

Leadership distribution consequences in schools: A particular look at organizational citizenship behavior of teacher

¹Manouchehr Jofreh, ²Fayegh Mohammadi, ²Ali Yasini

¹Management Department in Islamic Azad University at Central Tehran Branch of Iran

²Department of Psychology and Education, Kharazmi University of Tehran, Iran

Abstract: The current approach of leadership in the school highlights multiple leaders and power distribution in the school. This approach is called "distributed leadership". Educational researchers are now emphasizing on the most important consequences of distributed leadership for principals and schools. But "organizational citizenship behavior" as one of the most important teacher-related consequences, is neglected in their empirical attempts. The Current study tries to fill this gap through investigating the role of distributed leadership in organizational citizenship behavior of teachers. A representative sample including 360 teachers and 52 principals of Kraj primary schools have participated in the study and have completed distributed leadership and organizational citizenship behavior questionnaires. After reliability and construct validity analysis, research questions were responded using Pearson correlation coefficient and standard multiple regression. Results showed that there is a significant positive correlation between distributed leadership and the organizational citizenship behavior dimensions. Also the results of regression analysis showed that the dimensions of distributed leadership can significantly predict all of the organizational citizenship behavior dimensions. Results of this study draw attention to the importance of distributed leadership and organizational citizenship behavior as an important teacher-related consequence. Some implications were proposed in the final section of the article for policy makers, principals, teachers and researchers.

Key words: distributed leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, teachers, principals

INTRODUCTION

Schools have been dealing with several complex challenges during the last two decades. These challenges have given a more significant role to the leadership at schools as a strategic and important policy for facing the challenges. Moreover, the researchers and policymakers in the field of education have always been focusing on the critical and vital role of leadership in the effectiveness and improvement of school and they have been obliged to do so. The significance of leadership in obtaining achievements for the school has led to many studies and researches aimed to find the best way for leadership. The traditional approach to leadership is a subjective one and is confined to an individual as the official leader, a principal or a selected teacher who enjoys the characteristics of a hero (power, courage, control, self-confidence, organizational faithfulness and obedience by the cohorts, etc) (Oduro, 2004). The leadership traits and behavior theory as well as the contingency theories are resulted from such an approach. However, the leadership theories are following their own evolutionary path and new approaches such as Transaction Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Servant Leadership, etc have been introduced in the novel theories on leadership. The significant issue that has to be taken into consideration with regard to such new leadership methods is that they rely on one single person as the leader, on the one hand, and on the other hand, they have been originated outside the school setting and they have later been spread to the schools. However, a new method of leadership has been formed that lacks the above-mentioned limitations. In this method, school leaders have replaced one single leader and power distribution has replaced power concentration in the school. This new leadership method is known as Distributed Leadership (Elmore, 2000). Terms such as cooperative leadership, collective leadership, democratic leadership, and situational leadership have repeatedly been wrongly used instead of Distributed Leadership. But, these modes also suffer from the above-mentioned limitations (Spillane, 2006). However, some theorists (such as Hurlty) believe that distributed leadership is not a novel idea, rather it has been marginalized for a long period of time. Some others, such as Groom (2008) have introduced theorists such as Gibb, Katz & Hahn, and Schain, as the first theorists of Distributed Leadership theory. All of them are non-educational theorists and they have used the Distributed Leadership as equivalent to the Shared Leadership and Delivered Leadership. However, whether we call it "Shared" leadership or "delivered" leadership, the distributed leadership is necessarily focused on sharing leadership at school. According to Harris (2008), the distributed leadership is not a new leadership technique, but it is a representation of this fact that a successful leadership in the school requires sharing and distributing the activities.

Distributed Leadership: The Nature and Indices:

The distributed leadership is defined as a phenomenon in which the leadership activities are not performed by one single person; rather it is shared by the individuals and task forces (Storey, 2004; Yukl, 2002). Bennett, Wise, Woods & Harvey (2003) have stated that the distributed leadership is a team activity rather than being merely a personal one. The major principle of distributed leadership is the achievement of the school objectives by its leaders, rather than its leader. In Mack Bass’s view (2005), this principle is not only focused on empowering others, but also on an atmosphere where the individuals are able to grow up and to be enabled for leadership. This principle was not recognized as a leadership mode until the middle of the past century. It might be said that it has been discussed as a significant issue in the literature on school leadership since 1990s (Gron, 2002).

The significant point for understanding the distributed leadership is that this method is not necessarily a good or bad initiative; it is rather dependant on the situation of leadership as well as the primary objectives of the distribution of leadership roles. The expansion of the hierarchy or the increase in the number of the leaders does not necessarily indicate the distributed leadership. None of these features automatically leads to the improvement of functioning and performance. What matters is the nature and quality of the leadership performance (Harris & Muijs, 2005).

