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Abstract
The purpose of this study was to assess the role principals play in distributed leadership and its relationship with schools effectiveness as measured by the 2016 Grade-10 National Examination results. For this purpose, the following 4 basic questions were raised. The descriptive co-relational survey design and qualitative approach were employed to gather and analyze quantitative and qualitative data about distributed leadership practices and its relationship to the school effectiveness. Based on the analysis of the collected data, the following findings were obtained. With regard to the roles principals have been playing to make their schools more effective, principals during the interviews indicated as they did not play their roles of making their school more effective. Therefore, they revealed that they need improve their schools leadership and can help school leadership practice to improve school effectiveness. Participants of the interviews also indicated that school principals should identify and redefine school leadership responsibilities and roles, focusing on roles that can improve school results; distribute school leadership for staff members, engaging them and recognizing broader participation in leadership teams; develop skills for effective school leadership during the leadership process; make school leadership a more attractive profession by ensuring appropriate incentives and motivations. The analysis of one-sample t-test indicated that there was statistically insignificant mean difference between the obtained mean of Institutional Practice (3.0214 p=0.765) and the expected mean (3.00). Its t-value (0.300) was also less than the t- critical value (1.960). Thus, the calculated mean (3.0214) was more or less the same as the expected mean (3.00). This implies that, principals were partially practicing institutional practice forms of distributed leadership in the secondary schools of the city administration. The result of One- sample t-test revealed that there was statistically significant mean difference between the obtained mean of Intuitive Work Relation (1.5857 and p<0.05) and the expected mean (3.00). Its t-value (-70.205) was also greater than the t- critical value (1.960). Thus, the calculated mean (1.5857) was significantly lower than the expected mean (3.00). This implies that, principals were not practicing Intuitive Work Relation forms of distributed leadership in the secondary school of the city. The same is true for Spontaneous Collaboration form of distributed leadership. Meaning, principals were not practicing Spontaneous Collaboration forms of distributed leadership in the secondary schools in the city administration. Finding of second third and research question was the correlation coefficient values (r) between all the three forms and of distributed leadership and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) were below 0.2 and above 0.0; this indicates that each of the three forms and of distributed leadership and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) were not significantly related to each other. Lastly, the correlation between distributed leadership and the school effectiveness was .063 and p value was 0.463. Since the p value 0.463 was larger than 0.05; thus the obtained correlation was statistically non significant. The analysis of correlation indicated the existence of a weak correlation (0.063) between distributed leadership and school effectiveness. The direction of the correlation between them was, however, in a positive direction. This implies that the increment or decrement of one of the variable can cause a weak change to the other. The correlation between distributed leadership and Schools Effectiveness (SE) as measured by the 2016 standardized Grade 10 national Examination result were not correlated in a way that is large or important enough to have an effect on each other. However, the direction of the correlation is positive. The questions raised in this study were about distributed leadership practice and its relation to school effectiveness. The findings and conclusions revealed a positive even though weak correlation between distributed
leadership and school effectiveness with in positive direction. To this effect, school principals need to distribute leadership roles across the staff members and organizations, for example vice-principals, department head and principals in other schools. The principal should provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues, to participate in school level Instructional decision making and leadership in improving academic achievement subject departments should aim to improve teaching and learning.

**Operational Terms:** Distributed leadership, School Leaders, School effectiveness, Preparatory school, Secondary school, Preparatory and Secondary school.

1.0 Introduction

Leadership can be conceptualized and studied as an individual or an organizational phenomenon. The former conception orients us toward an analysis of the beliefs, actions, personal traits, and influence of individuals recognized by others as leaders. An organizational perspective suggests that leadership is unlikely to be constituted solely of the actions and influence of an individual. Leadership is defined by Bush and Glover (2003) as a process of influence leading to the achievement of desired purposes. The researcher strongly agrees with them since the principal, as the leader, has to inspire and support teachers and learners in achieving the vision of the school. Kerry and Murdock (1993), state that leadership is not a matter of passive status or of the mere possession of some combination of traits. Farley (2002) noted that, like the talents for music and art, the talent for leadership involves much knowledge and disciplined practice. Leadership is the process of directing the behavior of others towards accomplishing a set of predetermined goals.

In terms of origin, the idea of distributed leadership has been derived from cognitive and social psychology, drawing particularly upon distributed cognition and activity theory (Gronn, 2008). Distributed leadership is a concept which is very much in vogue with researchers and leadership practitioners alike (Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris, and Hopkins, 2006), and there is a growing confidence that this contributes to the effectiveness of the organization (Gronn, 2002; Duignan and Bezzina, 2006). However, yet there seems to be little, if any, empirical data which links this to improved influence on pupil outcomes.

1.1 Background Of The Study

The issues of leadership for school improvement is now high on the research and policy agenda of many countries (Harris, 2005) and effective educational leadership makes a difference in improving learning (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom, 2004). There is nothing new or especially controversial about that idea. What is 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 (Leithwood, et al., 2004).

In relation to above the significance of effective leadership and management for the successful operation of schools and colleges has been increasingly acknowledged during the 1990s and into the twenty-first century (Bush, 2008). Governments in Africa and in some Asian countries substitute decentralization for democratization at the national level as they view it as a safe way of acquiring legitimacy to the grass root support (Crook, R and Jams, M, 1998). It is good to note here that education in most African states was a centralized system most adopted from their former colonials. Under such system, the central government was responsible for the provision of education. Such responsibility is seen as a burden as most of states suffer from severe economic constraints. As such, to decentralize their power to the grass roots is like the transfer of the burden form the central to the grass roots.
The current reform in the educational management in Ethiopia, therefore, is a political influence by the global trends. The educational management is consistent with the level of decentralization. That is to say, as the government continues to decentralize its power and financial control from the central to the low level, the educational management and leadership is also improved to exercise power and to be able to manage and control over the resources allocated.

The strategies for improving educational management in Ethiopia were pointed in this study from various documents such as, Education and Training Policy (ETP) of 1994, Ethiopian National Professional Standards Framework for School Supervisors of 2012 just to mention a few.

The “trend towards decentralization acknowledges that the dynamic for transformational change in schools must come increasingly from within the school community” (OECD, 2001b, p.47). However, we find that there are different degrees or models of decentralization in different countries as well as for different functions the administrative role of the principal, “has evolved from the practicing teacher, with added technical and administrative duties, to the full-time manager and developer of human, financial and physical resources.” (OECD, 2001b, Pp. 20 & 24)

In our cases, there is, however, very little evidence that most school leaders improve their schools’ performance and outcomes by practicing distributed leadership style. There is also a lack of relevant research focusing on how principal’s distributed leadership and colleagues’ cooperation affect school effectiveness.

Thus, this study investigated the role of principal’s in distributed leadership and its relationship to school effectiveness in Gondar town preparatory and secondary schools. In this study, the relationship between distributed leadership practice and school effectiveness had been examined thoroughly. Therefore, the thesis was entitled “The role of Principal in Distributed leadership practice and its relationship to school effectiveness in secondary and preparatory schools of Gondar city administration.”

1.2. Statement Of The Problem

Most recently, research has shown that the patterns of leadership distribution matter within an organization and that distributed leadership practice is more likely to equate with improved organizational performance and outcomes (Leithwood et al. 2004).

Gronn (2002) suggests that distributed leadership has especial relevance and applicability in contemporary, information-rich society ‘Schools now operate in complex, data-rich task environments as never before’ (p.18). This, according to Gronn (2002), increases interdependence and reliance on new forms of co-ordination, ‘both of which are highly conducive to the emergence of distributed leadership’ (p.19). Gronn (2002) argues that distributed leadership has organizational advantages too. It enables organizations to capitalize on a range of strengths, individuals to strengthen their skills and attributes, and aids bonding. These advantages amount to ‘an overall widening of the net of intelligence and organizational resourcefulness’ (p.37), which has applicability to schools as organizations.

