

Distributive Leadership as Management Strategy for School Effectiveness: The Place and Role of the OSCAR Coaching Model in South African Schools

R. J. (Nico) Botha¹ and P. K. (Paul) Triegaardt²

*¹Department of Education Leadership and Management, College of Education,
University of South Africa, PO Box 392, Pretoria, 0003, South Africa
Telephone: +27 8241163611, +27 7617224312*

*²Emirates National School, PO 69392, Al Ain, 0000, United Arab Emirates
E-mail: ¹<botharj@unisa.ac.za>, ²<p.triegaardt@ens.sch.ae>*

KEYWORDS Leadership Distribution. Coaching Model. Effective Schools. South Africa

ABSTRACT A common thread in contemporary research on principal leadership refers to the ways in which principals take important decisions. These decisions have become increasingly more complex in a system of school-based management due to the fact that an appeal has been made to principals by the South African Ministry of Education to take on more responsibilities in order to manage their schools effectively and to enhance school effectiveness and learner outcomes by doing so. The concept of shared or distributive leadership has become vital in a system of school-based management. The OSCAR coaching model is one way in which leadership can be distributed effectively across individuals in the school context. The purpose of this paper, based on a qualitative study in selected South African schools, is to explore how distributive leadership, via this coaching model, can contribute to school effectiveness. Ethnographic interviews were conducted with individuals and focus groups from purposefully selected schools to establish the perspectives of individuals on the place and role of the OSCAR coaching model. The outcomes of this paper show that the OSCAR coaching model, as management tool, serves as a significant contributor to school effectiveness as it supports and contributes to the distribution of leadership.

INTRODUCTION

The majority of problems that school principals are often confronted with in the workplace can mostly be defined as complex and uncertain – there is real uncertainty as to how these problems can be solved most effectively. These problems are being referred to in research literature as ‘ill-structured’ (Jonassen 1997; Bendixen and Schraw 2001) and specific leadership approaches are required to solve these problems (Marishane and Botha 2011; Botha 2013). Empirical research findings have showed that shared or distributive leadership increases the possibility of the principal, his school management team and other teachers in making the correct decisions during cognitive reasoning in the problem-solving process, specifically with regard to ill-structured problems (cf. Bendixen and Schraw 2001; Schraw 2001; Sinatra et al. 2003; Angeli and Valanides 2012).

These research findings have, however, not considered the possible direct and indirect contribution that coaching models, such as the OSCAR model (as distributive leadership tool), may make to school effectiveness. In order to attend

to this gap in knowledge, the purpose of this current paper, based on a qualitative study at selected South African schools (using ethnographic interviews) was to explore how distributive leadership via the OSCAR coaching model may contribute to school effectiveness in selective schools where this model had been in use for some time.

The concept of distributive leadership attracts a range of meanings and is associated with a variety of practices (Mayrowetz 2008; Triegaardt 2013; Botha 2014). The main purpose of distributive leadership is to bring the school management team and other teachers in contact with the goals and values of the school and to ‘free’ the principal of the many responsibilities of administration, management and other school activities (Loeser 2008). In such a distributive leadership model, all teachers collectively assume responsibility for the well-being of their schools. The distribution of leadership can also have an important effect on enhancing teacher engagement and involvement in decision-making by involving more teachers in leadership roles in the school system to generate innovations with a strong team approach and conse-

quently to run the school more effectively (Smylie et al. 2002; Marishane and Botha 2011, 2014; Triegaardt 2013).

The concept of shared or distributive leadership becomes vital in a system of school-based management and can take on a variety of forms or strategies. In this paper the focus will be on the OSCAR coaching model as a distributive leadership strategy towards school effectiveness. Very little research had been done locally on the link between distributive leadership and school effectiveness and/or school improvement. Before the research question and related sub-questions can be dealt with, the concepts of distributive leadership and the OSCAR coaching model must be conceptualised.

Theoretical Framework

The Concept of Distributive Leadership

Conceptualising 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, 2014).

Leadership can generally be defined as the "*process of directing the behaviour 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 (2003) 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 (Marishane and Botha 2011; Botha 2014).

