

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The Practices and Challenges of Distributed
Leadership in Addis Ababa University

By
Dejene Leta

JULY, 2014
ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The Practices and Challenges of Distributed
Leadership in Addis Ababa University

**A Thesis Submitted to School of Graduate Studies
College of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Educational Planning and Management**

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of
Arts in Educational Leadership and Management

By

The Practices and Challenges of Distributed
Leadership in Addis Ababa University

By
Dejene Leta

Approved by the Board of Examiners

Hussein Kedir (PhD)
Chairman, Department
Graduate Committee

Signature

Date

Hussein Kedir (PhD)
Advisor

Signature

Date

Befekdadu Zeleke (PhD)
Internal Examiner

Signature

Date

Seleshi Zeleke (PhD)
External Examiner

Signature

Date

DECLARATION

I, the under signed, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other University, and that all the sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Dejene Leta

Signature_____

Date_____

Confirmed by:

Hussein Kedir (PhD)

Signature _____

Date_____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all I would like to experience my sincere gratitude to my advisor Dr. Hussein Kedir without him this thesis would not be possible. Dr., thank you for your guidance, encouragement, and invaluable comments throughout this process.

I cannot begin to list everyone who helped me but I extend my thanks to each of them, especially to Mussie, Befekadu, Abenet, Amare, Tena, Abeyot, Betty, Fantish, Million, Tilahun and Yonas who helped and encouraged me during my stay in the university.

I would like to acknowledge the support and encouragement of my brother Habtamu Leta (who knows the values of education from the outset and doing his best to make my dream become reality) and Alemayehu Leta and my sister Elfresh Leta.

Dejene Leta
AAU, July2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	Pages
Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables.....	v
Acronyms and abbreviation	vi
Abstract.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	6
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	7
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	7
1.6. Limitation of the Study	7
1.7. Definitions of Key Terms.....	8
1.8. Organization of the Study.....	8
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE.....	9
2.1. The Concept of Leadership	9
2.2 Trait Theories of Leadership	10
2.3 Behavioral Theories of Leadership	10
2.3.1 The Hawthorne Studies	10
2.3.2 The Iowa Studies	11
2.3.3The Ohio State Studies	11
2.3.4 University of Michigan Studies	12
2.3.5 The Managerial Grid	13
2.4 Contingency Theories of Leadership	13
2.4.1. Fiedler’s Contingency Model	14
2.4.2. Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Theory.....	14
2.4.3. House’s Path Goal Theory	15
2.5. Leader Member Exchange Model.....	16
2.6. Leader Participation Model	16
2.7. Recent Approaches to Leadership	16

2.7.1. Attribution Theory of Leadership	16
2.7.2. Charismatic Leadership Theory	17
2.7.3. Visionary leadership Theory.....	17
2.7.4. Transactional and Transformational Leadership.....	18
2.8. The Notion of Distributive Leadership.....	19
2.9. The Theoretical Origins of Distributive Leadership.....	19
2.11. Distributed Leadership: A Re- Emerging Concept.....	20
2.10.1. A form of collective Leadership.....	21
2.10.2. Recognizing other people’s Expertise.....	21
2.10.3 Openness of the Boundaries.....	22
2.10.4. Interactions among leaders, followers and situations.....	22
2.11. Aspects of Distributive leadership.....	23
2.11.1. The Leader Plus Aspect.....	23
2.11.2. The Practice Aspect.....	23
2.12. The Changing Context of Higher Education.....	23
2.13. Distributed Leadership in Higher Education.....	24
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	27
3.1. The Research Method	27
3.2. Sources of Data.....	27
3.3. Sample and Sampling Technique.....	27
3.4. Instruments and Procedure of Data Collection.....	28
3.4. Instruments of Data Collection	28
3.4.2. Procedures of Data Collection.....	28
3.5. Method of Data Analysis.....	29
CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
OF DATA.....	30
4.1 Characteristics of the Respondents	30
4.2 Presentation and Discussion of Data	31
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND	
RECOMMENDATIONS	43
5.1. Summary.....	43
5.1.1. Major Findings.....	44

5.2. Conclusions.....	47
5.3. Recommendations.....	49
References	
Appendices	

LIST OF TABLES

Title	Pages
Table 1: Department / Centers of Respondents.....	30
Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents by Age and Sex.....	31
Table 3: Respondents Qualification and Academic Rank	32
Table 4: Work experience of Respondents.....	33
Table 5: Respondents Perception about distributed leadership.....	34
Table 6: Instructors' Opinion about Leadership Practice in AAU.....	35
Table 7: Major Problems of Distributed Leadership Practice in AAU.....	37
Table8: Contribution of Distributed Leadership to Better Teaching Research and Community Services.....	39
Table 9: Possible Solutions for Effective Practice of Distributed Leadership.....	41

Acronyms and abbreviation

AAU: Addis Ababa University

CBE: College of Business and Economics

CDS: College of Development Studies

CEBS: College of Education and Behavioral Studies

CNS: Colleges of Natural Science

CSS: College of Social Science

LPC: Least Preferred Co-worker

HEIs: Higher Education Institutions

SD: Standard Deviation

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to scrutinize the practice and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University. In order to meet the objectives of the study, descriptive survey method was employed. From 248, instructors, 78 instructors from 6 colleges, 3 deans from College of Social Science (CSS); College of Business and Economics CBE); Colleges of Natural Science (CNS); College of Development and Environmental Studies (CDS), College of Education and Behavioral Studies (CEBS) and College of Law and Governance Studies were selected for the study. Instructors were selected by Simple random sampling technique. Available sampling technique was used to select college deans. Questionnaire containing open and close-ended items, and semi structured interview, rating order and items constructed in terms of Likert scale were employed in the process of data gathering. The data obtained through the questionnaires were analyzed using frequency, percentages, mean, standard deviations, and rank order. The information obtained through open-ended questionnaires and the interviews were organized to supplement the quantitative data. Findings from the data analysis revealed that most instructors in AAU moderately perceived the features of distributed leadership. It was also noted that the leadership structure of the university moderately entertain the practice of distribution leadership. Furthermore, the study revealed that instructors participation in decision-making responsibilities beyond their own classroom and department functions and their collaboration to achieve the collective ambition of the university were undersized. Lack of team work, loose tie among college deans, department heads and instructors and lack of shared responsibility among instructors were the major challenges that deter the practice of distributed leadership practice in AAU. On the other hand, the study showed that ensuring well- built relation amongst college deans department heads and instructors, persuade team work and shared responsibility, creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership and collective responsibility, ensuring smooth collegial relationship amongst instructors were the major solutions to the problems. College deans and department head work hand in hand to strengthen as well as guarantee the participation of instructors in the decision making process of their respective college, ensuring, team work, strong relationship, shared responsibility and creating favorable conditions for effective practices of distributed leadership in the university were the major recommendations forwarded in the study.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter covers the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitations of the study, limitations of the study definition of key terms, and organization of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

Leadership is a complex phenomenon that exists in any organization where the need of inspiring and influencing members of the given organization. Gronn (2002) states leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal in the organization. Universities as educational organization adapt and apply different types of leadership approach that fits the existing context to achieve their own mission and goals. However the old way of leading people in this very flux and turbulent world become the risky job for university leaders. Besides, very swift global trends and local demands of higher education make the size and complexity of universities too big to lead. So, I believed that, in order to address these issues, the need of suitable leadership style that is able and capable of dealing with the existing reality and challenges is very decisive factor for most universities, if not all.

Universities experience multivariate challenges such as increased customer demands, competition, a need to deliver high quality teaching, research and engaging more actively in community service. These and other similar challenges of universities elsewhere in the world most aptly cannot be solved by traditional leadership style of the top-down approach where the leader leads, makes key decisions, motivates, and inspires other alone. Gronn (2002) states that interest has grown within organization studies in alternative models of leadership in which leadership is not limited to the formally appointed leader who envisions and act single-handedly. He further suggests that the distributed perspective introduces a dynamic understanding of leadership according to which leadership is no longer individually conceived. He argues against traditional approaches of leadership based on the assumption of the superiority of the leader and the dependence of followers on leaders no longer at work. Deem (2001) states that the concept of distributed leadership has been suggested as a response to new challenges posed toward higher

education institutions based on the understanding that mere hierarchical leadership practices are not well suited to global complexity.

Spillane (2006) states distributed leadership is a system of practice comprised of a collection of interacting components of leaders, followers, and situation. These interacting components must be understood together because the system is more than the sum of the component parts. He also found that ‘followers’ – those not designated as holders of formal leadership roles also contribute to leadership. However, distributed leadership goes beyond acknowledging that multiple individuals are involved in leadership practice and exploring the interactions between individuals and investigating the situation in which leadership is enacted. A distributed perspective on leadership is not a prescription for leadership but instead a lens or tool that we can use to examine leadership. A distributed perspective breaks away from the wonder woman, superman dilemma of leadership by focusing on the practice of leadership, not just the leader (Spillane, 2006)

Distributed leadership has become a popular representation of leadership which has encouraged a shift in focus from the attributes and behaviors of individual ‘leaders’ (as promoted within traditional trait, behavioral, situational, and transformational theories of leadership to a more systemic perspective, whereby ‘leadership’ is conceived of as a collective social process emerging through the interactions of multiple actors (Uhl-Bien, 2006). From this perspective, it is argued that:

Distributed leadership is not something ‘done’ by an individual ‘to’ others, or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization . . . [it] is a group activity that works through and within relationships, rather than individual action. (Bennett et al. 2003).

Hence, in my opinion, distributed leadership is a means that gives opportunity to members of the given organization to take leadership responsibility and boost their commitment to the overall goal attainment of the organization rather than relied on individual leaders because a shared vision can be attained more efficiently through shared responsibility

However, according to Simkins (2005), distributed leadership does not deny the importance of the role of individuals in formal leadership positions but assumes that it is part of the issue rather

than being the central unit of analysis. This approach has also been referred to as dispersed, “shared” or “collective” leadership where individuals at different levels of the organization can influence colleagues and the overall course of the organization.

University, by organizational feature experience collegial relationship amongst academic staff where the need of shared or collective leadership considered as a very important apparatus to attain the pre planned goals. However, in practice, the leadership and decision making power tilted to the top leaders only. As a result, around the world university under pressure to change in order to adapt a leadership approach that satisfies both the academic staff and societal expectations. University expected to create knowledge; conduct researches and provide community services to respond students’ needs and societal expectations. These challenges coupled with their unique features, such as academic freedom; collegial relationship; specialized and qualified academic staff; and its relative open boundary stimulate higher education policy makers and leaders to look in to distributed leadership approach to disperse and share leadership among the various members of the university in a range of degree and manner to realize the shared vision as per prescribed time frame or too soon.

Discussion about whether a distributed leadership model may be an appropriate alternate frame of leadership for the education sector has existed for some years. Scholars in the field of leadership argue that academic leadership exists in a highly specialized and professional, non-hierarchical environment that requires a practical and everyday process of supporting, managing, developing and inspiring academic colleagues. In line with this perspective, Jones and Novak (2009) state that leadership in universities should be by everyone from the Vice Chancellor to the casual car parking attendant, leadership is to do with how people relate to each other. Bolden et al. (2003), focused their study on leadership at the department level assuming that “this is the main operational unit of universities, the primary source of future senior academic leaders, and the main point of interface between leadership of the institution and leadership of the academic discipline”.

