

SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS IN GAUTENG: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR  
SCHOOL-BASED MANAGERS

by

NOMBASA NCEDIWE SOGA

Submitted in part fulfillment of the requirements for  
the degree of

MASTERS OF EDUCATION

in the subject

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF A E VAN ZYL

15 JUNE 2004

## ***ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS***

I would like to acknowledge the people who played a significant role in assisting me to pursue and to complete this research. My sincere gratitude and appreciation is directed at the following people and institutions:

My husband, Sipiwo, for his unwavering support, understanding and encouragement.

My children, Tiyo and Hloma, for giving me space to pursue my studies.

My colleague, Dr Lekgotla Mafisa, for giving me guidance and showing me the way when I started with my research.

My colleague, Mannie Ferreira, for supporting and encouraging me all the way.

Prof. A.E.Van Zyl, for his patience and the inspiring guidance and support throughout my studies.

My employer, the Gauteng Department of Education, for making it possible for me to pursue my studies.

Rebonwe Primary School, for their assistance in empirical research.

Eqinisweni Secondary School, for their assistance in empirical research.

Bonwelong Primary School, for their assistance in empirical research.

My mother, Lulama and my late father, Malixole Caledon, for giving me a good base and to enable me to value education.

All my friends, acquaintances and colleagues for their ongoing support.

Student number: **3279-141-0**

I declare that SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS IN GAUTENG: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR SCHOOL BASED MANAGERS is my own work and that all sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

---

(MRS N N SOGA

## SUMMARY

Self-management is a relatively new concept in South Africa. The transformation of education after 1994 resulted in the promulgation of the South African Schools Act (SASA) 84 of 1996, which started the process of decentralisation of education. The SASA mandates the school governing bodies (SGBs) to play an active role in decision making in schools. The justification for the self-management of schools is that it promotes effectiveness and efficiency in schools.

The aim of the study was to investigate the challenges that are faced and the benefits/opportunities that exist for self-managing schools. The secondary aim of the study was to investigate how self-managing schools could be supported so that they become more efficient and effective.

This study focuses on 2 ex-DET self-managing schools in Gauteng. The findings reveal that teamwork amongst educators, parents and communities is essential for self-managing schools to be effective and efficient.

### Key concepts

school-based managers

self-managing schools

section 21 functions

decentralisation

devolution

school governing body

school management team

principals

ex DET schools

ex Model C schools

## **ACRONYMS**

<b>BEE</b>	Black Economic Empowerment
<b>CEO</b>	Chief Executive Officer
<b>DET</b>	Department of Education and Training
<b>EMS</b>	Economic and Management Sciences
<b>ERA</b>	Education Reform Act
<b>GDE</b>	Gauteng Department of Education
<b>HOD</b>	Head of Department
<b>HSS</b>	Human and Social Sciences
<b>IDSO</b>	Institutional Development and Support Official
<b>LLC</b>	Language Literacy and Communication
<b>LO</b>	Life Orientations
<b>LMS</b>	Local Management of Schools
<b>LSM</b>	Learning Support Material
<b>NECC</b>	National Education Coordinating Committee
<b>NGO</b>	Non Governmental Organisations
<b>NZCER</b>	New Zealand Council for Educational Research
<b>OBE</b>	Outcomes Based Education
<b>OFSTED</b>	Office for standards in Education
<b>PFMA</b>	Public Finance Management Act
<b>PTSA</b>	Parent Teacher Student Association
<b>RNCS</b>	Revised National Curriculum Statements
<b>SASA</b>	South African Schools Act
<b>SGB</b>	School Governing Body
<b>SMT</b>	School Management Team

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### *CHAPTER ONE*

#### BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

1.1 Introduction	1-3
1.2 Motivation for the research	3
1.3 Description of the problem and problem formulation	4-5
1.4 Aims of the study	6
1.5 Significance of the study	6
1.6 Scope of the study	6
1.7 Limitations of the study	7
1.8 Methodological issues	7-8
1.9 Definition of terms	9
1.10 Demarcation of the study	9-10
1.11 Conclusion	10

## CHAPTER TWO

### *LITERATURE REVIEW*

<b>2.1 Introduction</b>	11
2.2 Defining self-managing schools	11-12
2.3 Background to self-managing schools in SA	12-15
2.4 Self-management initiatives from other countries	15
2.4.1 <i>Self-management of schools in the UK</i>	15-16
2.4.2 <i>Australia</i>	17-19
2.4.3 <i>United States of America</i>	20-22
2.4.4 <i>New Zealand</i>	22-25
2.5 Commonalities pertaining to self-managing schools	25
2.6 Self-managing schools and learner performance	26-27
2.7 Salient aspects for efficient self-management of schools	28-29
2.8 Conclusion	29-30

## CHAPTER THREE

### *RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS*

<b>3.1 Introduction</b>	31
3.2 Research design	31-32
3.3 Qualitative research approach	32
<i>3.3.1 Characteristics of qualitative research</i>	32-34
3.4 Ethics in qualitative research	34-36
3.5 Validity, generalizability and reliability in qualitative research	36
3.5.1 Methodological Principles	36
<i>3.5.1.1 Validity</i>	36
<i>3.5.1.2 Reliability</i>	37
<i>3.5.1.3 Generalizability</i>	37
3.6 Data collection methods	37
3.6.1 Interviews	38
<i>3.6.1.1 Open ended interviews</i>	38-39



3.6.2 Observation	40
3.6.3 Analysis of documents	41
3.7 Data management and analysis	41-42
<i>3.7.1 Data Management of the present study</i>	42-43
3.8 Conclusion	43

## CHAPTER FOUR

### *FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION OF EMPIRICAL RESEARCH*

<b>4.1 Introduction</b>	44
4.2 Research design	44-45
4.3 Methodology in brief	45
4.4 Data collection and analysis	45
4.5 Problems experienced	46
4.6 What was the researcher looking for?	46
4.7 Presentation of findings	47
4.7.1 Challenges faced by managers of self-managing schools	47-51
4.7.2 Benefits/opportunities for self-managing schools	51-52

4.7.3 Changing roles	52
4.7.3.1 <i>Changing roles of principals</i>	53
4.7.3.2 <i>Changing roles of SMTs</i>	53
4.7.3.3 <i>Changing roles of SGBs</i>	53-54
4.7.4 Self-management and learner performance	54-55
4.7.5 How can self-managing school be supported in order to be more efficient	55
4.7.5.1 <i>Support from parents and communities</i>	55-56
4.7.5.2 <i>Support needed from the government</i>	57-58
4.7.5.3 <i>Support needed from the business world</i>	58
4.8 Discussion of findings	59
4.8.1 The challenges of self-management	59-63
4.8.2 Benefits/opportunities of self-management	63-65
4.8.3 Self-management and learner performance	65-68
4.8.4 How can self-managed schools be managed to make them more efficient	68
4.8.4.1 <i>Support from parents and communities</i>	69-70
4.8.4.2 <i>Support from the government</i>	70-71

4.8.4.3 <i>Support from the business world</i>	71-72
4.9 Field Notes	72
4.9.1 Observation of meetings	72-73
4.9.2 Analysis of documents	73
4.10 Salient aspects for efficient self-management	73-74
4.11 Conclusion	74

## CHAPTER FIVE

### ***SUMMARIES, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS***

5.1 <b>Introduction</b>	75
5.2 Summaries	75
5.2.1 <i>Chapter two</i>	75-76
5.2.2 <i>Chapter three</i>	76
5.2.3 <i>Chapter four</i>	76
5.3 <b>Conclusions</b>	76
5.3.1 Benefits of self-management	77
5.3.2 Challenges of self-management	77-78

5.3.3	How can self-managed schools be supported	78
5.4	<b>Limitations</b>	79
5.5	<b>Recommendations</b>	79-80
6.	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	81-84
<b>ANNEXURES</b>	A1 & A2 B1-B6 C1-C3	



## CHAPTER ONE

### *INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH*

#### 1.1 INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

School-based management as a theoretical construct has been around since the 1960s. Recently it has become the centrepiece of current reforms in the countries of New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Australia, North America and Canada. Reforms concerning school-based management were promulgated by law, inter alia. the *Education Reform Act of 1988* in the United Kingdom and the *Education Act of 1989* in New Zealand (Caldwell & Spinks 1988:11-12; also see 2.4.1 and 2.4.4).

The education system in South Africa has changed after 1994 and is now based on the worldwide trend towards self-managing schools. The trend implies moving away from centralized, bureaucratic control of education towards the self-management of schools. The assumptions are that schools run effectively and better if school communities are given control of their own affairs (SA. Administration: Dept. of Education 2000). *The Education White Paper 2 on the organisation, governance and funding of schools* called for "democratic governance and school-based decision making in line with provincial guidelines" (South Africa 1996, sec. 3.1).

The trend towards devolving powers to schools was consolidated in the *South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996* (SASA). Self-Management in schools is reflected in section 20 and 21 of the *South African Schools Act*.

- Section 20: This section gives the School Governing Bodies (SGBs) the responsibility to develop policies, support the staff in the performance of their functions, adopt a constitution, develop the mission statement of the school, administer and control

school property, recommend the appointment of educators and employ and pay educators out of the SGB funds.

Section 21: This section makes provision for parents to assume joint responsibility with the education authorities for the provision and control of education and training in schools and gives schools extra allocated functions to control their own finances through, inter alia, extra-curricular fundraising functions (South Africa 1996, sec. 21). By allocating Section 21 functions to schools, the Head of Gauteng Department of Education (GDE) has given new meaning to the idea of democracy in the schools.

According to GDE circular 55/99, the allocation of Section 21 functions to schools are based on the following criteria:

- ❑ The school must have a democratically elected school governing body (SGB), and
- ❑ the SGB must have the capacity to ensure:
  - proper management systems, namely, planning and monitoring mechanisms;
  - proper budgeting and accounting systems that will ensure proper use of funds;
  - a safe and secure storage facility, and adequate administrative systems to perform section 21 functions;
  - capacity building programmes aimed at developing its members (South Africa 1999, circ.55/99).

Self-management refers to the following aspects of schools (SA. Manual on Self-Managing Schools 2000:7).

- ❑ power is shared between governing bodies and school management teams (SMTs);
- ❑ each school designs its own learning programmes within national guidelines which suit its learners' needs and interests;
- ❑ each school does its own development plan, i.e. its own vision and mission statement, decides on its particular priorities and draws up its own action plan;
- ❑ each school arranges its finances in a way that should meet its own needs and plans (each school should therefore draw up its own budget and raise funds);
- ❑ each school manages its staff and motivates and develops them to provide the best possible teaching and learning;

- ❑ each school negotiates its particular code of conduct and policies, for example, the admission policy, the language policy, religious policy, financial policy etc. (these, however, have to be in line with national principles);
- ❑ each school manages its own physical resources and is responsible for maintaining and developing the school property and equipment (SA. Administration: Dept. of Education 2000).

## 1.2 MOTIVATION FOR THE RESEARCH

The interest in conducting this study started when the researcher was working at the N6 Gauteng District Office of Education as the governance officer in 2000. During the interactions with schools and SGBs, the researcher realized that ex-DET schools often experience problems such as, inter alia, mismanagement of finances, lack of parental involvement, lack of team spirit amongst educators, conflicts between the SMTs and SGBs, conflicts between the SMTs and educators, learner disciplinary problems, run down conditions of school premises and principals and educators who sometimes feel that they are unable to take responsibility for the school's performance. These schools experienced these problems as compared to ex-Model C schools.

Ex-DET schools were previously under the control of the Department of Education and Training (DET) and are usually 'black schools' which are mostly situated in townships, informal settlements and rural areas. Ex-Model C schools were previously under the control of the House of Assembly during the apartheid era and are usually 'white schools'. Per capita expenditure among these systems was quite disparate and unequal, with the highest per capita spent on 'White schools' and least in the ex-DET schools. The learner/educator ratio ranged from 1:18 in ex-Model C schools to 1:70 in ex-DET schools and poor rural schools. There were also different admission policies and so access to schools was also not equal across the system. In 1994 the annual per capita expenditure by the state for schools from the most advantaged (White schools) was R5 403 per learner compared to R1 053 per learner for most Black schools (International Conference on Education and Decentralisation 2002:175). The ex-Model C schools tend to be situated in more affluent areas and are generally much better provided for than the ex-DET schools.



This study will try to explore the challenges faced by managers of self-managed schools in ex-DET schools in Gauteng. Part of the study will explore the opportunities for growth and development brought about by the self-management of these schools.

### **1.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM AND PROBLEM FORMULATION**

As stated earlier, the current situation in Gauteng Public Schools is that there is a significant difference between ex-DET public schools and ex-Model C schools in terms of the quality of management. Gauteng province has 2500 schools of which 1289 are self-managing schools. Only 819 ex-DET schools have been allocated section 21 functions whilst the remaining 470 ex-Model C schools have been allocated section 21 functions (Section 21 schools 2001-2). The allocation of section 21 functions to all the 470 ex-Model C schools is a result of the assumption that conditions in those schools are conducive for managing their own affairs. It is believed that ex-model C schools are able to manage their own finances, that parents and communities are capable of taking ownership of their schools, that management and governance systems are in place and that SGBs are functional.

According to Bordia (1997:1-3), the following are some of the problems that exist in ex-DET schools:

- ❑ Lack of accountability:

When schools were tightly controlled by Provincial Departments it was easy for ex-DET schools to blame the government when things went wrong or when things failed to happen, but now that many schools run their own affairs, they have to take more responsibility and use their resources smarter in order to achieve their goals. A lack of accountability exists since self-management is new to ex-DET schools.

- ❑ Lack of financial control and financial management:

Schools are required to draw up their own budgets and manage their own finances in ways that will meet their needs and plans. Most ex-DET principals and governing bodies often lack skills pertaining to financial control and management.

- ❑ Weak leadership:

Some principals are not able to manage their schools or their staff and learners in ways that will motivate them to provide the best possible teaching and learning.

❑ Lack of initiation and innovation:

Principals are expected to be abreast with the latest developments and to be agents of change in their schools. However, this is still not the case with some principals in the ex-DET schools.

❑ Conflicts between SGBs and school management teams (SMTs):

The school governing bodies and the school management teams need to share power and responsibility to work cooperatively. This seems to be a problem in most ex-DET schools.

The inequality among South African schools results from historical advantages that White schools enjoyed and disadvantages that Black schools suffered. Prior to the 1994 democratic elections, the apartheid laws favoured ex-Model C schools (SA. Administration: Dept. of Education 2000). This resulted in all 470 ex-Model C schools having been given blanket allocation of all Section 21 functions.

As stated earlier, the blanket allocation of section 21 functions to all the 470 ex-Model C schools in Gauteng is based on the assumption that ex-Model C schools are better prepared than ex-DET schools to be self-managing. Support by the provincial Department of Education is needed so that all schools in Gauteng can become self-managing (SA. Administration: Dept of Education 2000). Because of the problems in ex-DET schools, this study will focus on 2 self-managing, ex-DET schools in Gauteng and will attempt to answer the following questions:

- ❑ What are the challenges faced by managers of self-managed schools?
- ❑ What opportunities are brought about by the self-management of schools?
- ❑ How can self-managed schools be supported?

The existing challenges that are facing ex-DET South African schools, with particular reference to the Gauteng Province, led to the aims of this study as outlined below.

#### **1.4 AIMS OF THE STUDY**

The primary aim of the study is to investigate the challenges that are faced by school managers and the opportunities that exist for managers of self-managed schools to improve the overall performance or functionality of their schools.

The secondary aim is to provide a framework on how self managed schools can be supported so that:

- ❑ schools are empowered to manage and control their finances;
- ❑ schools are capable of building strong leadership in both their school management teams, governing bodies as well as educators;
- ❑ schools can develop a sense of responsibility, accountability and ownership of their decision making.

#### **1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The findings of this research will be useful to the Gauteng Department of Education and to the South African education as a whole to:

- ❑ enrich the knowledge base pertaining to self-managing schools and the challenges these schools face, and
- ❑ provide recommendations on how self-managed schools could be supported.

#### **1.6 SCOPE OF STUDY**

The study will be conducted at Eqinisweni Secondary School and Rebonwe Primary School. Both are self-managing ex-DET schools in the Johannesburg East District. Permission was granted to conduct research in these schools (see annexures A1 & A2). The reason for choosing the schools is that they are reachable and that the researcher will be able to attend meetings that are held in the evenings and during weekends. The other reason for choosing the schools is that they are representative of semi-urban ex-DET schools.

## **1.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The study will only be conducted in 2 schools in Gauteng, as it is impossible for the researcher to conduct research in all the 819 self-managing ex-DET schools. The intention of the study is not to generalize the findings to all other schools or to schools in similar situation but to establish salient features that are necessary to enhance the proper self-management of schools. It could also provide an impetus for further research on the subject.

## **1.8 METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES**

The qualitative approach was used in this study. Patton (1987:9) points out that qualitative methods provide depth and detail through direct quotations and careful description of situations, events, people, interactions and observed behaviours. The qualitative method of investigation is particularly oriented towards exploration, discovery and inductive logic claims (Patton 1987:15). The qualitative method is appropriate for this study because the researcher's aim is to explore how the managers of self-managed ex-DET schools are experiencing self-management. This requires the researcher to interact, conduct interviews and observe the research participants in their natural environment (schools).

In qualitative research, the researcher collects data by interacting with selected persons in their settings and by obtaining relevant documents (McMillan & Schumacher 1997:391).

The three data collection instruments that were used in this study are interviews, observation and the analysis of documents. The interviews, however, turned out to be the main data collection instrument.

### **1.8.1 Interviews**

The interview as a data collection technique was used since interviews are flexible and adaptable and can be used with many different problems and types of persons. Furthermore, non-verbal as well as verbal behaviour can be noted in face-to-face interviews and the

interviewer has an opportunity to motivate the respondent to be more open (McMillan & Schumacher 1997:263).

In this study the key informants/participants that will be interviewed are school management teams and school governing bodies. Both group and individual interviews were conducted. Preference was given to open-ended interviews because they are flexible and allow probing so that the interviewer can get more information from the participants (McMillan & Schumacher 1997:46). Field notes and audiotapes were used to record data.

### 1.8.2 Observations

As a technique for gathering information, the observational method relies on the researcher seeing and hearing things which she/he deems necessary to record since they are meaningful to the outcomes of the study (McMillan & Schumacher 1997:268). This data collection technique will be used when attending SGB and SMT meetings.

The advantage of this method as pointed out by Patton (1987:15) is that first hand experience with the programme allows the researcher to be inductive in approach. The inductive approach according to McMillan and Schumacher (1997:98) "allows the researcher to explore and discover with an emerging research design rather than test deductions from theories in a predetermined design. The research problem is typically reformulated during data collection so that the data closely represents the reality of the shared social experience.

### 1.8.3 Literature study and analysis of documents

Official documents such as minutes of meetings, school policies, financial reports and year-end results were analysed. The analyses of these documents were used as a data collection technique since they describe functions and values and reveal how various people define the organization (McMillan & Schumacher 1997:455). Many authoritative sources on school management were also studied. These aspects are significant in researching self-managing schools.

