

August 2014

Master's Degree Thesis

A study of teachers' perceptions of
their engagement in distributed
leadership in Bhutanese schools

Graduate School of Chosun University

Department of Education

Kelzang Tashi

A study of teachers' perceptions of their engagement in distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools

부탄 교사의 분산적 지도성 인식 수준에 관한 연구

August 23, 2014

Graduate School of Chosun University

Department of Education

Kelzang Tashi

A study of teachers' perceptions
of their engagement in distributed
leadership in Bhutanese schools

Advisor: Prof. Kyoung-oh Song

This thesis is submitted to the graduate school of
Chosun University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for a Master's degree in Education

May, 2014

Graduate School of Chosun University

Department of Education

Kelzang Tashi

This is to certify that the master's thesis of
Kelzang Tashi

has been approved by examining committee for
the thesis requirement for the Master's degree in
Education.

Committee Chairperson _____
Prof. Minseong Kim

Committee Member _____
Prof. Daesik Kim

Committee Member _____
Prof. Kyoung-oh Song

May, 2014

Graduate School of Chosun University

초록

부탄 교사의 분산적 지도성 인식 수준에 관한 연구

켈장타시
지도교수 : 송경오
교육학과
조선대학교

본 연구의 목적은 부탄 학교에서 교사들의 분산적 지도성 수준을 분산적 지도성의 네 가지 관점 하에서 측정하였다. 구체적으로 교사 성별, 경험, 자격, 학교 유형, 학교 위치에 따른 교사들의 분산적 지도성에 대한 인식 차이를 조사하고, 더 나아가 분산적 리더십 수준을 교사와 학교 변수 차이에 따라 분석하였다. 본 연구는 엘모어에 의해 만들어지고 고든에 의해 수정된 분산적 지도성 준비성 척도를 활용하여 무작위로 선정한 44개 학교 131명의 부탄교사들을 대상으로 조사를 실시하였다. 본 연구문제는 다음과 같다.

- 1) 분산적 지도성의 네 가지 측면에서 보았을 때, 부탄 교사들의 분산적 지도성 인식 수준은 어떠한가?
- 2) 부탄교사들의 분산적 지도성에 대한 인식수준은 성별, 경력, 학력에 따라 차이가 있는가?
- 3) 부탄교사들의 분산적 지도성에 대한 인식수준은 학교유형, 소재지에 따라 차이가 있는가?

4) 부탄교사들의 분산적 지도성에 대한 인식수준은 교사개인 및 학교배경변수와 관련이 있는가?

전체적인 연구결과는 부탄 교사들이 비전, 공유된 책임이라는 학교문화 그리고 리더십행위라는 네 가지 차원에 모두 참여한다는 점을 보여주었다. 공유된 책임 영역에서 부탄교사들의 참여가 최대 수준이었으며 지도성 행위에서 부탄교사들의 참여가 가장 낮았다. 공유된 책임은 큰 효과를 내기 위한 중요한 토대이며 부탄 교사들은 공유된 책임에서 가장 많이 참여 하였고 그 다음으로 학교 문화, 임무, 비전과 목표와 리더십 행위 순으로 참여 수준을 나타냈다.

또한 본 연구에서 남자 교사와 교육 경력 20년 이상의 부탄교사들에게서 더 높은 수준의 지도성 역할을 발견할 수 있었으며, 또한 다른 사람들에게도 지도자로 보여졌다. 한편, 다른 많은 장애물 중에서 자원, 시간 그리고 기회가 분산적 지도성 행위에 충실히 참여하는 것을 저해하는 것으로 나타났다. 그리고 고등학교 교사들이 낮은 단계의 초등학교, 높은 단계의 초등학교, 중학교 교사들보다 분산적 지도성 행위에 더욱 참여하고 있었다. PGDE (Diploma in Education) 교사는 리더십 임무, 비전과 목표에 높은 참여를 하여 분산적 지도성 모델을 만드는 데 그 토대를 제시해 주었다.

본 연구의 결과는 부탄 중소 도시의 학교 교사들이 리더십 임무, 비전과 목표, 학교 문화와 리더십 행위 등의 분산적 지도성 요소에 더 높은 참여를 하고 있다는 것을 보여준다. 통계적으로 성별과 리더십 임무, 비전과 목표, 리더십 행위 사이에 긍정적인 연관성이 나타난 반면, 응답자의 성별과 공유된 책임감, 학

교 문화 사이에서는 긍정적인 연관성을 찾아볼 수 없었다. 유사하게도 교사의 자격, 경력, 학교 위치, 학교 유형과 리더십 임무, 비전과 목표 사이엔 강한 긍정적인 연관성이 있었지만 다른 세 가지 차원의 분산적 지도성 요소와는 연관성을 찾아볼 수 없었다. 시간과 자원의 제약을 이겨내고 지도성 활동에 참여할 수 있는 기회들을 창조해내는 것이 교사들이 분산된 지도성 행위에 참여할 수 있도록 하는데 가장 중요할 것이다.

본 연구의 결과는 향후 부탄 학교에서의 지도성 발전에 영향을 주게 될 것이고 부탄 학교에서 더욱 효과적인 지도성을 형성하는데 도움이 될 것으로 기대된다.

DEDICATION

To my mom Gompo Lhamo and dad Gompo, who never ceases to inspire me. Due to their indestructible merits my dreams come true through less effort.

To my wife Dema Yangzom, who supported me throughout this process. Without her patience, encouragement, and love this thesis could not have been completed.

ABSTRACT

A study of teachers' perceptions of their engagement in distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools

Kelzang Tashi

Advisor: Prof. Kyoung-oh Song

Department of Education

Graduate School of Chosun University

The purpose of this study was to understand the teacher engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools. It seeks to investigate the differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on teacher and school background including gender, experience and qualification, school type and school location. It further analyzed the relationship of dimensions of distributed leadership with teacher and school variables. The study employed a Likert-scale survey, Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS), developed by Elmore and modified by Gordon, to 131 certified Bhutanese teachers with minimum of Certificate and maximum of Master degree within 44 randomly selected schools from several regions. The overall results indicate that teachers were engaged in all four dimensions, including: 1) mission, vision and goals, 2) shared responsibility, 3) school culture, and 4) leadership practices. Maximum teacher participation occurred with shared responsibility and the least engagement within leadership practices. Shared responsibility is most important foundation to produce greater effect and Bhutanese teachers indicated that they engaged most in shared responsibility followed by school culture, mission vision and goals, and leadership practices. The study found that male and senior

teachers with more than 20 years in education were involved in leadership roles and were viewed by others as leaders. On the other hand resources, time and opportunities are few among many barriers that impaired full participation in distributed leadership practices.

High secondary teachers are more engaged in distributed leadership practices than lower secondary, elementary, and higher secondary school teachers. Post graduate Diploma in Education (PGDE) teachers indicated highest engagement for mission vision and goals which provides a foundation for initiating a distributed leadership model. The results show that semi-urban school teachers engaged more distributed leadership practices especially in terms of mission vision & goals, school culture and leadership practices. Although statistically positive correlation was seen between gender and mission vision & goals and leadership practices, there was no positive correlation for respondent's gender with shared responsibility and school culture. Similarly there was strong positive correlation between qualification, experience, school location, and school type with mission vision & goals; however, there was no relation with other three dimensions of distributed leadership. Overcoming the barriers of time and resources, as well as creating opportunities to take part in leadership activities are critical for engaging teachers in distributed leadership practices.

Keywords: Distributed leadership, mission, shared responsibility, school culture leadership practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to a number of individuals for their collective support and guidance to me while I completed the Master program in Education. I could never have explored the depths without the help, support, guidance and efforts of a lot of people. Writing my thesis, I have learned many things about perseverance, discipline and the importance of my friends and family. I sincerely thank and acknowledge the valuable support and guidance of the following individuals:

I would first like to thank Ministry of Education, Royal Government of Bhutan, particularly for nominating me to pursue a Master's degree in Education, majoring Educational Administration at Chosun University, South Korea. Your investment has made me professionally competent to serve the Tsa-Wa-Sum.

I am most grateful to Korean government for awarding me the most prestigious scholarship in Korea. I am always honored to be the first Bhutanese Korean Government Scholarship Programme (KGSP) grantee for graduate programme 2011. Without Korean government's assistant and support, it would have been impossible for me to pursue this dream.

No words can thank Dr. Song Kyoung-oh, my thesis advisor, for the timelines that were set, the thought provoking questions that she would place in the margins of my many drafts, and the wealth of knowledge that she has shared over the last two years. I am grateful for her guidance, interest in and continued support of my work. She provided me with the learning without which this thesis could not have been written.

I am also grateful to Dr. Kim Minseong, committee chair, who guided me to conduct pilot study. Her technical expertise in quantitative methodology was invaluable. I thank her for giving precious time, effort and care that had helped me to advance further for final test.

I would also like to take an opportunity to thank the examining board members, Dr. Kim Minseong, Dr. Kim Daesik, and Dr. Song Kyoung-oh for being my examiners. I really appreciate their time as well as their invaluable comments.

Above all, I owe love and gratitude to my parents for being the best parents a son could ever imagine. My mother is a brilliant and decent woman who never ceases to inspire me. She is a constant source of inspiration to me. My father is a person with integrity, honesty and commitment. His beliefs give me the determination to reach my goals. Although neither of you fully understand what this process has entailed, it is important to me for both of you to know that I could not have done this without your love, prayers, and support. I thank my brothers and sisters for encouraging me throughout the process in too many ways to even mention. My father-in-law and mother-in-law are extraordinary people who encourage me and I can never thank them enough. Thanks to my family members, friends and colleagues for their unwavering support. Last and most importantly, I thank my wife, for the support and patience she showed during my absence at home for three long years. Thank you for taking pride and interest in everything I do!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Dedication | IV |
| Abstract | V |
| Acknowledgments..... | VII |
| Table of Contents..... | IX |
| List of Tables | XI |
| List of Acronyms..... | XII |
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| a. Problem Statement..... | 3 |
| b. Purpose of the Study..... | 6 |
| c. Research Questions..... | 7 |
| d. Significance of the Study..... | 7 |
| e. Document Organization and Content..... | 8 |
| f. Limitations..... | 9 |
| II. LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 11 |
| A. Review of the research on Distributed Leadership..... | 11 |
| 1. Definition of Leadership..... | 11 |
| 2. Types of Leadership..... | 12 |
| a. Instructional Leadership..... | 12 |
| b. Situational Leadership..... | 13 |
| c. Servant Leadership | 14 |
| d. Transformational Leadership..... | 15 |
| e. Transactional Leadership..... | 16 |
| f. Sustainable Leadership..... | 16 |
| 3. Distributed Leadership..... | 17 |
| a. Conception of Distributed Leadership..... | 17 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| b. | Importance of Distributed Leadership..... | 21 |
| c. | Dimensions of Distributed Leadership..... | 28 |
| 4. | Distributed Leadership in Bhutanese Schools..... | 23 |
| 1. | Bhutanese Education System..... | 33 |
| 2. | Importance of Distributed Leadership in Bhutanese schools..... | 36 |
| III. | METHODS..... | 39 |
| A. | Data..... | 39 |
| B. | Instrumentation..... | 45 |
| C. | Statistical Analysis..... | 49 |
| D. | Ethical Consideration..... | 51 |
| IV. | RESULTS..... | 52 |
| A. | Descriptive Statistics..... | 52 |
| B. | Results of the group difference test by teacher variables..... | 59 |
| C. | Results of the group difference test by school variables..... | 65 |
| D. | Relationship between distributed leadership & teacher and school variables..... | 70 |
| E. | Discussion of Findings..... | 72 |
| V. | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS..... | 83 |
| A. | Summary..... | 83 |
| B. | Conclusions..... | 88 |
| C. | Recommendations for Future Research..... | 90 |
| | REFERENCES..... | 92 |
| | Appendices..... | 99 |
| | Appendix A: Distributed Leadership Questionnaire..... | 99 |
| | Appendix B: Permission for Use of DLRS..... | 105 |
| | Appendix C: Permission from the Ministry of Education, Bhutan..... | 106 |
| | Appendix D: Email Correspondence to Participating Teachers..... | 107 |
| | Appendix E: Statement of Consent..... | 108 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Table 3.1. Changes made in demographic information..... | 31 |
| 2. Table 3.2. Details of participants..... | 33 |
| 3. Table 3.3. Details of teacher and school participants..... | 34 |
| 4. Table 3.4. Reliability test of survey questionnaire..... | 36 |
| 5. Table 4.1. Descriptive statistics..... | 39 |
| 6. Table 4.2. Vision mission and goals..... | 40 |
| 7. Table 4.3. Shared responsibility..... | 41 |
| 8. Table 4.4. School culture..... | 42 |
| 9. Table 4.5. Leadership practices..... | 43 |
| 10. Table 4.6. DLSR dimension differences by gender..... | 45 |
| 11. Table 4.7. DLSR dimension differences by teacher's experience..... | 46 |
| 12. Table 4.8. DLSR dimension differences by teacher's qualification..... | 48 |
| 13. Table 4.9. DLSR dimension differences by type of school..... | 49 |
| 14. Table 4.10. DLSR dimension differences by location of the school..... | 51 |
| 15. Table 4.11. Pearson's correlation between DL dimensions and teacher variables..... | 52 |
| 16. Table 4.12. Pearson's correlation between DL dimensions and school variables..... | 53 |

LIST OF ACRONYMS

PS: Elementary/Primary School

LSS: Lower Secondary School

MSS: Middle Secondary School

HSS: Higher Secondary School

MOE: Ministry of Education

DL: Distributed Leadership

MV&G: Mission vision and goals

DLRS: Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale

PTC: Primary Teacher Certificate

B.Ed: Bachelor of Education

PGDE: Post Graduate Diploma in Education

M.Ed: Master in Education

RCSC: Royal Civil Service of Bhutan

I. INTRODUCTION

Educational reform places an emphasis upon the relationship between leadership and school improvement, thereby, revealing a powerful impact on school change (Harris, 2002). Furthermore, the social and political forces have united to create an environment in which educational reform is expected and in which schools feel continued pressure to improve. Contemporary educational reform places great attention upon the relationship between leadership and school improvement (Harris, 2005). The pressure of educational reform leads educational leaders in this era of accountability to shift their thinking and to develop leadership skills throughout the school (Neuman, 2000). This shift in philosophy leads school principals and other educational leaders to look for new possibilities to perform their leadership tasks. Although there have been bulky leadership theories in the recent years, the majority of studies are largely concerned with the leadership capabilities of just one person (Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004). Likewise the traditional school administration has been following that of top-down approach where the leader leads, makes key decisions, motivates, and inspires (Harris & Muijs, 2005). Many educators face challenges of politics, hostility, selfishness, and violence and in order to overcome these obstacles it requires teamwork, motivation, empowerment, and communication (Hoyle, 1992). Therefore, it is unwise to think that principal is the only one responsible for providing leadership for school improvement thus presenting a compelling argument for re-defining leadership away from role-based conceptions and towards distributive views (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Spillane, Halverson, & Kaplan, 2001).

In many western countries, there has been an ongoing interest in the power of leadership to generate and sustain school improvement (Anderson, 2004; Hoyle, 2007). Among lots of

leadership practices, the recent studies have begun to focus on distributed leadership. The distributed form of leadership is an alternative perspective that is gaining more followers as it allows for shared decision making in order to produce greater effect (Yukl, 2002). According to Arrowsmith (2005), there are three main characteristics of distributed leadership that must be evaluated in order to gain an understanding of distributed leadership. Firstly, distributed leadership is a term used in connection with a group, not individuals. Secondly, there are fluid boundaries with reference to who can be included in the leadership role. Lastly, distributed leadership involves multiple expertise across the group of leaders as the individual's participation is based on their field of expertise. Therefore, people work together in a way that assembles their expertise and distributes a product that is greater than the sum of its parts (Bennett, Wise, Woods & Harvey, 2003). Above all school leadership is critical to school improvement and to create a situation in which best form of teaching and learning can occur. In fact the quality of leadership determines the motivation of teachers and the quality of teaching in the classroom (Leithwood, Jantzi, Ryan, & Steinbach, 1997; Fullan, 2001; Sergiovanni, 2001).

Although the distributed leadership is receiving great attention in recent educational discourse, there is no single study conducted that focuses on practice of distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools. Traditionally, Bhutanese schools have been following a top down approach of leadership styles. Moreover the concept of distributed leadership was actually born after the introduction of five year development plan in 1961. According to Dyenka (1999) the only form of formal education available in Bhutan before 1960s was monastic education. Good classroom teachers were appointed as principals. Some university graduates were also directly recruited as either principals or assistant principals of high schools (Dorji,

2005). Since after the introduction of western education in the country Bhutan was subject to frequent change in curriculum as well as in administrative system. These recruits lack theoretical understanding of effective leadership as they were recruited directly without having proper leadership trainings. Although there is ongoing master programme for leadership and management; only few principals had undergone this programme. The decentralization system which is a feature of distributed leadership started in Bhutan as early as 1980s and effectively preceded decentralization initiatives in most developing countries, where decentralization propagated in 1990s (Ura, 2004). However, no researchers have ventured to examine the actual teacher engagement in distributed leadership. Therefore, this study aims to investigate teacher engagement within the dimensions of distributed leadership and teacher and school demographic variables were examined to determine if they impacted scores on practice of distributed leadership in different level of schools.

A. Problem Statement

The enormous weight of the many associated expectations rests customarily upon the school principal (Danielson, 2007). Traditionally, leaders often considered distributed leadership as an opportunity to disburse workload or menial responsibilities to others and administrative works were seldom shared between principal and teacher which have enormous effect on student achievement. However, the pressure for improved student achievement has never been superior as schools face significant challenges to respond to the demands associated with preparing students for the 21st century and standards-based reform (Elmore, 2000). According to Fullan (1998), “the constant bombardment of new tasks and the continual interruptions keep principals off balance.” (p. 6). It is beyond the capacity of school

principals to handle all things and this necessitates a distribution of power to employ teachers' expertise to create cultures that enhance development of teaching, learning and leadership (Elmore, 2000a). Thus, it is clear that we need to consider changes in school leadership styles by breaking the isolation of traditional positional leadership and utilizing the capabilities of teachers and other staffs. In fact, distributed leadership aims to enhance teaching and learning by building the capacity of teachers and engaging students more actively in their learning. Furthermore, Duignan (2006) state that distributed leadership has a clear purpose of whole school improvement which is not only an important motivator but also contributor to quality teaching and learning in the classrooms.