According to Duignan and Bezzina (2006), the factors that drive schools towards developing structures and processes for distributing leadership include the increasing isolation of principals, the increasing complexity of their work, and growing ambiguity in contemporary school operations. With regard to the first factor, Duignan et al. (2006:3) said, “principals sometimes operate out of an isolationist or bunker mentality with the result that they find it difficult to share their leadership responsibilities.” It leads to the development of a dependency among the school community whereby no event is complete without the principal, and no decision proceeds without his/her involvement. Such a stance constitutes a very narrow view of leadership and can lead to some of the problems, which are beginning to emerge in leadership succession and recruitment.

Relevant experiences and observations were reported by Amhara Regional Education Bureau (AREB) (2010), in which some school leadership setbacks were pinpointed; the leadership was not able to provide sound leadership techniques; could not get involved in promoting social and interpersonal relations; did not demonstrate expert knowledge about schooling and educational activities; did not empower the followers and did not encourage the staff to exchange views on.
However, these reports comprise the educational practices and experiences of the country as well as the Amhara Region as a whole. The findings of these reports may or may not be relevant to our specific contexts.

Thus, by this inquiry the researcher investigated the relationship between the role of principals in distributed leadership practice and its relationship to school effectiveness. Thus, in this study the following 4 basic research questions were raised:

1.3. Basic Research Questions
1. What roles principals have been playing to make their schools more effective?
2. To what extent is Spontaneous collaboration of distributed leadership practiced in the sample schools?
3. To what extent is Intuitive working relations of distributed leadership practiced in the sample schools?
4. To what extent is Institutionalized practice of distributed leadership practiced in the sample schools?
5. What is the relationship between the three forms (i.e. spontaneous collaboration, Intuitive working relations and Institutionalized practice) of distributed leadership and school effectiveness as measured by the 2016, Grade-10, National Examination result?
6. What is the relationship between the distributed leadership as a whole and school effectiveness as measured by the 2016, Grade-10, National Examination result?

1.4. Objectives Of The Study
1.4.1. General Objectives of The Study
To assess the roles of principals’ in distributive leadership practice and its relationship to the school effectiveness the case of secondary and preparatory schools of Gondar city Administration.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives Of The Study
Specifically the study has the following objectives:
1. To assess the roles principals have been playing to make their schools more effective.
2. To assess the extent to which spontaneous collaboration of distributed leadership practiced in the sample schools.
3. To assess the extent to which Intuitive working relations of distributed leadership practiced in the sample schools.
4. To assess the extent to which Institutionalized practice of distributed leadership practiced in the sample schools.
5. To Assess the relationship between the three forms (i.e. Spontaneous collaboration, Intuitive working relations and Institutionalized practice) of distributed leadership and school effectiveness as measured by the 2016, Grade-10, National Examination result.
6. Investigate the relationship between distributed leadership and school effectiveness as measured by the 2016, Grade-10, National Exam Result.

1.5. Significance Of The Study
Since recently much attention has been given to school management and leadership, the finding of this study may have the following potential significances:Findings of this study may provide principals and other educational concerned bodies’ valuable information about the concept and practice of distributive leaders. Findings of this study may be also useful to school leaders to coordinate organizational structures, identify the technical expertise of teachers, create common goals, and utilize artifacts to make instructional decisions. Would increase the awareness of teachers regarding their roles that they have to contribute in distributed leadership process of their schools.
Would help principals to explore the relative contribution of different factors in distributive leadership related to school effectiveness. Would help school principals - better understand the level of influence-
distributed leadership has on school effectiveness on student learning outcome. Lastly, findings of this study will add some input for individuals who want to conduct further studies in related to the roles principal play on distributive leadership and its relation on school effectiveness.

1.6. Delimitation Of The Study
Even though scholars studied distributed leadership through varies dimensions, in this study the researcher studied distributed leadership through the three forms i.e. institutionalized practices, Spontaneous collaboration, Intuitive working relations. It was also limited to study only the effectiveness of distributive leadership with regard to grade 10 national examination results. Thus, conceptually, the scope of the study was limited to investigate the relationship between distributive leadership and school effectiveness as measured by the 2016 grade 10 students’ national examination results.

1.7. Limitation Of The Study
In conducting this thesis, many challenges and problems encountered. In the first place, it was not inclusive of all secondary and preparatory schools in Gondar town, Ethiopia. Secondly, it was highly confined to using foreign materials as part of a review literature. More specifically, there was no much access to locally produced documents related to the problem raised in the study. As a result, the study had to examine the issue with available reference to prior contributions in the same area except foreign articles.

1.8 Operational Definition Of Terms
For the sake of common understanding, terms related to the research are defined in the following way:
- **Distributed leadership:** Is generated solely by the role and position of the principal and instead frames leadership as a practice that involves an array of individuals whose dynamic interactions mobilize and guide teachers in the process of instructional change. In this study, distributed leadership was represented and conceptualized by the 3 forms distributed Leadership.
- **School Leaders:** Secondary and preparatory school principals, vice principals, supervisors and teachers in Gondar Town.
- **School effectiveness:** In this study, it was defined and represented by 2016 Grade ten National Examination Results. Thus, School effectiveness, in the whole text of the thesis, refers the 2016 exam results of Grade-10 students.
- **Preparatory school:** Is a school students learn from grade 11 – 12.
- **Secondary school:** Is a school students learn from grade 9 – 10.
- **Preparatory and Secondary school:** Is a school students learn from grade 9 – 12.

1.9. Chapterization Of The Study
This research study has been categorized in five parts. They were: part one: is introduction of the study, part two: review of related literature, part three: methodology of the study, part four: presentation and analysis of results and discussion and the last part: summary, conclusion and recommendation.

2.0 Review Of Related Literature
This section of the study gives a summary of what scholars have about the concept of Leadership, the concepts of distributive leadership, forms of distributed leadership, the roles of principal practice on distributed leadership, and the school effectiveness.

2.1 Research Studies Related With Distributed Leadership
Mary Theresa Streck (2009) conducted a study entitled, Distributed Leadership and Shared Decision Making: Leadership Practices That Promote Collaboration”. The main objective of the study was to explore parents’, teachers’ and school leaders’ perceptions of leadership practices that promoted
collaboration through shared decision making. “If schools are to embrace a distributed leadership perspective, the practice of leadership has to be the central concern” (Spillane, 2006, p. 84). A secondary this study was to examine the school district’s plan to implement CR 100.11. He conducted studying at the Sage Colleges. The major findings of the study were revealed that participants valued trust and communication practices in their building leaders and desired greater autonomy in the decision making process from central administration. Results suggest that the district leaders, with the building level participants, need to revisit and revise the district’s plan on shared decision making. Participants recommended leadership practices to improve the decision making process on the district level and the two most frequently mentioned practices related to establishing a trusting environment and maintaining open lines of communication.

Ali Çağatay Kılınç, (2014) conducted a study entitled, A Quantitative Study of the Relationship between Distributed Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Perceptions of Turkish Primary School Teachers”. The main objective of the study to determine the relationship between primary school teachers' perceptions on distributed leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). The method of analysis used by him collected through "Distributed Leadership Scale" and "Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale". Descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and simple regression analysis were used to analyze the study data. The major findings of the study were of the current study revealed that primary school teachers' perceptions of distributed leadership was positively and significantly related to teacher OCBs. Furthermore, distributed leadership was a positive and significant predictor of teacher OCBs.