## 1.9 DEFINITION OF TERMS

### SELF-MANAGING SCHOOL

The term 'self-managing school' refers to schools where there have been significant and consistent decentralization from the central authority to the school level of authority so that schools are empowered to make decisions related to the allocation of resources. This devolution is administrative rather than political and decisions at school level are being made within the framework of local, state or national policies and guidelines. The school remains accountable to a central authority for the manner in which resources are allocated (Caldwell & Spinks 1988: 5; also see section 2.2).

### SCHOOL-BASED MANAGERS

This term 'school-based managers' will be used interchangeably with site-based managers or school management teams that consist of the principal, the deputy principal(s) and the head(s) of department(s) in a school.

### SECTION 21 FUNCTIONS

These are the additional functions allocated to schools in terms of section 21 of the *South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996*. These functions give schools extra powers and responsibilities, which make them more self-managing (see section 1.1).

## 1.10 DERMACATION OF THE FIELD OF STUDY

**Chapter 1** gives the background to the problem, description of the problem and problem formulation. It also explains the rationale for the research and also describes its aims, significance scope, limitations and research methodology.

**Chapter 2** provides a background to the self-management of schools in South Africa. It will explore self-managing schools in Australia, New Zealand, the United States of America and the United Kingdom to ascertain how these countries are dealing with self-management of schools. In essence, this chapter will constitute a review of the literature on self-managing schools.

**Chapter 3** provides a description of the particular research design for this study. A detailed explanation of the methodology used will be given.

**Chapter 4** provides the results and interpretations of the empirical research.

**Chapter 5** provides a summary of the research results. On the basis of analysed and interpreted data, conclusions and recommendations are made. In this chapter, limitations of the study are pointed out and acknowledged.

## **1.11 CONCLUSION**

In this chapter a brief introduction to this study is given. The problem is described and formulated. The rationale and the aims of the study are outlined. The significance, the scope and the limitations of the study are presented. The methodological issues are outlined and the demarcation of the field of study is provided. The subsequent chapter deals with the literature study on self-managing schools.

## CHAPTER TWO

### *LITERATURE REVIEW*

#### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter does not only provide a background to the self-managing schools in South Africa *per se*. It also focuses on the countries where self-management of schools was developed: Australia, New Zealand, United States of America and the United Kingdom. Such a study is necessary since self-management of schools is a new approach in the South African educational system which is following the trends of these countries as far as the self-management of schools is concerned.

The purpose of this chapter is to identify the salient aspects that are necessary for efficient self-management of schools which are found in the literature on self-managing schools pertaining to the countries mentioned above. The essentials of proper self-management of schools will be discussed. This will be done mainly to give structure to the interviews (empirical research) so that the self-managed South African schools which are faced with a concept with which it still has to come to terms with, can be aided. South Africa can certainly learn from countries where self-management of schools is well developed.

It should be noted that different countries use different names for self-management of schools, such as site-based management, school-based management, local management of schools (LMS), school-based decision making, self-governing schools, devolution and decentralization.

#### 2.2 DEFINING SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS

Since self-managing schools is a relatively new concept in South Africa, it needs to be more clearly defined. As mentioned earlier, the concept "self-managing school" is also known by other terms (see section 2.1). Caldwell and Spinks (1988:5) define a self-managing school as

one [where] there has been significant and consistent decentralization to the school level of authority to make decisions related to the allocation of resources. This decentralization is administrative rather than political, with decisions at the school level being made within a framework of local, state or national policies



and guidelines. The school[however] remains accountable to a central authority for the manner in which resources are allocated.

Mohrman, Wohlstetter and Associates (1994:56), on the other hand, define school-based management as

the formal alteration of governance structures as a form of decentralization that identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement and relies on the distribution of decision making authority as the means through which improvements might be stimulated and sustained. Some formal authority to make decisions in the domains of budget, personnel and [instructional] programmes is delegated to and often distributed among site-level actors. Some formal structure [council, committee, team, board] often composed of principals, teachers, parents, and at times students and community residents is created so that site participants can be directly involved in school wide decision making.

The common golden thread to be distinguished from these definitions is that power to make certain decisions has been shifted from the central authority to the sites (schools). The justification for the self-management of schools is that it promotes effectiveness and efficiency at school level since major decisions are made at school level (Caldwell and Spinks 1988:5).

### **2.3 BACKGROUND TO SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS IN SOUTH AFRICA (A legislative framework)**

The movement for decentralization of education in South Africa has emerged from two main eras in its education: the apartheid education era and the subsequent post-apartheid period. At the height of the struggle against apartheid education, the National Education Coordinating Committee (NECC) put forward the popular slogan "Peoples education for peoples power". *The Peoples Education* campaign that featured prominently during the late 1980s, called for the establishment of parent, teacher and student associations in the townships in order to ensure participative governance by all key stakeholders within the schools (Fleisch[s.a]: 1). Even though it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of these structures, their presence created an awareness and prompted further discourse pertaining school control that involved all key stakeholders, namely parents, educators and learners.

The focus on school control resulted in the *Education Affairs Act of 1988* under the apartheid national party government that devolved significant powers of financial control

and policy making to school governors in white schools that fell under the House of Assembly (Fleisch [s.a.]: 1).

In most Black schools, that fell under the Department of Education and Training (DET), non statutory Parent-Teacher-Student Associations (PTSAs) were established in secondary schools and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) in primary schools.

Karlsson and Pampallis (1995:132) argue that the PTSAs/PTAs were the unofficial governance structures that were established in opposition to Apartheid Education. Their aim was for communities to begin to control their schools, wrest a measure of control away from the state education departments, undermine what they considered as illegitimate official governance structures (school boards) and work towards resolving crises in black schools (Most Black schools in the mid 1980s were characterized by the breakdown in the culture of learning and deterioration of physical property of schools). These structures had no decision making powers but only advisory powers. The Apartheid government had never recognized PTSAs/PTAs as legitimate structures and this made it difficult for them to assert their authority (Karlsson, Pampallis & Sithole 1996:118).

According to Sithole (1994:47) PTSAs/PTAs were regarded as an important formation that gave concrete expression to popular participation in the formulation and implementation of education policies and the institutionalization of participatory democracy:

“The principle of inclusivity which was a key element and organization and operation of PTSAs/PTAs was a cornerstone of the new system of the educational governance” (Sithole 1994:48). Karlsson and Pampallis (1995:132) further argue that the widespread support of PTSAs/PTAs in Black communities and the principle on which they were based, viz, participatory governance, was adopted as government policy in the 1995 *White Paper 1 on Education and Training*.<sup>1</sup>

In the post apartheid period after 1994 both the *Hunter Report* <sup>2</sup>of 1995 and *the White Paper 2 of 1996 on school structure, organisation and funding* further stressed the

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the principles that should drive the national policy according the White Paper 1 is the principle of democratic governance that should be reflected in every level of the system, by the involvement in consultation and appropriate forms of decision making of representatives of the main stakeholders, interest groups and role players (UNISA 2000:34).

<sup>2</sup> The Hunter Report was aimed to review the organization, governance and funding of schools. The Report stressed the importance of stakeholder participation in school level decision making (UNISA 2000:60).

importance of active stakeholder participation in school level decision making. Section 6.22 of the *Hunter Report* stated that governing bodies should be representative of the main stakeholders. In primary schools, parents and teachers should have significant representation, as should parents, teachers and learners in secondary schools" (Fleisch [s.a]: 2). The *Education White Paper 2 on school structure, organisation and funding* further stated that 'the sphere of governing bodies is governance, by which is meant policy determination in which the democratic participation of the schools' stakeholders is essential" (SA 1995, sec.4.7).

The most significant piece of legislation that revealed that a new decentralised approach to governance was to make its way into all public schools was the *School Education Act No.6 of 1995*. Section 3(j) of this act states that state involvement in the school governance should be limited to the minimum level required for accountability (SA 1995, sec. 3j).

The trend towards devolution of powers to schools was consolidated in the *South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996 (SASA)*. SASA devolves financial control and policy making to school governing bodies (SA 1996, sec. 20). Section 21 of SASA provides opportunities for school governing bodies (SGBs) to take more responsibility in the spheres of:

- ❑ maintaining and improving the school's property, buildings and grounds occupied by the school, including hostels if applicable,
- ❑ purchasing textbooks, educational materials or equipment for the school,
- ❑ paying for services of the school (SA 1996, sec. 21).

Section 16 (1) of SASA states that the governance of every public school is vested in its governing body. At the heart of SASA is the principle that each school should be on the path towards self-management if it has not already been established (SA 1996, sec. 16).

Site-based management is an attempt to transform schools into communities where the educators, learners and parents participate constructively in major decisions that affect them. Parents in the form of school governing bodies are given authority in running their schools. Parents have a greater say and influence in their children's education since the ownership of the schools is put in the hands of communities. Self-management of schools ensures quicker

decision making, innovations, flexibility and accountability that in turn make schools to be effective and efficient (David 1996:9).

## 2.4 SELF-MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES FROM OTHER COUNTRIES

As mentioned, South Africa is following the trend of other countries in terms of the self-management of schools. It is therefore necessary to explore self-management of schools in these countries to ascertain how they perceive it.

### 2.4.1 SELF-MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

According to Caldwell and Spinks (1988:9) the *Conservative Manifesto* for the 1987 national elections in Britain contained four major proposals pertaining to educational reforms:

- ❑ a national core curriculum,
- ❑ control over schools budgets to be given to governing bodies and head teachers of all secondary schools and many primary schools within five years,
- ❑ increasing parental choice by fostering diversity and increasing access,
- ❑ allowing state schools to opt out of local education authority (LEA) control, with grants from the national government being made directly to the school.

Each of these proposals had implications for the management of schools and a shift in the centralization-decentralization continuum towards self-management.

In 1988, the *Education Reform Act (ERA)* was passed in England. The most important part of this legislation was the delegation of financial management to governing boards that are predominantly composed of parents and trustees. The idea behind this legislation was the delegation of financial responsibility to schools. This was to allow school governing bodies and teachers the opportunity to allocate funds to their particular priorities to meet the specific needs of their clients. The decentralization plan in England is called Local Management of Schools (LMS). This plan makes provision for funds being routed directly to individual schools and managed by the principal and school trustees.

The school trustees are the members of the governing body that is made up of the principal, elected parents, community members, teaching and support staff members and in some case students. This body determines how monies will be spent and makes decisions on the appointment of personnel and the buying of equipment for the school (Williams et al. 1997:627).

According to Bullock and Thomas (1997:52) the decentralization of responsibilities in the United Kingdom (UK) mainly concerns finances and human and physical resources. Responsibility over staffing has made locally managed schools the quasi-employer of staff. In Britain and Wales however, the proposal contained in the *Conservative Manifesto of 1987* decentralization of the national core curriculum was not effected because there is still no decentralization of the curriculum in the afore mentioned countries (also see 2.4.1). Schools are still required to provide the national curriculum and national assessment rather than the locally determined one. This implies that the central government specifies the curriculum and the national assessment. In this regard they are still constrained to follow national policies (Bullock & Thomas 1997:52-53).

Williams et al. (1997:627-631) argue that decentralization in the UK has brought about the following changes:

- ❑ State schools are more independent and self-sufficient.
- ❑ The workload of the principal has increased. More paperwork and financial management are required.
- ❑ More training and support is required for principals and teachers to re-skill.
- ❑ The role of the principal becomes varied and more complex.
- ❑ School-based budgeting, a demanding aspect of self-managing schools, has taken the principal out of the school and the classroom.
- ❑ Participative management has replaced autocratic management.
- ❑ Decentralization has resulted in schools adopting a new culture, values and ideologies. The enterprise culture requires the schools to engage in aggressive marketing and image projection to recruit more learners, balance budgets and raise funds for their schools.

## 2.4.2 AUSTRALIA

Victoria is the most prominent state as far as the practices of self-management of schools in Australia is concerned. Caldwell and Spinks (1988:14) report that the changes towards decentralization in Australia came about with the election to government, of the Australian Labour Party in 1983. Developments towards decentralization in Victoria were shaped by a series of Ministerial Papers which signaled the government's intent of ensuring that school councils would in future have the major responsibility for deciding educational policies of their schools. Planning and budgeting were also envisaged for the school councils.

The first of the Ministerial Papers set out the following guiding principles:

- ❑ genuine devolution and responsibility to the school community;
- ❑ collaborative decision making processes;
- ❑ a responsive democracy;
- ❑ effectiveness of educational outcomes;
- ❑ the active redress of disadvantage and discrimination (Caldwell et al. 1988:14).

Caldwell and Spinks (1988:14) further claim that the introduction of two further priorities by the Australian government, namely, a comprehensive School Improvement Plan and programme budgeting in all government departments, laid the foundation for the far reaching approach to school-based management. The purpose of the School Improvement Plan was to encourage and support collaborative practices between parents, students and teachers in schools and to encourage and support a cyclical process of school evaluation, planning, implementation and re-evaluation.

A five year strategy commencing in 1984 was adopted for the introduction of programme budgeting in approximately 2200 schools in Victoria. A pilot project started in the same year (1984) involving 3-5 schools in each of the 12 administrative regions of the state. The emphasis in the first 3 years was on the development of the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes. A series of seminars were conducted for principals (head teachers), teachers, parents and students. By the end of 1986, more than 1100 schools had participated in the seminars (Caldwell et al. 1988:14).

According to Caldwell et al. (1988:12), plans had been made in Victoria by 1987 for the significant decentralization of responsibility in budgeting. Every state school in Victoria has a school-site council of parent, teachers and for secondary schools, students. These councils have the power within a framework of state policies and priorities to set educational policy for the school, approve the budget and evaluate the educational programme. Curriculum, however, is still determined centrally, with tight control exercised through inspection (Caldwell et al. 1988:12).

One of the principles of the Australian model for local management is the concept of continuous improvement and accountability (Tunbridge & Stuart: <http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000>). Mutual accountability is ensured by the introduction of school site councils consisting of parents, educators, significant others from the community and learners in secondary schools (primary schools do not have learner representatives in the school site council). These councils have to operate within a framework of state policies to generate school policies (Caldwell & Spinks 1988:13).

#### 2.4.2.1 ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF SELF-MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOLS IN AUSTRALIA

According to Woolley (<http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000>) the self-management of schools in Australia imply the following:

- ❑ Schools and their communities have responsibility for the management of major operations like finances, personnel, staffing and facilities although the central system remains the chief source of funds.
- ❑ Budgets are handed down to schools and the decisions on how funds are allocated rest with the principals in consultation with the school governing bodies and the educators.
- ❑ The local community, parents and significant others from that community are represented in decision making bodies of the school.
- ❑ Self-management of schools provides guaranteed access for parent participation in decision making in local schools and parents' involvement in their children's education.
- ❑ The relationship between the school and the education system leans more and more towards the school taking increased responsibility for its operations and outcomes.

- ❑ Local management of schools means training and multi-skilling of principals and educators since education management has become more complex: collaborative working requires skills.
- ❑ The school and its community have been provided with increased discretion in financial and physical resources although the central system remains the chief source of funds.

According to Holmes (<http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000>), Local Management of Schools (LMS) enhances local participation and ownership. It enables collaboration and facilitates decision making at the local level. Involvement and participation bring about commitment and responsibility in people and improves the quality of their decisions. The thrust towards LMS, according to Holmes, is improving students' learning outcomes.

McMillan (<http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000>) argues that

local school management alone is not responsible for improved student learning. It can provide the capacity for local decision making on the allocation of some resources to meet the needs of students but it is the skill of teachers, the collaborative nature of the learning environment, the use of appropriate pedagogy and the provision of sufficient and appropriate resources that collectively improve the learning outcomes of students.

Spinks and Rockliff (<http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000>) further argue that the relationship between local school management and improved learning outcomes is not direct but rather indirect in nature and dependent on how schools use tools delivered by LMS to focus on improving learning and teaching.

From the above discussions it is apparent that the mere devolution of authority to schools does not automatically lead to improved learners' outcomes unless, according to O'Callaghan (<http://www.sappa.sa.edu.au/local>), the expected outcome of LMS is clearly and explicitly associated with improving curriculum delivery at the local level. According to her, school restructuring, shifts in central/local relationships and the devolution of agreed resources and responsibilities would be fruitless if there is no focus on improving student learning.

It should be noted that this study does not focus on the impact that self-management of schools have on learning outcomes *per se* but rather on an exploration of the aspects that are necessary for efficient self-management of schools.



### 2.4.3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

According to Caldwell and Spinks (1988:15), the term school-site management was originally used by a New York State reform commission (year not stated) and was intended to cover a comprehensive approach to decentralization, with resources defined broadly to include matters related to curriculum and personnel in addition to finance being devolved to the school level.

The mid to late seventies, according to Caldwell and Spinks (1988:16), marked the peak of the interest in school-site management in the United States of America. The seventies, or the first wave of reform as referred to by Candoli (1995:xi) and Caldwell and Spinks (1988:17), focused on administrative decentralization to regional or sub-district units and the political decentralization to community boards in some large urban districts.

In the 1980s, according to Candoli (1995:xi-xii), the emphasis was on the state-directed curriculum and mandated evaluation of personnel by officials from the central government. This reform was spearheaded by the states of Texas, Kentucky, Connecticut and Pennsylvania.

The 1990s saw a clear shift from the state to the district level and more importantly to the school-site level. Whilst each state in America still sets broad goals for the educational system in the form of objectives for achievement and student accomplishment, the shift has been towards the local school system developing specific objectives with which to meet those broad state goals (Candoli 1995:xi-xii).

According to Bullock and Thomas (1997:56-57), some form of school-based management is widespread in America and although the practice varies from state to state, its major emphasis throughout America is with respect to the choices of resources and much less so on the curriculum. Decentralisation in America is more geared towards financial delegation to schools. Bullock and Thomas (1997:57) further argue that the district curriculum guidelines are produced at regional level in the American education system. The responsibility of the school is to modify, supplement and deliver the curriculum with the emphasis on determining on how rather than what to teach.

School-based management in America is aimed at improving the academic performance of schools by changing their organizational design (Mohrman, Wohlstetter & Associates 1994:53). In America the intent of school-based management, namely improving academic performance, was mainly addressed through the mechanism of budget. Schools were provided with a lump-sum allocation determined on the basis of per capita requirement, with weighing factors varying according to the level of schooling and category of educational need. According to Caldwell and Spinks (1988:3), the support of school-based management is very high in America because it is believed to bring about school improvement.

Mohrman et al. (1994:58-61) claim that the rationale behind school-based management in the USA, is the delegation of budgeting powers to schools to improve the capacity of the school by increasing the involvement of school level stakeholders in managing since this would improve school performance. School level councils are given decision making powers because its believed that members better understand the needs of students. This power, according to Mohrman et al. (1994:2), should be dispersed throughout subcommittees in schools, whose members have an increased need for professional development because of the new roles of educators, the principal, the learners and the administration personnel serving in those committees.

Wohlstetter and Mohrman (<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/CPRE>) present a different argument that “so far, there has been scant evidence that schools get better just because decisions are made by those closer to the classroom”. The change and improvements in the schools, according to them, depend on how schools are managed and governed. In order for schools to change and improve, they argue that there should be a passionate quest for improvement on the part of the principal, teachers, learners and parents. According to them “the bottom line is that school-based management is not an end in itself, although research indicates that it can help foster an improved school culture and higher-quality decision” (Wohlstetter et al. <http://www.ed.gov.pubs/CPRE>).

