Leadership Styles of Secondary School Principals: South African Cases

Mlungiseleli Ziduli*, Andrea Mqondiso Buka, Maisha Molepo and
Mlungiseleli Morris Jadezweni

Faculty of Educational Sciences, Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha, 5117, South Africa
*Mobile: 0783489970, *E-mail: mziduli333@gmail.com*

KEYWORDS Performance. Learners. Rural Areas. Effective. Community

ABSTRACT This paper examines best basic leadership styles that can be used by principals to improve academic performance of learners in rural schools. Authors argue that basic leadership styles can have positive effects in learner performance. The study was conducted in best performing rural schools in the Eastern Cape Province. The belief is that poor performing schools can learn from successful schools. A phenomenological study with an interpretive-constructivism approach was conducted to establish basic leadership styles that can be used by rural school principals (which were purposely selected) to improve the academic performance of learners. Data collected through interviews were thematically analyzed and revealed that: democratic and autocratic leadership styles were used by successful rural secondary school principals; *laissez-faire* leadership style adversely affected culture of teaching and learning. It is recommended that the Department of Basic Education should spend more time and money on training principals on leadership skills.

INTRODUCTION

Currently, the South African education system fails to produce desired quality results, especially in rural areas. Oupa (2014) states that South Africa continues to battle the challenge of under-performance in schools that are predominantly situated in socio-economic unfavourable settings. Eastern Cape is one of the most remote rural provinces in South Africa which is always number last despite its steady improvement in matric results. "Despite an increase in the Eastern Cape's 2017 matric results, the province still finds itself at the bottom of the food chain" (Khanyi 2018: 1). This implies that schools in poverty-stricken rural communities are struggling to produce quality performance particularly for grade 12 learners. In such cases, poor management and less effective leadership styles on the part of school principals can be put into question. Allie (2014) argues that poor grade12 results is a persisting problem in South African disadvantaged schools and principals should be encouraged to apply certain leadership styles to improve the academic performance of learners. According to Witten (2017), poor leadership is failing learners in South African disadvantaged schools.

Authors argue that principals' leadership style is the most important factor amongst other factors that must be considered by school prin-cipals if they want to improve the academic performance of learners in rural areas where the performance is not pleasing. The principal's leadership style(s) is considered today to be one of the most important and influential variable in the functioning of the school (Abu-Hussain 2014). School leadership has great influence on student achievement (Tatlah et al. 2014). Education leaders are faced with problem of improving the academic performance of all students (Dahie et al. 2015). This means that effective leadership styles are urgently needed in disadvantaged schools, especially those that are situated in poor rural communities. Authors cogitate (consider) that there are other factors that may cause rural secondary schools to underperform other than leadership styles. These factors are: poor resources, poor infrastructure, overcrowded classes, high rate of pregnancy, drug abuse, illiterate parents, undisciplined learners, shortage of educators and bad roads.

Buka and Molepo (2016) concur that schools in disadvantaged areas are engulfed with prevalence of school violence, teacher burn-out, HIV/AIDS, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy and crime. However, despite the above difficult and unacceptable conditions, some successful secondary school principals in the rural areas are using certain leadership styles to make their schools effective. Allie (2014) argues that it is

unfortunate that in poor rural communities, there are shortages of human assets and resources, yet some school principals work hard to produce accepted academic performance by making use of certain leadership styles. This paper values good leadership style(s) as a crucial component that can make schools successful, regardless of unacceptable difficult conditions experienced by principals in rural communities. The quality of school leadership is widely regarded as the most important factor in South Africa (Debeer et al. 2017). Sibanda (2017) avers that good leadership style spurs high learner performance. This implies that bad leadership negatively affects learners' performance.

The aim of this paper is to find out the basic leadership styles of school principals that can help improve academic performance of learners in poor rural schools where there is scarcity of resources and high failure rate. The researchers observed that some schools in rural areas perform well despite the difficult conditions of scarcity of resources while others put forward the scarcity of resources as a basic reason that causes them to perform poor. According to Preston and Barnes (2017), one way to promote student achievement and well-being is through recognizing what successful rural principals do and then use that information to capitalize on those constructive leadership actions and behaviors. This implies that poor performing schools can learn much on what successful principals in the same rural vicinity do to improve their academic performance.