A review of the available literature on distributed leadership reveals that this approach is directed towards sharing the decision making responsibility and creating a collective atmosphere in the school. This method of leadership is related to the participatory decision-making and organizational democracy and a purposeful decision directed towards the creation of an atmosphere that reflects a multi-dimensional trust in the schools (Lamberopoulos & Vivitsou, 2011).

Wallach, Lambert, Copland & Lowry (2005) count some features as the basis of the distributed leadership. According to them, the distributed leadership is based on collective activities and purposes and the positive reflection of such a process goes much beyond the sum of the activities of every school members. Moreover, the distributed leadership is based on the organizational and interpersonal skills, rather than the hierarchical structure. Other than participatory and collective decision-making, responsibility and accountability in the school are also among the collective and team affair, that is to say when a success or a failure occurs to the distributed leadership, all school members including teachers and the staff (not the principal alone) are to be accountable. This principle (the principle of accountability) refers to this point that the distributed leadership is shaped based on the empowerment of teachers and students in order to participate in leadership process of the school (Harris, 2008).

Meanwhile, two reasons are introduced as the main factors for the appearance of the distributed leadership, in the studies carried out on leadership. A failure or inefficiency of the hero and charismatic leaders, together with the transformational leaders (due to ignoring and disregarding the merits of teachers and other beneficiaries in leadership, confinement of power in the hands of the leaders, and disregarding the cooperative trust and efforts) and other increasing complications of the schools requires the most appropriate mode of leadership for schools (Hurtly, 2009). In support of the second reason, Bolden (2008; cited in Lambropoulos & Vivitsou, 2001) states that the distributed leadership in line with the improvement of team creativity and cooperative spirit is to be regarded as the main aspect of schools in the 21st century and in fact, it is a response to the changing and updated needs of schools and its conformity to the rapid changes in the environment and the community.

To better understand this method of leadership and to identify its features, the researchers have introduced several indices. Elmore (2000) has compiled the most comprehensive pattern for the distributed leadership within the framework of 5 indices (table 1).

Table 1: Distributed Leadership Indices

Indices	Description
School Culture	School culture includes values, norms and beliefs that support the leadership distribution at school and provide the environment where the teachers are encouraged to cooperate with each other and to take part in the decision-makings for the school and the professional improvement as well as their own training for leadership. In such an environment, the principal is the appropriate symbol for the teachers in line with the leadership distribution by taking the advantage of collective functions and behaviors and the distribution of responsibilities. Moreover, it indicates the level of parents participation and their accountability for the educational progress of their children and following up the way of performing school tasks.
Collective Decision-Making	This index of the distributed leadership refers to the fact that to what extent the decision-making has been transformed from the hierarchical mode to the bilateral and distributed pattern, and to what extent the teachers have participated in the decision-making process. In the distributed leadership pattern, the “backroom decision making” is decreased. The principal provides the teachers with the required resources and facilities, aimed to satisfy them in order to encourage them participate in the systematic distribution of leadership and data collection, so that the final decisions may be planned by their cooperation and this leads to the improvement of the level of their accountability towards the educational progress of the students.
Leadership Experiences	The leadership experiences refers to the level of involvement of the teachers and other staff members in the distribution of the leadership and it focuses on the supports of the principal (providing the resources and facilities, attracting the participation of the members, empowering them, providing the data, etc) for planning on the improvement of the school, improving collective decision-making and accountability in the

	schools and among the students and the parents. Generally, this index includes the daily activities of the schools in line with the distribution and development of leadership, the individuals who are responsible to carry these activities out, the tools required for an optimal performance of leadership, the planned measures or objectives in line with the leadership distribution.
Professional Evaluation and Development	This index of the distributed leadership deals with the intellectual maturity and evaluation of the teachers and other school members. It also includes the issues such as the evaluation and appreciation of the teachers as educational leaders, providing them with appropriate opportunity and sufficient information resources aimed at the assessment of their performance and making decisions about them, taking their abilities and performance into consideration.
Mission, Objectives, Perspective	This index refers to the fact that to what extent the teachers and school staff are involved in specifying the mission, perspective and objectives of the school, and to what extent this has been carried out systematically and based on the records and experiences of the teachers. Moreover, this index refers to the protective atmosphere of the schools for the newcomer teachers and encouraging them to accept the leadership responsibilities that result in the establishment of mutual trust and expectations among the principal, teachers and other school members.