Wohlstetter et al. (<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/CPRE>) further argue that school-based management cannot succeed by simply giving schools more power over such things as budgets and personnel. In addition to power, they claim, the following commodities are essential for making good and productive decisions:

- ❑ **Knowledge** of the organization so that employees can improve it (knowledge on how to employ new approaches to teaching, knowledge on how to develop a budget, knowledge of interpersonal and problem-solving skills);
- ❑ **Information** about student performance and comparisons with other schools;
- ❑ **Rewards** to acknowledge the extra effort that school-based management requires and to recognize improvements.

Mohrman et al. (1994: 2) further argue that the power over the budget is dispersed throughout the subcommittees whose members have an increased need for professional development because of the new roles of educators, the principal, the learners and the administration personnel serving in those committees.

#### 2.4.4 NEW ZEALAND

According to Bullock and Thomas (1997:53) the *Picot Report* of 1988 recommended radical devolution of power, resources and decision making responsibilities from the national government to schools and their communities. After the release of the *Picot Report*, the New Zealand government released a white paper entitled *Tomorrow's Schools*, accepting most of Picot's recommendations and the implementation process was set in motion. This led to the passing of the *Education Act* in October 1989 when schools in New Zealand took over their own administration. The passing of the *Education Act of 1989* in New Zealand, led to all the regional school boards being abolished and governing school councils being established to manage school affairs (Wylie: [http://www.saeec.ca/old\\_rprt.html](http://www.saeec.ca/old_rprt.html)).

The impact of the 1989 educational reforms in New Zealand was that they shifted substantial financial and administrative responsibilities for managing schools to elected governing school councils. These governing school councils whose membership included the principal, teachers, parents and other people from the community were elected by the parents at every school (<http://www.nzcer.org.nz/research>).

According to Bullock and Thomas (1997:53) the central government distributes funds to schools and the school governing councils allocate and manage the schools' operational grants and locally raised funds. The governing school council comprises of parents in the majority, educator representatives, the principal and in secondary schools, a student representative is

included. (Dimmock 1993:168). Governance of schools has been legislated to be shared by teachers and parents with the latter outnumbering the professional staff. According to Bullock and Thomas (1997:53-54) much of the responsibility for human and physical resources rests with the school governing councils. These responsibilities include inter alia, the appointment and dismissal of staff and the maintenance of buildings and grounds.

New Zealand has a national curriculum for which the schools are responsible. Strict central control of the curriculum and assessment limits autonomy but the New Zealand model, according to Williams et al (1997:627), allows the schools greater discretion in determining how their progress, in terms of curriculum delivery, is to be identified and measured. *The Education Review Office* is responsible for carrying out effectiveness reviews and assurance audits every three years in each educational institution in New Zealand.

*The New Zealand Council for Educational Research* (<http://www.nzcer.org.nz/research/edreform>) conducted a longitudinal research from 1990-1996. The purpose of the study was to monitor the impact of the 1989 education reforms known as *Tomorrow's Schools*. These reforms shifted substantial financial and administrative responsibilities for managing schools to elected boards of trustees. According to NZCER the 1989 educational reforms brought about the abolishing of enrolment zones on the grounds of increasing parental choice on schools their children would attend. The school funding was also increasingly based on per capita formula.

#### 2.4.4.1 THE IMPACTS OF EDUCATIONAL REFORMS IN NEW ZEALAND FROM 1989-1999

The main findings of the research conducted by the *New Zealand Council for Educational Research* (<http://www.nzcer.org.nz/research/edreform>) on the impact of self-management of schools in New Zealand were as follows:

- ❑ New partnerships that were formed between school governing councils and school professionals (educators) were usually working well and benefiting students.
- ❑ School governing councils were becoming more representative of the parents with women making up 52% of the members. For the first time, women were as likely as men to chair the council.
- ❑ Class sizes decreased.

- ❑ Parent satisfaction remained high at around 80%, the same level as before the reforms.
- ❑ The reforms brought about and increased professional satisfaction of the principals especially those from primary schools.
- ❑ The reforms brought about increased administrative workload to the principals' role. The outcomes of the increased administrative workload necessitated the delegation of duties to other staff members.
- ❑ Staffing was seen as inadequate and the majority of schools (about 54%) were employing more staff than they were funded for in 1999, compared to 11% in 1991 and 29% in 1996.
- ❑ There was a decline, rather than an increase in parental involvement.
- ❑ There was a strong interest in continuing professional development and a growing focus on integrated school development.
- ❑ The longer New Zealand schools managed themselves, the more they found their government funding inadequate.
- ❑ The school governing councils spent most of their time on funding and property.
- ❑ Schools fund-raising increased remarkably. The increase in locally raised funds was more consistent and much larger than the increase in government funding.
- ❑ Competition between schools increased remarkably. More parental choice led to increased ethnic and socio-economic polarization in primary schools as well as in secondary schools.
- ❑ The reforms increased autonomy at the local level in terms of local decisions, However, the principals and educators wanted the government to focus more on resourcing, workload and school support issues rather than on further changes to property or regulations.
- ❑ Schools in low socio-economic areas and with high Maori enrolment were likely to have gained least from the reforms and may even have gone backwards because of problems such as decreasing rolls, additional administrative costs and fewer voluntary resources to draw on.

From the above discussions of self-management of schools in countries like the United Kingdom, United States of America, Australia and New Zealand one could identify commonalities. The common thread in all the developments pertaining to self-managing schools has been a shift of power from the central government to the school. The shift of power is concerned with the allocation of resources, personnel and facilities (Caldwell & Spinks 1988:5).

## 2.5 COMMONALITIES PERTAINING TO SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, AUSTRALIA, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND NEW ZEALAND

The following are the commonalities that this researcher identified with regard to self-management of schools in the UK, Australia, USA and New Zealand:

- ❑ The first step towards implementing self-management in schools is the creation of school-site councils, for example, school governing bodies or school boards. These “boards of trustees” comprise the principal, educators, administration staff, parents and learners in secondary schools. Formal responsibility of managing school finances and approving the budget has been allocated to these site councils. These councils should operate within a framework of state policies to generate school policies.
- ❑ A lump sum is allocated to schools in order for schools to manage their own finances and to set priorities in order to meet the local needs is a characteristic of self-managing schools.
- ❑ Parental involvement is an important component of the self-management of schools. The influence of parents in the schools’ decision making power pertaining to the allocation of resources, personnel and facilities is increased.
- ❑ The devolution of finance, human and physical resources to schools is a characteristic of self-managing schools. Schools have a significant control over staffing, budgets, policies and daily operational procedures.
- ❑ Self-managing schools imply participative management and decision making.
- ❑ Schools are expected to come up with their own policies in line with the state policies
- ❑ Decision-making is pushed as near as possible to the point of delivery to increase accountability of schools to the community.
- ❑ Teamwork and shared leadership are implied.
- ❑ Local communities are empowered to make decisions through membership of school committees.
- ❑ Schools are independent in managing their own affairs and meeting local needs.

## 2.6 SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS AND LEARNER PERFORMANCE

Many writers have written about the link between self-management of schools and the improvement of teaching and learning and the learners' outcomes. Howells (1995:54) argues that, greater management efficiency must lead to more effective pupil learning. Odden (1994:106) states that self-managing schools should be more productive since it implies increased resources. Productivity in schools, according to him, should manifest itself in improved learner performance and organizational/school performance in general. He further argues that school-based management is generally implemented without specific or clearly defined outcomes either organizationally or for students and that this state of affairs sends conflicting signals about the nature and purpose of school-based management.

The question that arises from these arguments is whether changing resources, processes and structures can effectively alter schools outcomes and learner performance.

The findings of research done in the United Kingdom from 1993-1995 were that under local management of schools efficiency in terms of balancing budgets rather than effectiveness in terms of educational outcomes for pupils, was more easily achieved and evaluated (Huckman & Fletcher 1996:146).

School-based management will not automatically result in improved learner performance. School-based management can only act as a facilitator of effective learning. If the self-management of schools were implemented narrowly as a political reform that merely shifts power from the central office to school, it would be an inadequate effort to improve school performance (Wohlstetter 1995:26).

Odden (1994:104-105) agrees with this view in his statement that decentralized management does little to improve students achievements. He argues that real resources in USA schools have been rising at substantially high rates, yet while spending goes up, average student achievement does not. According to him an analysis of student achievement over the past two decades in the USA concludes that while there have been changes, student achievement in 1990 was about the same level as in 1970.

From the above discussion, it is apparent that the mere devolution of authority to schools does not automatically lead to improved learners outcomes. O'Callaghan (<http://www.sappa.sa.edu.au/local>) argues that the expected outcomes of LMS must be clearly and explicitly associated with improving curriculum delivery at local level. She further argues that without the focus on improving student learning, school restructuring, shifts in central/local relationships and devolution of agreed resources will be fruitless.

The findings of the research conducted in UK schools from 1991-1993 on the impact of local management of schools on learners' outcomes suggested that children's learning was linked with the resource context of the school. Local management was viewed by many head teachers (principals) and educators of the schools surveyed as providing flexibility to target resources to the needs of learners, allowing the purchase of learner support materials, employment of extra staff and spending to improve the working and learning environment. Where budgets were constrained, however, principals were less positive about the impact of local management and more concerned about deterioration in the educational services offered to learners (Bullock et al 1997:165).

Even though there is no conclusive evidence to suggest that LMS directly affects the quality of teaching and learning or the standards which pupils achieve, the opportunities it creates to influence the school environment, including the resources that support learning, should not be discounted, suggest Bullock et al. (1997:167).

Shields and Knapp (1997:294) and Dellar (<http://education.curtin.edu.au/>) agree with the view that local management of schools is no guarantee of improved learning opportunities for learners. According to Shields et al. (1997:294) the instructional focus should be combined with appropriate professional support for school-based reform to make a difference in what students experience in the classroom. The latter should form the basis for school-based management. Dellar (<http://education.curtin.edu.au/>) argues that school improvement initiatives that focus on structural and organizational changes only constitute a very limited strategy for successful change in education. Instead it is individuals and groups of individuals who need to alter their professional practice. The focus of school improvement efforts according to Dellar should be on facilitating change to teachers' perceptions, beliefs and practices concerning teaching and learning.



## 2.7 SALIENT ASPECTS THAT ARE IMPORTANT FOR EFFICIENT SELF-MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOLS

Many writers have written about school-based management, local school management, site-based management, decentralization and self-managing schools. Most of what has been written on self-managing schools seems to suggest that there are salient aspects that are important for the efficient self-management of schools. The following discussion will deal with these aspects.

As stated, Wohlstetter and Mohrman (<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/CPRE>) are of the opinion that the devolution of powers to schools concerning such things as budgets, personnel and curriculum, does not guarantee the success of school-based management since other commodities such as information, knowledge and skills and rewards are essential. Wohlstetter and Mohrman argue that empowering school sites with control over information, professional development (knowledge) and compensation systems (rewards) are essential for efficient school-based management.

Knowledge of the organization so that employees can improve it, according to Mohrman et al. (1994:69), is dependent on providing training to school sites to expand job skills, teamwork skills, problem solving, decision making and communication skills. Organizational knowledge, for example, budgeting and personnel skills as well as an understanding of the environment and strategies for responding to changes in the environment are necessary. School sites should have access to information to make good decisions. Information on organizational goals, finance and cost structures, environmental issues, the customer as well as organizational performance should be shared amongst stakeholders at the school. School sites should also have access to information about the extent to which they are meeting their clients' (parents and students) needs, argue Mohrman et al. (1994:64-66).

Odden (1994:110) concurs with Wohlstetter and Mohrman that school-based management would work more effectively if information, knowledge, power and rewards are decentralized. This, according to him, suggests that a school finance system aligned with system reforms would:

- target the school to be financed;

- ❑ budget the bulk of revenues in a lump sum to schools and give schools power to recruit and hire personnel;
- ❑ include an extensive on line computerized information base on revenues, expenditures, achievement and other data;
- ❑ set aside 2-4% of school revenues for ongoing professional development and training;
- ❑ restructure teacher remuneration so that teachers are paid both individually on the basis of their knowledge and skills and as a group for achievement gains made by students in each school.

Caldwell (2001:12) advances the argument that rewards and incentives are an essential element for efficient self-management of schools. He further says that incentives, recognition and reward schemes should be designed to make explicit the link between effort and outcomes pertaining to the commitment of self-management and the improvement in learning outcomes. He acknowledges that more attention should be focused on intrinsic and extrinsic incentives and rewards.

According to Sackney and Dibski (1994:108-111), cultural norms, values, assumptions and belief systems should change before school-based management can realize its potential. If school-based management is to work, more attention needs to be focused on instructional improvement. School systems need to transform their culture from one of central control to that which values autonomy and empowerment. Such a restructuring entails more attention to professional development in the areas of shared decision-making, team building, conflict resolution, effective communication, planning and evaluation. According to Sackney et al. (1994:111), school-based management must be restructured around the notions of improvement, equity and equality of opportunity. If not, school-based management will be another educational reform that will not fly.

## **2.8 CONCLUSION**

In this chapter the researcher provided the background to self-managing schools in South Africa. The focus of this chapter was placed on countries where self-management of schools has been developed. The United States of America, Australia, United Kingdom and New Zealand were scrutinized in this regard to identify commonalities pertaining to self-managing

schools. The generalities pertaining to self-management were discussed. Authoritative authors agree that self-management implies the formation of a school-based council, devolution of financial powers to schools, participative management, training as well as parental involvement. They also agree that there is no conclusive evidence that link self-management of schools to improved learner achievement. They further agree that school-based management should focus on combining instructional focus and appropriate professional support in order to make a difference in what students learn in the classroom. In the following chapter, the description of the research design used for the study will be provided. A detailed explanation of the methodology used will be given.

## CHAPTER THREE

### *RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS*

#### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a description of the research design for this study. It also gives a detailed explanation of the research approach and the data collection methods employed.

The study is aimed at answering the following questions:

- ❑ What are the challenges faced by managers of the 2 self-managing schools (Rebonwe Primary and Equisweni Secondary) chosen for the study?
- ❑ What opportunities for school improvement are brought about by the self-management of schools?
- ❑ How can self-managed schools be supported? (See section 1.3.)

The study focuses on school management teams (SMTS) and school governing bodies (SGBS) of 2 former DET schools to investigate how they are experiencing self-management of their schools. Interviews were conducted, recorded and transcribed. The researcher also attended SGB, staff and SMT meetings to observe how the meetings were conducted, what is discussed in meetings and how people behave in meetings. The researcher took field notes that form part of the findings.

The 2 schools were chosen because they are typical former DET schools and they are easy to reach.

#### 3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

McMillan and Schumacher (1997:33) refer to the research design as a plan and structure of the investigation used to obtain evidence to answer research questions. De Vos (1998:77) further

claims that the research design is the overall plan of conducting the whole research study. In other words, De Vos argues, a research design is the blueprint according to which data are collected to investigate the research hypothesis or question in the most economical manner.

The researcher has selected the qualitative research approach to collect data. The rationale for using qualitative approach will be discussed in the following section.

### 3.3 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH APPROACH

Qualitative research is defined as a multi-perspective approach to social interaction, aimed at describing, making sense, interpreting or reconstructing this interaction in terms of the meanings that the research subjects/respondents attach to it (Denzin & Lincoln 1994:2 as quoted in De Vos 1998:240).

Hoberg (1999:76) concurs with the view that qualitative research is mainly aimed at understanding the research problem from the participants' points of view. Qualitative research is mainly concerned with understanding the research problem from the research participants' perspective as they (research participants) experience the problem as it is related to their reality (the school and education) and as they view the problem and ascribe meaning to their life-world. Often researchers use the participants' own words in the report as the participants' narration can best explain the meaning that they ascribe to their world, feelings, beliefs, thoughts, actions and ideals (Hoberg 1999:76).

#### 3.3.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF QUALITATIVE APPROACH

3.3.1.1 McCracken (1988:18) assert that **in qualitative research, the investigator serves as a research instrument/tool in the collection and analysis of data.** This according to him means that the investigator cannot fulfill qualitative research objectives without using a broad range of his/her own experience, imagination and intellect in ways that are various and unpredictable. The researcher concurs with this view that it is difficult to detach oneself when investigating social interactions. The researcher's own emotions, points of view, experiences, intellect will always form part of the data

collection and data analysis processes. The researcher will address this by indicating it as the observer's comments as part of the field notes.

3.3.1.2 **Qualitative research has a natural setting as the direct source of data.** Qualitative designs typically investigate behaviour as it occurs naturally in non-contrived situations and there is no manipulation of conditions or experience. In a sense qualitative designs are non-experimental (McMillan & Schumacher 1997:40; Anderson, Herr & Nihlen 1994:110-111). The qualitative approach is appropriate for this study because it is conducted in the natural setting (schools in this case) and no experiments were conducted.

3.3.1.3 **In qualitative research design context is critical.** In other words, action can best be understood when it is observed in the context in which it occurs (Marshall & Rossman (1995:44; Neuman 2000:146; Creswell 1994:7; Bryman 1994: 78;De Vos: 241). The study is not aimed at generalizing the findings to all the schools in South Africa but to understand and maybe apply the recommendations to the schools in similar situation and context.

3.3.1.4 According to Taylor & Bogdan (1998:7) and Bogdan & Biklen (1992:29-30) **qualitative research is descriptive and exploratory in nature.** This means that data is presented in the form of words and pictures rather than numbers. Data include interview transcripts, field notes, photographs, videotapes, personal documents, memos and other documents of records. For this study data includes interview transcripts, field notes, audiotapes, official documents and the observer's comments.

Data were collected by conducting interviews, observing proceedings in meetings and analyzing documents. What makes qualitative approach relevant for this particular study is that the researcher is trying to discover and explore how managers and governors of these self-managing schools experience self-management.

The interviews conducted when combined with the observation of meetings and the analyses of schools documents provide wealth, depth and detail through direct quotations, description of interactions and observed behaviours. In collecting qualitative data the researcher seeks to

capture the richness of peoples' experiences in their own terms (Patton 1987:10, De Vos 1998:42, Palys 1997:395).

The interactive nature of qualitative research makes it relevant for this study because the researcher has spent some time in the field (schools in this case) attending meetings, collecting documents and conducting interviews. The aim of the researcher is not to generalize the findings to all other similar schools in the Gauteng province. Instead she (the researcher) seeks to explain the experiences of the research participants (SGBS, SMTS, educators) in their own setting, namely, schools and communities. The positive aspect of qualitative research according to Hoberg (1999:31) is that it gives attention to detail and it has the ability to embrace both verbal and non-verbal behaviour, uncover meanings and reveal subtleties and complexities of cases or issues.

### **3.4 ETHICS IN QUALITATIVE RESEARCH**

De Vos (1998:24) defines ethics as "a set of moral principles which is suggested by an individual or a group, is subsequently widely accepted, and which offers rules and behavioural expectations about the most correct conduct towards experimental subjects and respondents, employers, sponsors, researchers, assistants and students".