The question that comes first in the mind is: Which basic leadership styles are used by the successful schools in poor rural communities where there is scarcity of resources and difficult working conditions? The researchers anticipate that those leadership practices of successful principals would be used by Department of Basic Education to advise and encourage less performing principals to perform better.

Literature Review

There is a common saying that "everything rise and fall on leadership". This implies that the success or failure of any organisation solely depends on leadership style(s) used by a certain particular leader. Principals as leaders are required to lead schools by making use of certain leadership styles or values (Abu-Hussain

2014). For this reason, it can be said that school principals should prefer to use leadership styles that has the greatest positive impact in determining the success of the school. It is expected that principals, as leaders in learning and teaching institutions, have explicit knowledge of contemporary leadership theories as well as the skills to utilize this knowledge (Allie 2014). Furthermore, it is widely believed that a good principal is the key to a successful school (Gregory and Willis 2013). Ziduli (2016) argues that the success or failure of a school, as an organization, lies on the leadership styles practiced by the school principal. This paper focuses on three basic leadership styles generally known as autocratic, democratic and *laissez-faire*.

The Concept of Leader and Leadership

Authors anticipate a leader as being someone who is always seeing ahead of other people and thinks above other people. A leader is a person who sees something that needs to be done, knows that he or she can help make it happens and gets started (Bhatti et al. 2012). Tatlah et al. (2014) notice the following actions of an effective leader: A leader sees opportunity and captures it; he/she sees future which is different and better and helps others to see that picture too; he/she is a coach, an encourager and is willing to take risks today for something better for tomorrow.

Leadership is a social influence in which the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates in an effort to reach organization goals, a process whereby one person exerts social influence over other members of the group, a process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group of individuals in an effort towards goal achievement in given situations, and a relational concept involving both the influencing agent and the person being influenced (Bhatti et al. 2012). According to Muthoni (2017) school leadership is the process of enlisting and guiding the talents and energies of teachers, students and parents towards achieving common educational aims.

Effective leadership starts at the top (Debeer et al. 2017). This implies that school principals are expected to be effective and accountable leaders. Effective leadership is the extent to which a leader continually and progressively leading and directing his/her followers to the agreed destination (Bhatti et al. 2012). Preston and Barnes (2017)

argue that effective leadership is instituted on establishment and maintenance of relationships.

In this paper, authors argue that principal's leadership style may have great positive influence at schools. Therefore, principals should envisage their leadership style(s) as crucial component that can help to improve their schools. Many principals do not contemplate their leadership styles as crucial in teachers' job performance (Muthoni 2017). Fisher (2005) maintains that all schools could be able to excel academically if principals' leadership styles can have a positive influence. Sibanda (2017) found that good leadership spurs high learner performance. Muthoni (2017) found that there is a strong positive relationship between the leadership style and school performance. A plethora of researchers have documented that successful leadership is a catalyst for improved student achievement and well-being (Preston and Barnes 2017; Day et al. 2011; Dinham 2008; Heck and Halliger 2011; Leithwood et al. 2008; Louis et al. 2010; Moffitt 2007; Robinson 2011; Sebastian and Allensworth 2012). Atsebeha (2016) concurs that a principal's leadership style has an effect on teachers as well as students. Leadership style has been found to have direct effect on school programs, instruction, and student outcomes (Menon 2014). The above literature review indicates that the success or failure of the school depends on the shoulders and leadership style of the school principal (Ziduli 2016).

Leadership Styles

A principal's leadership style refers to the "pattern or way of doing things by the principal in pursuit of his or her duties" (Jay 2014: 8). According to Adeyemi (2010: 84), "a leadership style is the ability of a leader to get tasks done with the assistance and cooperation of people in a school system." Leadership style encompasses the manner in which the leader undertakes the process of convincing and recruiting people for addressing specific goal attainment (Bennett and Anderson 2003). If the principal has an effective leadership style, he or she can engender a positive climate in the school (Muthoni 2017). Principals' leadership styles are seen in their behaviours and how they interrelate with teachers, students, parents and other school staff (Muthoni 2017).