According to Camburn (2003), distributed model of leadership provides such a middle ground in which leadership in higher education occurs within the context of the transitory nature of many roles in learning and teaching and the various contributions of roles between academics and professional staff. Universities demand a sound leadership that enables everyone in the

organization to develop a shared vision, develop a culture of innovation and continual improvement, and taking positive action to enable everyone in the organization contribute their full potential towards the vision and their work (Camburn,2003).

Like the rest of the education sector the majority of research on leadership higher education concludes that leadership in universities is widely distributed Middlehurst, (1993) states leadership should be distributed across the institution. Despite this, however, the actual processes and practices by which leadership is distributed and the implications for leadership practice and development in universities have received relatively little attention. In nut shell, my goal in this study is to investigate the perception, practices, and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Universities impact and are impacted by the supra environment. In order to respond to the changing environment, they are expected to involve actively in teaching, research and community services more than ever. On time and proportional response to the ever changing milieu requires new way of leadership approach that encompasses member of the academic staff in decision making in various degree and size. However, despite these continuous and progressive changes of the global aspects, the leadership style of most universities are traditional top-down approach where a decision making power significantly in the hand of top leaders. This nature of universities with respect to leadership styles most probably deters them for timely realization of their vision and mission. Hence, applying leadership style that fit and outdone the harsh and turbulent milieu is not a matter of option, rather it is an issue of survival. In my opinion, universities that encourages leaders to share responsibilities and authority to member of the organization through distributed perspective are not only successful universities in their multivariate endeavors, but also they are able to equipped themselves with the necessary apparatuses to fight or flight the dynamic global phenomenon.

Spillane et al. (2004), state that research on distributed forms of leadership is still at its early stages and the available empirical evidence about it is not abundant. Besides, the characteristics and application of distributed leadership in higher education have not been adequately explored.

Nevertheless, Hulpia and Devos (2010) explored the link between distributed leadership and teachers' organizational commitment through semi-structured interviews with teachers. They found that teachers were more committed to the school when school leaders were highly accessible and encouraged their participation in decision making. In another study, Leithwood, et.al. (2009), examined the relationship between distributed leadership and teachers' academic optimism. According to their findings, there was a significant association between planned approaches to the distribution of leadership and high levels of academic optimism.

Similarly, Harris (2008), after comprehensive overviews of the literature states that focus has been increasing on distributed leadership in higher education. Bryman (2009), on other research aimed to develop recommendations on how leadership and leadership development can be enhanced, particularly through encouraging collective engagement with the leadership process and then he concludes that academic leaders need to create an environment or context for academics and others to fulfill their potential and interest in their work if leadership and leadership development takes place, as opposed to focusing solely on the traits and capabilities of individual leaders. Bolden et.al (2008) state that "successful university leadership requires the dynamic interplay between a range of factors and priorities at a number of levels: individual, social, structural/organizational, contextual and developmental" Pearce and Sims (2002) also found that distributed leadership patterns lead to higher performance as compared to traditional 'leader-dominated' leadership patterns.

Therefore, from the above mentioned researches and insights one can easily conclude that distributed leadership play paramount role for the overall, goal/s attainment of higher education in general and universities in particular, if the nature, potency and flaw of distributed leadership with respect of educational organizations clearly studied. Consequently, the purposes of the study is to investigate the practices, and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University

The present-day reputation of the idea of distributed leadership and its consequent causes for the overall activities and leadership of universities gives rise to the research questions for this study. To fulfill the purposes of the study, the following research questions are identified regarding practices and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University:

1. How do instructors and college deans perceive the practice of distributed leadership?
2. To what extent do instructors participate in the leadership practices of the university?
3. What are the major challenges that affect the practice of distributed leadership in the university?
4. What are the possible measures being taken for effective practices of distributed leadership in the university?
5. To what extent does distributed leadership contribute to better teaching, research and community services of the university

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to investigate the practices and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University

To this end, the study was targeted to achieve the following specific objectives to:-

1. Look into academic staff perception about distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University.
2. Investigate the participation of instructors in leadership practices of Addis Ababa University
3. Identify the major challenges that affects the practices of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University
4. Recommend possible solutions for effective practice of distributed leadership in the University

5. To look in to the contribution of distributed leadership for better teaching, research and community service of the University.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The study has the following importance for academic staff of the University and other concerned bodies.

1. The results of the study may help university leadership to solve practical leadership challenges in the university.
2. The findings and recommendations of the study may provide clear insight into the existing practices and pitfalls of distributed leadership for higher education leadership policy makers
3. The results of this study may be used as a footstep for those who want to engage in further study on similar issue.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to Addis Ababa University. The study also restricted to academic staff of the university focused on distributed leadership practices and challenges. The study also enclosed to six colleges. These are: College of Social Science (CSS); College of Business and Economics (CBE); Colleges of Natural Science (CNS); College of Development Studies (CDS); College of Law and Governance Studies and College of Education and Behavioral Studies (CEBS).

1.6 Limitations of the Study

The extended time taken by respondents of AAU to fill the questionnaires and conducting interview, caring out research with routine office work, lack of current local studies related to the topic researched and shortage of time had not been the problems, the research would have been comprehensive and deepened.

1.7 Definitions of Key Terms

Leadership: It is an act of having influence on the activities of an organized group in its attempts to set and achieve its goals (Stodgill, 1997).

Distributed leadership: A leadership approach that emphasizes on social influence process aimed at achieving some collective goals (Yukl, 2002).

Academic rank: refers to the professional status of instructors at the time of this study.

Academic staff: those employees that are engaged in teaching activities.

1.8 Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters. Chapter one provides background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitations of the study, and definition of key terms were included. In the second Chapter relevant review of the related literature was incorporated. The third Chapter presented research design and methodology which included research method, data sources, sample population and sampling technique, instruments of data collection, procedures of data collection, and data analysis. The fourth Chapter dealt with presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data. The last Chapter included the summary, major findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents related literature that helps to enrich the study. The literature deals with the concept of leadership, the major theories of leadership, leadership member exchange models, leadership participation model, current approaches of leadership, the notion of distributed leadership, the theoretical origin of distributed leadership, distributed leadership as emerging concept, aspects of distributed leadership, the changing context of higher education and finally it treats distributed leadership in higher education.

2.1 The Concept of Leadership

Leadership has been a complex phenomenon about which many theories have been developed. There are numerous definitions about what it is and under what conditions it reveals itself. As Tead (1935) describes, it is an “... activity of influencing people to cooperate towards same goal which they come to find desirable.” As it can be understood from that statement it necessitates an interaction between the two constituents: those who lead and those who follow. Leaders cannot exist without followers and vice versa (Slater, 1995).

Moreover, for ages, people have been looking for direction, purpose and meaning to guide their collective activities. Leadership is needed to foster purpose, direction, imagination, and passion, especially in times of crisis or rapid change. At such times people look to leaders for hope, inspiration, and a pathway which will lead them to somewhere more desirable (Bolman and Deal, 1994).

As leadership has had a great impact on the culture, history, and civilization of humankind, theoretical explanations for it have been offered throughout history. Although the term leadership is mostly associated with industry and business, it is of great importance to education as well. In order to have clear understanding about the various stages and development of leadership, the major theories of leadership have been elucidated underneath.

2.2 Trait Theories of Leadership

The study of special traits of leaders emerged from the belief that leadership and abilities such as intelligence were inherited. In addition to intelligence other factors such as birth order, status and liberal parents highly correlate with leadership.

This approach dominated the study of leadership up to the 1950s. It tried to define any distinguishing physical or psychological characteristics of the individual that explains the behavior of leaders (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). It claims that leadership ability is inborn. As the distinguished philosopher Aristotle (cited in Hoy & Miskel, 1991) enunciates that ‘‘from the hour of birth, some are marked out for subjection, others for rule.’

However, some shortcomings of this approach were identified. Firstly, it is not clarified which of the traits are most important and which are not. Secondly, some traits overlap. For example, tact, judgment, and common sense are listed as separate traits but the last one covers the preceding ones. Thirdly, trait studies do not distinguish between traits helping to become a leader and those enabling it to be maintained. Fourthly, most trait studies are descriptive. There is an assumption that the leader’s traits existed prior to leadership and most of them have failed to approach the study of personality as an organized whole.

2.3 Behavioral Theories of Leadership

Behavioral studies of leadership aim to identify behaviors that differentiate leaders from non-leaders (Robbins, 1998). Behavioral theories of leadership support that a set of particular behaviors can be named as a style of leadership. Leadership style refers to a distinctive behavior adopted by persons in formal positions of leadership (Campbell, et al., 1966) and several studies were conducted to identify those.

2.3.1 The Hawthorne Studies.

The Hawthorne studies were carried out between 1927 and 1932 at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Plant in the United States. In one of these studies a group of women workers who were assembling relay switches for telephones was moved to a special room and a series of

changes were introduced whose impact on productivity was investigated. The researchers concluded that every change increased production. Employees inferred that management cared about them and responded by working more productively. The “Hawthorne effect” is named after this phenomenon of working harder because of feelings of participation in something important (Roberts and Hunt, 1991).

2.3.2 The Iowa Studies

An attempt to identify different styles of leader behavior on the group was conducted at the University of Iowa by a group of scientists. The researcher’s came up with three leadership styles to determine their effect on the attitudes and productivity of the subordinates. Authoritarian leaders were very directive and did not allow any participation in the decision-making process. They assume full authority and responsibility from initiation to task completion. Democratic leaders promoted group discussion and decision-making. They encouraged subordinates to express their ideas and make suggestions. Laissez-faire leaders let the group decide on their own and gave them complete freedom. In other words, they do not provide any leadership at all. Some of the implications of the research were that of the three styles of leadership, subordinates preferred democratic style the best. They also preferred laissez-faire leadership style over the authoritarian one. Authoritarian leaders receive aggressive or apathetic behavior from their subordinates. Productivity was slightly higher under the authoritarian leader than under the democratic one. However, it turned out to be the lowest under the laissez-faire leader’s supervision (Lambert, 1998).

2.3.3. The Ohio State Studies

The Ohio State Leadership studies represent an interdisciplinary undertaking. Psychologists, sociologists and economists were the major contributors. Not all projects used the same methods to measure leadership behavior; The leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was employed. This questionnaire has been used in order to study the leadership behaviors of commanders, and crew members of bomber crews in the Department of the Air Force, commissioned officers, non-commissioned personnel and civilian administrators in the Department of the Navy, foremen in a manufacturing plant, executives in regional cooperative associations, college administrators,

school superintendents, principals and teachers, leaders in a wide variety of student and civilian groups and organizations (Stodgill and Coons, 1957).

The question of how a leader behaves was an important motive which urged the researchers to develop a method. The way a leader carries out activities had become the major core of interest common to all individual research activities of the staff members. Therefore, it was decided to make the development of a leader description instrument which aimed at identifying the methods and strategies of a leader (Hemphill and Coons, 1957).

After an extensive factor analysis of all the items in The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, two scores were obtained: Consideration refers to behavior on the part of a leader which is characterized by warm and friendly relations with the group members and concern for the welfare of the group. Initiating structure also refers to activities on the part of a leader that introduce new ways of doing things, and new procedures for solving group problems (Hemphill, 1957).