Through the lens of distributed leadership, the school leaders endeavor to create a culture that engages every teacher and student in the school in learning. In order for distributed leadership to take firm hold and thrive in a school, principals should determine ways to empower teachers to assume leadership roles with the ultimate goal of influencing one another to improve student learning, which is the mission of all schools (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). Almost all the studies recommend a collaborative model that involves the maximum participation of school faculty through shared decision-making as defined by a distributed leadership model (Gronn, 2008; Spillane, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990; Blase & Blase; 1994). In developed countries like USA and UK, schools are striving to provide more effective learning communities by engaging teachers in leadership activities and professional learning. If principals want to become effective leaders by employing distributed style of leadership, they need to first have knowledge of leadership theory and research on how schools can become successful. However, research suggests that many principals lack the understanding to carry out their role successfully (Williams, 2006).

While coming into Bhutanese context the education system has reformed greatly over the past decades and witnessed principal's roles and responsibilities changing recurrently due to frequent modification which cause leaders to face continuous challenges in their jobs. Although Bhutanese authorities believe that distributive style of leadership can enhance the quality of education there is no formal study that focuses on practice of distributed leadership in their schools. However, there are many informal observations of successful schools which are hypothetically cemented to the notion of effective administrative system. In many developing countries like Bhutan, most schools practice the heroic type of leadership without considering potential talents and expertise of their teachers. They view leaderships as positional and their styles are based on the authority bestowed by the position itself. They are also accountable to the authorities and communities by virtue of their position with little consideration of other staffs' potential.

Bhutan started planned socio-economic development activities with the launching of the first Five Year Plan in 1961 (RGOB [Royal Government of Bhutan] 1999). The concept of distributed form of leadership was actually born when five year plan was first introduced in 1961. To gain an understanding of teachers' engagement within four dimensions of distributed leadership and to identify leadership needs, the study focused on the teachers' perception of engagement within four dimensions of the distributed leadership. In addition, the study determined the differences in engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership by school level and location as well as the differences in distributed leadership practices by demographic characteristics of teachers by gender, qualification, and experience. All schools need strong leadership in this era of accountability, and Bhutan is expecting distributed leadership to improve student achievement. This study investigated the level of

teacher engagement, how they vary among different levels, and their relations within four dimensions of the distributed leadership.

B. Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to contribute to knowledge about the perceptions of distributed leadership in Bhutan. It aims to explore to what extent teachers in Bhutan are engaged in practice of distributed leadership. It also aims to investigate how different level of schools in Bhutan vary according to teacher and school demographic variables, such as, gender, experience, qualification, type and location of the schools. Another purpose of this study is to examine if four dimensions of distributed leadership relate to teacher and school variables. The study investigates not only how different levels of schools vary but also how principals engage other teachers in leadership activities. The exploratory research questions and hypotheses were developed following a review of the literature and the completion of a pilot study. Survey questionnaire was administered to explore distributed leadership practices and how these practices differ among schools. The present study is set within four levels of schools, such as, elementary or primary school(PS), lower secondary school(LSS), middle secondary school(MSS) and higher secondary school(HSS) and was specifically chosen to examine their engagement of distributed leadership(DS) in their respective schools. While this is not a large enough sample to be a representative one in a scientific sense, it is considered that many of the issues explored in depth are typical of the four levels of school.

C. Research questions

This study endeavors to explore a void in the theory and practice of distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools. In this study the teachers' views and practices of distributed leadership by their principals are discussed to gain insight on actual and prevailing system of leadership in Bhutan. This study explores the extent to which principals are using and how different level schools vary in terms of practice of this contemporary leadership approach. The following four research questions drive this study:

- 1) To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership in Bhutan?
- 2) Are there any differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on teacher background including gender, experience and qualification?
- 3) Are there any differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on school demographic information such as school type and location?
- 4) Do the dimensions of distributed leadership relate to teacher and school variables?

C. Significance of this Study

The results of this study will provide insight and information for administrators, practitioners, and researchers about practice of distributed leadership. It will contribute to both the theory and practice of distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools. As schools are increasingly under public scrutiny, principals are becoming more accountable to expectations of school improvement. Moreover the management appears more complex as the school becomes larger in all aspects thus demanding to distribute leadership tasks among others. It has been evident in researches that leadership should be distributed throughout the teachers

rather than concentrated in one position for the improvement of the school (Copland, 2003; Elmore, 2000a; Lashway, 2003). Recent studies of schools invariably identify the principal's leadership as a factor in a school's success.

Additionally, in researching these questions with teachers, this study aims to support schools in becoming more aware of their own leadership perceptions and practices, with particular reference to the possibilities offered by distributed leadership to positively influence teaching and learning. The outcome of the thesis will hopefully provide useful insights to advance leadership practices in Bhutanese school settings. Furthermore, the findings from this study will not only contribute to a limited literature on education administration but will also encourage principals in Bhutan to employ distributed style of leadership. Although the outcomes may be generalizable to only selected group of school (Fraas, 2008), the study may lend some important suggestions to other school districts that have similarly engaged in distributed leadership or to those that are thinking about adopting it as a leadership model for school improvement. Therefore, this research has dual purpose of being a guide to other school leaders thinking about adopting distributed leadership and an aid to those schools already employing the distributed leadership or similar model. Lastly, realizing the importance of principal leadership across the world, this study may be significant in tempting principals to employ distributed leadership which would in turn bring significant changes in their schools.

E. Document Organization and Content

This thesis is presented in five sections and organized in a way that provides the reader with a framework for understanding distributed leadership and the teacher's perception of

distributed leadership in their schools. Chapter 1 is preceded by an abstract of the study and contains an introduction to the research, problem statement, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, document organization and content, and limitations. Chapter 2 reviews the literature to gain a better understanding of what leadership is, types of leadership, what distributed leadership is, what the dimensions of distributed leadership is, why it is important for modern education, and finally, why distributed leadership is important in Bhutanese Schools. The existing literature on leaderships is presented carefully.

Chapter 3 consists of the methodology and data sources. Under selection of data, the pilot and final study were discussed in detail including the information about the site and participants' demographic data. It is followed by measures, statistical analysis and ethical considerations. Chapter 4 presents the findings for each research question. It outlines a profile of each of the four schools and discusses and analyses the findings from the teachers' questionnaires, by teacher and school background variables. Finally, Chapter 5 includes summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations for future research. Appendices include all pertinent supporting documentation that was used in the study or referenced within the report of findings.

F. Limitations

Like all research, this study has certain limitations and delimitations. First, a limitation would exist in the survey results if teachers discussed the survey items with their principals prior to responding. Second, the data were collected solely through email interviewing and did not attempt to employ any other methods. Third, since this study was limited to 131 teachers from four levels of schools the participants may not have adequately represented the

views of all the 7786 teachers working in 553 (Elementary to Higher Secondary schools) Ministry of Education (2012). The outcomes would be more bona fide if the study employed several survey interviews on a large scale. Fourth, this study is limited by the parameters of perceived thoughts and beliefs of teachers about school leadership and the extent of their understanding and use of the terms ‘distributed leadership’. Moreover I was able to contact acquainted teachers who had access to internet facilities. Therefore, most of the participants’ schools were in urban or semi-urban region, which might comparably have dissimilar leadership practices when compared to Bhutan’s far-flung schools.

Fifth, only 44 schools participated in this study. Since the number of school participants is limited, the breadth to make generalizations is slightly reduced. Therefore, it is imperative to understand that it cannot be a representation of an overall picture of leaderships in Bhutan. Sixth, it is also worth acknowledging that this study was conducted through email interviews in English language as an email facility in our language is not very user-friendly. This choice might have also limited the responses of some of my study participants in sharing their ideas and experiences. Seventh, the instrument employed in this study was developed based on American Education system. The reliability test was not high even though it was amended to fit Bhutanese Education System after the pilot study. Some of the reasons can be attributed to differences in Education System considering the cultural differences between East and West. Lastly, readers are expected to recognize that the purpose of this study is to shed light on distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools rather than regarding it as a commentary on leaderships in all schools.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of existing literature related to leadership in schools and the practice of distributed leadership and its role in school enhancement. It discusses the overall definition of leadership, types of leadership, distributed leadership and its dimensions. Finally it examines the Bhutanese education system.

A. Review of the Research on Leadership

1. Definition of Leadership

Generally, the word ‘leadership’ is a complex and multifaceted terminology which is commonly used in discussion in various organizations. However, this terminology has been defined many times in different ways by many researchers. When describing leadership as a social interactive process, Cammock (2001) declares that, ‘Leadership is a holistic process that involves leaders and followers interacting in particular social contexts’ (p. 27). Similar to Cammock’s definition, Northouse (2007) identifies leadership as a process by which a person influences a group of individuals to reach a common goal. In addition leadership is an integrated process where leaders intermingle with followers in a social context as it is basically a social process by which a person persuades the followers to achieve specific goals by motivating, guiding and leading them. Therefore, it is unarguable that leadership naturally takes place in a group context where a leader exercises influence on followers to carry out some task, motivating them through development of a mission, vision and goals etc. Educational leadership is a way to influence the enthusiasm, knowledge, affect or practices of other members of schools or the way they understand the practice of influence (Spillane, 2006). Similarly, Elmore (2000b) defines leadership in education as focusing the leader’s role

on guidance and improvement of instruction. He remarks that leadership is a process that can be learned and is also related to inherent traits. He clearly undergirds the concept of inborn and made leaders.

Drawn from the literature on educational leadership, this study defines that leadership is a process of principals influencing teachers toward the development of their knowledge, instructional practice and leadership qualities (Elmore, 2000b; Northouse, 2007). It is vivid clear that leaders influence followers to improve their skills to reach the goals of schools, a complicated task. Therefore, there is incessant need for able and creative leaders at every levels in every societies and finally at all times.

2. Types of Leadership

Due to growing and diverse body of literature on the topic of school leadership there have been significant paradigms shifts in the understanding of leadership in schools. Some of different leadership practices that will be reviewed are instructional, situational, servant, transformational, transactional, sustainable, and distributed leadership. It has been particularly selected to review the fundamental principles of each leadership. Furthermore, as these leaderships are equally critical for school improvement it is worth discussing before delving into distributed leadership.

a. Instructional leadership

Instructional leadership is one of the most useful tools in creating a forward-looking and student-centered school environment. Moreover, instructional leadership is the dynamic delivery of the curriculum in the classroom through strategies based on reflection, assessment and evaluation to ensure optimum learning and is regarded as most popular theme in

educational leadership. The importance of the principal's role as an instructional leader and the direct relationship on changing instructional practice to improve student performance has been researched extensively (Quinn, 2002). The principal's instructional leadership role such as informing teachers about new educational strategies, technologies and tools that apply to effective instruction (Leithwood, 1994) has been described as a critical element in determining the overall effectiveness of a school (Hallinger, 2003). Furthermore, Leithwood and Duke (1999) described instructional leadership as attending to school culture and other organizational variables believed to influence "the behaviors of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students" (p.47). Instructional leadership can be defined as "those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning." In practice, this means that the principal encourages educational achievement by making instructional quality the top priority of the school and brings that vision to realization.

b. Situational leadership

The fundamental principle of situational leadership is that the leader adapts his/her leadership approach to followers' maturity based on their willingness and ability to perform a specific task. One weakness of this approach is that it is very difficult to predict in advance which type of leadership would be most effective in a particular situation (Sousa, 2003). According to Hersey (1996), the Situational Leadership Model suggests that there is no "one size fits all" approach to leadership. Depending on the situation, varying levels of "leadership" and "management" are necessary. However, leaders must first identify their most important tasks or priorities. Second, leaders must consider the readiness level of their followers by

analyzing the group's ability and willingness. Depending on the level of these variables, leaders must apply the most appropriate leadership style to fit the given situation.

Marzano et al. (2005) describe four situational leadership styles: telling, participating, selling, and delegating. The telling style occurs when followers are incapable and unwilling to perform a task so that there is need for the leader to direct the followers' actions without much concern of their personal relationship. When followers are incapable but willing to perform the given task it is called as participating style. The leader interacts with subordinates in an amicable manner but still provides concrete guidance. The third one is selling style, which is used when subordinates are able but unwilling to perform the task. However, the leader does not have to provide much direction or guidance but must persuade subordinates to engage in the task. Lastly, when the followers are able and willing to perform the task, the leader leaves the execution of the task in the hands of followers with little or no interference or in other words with no concrete direction or guidance, mostly trusting followers to accomplish the task on their own. This kind of style is referred as a delegating style.

c. Servant leadership

The phrase 'servant leadership' was coined by Robert Greenleaf (1970), who believed that effective leadership surfaces from a desire to help others. A servant-leader focuses primarily on the growth and well-being of people and the communities to which they belong. Greenleaf points out that leadership without service is less substantial, more ego-driven and selfish, instead of being community centered, altruistic, and empathetic. According to Greenleaf (1970), the servant leader is servant first and it begins with the natural feeling that one wants

to serve. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. Crippen (2005) states the contradictory term servant-leadership is inclusive of personal service to society regardless of position. Servant leadership also has a unique perspective on the position of the leader within the organization. The best thing about this leadership is instead of occupying a position at the top of a hierarchy, it is positioned at the center of the organization (Marzano et al., 2005). They indicate that the central dynamic of servant leadership is nurturing those within the organization. The essential quality of servant leadership include: understanding the personal needs of those within the organization, healing wounds caused by conflict within the organization, being a steward of the resources of the organization, developing the skills of those within the organization, and being an effective listener.

d. Transformational leadership

Transformational leaders create new things from something old by changing the basic political and cultural systems (Tichy, Ulrich, 1984). According to Bogler (2001) the concept of transformational leadership gradually moved to the centre of the discourse as principals were expected to bring visionary leadership to the institution. Transformational leadership is usually defined as the “ability to empower others” with the purpose of bringing about a “major change in the form, nature, and function of some phenomenon” (Leithwood et al., 1992, p. 25). Furthermore, Leithwood and Jantzi, (1990) showed that school leaders who succeeded in their job have used a wide range of mechanisms to motivate and activate their staff to bring changes in their school. Transformational leadership is based on influence and is accomplished when leaders delegate and surrender power over people and events in order to achieve power over accomplishments and goal achievement (Ubben et al., 2001).

Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) identified six main characteristics of educational leaders who are transformational: building school vision and goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, symbolizing professional practices and values, demonstrating high performance expectations, and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions.

e. Transactional leadership

Transactional leadership develops from the exchange process between leaders and subordinates wherein the leader provides rewards in exchange for the performance of subordinates (Sousa, 2003). This leadership style is really beneficial in times of crisis or in emergency situations where consistency and reliability are absolutely fundamental for success. Each enters the transaction because of the expectation to fulfill self-interests, and it is the role of the leader to maintain the status quo by satisfying the needs of the followers (Bogler, 2001). According to Bass (1985), transactional leadership is distinguished by negotiation, exchange, and contractual dimensions between manager and employee. He further identified two sub-factors of transactional leadership. First, contingent reward refers to a situation where the leader rewards the follower on completion of an agreed task. Second, management by exception deals with a situation where the leader responds only on the occasion when things err. However, Silins (1994) indicate that management by exception appears to be a negative attribute of leadership and is further undergirded by (Yukl, 1999).

f. Sustainable leadership

Sustainable leadership spreads, sustains as well as depends on the leadership of others.

According to Hargreaves & Fink (2006) the meaning of sustain is to hold up; bear the weight of, be able to bear strain, suffering, and the like without collapse. Sustainability does not mean whether something can last long. It addresses how particular initiatives can be developed without compromising the development of others in the surrounding environment, now and in the future. Fullan (2005) defines educational sustainability as the capacity of a system to engage in the complexities of continuous improvement consistent with deep values of human purpose. Similarly, Hargreaves and Fink (2006) support the importance of sustainable educational leadership which helps to preserve and develop learning for all that matters, spreads and lasts. It matters because it preserves, protects, and promotes deep and broad learning for all in relationships of care for others. It lasts since it preserves and advances the most valuable aspects of learning and life over time, year upon year, from one leader to the next.

3. Distributed Leadership

a. Conception of distributed leadership

Leadership style is unique and in many ways knowing and understanding these styles will enhance the effectiveness of one's performance. Distributed leadership has been the subject of this study which is receiving great attention and increased support in recent educational discourse (Harris, 2005; Spillane, 2006). The concept of distributed leadership actually made brief appearances in the literature in the latter half of the 20th Century (Gronn, 2002b, p. 653; Mehar et al., 2006), but did not appear in titles until the turn of the 21st century. A comprehensive treatment of distributed leadership is evident in the studies conducted by three major pioneers of distributed leadership namely, Spillane et al. (2001) in North America,

Gronn (2000a, 2002) in Australia, and Harris (2004, 2005a, 2005b, 2006) in the United Kingdom. The traditional concept of leadership is the vision of only one person at the head of a group, directing, teaching, and encouraging the subordinates and leaders are most responsible for school's success and failure.

However, the idea of transforming schools is such an enormous task that principals should not be expected to do all the work alone even if they are outstanding leaders. The larger the school the more complex management becomes, so there is the need to distribute leadership tasks among others. It has been evident in research that leadership should be distributed throughout the teachers rather than concentrated in one position for the improvement of the school (Copland, 2003; Elmore, 2000a; Lashway, 2003). This conception of leadership distribution patterns suggests that more coordinated forms of leadership distribution make more productive contributions to school outcomes. In many countries school leaders are seen as formal roles based on authority or power, and people taking up those roles are considered responsible for the development and improvement of the school as a whole. However, Harris (2008) suggests use of distributed leadership in schools for two main reasons. Firstly, it has the power to free schools from the current rigid and inflexible leadership structures. Secondly, it has the potential to connect the practice of leadership more closely to teaching and learning (p. 29). She argues that the roles of different patterns of distributed leadership in school improvement have been significantly evident in several research studies conducted for the past decades.

According to Gronn (2002), distributed leadership in education appeared to be a hybrid form of leadership, a combination of hierarchical and heterarchical elements in particular. Furthermore, according to another pioneer, Harris (2008), distributed leadership is primarily

concerned with mobilizing leadership at all levels in the organization not just relying on leadership from the top which was the primary characteristics of traditional leadership. It aims to engage many individuals rather than the few in leadership activity within the school and actively distributing leadership practice among these individuals. She argues that the emphasis here is about leadership practice and not leadership functions.

According to Spillane (2004), a distributed leadership perspective recognizes that there are multiple leaders and that leadership activities are widely shared within and between. A distributed leadership model focuses upon the interactions, rather than the actions, of those who are in formal and informal leadership roles. It is primarily focused pertaining to leadership practice and how leadership influences organizational and instructional improvement (Spillane, 2006). A distributed perspective on leadership acknowledges the work of all individuals irrespective of their position whether or not formally designated as leaders who contribute to leadership practice. Distributed leadership is also central to system reconfiguration and organizational redesign which necessitates lateral, flatter decision-making processes (Hargreaves, 2007). Distributed leadership is all about involvement of multiple individuals whether they are leaders or subordinates. Distributed leadership is an aspect of leadership that recognizes leading and managing schools as involving multiple individuals including those who are not formally designated leaders (Spillane et al., 2008). The efforts of the multiple individuals create an organizational culture where hierarchical control gives way to shared collaboration (Hargreaves & Fink, 2008). Spillane (2006) described distributed leadership as a practice that is “a product of the joint interactions of school leaders, followers, and aspects of their situations such as tools and routines” (p. 3).

