The Impact of Purpose as a Principal Leadership Skill on the Performance of Select Township Schools in South Africa

P. Marais[1], Krishna K. Govender[2]*

[1]Regensys Business School, Sandton, South Africa, [2]University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa. *Email: govenderk@ukzn.ac.za

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the impact of "purpose" as a principal leadership skill on the performance of two township schools using a quantitative research design and collecting data from the school principals, teachers and matric learners, using the 28-scale Servant Leadership Test as well as Gallup's Q12 Employee Engagement survey. The questionnaires addressed the key objectives, namely, the extent to which the principals of the participating schools exhibited servant leadership and their understanding of "purpose" as one word in leadership and how teachers and learners perceived the impact of a "one-word" purpose-driven leader on the performance of the selected schools. Although no relationship could be demonstrated between "purpose" and the performance of the two township schools, it became evident that a significant increase in Servant Leadership leads to a significant increase in engagement and performance, as measured by the matric pass rate. It is recommended that workshops be facilitated with principals and teachers in order to entrench "purpose" deeper throughout the schools. In addition, Servant Leadership training has to conduced to increase the leadership ability of the school principals. Future research in the area of "purpose as one word," as well as Servant Leadership as a principal skillset within the South Africa's public school's leadership is recommended.

Keywords: Leadership, Schools, Servant Leadership, One-word Purpose
JEL Classifications: M14; I120

1. INTRODUCTION

Despite it being almost over two decades since South Africa attained democratic rule and demonic system of apartheid was dismantled, the country is still in a dire state, since the most critical contributor to the country's economy is drowned out by the largely dysfunctional basic education system. Schools are expected to maximize the potential of children through the facilitation of participative and vibrant spaces, led by leaders who are interested in the growth of others rather than their own interests (Christensen et al., 2008,). However, this ambition is unachievable due to the fact that of the 25,574 schools in South Africa, 80% are factually graded as dysfunctional (Department of Basic Education, 2018).

It may be surmised from the above that what is required to turnaround the current situation is "new age" leadership. Therefore,

the purpose of this study is to assess the impact of "purpose-led" leadership in its simplest form, on the performance of two township schools, within the context of a broken SA educational system.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership is defined as the process of motivating people to collaborate towards a common goal (Vroom and Jago, 2007. p. 18), and it is agreed by researchers in the field, that leadership plays a fundamental part in the success or failure of any business, political organization, schooling system or social movement (Koçak, 2019).

Leadership theory shows a clear distinction between conventional leadership and lateral leadership. It identifies conventional leadership as primarily characterized by the exertion of power which requires hierarchical processes, whereas lateral leadership

substitutes a subordinating approach with insight, innovation, collaboration and creativity, with the benefit of all stakeholders in mind (Koçak, 2019). Those who are privileged to lead others will recognize that during challenging times people look towards leadership more often and with even higher expectations. It is indeed uncanny how well the acronym VUCA defines the challenges leaders of organizations face in the context of COVID-19 today (Michelli, 2020). For this reason, people are now more than ever looking towards their leaders for clarity and hope in order to bring them together and empower them to move forward with confidence (Anderson, 2020). The VUCA world we live in also demands lateral leaders, unconventional thinkers that can find new ways in doing old things (Sloane, 2019).

Within this uncertain world, young people increasingly experience a mixture of anxiety and enthusiasm, asking themselves how they can lead, grow, thrive, and make a greater difference in the world. These young future leaders are interested in the "why" that could help to bear almost any "how" and therefore need to be led by leaders who are interested in the same things (Kian, 2019). The conscious shift in leadership theory has been 30 years in the making and has emerged as a response to the global organizational challenge of the absence of purpose and meaning in the workplace. Lack of meaning in turn has resulted in a reduction in staff engagement and performance, unethical behaviour, and the devastation of natural resources (Zhang et al., 2014). While *Transformational Leadership* builds on the foundation of *Transactional Leadership* (Bolden et al., 2003), it is the evolution of leaders into the realms of *Servant Leadership* and *Spiritual Leadership*, that truly opens the door for a more suitable style of leadership within an unconventional and VUCA world. Servant leaders in the words of Robert K. Greenleaf (Greenleaf. org, 2011), are leaders who make a conscious choice to be servants first. Ferguson and Milliman (2008:445) outline characteristics of *Spiritual Leadership* as being in service of the growth of people, living and leading authentically and most importantly, the articulation of a clearly defined *higher purpose*.