Consequences of Distributed Leadership: Organizational Citizenship Behavior of the Teachers:

In the first glance, distributed leadership has many benefits and consequences for the principals, because their role is no longer to maintain their position and to carry out strict organizational regulations, but they are responsible for the activities such as consultation, building trust, improvement of cooperation, supporting professional improvement of the teachers and educational guidance, etc. Considering the results of some researches (cited in Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001) with the distributed leadership, most principals have stated that their responsibilities and pressures have been decreased and even their relationship and interactions with the teachers have been improved. Other than the benefits for the principals, the distributed leadership has also many advantages for the teachers according to the researchers (such as Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Leithwood, Mascall & Strauss, 2008). In this approach, the teachers feel more attached to the school and this results in higher incentive, specialization and organizational and professional commitment as well as their academic optimism. By improving the capacities of school and decreasing the volume of responsibilities for a person in charge (the principal), this method enables and empower the teachers with the responsibilities that only the principal has been responsible for (Mack Bass, 2005). Therefore, this method provides the ground for the retrieval and reinforcement of the leadership capability of the teachers and provides the conditions for the students and the improvement of their success. With regard to the definitions and specifications mentioned about the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of the teachers, this highly significant variable can be assumed as one of the really valuable consequences of distributed leadership.

Organ (1988) first defined the variable of “organizational citizenship behavior” based on the “Willingness to Cooperate” theory of Chester Bernard. He believed that the organizational citizenship behavior is an optional and voluntary behavior, beyond the official role and it is done with no expectations, and although it is not directly related to the reward and punishment systems of the organizations, it helps the fluidity and effectiveness of its functioning; the concept of arbitrariness of these behavior means that they are not a part of the formal obligations of the role, job description and official duties of the employed person and it has not been referred to in the job contract. The individual is free to do them and disregarding them will not result in a certain punishment in the organization (cited in Zarinabadi, Behrangi, Navehebrahim & Farzad, 2008). According to him, the personnel with organizational citizenship behavior enjoy 5 aspects including 1) Altruism (helping others voluntarily and avoiding job problems for them, etc); 2) Conscientiousness (institutionalizing and accepting the organizational regulations and making them effective even when the individual is not present, etc); 3) Sportsmanship (willingness to tolerate the work problems, without complaint and not spending too much time on complaining on insignificant issues in the organization etc.); 4) courtesy (not violating the rights of other personnel, etc.); 5) Civic virtue (being too interested in and very committed to the organization and admitting that he/she is a small part of a huge system, etc).

Such behaviors are increasingly becoming significant, since as the organizations try to distribute leadership in their structure and their leadership duties and responsibilities are being distributed among the members of the organization, the borders of organizational activities are being increasingly expanded, therefore the need for team work, the distribution of responsibilities and consultation activities have unexpectedly increased and the personnel are feeling the need for a high level of behaviors and performances that are not explicitly included in their job description. So it is necessary that they participate in the successful organizational evolutions, without considering the official aspects of their job (Krishnan & Arora, 2008). The significance of the organizational citizenship behavior is unquestionable for the personnel of different organizations, but when it is the matter of schools, closer attentions are being paid. The role of schools in educating the human resources for the future and the comprehensive improvement of all nations is an unquestionable reason for the necessity of employing the teachers who benefit from a high level of organizational citizenship behavior. The duty of the teachers is the improvement of learning abilities in the students through teaching process, and considering the complex nature of learning, undoubtedly it cannot be created with a high quality, by merely performing certain prescribed duties (Oplatka, 2009; cited in Zarinabadi,, 2009).

Statement of the Problem:

The organizational citizenship behavior is one of the significant and effective variables and if the teachers are willing to take part in such behaviors, the achievement of the objectives will be accelerated for the schools. However, the main question is how such behaviors can be improved among the teachers. Can the expansion and distribution of leadership tasks among the teachers predict the occurrence of such behaviors in the teachers? Several researches have been carried out on the relationship between leadership methods and organizational citizenship behavior and most of them have reported a direct and significant relationship. For instance, the researchers of Management and Organizational Behavior (cited in Bamble, Shamsudin & Subramaniam, 2011) have realized in their studies that transaction leadership, transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, ethical leadership and servant leadership have a significant relationship with the organizational citizenship behavior of the personnel. However, only a few researches have been carried out on the relationship between the distributed leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. For example, Mascall, Leithwood, Strauss & Sacks (2008) have estimated a high direct and significant relationship between distributed leadership and organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers (as a dimension of the academic optimism of the teachers). Undoubtedly, relying on the results of numerous researches, the relationship between these two variables cannot be assumed, but considering the results of some other researches a non-directional hypothesis can be formulated. For example, Harris and Townsend (2007) concluded from the analysis of their case study on 22 schools that the most effective schools are the schools that put the highest investment on the distributed leadership. In another research, Leithwood *et al* (2008) analyzed the data collected from 200 schools and concluded that the distributed leadership provides the opportunities for the school to most effectively take the advantage of the capabilities of teachers and the staff. Flessa (2009) also concluded that through the distribution of leadership in schools, the teachers are convinced to invest on a wide range of their individual weak points and talents and to develop the behaviors beyond the role they take. Accordingly, the main problem of this study is whether the distributed leadership, as a new approach of leadership in the school can yield a significant explanation of the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers or not. Other than the necessity of responding to this question, the significant and critical role of the distributed leadership, considering the governing conditions for the Iranian schools (especially the elementary schools), the significance of organizational citizenship behaviors in the teachers (especially the elementary school teachers), and the limited published studies add to the significance of this study.