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 et al. (2004), distributive leadership means the same as dispersed, shared, collaborative and democratic leadership. Bennet et al. (2003: 7) 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 (1997: 457) state 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 Riehl (2003: 3) conclude by saying that distributive leadership ensures that "*teachers work together towards whole school improvement and school goals*."

With this in mind, Gronn (2002: 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 (2005: 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 (2005) 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 2014).

Ritchie and Woods (2007) explain that the democratic and distributive leadership model is similar in some ways which involves 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*” (Loeser 2008: 3).

Glew et al. (1995) state that, no matter what form the behavioural change may take through participative management, collaborative leadership requires true participation in leadership and decision-making at all levels and in multiple decision processes. The distribution would allow leaders at all levels to work collaboratively in order to achieve the maximum goal in education, namely that all learners will benefit from effective teaching and learning. Lewis and Andrews (2004) add that distributive leadership is a form of parallel leadership whereby teachers work with the principal in distinctive, yet complementary ways towards goals they all share.

Jameson (2007: 10), in turn, argues that “*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 developed, it may resemble collaborative leadership*”. Jameson (2007: 11) continues to argue that the distributive 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*”. Hafford-Letchfield et al. (2007: 171) are of the opinion that “*coaching and mentoring have strong links with distributive leadership because they are focused on problem solving and the continuous process of learning and reflection*”.

According to Carson et al. (2007), managers should encourage each member of the team to demonstrate leadership through personal meetings. During these meetings they should encourage such a member to utilise his or her strengths, provide clarity and offer support and advice. These practices are effective, because a supportive coaching environment is the main characteristic of distributive leadership. Stone (2007: 12) maintains that “*managers master the skill of*

coaching find that it can boost the performance of workers by making clear to them what they should do and how they should be doing it”.

From the discussion above it becomes clear that all the authors quoted have a very ‘authorised’ view of distributive leadership. In conclusion to this section it can be stated that the researchers have a more ‘democratic’ view of distributive leadership as required in a system of school-based management.

The OSCAR Coaching Model as Distributive Leadership Strategy

Gilbert and Whittleworth (2009) explain that coaching models can provide a simple structure that helps to keep the coaching process focussed, structured and time effective. One of the more well-known coaching models, namely the OSCAR coaching model, is a distributive leadership strategy that works well for managers because “*it is simple, it is easy to understand, it is common sense and managers are already using it without realising it*” (Gilbert and Whittleworth 2009: 12). This model was developed by Gilbert and Whittleworth and is widely being used in schools world-wide (Triegaardt 2013). It builds on and enhances previous models and is particularly useful for managers who seek to adopt a coaching style. The model “*provides a framework and simple structure that helps to keep the coaching process focussed and consists of five easy steps*” (Gilbert and Whittleworth 2009: 15):

- ♦ **Outcome (Destination):** This step helps the team member to clarify the outcomes (for the current session and in the long term). This allows leaders at all levels to work collaboratively in order to achieve the main goal in education, namely that all learners will benefit from effective teaching and learning.
- ♦ **Situation (Starting Point):** This step gives clarity on where the team member is right now in order to raise his or her awareness.
- ♦ **Choices and Consequences (Route Options or Brains):** This step, also referred to as brainstorming, helps the team members to generate as many alternative actions as possible and increases their awareness of the consequences of each choice.
- ♦ **Actions (Detailed Plan):** This step helps the team members to review the options generated and clarify the future steps of

the action plan. Shared leadership as a distributive leadership strategy develops and maintains high-level shared knowledge through a focus on action.

- ♦ **Review (*Making Sure We are on Track*):** This step helps team members to check continually if they are on course.

Problem Statement

The contextual framework described above now leads to the following statement of the problem of the paper: *How can coaching and specifically the OSCAR coaching model as distributive leadership strategy be used to ensure effective schools in South Africa?* The following five sub-questions were developed to provide answers to the question above:

- ♦ What is distributive leadership?
- ♦ How can distributive leadership support change to ensure effective schools?
- ♦ How can coaching be used as an effective distributive leadership strategy?
- ♦ How does one implement and maintain coaching as a distributive leadership strategy to ensure effective schools?
- ♦ How can the OSCAR coaching model be conceptualised as a distributive leadership strategy to ensure effectiveness in South African schools?