2.1. Servant Leadership

Emanuel (2018) stated that the era we are currently living in is characterised by self-serving leaders which is resulting in fragmenting organizations and has caused a breakdown in the fabric of society. From his study which aimed to explore school principal's understanding of servant leadership and the role they play within public schools, Emanuel (2018) concluded that servant leadership is considered a remarkable approach to sustainable success. A school principals' understanding of the value of their role as servant leaders revealed that principals had diverse and differing views of their roles as servant leaders (Emanuel, 2018). Moreover, they had a limited understanding of the value of servant leadership. This lack of understanding of the value of a servant leaders' role is evident in the principals' understanding of their roles as leaders, particularly, in relation to them being examples to their staff.

Wong (2019) explored the influence of servant leadership on teacher retention, as servant leadership is deemed as best-suited for the education setting, due to the fact that it naturally focusses on the growth of people. Results of the study further strengthened previous research, showing that servant leadership positively impacts on the satisfaction of teachers, which in turn improves retention. Anwar et al. (2018) reported that that empowerment, autonomy, giving space and responsibility, collectively had a significant effect on organizational citizenship behaviour and concluded that servant leadership significantly influenced overall school performance in a positive manner.

2.2. Purpose as One Word in Leadership

Purpose is why an organization exists and vision is aligned to purpose and dictates where an organization wants to get to, whereas mission is what bold moves the business has to take in order to achieve its vision, while values are to guide the behaviours of people towards delivering on all of the above. Since purpose sits at the heart of this ecosystem, it should be inspiring while striking a balance between aspiration and precision (Aziz, 2020). An organization's one word is its ultimate value, its purpose, its reason for being. It gives context to everything and clarity on what is best for the organization, its people, customers and all other stakeholders. It is an operating philosophy that can set an organization apart from all others (Carmichael, 2017). The difference between Purpose, Mission and Vision, is well articulated by Sooy (2013), where he explains that for people to connect to what an organization cares about, they need to be clear about how and what they do and why it matters. The "why" being the purpose statement of the organization that articulates clearly why you do what you do, the greater reason for its existence, its higher cause. The 'how' being the mission, the daily drive and delivery based on the purpose of the organization in order to achieve the "what," the vision the measurable impact the organization is aiming to make. Therefore, purpose gives clarity of focus as to why the organization exists, vision aligns it to its ultimate goal, and mission empowers the accomplishment of achieving the vision.

Based on the above logic, the "what" of a township school could be to obtain a 100% pass rate with 70% of matric learners achieving a bachelor's pass rate. The "how" could be through quality of teaching, quality of operations within the school, quality of discipline, mutual respect, inspiring nature of teachers and the quality of the environment in terms of infrastructure. The "why" will be the driver of both the "how" and the "what."

2.3 Purpose and Organizational Performance

Purpose enables organizations to tap into the basic human needs of individuals to be part of something great, generating higher engagement and output within businesses (Weinberger, 2020). A report by McKinsey titled "Profits with Purpose," supports this by confirming that companies with "purpose" outperform the stock market by 42% in terms of bottom line delivery (MEED, 2021). A study by Cvetanovski et al. (2021) involving more than 860 executives across the globe uncovered three elements that accelerates growth, namely creativity, analytics and purpose. Dhingra and Schaninger (2021) assert that seven out of ten people are reflecting on what their purpose could be due to the COVID-19 pandemic, reporting that people who are aligned to a greater sense of purpose at work are six and a half times more likely to have

higher resilience against the current challenges that faces our business environment.