Autocratic/Authoritarian Leadership Style

Authoritarian leadership style emanates from Mc Gregor's philosophical theory X which stipulates that it is a leader's role to coerce and control followers because people have an inherent aversion for work and will abstain from it whenever possible. Theory X also postulates that people must be compelled through force, intimidation or authority, and controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment in order to get them to accomplish the organizational needs (Clark 2010). According to Jay (2014), autocratic leadership style is a style whereby school leaders communicate irregularly to teaching staff with limited involvement in decision-making and less delegation. Business Dictionary (n.d.) defines authoritarian leadership as leadership style in which the leader dictates policies and procedures, decides what goals are to be achieved, and directs and controls all activities without any meaningful participation by the subordinates. Autocratic leadership refers to a system that gives full empowerment to the leader with minimal participation from the followers (Jay 2014). An autocratic leader shows consistent behavioural patterns involving acting alone and making unilateral decisions (Atsebeha 2016).

Jay (2014) observes the following characteristics of autocratic leaders: they do not consult members of the organization in the decision-making process; the leader sets all policies, predetermines the methods of work, determines the duties of followers, and specifies technical and performance evaluation standards. Despite the negative effects of autocratic leadership style, some scholars found that this type of leadership style has positive effects in organisational effectiveness such as a school. Atsebeha (2016) found that advantages of an autocratic leadership style are that: activities are usually performed quickly, and less time is spent on discussion; stress is reduced due to increased control and followers can be more productive.

An autocratic leadership style is successful in providing strong motivation for the leader (Atsebeha 2016). It can be said that an autocratic leadership style is successful where the leader is the most knowledgeable person when compared with followers. This means that school leaders must be equipped with leadership skills in order to improve their schools.

Democratic Leadership Style

Democratic leadership style is a style whereby leaders have time to listen and share ideas with their followers (Jay 2014). According to Goldman (2007), democratic leadership guides employees to participate in their groups and to make decisions. This style of leadership rests on the idea that members of the group, or their representatives, shall be involved in the making of policies - which means that teachers, parents, students and the school principal participate in the determination of the school rules and regulations (Ogunyinka and Adedoyin 2013). For that reason, the authors noticed that School Governing Bodies (SGBs), Represented Council of Learners (RCLs) and School Management Teams (SMTs) through South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 have been established in South Africa to democratize schools. School Governing Body members are represented by a democratically elected parent, teacher and learner components. Representative Council of Learners are represented by learners who stand as a voice of learners for the implementation of the school vision and their concerns. School Management Team is the professional body that manages and leads all the activities of the school to implement schools vision and achieve certain goals. Blasé and Anderson (1995: 37) state that "we saw schools as models of the possibilities of democratic life."

The advantages of a democratic leadership style are that every group member has a say, and there is a transfer of power from the leader to subordinates, which can allow group members to develop their knowledge and skills (Kane and Patapan 2010). To maintain stability and peace in a democratic school, principals must be decisively enough to quell conflicts that may arise because of freedom of speech, lack of experience and knowledge. Gill (2016) noticed that a democratic leadership style requires an extremely intuitive and observant leader who acts decisively when conflicts arise among team members. Van Deventer and Kruger (2005: 144) list the following positive effects of democratic leadership style: staff, parents and learners are motivated to realize the school's aims, staff experience job satisfaction; there is two-way movement of information and ideas; human relations are good; an atmosphere prevails in which staff and learners can develop to their full potential; staff turnover is low.

Jay (2014) notices that teamwork and participation of stakeholders are the common key characteristics of successful democratic schools. Jay (2014: 12) observes the following characteristics of democratic leaders: They tend to be more flexible and are responsive to one's needs; they are able to motivate followers to participate in decision-making and are respectful; they emphasize group and leader participation in the making of policies; they make sure that decisions about organizational matters are arrived at after consultation and communication with various people in the organization; these leaders attempt, as much as possible, to make each individual feel that he/she is an important member of the organization; communication is multidirectional while ideas are exchanged between employees and the leader.