Amani Ahmed Abdalla, (2014) conducted a study entitled, Distributed School Leadership, Perceptions & Practices”. The main objective of the study to explore the concept of distributed leadership among Teachers and schools’ Principals, the variation between perceptions and practices and how distributed leadership can impact teaching and learning. The method of analysis used by him a mixed methodological approach was chosen comprising a study of literature and statistical data, a questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and observations. The data was then analyzed and triangulated in order to provide effective and useful data. The major findings of the study were the analysis of the results reveals that all the respondents understand the concept of distributed leadership as they agreed that distributed leadership enhances the teaching and learning process. However, there is a gap between perception and practices of distributed leadership in their schools. These variations could be directly associated with school Principals as owners of distributed leadership practices, in particular, factors that relate to teaching and learning or review of practices and policies. However, some of these practices may not relate to Principals because Stakeholders or the School Board can be involved in major decisions or having insufficient budget for teachers’ training. On that basis, the study highlights such variations between perceptions and practices, as it explains their limitations and outlines further research suggestions.

Eilis Humphreys (2010) conducted a study entitled, Distributed Leadership and Its Impact on Teaching and Learning”. The main objective of the study to explore how it is understood in the Irish post primary school context, with particular reference to its impact on teaching and learning. The method of analysis used by him having identified that the research would be most appropriately conducted in a small number of schools, a mixed-method approach was decided on, through which a preliminary stage of questionnaires might enable a rich yield of relevant issues on distributed leadership to be identified, for a more searching investigation through a series of focus groups. The research focuses on three schools and the data gathered in each school consists of demographical information on the school, relevant documentation (e.g. schedule of posts of responsibility and a report on school-based project. Questionnaire was used to establish an agenda and to clarify the questions to be explored. For a deeper insight into the concept of distributed leadership and its links to teaching and learning, the methodology moves to a further stage, namely a qualitative one, using focus group discussions. As a result of reflection on action the author considered that ‘combining’ members of the three schools for focus group discussions would yield richer results for the researcher and enrich the learning experience. The major findings of the study were suggest that teachers support the concept of collaborative work practices such as planning and reviewing their work together and sharing resources
and ideas. Over 75% of participants agreed that teachers should work together in planning and reviewing their work, sharing ideas within and across subject departments and sharing their professional development experiences but less than 50% of respondents agreed that these practices were well established in their schools. While 95% of respondents agreed that a practice such as teachers working together enhances student learning, fewer than 50% of participants agreed that these types of practice occur.

Keietta Lattrail (2013) conducted a study entitled "Does Distributive Leadership Impact Student Achievement and School Culture?". The main objective of the study was to determine if there is a difference in how leadership is distributed in different schools (Title I and Non-Title I schools) and to examine the relationship between distributive leadership and student achievement in Title I and Non-Title I schools. Additionally, the study investigated the relationship between distributive leadership and school culture in Title I and Non-Title I schools. Finally, this study determined if the relationship between distributed leadership, school culture, and student achievement is moderated by Title I status. The method of analysis used by him in the current study implemented a quantitative research design to answer each of the five research questions. A t-test was performed to analyze question 1 to determine if there is a difference in Title I and Non-Title I schools. A bivariate correlation was conducted to analyze questions 2 and 3 of the research study to determine if a relationship exists between distributive leadership, student achievement and school. The major findings of the study were grouped into three broad perspectives for discussion. First, the relationship between distributive leadership and student achievement are reviewed, followed by a discussion of distributive leadership and school culture. The final subsection reviews Title I and Non-Title I status in relation to distributive leadership.

2.2 Research Studies Related With Student Achievement

Randy D. Baiza (2011) conducted a study entitled, Distributive Leadership and Student Achievement: A Case Study.” The main objective of this case study was to investigate the interactions between leaders who practice distributive leadership and followers within a school which leads to the development of routines and tools that reinforce student achievement. Qualitative methodology was utilized by him during this study, researching principal and teacher perceptions of distributed leadership and its relationship to student achievement. The district superintendent’s perception regarding distributed leadership and student achievement was researched as well. The knowledge of the superintendent, the principal and members of his faculty created a functional case study to conduct this research. Results from this study reflected information collected through observations of the principal and lead teachers, in-depth interviews and conversations, review of student achievement data and the researchers own experiences. The major findings of the study were significant. This case study adds further evidence to support research on distributive leadership and its relationship to student achievement. The research participants in particular the school district superintendent, and the school principal did not simply delegate tasks but practiced governance over the school’s social and situational contexts. Through the sharing of intellect and opinion, acknowledging and maximizing expertise, teachers were called on to share their expertise in instruction as well as providing opportunities or time, to dialogue, to share insights regarding students and the curriculum. Working together to improve student instruction created shared roles pulling their expertise and initiative directed toward increasing student achievement.

John Patrick Malloy (2012) conducted a study entitled, Effects of Distributed Leadership on Teachers’ academic Optimism and Student Achievement.” The main objective of the study to examined patterns of distributed leadership and their correlation to academic optimism. Further examined the impact that academic optimism has on student achievement. The method of analysis used by him the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze survey results. Means and standard deviations of each item and scale were determined. The internal reliability of each scale was tested using Cronbach’s alpha. Correlations between variables were estimated and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was used for hypotheses testing. The major findings of the study were Plan fully aligned distributed leadership is the only pattern of distributed leadership that had a positive
correlation to academic optimism. This form of leadership seems to have a direct effect on teachers’ academic optimism while other patterns have no effect or a negative effect. Spontaneous misalignment has a significant negative effect on each aspect of academic optimism and anarchic misalignment has a significant and negative effect on certain aspects of academic optimism. Plan fully aligned patterns of distributed leadership have a similar correlation to each aspect of academic optimism. However, academic optimism, an aggregate variable, does not have a direct effect on student achievement and does not mediate the effects of plan fully aligned distributed leadership on student achievement. Rather, academic press, a component of academic optimism, does have a direct effect on student achievement and does mediate the effects of plan fully aligned distributed leadership on student achievement. Plan fully aligned distributed leadership and academic press together have a 60% standardized total effect on student language achievement and a 63% standardized total effect on student math achievement. The conceptual framework and hypotheses for this study suggested that plan fully aligned distributed leadership mediated by academic optimism would improve student achievement. However, the results from this study indicate that plan fully aligned distributed leadership mediated by academic press has a significant, positive effect on student achievement.

However, some literature suggests Distributed leadership can be considered threatening to those in formal power positions, by relinquishing direct control over certain activities. Finally, Harris suggests that top-down approaches to distributed leadership, when not executed properly, can be interpreted as misguided delegation. Some have suggested that informal leadership “dispersion” can affect team outcomes negatively by contributing to inefficiencies within the team. Thus, the researcher tried to investigate the role principal play in distributed leadership and its relation on school effectiveness either positively or negatively on the context of Gondar Town secondary and preparatory schools.

3.0.Methodology
This chapter deals with the methodology and techniques of investigation used to obtain evidence to answer the research questions. This includes overall design of the study, source of data, participants of the study, sampling techniques, data collection instrument and procedure, and data analysis techniques.

3.1. Design Of The Study
This study was carried out using both qualitative and quantitative methods. More of the research work was conducted in quantitative data regarding participants’ perception of distributed leadership practices. The descriptive co-relational survey design was employed to gather and analyze quantitative data about distributed leadership practices of sample schools and the 2016 National Exam result of Grade ten students of the study area. The qualitative design was also employed to gather and analyze qualitative data regarding participants’ perception of distributed leadership practices and the principals’ role in distributed leadership.