According to McMillan & Schumacher (1997:418) qualitative researchers need to be sensitive to ethical principles because of the nature of their research topic (which can be a sensitive or a controversial topic) and because of the face to face interaction they have with the participants when collecting data. This requires the researcher to gain trust of the research participants and assure them of confidentiality and anonymity if so required. Mason (2001:290) further argues that ethical concerns must be a priority on the research agenda of any researcher.

De Vos (1998:25-35) identifies the following as some of the ethical issues that should be taken into consideration by any researcher:

#### **3.4.1 Informed consent**

De Vos (1998:25) argues that the identified participants must be informed about the investigation, its goal and the procedures that will be followed to collect data. This enables the participants to decide if they want to participate in the research or not. The researcher had meetings with the principals of both Equisweni secondary school and Rebonwe primary school to request permission to conduct research in the 2 schools. The 2 principals subsequently held meetings with various stakeholders within the 2 respective schools to brief them about the proposed research. Permission to conduct research was given in writing. (See annexures A1 & A2.)

#### 3.4.2 Deception of subjects/respondents

The researcher made sure that deception which is described as “deliberately misinterpreting facts in order to make another person believe what is not true” (De Vos 1998:27). He (De Vos) further argues that deception should not be inflicted to respondents. The researcher was open and transparent about the purpose of the research to the research participants. The researcher attended several meetings at both schools. (See section 3.1.2.)

#### 3.4.3 Violation of privacy

Under no circumstances should the privacy of respondents be violated. For example, using tape recorders, video camera and conducting the investigation without the knowledge of respondent is a violation of the respondents' privacy, asserts De Vos (1998:28-29). According to him, the respondents/participants should give consent to be part of the study. A written consent should also be given by the institution allowing the researcher to go ahead to conduct the investigation. The researcher was given a written consent by the 2 schools to conduct the research. The research participants agreed to have their institutions and name revealed. The principals of both schools requested the researcher to avail a copy of the final report to their schools.

#### 3.4.4 Actions and competence of researchers

According to De Vos (1998:30) researchers are ethically obliged to ensure that they are competent and adequately skilled to undertake the proposed investigation. According to him,



the well equipped researcher should evaluate all possible risks and advantages of the investigation and must assume responsibility for honouring promises made to respondents

### **3.5 VALIDITY, GENERALIZABILITY AND RELIABILITY IN QUALITATIVE RESEARCH**

Validity, generalizability and reliability are different kinds of measures of quality, rigour and wider potential of research, which are achieved according to certain methodological and disciplinary conventions and principles (Mason 2001:21).

#### **3.5.1 METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES**

##### **3.5.1.1 VALIDITY**

Validity in research means that you are observing, identifying or measuring what you say you are (Mason 2001:24). McMillan and Schumacher (1997:404) further argue that validity of qualitative designs is the degree to which the interpretations and concepts have mutual meanings between the participant and the researcher. McMillan et al. further claim that qualitative researchers, in trying to enhance validity in qualitative research, commonly use a combination of any of the following 9 strategies: prolonged and persistent field work, verbatim account of the participant language, low-inference descriptors, multiple researchers, mechanically recorded data, participant researcher, member checking, participant review and discrepant data (McMillan et al. 1997:404). The researcher recorded all the interviews, wrote field notes, attended several meetings at both schools and took notes during all the interviews.

##### **3.5.1.2 RELIABILITY**

Reliability refers to the consistency of the data. That is, whether the research would yield the same results if conducted by a different researcher or even the same researcher at different times (De Vos 1998:331).

The researcher has tried to address the question of reliability of the findings of this study by using triangulation method when gathering data. By using this method (triangulation), the researcher seeks to corroborate one data gathering method with the other.

### 3.5.1.3 GENERALIZABILITY

Generalizability involves the extent to which the researcher can make some form of wider claim on the basis of his/her research and analysis (Mason 2001:24). In other words, it refers to the degree to which the findings can be applied to other contexts and settings and with other groups. It is the ability to generalize the findings to larger populations (De Vos 1998:331)

The researcher does not seek to generalize her findings to the wider population but to establish salient features that are necessary to enhance proper self-management of schools. This could provide an impetus for further research on the subject. (See section 1.7.)

The next section deals with the data gathering methods to be used in this study.

## 3.6 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

The researcher has used interviews, observation and the analysis of documents to collect data. This would therefore imply the application of methodological triangulation as data collection in a single study (Taylor and Bogdan 1998:80; De Vos 1998:359). They assert that triangulation is the combination of two or more methods and results in gaining a deeper and clearer understanding of the setting and the people being studied.

### 3.6.1 INTERVIEWS

The researcher has conducted face-to-face, open-ended interviews with the principals, members of the SMT and members of the SGB. Group interviews were conducted with members of the SMT (excluding the 2 principals) and SGB members of the 2 schools. Group interviews were chosen because they are useful where a group of people has been working together for some time for a common purpose or where it is seen as important that everyone concerned is aware of what others in the group are saying. Moreover, in group interviews there

is a potential for discussions to develop, yielding a wide range of responses (Hoberg 1999:93-94). This helps the researcher to have a better view of what is happening at the school.

In addition to the group interviews, the researcher conducted individual interviews with the 2 principals. The main advantage of individual interviews according to Creswell (1994:150) is to gain an in-depth understanding of a person's opinions and experiences. Open-ended interviews were used with all the groups.

A further advantage of interviews is that they can allow the researcher access to past events and to situations at which the researcher is unable to be present (McKenzie, Powell & Usher 1997:165).

### 3.6.1.1 OPEN ENDED INTERVIEWS

The aim of the study is to investigate and explore how managers of self-managed schools experience self-management of schools in terms of the challenges they face and the opportunities that exist for them in order to improve the overall performance and functionality of their schools.

Open-ended interviews were chosen to help the researcher to gain more information about the experiences of self-managed schools through the eyes of the principals, SMTS and SGBS. The research participants play a stronger role in defining the content of the interview and they are allowed to talk freely on the topic. The researcher probed more deeply to get more information (Bogdan et al. 1992:9).

Hoberg (1999:85) concurs with the view that open-ended interviews are flexible and adaptable in that they allow the interviewer to probe so that he/she may go into more depth if she chooses or clear up any misunderstanding. In other words open-ended interviews allow the interviewer/researcher to make a true assessment of what the respondent really believes in.

De Vos (1998:299) on the other hand argues that open ended interviews cannot be regarded as truly open ended because only the answers are open ended, questions are pre-formulated and carefully arranged and are asked to the interviewee in a similar sequence. The researcher concurs with De Vos's view because the researcher herself has prepared interview schedules

for all the research participants. Pre-formulated questions were asked and the respondents were given an opportunity to expatiate when responding to questions.

The data from open-ended interviews consists of research participants' own words about their experiences, opinions, feelings and knowledge so that the researcher can develop insights and gain a perspective on how they (research participants) understand and interpret their reality (Patton 1987:11; Bogdan et al 1992:96; Anderson et al 1994:115). This according to Palys (1997:165) makes open-ended interviews clearly superior if the researcher is interested in hearing the respondents' experiences, opinions and feelings in their own words so as to understand the world as they see it.

The advantage of using this method according to De Vos (1998:299) is that data are obtained relatively systematically and this makes it easy to compare and analyze data. He further argues that this method does not require the interviewer to be particular skilled in the art of conducting interviews. This method therefore becomes relevant for the novice interviewer like the researcher of this study.

The researcher used field notes and a tape recorder to record data during the interviews.

### 3.6.2 OBSERVATION

This method assumes that behaviour is purposive and expressive of deeper values and beliefs. Observation as the data gathering method is used to record information as it occurs in the natural setting (Marshall & Rossman 1995:79; Creswell 1994:150; McMillan et al. 1997:268).

The researcher attended several meetings (SGB, SMT, staff & parents) to observe how meetings are conducted, what is discussed in meetings, how people behave in meetings, who dominates and how decisions are reached. This data gathering technique, when combined with interviews, will enable the researcher to record both verbal and non-verbal behaviours. Patton (1987:73) argues that the observation technique enables the researcher/observer to learn about things participants may be unwilling to talk about in an interview.

McMillan et al. (1997:268) further argue that the observational method relies on the researcher seeing and hearing things and recording these observations rather than relying on the research participants' self-report responses to questions. This allows the researcher to formulate his/her own version of what is occurring independent of the research participants (Gall et al. 1996:344). The primary advantage of using observation as the data gathering technique according to McMillan et al (1997:268) is that the researcher does not need to worry about the limitations of self-report bias because the information is not limited to what the research participants say but also to how they say it. Through observation, the researcher learns about behaviours and the meanings attached to those behaviours (Marshall et al 1995:79).

The researcher attended 10 meetings at the 2 schools, viz. 4 staff meetings, 4 SGB meetings, 2 SMT meeting and 1 parents' meeting. The main aim of attending these meetings was for the researcher to learn about what is discussed in meetings, to observe the behaviours of participants and to further learn about the level and nature of their participation in such meetings. The observational method when combined with the interviews provides more meaning and depth to the data.

### 3.6.3 ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTS

In addition to interviews and observations, selected documents were analyzed because they provide an internal perspective of the organization, they show the official chain of command and they provide clues about the values of the organization (McMillan et al. 1997:455). The researcher analyzed the following documents: The schools' vision and missions, the financial policies, the school development plans, minutes of meetings, year end results and the budgets and financial reports.

Documents provide both historical and contextual dimensions to the researcher's observations and interviews. They enrich what the researcher sees and hears by supporting, expanding and challenging the researcher's portrayals and perceptions. The researcher's understanding of the phenomenon in question grows as he/she makes use of documents and artifacts that are part of people's lives (Hoberg 1999:117).

The relevance of the analysis of documents to this particular study is that they will provide answers on how the 2 self-managing schools operate, what values they hold, the salient aspects that are necessary for efficient self-management of schools viz. handling of finances, involvement of parents in school activities, whether meetings are used to discuss issues that will have an impact on management and governance, school improvement and curriculum delivery.

### **3.7 DATA MANAGEMENT AND ANALYSIS**

Data management is an integral part of data analysis. It consists of the activities aimed at achieving a systematic, coherent manner of data collection, storage and retrieval (De Vos 1998:335).

McMillan and Schumacher (1997:502) define qualitative data analysis as a systematic process of selecting, categorizing, comparing, synthesizing and interpreting to provide explanations of the single phenomenon of interest (De Vos 1998:334). Data in qualitative analysis are usually in the format of textual narrative (transcribed interviews), written description of observations (field notes) and reflections (ideas and conjectures recorded in the researcher's diary). Managing such data is quite a challenge, as the researcher needs to make sense of the data as well as locating description to illustrate a concept (De Vos 1998:335).

The researcher of the present study also found the data analysis process quite challenging because there was a vast amount of data collected through interviews, document analysis and observations in meetings. The other factor that made data analysis quite difficult was that it was only done at the end of data collection and this proved to be quite daunting for the researcher. The reasons for the expressed difficulty are the following:

- ❑ the sorting and filing;
- ❑ having to identify themes and categories amongst massive data;
- ❑ reducing data into manageable themes and categories. (See annexures C1, C2 & C3.)

#### **3.7.1 DATA MANAGEMENT FOR THE PRESENT STUDY**

- The master file (file no.1) consisted of the raw data from transcribed interviews and field notes that included minutes of all meetings attended by the researcher.
- Selected documents from the 2 self-managing schools were stored in a separate file (file no.2).
- Audiotapes were filed separately.

The researcher was guided by Tesch's eight steps approach in data analysis as outlined by de Vos (1998:34).

1. Each transcribed interview was read carefully, re-read and compared with the hand written responses that were used as a backup in case the tapes fail.
2. Six interviews were selected, i.e. 2 SGB, 2 SMT and 2 principal. (See annexes B1-B6.)
3. Interviews were read carefully in order to make sense of what they are trying to convey. Main thoughts were highlighted and written down.
4. Similar topics were clustered together in all the interviews.
5. Data was compared to establish themes, trends and patterns.
6. Emerging themes, pattern and trends were identified and written down.
7. Emerging themes and patterns were cross-referenced with the research question to ensure that the research does not lose focus.
8. The themes were categorized into topics. Related topics were put in one category.
9. Data material belonging to each category was assembled in one place, coloured paper with codes was used to divide different categories.

### **3.8 CONCLUSION**

In this section the research design and the rationale for using the qualitative approach was discussed. Ethical issues were dealt with and the methods to be used in collecting data for this study have been outlined and explained in detail. The subsequent chapter will deal with the findings and interpretations of the empirical research.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION OF EMPIRICAL RESEARCH**

#### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

The primary aim of the study was to investigate the challenges that face and the opportunities that exist for managers of the self-managed schools to improve the performance of functionality of their schools.

The secondary aim was to provide a framework of how self-managed schools can be supported so that:

- ❑ schools are empowered to manage and control their finances;
- ❑ schools are capable of building strong leadership in both their school management teams (SMT), school governing bodies (SGBs) as well as educators;
- ❑ schools can develop a sense of responsibility, accountability and ownership of their decision making. (See section 1.4.)

#### **4.2 RESEARCH DESIGN**

As mentioned in the previous chapter qualitative research methodology was used to collect data for this study since the primary aim was to investigate and discover the faced and the opportunities that exist for managers of the 2 self-managed schools under study. The primary instrument used to collect data was through open-ended interviews. This instrument was selected because the researcher wanted to get the participants' perspectives and experiences of self-management. The researcher also observed several meetings and analysed a few documents, however most of the data presented is based on the interviews. Data from the observation of meetings and analysis of documents is presented as part of the field notes.



The results of this study are presented in the context of its limitations as pointed out in section 1.7. The intention of the study is to establish salient features that are necessary to enhance proper self-management. Therefore the aim of this study is not to generalize the findings to all other schools or to schools in similar situation as the 2 self-managed schools under study but the findings could provide an impetus for further research on the subject.

### **4.3 METHODOLOGY IN BRIEF**

Six interviews were conducted, 3 were conducted at Rebonwe primary school and the other 3 were conducted at Eqinisweni secondary school. Out of the six, two were individual interviews with the principals of both schools, two were conducted with the SMTs and the other two with the SGBs of both schools. Pre formulated questions were asked and the participants were allowed to expatiate.

All the interviews were recorded and transcribed.

The researcher attended ten meetings between the two schools; four SGB meetings, four staff meetings and 2 SMT meetings.

The following documents were analyzed; minutes of SGB, SMT and staff meetings, Grade 12 results from 1999-2002, Grades 6 & 7 results from 1999-2002. This was done mainly to check the impact of self-management on learner achievement/performance focusing on higher grades.

### **4.4 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS**

Each of the six interviews conducted lasted between 45 minutes and 1 hour. All the interviews were audio recorded. They were transcribed and checked against the taped discussions and the written responses. Transcriptions were analysed guided by Tesch's eight steps approach (De Vos 1998:34).

Meetings were attended and the results are presented as field notes.

#### **4.5 PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED**

The researcher experienced problems when she was transcribing the interviews because there were responses that were inaudible on the tape. These were question 8 of the SMT interview at Eqinisweni Secondary School, question 8 of the SGB interview at Eqinisweni Secondary School, question 8 of the SGB interview at Rebonwe Primary School as well as questions 13 and 14 of the principal interview at Eqinisweni Secondary School. The researcher had to ask the questions with individual respondents over the phone. A 2<sup>nd</sup> interview was conducted with the principal of Eqinisweni Secondary School for the 2 questions that were not audible on the tape. The interview schedules are attached as annexures B1-B6.

#### **4.6 WHAT WAS THE RESEARCHER LOOKING FOR?**

##### **INTERVIEWS**

The interviews were conducted to investigate how managers of the 2 self-managed schools experience self-management in terms of challenges they face and the opportunities that exist for them in order to improve the overall performance and functionality of their schools. (See section 3.6.1.1.)

##### **MEETINGS**

Meetings were conducted mainly to observe what is discussed in meetings, how meetings are conducted, who dominates in meetings, how decisions are made and what are the traits of participants. (See section 3.6.2.)

##### **DOCUMENTS**

A few documents were analyzed mainly to identify salient aspects that are necessary for efficient self-management of schools.

## 4.7 PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The findings of this study are organized under the following headings: Challenges faced by managers of self-managed schools, benefits/opportunities for self-managing schools, self-management and learner achievement, changing roles, salient features for efficient self-management and how self-managing schools can be supported to make them more efficient.

### 4.7.1 CHALLENGES FACED BY MANAGERS OF SELF-MANAGED SCHOOLS

An overwhelming majority of participants from all groups/individuals interviewed cited constant fear of overspending, misusing funds and the potential for fraud as one of the challenges faced by managers of self-managed schools. (See annexures C2, C3 & B6.) The fact that they have to control large sums of money they never controlled before cause them to focus more on money and financial management and control. (See annexure C2) The challenge for them, they stated is that managing a lot of money demands strict financial management and control and over cautiousness when spending. (See annexure C1 & C2.) One participant expressed this general sentiment; 'There is fear of overspending. The school has to be extra careful about spending. Strict financial control is needed' (see annexure B3).

Another participant echoed: 'We must be careful about spending and take good care of what we have. We should guard against overspending and misusing funds' (see annexure B6).

To further express this sentiment, one participant added: 'If the school can overspend there is a fear that the section 21 functions might be taken away by the department' (see annexure B3).

The pressure of accountability and more responsibility was identified as another challenge of self-management. The majority of participants expressed this view. (See annexures C1-C3). Their comments in this regard were that the participatory and democratic nature of self-management requires consultation and involvement in decision making by all stakeholders. The stated challenge is that if things go wrong and if the very people involved in decision making flout procedures and policies agreed upon, the managers are the ones that should be

accountable at the end of the day. In this regard one SGB member noted: 'There are challenges of accountability. People flout procedures, the tuck shop is running at a loss because of this and the SGB is accountable' (see annexure B5).

There are demands for the principals to be more accountable because of their position as chief accounting officers as mandated by the Department of Education. One principal observed: 'There is a need to be more accountable because I am seen as the chief accounting officer and that is quite frightening' (see annexure B1).

Pole and Chalwa-Duggan (1996:75) are congruent with the views expressed by the participants. They argue that self-management puts pressure on managers and governors in terms of accountability. Devolution of powers and accountability to schools, they claim, are outweighed by enormous increase in workload that is associated with the demands of accountability.

The participants also noted the misconception by parents, communities and some educators that self-managed schools have a lot of money has resulted into 3 different problems:

For parents it has resulted in the decrease in the payment of school fees. One participant observed: 'Parents think that the school has a lot of money. The payment of school fees has gone down even though it was the resolution taken in the mass meeting' (see annexure B6).

Section 39(1) of SASA states that school fees may be determined and charged at a public school only if a resolution to do so has been adopted by the majority of parents attending the annual parents meeting (South Africa 1996, sec. 39). Section 40(1) of SASA further states that a parent is liable to pay school fees determined in terms of section 39 unless or to the extent that he or she has been exempted from payment (South Africa 1996, sec. 40).

As far as communities are concerned they projected that the misconception could attract hooligans from outside to break into the school and steal equipment and other valuables.

To express this view, one principal stated: 'Exposure to buy equipment opens up problems like theft. 2 burglaries have already taken place, one last week. People feel that the school is well to do' (see annexure B1).