A democratic leader consults and discusses an issue with other people before decision is taken. Although it seems as long process, but the outcomes are accepted and owned by people the people than those of autocratic leader. As participation takes time, this approach can lead to things happening more slowly but often, the end result is better (Bhatti et al. 2012). Van Deventer and Kruger (2005: 144) observe tat the disadvantages of democratic leadership is that "a great deal of time can be lost because too many people have to be consulted and for that reason, discussions may be too long." Furthermore, every decision can entail such a slow process that it can lead to opportunities being missed or risks being avoided too late (Peteman 2000: 7). Gill (2016) lists the following disadvantages of democratic leadership: leaders can become overly dependent on the expertise and experience of subordinates; collaboration can consume valuable time getting input from people who are not in agreement; fast, incisive decisions may be difficult or even impossible, resulting in missed deadlines; relying on consensus from people who are misinformed or lack accurate data can be costly; leaders can become burdened by the challenge of overseeing experts on collaborative teams.

A Laissez-faire Leadership Style

Laissez-faire is a French word which literally means 'let people do what they wish (Musaazi 1982: 63). *Laissez-faire* leadership style is also known as the hands-off style whereby a leader

allows group members to make their own decisions (Aunga and Masare 2017; Jay 2014). This type of leadership allows complete freedom to group decision without the leader's participation. This implies that the leader does not interfere in the course of events determined by the group. This is a style whereby a leader advocates minimal supervision and moderate involvement in the instructional process (Jay 2014). Ogunyinka and Adedoyin (2013) concur that a *laissez-faire* educational leader supplies materials and ideas and only participates whenever the need arises. Van Deventer and Kruger (2005: 143) noted the following negative effects of a *laissez-fair*e educational leader: performance in the school is generally poor; clear aims and outcomes are not set; there is general frustration, aimlessness and indecision; educators work haphazardly and as a result, they become demotivated and experience little job satisfaction.

The disadvantages of a *laissez-faire* leadership style are that; this leadership practice could leave group members doing the wrong thing without realizing it, and there is less personal growth (Kocker 2009). The above author also emphasizes that working on different activities and making various decisions on different issues without a leader leads to low productivity and low job satisfaction. Nsubuga (2008) adds that complete delegation creates performance problems since the leader does not follow up on subordinates when they are working. It can be said that a *laissez-fair*e leadership style does not respect finish up time for job to be done.

 Various scholars have noticed a number of advantages of *laissez-fair* leadership style it leaves the group members freedom to make their own decisions and perform their activities in a way they like without the direction of the leader (Kocker 2009) which can stimulate individual development (Van Deventer and Kruger 2005). This type of leadership can be successful where members of a group are highly trained in their own areas of proficiency (Nsubuga 2008: 18). *Laissez-faire* leadership style is described by Hackman and Johnsfon (2009) as the most effective style, especially where followers are matured and highly motivated. This leadership style provides group members an opportunity to be effective if they work jointly in terms of the ownership and accountability it bestows on members (Kocker 2009). Morepver, Siddiqui (2015) concurs that *laissez-faire* leadership has the following advantages: It provides positive effects on job satisfaction of workers and results in enhancing their morale; subordinates are expected to take initiative of what they need to do; it gives complete freedom to subordinates; subordinates are expected to be capable of performing their jobs in a way required on the basis of their knowledge and skills; subordinates can accomplish their tasks independently and yet successfully; this style is effective if the subordinates are experienced and fully committed to achieve their objectives.

METHODOLOGY

The population of this study consisted of 39 principals of the secondary schools in one education district in the Eastern Cape Province of the Republic of South Africa. A case study research design and purposive sampling method were used to select 6 secondary school principals that have good records of academic performance in poor rural areas. Out of six secondary school principals selected and interviewed, two were females and four were males. An open-ended interview schedule was used as an instrument of data collection for individual interviews. Research participants were informed of the purpose and procedures of the study. Written consent from individual participants was sought before the inquiry commenced. Confidentiality and anonymity of participants were assured through use of pseudonyms in the transcription of the interviews. Participants were guaranteed that the researchers would adhere to ethical research procedures and report on the research findings in a professional and accountable manner. Bell (2001: 103) states that reliability is the extent to which a test or procedures produce similar results under constant conditions on all occasions. To ensure reliability, a questionnaire used for data collection was tested during a pilot study and corrections were made. This means, the questionnaire was used for the second time during data collection.

FINDINGS

In this paper, the findings are presented under the themes that emerged from responses of the respondents. The first finding revealed that both democratic and autocratic leadership styles were used by well performing schools in poor

rural communities. Secondly, the researchers found that a *laissez-faire* style of leadership adversely affect the culture of teaching and learning in rural schools, and that results to poor performance of learners.