According to A. Harris (2004), there are three important things leaders should consider in

order to have distributed leadership. First, distributed leadership requires those in formal leadership positions to relinquish power to others. This requirement potentially places the principals in a vulnerable position due to lack of direct control over certain activities. Additionally, there are financial barriers as leadership personal in schools carries additional increments. Therefore, to secure informal leadership in schools will require principals to use other incentives and to seek alternative ways of remunerating staff who take on additional leadership responsibilities. Second, the 'top-down' approaches to leadership triggers significant obstructions in the development of fair distributed leadership. The current hierarchy of leadership within schools means that power dwells with the leaders, that is, at the top of the school. In addition there are many other factors which prevent teachers from participating meaningfully in leadership programmes. Finally and most importantly, distributed leadership poses the major challenge of how to distribute responsibilities and authorities and more importantly who will distribute responsibilities and authorities. These studies clearly points out that a 'top-down' approach to distributed leadership is possible and that giving improvement or development responsibilities to teachers offers a means of empowering others to lead. Therefore, it is imperative to implement these three points in order to have successful distributed leadership in our schools. However, it is vital to ensure that distributed leadership is not simply misguided delegation. Instead, it implies a social and equal distribution of leadership where the leadership function is stretched over the work of a number of individuals and where the leadership task is accomplished through the interaction of multiple leaders (Spillane, 2002).

Distributed leadership as leadership practice is located in the webs of relationships or networked interactions between leaders and followers that define the organization's culture

(Hargreaves & Fink, 2008; Spillane, 2006). Here, everyone in the organization is given opportunity to partake in decision-making. Harris (2008), points out that distributed leadership does not mean that everyone in the organization leads, but that decision making is governed by the interaction of individuals rather than individual directions. Gronn (2000) identifies three major actions in distributed leadership: *collaboration*, *intuitive working relations* and *institutionalized practices*. According to Gronn (2000) spontaneous *collaboration* takes place when interaction is not allocated and two or more individuals utilize their expertise to solve a problem. *Intuitive working* relations occur in a certain time when two or more members depend a lot on each other to solve a particular problem or achieve tasks. *Institutional practices* are defined as the role assignments of the formal positions in an organization. Gronn strongly believes that school leaders tend to share their leadership in these specific manners. Later, Elmore (2000b) advances the Gronn model by linking it further to instructional improvement and school achievement, employing multiple sources of leadership and utilizing individual skills. He defines the term with broader aspects that the complex nature of instructional practice requires exercise of shared and complementary expertise rather than the hierarchical division of knowledge in order to have greater success. Indeed, the concept of distributed leadership is developed through the use of dissimilar areas of expertise to achieve the common goal.

b. Importance of distributed leadership

During the last 10 years, the concept of distributed leadership has swept through the theory and practice of educational leadership. The recent provenance of distributed leadership in the field of education can be traced to seminal publications by Gronn and Spillane. Gronn (2000)

linked ideas of distributed leadership to an intellectual project stretching back to the 1950s, relating it to distributed cognition and to activity theory offering ‘an entirely new conception of workplace ecology’. Spillane et al. (2004) similarly suggested distributed leadership to be a lens through which to examine and understand better the interrelationship of the social and physical environment’. In both cases, distributed leadership was offered as a heuristic tool, not a type of or prescription for practice. Such detachment swiftly gave way to explicit or implicit assertions by others that distributed leadership was a form of practice and, moreover, a recommended one. By 2009, Seashore Louis et al. (2009) concluded that distributed leadership had become ‘a mantra for reshaping leadership practice’. They observed that more and more schools are trying to adopt distributed leadership and that official agencies are encouraging them to do so (NCSL, 2011; OECD, 2011). Despite the slipperiness of the concept and its uncertain relationship with preexisting theories, distributed leadership has metamorphosed from a means of refocusing leadership research to a kind of leadership ideal. Day et al. (2010: 16) unequivocally claim, ‘There is a connection between the increased distribution of leadership roles and responsibilities and the Educational Management Administration & Leadership improvement of pupil outcomes.’

Distributive leadership is not simply an organizational arrangement nor a process whereby a principal delegates responsibilities to others. Rather, it is more of a mindset or a perspective which can find expression in different ways. Spillane et al (2004), for instance, stress the social dimension through which the work of various individuals expresses itself, collectively, as a leadership function. Essential to it is an ethos of shared responsibility which, in turn, encourages initiatives serving a common purpose. It flourishes in a climate of trust, support and openness to new learning situation. Distributive leadership involves the leadership

functions of a school being shared by many people in ways that strengthen the whole school community, intensifying a sense of engagement and shared responsibility while making the workload more manageable. Distributive leadership widens the basis for decision-making and creates a flatter administrative structure. This helps teachers to actively participate in decision-making. As a result, each individual has greater opportunities to contribute to the common good in ways that will enhance learning and teaching as well as the organizational effectiveness of the school. This general approach really belongs within an overall conceptual framework which supports a shared vision and such values as fairness, equity, inclusion and respect.

Harris and Spillane (2008) suggested that there are three main reasons for the current popularity of distributed leadership. Distributed leadership has descriptive, representational and normative power. Firstly, distributed leadership has *normative power*; it reflects current changes in leadership practice in schools. The growth of what Gronn (2003) has termed 'greedy work' in schools has resulted in the expansion of leadership tasks and responsibilities. This has required leadership to be actively and purposefully distributed within the school. The model of the singular, heroic leader is at last being replaced with leadership that is focused upon teams rather than individuals and places a greater emphasis upon teacher, support staff and students as leaders (Harris, 2004). Distributed leadership practices in schools endeavor to augment teaching and learning by building the capacity of teachers and engaging students more meaningfully in their learning. Duignan (2006) states that distributed leadership have a clear purpose of whole school improvement; an important motivator as well as contributor to quality teaching and learning in the classrooms. Through this type of leadership approach school leaders try to build a system that engages every teachers and

students in the school in learning more effectively and meaningfully. However, the commitment from stakeholders is very crucial to school's success. Some research has shown that motivated teachers participate in school improvement with greater commitment.

Harris (2002) found that shared or distributed leadership is a key determinant of the motivation of teachers. With regard to school improvement and change, she points to an extensive body of research, which confirms that strong collegial relationships, mutual trust, support and a focus on enquiry are crucial for effective improvement. As we move forward schools have become more dependent on the leadership of principals and other members of a school for continuous improvement and are being asked to be more accountable for the education of students through effective leadership of school principals and teachers (Ferrandino, 2001). It is through distributed leadership that schools are trying to provide more effective learning communities by meaningfully engaging teachers in leadership activities and professional learning. According to (Williams, 2006) for principals to become effective leaders by utilizing a more distributed style of leadership, they need to have knowledge of school leadership theory and research on how schools become successful. Research suggests that majority of principals lacks the understanding to carry out their role and responsibilities successfully. The study also shows that school leadership is focused on learning and distributed among teachers rather than limiting to those designated leadership positions. It suggests that teacher leadership is as important as principal leadership. Students and parents play a vital role in goal-setting and decision-making though they are omitted from formal leadership. Therefore, leadership for overall school development could be defined as a shared social process or otherwise as distributed leadership.

Secondly, distributed leadership has *representational* power. It represents the alternative

approaches to leadership that have arisen because of increased external demands and pressures on schools. As schools reposition and redefine themselves, distributed, extended and shared leadership practices are more prevalent. As schools engage with complex collaborative arrangements, distributed forms of leadership will be required to ‘cross multiple types of boundaries and to share ideas and insights’ (Wenger et al., 2002). As the world of education increasingly gets complex the work of leadership will require diverse types of expertise and forms of leadership flexible enough to meet changing challenges and new demands. There is also growing concept of acceptance that the old organizational structures of schooling simply do not fit the requirements of learning in the twenty-first century. New models like distributed leadership through the looking glass of schooling are emerging rapidly based on collaboration, networking and multi-agency working (federations, partnerships, networked learning communities, extended schools, etc. These new and more complex forms of schooling system require new and more effective leadership approaches. These approaches are needed to navigate a very different organizational landscape of education. Critics argue that distributed leadership is nothing more than a ‘new orthodoxy’ which reinforces managerialist principles (Fitzgerald and Gunter 2007; Timperley 2005).

Alternatively proponents of distributed leadership suggest that it offers a new way of thinking about leadership in schools and provides a powerful tool for transforming leadership practice (Spillane and Camburn 2006). However, the leadership industry is susceptible to new theories or labels for leadership. In fact its existence depends upon it. Yet, many of these new theories or labels appear in the leadership field without any empirical evidence or testing. They emerge as the latest set of leadership ideas and are championed, celebrated and then discarded. Distributed leadership is undoubtedly ‘‘the new kid on the block’’ (Gronn 2000, p.

34). The early studies are already identifying differing interpretations of distributed leadership and its impact on the school. The concept of teachers working together to improve their teaching practices is a move away from the isolation and individualism of teaching as highlighted by authors such as Lortie (1975, cited in Spillane 2001) and Fullan (1993) and, in an era of rapid and significant change, it was essential that teachers would work together rather than separately. Teamwork was one of the structural changes that supported the introduction of new curriculum content and methodologies. Distributed leadership is seen as one of the most important form of leadership which can act as a complement rather than a substitute to traditional vertical leadership (Pearce 2004). Pearce noted that although vertical leadership styles can suppress the team member participation in decision making, it still plays an important role in team design and boundary management, two factors which are considered as important for the ongoing success of distributed leadership.

Lastly and most importantly, distributed leadership has *empirical* power. There are an increasing number of studies that highlight a powerful relationship between distributed forms of leadership and positive organizational change (Harris et al., 2007). Most recently research has shown that the patterns of leadership distribution matter within an organization and that distributed leadership practice is more likely to equate with improved organizational performance and outcomes (Leithwood et al., 2004, 2007). Recent research in the UK and the USA shows that leadership is one of the most important factors in making a school successful (OECD 2008, Harris 2004, Leithwood and Riehl 2003, NAHT 2000, King et al 1996). In the USA the research concluded that leadership has a significant effect on student learning, second only to the effects of the quality of the curriculum and teaching (Leithwood and Riehl 2003). In the UK, research also supports the importance of leadership: where leadership is

weak it is more difficult for a teacher to do a good job. Where it is effective staff and pupils are better motivated, people know what is going on because communications are clear and frequent, and everyone feels they are pulling together and working towards shared goals (Day, Sammons et al 2007).

Another research, particularly two recent studies of successful school leadership have declared the importance of distributed leadership in securing school improvement. In 1999 the NAHT (National Association of Headteachers) commissioned research to identify and examine successful leadership practice in schools (Day et al., 2000). In 2001 the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) financed the research that explored the successful leaderships in schools facing challenging circumstances (Harris and Chapman, 2002). Both of these studies offer a contemporary view of successful leadership providing insights into leadership practices in schools that are in the process of improving. The central theme stemmed out from both studies was that successful leaders recognized the drawbacks of a singular leadership style and saw their leadership role as being primarily concerned with empowering others to lead. Another longitudinal research of inter-organizational rule-making groups conducted by Feyerherm (1994) provided clear evidence concerning the shared nature of leadership behaviors in teams which were facing a highly complex and interdependent task, requiring the integration of differing viewpoints and interests. In such highly interdependent situations, in which no single individual is capable of possessing all the relevant expertise for reaching a common goal, distributed leadership seems particularly useful (Pearce 2004).

The subsequent researchers has indicated that distributed leadership can appear in different forms, and only if different individuals within a group recognize each other as leaders

(distributed-coordinated leadership) does distributed leadership lead to increased overall performance. Suppose, if the different individuals within the institution do not recognize each other as leaders (distributed-fragmented leadership) there seems to be no enhanced performance over traditional vertical leadership (Mehra et al. 2006). In conclusion distributed leadership does not confine the teachers' engagement to pedagogical issues but broadened the scope of their leadership to decision-making in the overall operation of the school.

c. Dimensions of distributed leadership

Although it is possible to have more or less than four dimensions of distributed leadership this study discusses specifically four dimensions: mission, vision and goals; school culture; shared responsibility and leadership practices. First, many research studies emphasize the importance of setting the *mission, vision and goals* of a school and the impact of this on school achievement (MacBeath, 2005; Neuman & Simons, 2000). It is one of the dimensions through which leadership influenced student learning. Leithwood and Jantzi (1999) defines school mission as what members of the school understand to be both the implicit and explicit purpose and direction of the school. Hallinger and Heck (1998) saw establishing clear school mission as the avenue that principals use to shape teachers' expectations and student opportunity to learn in school. Schools that have a clear academically oriented mission are better able to make decisions in the interest of students and allocate resources toward improving teaching and learning (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Furthermore, MacBeath's (2005) suggests that the schools which are more developed in terms of teaching and learning are those that have clear mission, vision and goals. Without a specific mission and vision, leaders seldom understand how what they are doing might

augment the school improvement. Additionally, the development of schools can have rapid progress if they have a clear mission, vision and goals; and at the same time stakeholders are aware of successful and effective implementations.

Neuman and Simmons (2000) explained that aim of distributed leadership is to “develop a shared vision with clear goals that focused on student learning” (p. 11). Furthermore, Sergiovanni (2000) characterized vision as an “education platform” that incorporates the school’s beliefs about preferred aims, methods, and climate which would create a “community of mind” that establishes behavioral norms for the organization. Schools that share vision and mission will experience a cohesive school-wide focus among school members. Similarly, DuFour and Eaker (1998) identified this dimension as the building block of a professional learning community. They explained that “mission establishes an organization’s purpose, vision instills a sense of direction and goals represent measurable steps that can be used to assess in advancing towards the vision” (p. 62). However, the mission, vision, and goals of a school can only be effective if all the members in an organization are aware of it and are clear, meaningful, useful, and up to date and reflect important educational values that support the educational direction. Also, the meta-analysis research conducted by Walters et al. (2004) concluded that the impact of school mission had an average effect size on students’ achievement (p.4).

School culture is the second leadership dimension identified by Elmore (2000) as influencing student achievement. School culture is framed over the course of a school’s history after its establishment. DuFour and Eaker (1998) explained that it is founded upon “the assumptions, beliefs, values, and habits that constitute the norm of the organization – norms that shape how its people think, feel, and act” (p. 131). Considering norms of school

Sergiovanni (2000) defines culture as “the normative glue that holds a particular school together” (p. 1). Furthermore he argued that if the components of culture are shared vision, values, and beliefs then culture could serve as “a compass that steers people in a common direction and shapes the decisions and practices of school members” (p. 1). Therefore, the role of culture to school effectiveness depends on the content of these norms, values, beliefs, and assumptions. Stolp (1994) proposed that the “vision for creating a healthy school culture should be a collaborative activity among teachers, students, parents, staff, and the principal” (p. 1). The outcomes of a collaborative culture include high morale, enhanced commitment to teaching, and high student achievement.

Brandt (2003) suggested that a school culture that invites deep and sustained professional learning would have a powerful impact on student learning. Gordon (2005) examined the impact of the dimensions of distributed leadership on school performance and student achievement. Data was collected from 1,257 teachers of 36 Connecticut schools where 26 elementary and 10 secondary schools were selected. The Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS) was utilized to gather survey. Among the dimensions of distributed leadership, the results indicated that only one dimension, school culture, could predict student achievement to a statistically significant degree. The other dimensions contributed to school performance collectively but were not individually significant. Similarly, Walters et al. (2004) research found that the impact of school culture on student achievement had an average effect size (p. 4).

Shared responsibility is another important dimension of distributed leadership as teachers are motivated when they think they are part of the school administration and have involvement in the decision-making in day-to-day activities. Decision making is no more one

man's business but a shared responsibility if one endeavors to achieve collective success in their school. Shared responsibility has emerged as an important factor in enabling future leaders to develop and to distribute leadership tasks among teachers. Duignan (2006) advocates for sharing the responsibility in decision-making since it help to create a greater ownership of decisions by teachers. Though teacher leadership is a familiar term at present, previously principals had poor knowledge and hesitation about this concept (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). They continued to play single role and never gave way for teachers to make decision. Even now, many principals in developing countries would think about teacher leadership as the team leader or subject leader. Every teacher has expertise in different fields and without employing the potential of all teachers, achieving the school goals would be difficult.

The positive impact of shared responsibility is evident in a study by Devos and Hulpia (2010) where they explores the nature of distributed leadership and how its practice might relate to school improvement through teachers' organizational commitment. Their research is a follow-up study of a larger project on school members' commitment to the schools. Four schools were selected purposively based on high and low potentiality in school performance. The interview questions focused on different dimensions and characteristics of distributed leadership and organizational commitment. Their findings indicate that it is important for principals to encourage teachers to participate in school decision-making processes actively to help make their schools successful as a whole. Furthermore, Ramsey and Dorseif (1994) presented their research findings at the Schools for the 21st Century Consortium. They explained that they administered questionnaires in 1992 and again in 1993. The data showed a positive relationship between shared decision-making and student achievement. They

concluded that as shared decision making in the schools increased and become “institutionalized,” student scores increased.

A *leadership practice* is the final dimension included among the recommended conditions. Leadership practices explain how school leaders define, present and carry out their interaction with others in the process of leading. It is an important dimension of distributed leadership that is carried out with the collaboration of others in leading process. Principals can play the role in distributing leadership tasks to teachers and engaging them actively in school leadership so that they may have academic optimism. A study by Mascall, Leithwood, Straus and Sacks (2008) examines the relationship between the patterns of distributed leadership and teachers' academic optimism for effective schools. They hypothesized that teachers' academic optimism would be most strongly and positively associated with the patterns of leadership distribution giving greatest weight to the coordination of leadership efforts. According to Spillane et al. (2001), it is the “interaction of leaders and tools of various sorts” (p. 26). Leadership practice should be distributed among formal and informal leaders (Sheppard, 2003; Spillane et al., 2001). Lambert (2003) suggested that positional leaders needed to be “clear about their core values and confident in their own capacity to work well with others by influencing, facilitating, guiding and mentoring” (p. 44).

Although distributed leadership involves many leaders including teachers, the ultimate responsibility to hold the institution together in a creative relationship is the responsibility of the leader alone. Elmore (2000) further explained that the job of the leader is to buffer teachers from extraneous and non-instructional issues so as to create an active arena for engaging and using quality interventions on instructional issues” (p. 12). Harris (2002) found that effective leadership practice involves leadership that is structural, political, symbolic,

inspirational, instructional, distributed, and transformational – that gave staff the confidence and responsibility to lead. Waters et al. (2004) identified 21 leadership responsibilities in a research metaanalysis that measured the effect of leadership practices on student achievement. These had significant impact on student achievement and include the five leadership dimensions postulated by Elmore (2000). The research found a positive relationship between leadership practices and student achievement with a .25 average effect size.