It is against the above background that this research will focus on the "why," being the purpose of a township school and assess the impact of a "one-word" purpose-driven leader on staff and learner engagement, and the performance of two selected township schools, as reflected in the matric pass rate. The research will attempt to ascertain whether a "one-word purpose" could be a credible tool for the leadership of township schools that could be used for resolving their complexities.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The chosen research philosophy for this study is *Pragmatism*, and the approach is deductive, since quantitative data will be collected to compare the impact of purpose-based leadership on the performance of two township schools. Two populations will be investigated, namely township School A and township School B and a sample will be selected from among each population (Leedy, 2013:206), comprising teachers and learners. A sample size formula was used to ensure that the sample sizes selected from each population is specifically calculated to achieve a margin of error of 5% at a 95% confidence level (Deziel, 2018). The final ideal sample size is thus proposed in Table 1.

3.1. Data Collection and Analysis

In the first part, each principal was requested to complete an unprompted questionnaire to ascertain their consciousness and understanding of their school's purpose in one word, as well as the meaning of that word. Thereafter, each principal was provided with a questionnaire in which they were prompted to select one word from five, and match the selected word with its nearest meaning, also as from an option of five. Each principal was then asked to do a self-assessment by completing Liden's quantitative Servant Leadership Test (Liden et al., 2015), in order for their own views to be compared to those of their subordinates. The chosen samples of teachers from both School A and School B also completed Liden's 28-scale Servant Leadership Test questionnaire in order to assess their views of their principal as a servant leader (Liden et al., 2015). Each group of teachers also completed Gallup's Q2 Employee Engagement Survey (gullup.com), to measure the engagement level of each group of teachers from School A and School B.

Each group of learners also completed Liden's quantitative 28-scale Servant Leadership Test in order to assess their views of their principal as a servant leader (Liden et al., 2015). Lastly, each group of learners completed an adapted version of Gallup's Q12 Employee Engagement Survey (gallup.com) questionnaire to measure the level of engagement of each group of matric learners within School A and School B.

Table 1: Sample size

	School A	School B
Principal	1	1
Teachers	68	48
Learners	208	136

3.2. Reliability and Validity

Cronbach's alpha was used to measure whether or not an overall score across various questions are reliable and values above 0.8 (Field, 2009) were considered to be a high level of reliability. In terms of construct validity, Liden's 28-scale Servant Leadership Test (Liden, et al., 2015), and Gallup's Q12 Employee Engagement Survey (gallup.com) were used and previously validated both internationally and in the SA context (Grobler and Flotman, 2020). Nevertheless, there was need to determine their validity using Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

Table 2 reflects the response rate which is very good across all sample groups and was exceed with respect to the learners of School B.

4.1. Reliability and Validity

As can be seen in both Tables 3 and 4, the Servant Leadership questionnaire and Gallup's engagement questionnaire are both found to be reliable.

To ascertain construct validity confirmatory factor analysis were performed based on the scale information and only the multiple Goodness of Fit indices are reported in Table 5, which confirm that the instrument was valid.

Gallup's Q12 Employee Engagement Survey (gallup.com), is also accepted as valid, with a Minimum Sample Discrepancy divided by Degrees of Freedom (CMIN/DF) just over 3, a Comparative Fit Index (CFI) almost 0.9, and a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) value smaller than 0,10 (Table 6, all of which also indicates good fit).