One SMT member of Eqinisweni secondary school mentioned the issue of irresponsible buying by educators because they think that the school has a lot of money. According to him, this

misconception results in a spending spree by educators at the expense of learners' need. To express this view, he noted: "Educators feel that the school has a lot of money and there is wastage at times. Sometimes educators buy for the sake of buying without considering the needs of the learners' (see annexure B4).

The dilemma expressed by some SMT members of both schools and both principals was that of consultation versus control especially when it comes to finances and financial control. Even though the finances of the schools are the responsibility of the SGBs as stated in SASA section 20 and 21, the principals still find it difficult to let go. This is because if anything goes wrong with the finances, they are still accountable.

In this regard one principal bluntly remarked: 'I am the chief accounting officer with anything that goes with management. Finances are to be controlled and who controls them? Me, the principal. When consulting them, I am not asking for permission. That is sometimes misconstrued especially by PL 1 educators' (see annexure B2).

Another principal succinctly remarked: ' There is a tendency to be selfish and not to want things being done without ones consent in all the projects' (see annexure B1).

Both principals noted two additional challenges. The principal of Rebonwe primary raised a concern of some principals (including himself) undermining workshops that are organized by GDE because some of them they feel, are below par. This tendency to undermine is transferred to GDE officials who are less informed about issues.

The principal of Eqinisweni secondary school posed Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) as a challenge especially when it comes to hiring people to audit their financial statements and run other projects in the school. The challenge according to him is that most people from the townships do not have the necessary qualifications to audit books and to coordinate projects. Even though they might have experience, it is difficult for them to analyse things on paper. This causes a lot of conflict with the educators because some are of the view that people with the required qualifications and skills should be hired, irrespective of where come from. This sometimes undermines the call for BEE.

Members of the SMT of both schools on the other hand cited challenges in terms of the roles they have to play under self-management. These ranged from being innovative and being agents of change and development, a challenge to be role models for educators and a challenge of changing attitudes of educators in terms of taking their responsibilities and duties

seriously. This according to them puts them under constant pressure to study and improve themselves in terms of management skills and knowledge.

Research on the private sector indicates that knowledge and skills are important to decentralized management. First, employees need training to expand their job skills and increase the breadth of their perspective, so that they can contribute in more ways to the organization and more knowledgeably to decisions about improvements. Secondly, individuals need teamwork skills for participating in high involvement management. Thirdly, individuals need organizational knowledge. This includes budgeting and personnel skills, as well as an understanding of the environment and strategies for responding to changes in the environment. ([http: www.ed.gov/pubs/SER/SchBasedMgmt/section2.html](http://www.ed.gov/pubs/SER/SchBasedMgmt/section2.html)).

Furthermore some SGB members of one school (name of the school withheld) expressed apparent different views in terms of the partnership of working with educators with regards to decision making. The SGB chairperson of one school (name of the school withheld) claimed that educators have a tendency of looking down and to undermine the parent component of the SGB when it comes to decision making because parents are not educated. He claimed that: 'Educators are looking down upon SGB because they are not educated. The SGB is just rubberstamping what has been decided upon by educators for example, year plans' (see annexure B5).

An educator member of the SGB of the same school (name of the school withheld), however, responded to the statement by alluding to the fact that the problem of apparent lack of participation by parent members of the SGB is due to lack of skills and knowledge in some areas. This results in educator members being the main contributors. He remarked that: 'Parents have inferiority complex. They don't come up with ideas to help the school improve. There is lack of knowledge in contributing towards the vision and mission. Educators are the only contributors' (see annexure B5). He further recommended that training should be conducted for SGBs so that they are empowered to give strategic direction and vision to schools. Section 19 (1a) of SASA mandates the Head of the Education Department (HOD) to provide introductory training for newly elected governing bodies to perform their functions. Section 19(1b) of SASA further mandates the HOD to provide continuing training to governing bodies to promote the effective performance of their functions or to enable them to assume additional functions (South Africa 1996, sec. 19).

#### 4.7.2 BENEFITS/OPPORTUNITIES FOR SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS

All the groups interviewed unanimously agreed that self-management benefit schools. The majority of the participants identified the following benefits:

- ❑ The freedom of choice it gives schools
- ❑ Quick decision making because there is no bureaucratic consultation
- ❑ Autonomy/Independence it gives schools

In terms of the freedom of choice the majority of participants of both schools alluded to the fact that self-management afford schools the opportunity to choose what to buy, who to buy from and where to buy. They cited the freedom to choose the suppliers and their own material according to their needs as the most important benefit. The direct negotiations with suppliers, according to them, give them an opportunity to negotiate discounts and donations.

To express this view, one SGB member remarked: 'Different suppliers come to the school to market their products. Previously this was done by the department. We can negotiate discounts, we operate businesslike. We are also experienced on who is the cheapest supplier. We look for quality and not just give them business' (see annexure B6).

One SMT member further noted: 'When we buy there is that direct negotiation with the suppliers in terms of negotiating discounts and donations' (see annexure B4). Another SMT member summed it up as follows: 'The choice of suppliers is a plus' (see annexure B4).

Regarding quick decision making there was consensus amongst most participants of both schools that quick decision making enables schools to be more effective and efficient when responding to their needs because they do not have to wait for the department for approval. Mostly SMT and SGB members of both schools responded to this theme.

In this regard one SGB member articulated: 'The advantage is that whatever the school needs can be done quickly because funds are managed within the school. We don't have to apply to the department for funds, that could take 5 to 6 months to fix (see annexure B5).

Another SGB member noted: 'Quick decisions are made for something that is needed urgently because there is no need for approval by the department' (see annexure B5)

Yet another SGB member summed it up as follows: 'There is no bureaucratic consultation' (see annexure B6).

Both principals were in agreement that self-management provides the schools with independence/autonomy that was not there before. The independence reported under self-management includes independence to make own decisions, to run own affairs and to shop wherever you choose.

When asked about the benefits of self-management the principal of Rebonwe primary school responded: 'Above all you find yourself very independent. We don't look at authorities as a threat but as one kind of support' (see annexure B1). One SMT member echoed the sentiments: 'We are not scared of GDE officials anymore, we now have a voice and are being listened to' (see annexure B4).

To argue the point of independence further the principal of Eqinisweni secondary school added: 'Independence goes a long way. To minimize on the cost of books you can go to the supermarket and buy them. The avenues are open and the shopping horizon is widened. You are able to throw your net all over the country' (see annexure B2).

#### 4.7.3 CHANGING ROLES

The majority of participants of both schools indicated that their roles have changed somehow under self-management. According to them, the impact of self-management is that the roles of principals, SGBs, SMTs, educators, parents and learners are profoundly affected. However, the SMT members of Eqinisweni secondary school did not see a change in terms of their roles and operations.

This is how they see their roles:

##### 4.7.3.1 THE CHANGING ROLES OF PRINCIPALS

Both principals acknowledge that their roles have changed under self-management. They both identified the bigger responsibility that self-management puts on their shoulders which requires



them to work harder and to be more accountable. This puts pressure on principals of self-managing schools to develop themselves in terms of management issues. (See annexure B1 & B2.)

One principal remarked: 'The role has changed, you are no longer like a simple supervisor, you are the real manager. The responsibility is becoming too big. You are no longer like a baby being nursed' (see annexure B2).

Another principal concurred; 'I see myself as a person who should double the effort with regards to accountability. I should be more responsible now' (see annexure B1).

The principal of Rebonwe primary school also indicated that as principals of self-managing schools, they are under constant pressure to develop themselves and sharpen their management skills. In this regard he remarked: 'There is a need for self-development, not only academics but on management lessons' (see annexure B1).

#### 4.7.3.2 CHANGING ROLES OF SMTs

The SMTs did not see their role as having changed much under self-management. No common themes were identified in this regard.

#### 4.7.3.3 CHANGING ROLES OF SGBs

Members of the school governing bodies of both schools see their roles as having changed under self-management. The fact that they are given more powers to manage school funds and to use those funds according to their needs enable SGBs to focus on school improvement.

To express this view one SGB member remarked: 'The SGB is given all the powers to govern the school. The SGB has the power to use funds according to the curricular needs and the needs of the community' (see annexure B5).

Another SGB member further remarked: 'The school processes can be improved because there is enough money. The life of the school has improved because we base our focus on school improvement' (see annexure B6).

Yet another SGB member explained: 'Funds are used to improve whatever is needed' (see annexure B5).

#### 4.7.4 SELF-MANAGEMENT AND LEARNER PERFORMANCE

The question pertaining to whether self-management has an impact on learner performance or not was only posed to members of the SMT and the principals of both schools since they are the ones who run day to day activities relating to curriculum delivery and learning outcomes. According to them, self-management has an impact on curriculum delivery in general and learner performance in particular. The benefits were attributed to 2 main things by respondents of both schools, namely; the attitudes of educators and the availability/accessibility of Learning Support Material (LSM).

The SMT member of Rebonwe primary remarked: 'There are more resources, LSM is in place. Learners no longer share textbooks as they used to. Each child has got his own' (see annexure B3).

Another SMT member explained:

The benefits [for learners] are that we are able to order LSM at own pace and our own time. Most learners have textbooks after the school was allocated section 21 functions. Learners are passing and show a lot of understanding because of resources at their disposal. Learning becomes more effective because educators choose the LSM they want. Grade 12 results for 2001 have improved and we got a 96% overall pass rate.

The principal of Equisweni secondary school said:

I wish this thing should have started a long time ago. This comes from the bottom of my heart. Now we are able to access what we need. We are able to purchase teaching aids that we never had before. This increases the level of achievement of learners. We were able to establish 2 computer centres. We are a 21<sup>st</sup> century school. We can be compared to former Model C schools and to schools overseas (see annexure B2).

The other principal remarked: 'Under self-management learners contribute and benefit. There is a willing team of staff. Projects are run and educators do things from a selfless point of view. The motto of the school is to treat learners as our own children' (see annexure B1).

The SMT members of both schools highlighted the attitude of educators and the positive atmosphere in their schools other contributing factors for improved learner performance.

As far as attitudes of educators are concerned, one SMT member said: 'Attitudes of educators are also positive. It is now easy for educators to deliver' (see annexure B4).

Another SMT member observed: 'The atmosphere is positive, the debate group [learners of Rebonwe primary school] excels' (see annexure B3).

#### 4.7.5 HOW CAN SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS BE SUPPORTED IN ORDER TO BE MORE EFFICIENT?

All the participants indicated that if all stakeholders could work together and support one another, self-managing schools would be made more efficient and effective. The kind of support identified is grouped into 3 main categories: support by parents and communities, support by GDE and support by businesses.

##### 4.7.5.1 SUPPORT FROM PARENTS AND COMMUNITIES

As far as parental and community support the following points were mentioned:

- ❑ More parental involvement is needed.
- ❑ Parents should reclaim their position and take ownership of their schools.
- ❑ Parents should initiate and lead projects and not only support them.
- ❑ Parents should pay school fees and help with fundraising projects.
- ❑ Parents should be involved in disciplining learners. (See annexures C1-C3.)

On parental and community involvement and support, one SMT member remarked: 'Parental support is needed. Communities and churches should support the school' (see annexure B3).

The principal of Eqinisweni secondary school concurred: 'We need total support from parents, their support should be above that of the department because they are closer to the school' (see annexure B2).

The principal of Rebonwe primary school further remarked:

A greater amount of parental involvement is needed, at least 95%. Parents to take the lead. Most of the time educators initiate projects and parents only come to support, especially parents who are not members of the SGB. We need real self-managed school where parents initiate projects and are involved. If that could happen, what we call self-managing schools will look like a picnic' (see annexure B1).

To further this argument, one SMT member remarked: 'Parents should attend meetings to highlight if things are not going right. Parents in Black communities do not attend meetings' (see annexure B4). One SGB member said: 'Parental support is needed to ensure that uniform is bought and worn by learners. United we stand, divided we fall' (see annexure B6).

Yet another SGB member remarked: 'Parents should pay school fees to supplement what the school has' (see annexure B6).

On the need for parents and communities to take ownership of their schools the following remarks were made:

The principal from Eqinisweni secondary school remarked: 'Parents should reclaim their position to own their schools. Parents should understand that the schools belong to them and to regard their schools as their homes' (see annexure B2).

The SMT of Eqinisweni secondary school summed it up as follows: 'Parents should look not for what the school and the government can do for them but what themselves can do for the school' (see annexure B4).

#### 4.7.5.2 SUPPORT NEEDED FROM THE GOVERNMENT

The majority of the participants of both schools were in agreement that in order to make self-managing schools more efficient and effective, support from the government is needed. The support needed ranges from financial support, capacity building and moral support.

On financial support from GDE the views of the respondents of both schools were as follows:

The principal of Eqinisweni secondary school remarked: 'The government should continue with the subsidies, we can't rely on school fees. Government policies and finance is also needed to support the school' (see annexure B2).

The other principal noted: 'More money is needed to get resources for the school e.g. a computer centre' (see annexure B1).

An SGB member said: 'We need more money from the state. In 2004 we are going to implement the Revised National Curriculum Statements (RNCS) and therefore textbooks will be replaced. More money will be spent on LSM so the government should not reduce the budget' (see annexure B6).

On moral support by GDE, the views of respondents of both schools were as follows:

The principal of Eqinisweni secondary school remarked: 'The government lacks support by the district officials[support from district officials is lacking]. They wait until there are problems before the IDSO comes' (see annexure B2).

One SMT member further remarked: 'GDE needs to visit the school regularly not only when something bad has happened' (see annexure B4).

An SGB member concurred: 'Moral support from the department is lacking e.g. giving feedback to the school. The IDSO, Instead of motivating educators, he demoralizes them' (see annexure B5).

Another SGB member remarked: 'OFSTED should come to our school to support and check. By so doing we know our grey areas and fix those. They must visit regularly to check whether the school is on the right track' (see annexure B6).

Another SMT member said: 'District office learning area facilitators should give more support to the school' (see annexure B3).

In terms of capacity building and ongoing support by the district most respondents aired their desire for ongoing training and empowerment of SGBs and SMTs by the government.

In this regard one SMT member observed: 'Workshops that are conducted by GDE should be an ongoing process. There should be follow-ups on major things' (see annexure B3).

Another SMT member said: 'GDE should be proactive in terms of workshops, changes [in terms dates, cancellations and postponement of workshops] need to be communicated with the school on time' (see annexure B4).

An SGB member further observed: 'We need training in financial management so that the SGB do[does] not misuse the money' (see annexure B5).

#### 4.7.5.3 SUPPORT NEEDED FROM THE BUSINESS WORLD

Financial support, support for school projects and skills development were highlighted as the kind of support that is needed from businesses by the principal and SGB members of Eqinisweni secondary school.

In this regard the principal of Eqinisweni secondary school remarked: 'Big businesses do not trust the schools. They should give financial assistance, support projects and develop skills to market the school. There is a lack of marketing skills' (see annexure B2).

An SGB member further remarked: 'We need financial support from the business world. Businesses only consider former Model C schools and not township schools. Through relationships with the former Model C schools, the school can get financial support [from businesses]' (see annexure B5).

### 4.8 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

In this chapter, the researcher has reported the perceptions and experiences of managers and governors of the two self-managed schools under study in terms of the challenges they face and the opportunities/benefits that exist for self-managed schools.

The findings of this study are not to be generalized to all other schools, or to schools in similar situations but they could form a basis for further research on the topic. The researcher discusses the salient issues that emerged from the study. These issues are discussed under the following headings:

- ❑ The challenges of self-management
- ❑ Opportunities/benefits of self-management
- ❑ Self-management and learner achievement
- ❑ How can self-managed schools be supported to make them more effective and efficient?
- ❑ Salient features for efficient self-management

#### 4.8.1 THE CHALLENGES OF SELF-MANAGEMENT

The challenge cited by an overwhelming majority of participants of both schools is the constant fear of overspending and misusing money. This is caused by the fact that self-managing schools are managing big funds they have never managed before. This, according to them, causes a lot of pressure especially for principals and governors. (See section 4.7.1.) The cited challenge was not surprising to the researcher because the researcher has worked closely with SMTs and SGBs in schools and some of the problems identified, especially in historically disadvantaged schools is that most members of the governing bodies are lay people when it comes to finances and financial management. Furthermore, some principals themselves are not well versed when it comes to financial management. This has resulted in most reports of mismanagement of finances, [particularly in former DET schools] (Mestry International Conference on Education and Decentralisation 2002:294).

Section 37 of the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (SASA), entrusts SGBs with the financial management of schools (South Africa 1996 sec. 37). The question arises: Are SGBs empowered to manage school finances? Section 19(1) of SASA mandates the provincial head of the education department to:

- ❑ Provide introductory training for newly elected governing bodies to enable them to perform their functions.
- ❑ Provide continuing training to governing bodies to promote the effective performance of their function or to enable them to assume additional functions (South Africa 1996 sec. 19).

The training programmes for SGBs have financial management built in them but the question is whether they reach the people they are supposed to reach. Most parent member of the SGB in most former DET schools are either illiterate or semi literate and so they might not necessarily benefit in some of these workshops. The problem is that most of the workshops are conducted

in English and most training manuals are written in English. Although the researcher did not determine the qualifications of parent members of the SGBs, she observed illiteracy and semi literacy during meetings. The researcher also reports on her experience of working with SGBs on her capacity as an official of the department of education. The principal of Equisweni secondary school also highlighted the problem of illiteracy of parent members of the SGB. (See annexure B2.)

Where does this leave some members of the SGBs?

Section 19(2) of SASA states that the provincial head of the education department must ensure that principals and other officials of the education department render all the necessary assistance to governing bodies in the performance of their duties (South Africa 1996 sec. 19).

The second issue highlighted as a challenge was the pressure of accountability and responsibility under self-management. (See section 4.7.1.) The participatory nature of decision making required by self-management means that people have to be involved in decision making. The question arises: How is accountability shared for decisions made? Who is accountable to whom and for what?

The research findings of the study conducted by Hallinger, Murphy and Hausman on the restructuring of schools in the USA indicated that principals who were part of the study, expressed serious concerns for the fact that they were in the 'hot seat' for school decisions reached jointly by a school-based council. The principals expressed serious concerns of accountability. (Sackney and Dibski 1994:104). This somewhat concurs with my findings in that both principals highlighted the huge responsibility of accountability under self-management. Principals as chief accounting officers feel most of the pressure because if any thing goes wrong in their schools, they are still accountable. (See annexure B1 & B2.)

According to Sackney and Dibski from the USA (1994:104), accountability goes hand in hand with authority and power. They further argue that the final responsibility for the operations of the school reside with the principal. What about the accountability of governing bodies? Bullock and Thomas from the UK (1997:119) further argue that the accountability of professionals requires governing bodies to have access to information and be able to use that information to make independent judgements.