3.2. Populations, Sample And Sampling Techniques
3.2.1. Population
In the town of Gondar, there are eleven governmental secondary and preparatory schools. These schools were grouped under four clusters. “Fasiledes Cluster” which includes Fasiledes Preparatory, Fasiledes General Secondary, Shinta General Secondary and Preparatory and Waliya General Secondary School. “Hidar -11 Cluster” which includes Hidar -11 General Secondary and Preparatory, Ayertena General Secondary, Gondar University Community General Secondary and Preparatory, and Kings General Secondary school. “Azezo Cluster” which includes Azezo General Secondary and Preparatory, AzezoDemaza General Secondary and HidasieTeda General Secondary School. “Ediget-Feleg Cluster” which includes Angereb General Secondary and Preparatory, Ediget-Feleg General Secondary, Walaya General Secondary and DebereSelam Catholic General Secondary and Preparatory School. All teachers and principals working only in these Eleven Governmental secondary and preparatory schools in 2016 academic year was consider as population of this study. The researcher was not including the same level private schools in the study; because, from his empirical experience he has learned that the performance of students in these schools is by far better
than of students of governmental schools. Thus, the total population of the study will be 628 teachers and 11 principals, which are of the governmental schools.

3.2.2. Sample And Sampling Techniques

From these total Eleven Governmental General secondary and preparatory schools, only Azozo, Angerb, Hidar -11 and Shinta General Secondary and preparatory schools were selected as sample group by purposive random sampling technique this is because the researcher wants to give one equal opportunity to all the clusters.

The total population size of teachers teaching in the sample schools is 312 and 4 principals. Because the total population size of teachers (i.e. 312) teaching in the selected sample schools were not manageable, the researcher was take only 45% (i.e. 140) of them shared equally among the sample schools (i.e. 45% from the total population of each school). Accordingly, 54 from the total of 120 from Azozo, 28 from 62 from Angerb, 27 from 61 from Hidar -11, and 31 from 69 teachers from Shinta general secondary and preparatory school were selected as sample members by simple random sampling technique.

As far as the principals are concerned, it is logical to select all of the four principals who work in the sampled schools as a participant for the study. However, three of them are selected since one of the principals is the researcher himself. For more information see the following table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Demographic Variable of Teacher Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 reported the various socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. For instance, the sex distribution row indicated that 72 (51.4%) respondents are male and 68 (48.6%) are females. Similarly, as it is shown in the table, 111(79.3 %) respondents are degree holders and the remaining 29 (20.7 %) of the respondents are master degree holder. In this study, the year of services of participants shows that, majority of them lies in the 9-16 years which accounts for about 53.6% (75) of the participants. From the total study participants the second highest year of services of participants was found in the 17-24 years of services, which accounts 28.6% (40) of the participants, and followed by the 1-8 years of services, which account for 12.1% (17) of the participants. In the current study, the least participants who account 5.7% (8) are above 25 years of service.

3.3. DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES

The main data gathering instruments in this study were questionnaires, interviews and observation of students’ national exam result. The researcher employed these instruments; because, all of them enable the researcher to gather reliable data and are not time consuming.
3.3.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire was prepared on the basis of various scholars in the field recommended. Items were adopted from the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale Copyright © 2004 by the Connecticut State Board of Education in the name of the Secretary of the State of Connecticut (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2004, Cited in, Whittington M.2009). The survey utilized a five point Likert scale of Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Partially Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree as options to the respondents. One point was assigned to items rated as strongly disagree. Two points were assigned to items rated as disagree. Three points were assigned to items rated as partially agree. Likert scale four was assigned to items rated as Agree. Likert scale five assigned to items rated as Strongly Agree. There are 28 questions: In the questionnaire 1-10 related with institutional practice, 11-19 related with intuitive work relation, and 20-28 related with spontaneous collaboration.

3.3.2. Semi-Structured Interviews

It is considered as an efficient tool to collect detailed data about the issue. To examine participants’ perceived experience, the researcher prepared 16 questions for principals that were rightly connected to research question and conducted 3 face-to-face interviews with all school principals. Thus in this study, the researcher conducted interview for at least 25 to 40 minutes for each of the participants in order to find out the roles principals play in distributed leadership and how distributive leadership was practiced in their schools. During the interviews, the researcher had taken some important notes and finally summarized all the responses on a suitable manner for analysis.

3.4. Data Analysis Techniques And Procedures

By considering the nature of the research questions and purpose of the thesis, both quantitative technique and qualitative data analysis approach were used to analyze the collected data. Specifically, to identify the roles secondary school principals practiced in their schools’ leadership process, and to measure the extent to which the three forms (i.e. Spontaneous collaboration, Intuitive working relations and Institutionalized practice of distributed leadership are practiced in the sample schools principals, One-sample t-test was employed. Whereas; to determine whether a statistically significant relationship existed between the three forms (i.e. spontaneous collaboration, Intuitive working relations and Institutionalized practice) of distributed leadership and school effectiveness as measured by the 2016 Grade 10 Standardized National Examination result, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed. To support the quantitative data, the researcher conducted interviews with the 3 principals who were selected as participants. Thus, the qualitative data was analyzed qualitatively.

Editing was also done to assure that the data was accurate, consistent with other facts gathered, uniformly entered, as completed as possible and had been well arranged to facilitate coding and tabulation. Then the researcher assigned unique numbers for each items of the questionnaire before the collected data were encoded on the SPSS.

4.0 Analysis And Interpretation

The data collected from the interviews with principals was analyzed as follows: the researcher conducted a series of interviews with sample school principals throughout the study process and wanted to access the real world of the school principals. In these interviews the researcher spoke with principals from a variety of backgrounds all whom had relevant experiences to share. In total three principals were interviewed who came from across the three secondary and preparatory schools and who had different levels of experience. The interviews produced evidence of the need for new principals to be trained in the operations of school administration such as timetabling and the workings of the systems of supervision and substitution. This need is exacerbated by the fact that the majority of those appointed recently come to the position without any experience at deputy principal level.

One principal spoke about the practical training, he said relating to the importance of addressing broader issues like vision and leadership within the induction programs: In this complex and
ever-changing world, principals need a grounding in organisational development and organisational change and a background in education ...there has to be a broader issue of leadership and educational vision. You don’t get that on by learning on the job (one of the principals).

Similarly, the ideas which were shared by the majority of the participant principals were many principals did not perform tasks which are directly related to instructional leadership tasks. Thus, from this it can be concluded that principals played mostly administrative roles but they lacked to have instructional leadership roles.

During the interviews, it was frequently indicated that principals were not adequately playing their roles of distributed leadership tasks. In similar issues, one participant of the interviews commented, “One of the new roles school leaders are being asked to play is to work beyond their school borders to contribute to the success of the system as a whole.” The majority participants agreed and confirmed that secondary school principals have not been involved in the tasks of developing job descriptions for each staff members and thus, enabling them to play their roles effectively.