Table 2: Response Rate

	School A		School B	
Principal	1	1	1	1
Teachers	68	63	48	40
Learners	208	197	136	164

Table 3: Servant Leadership questionnaire reliability

Seven pillars	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean inter-item correlation
Emotional healing	0.569	0.251
Creating value for the community	0.773	0.462
Conceptual skills	0.791	0.489
Empowering	0.523	0.223
Helping subordinates grow and succeed	0.728	0.403
Putting subordinates first	0.733	0.410
Behaving ethically	0.640	0.308

Table 4: Reliability of Employee engagement 1

Cronbach's Alpha	Mean Inter item correlation
0.799	0.262

Table 5: Servant Leadership questionnaire validity

CMIN/DF	CFI	RMSEA	LO90	HI90
2.653	0.881	0.068	0.055	0.064

4.2. Awareness of One-word Purpose

In terms of awareness of the one-word purpose, both principals displayed full understanding and awareness; however, only 7.9% of teachers from School A and 12.5% of teachers from School B understood the one word that their school stood for. Similarly, only 9.1% of all learners from School A were aware of the one word which their school stood for, while the vast majority (79.9%) of the sample of learners for School B understood what was the "one-word" purpose of their school.

4.3. Servant Leadership

Both Principal A and Principal B strongly perceive themselves as being Servant Leaders. The most notable difference in data between School A and School B is observed in the teachers' assessment of their principals in terms of Servant Leadership. In terms of the learner's perception of their principal as a Servant Leader, a variable of medium significance is detected in only 5 out of 28 questions between Principal A and Principal B, while a question of high significance is indicated by Question 3, "Our Principal can tell if something is wrong" (0.421). The highest difference between Principal A and Principal B was detected in Question 7, "Our Principal holds high ethical standards" (0.509).

4.4. Teachers' and Learners' Engagement

Although no significant variable is detected between School A and School B in terms of learner's engagement, with only 4 of 12 questions showing medium significance according to the Phi Co-efficient, a marked difference is shown in teachers' engagement. While only 1 out of the 12 questions resulted in no significant

difference in proportions between the engagement of the teachers of School A and School B, 7 out of 12 areas shows medium significance in difference, while 4 out of 12 areas indicate practical significance in variance of teachers' engagement.

4.5. Relationship between Purpose Statements, Servant Leadership and Engagement

Overall, a small level of significance is detected in the relationship between purpose and Servant Leadership and purpose and Engagement in terms of teachers from School A and School B. As is evident from Table 7, the purpose statements of the schools did have a small level of significant impact on perception of conceptual skills of principals, perception of the leaders being empowering, putting their subordinates first and behaving ethically. The "purpose" words of School A and School B also had a small effect on perception of teachers that leadership empowers subordinates.

In terms of both samples of learners, an even smaller level of significance is detected in the relationship between purpose and Servant Leadership and purpose and Engagement, as seen in Table 8 below. The purpose statements of the schools again show a small level of significant impact on perception of conceptual skills of principals and perception of their ethical skills. The purpose description of School A and School B also had a small effect on perception of leadership being ethical, and again on overall engagement level of learners.

4.6. Comparison of the Schools' Performance

A comparison between School A and School B is presented in Table 9 in terms of matric pass rate, bachelor's pass rate and percentage distinctions per annum over a period of 3 years. By using Cohen's D-effect size to indicate significant variances between the data, where >0.8 is considered practically significant,

Table 6: Engagement questionnaire validity

CMIN/DF	CFI	RMSEA	LO90	HI90
3.124	0.899	0.068	0.055	0.064

Table 7: Purpose, servant leadership and engagement relationship – -teachers' perspective

	Purpose word	Purpose statement	Purpose Description	Purpose Definition
SLQ emotional healing				
R-square	0.020690	0.043830	0.001783	0.064460
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.0594	0.0250	0.7038	0.0027
SLQ value community				
R-square	0.002208	0.02195	0.007109	0.010280
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.6595	0.1468	0.4552	0.03326
SLQ conceptual skills				
R-square	0.000046	0.024770	0.014850	0.012970
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.9427	0.0412	0.2641	0.2158
SLQ empowering				
R-square	0.044280	0.050230	0.000255	0.016470
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.0193	0.0160	0.8900	0.1558
SLQ subordinates grow				
R-square	0.000132	0.02357	0.000000	0.005579
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.9032	0.1390	0.9944	0.4362
SLQ subordinates first				
R-square	0.003857	0.06838	0.000661	0.02932
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.5600	0.0107	0.8194	0.0769
SLQ behave ethically				
R-square	0.000482	0.038020	0.000209	0.019790
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.8440	0.0419	0.9010	0.1523
Engagement				
R-square	0.024950	0.019700	0.0000028	0.004013
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.0392	0.2055	0.9607	0.5165