Hoy & Miskel (1991) challenge that initiating structure represents any leader behavior that clearly outlines the relationship between the leader and the subordinates establishing defined patterns of the organization, channels of communication, and procedures at the same time. However, consideration reflects leader behavior that shows friendship, trust, warmth, interest, and respect.

2.3.4 University of Michigan Studies

Katz and Kahn (1966) consider leadership to be over and above mechanical compliance with the routine defectiveness of the organization as an organization consists of human beings in positions of authority and power rather than computers. In terms of the differences between the cognitive orientation and affective style of the leader, there are two basic dimensions of the leader-follower relationship which are task direction and socio-economic supportiveness.

There are two distinct styles of leadership: Production-oriented and Employee centered which are at opposite ends of the same continuum. Production-oriented leaders valued mission or task accomplishment and the technical aspects of the job. Employee-centered leaders delegated decision-making and assist followers in satisfying their needs in a supportive work environment (Hoy and Miskel, 1991).

In terms of effectiveness, a leader who successfully integrates primary and secondary relationships within the organization is the best. Primary relationships refer to face to face interaction and tend to be person specific such as relationships in the families or among friends whereas secondary relations refer to interpersonal relationships required by organizational role such as in the case of division of labor. Thus, a successful leader integrates organizational requirements with the needs persons and he does this in ways which are not damaging to the organization, but enhancing it. The leader achieves this through promoting group loyalty and showing care for persons as persons (Katz & Kahn, 1966).

2.3.5 The Managerial Grid

The Managerial Grid or recently called as The Leadership Grid is a framework to classify leadership styles that focus on a leader's concern for task accomplishment and people at the same time. Concern for production involves results, the bottom line, performance, mission, and profits. Concern for people involves group members and co-workers. Each of these concerns is in varying degrees along a continuum from 1 to 9. Leaders can integrate their concerns for people with production to be opportunistic or paternalistic/materialistic. The opportunistic leader moves to any Grid style needed to achieve personal gain and self-promotion, but the paternalistic/materialistic adopts the high 9 level of concern from 9, 1 and 1, 9 in order to create a combined style of monitoring parent-like behavior. On the Grid, a 9, 9 styles (team management) are desirable in that it results in high productivity, satisfaction, and creativity (DuBrin, 1997).

2.4 Contingency Theories of Leadership

The contingency view of leadership emerged from systems theory and its impact on organizational and administrative theory. According to this model, specific leader behaviors relate to group performance and satisfaction. In order to achieve this, certain variables interact with each other such as the leader himself, the position he holds, group members, internal, and external environment of the organization. A successful match between the leader and the group's performance and satisfaction is 'contingent' upon these variables. Three situational variables intervene between the leader's style and effectiveness which are leader-member relations, task

structure, and power position. Groups are classified as either favorable or unfavorable based on these criteria (Monahan and Hengst, 1982).

2.4.1 Fiedler's Contingency Model

Fiedler (1967) claims that if organizational performance is to be improved, we must cope not only with the leader's style but also with the situational factors which influence him/her. Organizational performance can be improved either by the leader's fit to the situation or the situation's fit to the leader. He also states that leadership traits, if exist at all, would be exposed to many outside effects. Therefore, they are difficult to identify. He argues that a variety of causes may force a man to become a leader, many of which are totally unrelated to personality attributes one of which is inheritance of leadership.

He suggests that dealing with leadership effectiveness would be more logical and beneficial on the grounds that the ability to motivate other people may well be dependent upon one or more personality traits. A leader is effective to the extent to which he renders his group more productive. Thus, a leadership effectiveness trait can be termed as a consistent and measurable personality attributes which separates effective leaders from ineffective ones. However, the behavior related with these traits will reveal itself only under appropriate conditions

Fiedler also developed a semantic differentiating instrument through which the leader rated the co-worker with whom he worked least well called Least Preferred Co-worker Questionnaire (LPC). Leaders who rated their least preferred co-worker positively and favorably were classified as "relationship motivated" and those who rated their least preferred co-worker negatively and unfavorably were defined as "task motivated" (Monahan & Hengst, 1982).

2.4.2 Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Theory

According to this approach, leadership is the process of influencing individuals or groups activities in their efforts to goal achievement in a give situation. From this definition of leadership, it can be understood that the leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower, and the situation. The focus of the situational approach to leadership is on observed behavior, not on any hypothetical inborn or acquired ability or potential for leadership. Utmost

importance is attached to the behavior of leaders, their group members (followers) and various situations. Thus, training individuals in adapting styles of leader behavior to varying situations is of prime importance. Therefore, through education, training and development most people can increase their effectiveness in leadership roles. By observing frequency or infrequency of certain leader behavior in numerous types of situations, theoretical models can be developed so as to aid a leader to adopt the most appropriate leader behavior for the present situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969).

This model claims that the most effective leadership style is contingent upon the readiness level of the group members. It has two components: Ability refers to the skill, knowledge and experience an individual or group brings to a particular task and willingness refers to confidence, motivation, and commitment an individual or group has in order to achieve a specific task. The crucial aspect of situational leadership theory is that a leader should depend more on relationship behavior and less on task behavior as readiness level of the group members increases. Minimum of task and relationship behavior is required when a group member is very ready (DuBrin, 1997).

2.4.3 House's Path-Goal Theory

Path-goal theory focuses on how leaders influence followers' expectations. Robert House, the originator of the theory, proposes a model in which leader behavior unacceptable when employees regard it as a source of satisfaction (Kreitner&Kinicki, 1995). In addition to this, leader behavior is motivational when it eliminates factors that hinder goal accomplishment; provides guidance and support to the employees, and grants meaningful rewards in return for success. House claims that the leader should stay on the right path to achieve challenging goals. In contrast to Fiedler, who supports that leaders have one dominant leadership style, House believes that leaders can display more than one.

Directive leadership is providing guidance to employees about the task to be accomplished and ways to do it. Supportive leadership is being friendly, approachable, and concerned for the well-being and needs of the employees. Participative leadership is collaborating with the employees and taking their ideas into consideration during the decision-making process. Achievement-oriented leadership is setting high standards and challenging goals for the employees by encouraging them to perform at their highest level (Kreitner&Kinicki, 1995).

2.5 Leader Member Exchange Model

This model developed by George Graen and his followers challenges the well established assumption that leadership behavior is consistent. It proposes that a leader might be caring and considerate toward a team member yet uncaring and strict toward another (DuBrin, 1997). Each of these pairs of relationships or dyads must be evaluated in terms of whether the group member is “in” or “out” with the leader. The leader’s first impression of a group member’s competency has a strong impact of the group member’s belonging to the in-group or the out-group. In-group members have similar values and attitudes with the leader. However, out-group members do not have much in common with the leader and act somewhat detached from him. In-group members can become a part of a smooth functioning team whereas out-group members are unlikely to achieve good teamwork (DuBrin, 1997).

2.6 Leader Participation Model

Leader Participation Model is based on five modes of decision-making, which ranged from highly autocratic to fully consultative. The effectiveness of a mode depended upon several contingent factors which can be summed up as information sufficiency, structure of the problem, and subordinate attitudes and relationship with the leader (Sinha, 1995). This theory is normative in nature as it prescribes a set of rules to determine the form and amount of participative decision making in different situations.

This model indicates that leadership studies should be geared towards the situation not the leader. It is probably more sensible to talk about participative autocratic situations than leaders who possess these characteristics as leader behavior alters depending on the situation and a leader can adjust his or her style to different situations (Robbins, 1998).

2.7 Recent Approaches to Leadership

2.7.1 Attribution Leadership Theory

According to this theory, people have hidden leadership theories in their minds about what makes a good leader or, in another words, they have a leadership prototype; an image of a model leader. These implicit theories or prototypes refer to a mix of specific and more general

characteristics. The leader is favorable provided that he or she appeals to the implicit theories of the followers. Leadership is regarded as something to be largely symbolic and in “the eye of the beholder” (Schermerhorn et. al., 1994). One of the most interesting aspects of this theory is that effective leaders are associated with consistency in the decision making phase (Robbins, 1998).

2.7.2 Charismatic Leadership Theory

Sinha (1995) defines charisma as a “magical aura” which only a few leader may be granted. Max Weber (cited in Sinha, 1995) maintains that there are three bases of authority which are traditions, rights and privileges and charisma which is synonymous with heroism and an exemplary character of a person.

Owing to his character, strength and skill, super human qualities are attributed to a leader who saves his followers from a crisis or a catastrophic event and becomes an idol providing direction and inspiration to his followers. The charismatic leader attaches utmost importance to his vision, speech, capacity to take risks and above all the emotions of his subordinates (Sinha, 1995). Robert J. House (as cited in DuBrin, 1997) identified nine effects which charismatic leaders have on their followers such as group member’s trust in the correctness of the leader’s beliefs, congruence between the leader’s and the group’s beliefs, acceptance of the leader, affection for the leader, willing obedience to the leader, identification with and admiration for the leader, emotional involvement of the group member in the mission, challenging goals of the group member and belief in the accomplishment of the mission.

2.7.3 Visionary Leadership

Visionary leadership is the ability to create and express a realistic, attainable, and attractive vision of the future for organizations which grow continuously. Visionary leaders should create inspiring and innovative visions for their organizations rendering them credible in the eyes of the people in the organization at the same time

Visionary leaders have three qualities, which are related to their effectiveness. First, is the ability to explain and articulate the vision to the others. Second, is to express the vision not just verbally but through the leader’s behavior. Third, is to communicate the vision to different leadership

contexts. For example, the vision of the organization should appeal to employees in different departments (Robbins, 1998).

2.7.4 Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Since the late 1970s, transactional and transformational leadership has been a topic of discussion among leadership theorists, and was strongly influenced by the work of Burns (as cited in Yukl, 2010). Transactional leadership approaches followers with an eye to exchange one thing for another – e.g. job for votes, more work for better wages (Yukl, 2010). A transactional leader inspires followers by appealing to their self-interests. Transactional leaders are good for keeping things running smoothly. Values in a transactional organization include: honesty, fairness, responsibility and reciprocity. Burns (as cited in Yukl, 2010) also identified a second form of leadership from his studies, transformational leadership. Burns (as cited in Yukl, 2010) contended that a transformational leader is concerned with appealing to the moral values of his/her followers, to raise their self-consciousness about ethical issues, and to work in synergy to reform institutions.

Bass (1990) conducted additional research on transactional and transformational leadership. He posited a distinction between transactional and transformational leadership defined in terms of behaviors to influence followers (Bass, 1990). According to Bass (1990), transformational leaders recognized and sought to satisfy the needs of followers by engaging the full person. In addition, the transformational leader created a synergy in the organization by inspiring others to embrace and achieve collective goals. Bass (1990) maintained that transformational leaders have a moral imperative. He also asserted that transformational leaders must have a certain amount of charisma to get followers to transcend self-interests for the interests of the organization (Bass, 1990).

Bass and Avolio later developed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to measure a broad range of leadership types, from passive leadership to transformational leadership. The conceptual basis for the factor structure for the MLQ began with Burns' description of transactional and transformational leadership. The MLQ measures transformational behaviors – idealized influence, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation, and two transactional behaviors, contingent reward and passive management by exception. Bass and Avolio identified a third

dimension to leadership, laissez faire. The MLQ was, and is used today by organizations, to define leadership in relation to organizational effectiveness.

