 46(2), 172-188.
- [8]. Hamersly, F, Burn, & Storey. (2005). *Improving schools through teacher leadership*. UK: Open University Press
- [9]. Kaiser, R. B., & DeVries, D. L. (2000) *Leadership styles*. In W. E. Craighead and C. B. Nemeroff (Eds.), *The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology and behavioral science* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- [10]. Jermier and Kerris. (1997). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- [11]. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2004, February). *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. *School Leadership and Management*.
- [12]. Melnick. (1982). *Effective school leadership: Responding to change*. London: Paul Chapman.
- [13]. Prawda, (1993). *School principals' understanding of mutual Responsiveness in effective leadership*. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- [14]. Pearce & Conger. (2003). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [15]. Pounder, D. A. (1995). *Teacher teams: Exploring job characteristics and work-related outcomes of work group enhancement*. *Educational Administration*
- [16]. Shelley. (1960). *Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(3), 235-259.
- [17]. Spillane, J. P., Camburn, E. M. and StitzelPareja, A. (2001;2004). *Taking a distributed perspective to the school principal's work day*. *Leadership and Policy in School*
- [18]. Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). *Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective*. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3-34.
- [19]. Storey, A. (2004). *The problem of distributed leadership in schools*. *School Leadership & Management*, 24(3), 249-265.
- [20]. Work Gronn. (2000). *School centered management training*. London: Paul Chapman.
- [21]. Wallace, M. (2002). *Sharing leadership of schools through teamwork: A justifiable risk?* *Educational Management & Administration*, 29(2), 153-167.
- [22]. Woods, P. A. (2004). *Democratic leadership: Drawing distinctions with distributed leadership*. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 7(1), 3-26.
- [23]. Vroom & Yago. (1998). *What do we know about teacher leadership?* Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*