Table 2 the Secondary and Preparatory Schools Teachers’ Responses According To Institutionalized Practice Questionnaire from Question Number 1 -10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement of Respondents</th>
<th>Q.1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Q.2 Disagree</th>
<th>Q.3 Partially Agree</th>
<th>Q.4 Agree</th>
<th>Q.5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Q.6</th>
<th>Q.7</th>
<th>Q.8</th>
<th>Q.9</th>
<th>Q.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>1.254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 reported Teachers' Responses according to the given Institutionalized Practice Questionnaire from question number 1-10. For instance in question number one the agreement of respondents indicated that 23 (16.4%) of them are said strongly disagree, 41 (29.3%) of them are said disagree, 28 (20.0%) of them are said partially agree, 40 (28.6%) of them are said agree and 8 (5.7%) are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.78 and standard deviation is 1.194. In question number two 11 (7.9%) of them are said strongly disagree, 57 (40.7%) of them are said disagree, 10 (7.1%) of them are said partially agree, 44 (31.4%) of them are said agree and 18 (12.9%) are said strongly agree and their mean is 3.01 and standard deviation is 1.249. In question number three 12 (8.6%) of them are said strongly disagree, 35 (25%) of them are said disagree, 28 (20%) of them are said partially agree, 55 (39.3%) of them are said agree and 10 (7.1%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 3.11 and standard deviation is 1.226. In question number four 14 (10%) of them are said strongly disagree, 26 (18.6%) of them are said disagree, 12 (8.6%) of them are said partially agree, 67 (47.9%) of them are said agree and 21 (15%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 3.39 and standard deviation is 1.233. In question number five 17 (12.4%) of them are said strongly disagree, 37 (26.1%) of them are said disagree, 33 (23.6%) of them are said partially agree, 41 (29.3%) of them are said agree and 12 (8.6%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.96 and standard deviation is 1.181.

In question number six 13 (9.3%) of them are said strongly disagree, 44 (31.4%) of them are said disagree, 12 (8.6%) of them are partially agree, 57 (40.7%) of them are agree, and 14 (10.0%) strongly agree and their mean is 3.11 and standard deviation is 1.221. In question number seven 20 (14.3%) of them are said strongly disagree, 26 (18.6%) of them are said disagree, 10 (7.1%) of
them are said partially agree, 69 (49.3%) of them are said agree and 15 (10.7%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 3.24 and standard deviation is 1.279.

In question number eight 23 (16.4%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 40 (28.6%) of them are said disagree, 12 (8.6%) of them are said partially agree, 47 (33.6%) of them are said agree and 18 (12.9%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.98 and standard deviation is 1.344. In question number nine 32 (22.9%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 29 (20.7%) of them are said disagree, 23 (16.4%) of them are said partially agree, 50 (35.7%) of them are said agree and 6 (4.3%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.78 and standard deviation is 1.270. In question number ten 23 (16.4%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 43 (30.7%) of them are said disagree, 12 (8.6%) of them are said partially agree, 54 (38.6%) of them are said agree and 8 (5.7%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.86 and standard deviation is 1.254.

Table 3 the Secondary and Preparatory Schools Teachers’ Responses According to Intuitive work relation Questionnaire from question number 11 -19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaire</th>
<th>Q.11</th>
<th>Q.12</th>
<th>Q.13</th>
<th>Q.14</th>
<th>Q.15</th>
<th>Q.16</th>
<th>Q.17</th>
<th>Q.18</th>
<th>Q.19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reported Teachers’ Responses according to the given Intuitive work relation Questionnaire from question number 11 -19. For instance in question number 11 the agreement of respondents indicated that 5 (3.6%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 21 (15.0%) of them are said disagree, 26 (18.6%) of them are said partially agree, 40 (50.7%) of them are said agree and 8 (12.1%) are said strongly agree and their mean is 3.53 and standard deviation is 2.55. In question number 12, 44 (31.4%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 56 (40%) of them are said disagree, 12 (8.6%) of them are said partially agree, 17 (12.1%) of them are said agree and 11 (7.9%) are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.25 and standard deviation is 1.242. In question number 13, 41 (29.3%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 41 (29.3%) of them are said disagree, 19 (13.6%) of them are said partially agree, 21 (15%) of them are said agree and 18 (12.9%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.53 and standard deviation is 1.386. In question number 14, 33 (23.6%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 51 (36.4%) of them are said disagree, 13 (9.3%) of them are said partially agree, 27 (19.3%) of them are said agree and 16 (11.4%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.59 and standard deviation is 1.341. In question number 15, 33 (23.6%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 46 (32.9%) of them are said disagree, 27 (19.3%) of them are said partially agree, 23 (16.4%) of them are said agree and 11 (7.9%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.52 and standard deviation is 1.238. In question number 16, 48 (34.3%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 33 (23.6%) of them are said disagree, 17 (12.1%) of them are said partially agree, 26 (18.6%) of them are said agree, and 16 (11.4%) strongly agree and their mean is 2.49 and standard deviation is 1.417. In question number 17, 41 (29.3%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 52 (37.1%) of them are said disagree, 17 (12.1%) of them are said partially agree, 19 (13.6%) of them are said agree and 11 (7.9%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.34 and standard deviation is 1.250. In question number 18, 48 (34.3%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 37 (26.4%) of them are said disagree, 17 (12.1%) of them are said partially agree, 26 (18.6%) of them are said agree, and 16 (11.4%) strongly agree and their mean is 2.49 and standard deviation is 1.202 and question number 19, 48 (34.3%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 57 (40.7%) of them are said disagree, 20 (14.3%) of them are said partially
agree, 10 (7.1%) of them are said agree and 5 (3.6%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.05 and standard deviation is 1.048.

Table 4 the Secondary and Preparatory Schools Teachers’ Responses According to Spontaneous collaboration Questionnaire from question number 20-28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaire</th>
<th>Q.20</th>
<th>Q.21</th>
<th>Q.22</th>
<th>Q.23</th>
<th>Q.24</th>
<th>Q.25</th>
<th>Q.26</th>
<th>Q.27</th>
<th>Q.28</th>
<th>Q.29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 reported Teachers' Responses according to the given Spontaneous collaboration Questionnaire from question number 20-28. For instance in question number 20 the agreement of respondents indicated that 33 (23.6%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 43 (30.7%) of them are said disagree, 17 (12.1%) of them are said partially agree, 26 (18.6%) of them are said agree and 21 (15.0%) are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.71 and standard deviation is 1.401. In question number 21, 42 (30.0%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 36 (25.7%) of them are said disagree, 18 (12.9%) of them are said partially agree, 30 (21.4%) of them are said agree and 14 (10.0%) are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.56 and standard deviation is 1.374. In question number 22, 36 (25.7%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 46 (32.9%) of them are said disagree, 13 (9.3%) of them are said partially agree, 24 (17.1%) of them are said agree and 21 (15.0%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.63 and standard deviation is 1.416. In question number 23, 45 (32.1%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 50 (35.7%) of them are said disagree, 10 (7.1%) of them are said partially agree, 21 (15.0%) of them are said agree and 14 (10.0%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.35 and standard deviation is 1.335. In question number 24, 33 (23.6%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 46 (32.9%) of them are said disagree, 27 (19.3%) of them are said partially agree, 23 (16.4%) of them are said agree and 11 (7.9%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.52 and standard deviation is 1.238. In question number 25, 48 (34.3%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 33 (23.6%) of them are said disagree, 17 (12.1%) of them are partially agree, 26 (18.6%) of them are agree, and 16 (11.4%) strongly agree and their mean is 2.49 and standard deviation is 1.417.