METHODOLOGY

This paper was based on a qualitative research design and was narrative rather than statistical in nature with data collected in words rather than figures. Kaplan and Maxwell (1994) explain that the goal of understanding a phenomenon from the participants' point of view and its particular social and institutional context is largely lost when textual data are quantified. The overall purpose of adopting the qualitative research design for this paper was to gather data through investigating and understanding the challenges with regard to implementing the OSCAR coaching model as distributive leadership strategy to ensure school effectiveness.

McMillan and Schumacher (1997: 164) define the population of a study as "*a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects or events, that conform to specific criteria and on which the researcher intends to generalise the results of the research*". In this paper, the

population referred to all 27 primary schools in a selected ward of a specific school district in KwaZulu-Natal province, South Africa.

Edwards and Newton (1994) state that purposive sampling is sampling based on the knowledge and the expertise of the participants selected for this paper. In this paper, the sample was purposefully selected and consists of 25 members of the school management teams from five selected public primary schools in the district (five members of each of the five schools). Participants were given information about the research procedures, the depth of the interviews and the use of a digital recorder and field notes and were informed that they were expected to give as much information as possible during their discussions relating to their experience of the role of the OSCAR model as distributive leadership strategy in ensuring school effectiveness.

Ethnographic interviews are often used in qualitative research to combine immersive observation and one-on-one interviews. The advantages of using this type of interviews are that it enables a clear relationship with research participants over the period of study, it provides a rich source of visual data and helps to reveal unarticulated needs and that it captures behaviour in the different contexts of everyday life (Triegaardt 2013; Botha 2014). After a small scale pilot study was done, ethnographic interviews were conducted with individual participants and small focus groups (five members of the school management team of each school) in order to elaborate on their perspectives of their world and how they made sense of important events. Permission was obtained from the participants to use a digital recorder. Verbatim transcripts of the digital recordings were used as basis for data analysis.

According to Krefting (1991), triangulation is used to enhance the quality and credibility of research. Triangulation was done by analysing how each set of data answered the sub-questions. The subsequent analysis considered each set of data in relation to the sub-questions. In ascertaining the trustworthiness of the paper, dependability 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. The researchers determined credibility by representing the experiences of the participants as accurately as pos-

sible. This was achieved through intense observation and member checking.

Furthermore, to minimise ambiguity in this paper, the researchers have made sure that the questions were clear and meant the same to all respondents. Objectivity and validity in this paper were maintained by ensuring that all the data were collected systematically and that all the contributions and experiences of the participants were represented by digitally recording them and transcribing them for analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The empirical research findings are a culmination of a data-triangulation process, whereby data from semi-structured interviews were triangulated with data from focus-group interviews. The use of literature supports the outcomes of the empirical study. In addition, the researchers reviewed the transcripts of the interviews by comparing them to determine the similarities and differences between the data in order to determine patterns in the data. The findings were analysed according to each of the following eight

themes and sub-themes that have emerged from the data and will be discussed according to the five sub-questions phrased earlier. These themes with their respective sub-themes are depicted in the Table 1.

Findings with Regard to Research

Sub-question 1: What is Distributive Leadership?

All the participants in this paper agreed that school leadership is the task of the school principal and other senior staff to make schools more effective and increase learner outcomes. This view corresponds with the definitions of school leadership authors such as Elmore (2000), York-Barr and Duke (2004), Danielson (2007) and Botha (2013, 2014). The participants in the study have pointed out that distributive leadership is about teachers as leaders and also revealed that leadership strategies are about teamwork and that teamwork is an important strategy to ensure the effective distribution of leadership in schools. One of the participants explained the following in this regard: “We always try to get the other