Research Questions & Purposes:

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the role of the distributed leadership in the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers in the elementary schools of Karaj. To achieve this purpose, the following questions have been posed:

- 1) Is there a significant relationship between the distributed leadership and the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers?
- 2) Do the dimensions of the distributed leadership significantly explain each of the dimensions of the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers?

Research Methodology:

This study is to be classified under the descriptive researches category and correlational researches subcategory. Descriptive research, sometimes referred to as non-experimental research, deals with the relationship among the variables, testing the hypotheses, developing general concepts and rules, principles or theories that enjoy a universal validity. Unlike the experimental researches, the researcher does not manipulate the variables in a descriptive research, or he/she will not provide certain conditions for the occurrence of events (Sarmad Hejazi & Bazargan, 2004). Correlational research is classified under three major categories, based on the purpose of the study: 1) the analysis of the simultaneous relationship of the variables; 2) Regression analysis; 3) correlation matrix analysis. Considering the fact that this study deals with the pair relationships as well as the multivariable relationships, this research method is a descriptive correlational research and the correlation is a bivariate and regression correlation. The statistical population of this research includes all teachers and principals of the elementary schools in Karaj. To select the sample for this study, a cluster sampling method was used. So that, first the optimal size of the sample was determined, using Krejcie and Morgan table and then, using this sampling method, a survey was carried out for the four educational zones of Karaj, containing 360 teachers. The principal of each school (52 principals of 52 schools) were also included in the survey. In other words, the principals were also sampled by the sampling of the teachers. Table 2 describes the investigated sample based on the age and educational level of the respondents.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

Variables	category	redundancy		percent	
		Teacher	manager	teacher	manager
Age	20 to 30 years	31	00	8.6	00
	31 to 40 years	178	9	49.5	17.3
	41 to 50 years	147	42	40.8	80.7
	Fifty years to up	4	1	1.1	2
Education	Diploma	32	00	8.8	00
	Advanced Diploma	186	2	51.7	3.9
	Bachelor	135	23	37.2	44.3
	Graduate	7	27	2.3	51.8

Research Instrumentation:

To measure the research variables, two questionnaires were used. As these questionnaires were prepared in English, the required measures were taken to translate the questionnaires into Persian and back into English. When the cultural and semantic matching was proved, the questionnaires were ready to be used for final execution. The sampled teachers and principals declared their level of agreement with each one of the statements of the questionnaire by choosing one of the numbers of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 (for the highest to the lowest level of agreement), based on a 5-degree continuum.

The measurement of the distributed leadership:

To measure the understanding of teachers about the distributed leadership, the Elmore questionnaire with 20 statements (2000) was used. This questionnaire measures the level of distribution of leadership in the schools under study with regard to 5 dimensions (school culture, decision-making, leadership experiences, professional evaluation and development and mission, objectives and perspective). The reliability coefficient for the subscales and the questionnaire was estimated to be 0.87, 0.87, 0.85, 0.73 and 0.92, respectively. To study the construct validity, the confirmatory factor analysis was used. This analysis showed that these subscales have measured the variable of distributed leadership with a high power and perfect fitness. The results of this analysis are reported in table 3.