B. Distributed Leadership in Bhutanese Schools

1. Bhutanese Education System

First of all, the current education system in Bhutan has three main categories: general education, monastic education and non-formal education (Ministry of Education, Bhutan, 2012). The general education is by far the biggest and is commonly seen as the only educational structure. The basic education is free of cost up to Middle Secondary School which is equivalent to Middle School in other countries. Currently it comprises 11 years of free basic education from Pre Primary to grade X, divided into 7 years of primary education (PP-VI), which starts at the age of 6, and 4 years of Secondary Education (VII-X). At the end of the cycle (grade X) there is a national board examination, Bhutan Certificate for Secondary Education (BCSE) (Bhutan, Ministry of Education, 2012). The Bhutanese students need to appear two major board examinations which are conducted in December at the end of tenth and twelfth grade. However, the grade X students can either continue their general education in classes XI and XII in Higher Secondary Schools by appearing board examination or join the vocational training institutes or enter the labor market based on the students' performance. Although there are three categories of education, only the general education from Elementary

level to grade XII has been considered for this study.

Bhutanese schooling system is divided into four categories namely, elementary, lower secondary, middle secondary and higher secondary schools. As of December 2012 Bhutan has 344 public and 9 private elementary schools (Preprimary- grade 6) with 2,335 teachers serving in public schools and 132 teachers working in private schools covering 50,733 students altogether. There are 92 public and 1 private lower secondary schools (grade 7-8) with student enrollment totaling to 49,998 students. According to Ministry of Education, Bhutan (2012), there are 1,997 teachers working in lower secondary schools. Furthermore, 1,774 teachers works in 59 middle secondary schools (grade 9-10) of which 2 are owned by private entrepreneurs. Currently, there are 39,963 students enrolled in middle secondary schools. Finally, higher secondary school (grade11-12) enrolled 32,702 students in 2012 of which 34 schools are public and 14 private. There are 1,548 teachers teaching in higher secondary schools. However, the different levels of schools vary greatly in terms of organization, facility, teacher deployment, funding etc. School administration in Bhutan is shaped by the top-down traditions of the prevailing colonial system (Thornton, 2006). In the administration of school education, the Ministry of Education is the highest authority followed by District Education Officers (DEO) and the principal is the authority for management at the school level. In every school, there is a School Management Board (SMB) to assist principals in decision-making regarding academic improvement and management of the school. Depending on level of school and its enrollment the number of vice principals working in particular school vary greatly. Principals are also by huge margin considered as the most important and influential individuals in the school system (Tashi, 2013). Not all the teachers of a school are members of the SMB except for elementary schools in rural area

where the schools are run by principal and few teachers without vice principals. The participants in this committee set and implement disciplinary decisions and solve academic issues. SMB also includes representatives from community and parents.

In terms of administration and finance of school, there are two types of schools: public and private. The public schools fully run by government while private is run by proprietors. The majorities of schools are public and receive 100% government financial assistance for salary and wages. Physical facilities, infrastructure development, educational equipments, food allowance and teaching aids are also supplied by the government. There are only few private schools and the parents prefer their child to get enrolled in public schools as it is free. It is also important to note that all the schools follow same curriculum irrespective of public or private. Over the past years Bhutan has seen growing numbers of private schools, especially in the urban places like Thimphu.

The Royal Civil Service Commission of Bhutan (RCSC) in 2006 categorized the position of principals into four categories (Drukpa, 2009). First, Principal-I requires the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree or the Post Graduate Diploma in Education (PGDE) or a relevant field of specialization. This principal should also have a Master in educational leadership and management, as well as research methods and practices. Second, Principal-II requires a Master in a relevant field. The principal should have undertaken some courses in educational leadership and management. Third, Principal-III requires the B.Ed. or PGDE or Master in a relevant field. Educational leadership and management training, program design and organization, and research methods on education management issues are expected areas of study. Fourth, Principal-IV requires the B.Ed. or PGCE. Other requirements include training

in leadership and management and successful completion of a tenure period as vice-principal under the mentorship of a principal. According to Drukpa (2009), the roles and responsibilities are very similar and applied to all four levels of principals. However, many principals lack basic research methods and practices nor do they have Master or higher degree to perform their tasks effectively. Prior to becoming fulltime principal they assisted their principals if not shouldered extra responsibilities but most of them are not trained in educational leadership and management

2. Importance of Distributed Leadership in Bhutanese Schools

Since after introduction of western education there was no proper administrative system to administer before 1961 and it is not clear as to how they operated the school system. A formal western form of education was borrowed from the neighboring country of India in the early 1960s. Because the education system was borrowed, the curriculum and the curricular materials were also borrowed (Wangmo, 2003). Not only Bhutan borrowed curriculum and the curricular materials, she also hired the majority of its teachers and headmasters from India (Dorji, 2005). Due to heavy influence of Indian curricula and Indian teachers many Bhutanese shares similar accent to Indians. However, this trend fades as the schools are staffed by native Bhutanese. According to Drukpa (2009) it was only early in 1988 that the Ministry of Education started appointing Bhutanese teachers as heads of the schools and institutes. On the other hand, interestingly, Bhutan doesn't employ native English speakers like in other countries.

There is little or no evidence on objective selection criteria when the heads of schools were nationalized in 1988. According to Dorji (2005), good classroom teachers were appointed as head teachers. Some university graduates were also directly recruited as either principals or

assistant principals of high schools. However, currently, the title of assistant principal is replaced by vice principal. It is evident that principals had little or no training in school administration when the responsibility of school heads was handed over to the national teachers. However, they tried their best to be effective leaders despite inadequate administrative and leadership skills. Due to these challenges of managing schools without any formal or informal training, the Ministry of Education introduced some adhoc or in-service courses for principals where they could attend a three-week rigorous introduction to school management and leadership. From 2003 onwards, this has been formalized in two different ways. One is the introduction of a part-time Master of Education course for secondary school principals and the other is a part-time diploma course for primary school principals in school management and leadership which is a collaborative venture with St. Francis Xavier University in Nova Scotia, Canada (Dorji, 2005). A three-year part-time diploma program was offered starting in 2004 for principals with certificates to enhance their management and leadership skills. At the same time, priority was also offered to principals to acquire the B.Ed. degree through the distance education program of the Samtse and Paro College of Education, which is the only two colleges of Education in the country (Dorji, 2005).

At present in Bhutan, there are two key leadership positions in the school. Principals have the power to lead the school formally and vice principals assist the principals in executing rules and regulations. These two positions hold formal leadership and management roles, and are responsible for the development and improvement of the schools. However, only few principals earned higher degrees such as master degree. Gronn (2003) states, "Principals and other school administrators may be leaders, therefore, but they are not automatically so by

virtue of being administrators and managers" (p. 17). To make their schools more effective principals need to acquire current knowledge of leadership theory and research to engage teachers more in leadership activities. This is a challenging issue for improving principals and school leadership in Bhutan. Apart from this the schools in Bhutan face the problem of inadequate physical facilities, high teacher-student ratio, lack of qualified teachers and competent educational administrators. Teachers have little involvement in decision making related to development of their schools. As a result, they feel undervalued as they are excluded from the decision-making process about school development.

III. METHODS

This chapter outlines the methods adopted for this study and the reasons for the choices made. Information about the data sources, instrumentation, statistical analysis, data collection, and ethical considerations of the research design are presented. Creswell (2002), suggested that research methodology must consider the context of the research and the desired results in order to achieve meaningful research outcomes. Considering the context, quantitative approach was employed in this study as this approach suits the phenomenon under study. It allows me to interpret and analyze empirical data based on teacher's perception of school leadership, their practice of it and their thinking on distributing their leadership responsibilities within the Bhutanese context.

A. Data

This study focuses on the teachers' perspectives of distributed leadership and the leadership practices in their school contexts. Therefore, the unit of analysis for this study is teachers. The identified study population includes teachers from public schools based on random selection from all across the country. The total numbers of 31 and 131 teachers participated in the pilot and final study respectively.

A pilot study was first conducted to test the instrument's reliability and validity, the completeness of responses, and analyze the various measures within the instrument. Participants were invited randomly through an e-mail that contained an attachment of a Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS). The survey utilized a 5 point (1 to 5) Likert scale having the response options that ranges from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree and 5=strongly agree. The instrument was selected based on feasibility as it was

specifically designed to measure distributed leadership, which is the main focus of this study. Although 50 emails were sent to 50 different teachers only 31 teachers responded.

To examine the practice of distributed leadership, eleven schools and thirty one teachers (9 female, 22 male) from four different levels of schools namely elementary, lower secondary, middle secondary and higher secondary schools participated in this study. The teachers' level of education included 21 B.Ed degrees, 6 Master degrees and 2 with PGCE and Certificates respectively. The surveys were distributed to 11 elementary, 5 lower, 10 middle and 6 higher secondary schools. Most of the participant's experiences were below 10 years; however, 8 teachers reported that they served for 10 years and above. Similarly, the participants were selected randomly from different schools located in different parts of the country. 48.4% were located in urban region while 35.5% are situated in semi-urban. The remaining 16.1% were located in rural areas.

Content validity was performed along with the thesis advisor to ensure the feasibility of this instrument particularly for the current study. The content validity of the instrument was verified by the test of internal consistency. Judgments were also considered regarding the face validity of the final instrument. Reliability test was conducted to check the internal consistency. The study performed an analysis to determine the reliability of the instrument during the pilot test. The reliability of a test is a measure of the correlation between scores on the test and the hypothetical true values (Gable, 1986). Computing reliability based on internal consistency requires only one administration of the instrument and results can be used to interpret the correlation between the instrument and all other possible tests measuring the dimensions of interest (Gable, 1986). Therefore, reliability of the survey was determined

by the internal consistency of the items. The results of a pilot survey were loaded into SPSS 21 data base and tested using Cronbach’s alpha. Results of the test yielded a value of .914, confirming instrument reliability.

After conducting pilot test, the instrument was thoroughly reviewed to examine if there is need for necessary changes. The responses were reviewed and the questionnaire was revised to finalize the items based on any misunderstandings related to the questions. Based on reliability and content validity test the questionnaire was not much amended. Only, to collect the authentic responses minor changes have been made relating to the demographic information of the respondents as shown in <table 3.1>.

<Table 3.1> Changes in demographic information

| Demographic information | Pilot test | Final test |
|---------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Principal's qualification | Not mentioned | Mentioned |
| Principal's gender | Not mentioned | Mentioned |
| Location of school | Not mentioned | Mentioned |

The final study employed primary data collection method through email surveys as there is a limited secondary data sources. This approach was good because it covered a large population quickly and at a reasonable cost. With the advancement of modern technologies, the reliance on the interview as a means of information gathering has most recently expanded to electronic outlets, with questionnaires being administered via fax, electronic mail, and websites (Fontana & Frey, 2000). Furthermore, electronic survey methods, including surveys through emails and the web, have emerged as innovative survey techniques. These survey methods have both advantages and disadvantages as compared to existing survey techniques. One of the strongest arguments for utilizing this method is the benefit of cost reduction. This

reduction is mostly due to elimination of postage, mailing costs, and paper elimination (Dillman, 2000).

The data collection method was selected chiefly for three reasons; it allowed for self-administration, enabled rapid data collection, and it was cost effective. Therefore, it was unquestionably cost effective as I didn't have to travel to Bhutan to collect the data. Besides several benefits there are also potential disadvantages associated with electronic data gathering. For the researchers, e-mail is cost effective and provides an easy way to record data. Most importantly, this method of data collection also allows access to participants regardless of geographical location. This way it enhances to reduce the shallow generalization with small sample size which is based on certain region or location. On the other hand such kind of email surveys is limited to persons with internet facilities and the answers depend entirely on respondent's honesty. Lastly, all the data collected were carefully coded using SPSS 21 and Microsoft Excel 2007.

A total number of 150 teachers were invited to participate in the email survey where one needs to fill in the same questionnaire of a Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS). The sample frame is made up of individuals who are teachers working in Bhutanese schools which include Elementary, Lower Secondary, Middle secondary and Higher Secondary schools. The data was collected within three months from September, 2013 to November, 2013. While administering the survey the questionnaire contained a note to the survey where participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and honest answers are appreciated. The introductory letter along with letter of consent to principals, that accompanied the survey, indicated that information collected would be secured confidentially. The required consent such as research approval was prepared and given to the selected

organization along with questionnaires. After making minor changes regarding the details of the participants, out of 150 questionnaires being administered, 131 teachers responded. The details are shown in the <table3.2>.

<Table 3.2> Number of Participants

| Number of participants | Number of questionnaire administered | Number of questionnaire received | Total |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|
| 150 | 150 | 131 | 87.3% |

The participants for this study were 131 certified teachers with Certificate, B.Ed, and Post Graduate Diploma in Education and Master Degrees in Bhutan during the 2012-2013 academic year. Among 131 teachers, 33 are from Elementary, 32 from Lower Secondary, 32 from Middle and 34 from Higher secondary schools in Bhutan. There were 73 male and 58 female respondents with 100% native Bhutanese. The teachers' level of education included 95 B.Ed degrees, 12 PGDEs, 3 Certificates and 21 Master degrees. 17.6% of them were teaching within the experience range of 1-5 years. Similarly, 16% of them have more than 20 years teaching experience. Majority of the participants falls within the experience range of 6-10 and 11-15 years with a percentage of 33% and 22.9% respectively. 10.7% of them have the experience range of 16-20 years which is the least representation comparing to other four experience ranges.

In terms of school information 44 schools (11×4=44) participated in this study. Majority of the schools were located in a semi-urban region with almost 53% while only 20.5% were from rural areas. The remaining represents urban schools with 27.2%. The schools and teachers were randomly selected as the purpose of the study was to investigate practice of

distributed leadership among Bhutanese schools. In reference to virtual principal participation, a total number of 44 principals from 44 schools (11 elementary, 11 lower, 11 middle & 11 high schools) participated in this study. The principals' level of education included 2 Certificates, 25 B.Ed degrees, 1 PGDE and 16 Master degrees. Furthermore, 70% of them were male while 30% were female. The detail information of school, teachers and principals are shown in <table 3.3>.

<Table 3.3> Details of teacher and school participants

| | | | Frequency | Percentage | Total |
|---------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------|
| Teacher Information | Gender | Male | 73 | 56% | 100% |
| | | Female | 58 | 44% | |
| | | | 131 | 100% | |
| | Qualification | Certificate | 3 | 2.3% | 100% |
| | | B.Ed | 95 | 73% | |
| | | PGDE | 12 | 9.2% | |
| | | Master | 21 | 16% | |
| | | | | 131 | |
| | Experience | 1-5 | 23 | 17.6% | 100% |
| | | 6-10 | 43 | 33% | |
| | | 11-15 | 30 | 22.9% | |
| | | 16-20 | 14 | 10.7% | |
| | | 20+ | 21 | 16% | |
| | | | | 131 | |
| | Type | Elementary | 11 | 25% | 100% |
| Lower | | 11 | 25% | | |
| Middle | | 11 | 25% | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|------|-------|------|
| School Information | | Higher | 11 | 25% | |
| | | | 44 | 100% | |
| | Location | Urban | 12 | 27.2% | |
| | | Semi-urban | 23 | 52.3% | 100% |
| | | Rural | 9 | 20.5% | |
| | | 44 | 100% | | |
| Principal Information | Gender | Male | 31 | 70% | |
| | | Female | 13 | 30% | 100% |
| | | | 44 | 100% | |
| | Qualification | Certificate | 2 | 5% | |
| | | B.Ed | 25 | 56.8% | 100% |
| | | PGDE | 1 | 2% | |
| | | Master | 16 | 36.2% | |
| | | | 44 | 100% | |

B. Instrumentation

To measure the practice of distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools the instrument Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS)¹ developed by the Connecticut State Board of Education was employed. Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS) which was developed by experts specifically to measure distributed leadership by Connecticut State Board of Education (2004), and based on the four dimensions of distributed leadership, was built primarily upon the conclusions and theories presented in the literature review. Many researchers have employed this instrument to measure distributed leadership. Gordon, the developer of DLRS, has argued that the DLRS is an instrument that schools can use to

¹ See appendix for copy right information

measure leadership practices to identify weak areas, and to make changes for school improvement. Prior to using this instrument the permission has been duly sought by writing a formal request to the respective developers at Connecticut State Board of Education. Subsequently, the developers have emailed an approval letter with copy to my thesis advisor. The DLRS was developed by the Connecticut Department of Education using Elmore's five dimensions of distributed leadership: mission, vision, and goals; leadership practices; school culture; evaluation and professional development; and decision-making.

The survey instrument was developed in several stages to ensure content validity. Firstly, forty items were adopted from the existing questionnaire of DLRS and then reduced to thirty five items based on Bhutanese context. Then the reliability test was performed to examine internal consistency. Secondly, the newly developed questionnaire was also tested through electronic emails by six experienced Bhutanese teachers who were undergoing Master degree in LPU University, India. Furthermore, the pilot test was carried out, where 31 teachers participated from different level of schools. Thirdly, the answers were reviewed and content analysis has been initiated along with the thesis advisor to finalize the items based on any misconceptions related to the questions. Originally DLRS contains forty items that ask frequency within a five point Likert scale. However, considering contextual differences, only thirty five items out of forty were used. The remaining five items were eliminated which are irrelevant in Bhutanese schools. Since the ministry of education of Bhutan modifies curriculum based on the assessment data, the items such as, Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data was removed. Additionally, both the private and public schools follow singular curriculum developed by Department of Curriculum Research and Development (DCRD). The response options ranges from

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree and 5=strongly agree. Completion time, according to Gordon (2005) is less than 10 minutes with relative ease.

Having partly modified the survey consists of 35 questions within four dimensions: (1) Mission, Vision and Goals, (2) Shared Responsibilities, (3) School Culture, and (4) Leadership practices. Within the domain of school Mission, Vision and Goals there are 7 questions; 9 questions under Shared Responsibilities; 11 questions within the domain of School Culture, and 8 questions within the domain of Leadership Practices. The instrument primarily measures the distributed leadership in schools. The reliability test was performed to examine the internal consistency. The four dimensions were found to be internally consistent with value of Cronbach’s alpha .663, .645, .679 and .726 for mission, vision & goals, shared responsibilities, school culture and leadership practices respectively. The details of the survey questionnaires showing four dimensions including reliability test is presented in the <table 3.4>.