Democratic and Autocratic Leadership Styles

The study revealed that both democratic and autocratic leadership styles practiced by successful rural school principals produce the desired academic performance of learners. The South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 emphasizes that all school stakeholders [School Governing Bodies (SGBs) and School management Teams (SMTs)] should be involved in the governance and management of schools. In this study, principals responded that all the components of the SGB (parents, teachers and learners) and SMTs (principals, deputy principals and heads of departments) took part in decision-making processes. Sometimes, principals used their leadership and management skills to practice the autocratic leadership style. All respondents agreed that they used the autocratic style of leadership when they want to solve problems quickly and skillfully. The following extracts indicate that democratic and autocratic leadership styles were used by school principals to improve the academic performance of learners in rural areas:

I use democratic style of leadership because we are in a democratic country, where everyone's ideas are respected. You know, our learners too must have their say in the school.

There is no specific leadership style used as such, but it normally ranges from autocratic to democratic styles and also depends on the situation.

The principal must assign duties to everyone and consistently uses management and leadership skills to make a follow-up and hold teachers and learners accountable if they do not perform well.

The *Laissez-faire* Leadership Style

The participants in this study did not favour *laissez-faire* style of leadership. They complained that a *laissez-faire* leadership style negatively affected the culture of teaching and learning in rural schools. It was also found that principals who practiced *laissez-faire* leadership practiced favoritism. Such principals who practiced *laissez-faire* in rural areas did not give proper instructions on how things should be done in their schools. This resulted in poor teaching and low performance of learners. The study also revealed that lack of policies automatically resulted to high rate of learner and teacher absenteeism in poor performing schools. The following extracts demonstrate how the *laissez-faire* leadership style in rural schools negatively affects the culture of teaching and learning and low learner performance:

What I know is that if the principal uses laissez fair style in the school it would negatively affect the culture of teaching and learning and learners' results would be poor.

The failure of principals to give proper instructions on how things should be done in the school negatively affect teacher and learner performance.

Teachers may be absent from school and this may lead to less teaching and learning in the class and subsequently bring about higher failure rate in the school.

DISCUSSION

The study revealed that both democratic and autocratic leadership styles were used by the school principals to make their schools to perform better regardless of scarcity of resources in rural schools. These two leadership styles were used in different situations to solve different problems. This implies that principals use each of these two basic leadership styles depending on the situation. The study found that the *laissez-faire* leadership style did not produce the best result in poor rural communities where there is a high rate of illiteracy.

Democratic and Autocratic Leadership Styles

The study found that rural school principals used democratic leadership styles because it is where everyone's ideas are respected.

I use democratic style of leadership because we are in a democratic country, where everyone's ideas are respected. You know, our learners too must have their say in the school.

This implies that school and community stakeholders' ideas were considered. School

stakeholders (internal stakeholders), for example, include SGBs and SMTs whereas community stakeholders (external stakeholders) may include all the leaders of the community stakeholders present in that particular community, for example, chiefs, religious leaders, business people. School governing bodies comprises parents, teachers and learners' representatives. This implies that in rural democratic schools, the above stakeholders' ideas should be respected. Jay (2014) concurs with the above finding and states that a democratic leadership style is a style whereby leaders have time to listen and share ideas with their followers. The advantages of a democratic leadership style are that every group member gets a say (Kane and Patapan 2010). The democratic leadership style is characterised by a two-way movement of information and ideas (Van Deventer and Kruger 2005). Relationships are built on mutual trust between labour and management (Gill 2016).

Sometimes, principals were autocratic and assigned duties to teachers and learners. They used their authority which goes with the position of principal to coerce teachers and learners to do what is expected from them.

The principal must assign duties to everyone and consistently uses management and leadership skills to make a follow-up and hold teachers and learners accountable if they do not perform well.

According to Jay (2014), the autocratic leadership style is a style whereby school leaders communicate irregularly to teaching staff with limited involvement in decision-making and less delegation. McGregor's philosophical theory X stipulates that it is a leader's role to coerce and control followers because people have an inherent aversion to work and will abstain from it whenever possible (Clark 2010). In this way, the principal uses his or her authority as a school leader who is accountable to whatever is taking place in the school (Ziduli 2016). This implies that in a democratic school, autocracy is sometimes practiced to facilitate progress and to attain high quality education.