Table 3: result of confirmatory factor analysis

Variables and dimensions			Goodness of Fit Index
<i>distributed leadership</i>	β	T	Chi Square(X^2)= 2.41*
School culture	0.96	23.80*	Chi Square /Degrees of freedom (X^2/df)= 1/2
decision making	0.93	22.51*	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation =0.020,
Leadership practices	0.74	16.41*	Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)= 0.98
evaluation and professional development	0.65	13.22*	Adjusted goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)=0.95
Mission, vision and goals	0.54	11.67*	Comparative Fit Index (CFI)=1
Organizational citizenship behavior			Chi Square(X^2)=3.21*
Sacrifice	0.90	22.34*	Chi Square /Degrees of freedom (X^2/df)= 1.6
Conscientiousness	0.86	20.61*	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation =0.020,
Sportsmanship	0.83	19.92*	Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)= 1
Courtesy	0.85	20.38*	Adjusted goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)=0.98
Civic Virtue	0.91	22.67*	Comparative Fit Index (CFI)=1

The Measurement Of The Organizational Citizenship Behavior Of The Teachers:

To measure the understanding of the principals from the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers, the Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine and Bachrach questionnaire (1990) with 25 statements was used. This questionnaire was adjusted by Somech and Ron (2007) for the application in the schools. This questionnaire measures the level of occurrence of behaviors such as altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue (subscales) in the teachers, according to the principals. In this research the reliability coefficient for the subscales and the questionnaire as a whole is estimated to be 0.91, 0.67, 0.60, 0.86 and 0.71, respectively. To estimate the construct validity of this questionnaire, a confirmatory factor analysis was used. This analysis showed that these subscales have measured the variable of organizational citizenship behavior of teachers with a high power and perfect fitness. The results of this analysis are reported in table 3, and then the research variables measurement pattern has been drawn.

Findings:

Table 4 reports the mean and standard deviation of the research variables.

Table 4: Description of variables

<i>distributed leadership</i>			<i>Organizational citizenship behavior</i>		
variables	M	SD	variables	M	SD
School culture	4.36	0.95	Sacrifice	3.59	1.4
Decision making	4.25	0.78	Conscientiousness	3.93	0.76
Leadership practices	4.18	0.80	Sportsmanship	3.81	1.1
evaluation and professional development	3.98	0.96	Courtesy	4.24	1.03
Mission, vision and goals	3.77	0.94	Civic Virtue	4.01	0.91

As it can be observed in table 4, the mean of the dimensions of the distributed leadership and the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers in all dimensions are higher than 3. It is also observed that the highest mean among the dimensions of the distributed leadership belongs to the school culture with a mean of 4.36. The lowest mean belongs to the dimension of mission perspective and objectives with a mean of 3.77. Among the dimensions of the organizational citizenship behavior, the highest mean belongs to the dimension of courtesy with a mean of 4.24 and the lowest value belongs to the dimension of altruism with the mean of 3.59.

As it was mentioned, Pearson correlation coefficient is used to answer the first research question. Table 4 reports the coefficients and their significance.

A review of table 5 reveals that there is a positive and significant relationship between all dimensions of the distributed leadership and all dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. The highest correlation is estimated between the dimension of leadership experiences and altruism ($r=0.467$) and the lowest one is measured between mission, perspective and objectives, and courtesy ($r=0.194$).

Table 5: Correlation coefficients

<i>distributed leadership/OCB</i>	Sacrifice	Conscientiousness	Sportsmanship	Courtesy	Civic Virtue
School culture	0.443**	0.309**	0.320**	0.312**	0.387**
Decision making	0.287**	0.277**	0.284**	0.255**	0.305**
Leadership practices	0.467**	0.317**	0.319**	0.301**	0/401**
evaluation and professional development	0.437**	0.337**	0.282**	0.294**	0.358**
Mission, vision and goals	0.319**	0.244**	0.292**	0.194**	0.284**

As it was mentioned earlier, multiple regression analysis is used to answer the second research question. In this question, the 5 dimensions of the distributed leadership were simultaneously analyzed as the predictors of the 5 dimensions of the variable of organizational citizenship behavior for the teachers (predictor or criterion variables). The results are reported in table 6.

Table 6: multiple regression analysis

Predictive variables	Criterion variables	R ²	DF	F	β	t
School culture	Sacrifice	0.263	5 354	25.47*	0.066	0.650
Decision making					0.343	3.27*
Leadership practices					0.528	4.57*
evaluation and professional development					0.233	2.08*
Mission, vision and goals					0.017	0.212
School culture	Conscientiousness	0.133	5 354	11.02*	0.024	0.213
Decision making					0.274	2.41*
Leadership practices					0.326	2.60*
evaluation and professional development					0.250	2.04*
Mission, vision and goals					0.005	0.057
School culture	Sportsmanship	0.108	5 354	8.57*	0.207	2.07*
Decision making					0.061	0.543
Leadership practices					0.053	0.448
evaluation and professional development					0.017	0.145
Mission, vision and goals					0.203	2.06*
School culture	Courtesy	0.102	5 354	8.69*	0.155	1.37
Decision making					0.017	0.144
Leadership practices					0.125	0.975
evaluation and professional development					0.120	0.965
Mission, vision and goals					0.104	1.13
School culture	Civic Virtue	0.158	5 354	13.53*	0.110	0.999
Decision making					0.153	1.33
Leadership practices					0.318	2.52*
evaluation and professional development					0.120	0.98
Mission, vision and goals					0.002	0.025

