The Principal as a Distributed Leader:
Supporting Change and Improving South African Schools

R. J. (Nico) Botha[1] and P. K. (Paul) Triegaardt[2]

[1]Department of Education Leadership and Management, College of Education,
University of South Africa, P.O Box 392, Pretoria, 0003, South Africa
[2]P.O Box 57476, Madinat Zayed Region, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
E-mail: [1]<botharj@unisa.ac.za>, [2]<p_triegaardt@hotmail.co.uk>

ABSTRACT Prospects for the development and improvement of schools through exceptional principal leadership alone have proven to be both impractical and insecure. The idea of leadership distributed across a group of stakeholders has proven to be a useful framework for understanding the realities of schools and how schools might be improved. In this paper, based on a qualitative study, five South African school principals express their experiences on distributed leadership and give insights on how the distribution of leadership can support change and improve schools. The principals participating in this paper sought to focus their daily routines on the distribution of leadership tasks to ensure an improvement in school effectiveness and, subsequently, in academic outcomes. The paper concludes with recommendations on how so-called 'stuck' schools can be improved via effective distributed leadership into 'moving' schools.

INTRODUCTION

From the research literature (cf. Abudazi 2007; Bennett et al. 2013; MacBeath 2014; Botha 2015; Hatcher 2015; Jones et al. 2015) it becomes clear that there are mainly three elements which relate to the professional work of any school principal, namely, taking action to develop schools, to ensure that leaders know their leadership function, and to ensure that the leadership functions are fulfilled effectively within the school. Leadership in the school context therefore remains one of the key concepts that makes schools effective (Department of Education 2011; Marishane and Botha 2011; Gronn 2012; Botha 2013; Muijs and Harris 2013; Sinatra et al. 2013: Hatcher 2015).

According to the literature on school leadership (cf. Marishane and Botha 2011; Leithwood and Reihl 2013; Hatcher 2015), it is also evident that principals can no longer be expected to lead and manage schools on their own. One of the strategies, which school leaders can use, is to distribute leadership to ensure improvement in academic outcomes. *"Distribution of leadership means that it is not only the leadership of principals that counts, but also the leadership roles performed by deputy principals, substantives, support staff, members of the school councils, governing bodies and learners"* (Gronn 2012: 655). The culture of the democratic order displayed in South Africa requires school principals to exercise leadership that fully promotes the participation of all stakeholders (Swanepoel and Booyse 2006; Triegaardt 2013; Botha 2015).

In South Africa, there are typically two types of schools with regards to school effectiveness, namely, schools that are 'stuck' (not improving, non-effective and dysfunctional) and schools that are 'moving' (improving, effective and functional). The latter are characterized by, *inter alia* effective leadership and evidence that teachers work more collaboratively and in teams. This includes a competent principal who helps teachers achieve goals, resulting in more effective schools (Botha 2013, 2015; Hatcher 2015). These schools, called former Model C schools, are former so-called 'white' schools under the former apartheid system that nowadays receive their funding through school funds received from parents with little or no support from the government. As these schools are effective and functional they are being referred to as 'moving schools' (Triegaardt 2013).

Stuck schools, on the other hand, are schools with lower levels of academic achievement where teachers work on their own (seldom asking for help) and where there is little to no evidence of leadership present (Triegaardt 2013; Botha 2015; Jones et al. 2015). In addition, these schools do not have the resources (financial or otherwise) to be more effective in terms of, *inter alia*, academic results. As these types of schools are not effective and dysfunctional, they are referred to as 'stuck schools' (Triegaardt 2013).

Research Question of the Study

Distributed leadership is an emerging theory of leadership with a narrower focus on individual capabilities, skills, and talents. Instead, this type of leadership focuses on a joint responsibility for leadership activities (Mayrowetz 2008; Gronn 2012; Hatcher 2015). According to Triegaardt (2013), the distribution of leadership can be used as a strategy to empower moving schools. The purpose of distributed leadership is to connect teachers with the goals and values of the school and "freeing" the principal of the many responsibilities of administration (Botha 2015; Jones et al. 2015).