In question number 26, 41 (29.3%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 52 (37.1%) of them are said disagree, 17 (12.1%) of them are said partially agree, 19 (13.6%) of them are said agree and 11 (7.9%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.34 and standard deviation is 1.250. In question number 27, 59 (42.1%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 57 (40.7%) of them are said disagree, 3 (2.1%) of them are said partially agree, 10 (7.1%) of them are said agree and 11 (7.9%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.98 and standard deviation is 1.202 and question number 28, 48 (34.3%) of them are said that strongly disagree, 57 (40.7%) of them are said disagree, 20 (14.3%) of them are said partially agree, 10 (7.1%) of them are said agree and 5 (3.6%) of them are said strongly agree and their mean is 2.05 and standard deviation is 1.048.
4.1 The Practices Levels Of Distributed Leadership Behaviors In The Secondary And Preparatory Schools According To Teachers’ Responses

In the second section of this chapter, the researcher measured the extent to which Gondar town secondary and preparatory school principals practiced each of the 3 forms of distributed leadership. To this effect, One-Sample t- test was employed. Table 5 showed summary of the analysis.

Table 5: The Extent of the Three Forms of Distributive Leadership is practiced in general secondary and reparatory schools of Gondar city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Value = 3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mean of Institutional Practice</td>
<td>3.0214</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.84528</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mean of Intuitive Work Relation</td>
<td>1.5857</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.23836</td>
<td>-70.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mean of Spontaneous Collaboration</td>
<td>1.5968</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.18959</td>
<td>-87.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of the total Forms Of Distributed Leadership</td>
<td>2.0680</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.30589</td>
<td>-36.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of one sample t-test reveals that there was statistically insignificant mean difference between the obtained mean of Institutional Practice (3.0214 p=0.765) and the expected mean (3.00). Its t-value (0.300) was also less than the t- critical value (1.960). Thus, the calculated mean (3.0214) was more or less the same as the expected mean (3.00). This implies that, principals were partially practicing institutional practice forms of distributed leadership in the secondary schools of the city administration. Meaning, participants partially agreed that the school’s daily and weekly schedules provided time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues as well as meet with the administration to discuss instructional issues. They also confirmed that there was a formal structure in place in the school to provide teachers opportunities to participate in school level instructional decision making.

Moreover, when the practice of Institutional Practice was compared with the other forms it was the highest practiced form of distributed leadership. This implies that Institutional Practice, as a form of distributed leadership, practiced higher than Intuitive Work Relation, and Spontaneous Collaboration.

The result of one sample t-test also reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the obtained mean of Intuitive Work Relation (1.5857 and p<0.05) and the expected mean (3.00). Its t-value (-70.205) was also greater than the t- critical value (1.960). Thus, the calculated mean (1.5857) was significantly lower than the expected mean (3.00). This implies that, principals were not practicing Intuitive Work Relation forms of distributed leadership in the secondary school of the city. In other words, the selected schools did not have a set of shared values that guide the school improvement efforts; teachers’ instructional learning expectations were not high for their students and teachers and administrators did not share accountability for students’ academic performance as expected.

In addition, the result of one sample t-test reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the obtained mean of Spontaneous Collaboration (1.5968and p<0.05) and the expected mean (3.00). Its t-value (-87.572) was also greater than the t- critical value (1.960). Thus, the calculated mean (1.5968) was significantly lower than the expected mean (3.00). This implies that, principals were not practicing Spontaneous Collaboration forms of distributed leadership in the secondary schools in the city administration. Meaning, teachers, in the schools, were not discussing and helping one another to solve problems; teachers were not talking with one another about teaching and the curriculum. In addition to that teachers were not meeting frequently with instructional aides or specialists to discuss about outcomes of student.

In sum, the analysis of one sample t-test indicated the existence of statistically significant mean difference between the aggregate mean of the three forms of distributed leadership (2.0680) and the
test-value or the expected mean (3.00). The t-value (-36.051) was also significantly higher than the critical t-value in the t-distribution (1.960). Thus, the obtained mean score was significantly lower than the test-value or the expected mean (3.00). This implies that principals were not practicing distributed leadership in their schools. As (Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris, and Hopkins, 2006:52) point out “… distributed patterns of leadership don’t always serve the greater good. Distributed leadership is sometimes bad leadership”. They note that overall patterns of distributed leadership and its effects in large-scale samples may hide significant variations and discrepancies in which distributed leadership is less useful. Some have suggested that informal leadership “dispersion” can affect team outcomes negatively by contributing to inefficiencies within the team.

4.2 The Relationship Between the Three Forms (i.e. Spontaneous Collaboration, Intuitive Working Relations And Institutionalized Practice) of Distributed Leadership and School-Effectiveness

In order to determine whether there are significant relationships among the three forms (i.e. Spontaneous Collaboration, Intuitive Working Relations and Institutionalized Practice) of Distributed Leadership and School Effectiveness, Pearson Correlation Coefficient analysis was carried out. The scale model suggested by Davies (1971) was employed to describe the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Values of the correlation coefficients (r) range from -1.00 to +1.00, with values of 0.0 indicative of no correlation, values of ±0.20 indicative of a weak correlation, values of ±0.50 indicative of a moderate correlation, values of ±0.80 indicative of a strong correlations, and values of ±1.00 indicative of a perfect correlation (Hatcher,2003). In addition to the correlation coefficient value, probability (p) values were computed. If the p value was less than 0.05, then null hypothesis was rejected. If the p value was 0.05 or larger, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Table 6 summarized the Correlation between them.

Table 6 The Relationship Between Each of the Three Forms of Distributed Leadership with School Effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Institutional Practices</th>
<th>Intuitive work Relations</th>
<th>Spontaneous collaboration</th>
<th>School Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Practices</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive work Relations</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous collaboration</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Effectiveness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As indicated in the table 6 Institutional Practice (IP), had 0.043 and p=0.616 correlation coefficient value (r) with the Schools Effectiveness (SE) that is measured by 2016 grade 10 national examination result. This implies that there was no a significance correlation between Institutional Practice (IP) and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) because values of the correlation coefficients, ranges from .00 ± 0.20 are indicative of a weak correlation. The direction of the correlation between Institutional
Practice (IP) and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) was however, positive, but the strength of their correlation was too much weak.

As indicated in the table, Intuitive Work Relation (IWR) had 0.014 correlation coefficient value (r) with Schools Effectiveness (SE). This implies that there was not a significance correlation between Intuitive Work Relation (IWR) and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) because value of the correlation coefficient, ranges from 0.00 - 0.2 is indicative of a weak correlation. The direction of the correlation between Intuitive Work Relation (IWR) and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) was however, positive, but the strength of their correlation was weak.

However, this finding is not in line with the findings of one quantitative research studied in Maryland, which indicated that there was a significant relationship between intuitive working relations and school performance as measured by standardized mathematics assessments, r = .400, p = .019. The nature of the correlation coefficient indicated a moderate correlation between intuitive working relations and school performance in the area of mathematics. The null hypothesis was rejected because the p value of .019 was less than .05; thus the obtained correlation was statistically significant. As a result, it was concluded that there was a moderate relationship between the distributed leadership form, intuitive working relations and school performance as measured by a standardized mathematics assessment (Whitngton 2009).

As indicated in the table Spontaneous Collaboration (SC) had 0.094 correlation coefficient values (r) with the Schools Effectiveness (SE). This implies that there was not a significance correlation between Spontaneous Collaboration (SC) and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) because value of the correlation coefficient, ranges from 0.00 - 0.2 is indicative of weak correlation. The direction of the correlation between Institutional Practice (IP) and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) was however, positive, but the strength of their correlation was too much weak.

However, this finding was not in line with the findings of one quantitative research studied in Maryland, indicated that there was a significant relationship between spontaneous collaboration and school performance as measured by a standardized mathematics assessment. The nature of the correlation coefficient indicated a moderate correlation between spontaneous collaboration and school performance in the area of mathematics.