Table 1: Themes and sub-themes derived from the data

<i>Themes</i>	<i>Sub-themes</i>
<i>Theme 1:</i> Distributive leadership is about teacher leadership.	Initiate things; Lead other teachers; and motivation of teams.
<i>Theme 2:</i> Distributive leadership is about teamwork.	Decision- making; Role of subject and grade leaders; and sharing of knowledge and expertise.
<i>Theme 3:</i> Distributive leadership is about democracy and sharing the leadership at all levels.	Meetings; Teamwork; Involvement of teachers making decisions.
<i>Theme 4:</i> Distributive leadership is about the interaction between all leaders.	People skills; Sharing teamwork; Meetings to discuss progress; Monitoring progress; Collaborative work and sharing.
<i>Theme 5:</i> Distributive leadership is about sharing leadership and not the delegation of leadership	Responsibilities of principals teacher leadership; Coordination of leadership.
<i>Theme 6:</i> Distributive leadership is about ensuring effective schools.	Opportunities for staff to develop; involvement of teachers to lead; Clustering of schools which need support; Leadership skills development; Ownership; Sharing the work load.
<i>Theme 7:</i> Distributive leadership is about the development of coaches as a distributive leadership strategy	No formal training; Some training.
<i>Theme 8:</i> The OSCAR coaching model to facilitate meetings as a distributive leadership strategy to ensure effective schools	Opportunities to plan once a week; Grade and subject meetings minutes of meetings; Developing a curriculum; Yearly, weekly and monthly meetings; Sharing of expertise; Note taking and brain storming; Collaborative teamwork.

teachers on board to make decisions. They must do the job and if we prescribe to them what to do, then you actually force them what to do. So, we would like to get their inputs as well so that we can have a nice team work effect here at this school. I think this is what distributive leadership is all about". Another one added the following: *"Whatever there is to do, I go and plan it, go thoroughly through it and then usually we have a grade meeting once a week, I discuss it there with them and ask their input and then put it on paper and then we develop it".*

These views correspond with the research literature discussed earlier that stated clearly that there is a link between distributive and democratic leadership. The paper revealed that sharing leadership tasks is an important element of distributive leadership (Triegaardt 2013; Botha 2014).

**Findings with Regard to Research
Sub-question 2: How Can Distributive
Leadership Support Change to Ensure
Effective Schools?**

The participants agreed that distributive leadership supports and improves effective change in schools through the interaction of all leaders. Interaction occurs at effective schools through various tiers of distributive leadership, namely, the principal, the deputy, heads of departments as well as the teachers. The empirical study proved that interaction between leaders is necessary for a school to change and to be successful. It revealed furthermore that distributive leadership is about the sharing of leadership tasks and not the delegation thereof. This corresponds with the views of Harris (2005), Spillane et al. (2001) as well as Marishane and Botha (2011) and Botha (2014) discussed earlier. One of the participants (a principal) said the following in this regard: *"Teachers should work together as a team for change to take place. If they are not speaking from the same mouth regarding discipline, for example, then you are going to have a problem with discipline. You need to work together with everyone in order to get a system going that is working".*

Jameson (2007) has stated that distributive leadership improves effective schools through sharing leadership tasks. This empirical study revealed that more than 85% of the respondents agreed that the distribution of leadership can support change and that leadership responsibilities should be shared to achieve an organi-

sational goal. During a focus group interview with five members of a school management team, one of the participants' (a head of department) said: *"Distributive leadership is the responsibility or job of the principal"*, while another one added: *"Each teacher has some responsibility from the start and the principal should coordinates in ways that make the sharing of leadership more important"*. Another participant (a principal) stated in this regard that *"each teacher has some responsibility from the start and that the principal should coordinates in ways that make the sharing of leadership possible"*.

**Findings with Regard to Research
Sub-question 3: How Can Coaching be
Used as an Effective Distributive
Leadership Strategy?**

Coaching as distributive leadership strategy has strong links with action learning because the process is focused on problem-solving and the continuous process of learning and reflection (Hafford-Letchfield et al. 2007). Improvements in sharing practice seem to be enhanced by effective peer support. More effective and well-managed meetings will create opportunities for group coaching which should result in the entire school being more effective (Gilbert and Whittleworth 2009; Triegaardt 2013; Botha 2014).