Table 6 illustrates the results of the multiple regression analysis. In this table, the distributed leadership dimensions have been introduced into the pattern as a predictor variable and each dimension of the

organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers as the criterion variables. The main indices in the regression analysis include the values R^2 , F , β and t which are included separately in this table. As it can be noticed, the study of altruism of the teachers is regarded as the first criterion variable and ($R^2=0.263$) from the variance of this dimension is significantly distributed by the dimensions of the distributed leadership ($F[5,354]=25.47$, $P<0.05$). Moreover, the analysis of the special contribution of each dimension in predicting the altruism of the teachers showed that only three dimensions including school culture ($t=3.27$, $\beta=0.343$), leadership experiences ($t=4.57$, $\beta=0.528$) and professional evaluation and development ($t=2.08$, $\beta=0.233$) have a significant explanations.

Another dimension of the organizational citizenship behavior, is the conscientiousness of the teachers, and the results of regression analysis for this dimension shows that ($R^2=0.133$) percent of the variance of teachers' conscientiousness is significantly explained by the dimensions of the distributed leadership ($F[5,354]=11.02$, $P,0.05$). In this analysis, only 3 dimensions including school culture ($t=2.41$, $\beta=0.274$), leadership experiences ($t=2.60$, $\beta=0.326$) and the professional evaluation and development ($t=2.04$, $\beta=0.250$) had a significant explanation.

The analysis of the dimension of conscientiousness also revealed that the dimensions of the distributed leadership has significantly explained ($R^2=0.108$) of its variance ($F[5,354]=8.57$, $P,0.05$). Moreover, among the predictor dimensions, only the school culture ($t=2.07$, $\beta=0.207$), and mission, perspective and objectives ($t=2.06$, $\beta=0.103$) have been able to predict the dimension of conscientiousness.

Although the dimensions of the distributed leadership (together) have significantly explained ($F[5,354]=8.69$, $P<0.05$) the dimension of courtesy ($R^2=0.102$), the special contribution of none of them is significant ($P>0.05$).

The analysis of the regression coefficients for the last dimension, i.e. civic virtue, shows that ($R^2=0.158$) of the variance of this dimension is significantly explained ($F[5,354]=13.53$, $P<0.05$) by the distributed leadership. Moreover, among the dimensions of the distributed leadership, only the share of the leadership experience ($\beta=0.318$) is statistically significant ($t=2.52$).

Therefore, in response to the second question of this research the result shows that the dimensions of the distributed leadership significantly explain the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers. In comparison with the explained contribution, it is shown that the dimension of altruism has received the highest explanation ($R^2=0.263$) and the dimension of courtesy receives the lowest one ($R^2=0.102$).

Discussion & Conclusion:

Considering the results obtained here, it is concluded that the dimension of school culture in the schools under investigation has a higher coverage, compared with other dimensions of the distributed leadership. This result indicates that the distribution of leadership in the schools under study has been mostly successful in the domain of culture. Therefore, it can be said that the most essential factor required for the distribution of leadership at the elementary school, is the culture governing the school. As it is explained in the section on the distributed leadership indices, school culture refers to the atmosphere governing the school that supports the leadership distribution. It also refers to the support level of school principal for such a culture. Considering the obtained results, it can be said that the principal has been successful in that and he/she has been able to encourage the teachers to participate in this dimension of distributed leadership, despite the bureaucratic structure of schools. Also, the dimension of mission, perspective and objectives has received the lowest mean. This finding has its own potential justifications. This dimension of distributed leadership refers to the level of interference of the teachers in specifying the objectives and perspective of the school which has received the lowest value in this study among the dimensions of the distributed leadership. With regard to the concentrated structure of the schools, and specification of the objectives and perspectives of the schools, such a result is not unexpected in the higher levels. The two findings above have been in disagreement with some non-native findings. For example, Smith (2007) has carried out a research in the schools of the cities of Georgia under the title of "the involvement of teachers in the four dimensions of the distributed leadership". He concluded that according to the teachers, the dimension of missions, perspective and objectives had the highest coverage and the dimension of the leadership experiences had the lowest coverage in the schools under study. He stated that in these schools, the principal paid a great attention to the level of involvement and participation of teachers in school affairs and the specifications of the objectives and perspectives of the school, as well as the level of involvement and participation of the parents in specifying the mission and perspective of the schools. This issue results in such a conclusion. He believes that this result has been obtained from the non-bureaucratic and school-centered structure of schools under study.