In sum, all the correlation coefficient values (r) between all the three forms of distributed leadership and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) were below 0.2 and above 0.0; this indicates that each of the three forms of distributed leadership and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) were not significantly related to each other. In other words, the components of distributed leadership and Schools Effectiveness (SE) as measured by the 2016 grade 10 students national Examination result were not correlated in a way that is large or important enough to have an effect on each other.

Distributed leadership, it is claimed, also may allow members to better anticipate and respond to the demands of the organization’s environment. Solutions to organizational challenges may develop through distributed leadership, which would be unlikely to emerge from individual sources. Finally, overlapping actions that occur in some patterns of distributed leadership may further reinforce and extend leaders’ influence. Yet, however, no direct empirical connection has been established with improved pupil outcomes. These claims for distributed leadership are not insubstantial or insignificant. One might reasonably expect that if even just a few were to materialize the effects on a school’s contribution to student learning for example, would be significant. However, it is important to note that it is not simply assumed that distributed leadership is automatically a good thing (Leithwood, et al., 2006).

However, there is empirical evidence to support a strong relationship between distributed patterns of leadership and organizational performance. Work by Graetz (2000) offers a view of distributed leadership as a positive channel for change. He notes that “organizations most successful in managing the dynamics of loose-tight working relationships meld strong personalized leadership at the top with distributed leadership”. Similarly Gold et al. (2002), cited Bill Mulfored. (2003) in their study of ten “outstanding” school leaders, point towards the development of leadership capacity within the school as a key lever of success.
4.3 The Relation Between Distributed Leadership Practice And School Effectiveness

To answer the fourth basic research question which involves the determining the nature of relationship between distributed leadership as a whole and the implementation of school effectiveness, Pearson correlations was computed. In the following table, the statistical analysis was summarized.

Table 7 The Correlation between Distributed Leadership and the School Effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributed Leadership</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools’ Effectiveness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 the result of the correlation analysis indicates whether the particular correlation is significant or not. This measure varies from 0 (representing random relationships) to 1 (representing perfect linear relationships) or -1 (representing perfect negative linear relationships). In this case, the correlation between distributed leadership and the school effectiveness was 0.063 and p value was 0.463. Since the p value 0.463 was greater than 0.05; thus the obtained correlation was statistically non significant. The direction of the correlation between distributed leadership and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) was however, in a positive direction. This implies that the increment or decrement of one of the variable can cause a change to the other. But the strength of their correlation was weak.

It is clearly indicated that there is a strong relationship between principals’ distributed leadership styles and schools’ effectiveness. In the field of education stated as role of principals as instructional leadership is still in the state of transition from administrative emphasis to more instructional, democratic and participatory leadership (Marks & Printy, 2003, in Harris, Day, Hadfield, Hopkins, Hargreaves, Chapman, 2003). The pressure of globalization and social expectation is inducing principals take the lead in the instructional activities such as setting goals, leading academic programs, examining and evaluating teachers’ performance. They also stated that principals’ distributed leadership styles, policies and practices have a significant impact on the commitment level of teachers hence school effectiveness. He found that high-performing schools had principals who were effective managers of the human resources in their schools.

But during the interviews, it was revealed that in some schools there was a top down leadership style, which in this study is characterized as the opposite of distributed leadership style. In addition to, this, the data obtained from the interviews confirmed that secondary and preparatory school principals did not use supportive, participative and achievement-oriented leadership behaviors. The majority of principals agreed that decisions on various activities in their schools were not made after communication, consultation and discussions with the various members of the organization.

5.0 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter summarized the basic questions raised, the methodology employed to investigate the basic questions, major findings, the implications of these findings for school principals, teachers and other educational leaders. Recommendations of the study are described as well.

5.1 Summary Of The Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the role principals play in distributed leadership and its relationship with schools effectiveness as measured by the 2016 Grade 10 national Examination results. For this purpose the following 4 basic questions were raised.

1. What roles principals have been playing to make their schools more effective?
To what extent are the three forms distributed leadership practiced in the secondary and preparatory schools of Gondar town?

3. Is there any relationship between the three forms of distributed leadership and school effectiveness as measured by the 2016 Grade 10 national Examination?

4. Is there any relationship between distributed leadership as a whole and school effectiveness as measured by the 2016 grade 10 national examinations?

The descriptive co-relational survey design and qualitative approach were employed to gather and analyze qualitative and quantitative data about distributed leadership practices and its relationship to the school effectiveness.

5.2 Findings Of The Study

Based on the analysis of the collected data, the following findings were obtained.

1. With regard to the roles principals have been playing to make their schools more effective, principals during the interviews indicated as they did not play their roles of making their school more effective. Therefore, they revealed that they need improve their schools leadership and can help school leadership practice to improve school effectiveness. Participants of the interviews also indicated that school principals should identify and redefine school leadership responsibilities and roles, focusing on roles that can improve school results; distribute school leadership for staff members, engaging them and recognizing broader participation in leadership teams; develop skills for effective school leadership during the leadership process; make school leadership a more attractive profession by ensuring appropriate incentives and motivations.

2. The result of one sample t-test reveals that there was statistically insignificant mean difference between the obtained mean of Institutional Practice (3.0214 p=0.765) and the expected mean (3.00). Its t-value (0.300) was also less than the t-critical value (1.960). Thus, the calculated mean (3.0214) was more or less the same as the expected mean (3.00). This implies that, principals were partially practicing institutional practice forms of distributed leadership in the secondary schools of the city administration. Meaning, participants partially agreed that the school’s daily and weekly schedules provided time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues as well as meet with the administration to discuss instructional issues. They also confirmed that there was a formal structure in place in the school to provide teachers opportunities to participate in school level instructional decision making.

3. The result of one sample t-test also reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the obtained mean of Intuitive Work Relation (1.5857 and p<0.05) and the expected mean (3.00). Its t-value (-70.205) was also greater than the t-critical value (1.960). Thus, the calculated mean (1.5857) was significantly lower than the expected mean (3.00). This implies that, principals were not practicing Intuitive Work Relation forms of distributed leadership in the secondary school of the city. In other words, the selected schools did not have a set of shared values that guide the school improvement efforts; teachers’ instructional learning expectations were not high for their students and teachers and administrators did not share accountability for students’ academic performance as expected.

4. In addition, the result of one sample t-test reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the obtained mean of Spontaneous Collaboration (1.5968 and p<0.05) and the expected mean (3.00). Its t-value (-87.572) was also greater than the t-critical value (1.960). Thus, the calculated mean (1.5968) was significantly lower than the expected mean (3.00). This implies that, principals were not practicing Spontaneous Collaboration forms of distributed leadership in the secondary schools in the city administration. Meaning, teachers, in the schools, were not discussing and helping one another to solve problems; teachers were not talking with one another about teaching and the curriculum. In addition to that teachers were not meeting frequently with instructional aides or specialists to discuss about outcomes of student.

5. Finding of second and third research question was the correlation coefficient values (r) between all the three forms and of distributed leadership and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) were below 0.2 and above 0.0; this indicates that each of the three forms and of distributed leadership and the Schools
Effectiveness (SE) were not significantly related to each other. In other words, the components of distributed leadership and Schools Effectiveness (SE) as measured by 2016 grade 10 students National Examination result were not correlated in a way that is large or important enough to have an effect on each other.

6. Lastly, the correlation between distributed leadership and the school effectiveness was .063 and p value was 0.463. Since the p value 0.463 was larger than 0.05; thus the obtained correlation was statistically non significant. The analysis of correlation indicated the existence of a weak correlation (0.063) between distributed leadership and school effectiveness. The direction of the correlation between them was, however, in a positive direction. This implies that the increment or decrement of one of the variable can cause a weak change to the other.