The theoretical framework earlier in this paper revealed that teachers as leaders should also have an opportunity to take a leading role at school. The implementation of coaching models to facilitate meetings creates opportunities to lead and improve the school as a team. Participants explained that effective schools can even become more effective by implementing shared leadership and acceptance of accountability throughout the school. A participant (principal) stated in this regard: *"We give our post level 1 teachers the opportunity to sit in management and every three months we change one of them to give somebody else a chance so that they can see what happens at management level and so that they can go out and have a much better idea of how things work in a school. So, I think by doing that we develop the people and give them insight in this type of distributive action"*, while another participant (teacher) added: *"It will work because when leadership is distributive they don't take the duties of the principal as solely his or her own responsibility at that school, because people will just be careless at*

school and know that there is somebody who is responsible for this; so 'why should I do this?' But, if they have distributive leadership, then everything is shared amongst the personnel at school, so it becomes easy for everyone and everyone knows that he or she is accountable for the work that is done at school".

**Findings with Regard to Research
Sub-question 4: How Does One
Implement Coaching as a Distributive
Leadership Strategy to Ensure
Effective Schools?**

A description was given in the theoretical framework earlier of the human conduct of school leaders and it was revealed that they need to develop their leadership abilities to improve and sustain the sharing of best practices and innovation (Jameson 2007; Triegaardt 2013; Botha 2014). Implementing and participating in coaching practices should enable more teachers to get involved in this process through coaching (Edwards and Newton 1994). Recent efforts to democratise schools through the distribution of leadership have included efforts to empower teachers and professionalise teaching in the area of staff development by coaching the staff as discussed above in the theoretical framework.

Most coaching models are frameworks that provide a simple structure that helps to keep the coaching process focused and time effective (Triegaardt 2013). The empirical study proved that leaders are in need of personal training to become coaches in order to develop the teaching profession in South Africa. Only 4 out of 25 participants interviewed (16%) indicated that they had some form of training to become coaches, while a staggering 84% of the leaders still need training to become coaches. One of the participants (principal) mentioned: *"No, I haven't had any training in mentoring, coaching or anything like that"*, while another participant stated unambiguously: *"No, I have had no formal training"*.

**Findings with Regard to Research
Sub-question 5: How Can the OSCAR
Coaching Model be Conceptualised as a
Distributive Leadership Strategy to Ensure
Effectiveness in South African Schools?**

The theoretical framework earlier in the paper emphasised that developing and implement-

ing the OSCAR coaching model to facilitate meetings have an impact on well-managed meetings, save time, improve motivation, lead to better decision-making and quicker problem-solving and building stronger and more productive working relationships with team members (Gilbert and Whittleworth 2009; Triegaardt 2013). Any meeting that involves discussions, problem-solving and action planning is an opportunity for group coaching.

Group coaching involves providing leadership without taking the reins, focusing on asking questions instead of telling and listening while building consensus (Gilbert and Whittleworth 2009). It is the implementation of the process and the impact of team members' reactions on the process that form the basis of understanding the real purpose and the benefits of the OSCAR coaching model to facilitate meetings as a distributive leadership strategy. The purpose of the OSCAR coaching model in facilitating meetings is to provide a simple framework and structure that helps to keep the coaching process focussed and more time effective (Gilbert and Whittleworth 2009). The benefit of the OSCAR coaching model is that it works well for managers, because it is simple and easy to understand (Triegaardt 2013). A participant (principal) mentioned the following in this regard: *"When we have meetings I won't necessarily meet with everybody but they will feedback to me on a weekly basis. I have weekly one-on-one meetings with my heads of department where they will give feedback on their tasks that they have been given due to our distributive leadership system"*.