There is no specific leadership style used as such, but it normally ranges from autocratic to democratic styles and also depends on the situation.

The finding targeting on the need for principals to practice democratic leadership style to make schools productive concurs with literature cited by McKay and Allias (1995) which indicates that this type of leadership style generally produces better results in terms of productivity, costs, less absenteeism and lower staff turnover. Productivity increases as a result of a solutions-centric workforce that has input (Gill 2016). The above author argues that despite the above glamorous output of democratic leadership, its disadvantage is that leaders can become overly dependent on the expertise and experience of subordinates. This implies that followers should be experts and experienced people. One wonders how SGBs in rural areas where there is lot of illiteracy would get this experience and expertise. Mestry and Khumalo (2012) state that despite problems of illiteracy, lack of confidence and associated lack of knowledge of legislation, some schools with decisive principals in rural areas are moving forward to develop, monitor and evaluate policies. Unless principals can be decisive enough, conflicts may always arise as is always the case in less effective rural schools (authors' experiential knowledge and observation).

Laissez-faire Leadership Style

The *laissez-faire* leadership, like any other style, has both negative and positive sides. The general findings of the study revealed that it produces poor performance in rural schools where there is scarcity of resources and lack of knowledge and skills on education matters.

In the study, it was found that a *laissez-faire* leadership style affects culture of teaching and learning which eventually lead to poor learner academic performance.

What I know is that if the principal uses laissez fair style in the school, it would negatively affect the culture of teaching and learning and learners' results would be poor.

Jay (2014) states that a *laissez-faire* leadership style advocates minimal supervision and moderate involvement of the school leader in the instructional process. This may result to poor performance in an organisation such as school. Some people are not good at setting their own deadlines, managing their own projects and solving problems on their own and in such situations, projects can go off-track and deadlines can be missed when team members do not get

enough guidance or feedback from leaders (Cherry 2017). This style of leadership has been linked to negative outcomes, including poor job performance, low leader effectiveness and less group satisfaction (Cherry 2017).

The failure of principals to give proper instructions on how things should be done in the school negatively affect teacher and learner performance.

Van Deventer and Kruger (2005) concurs that this style of leadership leads to poor performance in schools. Working on different activities and making various decisions on different issues or topics alone without a leader may lead to low productivity and low job satisfaction (Kocker 2009). If school leaders are reluctant to supervise and monitor teachers, the culture of teaching and learning would be negatively affected. The quality of work given to learners would be poor. It would be even difficult to finish up the syllabus on time if work is done without supervision. This can result in poor performance of learners.

Laissez-faire leadership practiced by school leaders in rural areas may lead to high rate of teacher and learner absenteeism. One respondent indicated that:

Teachers may be absent from school and this may lead to less teaching and learning in the class and subsequently bring about higher failure rate in the school.

Nsubuga (2008) adds that complete delegation creates performance problems since the leader does not follow up on subordinates when they are working. Complete delegation without follow-up mechanisms creates performance problems (Aunga and Masare 2017). This leadership style leads to the lowest productivity among group members (Cherry 2017).

Laissez-faire leadership can be effective in situations where group members are highly skilled, motivated and capable of working on their own (Cherry 2017). Authors refute that this leadership style cannot be effective in rural schools, because most stakeholders lack leadership skills. They need to be motivated and given deadlines by the school leader. Teachers themselves are not motivated because they are overloaded, and material resources are scarce. Learners also do not get motivation at home because most of their parents are not conscious of education careers.