Moreover, another finding of this study reveals that for the principals, the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers has the highest mean in the dimension of courtesy and the lowest mean in the dimension of altruism. In a relatively similar research by Mascall *et al* (2008) under the title of "the relationship between the distributed leadership and academic optimism of teachers", the organizational citizenship behavior was considered as one of the dimensions of the academic optimism and they concluded that the distributed

leadership has a positive significant effect on the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers. And the dimension of the civic virtue has received the highest mean and the dimension of courtesy has received the lowest mean that is in disagreement with this study. Courtesy is one of the dimensions of the organizational citizenship behavior that refers to the interpersonal supports of the teachers for each other in order to achieve the objectives of the school much better and it is placed in a higher position, compared with other dimensions in this study. Considering the fact that teachers' involvement in the dimension of leadership experience is in a higher and more desirable level compared with other dimensions, it can be said that the teachers have been more active in helping each other for playing the leadership roles in a more efficient way, and accordingly this dimension has had a better condition.

In response to the first research question, the obtained result showed that there is positive significant relationship between the dimensions of the distributed leadership and the dimensions of the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers. There are many researches that have verified the relationship between the organizational citizenship behavior and several modes of leadership. For example, Bamble *et al* (2011) have concluded in their research that there is a positive significant relationship between the organizational citizenship behavior and most leadership modes (such as transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, etc). Mascall *et al* (2008) also concluded in their study that all dimensions of the distributed leadership have a positive significant relationship with the organizational citizenship behavior and this result is in agreement with this study. Therefore, it can be said that the leadership distribution in the schools will result in the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers.

However, the results of response to the second research question shows that all 5 dimensions of distributed leadership have a significant explanation for all 5 dimensions of the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers. This finding can be known as possible, considering the significant relationship obtained in the response to the first question. It was also shown that the dimension of altruism has the highest explanation and the dimension of courtesy has the lowest one. However, the significant issue for the findings of this question is the different role of each one of the distributed leadership dimensions in explaining each one of the dimensions of the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers. In the explanation of the dimension of courtesy the contribution of none of the dimensions was estimated to be significant. However, in the explanation of the altruism and contentiousness of the teachers only the contribution of three dimensions (school culture, leadership experiences and professional evaluation and development); in the explanation of the sportsmanship of teacher only the contribution of two dimensions (school culture, and mission, perspective and objectives); and in the explanation of the civic virtue only the contribution of the dimension of the leadership experiences have been significant. This finding reveals a fundamental and essential role for the school culture and the leadership experiences, as two basic dimensions of the distributed leadership. It might be said that these two dimensions have to be focused mostly for distributing the leadership in the schools and improving the organizational citizenship behavior. As the involvement of the teachers in the leadership experiences increases and the supportive and encouraging culture for the distribution of leadership in schools improves, it can be expected to observe a remarkable improvement in the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers, and most especially the dimension of altruism has the highest effectiveness among these dimensions.

Considering the sensitivity of the elementary school program and the significance of improving the culture of accountability and leadership among the teachers and the students, the distributed leadership can be regarded as the promising perspective of a great cultural step forward. Considering the concentrated structure of the schools in Iran and paying insufficient attention to the decision making and accountability among the teachers and students, this study has provided us with remarkable results in this regard. Regarding the bureaucratic structure of the schools, it can be observed that the management and leadership duties have considerably been distributed. And both the principals and the teachers enjoy the required incentive and willingness to adopt this new leadership method.

The structural concentration has always been an important obstacle for the identification of talents and advantages of the schools and the achievement of their extreme potential capabilities and potentials. Since decentralization and the change in the current education system needs the required background and facilities as well as a great time to be spent, it can be the best way to launch the decentralization from the schools themselves. According to Spillane *et al* (2001) the distributed leadership changes the passive mode of the schools into a dynamic one and makes the schools approach the position they deserve in the community. Therefore, the educationists are recommended to set the research and executive investments on this domain among their first priorities.

As Spillane *et al* (2001) stated that if the teachers are unaware of the distributed leadership method, the educational courses and workshops can be held to instruct them on this method. So, the school principals can hold educational courses and professional development courses to provide the teachers with the necessary knowledge on this method of leadership and its advantages.