So-called 'moving' schools do not always necessarily have all the equipment and resources, but with a teaching force that works together to solve problems, many obstacles can be overcome. Moving schools have principals who lead, as well as teachers who also lead in terms of their classrooms or departments. There is a collaborative approach to leading evident in all parts of the school.

This leads to the main research question of the study: What is the role of principals as distributing leaders in supporting change and improvement in so-called moving schools?

Theoretical Foundations of the Paper

The Concept of Distributed Leadership

Conceptualizing leadership is one of the most challenging tasks educational researchers, educational practitioners, and even educational leaders are faced with. It is such a complex concept that its definition as well as its description depend on how, when and by whom it is viewed and on one's ability to defend a particular viewpoint. Leadership also depends on the point of view and the conditions under which the definition or description is made (Pushpanadham 2006; Marishane and Botha 2011; Botha 2013; Jones et al. 2015).

Leadership can generally be defined as the *"process of directing the behavior of others towards the accomplishment of goals"* (Marishane and Botha 2011: 7). It involves elements such as influencing and motivating people (either as individuals or as groups), managing conflict, communicating with subordinates, and most importantly, taking the right decisions at

the right time. Muijs and Harris (2013) are of the opinion that leadership has been premised on a singular view of leadership and on individual trust. Educational leadership involves all these issues in an educational or school setting (Chaudhary 2010; Marishane and Botha 2011; Gronn 2012; Leithwood and Reihl 2013).

The concept "distributive leadership" in turn, attracts a range of meanings and is associated with a variety of practices. Mayrowetz (2008: 425) stated that different uses of this term have emerged and refers to distributive leadership as *"an emerging theory of leadership with a narrower focus on individual capabilities, skills, and talents"* that focuses on a joint responsibility for leadership activities. According to MacBeath (2014), distributive leadership means the same as dispersed, shared, collaborative and democratic leadership. Bennett et al. (2013), in turn, state that *"distributive leadership is an emergent property of a network of interacting individuals with an openness of boundaries and expertise"*, while House and Aditja (2007: 457) say that *"distributive leadership is the process of leadership which involves collaborative relationships that lead to collective action grounded in the shared values of people who work together to effect positive change"*. Leithwood and Reihl (2013: 3) conclude by saying that distributive leadership ensures that *"teachers work together towards whole school improvement and school goals"*.

With this in mind, Gronn (2012: 655) suggests *"that in the distribution of leadership it is not only the leadership of principals that counts, but also the leadership roles performed by deputy principals, substantives, support staff, members of school councils, governing bodies and learners."* MacBeath (2014: 355) concludes by viewing distributive leadership *"as an ability to relinquish one's role as ultimate decision-maker, trusting others to make the right decisions and a belief in the potential and authority of others, listening with the intent to understand that allows trust for leadership to be shared."*

According to these views and definitions, the purpose of distributive leadership is to bring teachers into contact with the goals and values of the school and to "free" the principal of his/her many responsibilities. In this distributive and democratic model, all teachers collectively assume responsibility for the well-being of the

school. Hatcher (2015) explains that democracy adds to the emergent character of distributive leadership and the notion that everyone, by virtue of his or her human status, should play a part in the process. The recognition of the capabilities of other members of the school to participate implies that the leader trusts his or her followers and will consequently be comfortable to share power, responsibilities and accountability (Triegaardt 2013; Botha 2013; Jones et al. 2015).

Ritchie and Woods (2007) explain that the democratic and distributive leadership model is similar in some ways, which involve distributing responsibility at all administrative levels, working through teams and engendering collective responsibility. In the distributive leadership model, the principal shares authority and power, teachers take leading roles, assume responsibility and act independently as individuals or groups. In the process, *"principals create leadership positions that allow capable and willing teachers to work in a more focused leadership capacity"* (Bennett et al. 2013: 3).