Section 16(1) of SASA states that: 'the governance of every public school is vested in its governing body and it may perform only such functions and obligations and exercise only such rights as prescribed by the act.' Section 16(3) on the other hand, states that the principal under the authority of the Head of Department must undertake the professional management of the school (South Africa 1996 sec. 16). When it comes to practice, this distinction is not always as clear-cut as it seems and could cause tension and conflicts. Fidler, Russell and Simkins from the UK (1997:78) argue that this potential for tension is caused by the fact that although head teachers (principals) are responsible for the educational leadership, management and organisation of the schools, governors can be called to account not only for financial mismanagement in the school but for any failure of educational leadership. According to them, giving governors and head teachers dual responsibility for the management for the management of the school assumes high degrees of consensus on both policy and practice. The situation is slightly different in South Africa because, even though SGBs have mandated power to govern and to support educational leadership in schools, most of the SGB members (especially from former DET schools) seem not to have capacity and skills to govern and to give strategic direction to schools. (See annexure B2 & B5.) The chairpersons of the SGBs often have to rely too much on the leadership and guidance of the principal for the effective functioning of the SGB. In other words, principals are still seen to have more powers than other members of the SGB. If there is a correlation between accountability and power, then who should be accountable to whom and for what?

The principal is accountable to the department, the SGB and the community at large. Mestry from South Africa, in his paper presented in the International Conference on Education and Decentralisation argue that principals are usually held responsible for all the functions and activities of the school. For example, the principal is the accounting officer of the school and is therefore held responsible for the financial management of the school. If the SGB is given autonomy to manage the school, then the accountability of managing the school needs to be reviewed (International Conference on Education and Decentralisation 2002:279).

Sackney and Dibski (1994:106) maintain: 'In school-based management systems, the principal becomes the key player... The principal, just as board and central office staff, finds it difficult to release authority while still retaining responsibility.' They further argue that school-based management means extra work for the principal. According to them, the principal is burdened by the increased time committed to collaborative decision making. The principal is expected to

involve staff, students, parents and the community in the decision making process. Where political and philosophical differences exist, more time and energy is expended on argument and debate other than on accomplishing something worthwhile (Sackney & Dibski 1994:106).

The concern about the misconception by parents and communities alike that self-managing schools have a lot of money was posed as another challenge by the participants. (See section 4.7.1.) According to them, this misconception results in the decrease of payment of school fees and the potential to attract burglars and thieves into the schools. (See annexure B3.)

This issue touches a lot on parental and community involvement and ownership. According to Mestry (International Conference on Education and Decentralisation 2002:294), parents of school communities show very little interest in school matters. This is evident in the attendance of parents at parents' meetings, the involvement of parents in fundraising projects, low attendance at parent-teacher meetings, payment of school fees, maintaining proper control of learning support material issued to their children, etc.

The predictable finding was the perceived inferiority complex of parent members of the SGB as expressed by one educator member of the SGB. The parent members of the SGB of one school (name of the school withheld) on the other hand are of the opinion that educators undermine them because they are illiterate. The SGB chairperson of that school (name of the school withheld) expressed this view. This finding was predictable in the sense that the researcher has worked with schools and attended SGB and educator meetings where the same view was expressed. It was observed that the SGB meetings attended when conducting this research that educator members and principals still dominate discussions and therefore decision making.

Pillay from South Africa (International Conference on Education and Decentralisation 2002:333),

further highlights the problem of illiteracy of some parent members of the SGB in his paper. His paper was based on the report presented by the *Task Team on Education Management Development* in 1996. The report was based on the investigation that was done by the task team on assessment of school level management and governance. The report noted the uneven level of experience and capacity in the SGBs as one challenge of the changes in

school-based management and governance. It also highlighted a high level of illiteracy on the parent members of the SGB that may hinder their active participation in school matters. The report further highlights the fact that in many schools (especially former DET), SGBs are not functioning as they should and that it is the principals that often take decisions that are merely rubberstamped by the SGB. (See section 4.7.1.)

#### 4.8.2 BENEFITS/OPPORTUNITIES OF SELF-MANAGEMENT

An overwhelming majority of participants from both schools were in agreement that self-management provides the freedom of choice for schools. The freedom of choice ranges from the freedom to choose the supplier, the freedom to choose the learning support material (LSM) and the freedom to choose where to buy. (See annexures B2, B4 & B6.) The freedom of choice of LSM in some way, enables educators to choose material that will address the needs of the learner and of the school at large. The question that arises is whether the freedom to choose LSM by educators has any impact on learners' outcomes. The participants did not link this to learner performance however, self-management and learner performance is discussed in the next section.

In terms of the freedom to choose suppliers, the majority of participants were in agreement that the direct negotiations with suppliers is an advantage to the school because suppliers compete against each other in order to get business in schools and would therefore come up with attractive packages. (See annexure B6.) At the end of the day schools (as clients), get value for their money. Furthermore, this enables school to negotiate discounts and donations directly with the suppliers. (See annexure B2 & B6.)

The SGBs and SMT members of both schools indicated the fact that there is less bureaucratic consultation in self-management schools. The acknowledged benefit for this is that schools can make quick decisions to address their immediate/urgent needs and priorities. (See section 4.7.2.) The main purpose of shifting decision-making to school is to bring the responsibility of decisions closer to the point of delivery sites (schools). This is intended to enable schools to base their decisions to the needs of learners and the community at large. The challenge for self-managing schools is whether the decisions have any bearing on the enhancement of learners' outcomes and school improvement.

Because schools are given powers to make decisions to address their unique needs and priorities, when things go wrong they are accountable for their own decisions and do not have to blame the department. As one SMT member correctly noted: 'We are now taken seriously and are in control. When we fail, we don't have GDE to blame at the end of the day' (see annexure B4).

According to Squelch (International Conference on Education and Decentralisation 2002:331), school-based decision making is directed at reducing bureaucracy so that schools can respond to changes quickly in order to meet the needs of their communities. Williams, Harold, Robertson and Southworth (1998:629) further argue that the freedom to make decisions and to implement change at the local level without a lot of central bureaucratic interference, has been appreciated and is an acknowledged benefit of education reform in New Zealand and England.

Moving management away from the central bureaucracy to the local level enhances local participation and ownership, it enables collaboration and facilitates decision making at the local level. Involvement and participation brings commitment and responsibility of people and improves the quality of decisions (Holmes <http://www.apapdc.edu.au>).

Regarding the autonomy and independence self-management affords the schools, both principals acknowledged this benefit. Even though self-managing schools are independent to run their own affairs to meet local needs, they still depend on the government for most funding. The South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (SASA) gives schools the autonomy to formulate policies, to recommend the appointment of educators, to determine school times, to develop a code of conduct for learners and to supplement the resources of the school. Section 21 schools (self-managing schools) are also given extra functions and therefore autonomy to buy LSM, to pay for their services and to maintain their surroundings and infrastructure (South Africa 1996, sec. 21).

### 4.8.3 SELF-MANAGEMENT AND LEARNER PERFORMANCE

Both the SMTs and the principals agree that self-management has an impact on learner achievement. (See annexure B1 & B2.) They cited two factors which in their views, enhance learners' outcomes:

- ❑ More and accessible resources for learners;
- ❑ Positive attitudes of educators that make it easy for them to deliver (teach)

The following table shows year-end results from the two schools from 1999-2002.

**Figure: 1**

School	Grade	1999	2000	2001	2002
Rebonwe Primary	6	-	98.8%	100%	100%
	7	-	-	100%	100%
Eqinisweni Secondary	12	48%	58%	94.6%	96.95%

What do these statistics indicate? Is there a direct correlation between self-management and learner performance?

So much has been written on the subject in trying to link self-management and learner achievement. Does self-management enhance learners' outcomes? Is there any linkage between self-management and learners achievement?

According to Caldwell ([http://www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/EPM/papers/BCaldwell/Open University/](http://www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/EPM/papers/BCaldwell/Open%20University/)), in Britain there has been no research that maps a cause-and effect relationship between local management and the discretionary use of resources on the one hand, and improved learning outcomes for students on the other, although there is opinion to the effect that gains have been made. Caldwell further argues that, for restructuring to have an enduring impact on schooling and learning, they should be unrelenting focus on learning outcomes. This means that new responsibilities, authorities and accountabilities must be used to improve learning and teaching.

What does this mean?

According to Caldwell (<http://www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/EPM/papers/Bcaldwell/OpenUniversity>) this means that extraordinary levels of professionalism in respect of knowledge and skills in state of the art approaches to learning and teaching, and leaders par excellence to help make it happen.

Self-management is a relatively new concept in South Africa. For South African schools, especially former DET schools, what Caldwell is suggesting seems like a 'tall order'. Self-management cannot and will not automatically improve learners' outcomes, what it does is to offer schools opportunities to make decisions at the school level as determined by the needs of the learners and the professional development of educators. Schools also need to acknowledge that educators are a valuable resource that is key to enhancing learners' outcomes.

Debus from Australia (<http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art>) believes that students outcomes are dependent on principals who make teaching and learning their core business. He further states that because principals have intimate knowledge of the local culture, circumstances and conditions, they must be instructional leaders in the areas of teaching and learning. This knowledge and skills, according to Debus, must be based on research and best practice. The curriculum therefore, must be based on the knowledge and above all, the skills necessary to make learning a lifelong process.

Woolley from Australia (<http://www.apapdc.edu.au.conference2000/papers/art>) poses the same questions that have been posed by many writers on the subject (Caldwell, Woolley, Debus etc.). Does local school management (LSM) in whatever form of degree, make any difference to what the students learn and how they learn it?

Woolley notes that while most initiatives in LSM have been couched in terms of improved schools, financial flexibility, greater autonomy, staff selection and improved resources, there has been a noticeable lack of LSM being directed specifically at improved student learning. He further argues that Australian authors who conducted research in this field, have concluded that little or no improvement in student learning outcomes has been noted over the 5 years of the Victorian (Australia) school of the future initiative (LSM).

Woolley acknowledges that well implemented LSM practices have a potential for what he calls 'educational good' and hence the opportunities for student learning to be enhanced.

All other things being equal (a rare circumstance for many struggling school communities), a locally managed school, with properly selected staff, enjoying a close relationship with the community and creative and sensitive leadership in a school with agreed directions rooted in improving student learning, will no doubt have successful outcomes. Perhaps, more fundamentally, I look for increased local school management that is championed by our educational and political leaders for the prime and the sole purpose of improving the learning opportunities and outcomes of all our students. I think that is what schools are for anyway (Woolley: <http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art>).

Keuhn (<http://www.bctf.bc.ca/research/report>) commenting on the research findings by Cathy Wylie from the *New Zealand Council for Educational Research* (NZCER), states that this indicated that school-based management has little improving effect on student achievement.

Spinks & Rockliff from Australia (<http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art>) on the other hand indicate that research does demonstrate a relationship between local school management and improved learning outcomes. However, this relationship, they note, is not direct but rather indirect in nature and is dependent on how schools use tools delivered by local management to focus on learning and teaching.

#### 4.8.4 HOW CAN SELF-MANAGED SCHOOLS BE SUPPORTED TO MAKE THEM MORE EFFICIENT?

All the participants from both schools emphasized the importance of teamwork amongst all stakeholders for self-management to be effective and efficient. (See annexure B1-B6.) The support needed as expressed by participants, is directed outside the school, only three SMT members from Eqinisweni secondary school indicated the need for support within the school.

In this regard one SMT member note: 'Without the support of educators, HODs cannot do their job. If educators acquire new information, they should share it with HODs. Educators should

do their part and teach because if one fails, the whole school fails and the whole community fails' (See annexure B4.)

Another SMT member added: 'some educators do not support the SMT because they say they [SMTs] are paid for doing their job. Educators need to know that the HODs are not the 'know it all' (See annexure B4.)

Yet another SMT member echoed: 'Some educators would like to see you fail but if the HOD fails, the whole school fails. HODs need to support each other by coming up with workshops that will enrich each other. Educators should do their part to be best teachers' (See annexure B4.)

The support needed as expressed by the participants is grouped into 3 topics:

- ❑ Support from parents and communities. (See section 4.7.5.1.)
- ❑ Support from the government (GDE in this case). (See section 4.7.5.2.)
- ❑ Support from businesses. (See section 4.7.5.3.)

#### 4.8.4.1 SUPPORT FROM PARENTS AND COMMUNITIES

In terms of the parental and community support, the majority of participants from both schools highlighted the following issues:

- ❑ More parental and community involvement needed. (See section 4.7.5.1.)
- ❑ Parents and communities should take ownership of their schools. (See section 4.7.5.1.)
- ❑ Parents should initiate and lead projects in schools (and not only support projects). (See 4.7.5.1.)
- ❑ Parents should pay school fees and raise school funds. (See 4.7.5.1.)
- ❑ Parent should be involved in disciplining learners. (See 4.7.5.1.)

Parental involvement in South Africa is legalised by the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (SASA). SASA provides power to parents and communities. The act expects parents to be meaningful partners in governance. It envisages a system where teachers collaborate with



parents to improve the quality of education (South Africa 1996, sec. 20). The system of OBE requires parents to play a meaningful role in the education of their children.

Mestry, a South African, in his paper presented at the International Conference on Education and Decentralisation, argue that one of the problems experienced by governing bodies and principals is lack of parental involvement:

Parents and school communities show very little interest in school matters. This is evident in the attendance of parents at parents' meetings, the involvement of parents in fundraising projects, low attendance at parent-teacher meetings, payment of school fees, maintaining proper control of learning support material issued to learners etc. (Mestry: International Conference on Education and Decentralisation 2002:287).

The findings of the ethnographic study that was conducted in historically disadvantaged African schools, as reported by Msila, a South African (International Conference on Education and Decentralisation 2002:278), are that the parents' role is crucial in enhancing learners' success. Community input is noted as being crucial in the development of the curriculum in schools and without community involvement, schools are less likely to succeed in their efforts to improve education). One of the contributing factors that affect parental involvement, according to the study, is school environment. At times the school environment seemed to be closed to parents. Msila further reports that a few parents in the study indicated that schools intimidated them and seem to be unreceptive to their ideas.

As reported in 4.8.1 above, most parents who are members of the SGB (particularly from ex DET schools) are illiterate or semi literate and sometimes feel that educators undermine their inputs and ideas because of this. SGBs should be empowered and training should be provided for them in order to perform their duties. If SGBs are empowered, they could come up with more effective strategies on how to involve the rest of the parents. Educators should also do their part and be accessible to parents.

Keuhn, from New Zealand (<http://www.bctf.bc.ca/researchreports>) notes that the leadership of the school principal is central to the operations of any structure that aims to have participants influence on the operations of the school. He further acknowledges that the role of the school leader to provide for a school culture that is inclusive of all stakeholders is quite challenging:

In order to work towards a vision of community partnerships, school leaders need to be cognisant of the requirements of all stakeholders often with competing agenda. This requires excellence in communicating, strategic planning, negotiating, liaising, marketing and entrepreneurial skills (Keuhn <http://www.bctf.bc.ca/researchreports>).

#### 4.8.4.2 SUPPORT FROM THE GOVERNMENT

All the participants from both schools indicated that self-managing schools still need a lot of support from the government (GDE in this case). The support needed ranges from financial and moral support and capacity building. The findings show that even though self-managing schools are given autonomy/independence to run their own affairs which includes coming up with innovative ways of fundraising, they still rely heavily on the subsidies they get from the department. Their main concern is the possibility of having their budgets cut by the government. (See annexure B1-B6.)

According to Murphy, a Canadian,) government support for a greater decentralization of school governance appears to be founded on economic factors:

Government officials have been seeking strategies for curbing expenditure. One of the widely used of these strategies has been transferring whenever possible, the cost of a service to the user. The introduction of school-based management in a school system provides the infrastructure for transferring the cost of specific educational services to parents if they perceive such services are necessary. A basic education is funded but nothing else (Murphy: EBSCOhost Full Display wysiwyg://bodyframe.8/http://ehostvgw5.)

Section 36 of SASA 84 of 1996 also imposes a responsibility on all governing bodies of public schools to do their utmost to improve the quality of education in their schools by raising additional resources to supplement those, which the state provides from public funds (South Africa 1996, sec. 36).

In terms of the moral support from the GDE officials, the majority of participants from both schools indicated that it was lacking. (See section 4.7.5.2.) The CEO of GDE (Mr. Petje) supports this view. In his article in the GDE monthly newsletter, Petje notes that GDE officials are in the dark about what is happening in schools:

Our monitoring capacity is weak, and we are unable to execute tasks or decisions. We have fantastic policies for implementation, but do very little to engage people. Something about district monitoring machinery in respect of the

interface strategy between Head Office and District office, and the District office and schools requires more attention (Petje: New from Triple One 2003:3).

As far as capacity building is concerned, the SGB and SMT members of both schools were in agreement that after workshops have been conducted, GDE should provide ongoing support in terms of monitoring and mentoring. Continuous capacity building programmes, support and mentoring are essential to enable the school principals, SMTs, SGBs and educators to handle the changes brought about by self-management. (See annexure B4-B6.)

#### 4.8.4.3 SUPPORT FROM THE BUSINESS WORLD

In terms of the support from businesses only the SGB members and the principal of Eqinisweni secondary school indicated the need for this kind of support. The support needed from the business world was indicated as financial support and skills development (especially marketing skills). (See annexure B2 & B5.)

In terms of financial support from businesses, one SGB member of Eqinisweni secondary school raised a concern that businesses tend to support former Model C schools and not township schools. In their view, only when township schools can partner with former Model C schools will businesses support them. (See annexure B5.) Furthermore the call for financial support from outside indicates that schools have come to realize that the funding from the government cannot meet all their needs hence governing bodies are required to come up with innovative ways of supplementing what the government gives schools. The perception held by members of the SGB could be that the governors of the former Model C schools are educated and some could even be owners of businesses as a result they might be having the right skills and resources to communicate with the business world.

As far as marketing skills are concerned, schools now have to compete with one another to attract learners and so one of the challenges they face is to market their schools positively in order to attract more learners.

## 4.9 FIELDNOTES

This section deals with the observation of meetings and analysis of documents.

### 4.9.1 OBSERVATION OF MEETINGS

The researcher observed that the principals are still in control. This manifested itself on how the meetings were conducted, who dominated most of the meetings and how decisions were reached. The principals chaired 8 of the meetings attended by the researcher except for two SGB meetings that were chaired by the chairpersons of the SGBs. The principals still dominate what is discussed in meetings and how decisions are reached. In one SGB meeting (name of the school withheld) the principal came up with the agenda just before the meeting started. In a staff meeting (name of the school withheld), when the treasurer of the SGB (an educator), was presenting a budget to staff members, a question was raised and was directed to the treasurer but the principal answered on behalf of the treasurer. In terms of the agenda items, finances and financial reports and projects dominated the meetings in both schools. There was less focus on real curriculum issues.

The researcher also observed that in staff meetings in both schools, the set up was that of the lecture, with the principal in front and doing most of the talking. As far as the SMT and SGB meetings are concerned the set up would be the round table but the principals still did a lot of talking. The researcher ascribed the different sitting arrangement to the fact that educators were big in numbers when compared to SMTs and SGBs, so it was easier to have a lecture type set up when conducting staff meetings. During staff and SMT meetings, it was mostly male educators who were participating. In SGB meetings, with special reference to Equisweni secondary school, even though meetings were mostly conducted in Sepedi, IsiZulu, the researcher, however, observed insecurities amongst parent members of the SGB in that they did not engage in discussions during meeting instead some of them would approach the researcher after the meetings and raise their concerns.