In line with the statements of Harris and Muijs (2005) the principals are suggested to try to implement the leadership distribution when they have realized the (cognitive, social, cultural and scientific) capabilities of the

teachers. Considering the fact that the results of this research reflect the considerable effectiveness of the distributed leadership for the organizational citizenship behaviors of the teachers and the dimension of the school culture and the leadership experiences are estimated as the significant dimensions in improving the organizational citizenship behavior of the teachers, the teachers are recommended to pay a higher attention to these dimensions in order to distribute the leadership in the schools.

Considering the fact that this research is limited to the elementary schools, it cannot be generalized to other schools. Then, the researchers are suggested to carry out further researches on other school levels (for males and females). Moreover, more reliable and desirable results can be obtained by the compilation of local questionnaires.

REFERENCES

Bambale, A.J., F. Shamsudin, C.H. Subramaniam, 2011. Stimulating Organizational Citizenship Behavior(OCB) Research For Theory Development: Exploration Of Leadership Paradigms, International. *Journal Of Academic Research In Business And Social Sciences*, pp: 1.

Bennett, N., C. Wise, P. Woods, & J.A. Harvey, 2003. *Distributed Leadership*. National College for School Leadership.

Blase, J., and J. Blasé, 2001. The micropolitics of instructional supervision: A call for research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38: 6-44.

Bogler, R. & A. Somech, 2005. Organizational citizenship behavior in school How does it relate to participation in decision making? *Journal of Educational Administration*. 43(5): 420-438.

Davis, D.R., T. McKlin, D. Page, & J. Brown, 2005. Validating a performance-based internship in Educational Leadership preparations: The Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement's 8 Roles of Effective School Leadership. Draft- Paper presented at the Annual Conference of that National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Washington D.C. pp: 1-23.

Elmore, Richard F., 2000. Building a new structure for school leadership. Washington, D.C. The Albert Shanker Institute

Flessa, J., 2009. Educational micropolitics and *distributed leadership*. *Peabody Journal of Education*. 84(3): 331-349.

Groon, P., 2002. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4): 423-451.

Harris, A., & A. Townsend, 2007. Developing leaders for tomorrow: releasing system potential. *School Leadership and Management*, pp: 169-179.

Harris, A., & D. Muijs, 2005. Improving schools through teacher leadership. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.

Harris, A., 2009. Distributed leadership. Institute of Education University of London. *Library of Congress*.7

Hartley, D., 2009. Education policy, distributed leadership and socio-cultural theory. *Educational Review, British Journal of Educational Studies*. 61: 139-150.

Humphreys, E., 2010. Distributed leadership and its impact on teaching and learning. *Education doctorate*. Nui maynooth. faculty of social sciences

Krishnan, v., p. Arora, 2008. Determinants of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *Asia-Pacific Business Review*, 5(1): 34-43.

Lambropoulos, N., A. Gourdin, & A. Bakharia, 2011. Distributed Leadership Collaboration Factors to Support Idea Generation in Computer Supported Collaborative eLearning.

Lambropoulos, N., M. Vivitsou, 2011. Distributed Leadership For Interconnected Worlds, *An Interdisciplinary Journal on Humans in ICT Environments*. 7(1): 4-8.

Leithwood, K., B. Mascall & T. Strauss, 2008. *Distributed Leadership According to the Evidence*. New York: Routledge.

Leithwood, K., B. Mascall, T. Strauss, 2009. *Distributed Leadership According to the Evidence*. London: Routledge.

MacBeath, J., 2005. Leadership as distributed: a matter of practice. *School Leadership and Management*, 25(4): 349-366.

Oduro, G.K.T., 2004. 'Distributed leadership' in schools: what English headteachers say about the 'pull' and 'push' factors, University of Cambridge

Podsakoff, P.M., S.B. Mackenzie, J.B. Paine, & D.G. Bachrach, 1990. "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and- Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research", *Journal of Management*., 26: 513-563.

Rivers, S.H.D., 2010. Leadership as a distributed phenomenon: a study of shared roles and grade student achievement. ProQuest Publisher. dissertation publishing. UMI Number: pp: 3412486.

Smith, L., 2007. A study of teacher engagement in four dimensions of distributed leadership in one school district in Georgia. Electronic Version Approved

Spillane, J.P., R. Halverson, & J.B. Diamond, 2001. Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3): 23-28.

Storey, A., 2004. The problem of distributed leadership in schools. *School leadership and management*, 24(3): 249-265.

Wallach, A., M. Lambert, M. Copland, L. Lowry, 2005. *Distributing Leadership: Moving from High School Hierarchy to Shared Responsibility*

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