2.8 The Notion of Distributed Leadership

Given the fact that distributed leadership as an area of scientific inquiry is still in its infancy, a common understanding of distributed leadership has yet to be conceived of (Bennett et al. 2003; Day et al. 2004). Some authors use the term shared leadership (e.g., Pearce 2004; Pearce and Sims 2002) while others employ the term distributed leadership (e.g., Gronn 2002). At this point, there seems to be no clear conceptual differences between these approaches, and different authors use them interchangeably (e.g., Day et al. 2004). Besides the different terms employed, different authors diverge in their conceptualizations of distributed leadership on various grounds, including the scope of the network of participating agents in the leadership process. Some authors have focused on a single team or group of people as their unit of analysis (e.g., Brown and Hosking Pearce 2004), while others have taken a more open-systems approach, taking the whole organization and even constituencies beyond the organizational boundaries as their unit of analysis (e.g., Spillane et al. 2004). However, despite these differences most authors agree upon two principles as underpinning the concept of distributed leadership: firstly, leadership is a shared influence process to which several individuals contribute and secondly, leadership arises from the interactions of diverse individuals which together form a group or network in which essential expertise is a dispersed quality.

2.9 The Theoretical Origins of Distributed Leadership

While it is only really since the turn of the millennium that the concept of distributed leadership has been widely embraced by scholars and practitioners, the origins of the concept go back quite a bit further. Oduro (2004) suggests that accounts of distributed leadership date back as far as 1250 BC, making it 'one of the most ancient leadership notions recommended for fulfilling organizational goals through people'. In terms of its theorization, however, Harris (2009) proposes that it's an idea that can be traced back as far as the mid 20s and possibly earlier. Gronn (2000) cites Gibb (1954) as the first author to refer explicitly to distributed leadership when proposing that 'leadership is probably best conceived as a group quality, as a set of functions which must be carried out by the group'.

Distributed leadership, however, is not the only theory or approach to call for such a reframing of how we understand leadership. The notion of ‘shared leadership’ has also been in use for some time (Pearce and Conger, 2003), ‘collective leadership’ (Denis et al, 2001), “collaborative leadership” (Rosenthal, 1998), ‘co-leadership’ (Heenan and Bennis, 1999) and ‘emergent leadership’ (Beck, 1981), to name but a few. However one common across all these accounts is the idea that leadership is not the monopoly or responsibility of just one person, with each suggesting a similar need for a more collective and systemic understanding of leadership as a social process (Barker, 2001).

Harris (2009) tracks the underlying theoretical foundations of distributed leadership and summarizes its:

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

From the above statement, one can easily understand that distributed leadership in the organization can incorporate all leadership dimensions with the intent of ensuring learning among leaders and in particular and organizational learning in general

2.10 Distributed Leadership: A Re-Emerging Concept

The term “distributed leadership” means different things to different people. Distributed leadership is believed to have been used for the first time by Gibb (1954), an Australian psychologist, who drew attention to the dynamics of influence processes as they impact on the work of different groups. Gibb suggests that leadership should not be viewed as the monopoly of the individual but rather as shared functions among individuals. The belief that leadership is best considered a group quality has gradually gained widespread acceptance in the field of education. Harris, Leithwood, Day, Sammons and Hopkins (2007) describe distributed leadership as “the leadership idea of the moment”, while Gronn (2000) refers to this concept as “the new kid on the block”. A review of the educational administration literature suggests that the concept of

distributed leadership has been embraced with enthusiasm by educational researchers and scholars

In reviewing related literature, the following distinctive elements of the concept of distributed leadership can be discerned (Gronn, 2000; MacBeath, 2005; Timperley, 2005; Spillane, 2006).

2.10.1 A form of Collective leadership

In characterizing distributed leadership, Silins and Mulford (2002) describe it as, “sharing learning through teams of staff working together to argument the range of knowledge and skills available for the organization to change and participating future developments”. The notion of distributed leadership is characterized as a form of collective leadership in which staff develops expertise by working collaboratively which incorporates the activities of numerous individuals in the organization who work together in the process of organizational change. A distributed view of leadership recognizes that leading organization engages multiple leaders who share responsibilities and operate for a common cause. The basic perspective distributed leadership moves outlined by Yukl (2002) as follow:

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

2.10.2 Recognizing other people’s Expertise

Distributive leadership highlights leadership as an emergent property of a group or network of interacting individuals (Gronn, 2002).He identified the notion of distributed leadership as “an emergent property of a group or network of individuals “in which group members “pool” their expertise. It is not something “done” by an individual “to” others, or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization.

When people work together in such a way; they pull together their abilities and expertise. The outcome is greater than the sum of their individual actions. Distributed leadership perspectives focuses on how leaders encourage and sustain conditions for successful schooling in interaction

with others, rather than on what structures are necessary for success (Spillane et al., 2004). All in all, distributed leadership is about more than accounting for all the leaders in an organization and adding up their actions to arrive at some more wide-ranging account of leadership (Spillane, 2006). Therefore, by distributing responsibilities among staff, it is believed that every member of the organization has the capability to work as a leader (Lambert, 1998).

2.10.3 Openness of the Boundaries

Distributed leadership suggests openness of the boundaries of leadership. This idea suggests that leadership should be available to organizational members who demonstrate their expertise in different aspects with leadership delivered to them (Woods et al., 2004). Leadership is not confined to a traditional definition that espouses only one person in charge of the organization (Spillane et al, 2004). Moreover, distributed leadership supports the view that varieties of expertise are distributed across many, not the few. Numerous perspectives and capabilities found in individuals through the organization can build concentrated dynamic which represents more than the sum of the individual contributors. It is possible that people other than those experts will then adopt, adapt and improve them within a mutually trusting and supportive culture that expertise are distributed throughout the organization.

2.10.4 Interactions among leaders, followers and situations

A distributed perspective focuses on interactions among leaders, followers and their situations. Most scholars appear to agree that distributed leadership is not the same as dividing tasks among personnel who perform defined and separate organizational roles; they believe that distributed leadership consists of dynamic interactions between multiple leaders and followers (Timperley, 2005). According to Spillane (2006), a distributed perspective on leadership involves two aspects: the

The leader-plus aspect recognizes that leading and running an organization involves multiple leaders. Leader-plus aspect alone is vital but not sufficient for explaining the complexity of leadership. The conceptual framework of distributed leadership developed by Spillane (2006) moves beyond the leader-plus aspect. Distributed leadership means more than shared leadership. As leadership moves away from a "command and control" model to a more "cultivate and coordinate" model, the way that leadership is taught must change, too. The leadership practice

aspect moves the focus from traditional leadership beyond an individual's actions to the interactions among leaders, followers and their situations (Spillane, 2006)

2.11 Aspects of Distributed leadership

According to Spillane and Diamond (2007), distributed perspective involves two aspects- the leader plus aspect and the practice aspect

2.11.1 The Leader plus Aspect

A distributed perspective acknowledges that the work of leading and managing schools involves multiple individuals. Leadership and management work involves more than what individuals in formal leadership positions do. People in formally designated leadership and management positions and those without any such designations can and do take responsibility for leading and managing the schoolhouse Spillane & Diamond (2007). In this way, leading and managing transcend formal positions (MacBeath, 2006). A distributed perspective then acknowledges and takes account of the work of all the individuals who have a hand in leadership and management practice. Looking at who performs what leadership and management functions, a distributed perspective cautions against investigating school leadership and management by focusing chiefly on what formally designated leaders do Spillane & Diamond (2007)

2.11.2 The Practice Aspect

A distributed perspective foregrounds the practice of leading and managing. A distributed perspective frames this practice in a particular way; it frames it as a product of the interactions of school leaders, followers, and aspects of their situation. This distributed view of leadership shifts focus from leaders and other formal and informal leaders to the web of leaders, followers, and their situations that gives form to leadership practice Spillane & Diamond (2007). The principles of distributed leadership provide a means for overcoming some of the problems.

2.12 The Changing Context of Higher Education

Drastic changes have taken place in the organizational environment of higher education institutions the world over. These changes stemmed from the substantial alteration in the macro-environment, including that of the political and economic systems, and of the microenvironment

inherent in the national education systems (Clark,1998) With these changes currently facing the institutions, their environment is becoming more complex, diverse and hostile, and especially less affluence (Clark 1998) These authors have equally argued that the new environment, with the added uncertainty it brings, poses something of a challenge to the traditional university functions of education and research. It also raises questions as to the operational mechanisms, organizational, functional and management capacity of these university institutions to meet the requirements of increased enrolments, competitiveness and financial restrictions (Bayenet et al. 2000).

In order to confront this new environment, it has been a widely held view by experts and policy makers that universities should adopt new, more entrepreneurial form of organization to acquire the strategic capacity to adjust and meet the needs of the outside world in an independent, dynamic, structured and coherent manner (Clark 1998; Davis 1998). They acknowledge this strategy unanimously as prerequisite if universities are to adapt and survive in the changing world.

Universities have long been regarded as centers of knowledge creation and application for the larger society, but not as learning organizations developing and transferring knowledge for the improvement of their own basic processes. The new competitive environment of higher education throughout the world appears to be creating incentive for universities to become active learning organizations. These changes can be understood as fundamental change in the architecture of academic organizations (Davis, 1998).

2.13 Distributed leadership in Higher Education

Universities influence and are influenced by the environment. Scott (2009) state that universities actively contribute to research and development and assume responsibility for the education of professional workforces who lead and operate in such globalised economies. Universities are subjected to a growing list of demands and expectations of various parties who have an active interest in education for globalised work and informed citizenship. Students, the key consumers of higher education services, are becoming more diverse and demanding in terms of their requirements, and demands for services which fit their circumstances. These diverse needs and

expectations of the society need sound leadership approaches that comply with these changes and expectations.

According to Simkins (2005) states the role of leadership in educational institutions claims that the idea of leadership as being context-related and dispersed among people represents a more constructive framework to understand such organizations. The concept of distributed leadership has been suggested in connection with a shift in paradigms in the study of leadership in organizational theory.

Like the rest of the education sector the majority of research on leadership and management in higher education concludes that leadership in universities is widely distributed (e.g. Middlehurst, 1993; Knight and Trowler, 2001) or should be distributed across the institution (Shattock, 2003) Harris (2009) states that distributed leadership is a lens to understand leadership practice. It is a conceptual and analytical framework for studying leadership interaction in higher education.

Fullan (2006) see external environmental forces creating various challenges for higher education, and these challenges require universities to develop change capable cultures, and the broad base of leaders and leadership capabilities required to achieve this. The challenges cover the need for greater access to higher education, pressures for new sources of revenue, greater demands for user pay schemes and changing patterns of participation, and the changing expectations of students and growing diversity and consequent pressures on maintaining academic standards (FullanandScott, 2009).

Jones, Applebee, Harvey and Lefoe (2010) explicitly relate the value of distributed leadership back to external challenge confronting universities:

Distributed leadership is being researched for its potential to explore alternate approaches to leadership. Such alternative approaches are part of universities' response to the challenges of operating in the globally competitive market in which education is increasingly recognized for its economic value. The changes facing higher education over the last twenty years have resulted in many challenges throughout the sector, not least of which is the need to reshape governance structures. (Harvey and Lefoe, 2010).