CONCLUSION

This paper focused on three basic leadership styles, namely, autocratic, democratic and *laissez faire.* The researchers aimed at determining the best leadership styles that can be used by school principals to improve learner academic performance in rural areas. The findings indicated that both democratic and autocratic leadership styles were used to improve effective teaching and learning in rural areas. Findings clearly showed that successful principals mixed these two basic leadership styles in their daily practice of leadership activities. The study further revealed that the *laissez-faire* leadership style failed to produce good performance in rural schools. Well performing rural school principals set deadlines for work done at their schools, regularly monitor and supervise teachers' and learners' work. They keep on motivating both learners and teachers to work hard. They also persist in motivating and creating peaceful relations with school stakeholders and community leaders.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The outcomes of the study revealed that there is a need for the Department of Basic Education to spend more time and money conducting leadership training workshops for school principals. There is a common saying that everything rises and falls on leadership. This implies that if the Department of Basic Education can equip principals with leadership skills, performance in schools can be improved. The focus of leadership training should be on all leadership styles that are found in the literature other than the three basic leadership styles. The reason for focusing on these three basic leadership styles (autocratic, democratic and *laissez faire*) in this paper is that other leadership styles are the extension of these three styles of leadership. Authors recommend that school stakeholders (SGBs and SMTs) should be included in systematic regular leadership training workshops.

REFERENCES

Adeyemi TO 2010. Principals' leadership styles and teachers' job performance in senior secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *International Jour-*

nal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 2(6): 83-91.

Abu-Hussain J 2014. Leadership styles and value systems of school principals. *American Journal of Educational Research,* 2(12): 1267-1276.

Allie F 2014. *The Influence of School Principals' Leadership Styles on the Effectiveness of Schools* MEd Dissertation, Unpublished. South Africa: Cape Peninsula University of Technology.

Atsebeha AT 2016. *Principals' Leadership Styles and Their Effects on Teachers' Performance.* D. Ed Thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Aunga DAO, Masare O 2017. Effect of leadership styles on teachers' performance in primary schools. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review,* 4(4): 42-52.

Bhatti N, Maitlo GM, Shaik N, Hashmi MA, Shaik FM 2012. The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style in job satisfaction. *International Business Research,* 5(2): 192-201.

Bell J 2001. *Doing your Research Project.* 3rd Edition. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Bennett N Anderson L 2003. *Rethinking Educational Leadership.* London: Sage Publications.

Birasnav M, Rangnekar S, Dalpati A 2011. Transformational leadership and human capital benefits: The role of knowledge management. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(2): 106-126.

Blasé J Anderson GL 1995. *Micro-politics of Educational Leadership: From Control to Empowerment.* New York: Cassell.

Buka AM Molepo M 2016. A psycho-pedagogic approach for inclusive classes in disadvantaged rural primary schools in South Africa: Advancing teaching practices. *Journal of Educational Science,* 12(1): 38-44.

Business Dictionary n.d. Authoritarian Leadership. From <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/authoritarian-leadership.html> (Retrieved on 14 February 2018).

Cherry K 2017. What is Laissez-faire Leadership? The Pros and Cons of the Delegative Leadership Style. From <http://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-laissez-fair-leadership-2795316> (Retrieved on 23 February 2018).

Clark D 2010. Theory x and Theory y. Big Dog and Little Dog's Performance Juxtaposition. From <http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/history/xy.html> (Retrieved on 14 February 2018).

Dahie AM, Mahamud AA, Hoshow AAA 2015. School Leadership and Student Achievement: Empirical Study from Secondary Schools in Mogadishu-Somalia. International Journal in Physical and Applied Sciences, 2(12): 55-58. From <https://www.researchgate. net/publication/309715732> (Retrieved on 21 February 2018).

Day C, Sammons P, Leithwood K, Hopkins D, Gu Q, Brown E, Ahtaridou E 2011. *Successful School Leadership: Linking with Learning and Achievement.* Maidenhead, England: McGraw Hill Education.

Debeer AL, du Toit P, Antonites A 2017. Leadership Development Programme for School Principals: Experiential Leadership Training and Skills Development that Ignites Change in Schools, Classrooms and Communities. From <www.up.ca.za> (Retrieved on 17 January 2018).

Department of Education 1996. *South African Schools Act 84 of 1996.* Pretoria: Government Print.

Dinham S 2008. *How to Get Your School Moving and Improving.* Melbourne, Australia: ACER Press.

Fisher EA 2005. Facing the challenges of outcomes measurement: The role of transformational leadership. *Administration in Social Work,* 29(4): 35-49.

Gill E 2016. What is Democratic/Participative Leadership? How Collaboration Can Boost Morale? ST Thomas University. From <http://online.stu.edu/democratic-participative-leadership> (Retrieved on 23 February 2018).