<Table 3.4> Reliability test of survey questionnaire

| Dimensions | Questions | Reliability |
|------------------------------|--|-------------|
| Mission Vision & Goals | 1.The school has clearly written vision and mission statements | 0.663 |
| | 2.Teachers understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly | |
| | 3.If parents are asked to describe the school’s mission, most will be able to describe the mission clearly | |
| | 4. If students are asked to describe the schools’ mission, most will be able to describe it clearly. | |
| | 5. School goals are aligned with the national educational statement. | |
| | 6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis for progress. | |

7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------|
| Shared Responsibility | 1. Teachers share accountability for students' academic performance. | 0.645 |
| | 2. Government resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most. | |
| | 3. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures. | |
| | 4. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues. | |
| | 5. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know whom to contact when they have questions and concerns. | |
| | 6. School teachers and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education. | |
| | 7. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. school performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement. | |
| | 8. Decisions to change instructional programs are based on assessment data. | |
| | 9. There is a formal structure in place in the school (academic council) to provide teachers opportunities to participate in school level instructional decision making. | |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-------|
| School Culture | 1. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers | 0.679 |
| | 2. There is mutual respect and trust between school head and the teachers. | |
| | 3. The school administrators (Head & Assistant Head) welcome teachers' input on issues related to instruction and improving student performance. | |
| | 4. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations. | |
| | 5. The principal actively encourages teachers to participate. | |
| | 6. My principal and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan. | |
| | 7. The principal actively participates in his or her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school. | |
| | 8. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my | |

individual professional needs and school needs.

9. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision making.

10. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.

11. My principal's practices are consistent with his or her words.

| | | |
|----------------------|--|-------|
| | 1. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals. | |
| | 2. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles. | |
| | 3. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students. | |
| | 4. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to school. | 0.726 |
| Leadership Practices | 5. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school. | |
| | 6. Expert teachers fill most leadership roles in the school. | |
| | 7. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles. | |
| | 8. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles. | |

C. Statistical Analysis

The data were analyzed employing Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS v.21). To measure the dimensions of distributed leadership, thirty-five items in the questionnaire were divided into the four dimensions, such as Mission, Vision and Goals, Shared Responsibility, School Culture, and Leadership Practices. In order to answer the first research question "To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership in Bhutan", a descriptive analysis with values such as mean and standard deviation were performed. Furthermore, frequency analysis was also

conducted for each dimension. The findings were reported by teachers' engagement of distributed leadership practices within each of the four dimensions.

Cooper and Schindler (2004) suggested that every sample will vary from its population, therefore, the statistical significance or insignificance must be reviewed. This study was made up of four samples from specified levels of school, such as Elementary, Lower Secondary, Middle Secondary, and Higher Secondary schools. Hence, to measure how different level of schools varied in terms of practice of distributed leadership One-Way ANOVA was computed followed by Tukey's HSD post hoc test. Furthermore, Independent Samples t-test was conducted to examine the differences among genders in terms of their perception on distributed leadership. These findings answered the research question 2 and 3 "Are there any differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on teacher background including gender, experience and qualification?" and "Are there any differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on school demographic information such as school type and location?" Finally, Pearson's Correlation was also employed to determine the relationships between teacher and school background information with dimension of distributed leadership. All the sum has been rounded to nearest tenth in all figures and the desired level of significance was $p < .05$ since this level is associated with a lower risk of being incorrect. These findings answered the research question "Do the dimensions of distributed leadership relate to teacher and school variables?" Further it was answered by analyzing the items with reference to the demographic data attained on the survey.

D. Ethical Considerations

It was not possible to carry out this research without the approval from the Ministry of Education, Bhutan, which had been collected from Bhutan. Following Fontana and Frey (2000), a letter of consent to the participants requesting to participate in the study was sent to all the teachers and their principals. Belmont Report (1979) outlines three basic principles relevant to the ethics of research involving human subjects, namely respect of persons, beneficence, and justice. In conducting this research great care was taken to understand and be familiar with any and all of the regulations associated with the fields of the study. It was extremely important to protect the rights of the participants. Cooper & Schindler (2003) contends that research must be designed so that a respondent does not suffer physical harm, discomfort, pain, embarrassment, or loss of privacy. Participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that information would be kept purely confidential. Anonymity was maintained during data collection and in writing about the findings. Data was stored confidentially in my computer protected by a personal password. Most importantly, confidentiality, anonymity and, the participant's right to privacy were some of the measures used to ensure that the participant's respect, beneficence, and justice.

IV. RESULTS

This chapter is a presentation and analysis of the data that were collected to examine the practice of distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools. The present study was guided by the following research questions: 1. To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership in Bhutan? 2. Are there any differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on teacher background including gender, experience and qualification? 3. Are there any differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on school demographic information such as type and school location? 4. Do dimensions of distributed leadership relate to teacher and school variables? The objective of this study was to examine the practice of distributed leadership in Bhutan. It begins with brief presentation of the descriptive statistics and ANOVA for all the variables included in the data analysis. Furthermore, it is followed by t-test and Pearson's correlation analysis for demographic characteristics such as gender, experience, qualification, type of school and school location.

A. Descriptive Statistics

The distributed leadership is represented in four dimensions such as mission, vision & goals, shared responsibility, school culture and leadership practices. The respondents were asked how the statements apply to their school. To answer the research question 1 'To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership in Bhutan?' a descriptive statistics is presented. The table 4.1 shows the descriptive statistics (such as mean, standard deviation, minimum value, and maximum value) for each dimension of distributed leadership.

<Table 4.1> Descriptive statistics

| Variables | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Mission Vision & Goals | 3.25 | 0.53 | 2.14 | 4.43 |
| Shared Responsibility | 3.69 | 0.50 | 2.11 | 4.89 |
| School Culture | 3.52 | 0.54 | 2.27 | 4.64 |
| Leadership Styles | 3.03 | 0.73 | 1.50 | 4.63 |

The results indicated that generally most teachers believe that there is practice of distributed leadership in their respective schools. The descriptive statistics showed that teachers report a mean of 3.69 for Shared Responsibility followed by School Culture (mean: 3.52). The descriptive statistics also show that the teachers report a medium level of Mission, Vision & Goals (mean: 3.25), while they report least for Leadership Practices (mean: 3.03), with the minimum of as low as 1.50 with maximum of 4.63. It signifies that there are some variations in teachers' thinking regarding the use of the components of a good leadership practices. The details are presented below.

1. Vision Mission & Goals

<Table 4.2> Vision mission and goals

| Statements | Strongly | | | Strongly | |
|------------|----------|-------|---------|----------|----------|
| | Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Disagree |
| 1 | 52.7% | 39.7% | 6.9% | 0.8% | |
| 2 | 2.3% | 21.4% | 38.2% | 29% | 9.2% |
| 3 | 3.1% | 4.6% | 23.7% | 33.6% | 35.1% |
| 4 | 4.6% | 9.9% | 25.2% | 31.3% | 29% |
| 5 | 42% | 32.1% | 12.2% | 9.9% | 3.8% |

| | | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|-------|-------|----------------------------|-------|
| 6 | 42.7% | 42.7% | 11.5% | 3.1% | |
| 7 | 21.4% | 16% | 16.8% | 26.7% | 19.1% |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| Average | | | | | |
| Percentage | 24.1% | 23.8% | 19.2% | 19.2% | 13.7% |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| Combined | Strongly Agree/Agree | | | Disagree/Strongly Disagree | |
| Percentage | 47.9% | | | 32.9% | |
| <hr/> | | | | | |

In terms of mission vision and goals the respondents were asked how the statements apply to their school, 47.9% answered “strongly agree and agree,” 19.2% responded “neutral,” while 32.9% answered “disagree and strongly disagree.” Further analysis of the data found that 24.1% of the 47.9% identified “strongly agree.” With regard to questions 2 which focused on teachers’ support and ability to describe the school’s mission, 38.2% of the respondents chose “disagree and strongly disagree” for teacher’s support on common goal and their ability to describe the school’s mission. Additionally, in regard to questions 3 and 4, which focused on their (parent and student) ability to describe the school’s mission, 68.7% of the respondents indicated “disagree and strongly disagree”, while 60.3% showed “disagree or strongly disagree” on the student’s ability to describe the school’s mission. Furthermore, question 7 which focused on teachers and administrators collectively establishing school goals and revising annually, 45.8% of the respondent preferred “disagree and strongly disagree.” Finally, the respondents selected “strongly agree” most often in questions 1, 5, 6 and 7 with the rating of 52.7%, 42%, 42.7%, and 24.4% respectively. These questions focus on clearly written vision and mission statements, alignment of goals with the national education statement, use of a school improvement plan to evaluate progress, and school goals being collectively established and revised by administrators and teachers.

2. Shared Responsibility

<Table 4.3> Shared responsibility

| Statements | Strongly | | | Strongly | |
|------------|----------------------|-------|---------|----------------------------|----------|
| | Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Disagree |
| 1 | 45.8% | 34.4% | 13% | 5.3% | 1.5% |
| 2 | 29.8% | 47.3% | 19.1% | 2.3% | 1.5% |
| 3 | 42% | 37.4% | 16.8% | 2.3% | 1.5% |
| 4 | 9.9% | 32.8% | 31.3% | 19.1% | 6.9% |
| 5 | 26% | 42.7% | 26% | 5.3% | |
| 6 | 26.7% | 46.6% | 16.8% | 9.9% | |
| 7 | 23.7% | 48.9% | 11.5% | 13% | 3.1% |
| 8 | 23.7% | 37.4% | 26% | 10.7% | 2.3% |
| 9 | 6.9% | 15.3% | 19.1% | 32.1% | 26.7% |
| Average | | | | | |
| Percentage | 26.1% | 38.1% | 20% | 11.1% | 4.8% |
| Combined | Strongly Agree/Agree | | | Disagree/Strongly Disagree | |
| Percentage | 64.2% | | | 15.9% | |

In answering the nine statements of how shared responsibility is related to the respondent's school setting 64.2% of the respondents selected "agree and strongly agree," while 15.9% selected "disagree and strongly disagree." Further examination of the data reveals additional findings. In regard to statement 1, which focused on shared accountability for students' academic performance, the respondents selected high "strongly agree" response of 45.8%. Similarly, statement 3 focused on the school learning community that continually improves effectiveness had a "strongly agree" response of 42%. These statements had the highest "strongly agree" percentage. As for statement 7, which focused on school making available a

variety of data had a high “agree” response of 48.9%. The second highest response rate in the “agree” category was 47.3%, found in statement 2, which focused on government resources being directed to those areas of need. In relation to statement 5 and 8, if the school clearly communicates the ‘chain of contact’, and if decision to change instructional programs are based on assessment data, had a “neutral” rating of 26% each. On the other hand, statement 9 which focused on a formal structure being in place to provide teachers and professional staffs opportunities in decision-making had the highest response rate of 32.1% in the “disagree and strongly disagree” category followed by statement 4 with 26%, which asked if the school’s day and weekly schedules provide time for teachers. The third highest response rate in the “disagree and strongly disagree” category was statement 8 with 13%, which asked if decision to change instructional programs are based on assessment data.

3. School Culture

<Table 4.4> School culture

| Statements | Strongly | | | | |
|------------|----------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| | Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | 29% | 39.7% | 18.3% | 8.4% | 4.6% |
| 2 | 38.9% | 33.6% | 25.2% | 1.5% | .8% |
| 3 | 33% | 39.7% | 17.6% | 7.6% | 2.3% |
| 4 | 29.8% | 38.9% | 19.8% | 7.6% | 3.8% |
| 5 | 3% | 22.9% | 28% | 31.3% | 15.3% |
| 6 | 8.4% | 20.6% | 31.3% | 19.8% | 19.8% |
| 7 | 31.1% | 37.4% | 18.3% | 10.7% | 2.3% |
| 8 | 39.7% | 36.6% | 15.3% | 6.1% | 2.3% |

| | | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|-------|----------------------------|-------|-------|
| 9 | 9.2% | 19.1% | 30.5% | 27.5% | 13.7% |
| 10 | 32.1% | 31.3% | 21.4% | 9.9% | 5.3% |
| 11 | 20.6% | 18.3% | 32.1% | 16% | 13% |
| Average | 25% | 30.7% | 23.4% | 13.3% | 7.5% |
| Percentage | | | | | |
| Combined | Strongly Agree/Agree | | Disagree/Strongly Disagree | | |
| Percentage | 55.7% | | 20.8% | | |

When examining school culture, 55.7% of the respondents selected “agree and strongly agree” in regard to how the statements apply to their school while 20.8% selected “disagree and strongly disagree.” 23.4% of them selected “neutral.” Further examination of the data reveals additional findings. In regard to statements 3, 7 and 10 (Principals and assistant principals welcome teachers’ input, and they actively participate in their professional development and their knowledge on current instructional issues) had similar “strongly agree” ratings of 33%, 31.1% and 32.1% respectively. Furthermore, 38.9% of the respondents selected “strongly agree” for statement 2, which focused on mutual respect and trust among teachers, while statement 8 had the highest “strongly agree” rating of 39.7%, which focused on teachers’ professional plan that includes activities which are based on their individual needs and school needs. On the other hand, statement 11, which asked if principal’s practices are consistent with their words, had the “disagree and strongly disagree” rating of 29%. Furthermore, statement 6, which asked if supervisors and teachers jointly develop annual professional plan, had the low rating of 8.4% for “strongly agree” while the respondents indicated as high as 39.6% for “disagree and strongly disagree” category. Similarly, statement 9, which asked whether teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making had second highest “disagree and strongly disagree” rating of 41.2%. Lastly, as for

statement 5, which asked if principal actively encourages teachers to participate, had the lowest “strongly agree” rating of 3% while it had the highest “disagree and strongly disagree” rating of 47%.

4. Leadership Practices

<Table 4.5> Leadership practices

| Statements | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|------------|----------------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | 19.8% | 14.5% | 29.8% | 19.1% | 16.8% |
| 2 | 9.2% | 13.7% | 25.2% | 28.2% | 23.7% |
| 3 | 22.9% | 32.8% | 21.4% | 15.3% | 7.6% |
| 4 | 9.2% | 17.6% | 26% | 23.7% | 23.7% |
| 5 | 8.4% | 14.5% | 23.7% | 33.6% | 19.8% |
| 6 | 18.3% | 14.5% | 17.6% | 30.5% | 19.1% |
| 7 | 19.1% | 19.8% | 26.7% | 18.3% | 16% |
| 8 | 28.2% | 50.4% | 18.3% | 1.5% | 1.5% |
| Average | 16.9% | 22.2% | 23.6% | 21.3% | 16% |
| Percentage | | | | | |
| Combined | Strongly Agree/Agree | | Disagree/Strongly Disagree | | |
| Percentage | 39.1% | | 37.3% | | |

In examining leadership practices, when asked how the statements apply to their school, 39.1% of the respondents selected “agree and strongly agree”, while 37.3% selected “disagree and strongly disagree.” Further examination of the data reveals additional findings as stated herein. In relation to statement 3, which asked if informal school leaders play

important role in improving the performance of professionals and achievement of students, 55.7% of the respondents selected “agree and strongly agree.” Statement 8 had the highest “agree and strongly agree” rating of 78.6% which focused on teachers’ interest in participating in school leadership roles. On the other hand the lowest “strongly agree” was 9.2% and highest “strongly disagree” rating was 23.7% for statement 2 and 4, which focused on: a) The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles, and b) Teachers who assumed the leadership roles have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to school. It had the “disagree and strongly disagree” rating of 51.9% and 47.4% respectively.

Similarly, statements 1 and 6 had the “disagree and strongly disagree” ratings of 36%, and 49.6%, respectively. Statement 1 asked if school provides teachers with professional developments aligned with the school mission and goals, while statement 6 focused on the expert teachers filling leadership roles. Statement 5 asked if teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions and had highest “disagree and strongly disagree” rating of 53.4%.

B. Results of the Group Difference Test by Teacher Variables

To answer the research question 2 'Are there any differences in teachers’ perception of distributed leadership based on teacher background variables including gender, experience and qualification?' Independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA was computed. The independent sample t-test in table 4.5 was conducted to examine if there is any differences in their perception of distributed leadership based on their gender.

1. Group Difference Test by Teacher's Gender

Table 4.6 summarizes the results of independent sample t-test including mean and standard deviation to examine if they vary in terms of practice of distributed leadership based on their gender.

<Table 4.6> DLSR dimension differences by teacher variables (gender)

| | Gender | <i>N</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>Df</i> | <i>P</i> (two-tailed) |
|------------------------|--------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Mission Vision & Goals | F | 58 | 3.1 | .53 | .44 | | 129 | 0.002 |
| | M | 73 | 3.38 | .50 | | -3.11 | | |
| Shared Responsibility | F | 58 | 3.66 | .47 | 1.27 | | 129 | 0.431 |
| | M | 73 | 3.72 | .53 | | -.79 | | |
| School Culture | F | 58 | 3.46 | .54 | .01 | | 129 | 0.255 |
| | M | 73 | 3.57 | .53 | | -1.14 | | |
| Leadership Practices | F | 58 | 2.86 | .56 | 13.15 | | 129 | 0.015 |
| | M | 73 | 3.16 | .81 | | -2.45 | | |

While examining the practice of mission, vision and goals based on their gender there was a significant difference in the scores for female ($M=3.1$, $SD=.53$) and male ($M=3.38$, $SD=.50$), $p=.002$. Similar results were identified in leadership practices with a significant difference in scores for female ($M=2.86$, $SD=.56$) and male ($M=3.16$, $SD=.81$), $p=.015$. The results indicate male teachers feel that they are more often engaged than female teachers in

distributed leadership especially, in mission, vision and goals and leadership practices dimensions. Furthermore, respondents showed different viewpoints toward shared responsibility and school culture but these differences were not significant.

2. Group Difference by Teacher’s Experience

The Oneway ANOVA was conducted to examine if there is any difference in their perception of distributed leadership based on their teaching experience. Table 4.7 summarizes the results of Oneway ANOVA including mean and standard deviation to examine if they vary in terms of practice of distributed leadership based on respondent’s experiences which are categorized under five groups, such as, 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years and more than 20 years.