According to Spillane et al., (2006), distributed leadership offers a powerful representation of leadership well suited to complex, changing and interdependent environments. The question remains, however, as to whether this represents the lived experience of leadership in higher

education or just an idealistic fantasy unattainable in practice. It could certainly be argued that the bureaucratic nature of universities, with their imbalances of power, authority and resources, combined with recognition and career paths that tend to reward individual over collective achievement are largely at odds with the principles and premises of distributed leadership. On a conceptual level, the notion of distributed leadership seems well aligned with notions of collegiality and professional autonomy which have traditionally been characteristic of higher education leadership, while also recognizing the wider institutional needs for effectively managing the changes that turbulent environments impose on Higher Education institutions

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This Chapter deals with research design, sources of data, sample and sampling techniques, instruments of data collection, procedures of data collection, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Method

In order to examine the practices and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University and to forward recommendations, it is essential to carry out a descriptive survey method. This is so because the method sets out to describe the insight, practice, challenges and solutions of distributed leadership in the University

3.2 Sources of Data

In this study, both primary and secondary sources of data were used to gather adequate information about the practice and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University. The primary sources were instructors and deans. The secondary sources were used to strengthen the primary sources. These include books, journals, and articles.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Techniques

Since the purpose of this study was to examine the practices and challenges of distributed leadership in AAU, the target population of this study was college deans, centers, department and instructors found in Addis Ababa University. As already indicated in the delimitation, the selection of six colleges conducted based on random sampling technique. In this regard, Leedy and Ormrod (2005) state that in simple random sampling technique, each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected.

College of Social Science (CSS); College of Business and Economics (CBE); Colleges of Natural Science (CNS); College of Development and Environmental Studies (CDS) and College of Law

and Governance Studies were selected for the study. From College of Social Science Department of Political Science and International Relation and Department of Philosophy from College of Business and Economics, Department of Public Administration and Developmental Management and Department of Economics, from Colleges of Natural Science Department of Chemistry and Department of Earth Science, from College of Development and Environmental Studies, Institute of Development Research and Institute of Gender Studies, from College of Law and Governance Studies, Center of Federal Studies and Center of Human Right Studies were selected using simple random sampling technique. To sum up, out of 248, instructors including department heads or center, 104 and from six colleges, a dean from each college was selected as a sample by available sampling technique. Though 110 respondents were included in the sample, Only 78 instructors and 3 college deans (totally 81 respondents) participated in the final analysis of the study.

3.4 Instruments and Procedures of Data Collection

3.4.1 Instruments of Data Collection

Two types of instruments were used in the process of necessary data gathering for the study. These were questionnaire, constructed in terms of closed and open ended items and semi structured interview. Questionnaire was used to collect data from instructors while interviews were carried out to collect information from college deans.

3.4.1.1 Questionnaire

Questionnaire was prepared and filled by AAU instructors. It was contained six parts designed to address the basic question of the study. The first part of the questionnaire was designed to obtain information on personal characteristics of the respondents. Items in the second part were designed to obtain information on the distributed leadership perception. The third part designed to acquire leadership practice in the university. The fourth part designed to obtain information regarding major problems of distributed leadership practice and the fifth and six parts were designed to obtain information about major solutions for effective practice of distributed leadership and distributed leadership contribution to better teaching, research and community services respectively

3.4.1.2 Interview

In addition to the questionnaires, unstructured interview was used to substantiate the information gathered by the questionnaire. The interview mainly addressed the practice of distributed leadership, the participation of instructors in the decision making process, college deans leadership roles, major problems observed regarding the practice of distributed leadership, major remedies about the problems and the contribution of distributed leadership to better teaching, research and community service in the university.

3.4.2 Procedures of Data Collection

In order to get better picture of the practices and challenges of distributed leadership in AAU, first, relevant literature have been reviewed to look into what has so far been done in relation to distributed leadership. Following that, data gathering tools were prepared. Then, in order to make sure the aptness of the instruments, pilot test was conducted for instructors in AAU who were not included in the sample of the study. Third, after improving the data gathering instruments on the basis of the results of the pilot test, administration of the instruments were carried out and eventually analysis of the collected data was done using statistical tools.

3.5 Methods of Data Analysis

Different statistical techniques were employed on the basis of the nature of the data collected. In analyzing the quantitative data, respondents were categorized and frequencies were tallied. Percentage and frequency counts were used to analyze the characteristics of the population as it helps to determine the relative standing of the respondents. Moreover, mean scores, standard deviations, and rank order were used for analyzing the questionnaires with five point Likert scales to assess the practices and challenges of distributed leadership in AAU. In analyzing the data obtained through an interview and open ended items, first summary sheets were prepared and the responses were analyzed. The five point Likertscale was interpreted as 5= Strongly Agree, 4= Agree, 3= Undecided, 2= Disagree, and 1= Strongly Disagree. For the purpose of easy analysis and interpretation, the mean values of each item and dimension were interpreted. The

mean values from 1.00-2.49 were represented as low, from 2.50-3.49 as moderate, from 3.50-4.49 as high, and from 4.50-5.00 as very high.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis, interpretation, and discussion of the data collected via questionnaire and semi structured interview. The data were discussed in two parts: the background of respondents and respondents' response with respect to research questions raised.

4.1 Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1: Department / Centers of Respondents

No	Colleges	Departments/Centers	Instructors		College Deans	
			No	%	No	%
1	College of Social Science	Political Science and International Relation	6	7.6	1	33.3
		Philosophy	7	8.6		
2	College of Business and Economics	Public Administration & Management	9	11.1		
		Economics	8	9.9		
3	College of Natural Science	Chemistry	7	8.6		
		Earth science	7	8.6		
4	College of Developmental Studies	Center for Population Studies	8	9.9	1	33.3
		Center for Gender Studies	7	8.6		
5	Colleges of Law and Governance studies	Center for federal studies	7	8.6	1	33.4
		Center for Human right	5	6.2		
6	Colleges of Education and Behavioral Studies	Curriculum and Teachers professional Devt	7	8.6		
		Total	78	100	3	100

As can be seen from Table 1, in the College of Social Science, 6 (7.6 %) of the respondents are from Political Science and International Relation, 7(8.6%) of the respondents are from philosophy department, from college of business and economics 9(11.1. %) of the respondents are from public administration and management department 8(9.9%) of the respondents are from economics department. Similarly, from the college of natural science, 7(8.6 %t) of the respondents are from chemistry and, 7(8.6. %t) of the respondents are from earth science departments. From college of developmental studies, 8(9.9 %) of the respondents are from center of population studies and, 7(8.6 %) of the respondents are from center of gender studies. From college of Law and Governance studies 7 (8.6 %), from center of federal studies and 5 (6.2%) from center of human right. In similar fashion, from college of education and behavioral studies, 7 (8.6 %) from the department of curriculum and teachers professional development and 3 (100%) college deans were selected for the final analysis of this study.

4.2 Presentation and Discussion of data

Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents by Age and Sex.

No	Item		Instructors		College deans	
			No	%	No	%
1	Age	a) Below 20	-	-	-	-
		b) 21-30	4	5.1	-	-
		c) 31-40	39	50.1	-	-
		d) 41-50	20	25.6	1	33.4
		e) ≥ 51	15	19.2	2	66.6
		Total	78	100	3	100
2	Sex	a) Male	59	75.6	3	100
		a) Female	19	24.4	-	-
		Total	78	100	3	100

As indicated in table 2 item1, the majority of the instructors were relatively adult in which 39 (50.1 %) of them range from 31-40 years. It is also indicated that 20 (25.6 %) of the instructors

were range from 41-50 years old. Besides, 2 (66.6 %) of college deans were above 51 years old while 1(33.4%) was with the range of 41-50 years old. This signified that the maturity of college deans may help to manage their respective colleges appropriately and effectively.

Regarding the sex distribution, 59 (75.6%) and 3(100 %)of the instructors and college deans were male respectively. The representation of females’ instructors in the university which was 19 (24.4%)considered as low. Therefore, the majority of the respondents in the sample areas of the study were males. Besides, colleges the university were predominantly males.

Table 3: Respondents Qualification and Academic Rank

No	Item	Instructors		College deans		
		No	%	No	%	
1	Qualification	a) B.A/ B.Sc	1	1.2	-	-
		b) M.A/ M.Sc	49	62.8	1	33.3
		c) PhD/MD	28	36.0	2	66.7
		d) Other	-	-	-	-
		Total	78	100	3	100
2	Academic Rank	a) Graduate Assistant	1	1.3	-	-
		b) Assistant Lecturer	6	7.7	-	-
		c) Lecturer	47	60.0	-	-
		d) Assistant Professor	6	7.7	-	-
		e) Associate Professor	18	23.1	3	100
		f) Professor	-	-	-	-
		g) Other	-	-	-	-
		Total	78	100	3	100

As shown in Table 3, item 1, 49(62.8%), 28 (36.0%), and 1 (1.2 %) of the instructors possess M.A/M.Sc, PhD/MD and BA/ B.Scdegrees respectively. This implies that majority of AAU instructors in AAU have MA/M.Sc qualification.WhileBA/B.Sc holder in the sample college

accounted 1 (1.2%). Regarding college deans, 2 (66.7%) and 1 (33.3%) of the respondents have PhD/MD and MA/ M.Sc respectively.

In the same Table, item 2 shows the academic rank of instructors. Accordingly, 18(23.1 %), 6 (7.7.%), 47 (60.0 %), 6 (7.7%) and 1 (1.3 %) of the instructors are associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, assistant lecturers and graduate assistant respectively. However, 3 (100%) of college deans are associate professors. on the other hand, there is no full professor respondent both in instructors and college deans in the sample colleges. From this figure one can easily infer that majority (83.1 %) instructors and 3 (100%) of the AAU instructors and deans in the sample area have lecturer and above academic rank.

Table 4: Work Experience of Respondents

Item		Instructors		College deans	
		No	%	No	%
Work experience	a) Below5	9	11.5	–	–
	b) 6-10 years	6	33.3	–	–
	c) 11-15 years	17	21.8	–	–
	d) 16-20 years	9	11.5	–	–
	e) Above20 years	17	21.8	3	100
	Total	78	100	3	100

As it is shown in Table 4, 9 (11.5 %), 6 (33.3 %), 17 (21%), 9 (11.5) and 17 (21.8%) of the respondents served for below 5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years and above twenty years as an instructor respectively. While 3 (100%) college deans served above 20 years. This implies that majority the instructors served for 6-10 years while all college deans served above 20 years.