Goldman E 2007. The significance of leadership style. *Educational Leadership,* 55(7): 20-22.

Gregory A, Willis P 2013. *Strategic Public Relations Leadership.* London: Routledge.

Hackman MZ, Johnson CE 2009. *Leadership: A Communication Perspective.* 5th Edition. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Heck RH, Halliger P 2011. Assessing the contribution of distributed leadership to school improvement and growth in math achievement. *American Educational Research Journal,* 46(3): 659-689.

Jay A 2014. *The Principals' Leadership Style and Teachers' Performance in Secondary Schools.* MEd Thesis. Ethiopia: Jimma University.

Kane J, Patapan H 2010. The artless art: Leadership and the limits of democratic rhetoric. *Australian Journal of Political Science,* 45(3): 371-389.

Khanyi B 2018. Eastern Cape Improves Matric Results, But Still Tailing: Inside Education. SABC News January 5. From <https://insideeeducation.org> (Retrieved on 28 February 2018).

Kocker M 2009. *Other-regarding Preferences and Leadership Styles.* Bonn: IZA.

Leithwood K, Harris A, Hopkins D 2008. Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management,* 28(1): 27-42.

Louis KS, Dretzke B, Wahlstrom K 2010. How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 21(3): 315–336.

Menon MW 2014. The relationship between transformational leadership, perceived leader effectiveness, and teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 52(4): 509-528.

McKay V, Allias C 1995. *A Sociology of Education.* Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.

Mestry R, Khumalo J 2012. Governing bodies and learner discipline: Managing rural schools in South Africa through a code of conduct. *South African Journal of Education,* 32(1): 97-110.

Moffitt JR 2007. *What Works: Principal Leadership Behaviors that Positively Impact Student Achievement in Elementary Schools.* Doctoral Dissertation, Unpublished. Statesboro, GA: Georgia Southern University.

Musaazi JCS 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Educational Administration.* London: McMillan.

Muthoni F 2017. Effect of Principals' Leadership Styles on Teachers' Job Performance in Public Secondary Schools. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention, 6(8): 72-86. From <www.ijhssi.org> (Retrieved on 14 February 2018).

Nsubuga Y 2008. *Analysis of Leadership Styles and School Performance of Secondary Schools in Uganda.* Doctoral Dissertation. Port Elizabeth, South Africa: Mandela Metropolitan University.

Ogunyinka EK, Adedoyin RC 2013. Leadership styles and work effectiveness of school principals in Ekiti State: Case study of Ado-Ekiti local government area. *Developing Country Studies,* 3(3): 64-73.

Oupa SML 2014. The role of school management teams in underperforming schools: A matter of values. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 5(3): 475-183.

Peteman C 2007. *Participation and Democratic Theory.* 21st Edition. London: Cambridge University Press.

Preston JP, Barnes KER 2017. *Successful Leadership in Rural Schools: Cultivating Collaboration.* Canada: University of Prince Edward Island.

Rasel 2013. Organisational Behavior: Advantages and Disadvantages of Autocratic Leadership. From <bankoinfo.com> (Retrieved on 18 May 2018).

Robinson V 2011. *Student-centered Leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sibanda L 2017. Understanding distributive leadership in South African schools: Challenges and prospects. *Issues in Educational Research,* 27(3): 567-581.

Siddiqui F 2015. The Pros and Cos of Laissez-faire Leadership. From <http://www.linkedin.com/> (Retrieved on 21 December 2015).

Sebastian J, Allensworth E 2012. The influence of principal leadership on classroom instruction and student learning: A student of mediated pathways to learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 48(4): 626-663.

Tatlah IA, Iqbal MZ, Amin M, Quraishi U 2014. Effect of leadership behavior of principals on students' academic achievement at secondary level: A comparison of the leaders and teachers perceptions. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education,* 8(1): 1-12.

Van Deventer I, Kruger AG 2005. *An Educator's Guide to School Management Skills.* Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Witten A 2017. *Shifting Paradigms: Changing Practice: Value-based Instructional Leadership in Schools.* South Africa: ACP Project Management and Publishing Services.

Ziduli M 2016. *The Managerial Leadership Styles of School Principals for School Effectiveness.* MEd Dissertation, Unpublished. Mthatha: Walter Sisulu University.