<Table 4.7> DLRS dimension difference by teacher’s experience

| Leadership | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----|------|-----|----------------|-----|------|------|------------|
| Dimensions | Experience | N | M | SD | ANOVA | df | F | P | Post-hoc |
| Mission Vision & Goals | 1-5 years | 23 | 3.30 | .47 | | | | | |
| | 6-10 years | 43 | 3.36 | .40 | | | | | |
| | 11-15 years | 30 | 3.32 | .60 | Between Groups | 4 | 3.50 | .010 | 6-10 >20+ |
| | 16-20 years | 14 | 3.28 | .59 | Within Groups | 126 | | | 11-15 >20+ |
| | More than 20 years | 21 | 2.88 | .55 | | | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.23 | .52 | | | | | |
| Shared Responsibility | 1-5 years | 23 | 3.61 | .41 | | | | | |
| | 6-10 years | 43 | 3.66 | .53 | | | | | |
| | 11-15 years | 30 | 3.84 | .55 | Between Groups | 4 | 1.20 | .314 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----|------|-----|----------------|-----|------|-----------|
| | 16-20 years | 14 | 3.55 | .61 | Within Groups | 126 | | |
| | More than 20 years | 21 | 3.74 | .39 | | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.68 | .50 | | | | |
| | 1-5 years | 23 | 3.43 | .42 | | | | |
| | 6-10 years | 43 | 3.60 | .56 | | | 1.12 | .352 |
| | 11-15 years | 30 | 3.62 | .58 | Between Groups | 4 | | |
| School Culture | 16-20 years | 14 | 3.35 | .51 | Within Groups | 126 | | |
| | More than 20 years | 21 | 3.44 | .53 | | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.49 | .52 | | | | |
| | 1-5 years | 23 | 2.73 | .69 | | | | |
| | 6-10 years | 43 | 3.08 | .70 | | | | |
| Leadership Practices | 11-15 years | 30 | 2.94 | .74 | Between Groups | 4 | 2.37 | .056 |
| | 16-20 years | 14 | 2.87 | .62 | Within Groups | 126 | | 20+>11-15 |
| | More than 20 years | 21 | 3.30 | .77 | | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 2.98 | .70 | | | | |

A one-way ANOVA was used to determine whether there were differences in teacher's perception of distributed leadership according to their experiences. Mission, vision and goals dimension differed significantly across the five different categories of experiences, $F(4,126) = 3.50$, $p = .010$. Further investigation of the data reveals that teachers who serve for more than 20 years engaged least in mission vision & goals dimension, followed by teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experiences. Teachers with 6-10 years of experiences reported highest engagement in mission vision & goals dimension. The leadership practices dimension had $F(4,126) = 2.37$, $p = .056$ which was considered as significant at $p < .10$. Teachers with more

than 20 years of teaching experiences indicated highest teacher engagement in leadership practices, while teachers with 1-5 years of experiences indicated least engagement. However, there was no significant difference in regard to teachers' beliefs about practice of distributed leadership in other two dimensions according to their experiences.

Tukey's HSD (honestly significant difference) test was used for post hoc test to compare the groups. Tukey's test is known as the rational method which had high statistical power with preserving Type I error (J. Lee, Kang, Kim, & Kang, 2007). Tukey's HSD showed that the teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience condition received significantly higher score for mission, vision & goals ($M=3.3588$, $SD=.39601$) than those with more than 20 years of experience condition ($M=2.8776$, $SD=.55496$). Similarly, it also revealed that teachers with 11-15 years condition received significantly high score ($M= 3.3190$, $SD= .60340$) than those with more than 20 years of experience condition ($M=2.8776$, $SD=.55496$). However, there were no significant differences among other groups. On the other hand Tukey's HSD revealed that the teachers with more 20 years of experience received significant higher score for leadership practices ($M= 3.300$, $SD= .737$) than those with 11-15 years of experience condition ($M= 2.726$, $SD= .772$). No significant differences originated among other groups.

3. Group Difference by Teacher's Qualification

The Oneway ANOVA was conducted to examine if there is any differences in their perception of distributed leadership based on their qualification. Table 4.8 summarizes the results of Oneway ANOVA including mean and standard deviation to examine if they vary in terms of practice of distributed leadership based on their qualification which are categorized

under four groups, such as, certificate, B.Ed, PGCE and master.

<Table 4.8> DLRS dimension difference by teacher's qualification

| Leadership | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|-----|------|-----|----------------|-----|------|------|-----------|
| Dimensions | Qualification | N | M | SD | ANOVA | df | F | P | Post-hoc |
| Mission Vision & Goals | Certificate | 3 | 2.95 | .36 | | | | | |
| | B.Ed | 95 | 3.16 | .52 | | | | | |
| | PGCE | 12 | 3.67 | .39 | Between Groups | 3 | 5.37 | .002 | B.Ed<PGCE |
| | Master | 21 | 3.47 | .51 | | 127 | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.31 | .44 | | | | | |
| Shared Responsibility | Certificate | 3 | 4.11 | .19 | | | | | |
| | B.Ed | 95 | 3.64 | .45 | | | | | |
| | PGCE | 12 | 3.88 | .42 | Between Groups | 3 | 1.64 | .183 | |
| | Master | 21 | 3.75 | .74 | Within Groups | 127 | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.85 | .45 | | | | | |
| School Culture | Certificate | 3 | 3.76 | .41 | | | | | |
| | B.Ed | 95 | 3.46 | .54 | | | | | |
| | PGCE | 12 | 3.76 | .38 | Between Groups | 3 | 1.95 | .125 | |
| | Master | 21 | 3.66 | .54 | Within Groups | 127 | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.66 | .47 | | | | | |
| Leadership Practices | Certificate | 3 | 2.63 | .76 | | | | | |
| | B.Ed | 95 | 2.97 | .72 | Between Groups | 3 | | | |
| | PGCE | 12 | 3.25 | .76 | Within Groups | | 1.36 | .258 | |
| | Master | 21 | 3.21 | .74 | | 127 | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.01 | .74 | | | | | |

Oneway ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of respondents' qualification on

each of the four variables. These variables were also separated based on mission, vision and goals, shared responsibility, school culture and leadership practices. There was a significant main effect for mission, vision and goals scores, $F(3,127) = 5.37, p = .002$. Further review of the data revealed that individuals with certificate degree have the lowest engagement of distributed leadership practices in mission vision & goals, whereas those with PGCE have the highest engagement of distributed leadership practices in mission vision & goals dimension. No statistically significant main effects were found among other variables. HSD showed that the teachers with minimum degree of PGCE condition ($M = 3.6667, SD = .38686$) received high score than those with Bachelor of Education condition ($M = 3.1624, SD = .51618$). However, there were no significant differences among other groups.

C. Results of the Group Difference Test by School Variables

To answer the research question 3 Are there any differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on school demographic information such as school type and location? One-way ANOVA was computed. The ANOVA in table 4.9 was conducted to examine if there is any difference in their perception of distributed leadership based on the type of schools, such as, elementary, lower secondary, middle secondary and high schools.

1. Group Difference by Type of School

<Table 4.9> DLRS dimension difference by type of the school

| Leadership | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------|------|------|-----|----------------|-----|-------|------|-------------------|
| Dimensions | Type | N | M | SD | ANOVA | df | F | P | Post-hoc |
| Mission Vision & Goals | Elementary | 33 | 3.14 | .56 | | | | | |
| | Lower | 32 | 3.25 | .37 | Between Groups | 3 | | | |
| | Middle | 32 | 3.03 | .57 | Within Groups | 127 | 8.044 | .000 | High>Elementary |
| | High | 34 | 3.58 | .43 | | | | | High>Middle |
| Shared Responsibility | Total | 131 | 3.25 | .48 | | | | | |
| | Elementary | 33 | 3.78 | .43 | | | | | |
| | Lower | 32 | 3.74 | .46 | Between Groups | 3 | | | Middle>Elementary |
| | Middle | 32 | 3.46 | .43 | Within Groups | 127 | 3.311 | .022 | High>Middle |
| School Culture | High | 34 | 3.79 | .61 | | | | | Elementary>Lower |
| | Total | 131 | 3.69 | .48 | | | | | |
| | Elementary | 33 | 3.49 | .60 | | | | | |
| | Lower | 32 | 3.59 | .51 | Between Groups | 3 | | | Middle>Lower |
| Leadership Practices | Middle | 32 | 3.26 | .43 | Within Groups | 127 | 4.965 | .003 | High>Middle |
| | High | 34 | 3.74 | .49 | | | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.52 | .51 | | | | | |
| | Elementary | 33 | 3.14 | .82 | | | | | |
| Leadership Practices | Lower | 32 | 3.02 | .66 | Between Groups | 3 | 2.960 | .035 | Elementary>Lower |
| | Middle | 32 | 2.72 | .58 | Within Groups | 127 | | | High>Middle |
| | High | 34 | 3.21 | .75 | | | | | |
| Total | 131 | 3.02 | .70 | | | | | | |

There was a significant difference in all the variables when examined based on type of school. The first dimension, mission, vision and goals had the scores of, $F(3,127) = 8.044$,

$p = .000$ followed by shared responsibility with the scores of, $F(3,127)=3.311$, $p=.022$. Similarly, both the school culture and leadership practices had the significant differences with the scores of $F(3,127)=4.965$, $p=.003$ and $F(3,127) =2.960$, $p=.035$ respectively. The middle secondary school had the lowest engagement of distributed leadership practices (3.03, 3.46, 3.26, and 2.72) while the higher secondary school had the highest engagement of distributed leadership practices (3.58, 3.79, 3.74, and 3.21) in all the distributed leadership dimensions. The lower secondary school indicated higher engagement (3.25, 3.59) than elementary school in mission, vision and goals and school culture dimensions. On the other hand, elementary had higher engagement (3.78, 3.14) than lower secondary schools in shared responsibility and leadership practices. The higher secondary school practiced distributed leadership more than middle secondary school. The further analysis of the data revealed that the practice of distributed leadership in their schools vary from one to another type of school.

Tukey's HSD for MV&G showed that the higher secondary school condition received significantly higher score ($M=.44551$, $SD=.11978$) than elementary and middle secondary school condition ($M=.10701$, $SD=.12161$), $M=.11174$, $SD=.12161$) respectively. With regard to shared responsibility the middle secondary school condition received significant higher score ($M=3.4583$, $SD=.43241$) than elementary school condition ($M=3.7811$, $SD=.43344$). However, higher secondary school condition showed significant high score ($M=3.7908$, $SD=.61211$) than middle secondary school condition ($M=3.4583$, $SD=.43241$). Elementary school condition received higher score ($M= 3.7811$, $SD=.43344$) than lower school condition ($M=3.7361$, $SD=.46007$). For school culture the middle secondary school condition received significant high score ($M=3.2614$, $SD=.43369$) than lower secondary school condition ($M=3.5852$, $SD=.51215$). On the other hand, higher secondary school condition showed

significant higher score ($M=3.2614$, $SD=.43369$) than middle secondary school. Finally, for leadership practices dimension, the elementary school condition received significantly higher score ($M=3.1402$, $SD=.82013$) than lower secondary school condition ($M=3.0234$, $SD=.65642$). Further investigation revealed that the higher secondary school condition received significantly higher score ($M=3.2059$, $SD=.75245$) than middle secondary school condition ($M=2.722$, $SD=.58002$).

2. Group Difference by Location of the School

The Oneway ANOVA was conducted to examine if there is any differences in their perception of distributed leadership based on location of the school. Table 4.10 summarizes the results of Oneway ANOVA including mean and standard deviation to examine if they vary in terms of practice of distributed leadership based on school location which are categorized under three groups, such as, urban, semi-urban and rural.

<Table 4.10> DLRS dimension difference by location of the school

| Leadership | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------|-----|------|-----|----------------|-----|-------|------|------------------|
| Dimensions | Location | N | M | SD | ANOVA | df | F | P | Post-hoc |
| Mission Vision & Goals | Urban | 35 | 3.31 | .41 | Between Groups | 2 | 2.992 | .054 | Semi-Urban>Rural |
| | Semi-urban | 67 | 3.31 | .61 | | | | | |
| | Rural | 29 | 3.04 | .41 | Within Groups | 128 | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.22 | .48 | | | | | |
| Shared Responsibility | Urban | 35 | 3.67 | .50 | Between Groups | 2 | .884 | .416 | |
| | Semi-urban | 67 | 3.75 | .57 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|------------|-----|------|-----|----------------|-----|-------|------|------------------|
| | Rural | 29 | 3.60 | .32 | Within Groups | 128 | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.67 | .46 | | | | | |
| | Urban | 35 | 3.52 | .57 | | | | | |
| School Culture | Semi-urban | 67 | 3.60 | .54 | Between Groups | 2 | 2.453 | .090 | Semi-Urban>Rural |
| | Rural | 29 | 3.34 | .44 | Within Groups | 128 | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.49 | .52 | | | | | |
| | Urban | 35 | 2.79 | .56 | | | | | |
| Leadership Practices | Semi-urban | 67 | 3.13 | .79 | Between Groups | 2 | 2.601 | .078 | Semi-Urban>Rural |
| | Rural | 29 | 3.07 | .71 | Within Groups | 128 | | | |
| | Total | 131 | 3.00 | .69 | | | | | |

As shown in table 4.10, although no statistically significant main effect or interaction was found in all dimensions since p value is higher than the standard level of significance, however, for the mission, vision & goals, school culture and leadership practices dimensions, the findings indicated the significant differences of $p=.054$, $p=0.09$, and $p=.078$ respectively at $p<10$. The results show that semi-urban engage more distributed leadership practices in terms of mission vision & goals, school culture and leadership practices than urban and rural school. Tukey's HSD indicated that semi-urban condition received higher score ($M=3.3113$, $SD=.60554$) than those in rural condition ($M=.40962$, $SD=.07606$). There were no significant differences for shared responsibility.

D. Relationship between Distributed Leadership and Teacher and School Variables

To answer the research question 3 'Do the dimensions of distributed leadership relate to teacher and school variables?' Pearson's correlation was computed. The Pearson's correlation was conducted to assess the relationship between distributed leadership and teacher variables.

1. Relationship between Teacher Variables and Distributed Leadership Dimensions

The Pearson's correlation was conducted to assess the relationship between distributed leadership and teacher variables. Table 4.11 summarizes the results of Pearson's correlation between distributed leadership dimensions and teacher variables such as gender, qualification and experience.

<Table 4.11> Correlations between distributed leadership dimensions and teacher variables

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---|
| 1 Teacher's gender | 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 Teacher's Qualification | .209* | 1 | | | | | |
| 3 Teacher's experience | -.148 | -.286 | 1 | | | | |
| 4 Mission Vision & Goals | .266** | .279** | .244** | 1 | | | |
| 5 Shared Responsibility | .068 | .066 | .057 | .380*** | 1 | | |
| 6 School Culture | .101 | .144 | -.059 | .500*** | .673*** | 1 | |
| 7 Leadership Practices | .203* | .160 | -.107 | .462*** | .414*** | .434*** | 1 |

*p<.05**p<.01***p<.001

A Pearson correlation was used for examining the relationships between teacher variables and distributed leadership dimensions. As a result, the respondent's gender highly correlated

to mission, vision and goals. The analysis revealed a significant and positive correlation of between mission, vision & goals and respondent's gender ($r = .266, n=131, p<.01$). There was positive relationship between leadership practices and respondent's gender ($r=.203, n=131, p=.02$). There was also a strong positive correlation ($r=.279, n=131, p<01$) between mission, vision and goals and respondent's qualification. Furthermore, there was also positive correlation ($r=.244, n=131, p<01$) between mission, vision and goals and respondent's experience. Although statistically positive correlation was seen among gender, qualification and experience with mission vision and goals and leadership practices, there was no positive correlation with shared responsibility and school culture.

2. Relationship between Distributed Leadership Dimensions and School Variables

The Pearson's correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between distributed leadership and school variables. Table 4.12 summarizes the results of Pearson's correlation between distributed leadership dimensions and school variables such as urban, semi-urban and rural.

<Table 4.12> Correlations between distributed leadership dimensions and school variables

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|------------------------|--------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---|
| 1 | Type of school | 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | School location | -.213* | 1 | | | | |
| 3 | Mission Vision & Goals | .245** | .170* | 1 | | | |
| 4 | Shared Responsibility | -0.051 | -.040 | .380*** | 1 | | |
| 5 | School Culture | 0.092 | -.105 | .500*** | .673*** | 1 | |
| 6 | Leadership Practices | -0.012 | .144 | .462*** | .414** | .434*** | 1 |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

A Pearson correlation was used for examining the relationships between school demographic information and distributed leadership dimensions. As a result, the type of school moderately correlated to mission, vision and goals. There was a positive correlation ($r=.245$, $n=131$, $p<.05$) between mission, vision & goals and type of school. Similarly, correlation was observed between school location and mission, vision & goals, and it was statistically significant at ($r=.170$, $n=131$, $p<.10$). Except for mission vision and goals, there was no positive correlation for type of school and school location with other three dimensions of distributed leadership.

E. Discussion of Findings

Distributed leadership is a contemporary leadership which is gaining increasing importance around the world. Elmore (2000) developed a model of distributed leadership with five dimensions; the model was revised by Gordon (2004) in her study to include four dimensions: mission, vision, and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility. The engagement of teachers within these four dimensions of distributed leadership practices and how they vary were analyzed from the survey results of 131 teachers who worked in 44 different schools. The findings were compared with existing literature on distributed leadership in the west. An analysis of this data provided insight into understanding the engagement of teachers within the four dimensions of distributed leadership.

To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership in Bhutan?

Overall, teachers who participated in this study are engaged in distributed leadership

practices representing all four dimensions. The results reveal that teachers believed that the mission vision and goals are well established, and most of them support and understand their mission which is aligned with national education statement. Consistent with the literature, Harrison (2005) found that within distributed leadership, leaders need to work together in order to create a shared vision or goal. Spillane, Halverson and Diamond (2004) and Hallinger (2003) believe that developing and working toward a shared vision is the first function involving leadership tasks. Most Bhutanese leaders are not trained neither has mandated distributed leadership practices in schools , however, it is encouraging to discover their schools being consistent with the literature where the first function of leadership is to develop a shared mission. Within this dimension of mission, vision, and goals teachers reported, however, teachers did not believed parents and students were aware of the mission of the school. Furthermore, less than half of them indicated that parents and students don't have ability to describe the school's mission clearly. The literature on distributed leadership explains that all stakeholders such as parents, students and staff members need to be involved in planning and action for the school (Huffman & Jacobson, 2003). Pechura (2001) also found that in order to build leadership capacity of the school, parents and students must be given opportunities to participate in leadership. Lunenberg and Ornstein (2004) concluded that parents must have ownership for distributed leadership to be realized. Their inability to describe the mission, vision and goals can be attributed to prevailing common practices in Bhutanese schools. Since most schools don't engage parents and students while setting mission, it turns out to be very difficult task for them to describe their schools' mission, vision and goals.

The current study found that the dimension of shared responsibility is the dimension in

which most teachers in Bhutan are engaged. The study indicated that teachers believe that their school is a learning community that continuously improves effectiveness. Structural support for a learning community can be defined as teachers having a collaborative working relationship with other and working toward a mutual purpose of the school (Harrison, 2005; Phillips, 2004). Although most teachers who participated in this study reported that the teachers clearly work toward a shared purpose, most of them argued that there is no formal structure in place to provide teachers and professional staffs opportunities in decision-making. In Bhutanese schools there is no established formal structures to provide teachers opportunities to participate in school level instructional decision making. Further analysis showed that teachers who participated in this study did not have enough time in their schedules to collaborate with others. Most Bhutanese teachers are burdened with extra-curricular responsibilities which make them difficult to collaborate on instructional issues. With teachers not having time to collaborate, teachers and administrators will have to work in isolation (McQuaig, 1996).