Table 5: Respondents Perception about Distributed Leadership

No	Item	Instructors		
		No	Mean	SD
1	To what extent do you perceived distributed leadership?	78	3.13	1.25
2	To what extent do you perceived yourself as a decision maker?	78	2.92	1.42
3	To what extent have you been recognized by your colleagues for taking leadership roles?	78	2.91	1.31
4	To what extent does the leadership of the university allow the practice of distributed leadership?	78	2.49	1.23
5	To what extent do your colleagues willingly take additional responsibilities of decision making?	78	3.17	1.23

From the data in Table 5 item1, the mean scores of respondents was 3.13 this indicates that the majority of the instructors moderately perceived the features of distributed leadership. Similarly, college deans were also asked their understanding about distributed leadership and it was found that they comprehended the concept of distributed leadership moderately, too. This shows that distributed leadership as a leadership approach is not significantly conceived and exist in the university. Gronn (2000) described distributed leadership as a ‘new architecture for leadership’, different from both traits/behaviors (agency) theories that focus on the individual leaders and has not highly perceived by higher education community due to its novelty. As it is indicated on item 2 in Table 5, the computed mean score of respondents showed 2.92 this implies that the majority of the respondents perceived themselves as decision makers moderately. Similarly, college deans were asked about instructors decision making activities in the university and the result shows that most of the instructors were not involved significantly in the decision making activities of the university. Concerning item 3 in Table 5, the mean score of the respondents was 2.91 this indicated that the majority of the respondents believed that their colleagues exhibited taking

leadership roles in the university moderately. The result of item 3 match with item 2 of the same table showed the mean score of 2.92 where the majority of the respondents replied that they take decision making roles in their respective college. In the same way, college deans were asked about their colleagues recognized when they conducted leadership roles, accordingly, all college deans stated that they were recognized by their colleagues when they taking leadership roles.

With regard to item 4 in Table 5, the mean score of the respondents was 2.49. From this result, it possible to conclude that the leadership of structure of the university agrees to the practice of distribution leadership is low. As it can be seen from Table 5, item 5, the mean score of the respondents was 3.17, this result indicates that instructors in AAU willingly take additional responsibilities of decision making in moderately

Table 6: Instructors’ Opinion about Leadership Practice in AAU

No	Item	Instructors		
		No	Mean	SD
1	Instructors significantly involve in decision making	78	2,81	1.11
2	Instructors engage in decision-making responsibilities beyond their own class room and department functions	78	2.47	0.97
3	Instructors have an opportunity to participate indecision-making in their respective college	78	2.41	1.11
4	Instructors share knowledge and experience one another in the university	78	3.09	1.16
5	Instructors help one another to solve the respective college problems	78	2.42	1.13
6	Instructors provided sufficient time to collaborate with colleagues on work related issues in the university	78	2.45	1.07
7	Instructors cooperate each other to achieve the collective ambition of the university	78	2.41	1.13
8	In the university, its common that everyone is involved in decision making	78	3.04	1.34
9	Instructors share collective responsibilities for the goal attainment of their department	78	3.59	1.82

It can be seen from Table 6 item 1, the mean score of the respondents was 2.81. This implies that instructors' involvement in the decision making of the university was moderate. For item 2 in the same Table, the mean score of respondents was 2.47. This indicates that Instructors engagement in decision-making responsibilities beyond their own class room and department function was low. In the same way the data obtained from college deans through interview shows that the participation of instructors in decision making beyond their class room and department function in the university was small.

With regard to item 5, 6 and 7 in Table 6 the mean scores of the respondents were 2.42, 2.45 and 2.41 respectively. These results indicate that instructors helping each other to solve the respective college problems, provision of sufficient time to instructor to collaborate with colleagues on work related issues in the university and cooperation of instructors to achieve the collective ambition of the university were low. Therefore, one can infer that without significant and well built support amongst instructors, great concern for team work and creating sense of oneness to academic staff, it will be too difficult to achieve the overall goal of the university.

For item 8 in the same Table, the mean score of the respondents was 3.04. This implies that in the university, everyone is involved in decision making moderately. It can be seen from Table 6 item 9 that, respondents were asked to give their agreement or disagreement regarding sharing collective responsibilities for the goal attainment of their department. Accordingly the mean score was 3.59. This indicates that sharing collective responsibilities for the goal attainment of the department in AAU by instructors was high. This also indicates that the instructors were more involved in decision making activities concerned their department functions than college or individual level.

Table 7: Major Challenges of Distributed Leadership Practice in AAU

No	Item	Instructors		
		No	Mean	SD
1	Poor perception about distributed leadership	78	2.38	1.14
2	Lack of team work	78	3.71	3.62
3	Lack of communication	78	3.31	1.44
4	Lack of shared responsibility amongst instructors	78	4.59	0.56
5	Traditional and rigid leadership structure of the university	78	3.10	1.52
6	Absence of collegial relationship amongst instructors	78	3.17	1.49
7	Loosely tie amongst college deans, department heads and instructors	78	3.58	1.33
8	Top leaders fear to instructors' participation in the decision making	78	2.40	1.12
9	Unwillingness of instructors to participate in the decision making process	78	2.45	1.33

It can be seen from Table 7 item 1, the mean score of the respondents was 2.38. This indicates that poor perception of about distributed leadership by academic staff of the university was not the major challenge for the practice of distributed leadership because it was rated low by most of the respondents. However, for item 2 in the same Table, the mean score of the respondents was 3.71. The mean score of the respondents vividly depicts that lack of team work was the major challenge that hinder the practices of distributed leadership in the university and rated high.

Similarly, in item 3 of the same Table, the mean score of the respondents was 3.31. This implies that lack of communication as a major challenge of the practices of distributed leadership in the university rated moderate.

With regard to item 4, in Table 7 the mean score of the respondents was 4.59. This shows that respondents rated lack of shared responsibility amongst instructors was very high. From this one can easily conclude that lack of shared responsibility amongst instructors in the university was the major challenges that hinder the practice of distributed leadership in the university because one of the major aspects of distributed leadership practice is shared responsibility.

It can be seen from Table 7 item 5 and 6, the mean scores of the respondents were 3.10 and 3.17 respectively. These indicate that traditional and rigid leadership structure of the university and absence of collegial relationship amongst instructors are the challenges that affect the practice of distributed leadership practice in the university moderately. Similarly, the data obtained from interview depicts that the leadership structure of the university did not significantly permit for effective practice of distributed leadership. However, for item 8 in the same Table, the mean score of the respondents was 3.58. The mean score of the respondents clearly portray that loosely tie amongst college deans, department heads and instructors in the university are considered the major challenges that deter the practices of distributed leadership in the university because it was rated high by most of the respondents.

With regard to item 9, and 10 in Table 7 the mean scores of the respondents were 2.40 and 2.45 respectively. These indicate that top leaders fear to participating instructors in the decision making and unwillingness of instructors to participate in the decision making were rated low. Therefore, this implies that both top leaders fear to participate instructors in the decision making and unwillingness of instructors to participate in decision making in the university were not considered as the major problems that affect the practice of distributed leadership in the university. Moreover, based on open ended items results, poor leadership ability, lack of commitment, lack of motivational skills, task overload, and lack of time were the major problems of the of distributed leadership practices in the university. In the same way, interviews were conducted for college deans to mention the major challenges regarding distributed leadership practices; accordingly, work overload, frequent meeting, and special assignments were the major challenges of distributed leadership practice in the university.

Table 8: Contribution of Distributed Leadership to Better Teaching Research and Community Services

No	Item	Instructors		
		No	Mean	SD
1	Involving instructors in community service activities	78	3.26	1.29
2	Persuade instructors in community service assessment	78	3.14	1.43
3	Persuade group effort in teaching	78	3.68	1.15
4	Persuade group effort in research	78	3.55	1.15
5	Engaging instructors to participating leadership roles in their department function	78	3.64	1.34
6	Ensure mutual respect among instructors in the university	78	4.55	0.75
7	Encourage instructors to discuss the use of teaching materials	78	3.19	1.41

It can be seen from Table 8 item 1 and 2 the mean scores of the respondents were 3.26 and 3.14 respectively. This indicates that the majority of the respondents rated that involving instructors in community service activities in the university and persuading instructors in community service assessment were moderate. From these, one can easily conclude that instructors in the university were not involved both in community services and its assessment beyond the average level.

With regard to item 3, and 4 in Table 8 the mean scores of the respondents were 3.68 and 3.55 respectively. These indicate that distributed leadership practice will contribute highly for persuading group effort in teaching and research in the university. As it clearly known that distributed leadership in higher education is about persuading and acknowledging group effort toward goal attainment of higher education.

Regarding item 5 in Table 8, the mean score of the respondents was 3.64. The mean scores of the respondents clearly depict that engaging instructors to participating leadership roles in their department functions was rated high. From this, one can understand that if instructors in their respective department participate in leadership role in distributed manner will help for the goal attainment of the department function such as teaching and research and community services of the university as well. In the same Table in item 6, the respondents were asked to rate the important of ensure mutual respect among instructors in the university for better teaching, research and community services of the university. Accordingly, the mean score of the respondents was 4.55. from this one easily concludes that ensuring mutual respect amongst instructors contribute for better teaching , research and community services in the university was very high.

Regarding item 7 in Table 8, the mean score of the respondents was 3.19. The mean scores of the respondents clearly shows that encouraging instructors to discuss the use of teaching materials in the university for better teaching, research and community service was moderate. The mean score of ensure mutual respect amongst instructors in the university was 4.55.this shows that ensuring mutual respect amongst instructors in AAU contribute for better teaching , research and community service in the university was very high. Moreover, college deans were asked to mention the importance of distributed leadership in the University for better teaching, research and community services. Accordingly, most of college deans agreed that involving instructors and department heads in the decision making process and sharing the responsibility amongst them regarding teaching, research and community services of the university play paramount role to the effective and efficient implementation of the aforementioned pillars of the university

Rank Analysis

Table 9: Possible Solutions for Effective Practice of Distributed Leadership

Possible solutions	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank order
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Ensure well- built relation amongst college deans department heads and instructors	40	15	10	5	4	2	2	1
Persuade team work and shared responsibility	29	15	11	10	5	4	4	2
Creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership and collective responsibility	25	14	12	17	3	5	2	3
Creating Strong collegial relationship amongst instructors	15	20	10	10	9	11	3	4
Encourage staff to participating in decision making	10	12	10	10	30	3	2	5
Deans and department heads encourage instructors in decision making	5	10	15	30	10	0	8	6
Oversee leadership structure to smooth the progress of distributed leadership	4	5	5	11	20	20	13	7

As the data in Table 9 shows, respondents were asked to rank the possible solutions to effective practices of distributed leadership in AAU. Accordingly, ensuring well built relation amongst college deans, department heads and instructors was ranked 1st by 40 respondents. Instructors (29) also ranked persuading team work and shared responsibility as the 2nd possible solution for effective practice of distributed leadership in AAU. Similarly (25) instructors were ranked creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership and collective responsibility the 3rd

possible solution to the problem. Besides, Creating Strong collegial relationship amongst instructors, encourage staff to participating in decision making, deans and department heads encourage instructors in decision making, and oversee leadership structure to smooth the progress of distributed leadership were ranked 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th respectively. The data obtained from interview also revealed that involving instructors and department heads in the decision making process, ensuring team spirit and shared responsibility are the major solutions to the problems

Therefore, from the above ranked responses one can clearly observe that strong relation amongst college deans, department heads and instructors in the university play significant role for the effectiveness of distributed leadership practices AAU demonstrate as collegial relationship, professionalism and academic freedom and teamwork, therefore, applying team work, shared responsibility, involving staff in decision making activities are not only play paramount roles for the effective practice of distributed leadership but also help the university leadership to realize its vision, mission and goals the sooner possible.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the summary, conclusions, and recommendations made depending on the findings.

5.1 Summary

The prime aim of this study is to investigate the practices and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University.