Distributed Leadership in the School Context

The presence of a cooperative leadership team and the amount of leadership support plays a significantly positive key role in predicting the teachers' commitment to school. In addition, participative decision-making and distribution of the supportive leadership function have a significant positive impact on the teachers' commitment to the development of the school (Hulpia et al. 2010; Gronn 2012; Hatcher 2015). Distributed leadership develops within a school climate of collaboration, where teachers are able to choose meaningful leadership roles connected to teaching and learning. The school principal plays a key role in supporting new leaders by communicating a common purpose, building on a school climate of collaboration, while modeling leadership tools and routines (Chamberland 2009; Botha 2015).

Principals and teachers alike are challenged with the higher demands and requirements in preparing the future generations for the 21st century. Professional development of teachers is a key focus in a school's transformation efforts. In an earlier paper by Louis et al. (2010), it was indicated that school transformation in today's educational system is dependent, in part, by how well teachers work together with their principal and colleagues. Researchers have discussed the important role principals play in supporting and encouraging the teachers' professional development needs. Results from this paper indicate that trust in leadership is not only appreciated, but is also the key to the school-wide implementation of professional development initiatives. Indeed, school leaders can have a significant influence on the teachers' classroom practices through their efforts to motivate teachers and create workplace settings compatible with instructional practices known to be effective (MacBeath 2014).

Distributed Leadership and Democratic Leadership

Democracy adds to the emergent character of distributed leadership and the notion that everyone, by virtue of his or her human status, should play a part in democracy (Jones et al. 2015). The recognition of the capabilities of other members of the school to participate implies that the leader trusts his or her followers and will consequently be comfortable to share power with the rest of them (Hatcher 2015). The purpose of distributed leadership is to connect teachers with the goals and values of the school and "freeing" the principal of the many responsibilities of administration. In the distributed and democratic model, all teachers collectively assume responsibility for the well-being of the school. The democratic leadership model is similar in some ways to the distributed leadership model, which involves distributing responsibility at all administrative levels, working through teams, and engendering collective responsibility (Ritchie and Woods 2007; Triegaardt 2013; Hatcher 2015).

The democratic and distributed leadership model has many benefits for a school. These models advance the efficient implementation of decisions, maximize the range of knowledge and experience that go into school administration, make all key administrative decisions visible to all, and hold everyone accountable for the effective management of the school, promote harmonious administration, cultivate the civic goals of schooling, and may likely increase teacher retention. These benefits advance the quality of school life and thereby foster learner development and performance (Sinatra et al. 2013; Triegaardt 2013; Botha 2015).

Distributed Leadership and Teacher Leadership

The recognition of teacher leadership comes from new understandings of school development and leadership that suggest active involvement of individuals at all levels and within all domains of school is necessary if change is to take hold (York-Barr and Duke 2014).

School improvement depends on the active involvement of teacher leaders at the classroom level and beyond. In every school, teacher leaders can find numerous opportunities to extend their influence beyond their own classrooms to the department or teaching team across the school and beyond the school (Danielson 2007). In Russia the improvement of schools is also important. Education was listed as one of the four priorities for national development. The Russian government initiated educational reforms to promote economic growth. Educational reforms in Russia included the establishing of a national standard curriculum, launching the unified state examination, improving the quality of examination, reforming vocational education and diversifying educational funding (Lu and Ma 2008; Chamberland 2009).

Distributed leadership involves more teachers in leadership roles in the school system to generate innovations with a strong team approach to run a school effectively. The distribution of leadership can have an important effect on enhancing teacher engagement and involvement in decision-making. When teachers are involved in decision-making, ideas will be shared among leaders (Gronn 2012; MacBeath 2014; Botha 2015).

Distributed Leadership and Collaborative Leadership

Collaborators need to entertain the view that something new or unique might arise from a mutual inquiry that could reconstruct the participants' view of reality (Engestrom et al. 2008). No matter what form the behavioral change may take through participative management or total quality management, collaborative leadership requires true participation in leadership and decision-making at all levels and in multiple decision processes (Glew et al. 2005). The distribution would allow leaders at all levels to work collaboratively to achieve the maximum goal in education. The maximum goal is that all learners will benefit academically through the leadership in schools (Hatcher 2015; Jones et al. 2015).