Table 8: Purpose, servant leadership and engagement relationship – learners' perspectives

	Purpose word	Purpose statement	Purpose Description	Purpose definition
SLQ emotional healing				
R-square	0.004950	0.007660	0.000015	0.001330
Sig. (2-tailed)	1.7520	0.0877	0.9401	0.4928
SLQ value community				
R-square	0.000185	0.001020	0.008221	0.000798
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.7922	0.4975	0.0874	0.5825
SLQ conceptual skills				
R-square	0.008447	0.026250	0.010060	0.007846
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.0804	0.0010	0,0567	0.0999
SLQ empowering				
R-square	0.000692	0.000000	0.003915	0.000423
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.6171	0.2387	0.2387	0.7055
SLQ subordinates grow				
R-square	0.000000	0.005226	0.003871	0.005019
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.9873	0.1283	0.2406	0.1810
SLQ subordinates first				
R-square	0.003236	0.000623	0.004091	0.000055
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.2097	0.6020	0.2204	0.8912
SLQ behave ethically				
R-square	0.002875	0.014030	0.016400	0.003671
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.3059	0.0173	0.0136	0.2550
Engagement				
R-square	0.000221	0.001604	0.013070	0.004197
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.7842	0.3804	0.0325	0.2195

Table 9: Comparison of Performance between School A and School B

	2018	2019	2020	Mean	Std Deviation	Cohen's D-effect size	T-test P-value
Percentage passed							
A	87.90	96.10	97.90	93.95	5.35	2.390	0.043
B	87.30	76.80	78.30	80.80	5.66		
Bachelor pass rate							
A	47.30	66.10	80.40	64.80	16.80	1.370	0.231
B	51.00	46.60	47.50	48.37	2.32		
Percentage distinctions							
A	23.90	37.94	49.25	37.03	12.70	0.515	0.564
B	47.27	25.83	15.50	29.53	16.21		

a profound variable in matric pass rate (2.390) and a significant variable in bachelor's pass rate (1.370) are detected. A notable medium variance of 0.595 is also detected in the variance of percentage of distinctions between the two schools.

5. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Evidence shows that purpose seemingly remains the most misunderstood buzzword of today, with lack of understanding and implementation being highlighted. For example, only 28% of respondents in a PWC (2019) employee survey reported that their organization delivers on its said purpose. This study revealed that both Principal A and Principal B had failed to implement their own school's purpose within their organizations. This statement is supported by the low levels of understanding and awareness pertaining to purpose, amongst teacher and learner samples from both schools who participated in this study.

Both leaders perceive themselves as highly capable Servant Leaders with Principal B rating himself higher in 5 out of the 7 pillars of Servant Leadership, while Principal A rated himself higher in only 2 out of the 7 areas. The one-word purpose of School A was *Light*, and its interpretation is *To be a beacon of light* and that of was *Success*, and its interpretation is *To successfully produce quality, self-reliant, responsible citizens*. Both school principals are found to show high levels of understanding their school's one-word purpose.

Teachers from School A showed significantly higher engagement levels than teachers from School B. Teachers from School A further showed 20% higher overall engagement than teachers from school B. Overall, the engagement level of learners from School A was only moderately higher that learners from School B, as shown by the learner's group statistics comparison.

It became apparent that the significant variance in the performance of the two schools cannot be attributed to the impact of a "one-word" purpose-driven leader. In terms of Servant Leadership, Principal A was scored 27.61% higher than Principal B by teachers, which implies that Principal A is perceived by teachers as a higher-level Servant Leader than Principal B. Principal A also scored 7.7% higher than Principal B by learners. Teachers from School A were significantly more engaged than teachers from School B, while learners from School A were only slightly more engaged than learners from School B.