Spillane and Sherer (2004) found, while working at Adams Elementary, that the principal was creative in making time for teachers to collaborate when she established the breakfast club giving teachers an opportunity to interact regarding instruction. In order to share leadership responsibilities, teachers must be given time to collaborate (Gordon, 2005), because collaboration assisted in improving teacher participation in decision making (Mutter, 2004). Leadership capacity also increases when teachers collaborate and interact (Sabitini, 2002). Yukl (2002) explained that the collective capacity of distributed leadership allows the school to work more effectively. Similarly, they think that the decision to change instructional programs is not based on assessment data. Professional learning communities in

reference to schools is a term which refers to all stakeholders such as parents, students and staff members being involved in the planning, action and assessments of improvements for the school (Huffman & Jacobson, 2003).

Within the dimension of school culture, the results show that teachers in Bhutan observed high levels of mutual trust and support between teachers, administrators and other professional staffs. Majority of them believe that their professional development plan includes activities that are based on their individual professional needs and school needs. The literature relates that leaders need to develop relationships and trust in order to establish shared values that will enable leaders to share in the decision making process (Harrison,2005). Distributed leadership is built on trust (Reeves, 2006). Positive effects come from the effect of relationships being built on mutual trust and respect within the organization (Phillips, 2004) and having trust also impacts the structural support of the learning community (Harrison; Phillips). Teachers must feel trusted in order to be empowered (Sabitini, 2002). Spillane et al. (2004) found the second function involving leadership task and function was based on managing a school culture by building trust among staffs. Blasé and Blasé (1999) found that principals must be committed to establishing trust in order to adopt distributed leadership.

The present study also found within the dimension of school culture that principals did not encourage teachers to participate in decision making, and neither did the teachers participate in instructional decision making. In Bhutan, it is a wide-known fact that majority of decision is made by principal alone. Since Bhutanese administrative system is still following traditional concept of top-down approach, teachers did not have the opportunity to engage in decision making. Heller and Firestone (1995), Inman and Marlowe (2004), and Phillips (2004) found that encouraging staff members is a key leadership function. Distributed leadership

involves a decision by the principal to allow decisions to be made by others (The Hay Group, 2004). In order to support change within a school, McQuaig (1996) found that teachers must be included in the decision-making process, as it is a critical component of shared decision making. Pechura (2001) found that teachers needed to be encouraged to participate in decision making and become involved in decision making that impact students, as they are the most influential contributors to the success of students. Bhutanese school teachers reported no support of principals in regard to decision making, and teachers are not participating in instructional decision making, which Spillane et al. (2004) considers essential in distributed leadership. Furthermore, most of the teachers did not agree on their principal being consistent with their words.

The current study found that teachers were least engaged in this leadership practices dimension. While teachers supported the importance of informal leader's role in improving the performance and achievement of students, they reported that teachers who assume leadership roles don't have sufficient school time to make meaningful contributions. Some of the leadership practices barriers were that teachers did not have time or resources to make meaningful contributions to the school; however, teachers reported that they are highly interested in leadership roles. Teachers believed they do not have enough time or sufficient resources to make meaningful contributions to the school. In most schools due to teacher shortages they need to shoulder extra responsibilities. Teachers need to teach as well as bear certain responsibilities even if they are assuming leadership roles. It is evident that schools in semi urban and rural areas are facing resource shortages to make meaningful contribution. Many schools in rural areas are yet to receive internet, electricity, motor roads etc. Blasé and Blasé, (1999), Harrison (2005), Katzenmeyer and Moller (1996), and Phillips (2004), found

that distributed leadership cannot be successfully implemented without support of time and resources. Spillane et al. (2004) concedes that the third most important function for instructional leadership is in providing resources such as time and materials to teachers. Teachers who are making leadership decisions need to be given time and resources in order to share in the leadership responsibilities (Gordon, 2005; Stone, Horejs and Lomas, 1997).

Further, most of them disagreed that expert teachers fill leadership roles, while interestingly, majority of teachers are interested in leadership roles. The teachers in Bhutan can apply for leadership after working as a teacher with extra responsibilities for at least seven years. Whether or not one is expert in administration, one cannot be a principal if individuals have not served for seven years. Stone et al. (1997) found that experienced teachers are the teacher leaders within the school, but Pechura (2001) explained how all teachers need to be given opportunities for leadership roles within the school. Spillane and Sherer (2004) found that new teachers within small groups, such as grade levels, are provided opportunities to become teacher leaders. Arrowsmith (2005) states that leaders in distributed leadership are selected based on expertise in the subject matter and not experience. The current study found that teachers in Bhutan are only highly interested in participating in leadership roles within the school. Stone et al. (1997) found that teacher leaders participate in leadership position in order to be able to make decisions. Distributed leadership is dependent upon individuals within the school being in leadership roles (McQuaig, 1996). Researchers observe that teachers who are leaders have a sense of ownership of the school, which leads to increased motivation, professionalism and commitment (Blase & Blase, 2001).

Are there any differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on teacher background including gender, experience and qualification?

The results show significant differences in teacher engagement in the dimensions of distributed leadership especially with mission, vision & goals and leadership practices. The male teachers indicated higher engagement of distributed leadership practices than female teachers for both mission vision and goals and leadership practices. However, this is inconsistent with research by Camburn, Rowan and Taylor (2003) who found that gender does not make a difference in the findings on instructional leadership practices within distributed leadership. Similarly, when group differences were examined based on teacher's experiences, the data showed significant differences in teacher engagement in the dimensions of mission, vision & goals and leadership practices. The data revealed that teachers who serve for more than 20 years engaged least in mission vision & goals dimension, followed by teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experiences. Teachers with 6-10 years of experiences reported highest engagement in mission vision & goals dimension. On the other hand, teachers with more than 20 years of teaching experiences indicated highest teacher engagement in leadership practices, while teachers with 1-5 years indicated least engagement. No statistically significant difference was observed for school culture and share responsibility. The study found that the findings for leadership practices are consistent with findings of other studies. Senior teachers who are over 20 years of experience are most engaged in leadership practices than newer teachers with 1-5 or 6-10 years of experience in education. These findings are consistent with the literature as Stone et al. (1997) found that senior teachers participated more in leadership practices at elementary, middle and high school levels. Harrison (2005) found that new teachers were active followers, leaving senior teachers in

more positional leadership positions as they are more knowledgeable and experienced. Harrison found that senior teachers engaged in leadership task by committees and were thought of as more experienced teacher leaders.

While examining the influence of teacher's qualification on practice of distributed leadership, the data revealed that individuals with Certificates has the lowest engagement of distributed leadership practices in mission vision & goals, whereas those with PGCE has the highest engagement of distributed leadership practices in mission vision & goals dimension. However, no statistically significant main effects were found among other dimensions. There were no significant differences found within qualification of teachers (Smith 2007), however, Stone et al. (1997) found that senior teachers are the teacher leaders within the school. These findings were, however, almost consistent especially with elementary school teachers as gender, race nor highest degree were related to the functions of leadership practices (Camburn, Rowan and Taylor, 2003).

Are there any differences in teachers' perception of distributed leadership based on school demographic information such as school type and location?

PS, LSS, MSS and HSS teachers differed in their engagement within all dimensions of distributed leadership practices. In general, the middle school teachers are least engaged in distributed leadership practices while the HSS teachers indicated highest engagement of distributed leadership practices. Within mission, vision and goals, HSS teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices more than LSS, PS or MSS teachers. LSS teachers indicated higher engagement of distributed leadership practices than PS in mission, vision and goals and school culture dimensions. On the other hand PS teachers reported higher engagement in

distributed leadership practices than LSS teachers in shared responsibility and leadership practices. HSS teachers believed their parents would be able to describe the mission, vision, and goals of the school, more than other teachers believed their parents would be more able to do so. PS teachers believed that most of the teachers cannot understand nor do they think that their parents can describe the mission than other teachers, which is not consistent with the literature. According to Pechura (2001) the elementary level, teachers, parents and students were found to be ready to become involved with leadership within the school. HSS teachers believe that their school has clearly written goals which are aligned with national education statement and uses school improvement plan to evaluate progress. However, MSS teachers believed that their school goals are being collectively established and revised by administrators and teachers than other teachers.

Within shared responsibility, HSS more often than other school teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices especially in MV&G, shared responsibility and school culture. However, PS teachers engaged more in leadership practices than other LSS and MSS teachers. At the elementary level, leadership practices have been embedded routinely within faculty meetings, committee meetings and grade level meetings allowing for distributed leadership (Harrison, 2005). One consideration for elementary teachers being engaged in more leadership practices is that there are few teachers in majority of Bhutanese elementary schools. Therefore, they may have more opportunities within grade level meetings and faculty meetings for them to engage in distributed leadership practices. PS teachers more often than other teachers had time to collaborate with other teachers. This can be attributed to school size, work load, and lesser school activities. Gordon (2005) found that teachers in leadership positions must be given time to collaborate and engage in their leadership

positions. Spillane and Sherer (2004) and Stone et al. (1997) found that principals had to make the time, even if they had to develop creative ways, for teachers to collaborate with each other. HSS teachers more often viewed than other teachers, that their school as a learning community. Harrison (2005) found that distributed leadership where teachers work in a collaborative environment positively impacts a learning environment and increases the positive feelings by the teachers towards the school as a learning community

Within school culture, HSS teachers engaged more than other school teachers in distributed leadership practices. The HSS teachers followed by PS teachers feel a high degree of trust and respect among teachers and other professional staff. Elementary principals begin to develop relationships focusing on building trust and working collaboratively with teachers (Harrison, 2005). Lucia (2004) found that elementary school teachers are nurturing which leads to a bottoms-up design instead of a top-down approach. Similarly, Stone et al. (1997) found that high school teachers were able to build trust and respect with other school personnel in the school. LSS teachers indicated higher level of professional development plan which includes activities that are based on their individual professional and school needs. Furthermore, LSS teachers believed that their principals are more consistent with their words than other teachers. In contrast to MSS teachers, LSS teachers believed that they often participate in instructional decision-making. Lastly, more than all other school teachers PS teachers firmly believed that their principal actively encourage them to participate in decision-making.

Within the dimension of leadership practices, LSS and PS teachers more often than HSS or MSS teachers want to participate in leadership roles. This finding is in consistent to the finding by Lucia (2004) who found that elementary teachers expressed a desire to lead within

and beyond their class. PS teachers further believed that they have sufficient school time to make meaningful contributions. PS teachers also supported the idea of most experts filling the leadership roles in their school, while MSS teachers disagreed most. Elementary teachers emerge as teacher leaders and engage in sharing, coaching, reflecting and modeling (Sabitini, 2002). Teachers at the elementary level see their opportunity for becoming teacher leaders by being requested to be leaders, elected, asked or volunteered (Stone et al., 1997). Finally the results show that semi-urban engaged more distributed leadership practices in terms of mission vision & goals, school culture and leadership practices than urban and rural school.

Do the dimensions of distributed leadership relate to teacher and school variables?

Although statistically positive correlation was seen between gender and mission vision & goals and leadership practices, there was no positive correlation for respondent's gender with shared responsibility and school culture. Similarly there was strong positive correlation between qualification and experience with mission vision & goals, however, there was no relation with other three dimensions of distributed leadership. The overall results indicated that respondent's gender, qualification and experience did not relate to dimensions of distributed leadership, especially with regard to school culture and shared responsibility. Further, except for mission, vision & goals, the school variables did not correlate with other three dimensions of distributed leadership. Although statistically positive correlation was seen with MVG, there was no positive correlation for type of school and school location with other three dimensions of distributed leadership. The positive correlation among teacher and school demographic variables with mission vision and goals and leadership practices are consistent with the findings in other studies.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Summary

This chapter presents an overview of the study that includes research questions, findings, methods, conclusions, and recommendations. The purpose of this study was to understand the extent of teacher engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership in Bhutan. In addition, the study determined the differences in engagement within the four dimensions among PS, LSS, MSS, and HSS levels, as well as differences in distributed leadership practices by demographic characteristics of teachers and schools, including: gender; qualification; years of experience; type of school; and school location. There are various interpretations of the term “distributed leadership” (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 1999; Spillane, 2001; Harris, 2003; Lashway, 2003), however, for purposes of this study, the term was defined as a leadership phenomenon in which leadership activities are practiced among several people within an organization or team (Storey, 2004; Yukl, 2002). Elmore’s conceptual framework of distributed leadership was modified by Gordon to define four dimensions of distributed leadership: mission, vision, and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility. The main question for this study was:

1. To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership in Bhutan?
2. Are there any differences in teachers’ perception of distributed leadership based on teacher background including gender, experience and qualification?
3. Are there any differences in teachers’ perception of distributed leadership based on school demographic information such as school type and location?

4. Do the dimensions of distributed leadership relate to teacher and school variables?

There are many kinds of principal leaderships, however, according to time and need new leadership styles emerge. One of the contemporary leadership is distributed leadership, which is widely gaining popularity. According to its literal meaning it means that leadership is distributed among the staffs in the organization. Every school has a principal, but in distributed leadership everyone is a leader. Distributed leadership is about engaging many people rather than the few in leadership activity within the school and actively distributing leadership practice. Every teacher including non-teaching staff reserves the right to make decision if the school is to succeed. Furthermore, distributed leadership is not limited to only leadership practices. It also covers large files of school activities such as planning, collaborating, and maintaining good relationship among colleagues etc. Since the leadership styles in distributed leadership are spread among the staffs the outcome becomes more productive and successful. Distributed leadership for teaching and learning is a leadership approach in which collaborative working is undertaken between individuals who trust and respect each other's contribution. There is need for trust and respect among the individuals if they are mandating distributed leadership in their school. Without trust it won't be successful one. Distributed leadership allows and welcomes individuals to critique, plan, assess, reflect, and replan etc. on their own as well as colleague's work.

Bhutanese schools have been following a top down approach of leadership styles. Moreover the concept of distributed leadership was actually born after the introduction of five year development plan in 1961. According to Dyenka (1999) the only form of formal education available in Bhutan before 1960s was monastic education. Good classroom teachers were appointed as principals. Some university graduates were also directly recruited

as either principals or assistant principals of high schools (Dorji, 2005). These recruits lack theoretical understanding of effective leadership as they were recruited directly without having proper leadership trainings. Moreover, after the introduction of western education in the country Bhutan was subject to frequent change in curriculum as well as in administrative system. As of now only few principals had undergone leadership and management programmes. The decentralization system which is a feature of distributed leadership started in Bhutan as early as 1980s and effectively preceded decentralization initiatives in most developing countries, where decentralization propagated in 1990s (Ura, 2004). However, no researchers have ventured to examine the actual teacher engagement in distributed leadership.

Gordon developed the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS) to measure teacher engagement of distributed leadership practices within these four dimensions in order to identify leadership needs. The 40-item survey was further reduced to 35 questions by carefully selecting questions which are most relevant to Bhutanese school context. Further, the 35 items on the survey were mapped to the four dimensions of distributed leadership by the researcher. This study includes 131 teachers. Among 131 teachers, 33 are from Elementary, 32 from Lower Secondary, 32 from Middle and 34 from High schools in Bhutan. There were 73 male and 58 female respondents with 100% native Bhutanese. Majority of the schools were located in a semi-urban region with almost 53% while only 20.5% were from rural areas. The study employed quantitative method using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 to generate frequencies, means and percentages for each items on the survey. For research question one, the data were reported using descriptive statistics. For research question two, t-test and ANOVA were conducted to examine the group differences and reported by dimension. For research question three, ANOVA were conducted

between demographic characteristics and reported by dimension. For research question four, correlations were computed in order to examine the relationship between demographic variables and dimensions of distributed leadership.

In general most teachers believe that there is practice of distributed leadership in their respective schools. The most frequent distributed leadership practices were found within the dimension of shared responsibility (mean: 3.69, min: 2.11, max: 4.89) followed by school culture (mean: 3.52, min: 2.27, max: 4.64). The descriptive statistics also show that the teachers report a medium level of mission, vision & goals (mean: 3.25, min: 2.14, max: 4.43), while they report least for leadership practices (mean: 3.03), with the minimum of as low as 1.50 with maximum of 4.63. It signifies that there are some variations in teachers' thinking regarding the use of the components of a good leadership practices. There are six important findings for *mission, vision & goals*. Most teachers believed that their school has clearly written goals which are aligned with national education statement and uses school improvement plan to evaluate progress. They further agreed that school goals are being collectively established and revised by administrators and teachers. Teachers reported, however, they did not believe parents and students were aware of the mission of the school. Furthermore, less than half of them indicated that teachers don't have ability to describe the school's mission.

Five additional findings were found within the dimension of *shared responsibility*. Teachers reported that they believe in shared accountability for student's academic performance. Similarly they think that their school is a learning community that continuously improves effectiveness. Even though teachers were highly engaged in shared responsibility, they reported that there is no formal structure in place to provide teachers and professional

staffs opportunities in decision-making. The teachers believed that the school's day and weekly schedules doesn't provide time for them to collaborate on instructional issues. Similarly, they think that the decision to change instructional programs is not based on assessment data. Five other findings evolved from an analysis of teacher participation within the dimension of *school culture*. Most of the teachers think that they maintain mutual trust and respect among teachers, administrators, and other professional staff. Majority of them believed that their professional development plan includes activities that are based on their individual professional needs and school needs. However, most of the teachers did not agree on their principal being consistent with their words. Furthermore, most of them listed they did not participate in instructional decision-making. Lastly, many teachers thought that their principal doesn't encourage them to participate.

However, with respect to *leadership practices*, the study showed that teachers were least engaged in this dimension. While teachers supported the importance of informal leader's role in improving the performance and achievement of students, they reported that teachers who assume leadership roles don't have sufficient school time to make meaningful contributions. Further most of them disagreed that expert teacher fill leadership roles, while interestingly, majority of teachers are interested in leadership roles. Teachers are most engaged in shared responsibility, with enormous trust and respect among colleagues, which is one of the most important characteristics of distributed leadership. The availability of resources, time, and the parents and students who perceived not to understand school goals are main factors that influenced full participation in distributed leadership practices. Teachers in HSS are more engaged in distributed leadership practices than LSS, PS and MSS teachers, largely due to differences in mission vision & goals and leadership practices. HSS teachers believed their

parents would be able to describe the mission, vision, and goals of the school. They further believed that their school has clearly written goals that are aligned with national education statement and uses school improvement plan to evaluate progress. On the other hand, most teachers involved in distributed leadership practices are males and seniors. Teachers were least engaged in leadership practices dimension and most of them did not agree on their principal being consistent with their words. Moreover, many teachers thought their principal did not encourage them to participate. However, most teachers supported the importance of informal leader's role in improving the performance and achievement of students.

B. Conclusions

Although teachers are engaged within the four dimension of distributed leadership, other criteria such as time, resource, and support etc. must be felt for a school to be embedded with distributed leadership. Without either of these practices, distributed leadership will not occur. In Bhutan distributed leadership is perceived as little more than delegating tasks to teachers, however, principals need to know that it is also about building leadership capacity in their schools. As the education system in Bhutan continues to reform, principals should gradually move away from positional leadership styles to a more distributed leadership approach. Distributed leadership not only utilizes the expertise of the teachers within the schools in a collaborative way but also ultimately aid to overall school improvement. The results of this study may instigate principals to be more interested in this type of leadership considering the shift in power and resources and its potential to improve teaching and learning in schools to ultimate success. Furthermore, the study may motivate policy makers to mandate distributed leadership to improve school leadership in Bhutan.