Distributed Leadership and Shared Leadership

Distributed leadership is a form of parallel leadership where teacher leaders work with principals in distinctive, yet complementary ways towards goals they all share (Lewis and Andrews 2014). Distributed leadership is a form of shared leadership that is distributed to key stakeholders throughout the school. Jameson (2007: 10) says in this regard: *"Shared leadership implies more than one person exercising some degree of joint leadership and the term does not necessarily include real sharing of power, authority and responsibility at different hierarchical levels. When shared leadership is more advanced or developed, it may resemble collaborative leadership."*

The distributed management model fits well with a school structure that is more dynamic, and one that utilizes teams and taskforces with a specific focus that cuts across other hierarchical strata. The strength of this model is that senior leadership teams can respond very quickly to changing circumstances. The distributed leadership model is flexible because the model generates a larger pool of staff that is experienced and confident in managing change (Triegaardt 2013; Hatcher 2015).

The distributed leadership model *"goes some way further than shared leadership along the continuum towards fuller group engagement in leadership in specifying distribution of tasks and responsibilities, though not necessarily knowledge, power and authority and it does not imply people necessarily work together to share the knowledge, power and authority of executive leadership"* (Jameson 2007: 11).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The epistemological knowledge view (how knowledge is acquired) and ontological reality view (how reality is perceived) are crucial positions in any research inquiry. In this paper, these two knowledge views are premised on the fact that knowledge is not produced through an objective researcher who collects facts about the social world and builds up an explanation in a chain of causality (positivism), but that reality is socially constructed rather than objectively de-

termined (Terre Blanche and Durrheim 2009). This view is consistent with the traditions of qualitative and case-study research (Noor 2008).

The research approach used in this paper was qualitative in nature. While the population of the paper was from primary schools in a specific district in the KwaZulu-Natal province of South Africa, the sample of the paper comprised five individual case studies conducted in five selected primary schools in this district. The sample of five schools consists of five highly effective and moving schools in terms of academic achievement. The sampling of schools was done in a purposeful manner, based on the assumption that the researcher wants to discover, understand and gain insight on the distributed leadership approach of the school principals in highly effective schools and therefore he must select a sample from which the most can be gained. To begin purposive sampling, the selection criteria for choosing the people or sites to be studied must be determined (Le Compte and Preissle 2003).

In this process, all five primary schools mentioned above were evaluated against the National Department of Education's whole-school evaluation criteria (Department of Education 2011). All five schools received guidelines, which have to be used when a school is being evaluated according to the evaluation criteria, in order to ensure that evaluations are carried out consistently and supervisors are using the same criteria when reaching conclusions. The focus areas during the evaluations are: basic functionality of the school, leadership, management and communication, governance and relationships, quality of teaching and educator development, curriculum provision and resources, learner achievement, school safety, security and discipline, school infrastructure, and parents and community. The evaluation guidance forms the theoretical basis to evaluate whether schools can be classified as functional (moved schools) or dysfunctional (stuck schools).

Data from the interviews was transcribed, analyzed and discussed. The researchers attempted to make sense of all the data collected qualitatively, that is, from unstructured interviews and documentary analysis. The developmental data analysis was carried out in line with eight steps as provided by Tesch (in Creswell 2003):