5.3 Relating The Findings With The Reviews Of Related Literature

In the literature review was a discussion of Jane O’Connor Lizotte (2013) the study concluded that principals and school leaders who seek to better understand what a principal does (or does not do) to influence distributed leadership in a school, while considering the benefits and drawbacks of these efforts.

Thus, the current findings are consistent with much of the current research discussed in Chapter 2 Jane O’Connor Lizotte (2013). Because, the roles principals have been playing to make their schools more effective, principals during the interviews indicated as they did not play their roles of making their school more effective. Therefore, they revealed that they need improve their schools leadership and can help school leadership practice to improve school effectiveness. Participants of the interviews also indicated that school principals should identify and redefine school leadership responsibilities and roles, focusing on roles that can improve school results; distribute school leadership for staff members, engaging them and recognizing broader participation in leadership teams; develop skills for effective school leadership during the leadership process; make school leadership a more attractive profession by ensuring appropriate incentives and motivations.

In the literature review Eilis Humphreys (2010) the study conducted, Distributed Leadership and Its Impact on Teaching and Learning. The study concluded that teachers should work together in planning and reviewing their work, sharing ideas within and across subject departments and sharing their professional development experiences in their schools. The current findings are consistent with much of the current research discussed in Chapter 2 Eilis Humphreys (2010). Because, the result of one sample t-test reveals that there was statistically insignificant mean difference between the obtained mean of Institutional Practice (3.0214 p=0.765) and the expected mean (3.00). Its t-value (0.300) was also less than the t-critical value (1.960). Thus, the calculated mean (3.0214) was more or less the same as the expected mean (3.00). This implies that, principals were partially practicing institutional practice forms of distributed leadership in the secondary schools of the city administration. Meaning, participants partially agreed that the school’s daily and weekly schedules provided time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues as well as meet with the administration to discuss instructional issues. They also confirmed that there was a formal structure in place in the school to provide teachers opportunities to participate in school level instructional decision making.

In the literature review was a discussion of Monique Whittington Davis (2009) the study concluded that none of the three forms of distributed leadership (spontaneous collaboration, intuitive working relations, and institutionalized practices) revealed a positive and statistically significant relationship on third grade reading performance as measured by the Maryland School Assessment. Thus, the current findings are consistent with much of the current research discussed in Chapter 2 Monique Whittington Davis (2009). Because, the finding of second and third research question was the correlation coefficient values (r) between all the three forms and of distributed leadership and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) were below 0.2 and above 0.0; this indicates that each of the three forms and of distributed leadership and the Schools Effectiveness (SE) were not significantly related to each other. In other words, the components of distributed leadership and Schools Effectiveness (SE) as measured by 2016 grade 10 students National Examination result were not correlated in a way that is large or important enough to have an effect on each other.
In the literature review was a discussion of Keietta-Latraill (2013). Does Distributive Leadership Impact Student Achievement and School Culture? In conducting a correlation analysis, the results revealed a relationship does not exist between distributive leadership and student achievement. Thus, the current findings are consistent with much of the current research discussed in Chapter 2 Keietta-Latraill (2013). In conducting a correlation analysis, indicated the existence of a weak correlation between distributed leadership and school effectiveness. Additionally, the current study failed to identify if this relationship influences student achievement. In a similar study conducted by Keietta-Latraill (2013) a qualitative research design was performed to study leadership and student achievement. The current study utilizes a qualitative method as previous studies which may be a contributing factor for a lack of correlation between student achievement and distributive leadership.

5.4 Conclusion

In light of the analysis and discussions carried out in the research, all the three forms of distributed leadership are practiced in the general secondary and preparatory schools in Gondar city administration, at low level. Meaning, there is no a formal structure in the school to provide teachers opportunities to participate in school level instructional decision making. The correlation between distributed leadership and Schools Effectiveness (SE) as measured by the 2016 standardized Grade 10 national Examination result were not correlated in a way that is large or important enough to have an effect on each other. However, the direction of the correlation is positive. Thus, it can be conclude that when distributed leadership is practiced in a better way the schools become effective and the student learning outcome will be improved.

5.5 Recommendations

The questions raised in this study were about distributed leadership practice and its relation to school effectiveness. The findings and conclusions revealed a positive even though weak correlation between distributed leadership and school effectiveness with in positive direction.

- To this effect, school principals need to distribute leadership roles across the staff members and organizations, for example vice- principals, department head and principals in other schools. This can improve school effectiveness by building capacity for continuous improvement, for addressing within-school variation and for succession planning. This may require developing incentives and development opportunities to reward and support participation and performance in distributed leadership teams.

- The principal should provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues, to participate in school level Instructional decision making and leadership in improving academic achievement subject departments should aim to improve teaching and learning.

- Since, high degree of distributed leadership practice in schools improves school effectiveness; principals of schools need to delegate some of schools’ duties by establishing a flexible administrative structure to participate and involved teachers in the schools’ leadership roles beyond their classroom.

- The role of principal’s practice on distributive leadership in the school should be related to the teachers discussing and helping one another to solve problems, teachers talking with one another about teaching and the curriculum, and teachers meeting frequently with instructional aides or specialists to discuss about the school effectiveness to improve the learning outcomes of student.

- Principals must be work on ‘the operation of distributive leadership throughout the school in a manner which enables people to work together to improve teaching and learning by creating the conditions for teachers to work collaboratively and exercise influence over each other for acknowledging and developing leadership among a wide range of teachers.

- In order to create effective schools and improve the students’ learning outcomes educational sectors have to provide more emphasis for principals with training opportunities to make principals play important roles in distributing leadership practice among teachers.
• Teachers should perceive themselves to be leaders and they have to see themselves as leaders of their students within beyond the classroom, having a direct influence on their learning by being full participants in the process of school effectiveness.

• Further investigation is needed on the roles principal play on distributive leadership and its relation on school effectiveness by considering additional dimensions of distributive leadership, by taking in account different results of studies on the same Title at large scale and large sampling size.

5.6 Suggestions For Further Research

This study was an initial investigation to determine the role of principal in distributed leadership practice and its relationship to school effectiveness. The Distributed Leadership Scale was designed to measure the relationship between each of the three forms of distributed leadership and school Effectiveness.

In future studies, researchers might focus on other grade levels. With additional studies that assess the relationship between distributed leadership and school Effectiveness beyond General secondary and preparatory school. Subsequent studies might consider collecting teacher perceptions of the practice of distributed leadership multiple times during a school year as well as employing larger sample sizes and including a different geographic makeup. Moreover, further research examining the responses of teachers and administrators, and even students and parents on the variables of the current study should be conducted.

ACHRONYMS UESD IN THE STUDY:
AREB-Amhara Regional Education Bureau, DLRS-Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale, EDPM-Educational Planning and Management, ESM-Experience Sampling Method, ETP-Education and Training Policy, GEQIP-General Education Quality Improvement Package, IP-Institutional Practice, IWR-Intuitive Working Relations, LOLSO-Leadership for Organizational Learning and Student Outcomes, MSA-Maryland School Assessment, OCBs-Organizational citizenship behaviors, OECD-Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OL-Organizational learning, PQ-Principal Questionnaire, PTA-Parent Teacher Association, SC-Spontaneous Collaborations, SE-School Effectiveness, SES-Socio Economic Status, SLECMAQ-School Leadership, Environment,ClassroomManagement Assessment Questionnaire, SPSS-Statistical Package for Social Science, SSQ-School Staff Questionnaire, UNESCO-United nation of education, science and cultural organization, USA-United States of America, USAID-United States Agency for International Development
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