## 4.9.2 ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTS

Nothing much came out of the analysis of school documents such as policies, year plans and school development plans. The year end results, with particular reference to grade 12 results show a considerable improvement from 1999-2002 (also see fig.1). Even though the researcher could not establish the direct link between self-management and learner achievement, it is apparent that what self-management does is to create opportunities for schools to direct their resources for the benefit of both learners and educators. Nothing came out of the analysis of minutes other than what has been discussed in the previous section. (See section 4.9.1.)

## 4.10 SALIENT ASPECTS FOR EFFICIENT SELF-MANAGEMENT

The findings revealed the following aspects as essential for efficient and effective self-management:

- ❑ Parental involvement and visible participation. (See section 4.7.5.1.)
- ❑ Teamwork amongst all stakeholders. (See section 4.8.4.)
- ❑ Participative management and decision making. (See section 4.8.1.)
- ❑ Empowerment of SGBs and communities to be 'real' partners in education, to make informed decisions and to take ownership of schools. (See section 4.8.4.2.)
- ❑ Capacity building for principals, SMTs and educators. (See section 4.8.4.2.)
- ❑ Ongoing support and mentoring by the district. (See section 4.8.4.2.)
- ❑ Forming meaningful relationships with the business world. (See section 4.8.4.2.)

## 4.11 CONCLUSION

In this chapter the findings of the research were presented and discussed. The main benefits of self-management were identified as being able to make quick decisions, the freedom of choice and the independence/autonomy self-management provides schools. The main

challenges that were identified were the constant fear of overspending and misusing funds which results in self-managing schools focusing a lot on money and financial management rather than curriculum issues, the challenge of accountability and the lack of parental and community involvement. The salient aspects for efficient self-management were identified as teamwork amongst stakeholders, parental and community involvement and capacity building and ongoing support by the government.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### *SUMMARIES, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS*

#### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

The research has attempted to identify the benefits as well as the challenges of self-management in schools. It has also attempted to outline how self-managing schools could be supported for them to be more efficient and effective. Salient aspects of self-management have also been presented. This chapter deals with the summaries of chapters, conclusions and recommendations. Limitations of the study are also pointed out and acknowledged.

#### 5.2 SUMMARIES

### **5.2.1 Chapter two**

The background of self-management in South Africa was presented. The focus here was on the countries where self-management of schools was developed: Australia, New Zealand, United States of America (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK). Salient aspects that are necessary for efficient self-management pertaining to the countries mentioned above were identified. The essentials of self-management were also discussed. Commonalities pertaining to self-management of schools in the countries mentioned above were presented.

The findings of the literature study on the impact of self-management in the above countries revealed the following. (See section 2.5.):

- ❑ Enhancement of local participation and ownership.
- ❑ Enhancement of parental involvement in decision making.
- ❑ Shared leadership and teamwork.
- ❑ Participative management.
- ❑ Schools are independent to run their own affairs.
- ❑ Schools are accountable for decisions they make.
- ❑ There is no direct link between self-management and learner achievement.

### **5.2.2 Chapter three**

The qualitative approach was used because of its multi-perspective approach, descriptive and exploratory nature. (See sections 3.3 & 3.1.1.4.) The interactive nature of qualitative research made it relevant for the study. Two self-managing schools (Rebonwe primary school and Eqiniswa secondary school) were chosen to participate in this study. Data collection methods used included interviews, observations in meetings and analysis of some few documents. (See sections 3.1.1.4.) Ethics in qualitative research were outlined (see section 3.4) and limitations of the study were identified. (See section 3.5.)

### **5.2.3 Chapter four**

The data revealed that self-management has benefits as well as challenges (See sections 4.7.1 & 4.7.2.) The data also revealed that self-managing schools need to be supported in



order to be more efficient and effective. Teamwork amongst all stakeholders and role players was identified as an essential element for efficient self-management (See section 4.7.5.)

### 5.3 CONCLUSIONS

The findings of the study revealed that principals, SGBs and SMTs regard self-management of schools as a positive initiative that gives schools the latitude to manage themselves and to address their own unique needs. The data also revealed that teamwork amongst stakeholders (parents, communities, SGBs, educators, learners, businesses and government) is essential for efficient self-management (See section 5.2.3.)

#### 5.3.1 BENEFITS OF SELF-MANAGEMENT

Interviews conducted showed that the benefits of self-management include:

- ❑ The freedom of choice. (See section 4.7.2.)
- ❑ Quick decision making. (See section 4.7.2.)
- ❑ Autonomy/independence afforded to the schools. (See section 4.7.2.)

Under self-management, schools have a freedom to choose their Learning Support Material (LSM), including equipment. This has a potential of raising the morale of both the principal and staff in that they experience the results of increased control and flexibility at school level. It also benefits the schools because it allows the schools greater flexibility and choice in terms of addressing their priorities and the needs of the learners. The freedom to choose the supplier is an added benefit because schools negotiate directly with different suppliers in terms of discounts and donations/sponsorships and this provides better value for money. (See section 4.7.2.)

Self-management allows schools to make quick decisions and to respond quickly to changing needs and priorities. (See section 4.7.2.)

Self-management affords schools independence to run their own affairs and to make their own decisions. The schools involved in this study see themselves as being self-sufficient even though they still need financial support from the government. (See section 4.8.4.2.)

### 5.3.2 CHALLENGES OF SELF-MANAGEMENT

The challenges of self-management which became evident include the following:

- ❑ Constant fear of overspending and misusing funds. (See section 4.7.1.)
- ❑ The challenges of accountability. (See section 4.7.1.)
- ❑ Lack of parental and community involvement. (See section 4.8.4.1.)
- ❑ Minimal support by the government. (See section 4.8.4.2.)

The constant fear of overspending results in schools focusing more on money and administration rather than curriculum issues. Mutual accountability for decision made is a challenge for both principals and SGBs. The participatory and democratic nature of self-management requires consultation when decisions are to be made. The challenge is, who is accountable when wrong decisions are made. The principals as the chief accounting officers find it difficult to let go in terms of control, when at the end of the day they are held accountable for everything that takes place in their schools. (See section 4.7.1.)

The lack of parental and community involvement is evidenced by non payment of schools, lack of involvement in fund raising initiatives, low attendance in meetings, burglaries and theft because of the misconception that self-managing schools a lot of money, lack of initiative by parents when it comes to school projects. The lack of parental involvement could be attributed to lack of skills and time.

5.3.2.1 Other challenges identified by the researcher include the following:

- ❑ Some members of the SGB lack confidence because they are illiterate and because they lack knowledge in terms of providing strategic leadership to the schools. (See sections 4.7.1 & 4.8.1.)
- ❑ Limited support by the government through district offices of education. (See section 4.7.5.2.)
- ❑ Increased workload in terms of administration. (See annexure B6.)
- ❑ Lots of focus on money and finances at the expense of curriculum issues. (See annexure B4.)

- ❑ Educators still dominate decision making in terms of coming up with policies, drafting year plans and school development plans because some SGBs lack knowledge and skills to make informed decisions in educational matters. (See sections 4.7.1 & 4.8.1.)

### 5.3.3 HOW CAN SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS BE SUPPORTED?

Interviews conducted showed that stakeholder involvement and participation is key for efficient and effective self-management in schools. The support needed which became evident include the following:

- ❑ Parents should be involved, initiate and lead school projects, pay school fees and raise funds to supplement the government subsidies. (See section 4.7.5.1.)
- ❑ Communities should reclaim and take ownership of their schools. (See section 4.7.5.1)
- ❑ Parents should attend meetings and participate in educational processes. (See section 4.7.5.1.)
- ❑ Capacity building programmes should be ongoing and follow-ups should be made to ensure implementation. (See section 4.7.5.2.)
- ❑ The government should not only provide financial support but moral support and mentoring. (See section 4.7.5.2.)
- ❑ Businesses should also give financial support and skills development to schools. (See section 4.7.5.3.)

## 5.4 LIMITATIONS

The aim of the study was not to generalize hence the research was limited to 2 self-managing schools. However, the study could serve as an impetus for further research. The schools were chosen because they are ex-DET schools that are situated in semi urban areas. The aim was to investigate how ex-DET self-managing schools experience self-management.

## 5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

Self-managing schools need the support and participation of all stakeholders in order to be more efficient and effective. The recommendations include the following:

- ❑ Effective partnerships need to be formed between self-managing schools and communities in order to improve schools and thereby learning outcomes.
- ❑ Educators should realize the importance of parental involvement in education and value their ideas and contributions.
- ❑ Teamwork amongst educators, parents and communities enhances self-management. Team building programmes should be provided.
- ❑ School Governing Bodies need effective support and empowerment to ensure their effective functioning. Capacity building programmes by the department need to focus and address the changing needs brought about by self-management in schools. These programmes need to be sustained.
- ❑ Appropriate training and development, including mentoring by government officials, should be provided for principals and SMTs to ensure that they provide effective leadership in self-managing schools.
- ❑ Ongoing professional development programmes should be provided for self-managing schools. Teachers are a valuable source of information and play a vital role in the teaching and learning process.
- ❑ Self-management does not automatically lead to improved learning outcomes but only provides opportunities to improve learning outcomes. A concerted effort should be directed towards improving learning outcomes because after all that is the core business of education. Resources should be directed to enhance learner achievement.

## 6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, G.L., Herr, K. & Nihlen, A.S. 1994. *Studying Your Own School: An Educator's Guide to Qualitative Practitioner Research*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
2. Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. 1992. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
3. Bordia, A. 1997. Moving towards Self-Managing Schools. Revised discussion paper: 1-5 [s.l.: s.n.].
4. Bryman, A. 1984. Debate about quantitative and qualitative research: A question of method or epistemology? *British Journal of Sociology*, xxxv(1): 75-92.
5. Bullock, A & Thomas, H. 1997. *Schools at the centre: A study of decentralization*. London and New York: Routledge.
6. Caldwell, B.J. & Spinks, J.M. 1988. *The Self-Managing School*. East Sussex: The Falmer Press.
7. Caldwell, B. J. 2001: [http://www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/EPM/papers/Bcaldwell/Open University/](http://www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/EPM/papers/Bcaldwell/OpenUniversity/). (accessed 2001/10/12).
8. Candoli, C. 1995. *Site-Based Management in Education: How to make it work in your school*. Pennsylvania: Technomic.

9. Creswell, W.L. 1994. *Research Design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
10. David, J.L. 1996. The Who, What And Why of Site-Based Management. *Educational Leadership*: 4-9
11. Debus, B. 2000: <http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art-4-9.htm> (accessed 2001/04/25).
12. Dellar, G.B. 1995: <http://education.curtin.edu.au/iier5/dellar.html> (accessed 2002/03/04).
13. De Vos A.S. (ed). 1998. *Research at grass roots: A primer for the caring professions*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
14. Dimmock, C. (Ed). 1993. *School-Based Management and School Effectiveness*. London: Routledge.
15. Fidler, B., Russell, S. & Simkins, T. (Ed) 1997. *Choices for Self-Managing Schools: Autonomy and Accountability*. London:P.C.P.
16. Fleisch, B. [S.a.]. *The Devolution of Authority to Schools: Legislation in Gauteng*. [s.l.]: McGill University.
17. Gall, M.D., Borg, W.M. & Gall, J.P. 1996. (6<sup>th</sup> edition). *Educational Research: An Introduction*. New York: Longman.
18. Hoberg, S.M. (ed). 1999. *Research methodology: Study Guide for MEDEM 2-R*. Pretoria: UNISA.
19. Holmes, G. 2000: [http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art\\_4\\_37.htm](http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art_4_37.htm) (accessed 2001/04/25).
20. Howells, J. 1995. Local management of schools: professional partnership and financial gains. *Towards Self-Managing Schools*, editor V Williams. London: Cassell: 43-57.
21. Huckman, L. & Fletcher, J. 1996. A Question of Costs: Budget Management in Secondary Schools: 130-148.
22. International Conference on Education and Decentralisation, African Experiences and Comparative Analysis (2002:Johannesburg).
23. Karlsson, J. & Pampallis, J. 1995. The Role of Governance Structures in the Sustainability of Learning Spaces: Democratic Governance of Public Schooling in South Africa. Durban: Education Policy Unit (Natal): 127-140.
24. Karlsson, J., Pampallis, J. & Sithole, S. 1996. Restructuring Educational Governance at Sub-National Levels in South Africa: Democratic Governance of Public Schooling in South Africa. Durban: Education Policy Unit (Natal): 115-126.
25. Kuehn, L. 1996: <http://www.bctf.bc.ca/ResearchReports/96ei04> (accessed 2002/03/04).

26. Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. 1995. *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
27. Mason, J. 2001. Planning and designing Qualitative Research. [s.l.:s.n.].
28. McCracken, G. 1988. *The Long Interview: Qualitative Research Methods Series 13*. Newbury Park: Sage.
29. McKenzie, G., Powell, J. & Usher, R. 1997. *Understanding Social Research: Perspectives on Methodology and Practice*. London: Falmer Press.
30. McMillan, J. 2000: [http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art\\_4\\_26.htm](http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art_4_26.htm).
31. McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. 1997. (4<sup>th</sup> Edition). *Research in Education: A conceptual introduction*. New York: Longman.
32. Mohrman, S.A., Wohlstetter, P. & Associates. 1994. *School-Based Management: Organizing for High Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
33. Murphy, P.J., wysiwyg://bodyframe.8/http://ehostvgw5.e...(accessed 2001/10/12).
34. Neuman, W.L. 2000. (4<sup>th</sup> edition). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
35. News from Triple One. 2003. By M. Petje. Monitoring Institutions: 2-3.
36. NZCER Research Projects: <http://www/nzcer.org.nz/research/edreform.htm> (accessed 2002/02/04).
37. O'Callagan, A. 1998: <http://www.sappa.sa.edu.au/local.htm> (accessed 2001/04/24).
38. Odden, A. 1994. Decentralized Management and School Finance: *Theory in Practice*, 33(2): 104-110.
39. Palys, T. 1997. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). *Research Decisions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.
40. Patton, M.Q. 1987. *How to Use Qualitative Method in Evaluation*. Newbury Park: Sage.
41. Petje, M. 2003. News From Triple One: Monitoring Institutions. Johannesburg: Communications Directorate: 2-3.
42. Pole, C.J & Chawla-Duggan, R. 1996. *Reshaping Education in the 1990: Perspectives on Secondary Schooling*. London: Falmer Press.
43. Sackney, L.E. & Dibski, D.J. 1994. School-Based Management: A Critical Perspective. *Educational Management and Administration*, 22(2): 104-111.
44. Shields, P.M. & Knapp, M.S. 1997 The Promise and Limits Of School-Based Reform: A National Snapshot, 79(2): 288-294.

45. Sithole, S. 1994. Parent-Teacher-Student Associations (PTSAs): Present State and Future Prospects: Democratic Governance of Public Schooling in South Africa. Durban: Education Policy Unit (Natal): 39-49.
46. South Africa. *A concept paper on section 21 functions: Implementation strategies and cases of best practice in provincial departments*. 2000. Pretoria: Education Foundation.
47. South Africa. 1995. School Education Act, No.6. Pretoria: Government Printers.
48. South Africa. 1996. *South African Schools Act, No 84*. Pretoria: Government Printers.  
South Africa. 1996. *South African Schools Act, no.84, 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
49. South Africa. 1999. *Allocated functions of school governing bodies according to SASA Act No 84 of 1996*. (Circ. 55/99).
50. South Africa. 1999. *The Self-Managing Schools Project: A review of the implementation in N7 District*. Johannesburg: GDE.
51. South Africa. 2000. *A Manual on School Funding Norms: The Self-Managing School: Section 21 Functions*. Pretoria: National Department of Education.
52. South Africa. 2000. *School Funding Norms: Self-Managing Schools: Section 21 Functions*. Pretoria: National Department of Education.
53. Spinks, J.M. & Rockliff, B. J. 2000: <http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art-4-18.hmt> (accessed 2001/04/25).
54. Taylor, S.J. & Bogdan, R. 1998. (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
55. Tunbridge, H., Stuart, B. 2000:  
[http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art\\_4\\_4.htm](http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art_4_4.htm) (accessed 2001/04/25)
56. Williams, R.C., Harold, B., Robertson, J., & Southworth, G. 1997. Sweeping Decentralization of Educational Decision-Making Authority: Lessons from England and New Zealand.:626-631.
57. Wohlstetter, P. & Mohrman, S.A. 1994: <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/CPRE/fb5sbm.html> (accessed 2001/04/24).
58. Wohlstetter, P. 1995. Getting School-Based Management Right: What Works and What doesn't. 77(1): 22-26.
59. Woolley, T. 2000: [http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art\\_4\\_10.htm](http://www.apapdc.edu.au/conference2000/papers/art_4_10.htm) (accessed 2001/04/25).
60. Wylie, C. 1997: [http://www.saeec.bc.ca/old\\_rprt.html](http://www.saeec.bc.ca/old_rprt.html). (accessed 2002/03/04).



## **ANNEXURE B1**

THE PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW AT REBONWE PRIMARY SCHOOL

DATE: 04 November 2002

TIME: 13h00

VENUE: The Principal's Office

Interviewer: When did you become the principal of this school?

Principal: When the school started in 1994.

Interviewer: When did your school become a section 21 school?

Principal: In 2000.

Interviewer: How do you view your role as the principal of a self-managing school?

Principal: I see myself as a person who should double the effort with regards to accountability, I should be more responsible now. I have to get more funds from the department and I should be directly involved in order to account.

Interviewer: Has your role as the principal changed in any way under self-management? If so, how?

- Principal: Yes. My role has changed because when I started it was a small school of 11 teachers and now I have 39 educators and ±1500 learners that I have to manage, therefore I need to be more responsible. This automatically needs change. There is also a need for self-development, not only academics but on management lessons.
- Interviewer: What is your working relationship with other members of the school management team?
- Principal: The relationship is characterized by respect, trust and willingness to work. This has contributed to what the school is today. The relationship is 102% good.
- Interviewer: What is your working relationship with the school governing body?
- Principal: The relationship with SGB is the best. The SGB is supportive of all projects that the school undertakes hence the success of the school. I have not experienced any conflict with the SGB, we have never been at loggerheads, never, not at all. The interest of the SGB has always been to see the school prosper.
- Interviewer: How does being a self-managing school benefit the learners?
- Principal: Under self-management, learners contribute and benefit. There is a willing team of staff. Projects are run and educators do things from a selfless point of view. The motto of the school is to treat learners as our own children.
- Interviewer: What are the benefits of being self-managing for the school?
- Principal: Above all you find yourself very independent. We don't look at authorities as a threat but as one kind of support. Self-management brings confidence and happiness. Everybody is playing their part, even if the principal is not there, the school will run smoothly. The principal is put at ease, the staff is free and happy and we don't deal with conflicts. The atmosphere is very positive. We look at each other as colleagues and not groups of cliques. People are here to work, educators enjoy teaching both intra and extra-mural activities. Netball and soccer teams go to high levels because people are positive.
- Interviewer: Are there challenges you face as the principal of a self-managed school? If so, what are those challenges?
- Principal: There is a tendency to look down upon people who bring information to you but who are also less informed. There is also a tendency to undermine workshops that are organized by the department because one feels that they are a waste of time and are below par. One wants to look upon supervisors with respect but one tends to feel that they are less informed about issues.
- Interviewer: How do you deal with this?