- *Step 1:* That the coder gets a sense of the whole by reading through all the transcrip-tions carefully, and jotting down some ideas as they come to mind.
- *Step 2:* Select one document, one interview, perhaps the most interesting, the shortest, and the one on top of the pile, and then go through it, asking oneself, "What is this about?" Do not think about the "substance" of the information, but rather its underlying meaning. Write thoughts in the margin.
- *Step 3:* When this task has been completed for several informants, make a list of all topics. Cluster together similar topics into columns that might be arranged as major topics, unique topics and leftovers.
- *Step 4:* Take this list and go back to the data. Abbreviate the topics as codes and write the codes next to the appropriate segments of the texts. Try out this preliminary organizing scheme to see whether new categories and codes emerge.
- *Step 5:* Find the most descriptive wording for the topics and turn them into categories. Look at ways of reducing the total list of categories by grouping topics that relate to each other. Perhaps draw lines between lines to show interrelationships.
- *Step 6:* Make a final decision on the abbreviation for each category and alphabetize these codes.
- *Step 7:* Assemble the data material belonging to each category in one place and perform a preliminary analysis.
- *Step 8:* If necessary, recode existing data.

Triangulation was done by analyzing how each set of data answered the research question. The subsequent analysis considered each set of data in relation to the question. To ascertain the trustworthiness of the paper the following were carried out: dependability in this paper was maintained by ensuring that all the data were collected systematically and that all the contributions and experiences of the participants were represented by recording and transcribing them for analysis. Furthermore, to minimize ambiguity it was ascertained in this paper that the questions were clear and meant the same to all respondents. Moreover, to maintain credibility, the researchers ensured that appropriate methods and techniques had been employed in such a way that other researchers have a step-by-step guide to how conclusions were arrived at. Similarly, the researchers determined credibility by presenting accurate descriptions or interpreta-

tions of human experiences that people who share that experience or perception would immediately recognize the descriptions (Krefting 2011).

Trustworthiness in this study was maintained by ensuring that all the data was collected systematically and that all the contributions and experiences of the participants were represented by recording and transcribing them for analysis. The reliability of the instruments in this paper was ascertained by ensuring that the questions were clear and meant the same to all respondents. The validity of the paper was maintained by ensuring that appropriate methods and techniques had been employed in such a way that other researchers would have a step-by-step guide to how the researchers had arrived at their conclusions. To assess trustworthiness in this research, the researchers determined credibility by representing the experiences of the participants as accurately as possible. This was achieved through intense observation and member checking.

OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The empirical research findings are a culmination of the data-triangulation process, whereby data from semi-structured interviews are triangulated with data from focus group interviews and documentary analysis. The use of literature supports the outcomes of the empirical study. In addition, the researchers reviewed the transcripts of the interviews from the participants to determine the similarities and differences between the data in order to determine patterns in the data. A constant comparative analysis of schools against their learner attainment was therefore made, because this is one of the main indicators of the effectiveness of a school.

The respondents' responses to questions during the interview phase and the researchers' conclusions about each of the themes that have emerged from the findings, will now be briefly discussed.

Distributed Leadership is about Teacher Leadership

Education is the key determinant for economic growth by accumulating human capital as advocates for the endogenous growth model have emphasized (Mankiw et al. 2012), while other fac-

tors such as infra-structure, micro-economic stability and institutional capacity also effected economic development in the so-called 'BRICS' countries.

The culture of such a democratic order also begins to emerge in other BRICS countries and has an influence on their education systems. BRICS is an acronym for the fast growing developing economies of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. The term was first prominently used in the Sachs' report (in Wilson and Purushothaman 2013), which speculated that by the year 2050, these five economies could be wealthier than most of the current major economic power houses such as Germany and France (Mankiw et al. 2012).

In moving schools, leaders need to ensure effective leadership and strategies to ensure continuous improvement of their schools (Triegaardt 2013). This could lead to more educated citizens who could contribute to the economic development within South Africa. Leaders need to distribute leadership tasks to ensure that all teachers have a role to play in the development of the school. Distributed leadership is an emergent property of a group or network of individuals where group members pool their expertise to develop the school (Gronn 2012). One principal interviewed said in this regard: *"Educational leadership is giving guidance to teachers within the class and outside of class, taking into account the whole-school setup."* In addition, another principal responded, *"It is a mammoth task, but I basically go on the three legs of being a leader, a manager and an administrator. Your leadership is basically your inspiration, your guidance, and your empowering of those that work with you."*