To achieve this aim, the following research questions were raised:

1. How do instructors and college deans perceive the practice of distributed leadership?
2. To what extent do instructors participate in the leadership practices of the university?
3. What are the major challenges that affect the practice of distributed leadership in the university?
4. What are the possible measures being taken for effective practices of distributed leadership in the university?
5. To what extent does distributed leadership contribute to better teaching, research and community services of the university

Review of the related literature was made based on the research questions raised. The study was conducted in AAU. More specifically, College of Social Science (CSS); College of Business and Economics (CBE); Colleges of Natural Science (CNS); College of Development and Environmental Studies (CDS) and College of Law and Governance. Instructors were selected based on simple random sampling techniques. The opinions of these instructors were gathered using questionnaire constructed in terms of close and open-ended items, rank order, and Likert scale. College deans were selected by available sampling technique. To acquire the necessary information, interviews were conducted for college deans.

Quantitative and qualitative methods were used in analyzing the data obtained through the instruments. In the analyses of the quantitative data, percentages, frequencies, mean scores,

standard deviations, and rank order were used. The average mean scores ranging from 1.00-2.49 represent low, 2.50-3.49, 3.50-4.49 and 4.50-5.00 represent moderate, high and very high respectively. In the analyses of the qualitative data, descriptive statements were used.

1.1.1 Major Findings

The major findings of the study are organized in to five groups based on the five basic questions raised and presented hereunder according to their sequence.

1. Instructors perception about distributed leadership

- With regard to instructors' perception about distributed leadership, the mean scores of respondents were(3.13) this indicates that the majority of the instructors moderately perceived the principles and features of distributed leadership in the university. However, the interview result shows that college deans were highly perceived the features of distributed leadership in the university.
- Concerning instructors' perception about decision making, the mean score of respondents showed (2.92.) This implies that the majority of the instructors perceived themselves as decision makers moderately.
- Regarding instructors perception about their colleagues leadership roles, the mean score of the respondents was (2.91) this indicates that the majority of the respondents believed that their colleagues exhibited taking leadership roles in the university moderately.
- With regard to the leadership structure of the university, the mean score of the respondents was (2.49). This implies that the leadership of structure of the university permitting to the practice of distribution leadership was low.

2. Instructors' opinion about leadership practices in AAU

- With respect to instructors' engagement in decision-making responsibilities beyond their own class room and department function, the mean score of the respondents was(2.47). This indicates that instructors' engagement in decision-making responsibilities beyond their own class room and department function was low. Similarly college deans also stated that instructor's involvement in the decision making activities beyond their own class room functions were insignificant.
- Concerning the experience of instructors helping one another to solve the respective college problems, the mean score of the respondents was 2.42. This implies that instructors helping each other to solve the respective college problems were low.
- With regard to instructors' collaboration to achieve the collective ambition of the university, the mean score of the respondents was 2.41. This indicates that collaboration to achieve the collective ambition of the university was low.
- Concerning the experience of instructors sharing collective responsibilities for the goal attainment of their department, the mean score was (3.59.) This indicates that sharing of collective responsibilities for the goal attainment of the department was high

3. Major challenges of distributed leadership practice in AAU

- The mean score of lack of communication was (3.31) this indicates that lack of communication was moderately affect the practice of distributed leadership in the university.
- With respect to the major problems of distributed leadership practice in AAU, the mean score of lack of team work was (3.71.) The score vividly depicts that lack of team work amongst instructors was highly hinder the practice of distributed leadership in the university.
- The mean scores of loosely tie amongst college deans, department heads and instructors was 3.58. This implies that lack of loosely tie amongst college deans, department heads and instructors deter the practice of distributed leadership in the university highly.

- Regarding the challenges of distributed leadership in the university, the mean score of lack of shared responsibility amongst instructors' was 4.59. This indicates that lack of shared responsibility amongst instructors in the university was very highly deterring the practice of distributed leadership.
- The data obtained from the open-ended items also shows that poor leadership ability, lack of commitment, lack of motivational skills, task overload, and lack of time were the major challenges of distributed leadership practices in the university.
- Besides, the data acquired from the interview also shows that. Heavy work load, frequent meeting, and special assignments were the major challenges that affect the practices of distributed leadership in the university.

4. Possible measures for effective practice of distributed leadership in AAU

- As it is indicated by AAU instructors, ensure well- built relation amongst college deans department heads and instructors persuade team work and shared responsibility creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership and collective responsibility and creating smooth collegial relationship amongst instructors were the major possible solutions for effective practice of distributed leadership in the university.
- The data obtained from interview also revealed that involving instructors and department heads in the decision making process, ensuring team spirit and shared responsibility are the major solutions to the problems.

5. Contribution of distributed leadership to better teaching research and Community service

- The mean scores of persuade group effort in teaching and research were 3.68 and 3.55 respectively. These indicate that distributed leadership practice will contribute highly for persuading group effort in teaching and research in the university.

- With regard to engaging instructors to participating leadership roles in their department functions, the mean score was 3.65. This implies that engaging instructors to participate in leadership roles in their department Function such as teaching and research were high.
- The mean score of ensuring mutual respect among instructors in the university was 4.55 this depicts that ensuring mutual respect amongst instructors in AAU contribute for better teaching , research and community service in the university was very high.
- College deans were also mentioned that involving instructors and department heads in the decision making process and sharing the responsibility amongst them regarding teaching, research and community service of the university play paramount role to the effective and efficient practices of distributed leadership in the university.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the major findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Instructors in Addis Ababa University moderately perceived the features of distributed leadership. This shows that lack of understanding about distributed leadership exceedingly as emerging leadership approach in higher education can prevent the contribution of instructors to involve and solve the multi faced problems as well as to realize the vision, mission and values of the university
2. With regard to the leadership structure of the university, the majority of instructors agreed that the leadership structure of the university permitting to the practices of distributed leadership were low. From this one can easily concluded that still the decision making power of the university tilted to the top leaders of the university and the majority of instructors accept the decision being made than participating on it.
3. As it is indicated by the majority of AAU instructors, their participation in decision-making responsibilities beyond their own class room and department functions were low. This clearly indicated that the majority of instructors in AAU were not participated in decision making activities concerning their respective college and the university as a whole. Similarly, instructors' collaboration to achieve the collective ambition of the university was

low. This also implies that without collaboration of instructors, it will be too difficult to achieve the shared vision of the university which requires collaboration and shared responsibility as moral fiber of success.

4. With regard to the major challenges of distributed leadership practices in AAU, lack of team work, loosely tie amongst college deans, department heads and instructors and lack of shared responsibility amongst instructors are the major challenges that hinder the practices of distributed leadership in the university. Therefore, without addressing these problems, it is too difficult to achieve the goals of the university.
5. As it is indicated by AAU instructors, ensure well- built relation amongst college deans department heads and instructors persuade team work and shared responsibility, creating favorable condition to facilitate team leadership and collective responsibility ensuring tough collegial relationship amongst instructors are the major possible solutions for effective practice of distributed leadership in the university. From this one can easily concludes that the practices of distributed leadership can be improved by applying the remedies forwarded by academic staff.
6. The responses of the study revealed that most of AAU instructors stated that distributed leadership practices contribute highly to persuade group effort in teaching and research in the university. From this, one can easily conclude that distributed leadership play significant role to achieve the diverse purposes of the university.
7. As it is indicated by AAU instructors, ensuring mutual respect among instructors in the university will contribute significantly for better teaching, research and community service in the university.
8. The responses of interview also revealed that involving instructors and department heads in the decision making process, ensuring team spirit and shared responsibility are the major solutions to address the challenges of distributed leadership practices in the university. This implies that both instructors and college deans relatively agreed up on the possible solutions of the problems

9. College deans were also mentioned that the effective and efficient practices of distributed leadership in the university through involving instructors and department heads in the decision making process and sharing of responsibility amongst them play paramount role for better teaching, research and community service of the university. This shows that both instructors and college deans relatively agreed up on the importance of distributed leadership roles to the various purpose of the university

5.3 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings and the conclusion drawn, the following recommendations were put forward:

1. The study revealed that instructors in AAU were moderately perceived the notion of distributed leadership. Therefore, mechanisms such as researches, training, professional debates, workshop, seminars etc about distributed leadership as emerging and well-suited leadership approach in higher education should be employed by university leadership.
2. The study illustrated that leadership structure of the university was very hierarchical and the decision making power of the university tilted to the top leaders. However, AAU as educational institution, staff professionalism and collegial relationship involving instructors in the decision making process is essential. Therefore. The leadership of AAU, should involve instructors in the decision making process to ensure their participation and concern.
3. As per the result of the study, the majority of AAU instructors actively participated in decision making activities in their departments' functions. On the other hand, their involvements in the different problems of their respective colleges were undersized. therefore, college deans and department head work hand in hand to strengthen as well as ensure the participation instructors in the decision making process of their respective college.
4. The study revealed that lack of team work, loosely ties amongst college deans, department heads and instructors and lack of shared responsibility amongst instructors were the major challenges that hinder the practice of distributed leadership in the university. Hence, the university leadership should design mechanisms to ensure, team work, strong relationship, shared responsibility and favorable conditions for effective practice of distributed leadership in the university.

5. As the study indicated, ensuring mutual respect among instructors and persuade group effort will contribute significantly for better teaching, research and community services. Therefore the leadership of the university should practice distributed leadership more effectively by taking into consideration its vision, missions and values.

REFERENCES

- Barker, R. (2001). The nature of leadership. *Human Relations*.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press
- Beck, A.P. and Peters, L. (1981). The research evidence for distributed leadership in therapy groups. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*.
- Bennett, N., Wise, C., Woods, P.A. and Harvey, J.A. (2003). *Distributed Leadership*. Nottingham: National College of School Leadership.
- Bolden, R., Petrov, G. and Gosling, J. (2008) *Developing Collective Leadership in Higher Education: Final Report for the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education*, London: LFHE.
- Bolman, L.G., Crow, G.M., Goldring, E., Slater, R.O., & Thurston, P.W. (1994). Taxonomy and overview. In W.K.Hoy (Ed.), *Educational administration: The UCEA document base USA*: McGraw Hill.
- Brown, M.H. and Hosking, D.M. (1986). Distributed leadership and skilled performance as successful organization in social movements. *Human Relations*.
- Bryman, A. (1993) *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Carlson, R.V. (1996). *Reframing and reform*. New York: Longman.
- Burns, J. M. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Camburn, E., Rowan, B., & Taylor, J. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: The case of the elementary schools adopting comprehensive school reform models. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25, 347–373.