Gilbert and Whittleworth (2009) also clarified that leaders need to be in control of a situation when implementing the OSCAR coaching model in order to ensure school effectiveness. All meetings must have a clear purpose and the focus must be on the development of teaching and learning in the school. Important strategies of the OSCAR coaching model to facilitate meetings are choices, consequences and action. These strategies can have an influence on the development of the school. Every meeting must have a choice and a consequence. Group decision-making consists of brainstorming all the possible choices available, and then deciding on the best choice. Decision-making involves making the best selection from a list of choices. The process involves evaluating the pros and

cons of each choice (the consequences). In addition, every meeting must have an action. A clear sign of a wasted meeting is for everyone to leave without agreeing on clear action planning.

A well-formed outcome, a clear situation and a creative decision-making process with full involvement of all people in the group, will lead to committed action planning that involves answering three questions (Gilbert and Whittleworth 2009: 18), namely:

- ♦ What actions shall we take?
- ♦ Who will take each action?
- ♦ When will each of the actions be taken?

A clear action plan with agreed responsibilities is the sign of a productive meeting. However, the only real measure of success is if the actions actually take place and lead to the desired outcome. The desired outcome is an improved teaching and learning environment. These strategies have a clear link to shared leadership. The empirical study revealed that leaders share leadership tasks at meetings to improve the school. The implementation of the OSCAR coaching model to facilitate meetings can have a clear impact on whole school development and can create opportunities for leaders to interact (Triegaardt 2013). During the empirical phase of the paper, it was determined that all the schools are in need of strategic distribution in order to ensure effective teamwork; as one of the participants stated: *“Part of good teamwork is to distribute the work among the team”*.

CONCLUSION

The nature of this paper was exploratory and provided insights into the role of distributive leadership to ensure effective schools in South Africa through the OSCAR coaching model. The paper has highlighted that sharing leadership with a democratic approach (distributive leadership) can improve school effectiveness. The OSCAR coaching model to facilitate meetings advocates a systematic problem-solving process in which the coaching leader facilitates the enhancement of teaching and learning. When coaching opportunities arise during the day, the leader uses his or her facilitation skills to engage the employee in the problem-solving process.

The research findings have added to the body of knowledge surrounding the OSCAR coaching model to facilitate meetings by high-

lighting the core coaching skills that are most likely to promote a successful coaching outcome. The challenge that lies ahead is for leaders to acquire these coaching skills so that they can make the transition to become coaching leaders and develop the school in such a way.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The distribution of leadership is a strategy of shared responsibility between all school leaders. School management team members need to participate in decision-making. As distribution of leadership is not a common practice at most schools, principals should develop a plan together with their school management teams to take their schools to a higher level of competence by giving other stakeholders more accountability and responsibility. This paper revealed that it is to a principal's advantage to involve other role-players in decision-making. A distributive leadership approach will ensure that the staff buy into a particular project and accept ownership thereof. Principals should, therefore, apply the principles of distributive leadership effectively by involving all teacher leaders in the management of the school.

A staggering 86% of participants in this paper agreed that distributive leadership will improve ineffective (dysfunctional) schools. Goals should be set for teachers at dysfunctional schools, forcing them to work together as a team. Goals such as punctuality and attendance of teachers can be a starting point to be implemented. Goals can be set at the first meeting when the OSCAR coaching model is introduced at these dysfunctional schools. Guidelines should be developed and provided to all schools to spell out the effectiveness of the distributive leadership strategy to principals through interaction with other leaders. In addition, the senior management team should empower and employ shared leadership approaches instead of a top-down, controlled approach. Classroom leaders should be encouraged to work in teams rather than in isolation, while all stakeholders should be willing to share information in order to implement the OSCAR coaching model for the effective facilitation of meetings.

It is furthermore recommended that principals be provided with training and development to evaluate the effectiveness of coaching models by reinforcing teamwork, building trust and

facilitating collaborative decision-making throughout the school and in departments. Principals need to be supported with the implementation of the OSCAR coaching model in order to facilitate meetings effectively.