Teachers reported that there is overall teacher engagement within four dimensions of a distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools. However, there were also several factors that impacted teacher participation in distributed leadership practices. Based on the findings, a comprehensive leadership development programme could be introduced for all principals in relation to their own contexts and needs. As UK, USA, Canada, Australia, Hong Kong and other developed countries have distinct models of leadership professional learning to prepare their principals (Caldwell, Calnin & Cahill, 2003; Daresh & Male, 2000), how can principals be good leaders in Bhutan without any formal leadership programme? One surefire way is successful Bhutanese principals can be role models for other principals in challenging schools and government can engage these principals in leadership learning programmes. It would be, however, better if the education policy in Bhutan provided mandatory professional leadership programmes for new principals of all level of schools. Furthermore, it would be far better if the ministry of education recruit principals based on their professional degree and leadership background and encourage more teachers to major in leadership and management.

Although there are limited workshops that are subject-based training for teachers to develop their pedagogy, there is no initiative proposed for improving teacher's leadership skills. Since distributed leadership encourages teachers to participate in leadership tasks of teaching and learning, teachers need training and additional resources to understand the new role. Training the principals about the mechanisms of distributed leadership and how to engage teachers in decision-making will be useful in the practice of a distributed leadership in their schools. While adopting a new leadership, the school leaders need to seek strategies for teachers who assume leadership roles to have more time/resources to do the work of leadership. If the schools aim for effective distributed leadership they need to encourage

parents and students to participate in decision-making and become involved as stakeholders within the school. Collaboration between parents, students and teachers will improve communication and help to understand the roles of each within education. Principals have to buy into distributed leadership and give up some of the power that goes with decision-making. School leaders need to recognize leadership skills and build capacity of new teachers to participate in leadership activities. Authorities need to understand that criteria should expound upon expertise and knowledge not in the experience. Furthermore, principals should be consistent with their words, encourage teachers to participate and allow their decisions to impact instructional decision making. Lastly, leaders within the schools should be mindful of the factors that hinder the success of distributed leadership and identify ways to overcome them.

C. Recommendations for Future Research

The current study investigated the practice of distributed leadership and teacher's perception of their engagement in four dimensions of distributed leadership in Bhutanese schools. Significant differences were identified among teacher and school demographic information. As there is relative lack of research on distributed leadership in Bhutan, many questions remain unanswered due to its limited size and scope. Practice of distributed leadership has been positively revealed from this study, however, there is a vast scope for future researches. Due to location of self and participants and partly due to cost and time I have used e-mail to gather data. Since electronic interviewing lacks face-to-face interaction, other forms of qualitative research, such as focus group interviews or qualitative interviews are recommended. Above all, the number of participants is limited to 131 from 44 schools, of

which 73 were male 58 female. Most of the participants' schools that I contacted were in urban or semi-urban regions. Furthermore, majority of the participants have at least bachelor degree. Therefore, it cannot represent an overall picture of distributed leadership in Bhutan nor can be extended as a commentary on leadership in all schools. The future researchers should include more participants considering equal number of male and female teachers with diverse degrees from different level of schools and regions. Lastly, the result of this study is solely from teachers' perspectives and thus I recommend including principals, parents, and students in future studies.

REFERENCES

- A, Hargreaves. & D, Fink. (2008). Distributed leadership: democracy or delivery? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(2), pp. 229-240.
- A, Harris. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 32(1), pp. 11-24. 118
- A, Harris. (2008). *Distributed school leadership: Developing tomorrow's leaders*. New York: Routledge.
- A.k, Azwifarwi. (2012). *Exploring teachers' perceptions of distributed leadership practices in selected secondary schools within Gauteng Province*. University of Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Barth, R.S. (1990). *Improving schools from within*. Jossey Bass: San Francisco, California.
- Bennett, N., Wise, C., Woods, P., & Harvey, J. (Spring 2003). *Distributed leadership*. Gloucestershire, England: National College for School Leadership.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (5th ed.). USA: Pearson Education Group, Inc.
- Bryman, A. (2006). *Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done?* *Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 97–113.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Barriers to integrating quantitative and qualitative research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 8–22. 115
- Bhutan Ministry of Education. (2012). *Education general statistics*. Thimphu, Bhutan: Author.
- Bhutan Ministry of Education. (2004) *The 23rd education policy guidelines and instructions*. Thimphu, Bhutan: Author.
- Blasé, J. & Blasé, J.(1999). Implementation of shared governance for instructional improvement: Principal's perspectives. *Journal of educational administration*, 37(5), 476-5000.
- B. M, Bass. (1985)*Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bracey, G. (2007). Assessing NCLB. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89 (10) 781-782. Brown, P. (2006). *Preparing principals for today's demands*. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7),525-526.
- Brown, R., Rutherford, D., & Boyle, B. (2000). *Leadership for school improvement: The role of the Head of*

- Department in UK secondary schools. School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(2), 237-258.
- Brundrett, M., Burton, N., & Smith, R. (2003). *Leadership in education*. 1st ed. Trowbridge, GB: Cromwell Press.
- Bryman, A. (2006). *Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done? Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 97–113.
- Colbeck, C. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate teaching and research. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69, 6, 647-661.
- Cova, B., & Elliot, R. (2008). Everything you always wanted to know about interpretive consumer research but were afraid to ask. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 11(2), 121 - 129.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools: Albany State University*: New York Press. Cambridge: National College for School Leadership.
- Camburn, E., Rowan, B., & Taylor, J. E. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: The case of elementary schools adopting comprehensive school reform models. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4), 347-373.
- Crawford, M. (2005). Distributed leadership and headship: A paradoxical relationship? *School Leadership & Management*, 25(3), 213-215.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davis, M. W. (2009). *Distributed leadership and school performance* (Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University).
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Devos, G., & Hulpia, H. (2010). How distributed leadership can make a difference in teachers' organizational commitment? A qualitative study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 565-575.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE
- Dorji, J. (2005). *Quality of education in Bhutan: The story of growth and change in the Bhutanese education*

- system*. Thimphu, Bhutan: KMT Publisher.
- D, Karma. (2009). *The Key elements of effective principal leadership in primary and lower secondary schools in Bhutan*. The University of New Brunswick, Canada.
- D, Mayrowetz. (2008). Making sense of distributed leadership: Exploring the multiple usages of the concept in the field. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(3), pp. 424-435.
- De Vaus, D. (2004). *Surveys in Social Research* (5th ed.). Great Britain: Routledge.
- DuFour, R.(2002). The Learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership*, 59 (8)12-15.
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, D.C.: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Elmore, R.F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Freebody, P. (2004). *Qualitative research in education: Interaction and practice*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, K. (2000). *The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text*. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*(pp. 645 - 672). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. (1st ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishing.
- Gabriel, J. (2005). *How to thrive as a teacher leader*. (1st ed.). Alexandria, VI: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gall, J., Gall, M., & Borg, W. (1996). *Educational Research: An Introduction (6th Ed.)*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- G, Devos. & H, Hulpia. (2010). How distributed leadership can make a difference in teachers' organizational commitment? A qualitative study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, pp.565-575.
- Gay, L. (1996). *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application (5th Ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Merrill.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1993). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. USA: Longman.
- Gordon, Z. (2005). *The effect of distributed leadership on student achievement* (Doctoral Dissertation, Central Connecticut State University, 2005).
- Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational management and*

- administration: *Journal of the British educational management and administration society*, 28 (3), 317-338.
- Gronn, P. (2003). *The new work of educational leaders*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, California.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423.
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2006). Models of successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 26(4), 371-395.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). *Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership*. Cambridge Journal of Education, 33 (3) 329-351.
- Harris, A. (2002). *Distributed leadership in schools: Leading or misleading?* (CV4 7AL).
- Harris, A.; Leithwood, K.; Day, C.; Sammons, P.; & Hopkins, D. (2007). Distributed Leadership and Organizational Change: Reviewing the evidence. *Journal of Education Change*, 8 (4), 337-347.
- Harrison, J., MacGibbon, L., & Morton, M. (2001). Regimes of trustworthiness in qualitative research: The rigors of reciprocity. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(3), 323-345.
- Hay Group Education (2004). *The Five pillars of distributed leadership in schools: An investigation into the advantages and disadvantages, causes and constraints of a more distributed form of leadership in schools*, NCLS.
- Dyenka, K. (199). *Teaching high school English in Bhutan: A study at the crossroads of language, literature and culture*. University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, NB.
- Kerlinger, F. & Lee, H. (2000). *Foundations of behavior research* (4th ed.). Northridge, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning
- Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. (1st ed.) Alexandria, VI: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lashway, L. (Summer, 2003). *Distributed leadership*. *Clearinghouse on Educational Policy Management*, 1-7. Retrieved January 31, 2013 from Research Roundup.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S. & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. The Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Ryan, S. (1997). *Leadership and team learning in secondary schools*. *School Leadership and Management*, 17(3), 303-325.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1998). *Distributed leadership and student engagement in school*. American

Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

- Leithwood, K., Mascal, B., Strauss, T., Sacks, R., Memon, N., & Yashkina, A. (2007). Distributing leadership to make schools smarter: Taking the ego out of the system. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(1) 37-67.
- Lichtman, M. (2009). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Lucia, R. T. (2004). *Distributed leadership: An exploratory study*. (Doctoral Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 2004). Dissertation Abstracts International, AAT3159315.
- MacBeath, J. (2005). Leadership as distributed: A matter of practice. *School Leadership and Management*, 25(4), 349-366.
- Meho, L. I. (2006) E-mail interviewing in qualitative research: A methodological discussion. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 57(10), 1284- 1295.
- Mehra, A., Smith, B., Dixon, A., & Robertson, B. (2006). Distributed leadership in teams: The network of leadership perceptions and team performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 232-245.
- Abu Nayeem, M.S. (2011). *Perceptions of Effective Leadership in Bangladesh Secondary Schools: Moving towards Distributed Leadership?* University of Canterbury Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Oduro, G. K. (2004). Distributed leadership in schools. *Education Journal*, (80), 23-25.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Royal Civil Service Commission of Bhutan. (2012). *The position classification: Towards excellence in the civil service*. Thimphu, Bhutan: Author.
- Scribner, J., Sawyer, R., Watson, S., & Myers, V. (2007). Teacher teams and distributed leadership: A study of group discourse and collaboration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 67-100.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. & Carver, F.D. (1975). *The New School Executive*, New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (2001). *What's in it for schools?* Routledge Falmer: London, England.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (2005) *Strengthening the heartbeat : Leading and learning together in schools* (1st ed.). San Francisco, California: Jossey Bass Publishing.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (4 ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

- Smith, L. M. (2007). *Study of teacher engagement in four dimensions of distributed leadership in one school district in Georgia*. Georgia Southern University
- Spillane, J. P. (2006 a.). *Distributed leadership*.(1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Leadership Library in Education.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 23-28.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 36 (1), 3-34.
- Spillane, J.P., Diamond, J.B. & Jita, L. (2003). Leading instruction: The distribution of leadership for instruction. *Journal of Curriculum studies*, 35 (5), 533-543.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Storey, A. (2004). The problem of distributed leadership in schools. *School leadership and management*, 24(3), 249-265.
- T, Kelzang. (2013) Exploring the distributed leadership practice of school leaders in Bhutanese Schools: A pilot study. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 164-173
- T, Kelzang. (2014) Occupational stress among Bhutanese teachers. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education*, 3(2), 71-79.
- Timperley, H. (2005). Distributed leadership: Developing theory from practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(4), 395-420.
- Wangmo, T. (2003). *Teachers' instructional practices and students' proficiency in writing at grade 4: A descriptive study of five Bhutanese schools*. University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, NB.
- Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Kruger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The illusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 398 -425.
- Wong, K. (2005). Conditions and practices of successful principalship in Shanghai, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(6), 552 - 562.
- Wright, L. L. (2008). Merits and limitations of distributed leadership: Experiences and understandings of school principals. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 69, 1 -3 3.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NY: Prentice Hall.

Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 959 - 978). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Zhang, J. & Faerman, S. (2007). Distributed leadership in the development of a knowledge sharing system.

European Journal of Information Systems, 16, 479- 493

APPENDICES

Appendix A: DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

Your responses are voluntary, confidential and **HONEST ANSWERS** are greatly appreciated. No individual will be identified in any reports.

Background Information

Tick the most appropriate one.

I. Participant's information

Respondent's Subject/major:

Respondent's qualification: PTC() B.Ed() PGCE() Masters() Designation:

Respondent's gender: Male () Female ()

Respondent's number of years as teacher: 1-5 years (), 5-10 years (), 10-15 years (), 15-20 years (), More than 20 years ().

II. General information

Type of School:

Location of the School: Urban () Semi-urban () Rural ()

- Elementary/Community PS ()
- Lowers SS ()
- Middles SS ()
- Higher SS ()

Name of the School:

Principal's gender: Male () Female ()

Principal's qualification:

PTC () B.Ed () PGCE () Masters ()

Dzongkhag/District:

1. What is your primary role at this school? Mark (√) ONE box.

Principal

Classroom Teacher

2. How many years have you been working in this school including the current school year? (Print

number of years in boxes using only whole numbers.) Example: If this is your first year in this school, write 01.
If this is your tenth year at this school, write 10.

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Please respond to the following statements in terms on how frequently each statement is descriptive of your school. Please tick (✓) and program number for each item.

| Items | Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Neutral 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 |
|--|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|------------------------|
| 1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements. | | | | | |
| 2. Teachers understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly. | | | | | |
| 3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most will be able to describe the mission clearly. | | | | | |
| 4. If students are asked to describe the schools' mission, most will be able to describe it clearly. | | | | | |
| 5. School goals are aligned with the national educational statement. | | | | | |
| 6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis for progress. | | | | | |
| 7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 8. Teachers share accountability for students' academic performance. | | | | | |
| 9. Government resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most. | | | | | |
| 10. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures. | | | | | |
| 11. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers. | | | | | |
| 12. There is mutual respect and trust between school head and the teachers. | | | | | |
| 13. The school administrators (Head & Assistant Head) welcome teachers' input on issues related to instruction and improving student performance. | | | | | |

| | Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Neutral 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 14. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 15. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues | | | | | |
| 16. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know whom to contact when they have questions and concerns. | | | | | |
| 17. School teachers and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education | | | | | |
| 18. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. school performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement. | | | | | |
| 19. Decisions to change instructional programs are based on assessment data. | | | | | |
| 20. There is a formal structure in place in the school (academic council) to provide teachers opportunities to participate in school level instructional decision making. | | | | | |
| 21. The principal actively encourages teachers to participate | | | | | |
| 22. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals. | | | | | |
| 23. The principal actively participates in his or her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school. | | | | | |
| 24. My principal and I jointly develop my annual | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| professional development plan | | | | | |
| 25. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs | | | | | |
| 26. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision making. | | | | | |

| | Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Neutral 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| 27. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues. | | | | | |
| 28. My principal's practices are consistent with his or her words. | | | | | |
| 29. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students. | | | | | |
| 30. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles. | | | | | |
| 31. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to school. | | | | | |
| 32. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school | | | | | |
| 33. Expert teachers fill most leadership roles in the school. | | | | | |
| 34. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles | | | | | |
| 35. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles. | | | | | |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

- Please attached the filled-form and send it to tashikelzang@yahoo.com

Appendix B: Permission for use of Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS)

RE: seeking permission to use DLRS

From: Jacobson, Larry [Larry.Jacobson@ct.gov]

Mar 28, 2013

To: Kelzang Tashi, 'inwhatways@chosun.ac.kr', 'minseong@Chosun.ac.kr'.

Dear Kelzang Tashi,

On behalf of the Connecticut State Department of Education you are authorized to use our Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale. Please let me know if you have any questions about the scale.

Best wishes in your masters research.

Larry Jacobson, Ph.D.

Education Consultant

Educational Leadership Program

Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification

Connecticut State Department of Education

860-713-6819

Appendix C: Permission from the Ministry of Education, Bhutan.



དཔལ་ལྷན་འབྲུག་གཞུང་། ཤེས་རིག་ལྷན་ཁག་།

Royal Government of Bhutan
Ministry of Education
Human Resource Division



MoE/HRD-HRDs/INSET/24/2013/ 4192

17th April 2013

To Whom It May Concern

This is to certify that Mr. Kelzang Tashi (EID#200701576), Teacher of Changzamtog LSS under Thimphu Thromde is presently pursuing Master of Education at Chosun University, Gwangju in South Korea starting 1st September 2011 for duration of 3 years under Korean Government Scholarship.

As a partial fulfillment of his master's course he is required to undertake and complete the research project related to school leadership in Bhutan. The Ministry would like to recommend him to carry out his proposed research project in Bhutan. Therefore, all concerned are requested to render support to Mr. Kelzang Tashi in collecting reliable data and information which will enable him to arrive at meaningful conclusion and recommendation.

For any clarification please contact HRD, MoE at +975-02-328214 during office hours.

(Tshesum Dawa)
Offtg. Chief HR Officer
DY. CHIEF
HUMAN RESOURCE OFFICER
Ministry of Education
Thimphu : Bhutan



Appendix D: Email Correspondence to Principals

Dear Sir(s)/Madam(s),

My name is Kelzang Tashi. I am currently undergoing Master of Education specializing Educational Administration at Chosun University, South Korea. I am conducting a study on distributed leadership and teacher's perception of their engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership. Recent research has indicated that the practice of distributed leadership has the potential to improve teaching and increase learning. The aim of this study is to investigate to what extent teachers are engaged in distributed leadership practices. It further seeks to examine if demographic information such as teacher and school variables impacted the practice of distributed leadership in their schools. It is my hope that the results of this study will be useful to both principals and policy makers. The survey is four pages and requires teachers to rate their perceptions about the practice of distributed leadership in their respective schools. It should take them only about 10-15 minutes to complete. No instructional time will be used and students are in no way involved.

The review board at Chosun University has approved this study. It was further approved by Ministry of Education, Bhutan. Their approval letter is attached. Teachers will not be compensated for this, and participation is completely voluntary. If you have further questions please reply to this e-mail or feel free to call me at +821077526842

Your time and effort are highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kelzang Tashi

Appendix E: Statement of Consent

I have read the above description of the research project and the researcher has clarified my queries to my satisfaction. I understand the purposes of this research and my role as a research participant.

I , agree to participate in this study.

.....
(Participant's signature) (Date)

To the best of my ability I , have explained the purpose, objectives, and the nature of this study toand I have clarified all of his/her queries about the research topic.

.....
(Researcher's signature) (Date)