A significant difference was reported between the output of School A and School B in terms of pass rate, with School A's mean score being 13.15% higher than that of School B, over a period of 3 years. A significant difference was also reported between the output of School A and School B in terms of bachelor pass rate, with School A's mean score being 16.23% higher than that of School B, over a period of 3 years. A medium difference between the output of School A and School B was reported in terms of the percentage of distinctions, with School A's mean score being 7.5% higher than School B's mean, over a 3-year period. It is however important to note that the percentage distinctions have significantly declined in the case of School B, from 47.27%, to 25.83%, to 15.50%. At the same time, distinctions from School A have significantly increased from 23.90%, to 37.94%, to 49.25%. This means that in 2020, School A has achieved more than 3 times the total of distinctions than what was achieved by School B.

It is therefore surmised that a high-level Servant Leader who leads a township school, can result in higher levels of staff engagement, ultimately resulting in higher levels of matric pass rate, including quality pass rate based on bachelor results and percentage of distinctions.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study, although not succeeding in demonstrating that "purpose" is a principal leadership skill that can impact the performance of township schools, still adds to the leadership literature in that Servant Leadership not only positively impacts the engagement levels of teachers, but is also likely to lead to higher levels of output in terms of matric pass rate, bachelor pass rate, and overall percentage of distinctions. This implies that if focus could be on the development of the leadership styles of principals, Servant Leadership could potentially lead our educational system towards higher levels of success in future.

Although both principals are clear on the purpose of their schools, neither have managed to implement their school's purpose fully. It is therefore recommended that both principals and the teachers are trained on the difference between purpose, mission, and vision, using Burkus's (2020) tool. It is also recommended that strategic workshops are held with both principals, their deputies and their heads of departments, in order to align their schools' purposes with their values and vision, and in doing so create clear direction for each school. Finally, it is recommended that a Servant Leadership course is identified, for each of the principals to attend, in order to increase their skills as Servant Leaders.

The findings are based on a quantitative study and considering the research topic, a mixed methods strategy may allow for probing some of the concepts pertaining to "purpose." Furthermore, Gallup's Engagement questionnaire was designed for corporate institutions, and although all questions are relevant to teachers within the working environment of a township school, it is questionable whether this tool is totally relevant for testing the engagement levels of learners.

In schools, teachers are the subordinates of principals, while learners are technically the subordinates of teachers. It is therefore likely that teachers would have a more informed view of the leadership styles of their principals than the learners. For this reason, this study could have been more robust if the samples were reduced to include only teachers, in doing so allowing for qualitative interviews with both teacher samples to gather a better understanding of the leadership style of their principals.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E. (2020), How To Lead Well Through Change'. Erika Andersen, Founding Partner of Proteus International Forbes. Available from: https://www.forbes.com/sites/erikaandersen/2020/06/23/how-to-lead-well-through-change/?sh=1d01238c3370 [Last accessed on 2021 Jun 12].

Anwar, M.N., Khizar, A., Malik, M.A. (2018), Servant leadership and school performance: Mediating effect of teachers' organizational citizenship behavior. International Journal of Health planning and Management, 6(7), 15-21. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325069783_Servant_Leadership_and_School_Performance_Mediating_Effect_of_Teachers%27_Organizational_Citizenship_Behavior [Last accessed on 2021 Jul 17].

Aziz, A. (2020), The Power of Purpose: The 7 Elements of a Great Purpose Statement, Forbes. Available from: https://www.forbes.com/sites/afdhelaziz/2020/02/18/the-power-of-purpose-the-7-elements-of-a-great-purpose-statement/?sh=33a53c323fad [Last accessed on 2021 Jul 28].