Stuck schools need to change their work ethics for distribution of leadership to be effective. One respondent said that, in moving schools, *"Teachers have got work ethics, they won't strike, they won't stay away for no reason, and they won't have other interests like taxi businesses. Their priority one, two and three is education and they want to do the best for their learners and they do cultural activities after school free of charge."* The same respondent replied further, *"Distribution of powers will not work in stuck schools, for the simple reason that in 'their' culture they only do what is in their job description and if their job description is not to be in charge of a certain thing,*

they will not take the responsibility for it. The biggest problem in their schools is punctuality, the biggest problem there is attendance, and they don't attend school. If they do attend school they don't attend school for the duration of the day, half way through the day they just excuse themselves. The principals there come late for school and leave early. They are the last ones to arrive and the first ones to leave while it should be the other way around."

Distributed Leadership is about Teamwork

Leadership appears rather to be a working relationship among members of a group, in which the leader acquires status through active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative tasks through to completion (Hersey et al. 2011). Distributed leadership can be classified into six different types (Mac-Beath 2014). Some of the types of distribution are formal (with a job description), pragmatic (indicated by necessity), strategic (when an individual's expertise is needed), opportunistic (based on people's preferences), incremental (based on previous performance), and cultural (when it promotes school culture).

One respondent followed a strategy of opportunistic distribution at his moving school by saying: *"I believe that distributive leadership should identify people that will be able to perform certain management tasks. For example, the sports year calendar at our school was always managed by a head of department. This year I have made that a post level 1 educator's responsibility because sports are his passion. So, I am looking for where people show their talents, where their passion lies and then try to develop them as well by giving them management functions in their respective areas."*

It was also clear in this paper that moving schools followed formal distribution as a strategy to ensure effectiveness within schools. Another respondent added, *"Well, distributive leadership is by giving responsibilities from your deputy principal to your HODs, to your senior teachers, and down to your level 1 teachers. We want to see that there is an even load being given right through and we would like to give responsibilities to junior teachers as well so that they can develop in the process as well."*

The paper also proved that moving schools followed a strategy of cultural distribution. Another respondent explained in this regard: *"Everybody is sharing it and everybody putting all of that together eventually to have one strong goal achieved. All schools are part of one big team, a team where education take place for all learners in the country."* Furthermore, he says, *"Education is all about teams and it does not matter where you are in the globe."* Some teams are more developed than others and are stuck because of the lack of resources and support from the government. Stuck schools need to get more involved in the development of their schools and accept the help offered by moving schools. Moving schools are indeed prepared to help stuck schools. One respondent says, *"We have a system of adopting a school. Schools in the rural areas are not on the same level as ours. And by us setting the example and by us showing the way things are done in meetings and in courses and the inputs we have."*

Distributed Leadership is about Democracy and Sharing of Leadership at all Levels

Teacher leadership is important to ensure effective leadership and teamwork must be utilized as a strategy to ensure effective schools. One respondent added that it is always *"a situation of two heads is better than one and if you can have good team work it will always be a very good outcome. But you must always remember that your team is as strong as the weakest player in the team"*. Further, a second respondent added, *"I think for professional support and professional motivation and encouragement it is necessary for educators to close ranks and motivate one another."* Moreover, a third respondent responded, *"We need to speak from the same mouth and work from the same guidance that the Department gives us in the form of syllabus work and that is why we have subject meetings and that is why we have grade meetings so that we can go forward by doing the same thing; by looking at academic aspects from the same background and from the same viewpoint."*

Stuck schools can implement meetings to improve teamwork at their schools. One respondent said, *"For teachers to work and share together is a very good thing, that is why we have regular grade meetings, regular subject meet-*

ings, so that they are all aware of what is expected from them and that they are all at the same level by the end of the week and the same amount of work has been done by the end of the week."

