According even though their principals listen to them,

Accordingto Stosich (2016, p. 48), most schools set up an instructional cabinetconsisting of a few teachers who are sent for expert training and are requiredto bring back to the institution that expertise. However, these cabinets onlylast a few years as they violate the norms of egalitarianism. Teachers who werenot involved in setting up the cabinet argued that there existed no clearmechanism to be followed by the principal in selecting specific teachingmembers to constitute it.

They argued that there could be cases ofnon-transparency in the selection criteria and deliberate support given by theprincipal to the selected members. Hargreaves and Fink (2008) conducted aresearch on Finland's educational system and determined the essence ofdistributed leadership style. Teachers and principals in Finland work on aculture of responsibility, cooperation, and trust such that when a principalsickens, the community of teachers embraces the school leadership (Hargreavesand Fink 2008, p. 235). The education system in Finland depicts that thecommunity of teachers together with the school principal are both responsibleto the efficacy of the school operations. Self-efficiency and Teacher Leadership   The aspect of self-efficiency islinked to the agency concept which states that human capacity can either beenhanced or weakened by a person's experience (Bangs and Frost 2015, p. 2). Environments that support distributed leadership can support self-efficiencybeliefs.

Distributed leadership is collaborative and interactive, and throughit, organizations are upheld, problems are solved, and positive practices aredeveloped. Collaborative professional cultures help to unravel the

potential ofteachers and raise the school capacity to meet student requirements and fosterachievement. In studying the leadership tasks, school leaders are at the coreof defining, presenting, and executing micro tasks while considering their interactionwith others (Spillane et al. 2001, p. 24). New Public Management   Some scholars still support thehierarchical governance approach arguing that having a central command and ahierarchical approach to governance heightens a school's expectation.

However, a more stable and sustainable approach to governance, the New PublicManagement, has emerged to dominate the force as presented in many countries. According to Mulford (2003, p. 8), the new public management approach advocatesfor decentralization of roles, accountability, and community involvement.   Additionally, some teachers raiseconcerns that even though their principals listen to them, they would wish thegovernment and national policymakers also to ask about their views.

They feelthat their ideas do not matter to the individuals in the top positions. Attimes, the teachers lack faith and capacity to judge agendas as they perceive themas political professionally. They argue that without government and policymakers'involvement, teachers may be in a position to improve the current system ofeducation (Bangs and Frost 2012, p. 24).   Decentralization acknowledges thatdynamism in schools has to be initiated from within the school. One way toachieve such decentralization in schools is by localizing delivery butcentralizing standards of operation.

Some countries embrace the idea of whospecifies a service and those that deliver the service.

In addition, a countrysuch as Korea has shifted their educational focus from a provider-orientedsystem to a consumer-oriented education system. The case is similar to Austriawhere the government seeks to shift from an administrative to a service-orientedmanagement (Mulford 2003, p. 9). Such changes in the education system alter theprincipal's current role of administrative and technical duties to a managerand developer of financial, physical, and human resources (OECD 2001, p.

20-24).   Traditionally, school success is gaugedon student academic performance. Schools need to be accountable for theirundertakings. There is a need to develop assessment tools that are in line withthe school goals, the creation of policy based on evidence, and creation of newattitudes towards failure. Failure is also part of learning. The strategies, practices, and instructional behaviors that teachers use are vital towardstudent's cognitive development and are partly determined by the teacher'sself-efficacy (Zee and Koomen 2016, p. 990).

DiscussionThe purpose of this research was to explorehow the distributed form of leadership influences the self-efficacy of ateacher. The study has proven that the core factors that impede teacherself-efficacy lie in the unprofessional conduct of their principals as well asthe ineffectiveness portrayed by the school heads. Hargreaves and Fink (2008, p. 230) argue that just like improvement of a person's body requires as well as

ecosystemimprovement, organization improvement does not rely on singular strategies buton the interaction of holistic and complex policies and systems. According to Hargreavesand Fink (2008, p. 230), there are three interrelated components that propel anorganization forward.

The first component is living systems which include thepeople working in an organization and who foster imagination, creativity, andinnovation. Secondly, an organization is a community and is divided into groupsof worship, directors, and departments among others. In a school setup, teachersare a community of practice. Tutors are mandated with planning the learningprograms as well as support the progress of students in their educational needs. The third important concept is the network of people and systems where theyhave to operate in partnership with the government and parents to create strongsystems that foster dynamism in education through substantive policy enactment(Hargreaves and Fink 2008, p. 230).

An institution that uses autocraticleadership model, in which one person becomes the sole decision maker, is boundto trample. And when the organization succeeds under the authoritarianleadership, the exit of the institution head causes institution failure. Positivevalues positively impact the administration while negative values negativelyaffect the performance of the institution.

Institutional heads which employ anautocratic leadership model are a hindrance to the success of the school andare stressing to their employees. However, a research conducted by Hall (2013) todetermine the contradiction

of reforming the leadership styles in England foundthat institutions are unwilling to embrace distributed leadership as they lackthe necessary understanding on what the leadership style is about (Hall 2013, p. 472). He argues that the charge towards distributed leadership isunaccompanied by the changing practices witnessed among teachers and theleaders in schools. He further argues that there is a lack of policies withrequired frameworks and suggestions for moving from current style of leadershipto the needed style of distributed leadership (Hall 2013, p. 473). The modern society requires employees'involvement in decision making to boost their morale and increase theircommitment.

According to Al-Ani and Al-Harthi (2015, p. 200), the values withina school are a conglomerate of personal, communal, global, and societalpersuasion. These values are too diverse that they at times conflict with oneanother.

Additionally, some of the set policies may require the use of specificvalues which may be conflicting with a person's set of values. When schooladministrators recognize the ideological perspectives of the education andvalue system, they are then able to know what their responsibilities, powers, duties, and obligations are. Haydon elaborates values to consist ofboth the guidelines and targets followed by the policymakers (Al-Ani andAl-Harthi 2015, p. 200).

When better policies are constituted, the running of aschool becomes easier. Instituting better policies includes creating multipleschool departments and assigning each department a manager. In addition, theunits are provided

with duties that they have to achieve. The department headbecomes the accountable personnel. The presence of departmental heads in schoolimplies that teachers have a central coordination point through which they areable to air their concerns and also resolve disputes fast. In addition, assigning teachers duties creates a form of responsibility for the teachers. Teaching the staff members as well as the students the purpose of havingrespect for one another and being committed to their duties is essentialtowards the wholesome success of an institution.

Whenever school administrators apply adistributed leadership model multiple benefits are experienced. First, theapproach fosters teamwork and collaboration. Collaborations ensure quickproblem-solving. Further, teachers work together towards achieving theinstitution's mission and vision. Collaboration results in increased teacherparticipation and engagement. Secondly, cooperation ensures control andincrease in student and staff performance. When departmental heads meet withthe school administrators, they are able to show rate teacher performances.

Publicly recognizing a teacher's performance results increases the morale andself-efficiency of the teacher. The teacher feels encouraged and recognized. Therefore, he or she works extra hard to get more recognition and rewards. The third merit lies in the institutionprogress. When autocratic leadership is employed, the success of an institutionends at the point the tenure of the school principal ends. Since the schoolhead was the sole decision maker and enforcer, he or she lives behind no personwith the necessary skills to succeed him or her.

Indeed, the teachers cannotwork without being controlled as they are used to following set instructions.