REFERENCES

- Angeli C, Valanides N 2012. Epistemological beliefs and ill-structured problem-solving in solo and paired contexts. *Educational Technology and Society*, 15(1): 2–14.
- Bendixen LD, Schraw G 2001. Why do Epistemological Beliefs Affect Ill-defined Problem Solving? *Paper Presented at the Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, Seattle, WA, 23 April.
- Bennett N, Wise C, Woods P, Harvey J 2003. *Distributed Leadership*. Oxford: Report for the National College for School Leadership.
- Botha, RJ 2013. *The Effective Management of a School: Towards Quality Outcomes*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Botha RJ 2014. Knowledge beliefs and problem-solving capabilities among South African school principals. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 38(3): 247–253.
- Carson JB, Tesluk PE, Marione JA 2007. Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 1217–1234.
- Cope M 2007. *The Seven Cs of Coaching: The Definitive Guide to Collaborative Coaching*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.
- Danielson C 2007. The many faces of leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 65(1): 17–24.
- Edwards JL, Newton RR 1994. The Effects of Cognitive Coaching and Teacher Efficacy and Thinking About Teaching. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education and Study Association*, 9 April. San Francisco, CA.
- Elmore R 2000. *Building a New Structure for School Leadership*. Washington DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Gilbert A, Whittleworth P 2009. *The OSCAR Coaching Model: Simplifying Workplace Coaching*. United Kingdom: Worth Consulting Ltd.
- Glew DJ, O'Learly-Kelley AM, Friggin RW, Van Fleet DD 1995. Participation in organizations: A preview of the issues and proposed framework for future analysis. *Journal of Management*, 21: 395–421.
- Gronn P 2003. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13: 423–451.
- Hafford-Letchfield T, Leonard K, Begum N, Chick NF 2007. *Leadership and Management in Social Care*. London: Sage.
- Harris A 2005. Leading or misleading? Distributed leadership and improvement. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(3): 255–265.
- Hatcher R 2005. The distribution of leadership and power in schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(2): 253–267.
- House RJ, Aditya RN 1997. The social scientific study of leadership: quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23: 409–473.
- Jameson J 2007. Investigating Collaborative Leadership for Communities of Practice in Learning and Skills. *Practitioner Study Programme 2006/07*. Lancaster University: CEL.
- Jonassen DH 1997. Instructional design models for well-structured and ill-structured problem-solving learning outcomes. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 4(1): 65–95.
- Kaplan B, Maxwell JA 1994. *Qualitative Study Methods for Evaluating Computer Information System in Evaluating Health Care Information Systems: Methods and Applications*. San Francisco Sage: Thousand Oaks.
- Krefting L 1991. Rigour in qualitative study: The assessment of trustworthiness. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 45(3): 214–222.
- Leithwood R, Reihl C 2003. *What We Know About Successful School Leadership*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Lewis M, Andrews D 2004. 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.
- Marishane RN, Botha RJ 2011. *School Leadership towards the Changing Context: A Case for School-Based Management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- MacBeath J 2005. Leadership as distributed: A matter of practice. *School Leadership and Management*, 25(4): 349–366.
- MacBeath J, Oduro GKT, Waterhouse J 2004. *Distributed Leadership: An Unpublished Study*. Oxford: National College for School Leadership.
- 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.
- McMillan JH, Schumacher S 1997. *Study in Education: A Conceptual Introduction*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Muijs D, Harris A 2003. Teacher leadership – improvement through empowerment. *Educational Management and Administration*, 31(4): 437–448.
- 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.
- Schraw G 2001. Current themes and future directions in epistemological research: A commentary. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(4): 451–464.
- Sinatra GM, Southerland SA, McConaughy F, Demastes JW 2003. Intentions and beliefs in students' understanding and acceptance of biological evolution. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(5): 510–528.
- Smylie M, Conley S, Marks HM 2002. Exploring new approaches to teacher leadership for school im-

- provement. In: J Murphy (Ed.): *The Educational Leadership Challenge: Redefining Leadership for the 21st Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 162–188.
- Spillane J, Halverson R, Diamond J 2001. *Towards a Theory of Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective*. Chicago: North-Western University, Institute for Policy Study.
- Stone FM 2007. *Coaching and Mentoring: How to Choose the Right Technique to Boost Employee Performance*. Melbourne, Australia: Institute for Teaching and School Leadership Limited.
- 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.
- York-Barr J, Duke K 2004. What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Study*, 74(3): 255–316.