Distributed Leadership is about Interaction between all Leaders

Distributed leadership means the same as dispersed leadership, shared leadership, collaborative leadership and democratic leadership (MacBeath 2014; Jones et al. 2015). Countries across the world could learn something from the experiences in China. The lesson to be learned from China's experience is not that economic growth is independent of high level human capital, but rather that China could have probably achieved higher economic growth with a better educated labor force, and that now that it is expanding higher education, it should actually experience higher growth than in the past (Fleischer 2012). Similarly, in South Africa, one respondent said that he managed his school through *"a leadership style of cooperative management where every stakeholder is given the opportunity to express their point of view and then manage the final decision."*

The role of distributed leadership is to ensure the running of effective schools through interaction between all leaders. To ensure that leadership is effective, interaction between leaders needs to be a link to the distribution process to ensure effective schools. Another respondent added*, "I am not an autocratic leader and I believe in sharing ideas and getting ideas from others and also getting input from the teachers. We are not afraid to go to the level 1 teachers and get their inputs in a matter as well."*

Stuck schools can begin to change their style of management and involve all teachers in the process of decision-making. One respondent said, *"Distribution of management functions, for example, if there are clubs and societies, every educator has to be part of a club or society where they are responsible for the organization and the logistics in the club. Every educator is also expected to be part of a winter and summer sports team, whether being in an administrative or in a coaching point of view, but their involvement there is also required."*

CONCLUSION

The research findings in this paper could form the basis of considerably expanded investigations into the field of distributed leadership enhancing the effectiveness of schools. The outcomes of this paper show that distributive leadership serves as a significant contributor to school improvement. These outcomes are of importance to all educational managers as they will be able to provide schools with guidelines to increase positive perceptions regarding the role of distributed leadership in school improvement.

In conclusion, while some schools have not yet achieved an acceptable level of effectiveness, others are indeed effective and could actually serve as models of improvements for others to emulate. It requires the involvement of all the stakeholders at a school to make a difference, and hence, the sharing of leadership tasks among teachers and the interaction between all leaders (moving and stuck schools) may serve as a starting point for enhancing the distribution of leadership in South Africa as a whole. Finally, the research findings in this paper could form the basis of considerably expanded investigations in the field of distributed leadership enhancing the effectiveness of stuck schools in South Africa.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While some schools have not yet achieved an acceptable level of effectiveness, others are indeed effective and functional, and could actually serve as models for school improvement for others to emulate. It requires the involvement of all the stakeholders at a school to make a difference. Hence, the sharing of leadership tasks among teachers and the interaction between all leaders via the distribution of leadership may serve as a starting point for enhancing school improvement in all South African schools.

REFERENCES

Abudazi H 2007. Absenteeism and beyond: Instructional Timeless and Consequences. Washington DC: World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, No 4376. From <http://go. workingbank.org//YTZOZYABWKO> (Retrieved on 14 January 2015).

Bennett N, Wise C, Woods P, Harvey J 2013. *Distributed Leadership. Report for the National College for School Leadership.* Oxford, England.

Botha, RJ 2013. *The Effective Management of a School: Towards Quality Outcomes*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Botha RJ 2015. The role of distributive leadership in functional South African schools. *Journal of Social Sciences,* 43(3): 207-215.

Chamberland L 2009. *Distributed Leadership: Developing a New Practice.* Doctoral Thesis. Santa Cruz: University of California.

Chaudhary L 2010. Land revenues, schools and literacy: A historical examination of public and private funding of education. *Indian Economics and Historical Review,* 47(2): 179-204.

Creswell JW 2003. *Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches.* 2nd Edition. Sagan: Sage Publishers.

Danielson C 2007. The many faces of leadership. *Educational Leadership,* 65(1):17–24.

Department of Education 2011. *Understand School Leadership and Governance in the South African Context.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Engestrom Y, Miettinen R, Punamaki, RL 2008. *Perspectives on Activity Theory.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fleischer B 2012. *Higher Education in China: A Growth Paradox?* Department of Economics. Ohio: Ohio State University.