- Campbell, R.F., Corbally, J.E., & Ramseyer, J.A. (1966). Introduction to educational administration. (3rd ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Clark B. Creating entrepreneurial universities: organizational pathways of transformation. Oxford: Pergamon Press 1998.
- Conger, J.A. (1998) Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding Leadership, Leadership Quarterly.
- Day, C. (2000). Beyond Transformational Leadership. Educational Leadership
- Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D., Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Gu, Q., Penlington, C., Mehta, P. And Kingston, A. (2007) The Impact of School Leadership on Pupil Outcomes: Interim Report. National College of School Leadership Nottingham UK
- Davis, S.H. (1998). The Truth about Visionary Leadership. Thrust for Educational leadership Retrieved February 12, 2014 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web:
<http://www.ebsco.com>
- Deal, T.E., & Petersen, K.D. (1994). Shaping school culture. San Francisco.
- Deluga, R.J. (1995). Relationship of transformational and transactional leadership with employee influencing strategies. Leaders and the leadership process: Readings, self-assessments and applications. IL: Austin Press.
- Deem, R. (2001) 'Managing Contemporary UK Universities - Manager-Academics And New Managerialism', Academic Leadership Online, www.academicleadership.org
- Denis, J.L., Lamothe, L. and Langley, A. (2001). The dynamics of collective leadership and Strategic change in pluralistic organisations. Academy of Management Journal
- DuBrin, A.J. (1997). Leadership: Research findings, practice, and skills. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Duke, D.L. (1998). The Normative Context of Organizational Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Retrieved September 25, 2013 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.
- Fiedler, F. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Foucault, M. (1978-86) *The History of Sexuality*, 3 vols. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fullan, M. & Scott, G. (2009). *Turnaround Leadership for Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibb, C. A. (1954). Leadership. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 877-917). Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership. *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Harris, A. (2008) (Ed.). *Distributed leadership: different perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer
- Hayes, J. (2010). *The Theory and Practice of Change Management*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heenan, D. and Bennis, W. (1999). *Co-Leaders: The Power of Great Partnerships*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1950). *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire*. Columbus, OH: Personnel Research Board, Ohio State University
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*. (4th ed.) New York: McGraw Hill.

- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). Development and validation of scores on the distributed leadership inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, XX, 1-22.
- Hunt, J.G. (1991). *Leadership: A new synthesis*. California: Sage Publications.
- Jones, S., Applebee, A., Harvey, M. & Lefoe, G. (2010). Scoping a distributed leadership matrix for higher education. In M. Devlin, J. Nagy and A. Lichtenberg (Eds.) *Research and Development in Higher Education: Reshaping Higher Education*, 33. Melbourne, 6–9 July, 2010.
- Jones, S., & Novak, B. (2009c). Student feedback and leadership. Resource portfolio. Strawberry Hills: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved July - 12, 2013, from <http://www.altc.edu.au/resource- leadership-assessment- rmit-2009>
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Knight, P.T. and Trowler, P.R. (2001) *Departmental Leadership in Higher Education*, Buckingham: SRHE and OU Press.
- Kreitner, R., & Knicki, A. (1995). *Organizational behavior*. (3rd ed.) Chicago: Irwin.
- Lambert, L. (1998) *Building Leadership Capacity in Schools*. Alexandria, VA, USA ASCD.
- MacBeath, J. (2005). *Leadership as distributed: a matter of practice*. School Leadership
- MacBeath, J., Odouro, G. & Waterhouse, J. (2004) *Distributed Leadership in Action: A Study of Current Practice in Schools, Distributed Leadership*. Nottingham National College for School Leadership (NCSL)
- Middlehurst, R. (1993) *Leading Academics*, Buckingham: SRHE and OU Press.
- Monahan, W.G., & Hengst, H.R. (1982). *Contemporary educational administration*. New York: MacMillan

- Oduro, G.K.T. (2004). Distributed leadership' in schools: what English head teachers say about the 'pull' and 'push' factors. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Manchester, 16–18 September.
- Pearce, C.L. and Sims, H.P. (2002). The relative influence of vertical vs. shared leadership on the longitudinal effectiveness of change management teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 6(2), pp. 172-197.
- Robbins, S.P. (1998). *Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications*. (8th ed.) New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Roberts, H.K., & Hunt, D.M. (1991). *Organizational behavior*. Boston: PWS Kent Publishing.
- Rosenthal, C.S. (1998). Determinants of collaborative leadership: civic engagement, gender or Organizational norms? *Political Research Quarterly*.
- Schermerhorn, J.R., Hunt, J.G., & Osborn, R.H. (1994). *Managing organizational behavior*. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Silins, H. and Mulford, W. (2002). Leadership and school results. In Leithwood, K. and Hallinger, P. (eds), *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 561–612.
- Simkins, T. (2005). Leadership in education: 'what works' or 'what makes sense'? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*
- Sinha, J.B.P. (1995). *The cultural context of leadership and power*. California: Sage Publications.
- Slater, R.O. (1995). Symbolic educational leadership and democracy in America. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Retrieved January 15, 2014 from EBSCO Database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.
- Shattock, M. (2003) *Managing Successful Universities*, Buckingham: SRHE and OU Press.

- Spillane, J.P. (2004) Distributed Leadership: What's all the Hoopla? Working paper, Northwestern University, Institute for Policy Research.
- Spillane, J.D. (2006). Distributed Leadership. Jossey-Bass. Wiley
- Spillane, J. and Diamond, J.B. (2007a). Distributed Leadership in Practice. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1950) Leadership, membership and organization. Psychological Bulletin,
- Tead, O. (1935). The art of leadership. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Timperley, H. S. (2005). Distributed leadership: Developing theory from practice. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 37(4), 395-420.
- Trowler, P., & Knight, P. T. (2000) 'coming to know in higher education: Theorizing faculty entry to new work contexts'. Higher Education Research & Development
- Woods, P.A. (2004) Democratic leadership: drawing distinctions with distributed leadership, International Journal of Leadership in Education.
- Yukl, G. A. (2002). Leadership in organizations (5th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Yukl, G. (2010), Leadership in organizations; Seventh edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
Educational Planning and Management
Questionnaire to be filled by Instructors

The purpose of this study is to scrutinize the practices and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University. The researcher will use the data gathered through this questionnaire for strictly academic purposes. You are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire honestly. Your response will be kept confidential. Your genuine response to this study is indispensable.

NB: please do not write your names in any part of the questionnaire!

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation!

PART I: Background Information

Direction: Please place an “X” mark on the space provided against the items

1. Sex:

Male _____

Female _____

2. Age:

Below 20 _____

21-30 _____

31-40 _____

41-50 _____

≥51 _____

3. Your department: _____

4. Your qualification:

B.A/ B.Sc _____

M.A / M.Sc _____

PhD/ MD _____

Other (specify) _____

5. You're academic rank:

Graduate Assistant _____ Associate Professor _____

Assistant-lecturer _____ Professor _____

Lecturer _____ other (specify _____)

Assistant Professor _____

6. Service

Total service years: _____

PART II: Items related to distributed leadership perception

Please indicate the degree of your perception about of distributed leadership by putting Circle.

There is five alternatives and their value is indicated as follows:

1 = Very low 2 = Low 3 = Medium 4 = High 5 = Very High

No	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1	To what extent is distributed leadership practiced at AAU	1	2	3	4	5
2	To what extent do you considered yourself as a decision maker in the university	1	2	3	4	5
3	To what extent have you been recognized by your colleagues for taking leadership roles	1	2	3	4	5
4	To what extent does the leadership structure of the university allow the practice of distributed leadership	1	2	3	4	5
5	To what extent do your colleagues willingly take on additional responsibilities of decision making	1	2	3	4	5

PART III: Items related to leadership practices in the University

Please indicate to what extent instructors and department heads participate in the leadership practice of the university by putting Circle. There are five alternatives and their value is indicated as follows:

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Undecided 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

N_o	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1	Instructors are significantly involved in decisions that affect the university functions	1	2	3	4	5
2	Instructors engage in decision-making responsibilities beyond their own classroom lectures and department functions	1	2	3	4	5
3	Instructors have an opportunities to participate indecision making in their respective college	1	2	3	4	5
4	Instructors share knowledge and experiences one another in the university	1	2	3	4	5
5	Instructors help one another to solve the respective college problems	1	2	3	4	5
6	Instructors provided sufficient time to collaborate with colleagues on work related issues in the university	1	2	3	4	5
7	Instructors cooperate each other to achieve the collective ambition of the university	1	2	3	4	5
8	In the university, its common that everyone is involved with decision making	1	2	3	4	5
9	Instructors share collective responsibilities for the goal attainment of their department	1	2	3	4	5

PART IV: Major problems related to distributed leadership practice in the University

Please indicate the major problems concerning distributed leadership practice in the university in terms of their degree of pressure by putting Circle. There are five alternatives and their value is indicated as follows:

1 = Very low 2 = Low 3 = Medium 4 = High 5 = Very High

No	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1	Poor perception about distributed leadership	1	2	3	4	5
2	Lack of team-work	1	2	3	4	5
3	Lack of communication	1	2	3	4	5
4	Lack of shared responsibility amongst instructors	1	2	3	4	5
5	Traditional and rigid leadership structure of the university	1	2	3	4	5
6	Absence collegial relationship amongst academic staff	1	2	3	4	5
7	Loosely tie amongst college deans department heads and instructors in the university	1	2	3	4	5
8	Top leaders fear to participate instructors in the decision making	1	2	3	4	5
9	Un willingness of instructors to participate in the decision making	1	2	3	4	5

10. Please mention other major problems (if any) that are not specified above:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

PART V: Items related to solutions for effective practices of distributed leadership in the University

Here are some solutions for effective practices of distributed leadership and you are required to **order** them by writing numbers 1-7 on the space provided in front of them.

1. Strong collegial relationship amongst academic staff _____
2. Encouraging staff to participating in the decision making _____
3. Persuading team work and shared responsibility _____
4. Ensure well-built **relation amongst college deans, department heads and instructors in the university**_____
5. Creating favorable condition to facilitated team leadership and collective responsibility _____
6. Deans and department heads encourage instructors to involve in decision making _____
7. Oversee leadership structure to smooth the progress of distributed leadership _____
8. Please mention other major solutions (if any) that are not specified above:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

PART VI: Items related to Distributed Leadership Contribution for better Teaching, Research and Community Services

Please indicate the degree of distributed leadership contribution for better teaching research and community services of the university by putting Circle. There are five alternatives and their value is indicated as follows:

1 = Very low 2 = Low 3 = Medium 4 = High 5 = Very High

No	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1	Involving instructors in planning community service activities	1	2	3	4	5
2	Persuade instructors in community services work assessment	1	2	3	4	5
3	Persuade group effort in teaching	1	2	3	4	5
4	Persuade group effort in research	1	2	3	4	5
5	Engaging instructors to participating leadership roles in their department functions	1	2	3	4	5
6	Ensure mutual respect among instructors in the university	1	2	3	4	5
7	Encourage instructors to discuss the use teaching materials	1	2	3	4	5

8. Please mention other major contributions of distributed leadership practice for better teaching Research and community services of the university (if any) that are not specified above:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Thank you again for your time and cooperation

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
Educational Planning and Management
Interview for college deans

The purpose of this study is to scrutinize the practices and challenges of distributed leadership in Addis Ababa University.

1. What does distributed leadership mean for you?
2. Do you consider instructors as a decision maker in Addis Ababa University? If yes, how?
3. Have you been recognized by your colleague for taking on leadership roles?
4. Do you think that the leadership structures at Addis Ababa University allow for high levels of distributed leadership?
5. Do you think that instructors engage in decision-making responsibilities beyond their own classroom lectures and department functions?
6. Can you list the major problems observed regarding distributed leadership practice in the university?
7. Can you mention some possible remedies for effective practices of distributed leadership in the university?
8. How distributed leadership practice contribute for better teaching and community service of the university

Thank you for your time and cooperation. As a reminder, this interview will remain confidential.