Carmichael, E. (2017), Find Your Core Drive: Your One Word', Productivity Game. Available from: https://Www.Youtube.Com/Watch?V=25ht5njkmom [Last accessed 2021 Jul 31].

Christensen, C.M., Horn, H.B., Johnson, C.W. (2008), Disrupting Class. How Disruptive Innovation Will Change the Way the World Learns. New York, United States: McGraw-Hill.

Cvetanovski, B., Jojart, O., Gregg, B., Hazan, E., Perrey, J. (2021), The Growth Triple Play: Creativity, Analytics and Purpose. Atlanta, United States: McKinsey and Company. Available from: https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/marketing-and-sales/our-insights/the-growth-triple-play-creativity-analytics-and-purpose [Last accessed on 2021 Jul 18].

Department of Basic Education. (2018), Education Statistics in South Africa. Available from: https://www.education.gov.za/portals/0/documents/publications/education%20statisti%20sA%202016.pdf?ver=2018-11-01-095102-947 [Last accessed on 2020 May 25].

Deziel, C. (2018), The Effects of a Small Sample Size Limitation. Garrisonville: Virginia Sciencing. Available from: https://www.sciencing.com/effects-small-sample-size-limitation-8545371.html [Last accessed on 2021 Aug 09].

Dhingra, N., Schaninger, B. (2021), The Search for Purpose at Work. Atlanta, United States: McKinsey and Company. Available from: https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/the-search-for-purpose-at-work [Last accessed on 2021 Jul 20].

Emanuel, S. (2018), Exploring School Principals Understanding and Practices of Servant Leadership', Research Space. Available from: https://www.researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/xmlui/handle/10413/18291 [Last accessed on 2021 Jul 15].

Ferguson, J., Milliman, J. (2008), Creating effective core organizational values: A spiritual leadership approach. International Journal of Public Administration, 31(4), 439-459.

Field, A. (2009), Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications.

Grobler, A., Flotman, A. (2020), The validation of the servant leadership scale. SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 46(3), a1754.

Kian, K. (2019), 6 Pieces of Wisdom to Help Young Leaders Thrive in Uncertain Times. Atlanta, United States: McKinsey and Company. Available from: https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/the-organization-blog/6-pieces-of-wisdom-to-help-young-leaders-thrive-in-uncertain-times [Last accessed on 2021 Jun 12].

Koçak, R. (2019), Leadership without hierarchy and authority: Lateral leadership. International Journal of Social Inquiry, 12(6), 657-680.

Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Meuser, J.D., Hu, J., Wu, J., Liao, C. (2015), Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. The Leadership Quarterly, 26(2), 254-269.

Michelli, J. (2020), VUCA, Coronavirus, and Tools for Human Experience Leadership. The Michelli Experience. Available from: https://www.josephmichelli.com/blog/vuca-coronavirus-human-experience-leadership [Last accessed on 2021 June 12].

PWC. (2019), The Power of Strategic Purpose. Strategy and Motivation. Available from: https://www.strategyand.pwc.com/gx/en/unique-solutions/capabilities-driven-strategy/approach/research-motivation.html [Last accessed on 2021 Aug 28].

Sooy, B. (2013), The Difference Between Purpose, Mission, and Vision. United States: Aespire. Available from: https://www.aespire.com/blog/communications/the-difference-between-your-purpose-and-mission [Last accessed on 2021 Mar 06].

Vroom, V.H., Jago, A.G. (2007), The role of the situation in leadership. American Psychologist, 62(1), 17-24; discussion 43-7.

Wong, R. (2019), Exploring the Influence of Servant Leadership on Teacher Satisfaction and Retention, CUP ED. Doctoral Dissertations, Thesis. Available from: https://www.digitalcommons.csp.edu/cup_commons_grad_edd/417 [Last accessed on 2021 Jul 17].

Zhang, T.C, Avery, G., Bergsteiner, H., More, E. (2014), The relationship between leadership paradigms and employee engagement. Journal of Global Responsibility, 5(1), 4-21.