Glew DJ, O'Learly-Kelley AM, Friggin RW, Van Fleet DD 2005. Participation in organizations: A preview of the issues and proposed framework for future analysis. *Journal of Management,* 21: 395-421.

Gronn P 2012. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13: 423–451.

Hatcher R 2015. The distribution of leadership and power in schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(2): 253–267.

Hersey P, Blanchard KH, Johnson DE 2011. *Management of School Behaviour: Leading Human Resources.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

House RJ, Aditya RN 2007. The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management* 23: 409–473.

Hulpia H, DeVos G, Van Keer H 2010. The influence of distributed leadership on teachers' school commitment: a multilevel approach. *The Journal of Educational Study*, 103(1): 40–52.

Jameson J 2007. *Investigating Collaborative Leadership for Communities of Practice in Learning and Skills.* Practitioner Study Programme. Lancaster: Lancaster University.

Jones M, Harvey S, Lefoe K, Ryland N 2015. Distributed Leadership. From <http://emedia.rmit.edu.au/distributedleadership/?q=node/10> (Retrieved on 9 June 2015).

Krefting L 2011. Rigour in qualitative study: The assessment of trustworthiness. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy,* 45(3): 214–222.

Le Compte M, Preissle J 2003. *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Study*. London: Academic Press Inc.

Leithwood R, Reihl 2013. *What We Know About Successful School Leadership*. Philadelphia: Temple University.

Lewis M, Andrews D 2014. Building sustainable futures: Emerging understandings of the significant contribution of the professional learning community. *Improving Schools*, 7(2): 129–150.

Loeser JM 2008. *School Leadership.* Richmond, Victoria: Ebsco Publishing.

Louis K, Leithwood K, Wahlstrom K, Anderson S 2010. *Investigating the Links to Improved Learning of Learners*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Lu W, Ma S 2008. Strategies of Russian educational reform in the early 21st century. *World Education Information,* 2: 16-18.

MacBeath J 2014. Leadership as distributed: A matter of practice. *School Leadership and Management*, 25(4): 349–366.

Mankiw NG, Romer D, Weil DN 2012. A contribution to the empires of economic youth. *The Quarterly Journey of Economics,* 107(2): 407-437.

Marishane RN, Botha RJ 2011. S*chool Leadership towards the Changing Context: A Case for School-Based Management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Mayrowetz D 2008. Making sense of distributed leadership: Exploring the multiple usages of the concept in the field. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 44(3): 424–435.

Muijs D, Harris A 2013. Teacher leadership: Improvement through empowerment. *Educational Management and Administration* 31(4): 437–448.

Noor KBM 2008. Case study: A strategic research methodology. *American Journal of Applied Sciences,* 5(11): 1602–1604.

Pushpanadham K 2006. Educational leadership for school-based management. *ABAC Journal* 26(1): 41–48.

Ritchie R, Woods PA 2007. Degrees of distribution: Towards an understanding of variations in the nature of distributed leadership in schools. *School Leadership and Management*, 27(4): 363–381.

Sinatra GM, Southerland SA, McConaughy F, Demastes JW 2013. Intentions and beliefs in students' understanding and acceptance of biological evolution. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching,* 40(5): 510–528.

Swanepoel C, Booysen J 2006. The involvement of teachers in school change: A comparison between the views of school principals in South Africa and nine other countries. *South African Journal of Education*, 26(2): 189–198.

Terre Blanche M, Durrheim K 2009. *Practical Research: Applied Methods for Social Research.* Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Triegaardt PK 2013. *The Role of Distributive Leadership as Strategy to Ensure Effective South African Schools: A Comparative Study Within Selected South African Schools*. DEd-Thesis, Unpublished. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Wilson D, Purushothaman R 2013. Dreaming with BRICs: The Path to 2050. From <http://ww2.goldmansachs.com/ideas/book/aa-dreaming.pdf> (Retrieved on 8 July 2014).

York-Barr J, Duke K 2014. What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Study*, 74(3): 255–316