- Principal: I deal with it by being vocal about things, vocal when things are not going right. By contributing positively and not to talk behind the District Director's back. Another challenge is that there are job offers for me and one has to make a choice whether one has to move on. The temptation to move on is always there but I still feel that there is much to offer at the school
- Interviewer: What is the level of participation of parents in school's activities?
- Principal: 80% of parents contribute by attending meetings, being part of the projects e.g. cultural activities and sports. Parents are willing to accompany learners during educational excursions.
- Interviewer: How often do parents have contact with the school? What is the nature of those contacts?
- Principal: On a daily basis. Parents come to school for related to their childrens' learning, governance. A team of mothers comes to school from Monday to Friday to clean the school and these mothers are not getting remunerated. The parents have taken a presidential call for Letsema (volunteerism). One side of the garden is shared with parents.
- Interviewer: What can be done to make self-managing schools more efficient?
- Principal: Less interference from the authorities is needed. If the authorities can stop to give a string of instructions and authority, people could be more creativity and this will take the school to greater levels. Schools should be given more autonomy. Educators should be given more autonomy to be creative in their classrooms, the red tape is stifling the educators' creativity. A greater amount of involvement from parents is needed, at least 95%. Parents have to take the lead. Most of the time educators initiate projects and parents only come to support, especially parents who are not members of the SGB. We need real self-managed schools where parents initiate projects and are involved. If that could happen, what we call self-managing schools will look like a picnic.
- Interviewer: How can self-managed schools be supported?
- Principal: Self-managed schools should be given more autonomy. If schools could be given latitude to be themselves, they will definitely succeed. Authorities should listen to the schools. Districts still pull strings, no top down but down to top approach is needed. More money is needed to get resources for the school e.g. a computer center.
- Interviewer: What aspects concerning the self-managing of schools do you feel insecure about?
- Principal: We were not exposed to deal with the amount of money that one is dealing with. We spend worryingly (sword is hanging, things have to be right). Exposure to buy equipment opens up problems like theft. 2 burglaries have

already taken place, one last week. People feel that the school is well to do. There is a need to be more accountable because I am seen as the chief accounting officer and that is quite frightening. I prefer to run the school without funds. Workshops on how to manage the school effectively bring a lot of development. There is a tendency to be selfish and not to want things being done without one's consent in all the projects. . It is a disadvantage being funded by the department because we rely more on what the government gives and do very little on fund raising projects.

## **ANNEXURE B2**

### THE PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW AT EQINISWENI SECONDARY SCHOOL

DATE: 20 November 2002

TIME: 11h00

VENUE: The Principal's Office

Interviewer: When did you become the principal of this school?

Principal: In April 1999. I have been an HOD at the school since 1994.

Interviewer: When did your school become a section 21 school?

Principal: In 1999.

Interviewer: How do you view your role as the principal of a self-managing school?

Principal: My role is that of acting as a CEO. Why? There are various committees that assist with the smooth running of the school. My role is to coordinate these committees effectively to ensure that they work to the prescribed rules so that the school can improve and run efficiently.

- Interviewer: Has your role as the principal changed in any way under self-management? If so, how?
- Principal: Yes. Why? Before schools were declared section 21, the biggest responsibility of the smooth running of the school, especially buying, was on the shoulders of the government. Now we are self autonomous, the government gives us allocation and school sees to it that it runs smoothly. The role has changed, you are no longer like a simple supervisor, you are the real manager. The responsibility is becoming too big. You are no longer like a baby being nursed.
- Interviewer: What is your working relationship with other members of the school management team?
- Principal: So far I am happy, we relate well and we coordinate well. My role is to see to it that we have that sound relationship, communicate well. HODs especially should have access to my office to discuss problems. That has promoted sound relationship. We have adopted an open door policy.
- Interviewer: What is your working relationship with the school governing body?
- Principal: To a certain extent they coordinate well with us , not only me but the SMT and the educators. The hiccup is that most of them are illiterate, most of them have not gone beyond Matric, only 1 or 2 who would understand the nitty gritty of governance, however we are happy. Our meetings are fruitful, we do clash but we are able to deal with differences. Since the SGB was elected everybody is still there, there are no withdrawals. They are all still involved. The impact of illiteracy on the SGB is that when there are matters that need a person with an understanding of education, however, we bring them on board but it takes time to explain and for them to understand. The plus is that we are still in good terms. We managed to develop the football pitch by planting grass. The SGB went on their own to parents to ask them to remove weed from the garden. The SGB is empowered during meetings to make spare time to explain (phone rings). The District Office organizes workshops to train the SGB. Sometimes we enlist the help of the NGO e.g. PROTEX to train them.
- Interviewer: How does being a self-managing school benefit the learners?
- Principal: I wish this thing should have started a long time ago. This comes from the bottom of my heart. Now we are able to assess what we need e.g. audiovisual, sporting grounds (netball, volleyball). Learners are able to enjoy when they are at school (phone rings). We no longer have to wait for 6 months or a year before we get something. We are able to purchase teaching aids that we never had before. This increases the level of achievement of learners (phone rings). We were able to establish 2 computer centers. We are a 21<sup>st</sup> century school. We can be compared to former Model C schools and to schools from other countries. Section 21 has helped a lot, I wish it could go on.
- Interviewer: What are the benefits of being self-managing for the school?

Principal: (Phone rings). Being a self-managing school does allow enough room for the school to say we need this without wanting for someone to do it or to give you that. We choose the supplier. Independence goes a long way, to minimize on the cost of books you can go to the supermarket and buy them. The avenues are open and the shopping horizon is widened. You are able to throw your net all over the country.

Interviewer: Are there challenges you face as the principal of a self-managed school? If so, what are those challenges?

Principal: Challenges are there (repeat). Sometimes if you lose your ground, you might say you have chosen the wrong profession. Entitlements by teachers are unreasonable at times, they misconstrue consultation with entitlement. Parents, however, are more supportive, even more than educators. Maybe it is because their children are here unlike educators whose children are elsewhere. Educators are able to pay high fees in former Model C schools. However, with good management, good skills and patience, those challenges sharpen your mind and are turned to positives. This changes you as a person to understand the needs of other human beings. Another challenge is with regard to auditing, the Black Economic Empowerment drive. We go out to look for Black people to give service to projects. The problem is that most of them only have experience and not qualifications and sometimes it is difficult for them to analyze things on paper (they can only talk) and so they find it difficult to coordinate these projects. This causes a lot of problems because educators will say 'why don't you go to someone with qualifications?' I overcome this by communicating because that is the biggest tool of a leader.

Interviewer: What is the level of participation of parents in school's activities?

Principal: We still lack their participation and impression in the school. They normally end in meetings because they think that is where their participation ends. There are some parents who think the disciplining of their children is the responsibility of the teacher. However, as long as we understand that most parents are illiterate and it takes time for them to understand that they should extend discipline and help with homework. They agree in meetings to pay school fees but when it comes to paying, we struggle. Even those who pay, they do so after a struggle. Out of ±1000 learners only 10 who come up to be exempted from paying school fees. This is sometimes caused by the community out there who still have the pre-1994 mentality to make the country ungovernable.

Interviewer: How do you overcome this?

Principal: (Phone rings). We are fortunate that most of the parents in the SGB are active in communities as politicians and as councilors and sometimes because of this we see positive changes. To a certain extent we are going there but the progress is very slow.

- Interviewer: How often do parents have contact with the school? What is the nature of those contacts?
- Principal: Those who come on their own and want to help are not many. Some parents who work in big computer companies have brought computer books to the school, the rest of the parents are don't care and are saying, "the government will provide' The parental involvement is not at the level I would like it to be.
- Interviewer: What can be done to make self-managing schools more efficient?
- Principal: The most important thing is openness, showing everybody that he/she is accepted and important, making people aware that schools are not government institutions but that they belong to them. Parents should reclaim their position to own their schools. The government should continue with the subsidies, we can't rely on school fees.
- Interviewer: How can self-managed schools be supported?
- Principal: Support is needed from all stakeholders, from national government to parents. Government policies and finance are needed to support the school. The government lacks support by the district office officials. They wait until there are problems before the IDSO comes. The government should train the SGB in particular. Parents in the SGB should serve for a very long period because when they begin to understand, their term of office expires. We need total support from parents, their support should be above that of the government because they are closer to the school, they can prevent burglaries and vandalism in the school. Parents should understand that the school belongs to them and to regard schools as their homes. Big businesses do not trust the schools. They should give financial assistance, support projects and help develop skills to market the school. There is a lack of marketing skills. The school magazine is not yet off the ground. The school intends to give bursaries for top achievers. There is a proposal that I intend to send to top 5 PSL teams. We need assistance with skills, money to sustain this. We need to create a programme for primaries [primary schools] in the neighbourhood to come and train at our school. Schools are doing something to improve themselves. Give them 10 years to reach that level. Learners should cooperate and not rely on teacher for discipline. Parents to reclaim their own schools and raise funds, parents don't pay school fees. Model C schools will belong to the past if all stakeholders cooperate. Changes are there, in learning and teaching there is improvement. The school is getting there. For Eqiniswaeni, the sky is the limit. No results less than 70%.
- Interviewer: What aspects concerning the self-managing of schools do you feel insecure about?
- Principal: Let me not buy your face. There is nothing at this school, we are open, I take criticism, I take things as they come (phone rings). I am the accounting officer with anything that goes with management. Finances are to be controlled and

who controls them? Me, the principal. When consulting them, I am not asking for permission. That is sometimes misconstrued especially by PL 1[post level] educators. Things of that nature can make people uncomfortable and insecure.

### **ANNEXURE B3**

SMT INTERVIEW AT REBONWE PRIMARY SCHOOL

DATE: 04 November 2002

TIME: 11H15

INTERVIEWEES

Ms N T Mgojo: HOD Maths

Ms N R Mmola: HOD Foundation Phase

Mr N S Ndou: HOD HSS and EMS

Mr S M Thlabane: Deputy Principal

Ms N Simbine: HOD LLC

Interviewer: When did you become members of the SMT?

Mg: In 1996.

Mm: In 1996.

Nd: In 1999.

Thl: HOD in 1999, deputy in 2002.

Si: In 1995.

Interviewer: How is your working relationship with the educators in your departments?



Thl: It is excellent, there is harmony and we are united.  
Nd: There is synergy in all departments, people are prepared to work and learn.

Interviewer: How are decisions made in your departments?

Nd: In departmental meetings where consensus is reached. Decisions guided by departmental policies.

Interviewer: How do you come up with budgets in your departments?

Mm: Each department draws up a budget and submits it to the main office.  
Nd: Budgets are done between July and August. School management plan guides the submission of budgets.

Interviewer: What are the benefits of being a self-managing school?

Thl: Smooth running, we do things according to the school plans and within a specific time and not to wait for the department.  
Nd: We manage our own funds. We are no hobo school, we don't have to keep on requesting for things from the department.  
Si: Prioritize according to own needs.  
Mg: We get funds as we need them.

Interviewer: What are the disadvantages of being a self-managing school?

Si: Fear of overspending. The school has to be extra careful about spending.  
Strict financial management and control is needed.  
Nd: If the school can overspending there is a fear that the Sec. 21 functions might be taken away from the school.  
Thl: Parents think the school has a lot of money. This can attract hooligans from outside.

Interviewer: How have your roles changed as the HODs of a self-managed school?

Si: The quality we want we get. Resources are easily available. No negatives in this school. We are enjoying ourselves here. Look at our school.  
Nd: Resources come on time and are not delayed. Our role as managers is simplified.  
Thl: The attitude of educators is positive. Being a sec. 21 school is a bonus. Science and Technology department is being sponsored by BMW who runs workshops for educators in order to build their capacity and improve their teaching skills.

Interviewer: Has the role of educators changed since your school became self-managing? If so, how?

Si: Resources easily accessible  
Nd: Morale high, attitudes positive.

- Thl: Schools that are not self-managing fail to attend workshops at times because of financial constraints. This is not the case in our school.
- Interviewer: Do you have teacher development programmes in your year plans? If so, what are the areas of development?
- Si: Teaching itself, orientation on how the departments are run. LLC focuses on developmental workshops that include creative writing and reading.
- Thl: The BMW sponsor focuses on Science and Technology. Workshops planned are for improvement of teaching skills.
- Mg: Maths workshops are planned. Class visits are done to identify the areas of development and subject meetings serve as mini workshops where educators share skills on teaching methods.
- Nd: In EMS and HSS, developmental needs of educators are detected through class visits.
- Interviewer: Who decides on the topics for these teacher development programmes?
- Thl: HODs decide according to the needs identified after class visits
- Si: Educators have inputs.
- Interviewer: Has self-management of the school any impact on curriculum delivery in general and students achievement in particular? If so, explain.
- Si: Yes, there are more resources, LSM is in place. Teacher development workshops can be run any time. Motivational speakers are often invited to address learners and prize-giving awards are held for learners. The school is able to pay for all these.
- Mg: Learners no longer share LSM (textbooks) as they used to. Each child has got his own.
- Thl: The atmosphere is excellent. Debate group excels.
- Nd: LSM for 2003 is already in place.
- Interviewer: What challenges do you face as members of the SMT of this school?
- Nd: As the SMT of this school we are required to be innovative and to be agents of development in conjunction with experts from the department in order to help educators.
- Si: We are expected to be the 'know all'. We are expected to be perfectionists when it comes to teaching and management.
- Thl: One is under constant pressure to study and improve oneself.
- Mm: We have a challenge to be role models to educators, to lead by example. If we don't act our word, we cant do it. We must do what we talk. If we can't teach the way we say they must teach, we cannot win. Do it yourself before you say people must pull up their socks.
- Interviewer: What opportunities are there for managers of a self-managing school?
- Mg: We are able to get what we want. Nothing is imposed by the department.

Thl: The departments are more organized.  
Nd: Workshops are organized both internally and externally.  
Si: Every year we see improvement.

Interviewer: How can the SMT of this school be supported in managing the school more effectively and efficiently?

Si: Parental support is needed. Communities and churches should support the school.  
Thl: Workshops that are conducted by GDE should be an ongoing process. There should be follow-ups on major things  
Nd: District office learning area facilitators should give more support to the school.

#### **NOTES:**

**Mg stands for Mgojo  
Mm stands for Mmola  
Nd stands for Ndou  
Si stands for Simbine  
Thl stands for Thlabane**

#### **ANNEXURE B4**

SMT INTERVIEW AT EQINISWENI SECONDARY SCHOOL

DATE 06 DECEMBER 2002

TIME: 10h00

INTERVIEWEES

Mr. J Kunene: Deputy Principal-Curriculum

Ms S Petje: HOD-LO

Ms D Maluleke: HOD-Practical Subjects

Interviewer: When did you become members of the SMT?

JK: In 1994 as an HOD and 2002 as the deputy principal.

SP: In 1999

DS: In 2002

Interviewer: How is your working relationship with the educators in your departments?

JK: Fine, differences are there but we put differences aside for the sake of the learners. Relations with HODs are excellent. We work as a team to achieve the objectives of the school.

SP: Healthy, the LO is the biggest department. Consultation is done, we talk to educators in a professional manner but there are still those who are reluctant to execute their duties.

DM: Healthy.

Interviewer: How are decisions made in your departments?

JK: We consult broadly to ensure ownership of that decision. Management sometimes takes decisions on their own

SP: Sometimes decisions are taken without consultation. An HOD is an overseer and needs other people to support.

DM: Consultation is done but the final decision is mine.

Interviewer: How do you come up with budgets in your departments?

JK: The needs analyses are submitted to the office by the HODs of various departments. The office then prioritizes the needs.

Interviewer: What are the benefits of being a self-managing school?

JK: Decisions are taken fast because there is no need for approval from the department. The choice of selection of the supplier is a plus.

SP: We are able to buy according to need.

DM: We are now taken seriously and are in control. When we fail we don't have GDE to blame at the end of the day.

Interviewer: What are the disadvantages of being a self-managing school?

JK: Educators feel that the school has a lot of money and there is wastage at times [spending spree]. Sometimes educators buy for the sake of buying without considering the needs of the school. At the end of the day, the needs of the learners are not considered. Educators lack discipline when it comes to buying. We are not used to controlling big monies. We can end up buying something we don't need.

DM: Over-expectations in terms of control, responsibility that were not there before. Lots of focus on money that is difficult to control. Fear of failure.

SP: We need more discipline, accountability and responsibility to ensure that things that are bought are really needed.

Interviewer: How have your roles changed as the HODs of a self-managed school?

JK: Our roles have not changed much, what have changed are the procedures.

DM: There is no change. What has changed is that we are now competing with Model C schools, it is not easy to reach the target but we can reach it.

- Interviewer: Has the role of educators changed since your school became self-managing? If so, how?
- JK: Not much, duties and responsibilities have not changed
- DM: Not much, what I see is more dedication. I don't know whether that is as a result of the school being self-managing or that people are encouraged and motivated because of the good results we got in 2002. We got 97% for Grade 12 in 2002. I also see a lot of educators reporting early for work.
- SP: Yes, the role of educators has changed. I find educators to be more responsible and accountable. Section 21 has helped educators to be more innovative. They are no longer restricted, if they want something, it is made available.
- Interviewer: Do you have teacher development programmes in your year plans? If so, what are the areas of development?
- JK: Yes, areas of development are decided through departmental meetings. Areas of development are linked to the subject matter e.g. OBE.
- SP: Areas of development such as labour issues, policies, and financial management are decided by educators.
- Interviewer: Who decides on the topics for these teacher development programmes?
- JK: Some are decided in the staff meetings e.g. labour, finance. Those that are related to the subject matter are decided in the various departments.
- SP: Suggestion box is used.
- Interviewer: Has self-management of the school any impact on curriculum delivery in general and students achievement in particular? If so, explain.
- JK: The benefits are that we are able to order LSM at our own pace in our own time. 90% of LSM for 2003 has already been delivered and this will enable us to start teaching on the 1<sup>st</sup> day in 2003. We are able to identify shortages immediately and payment arrangements can be made with suppliers directly. Most learners have textbooks after the school was allocated section 21 functions. This saves time in terms of writing notes. Attitudes of educators are also positive. It is now easy for the educators to deliver. Learners are passing and show a lot of understanding because of resources at their disposal.
- SP: Learning becomes more effective because educators choose the LSM they want. Grade 12 results for 2001 have improved and we got 96% overall pass rate.
- Interviewer: What challenges do you face as members of the SMT of this school?
- SP: Taking control of the school through consultation is sometimes difficult. We are human beings and we sometimes want to be popular and to be accepted

by educators and this is more difficult. We overcome this because we always thrive to be exemplary.

JK: Attitudes of some educators are not correct in terms of taking responsibility of their duties seriously. It is a mammoth task to change these attitudes. The SMT is trying to change the attitudes by talking to them, reminding them to stay focused on the achievement of the agreed goals. Another challenge is that educators expect miracles from management in terms of guidance. This is a transition stage and everybody is learning. Section 21 demands putting systems and procedures in place and SMT does not have a lot of skills in this. It also requires management to be firmer because they are dealing with a lot of money.

DM: Change comes with resistance. Having to convince people is the most difficult challenge.

Interviewer: What opportunities are there for managers of a self-managing school?

SP: We get to choose material we want. Needs of the school are considered. Section 21 functions empower us with management skills of accountability and responsibility to be able to handle a lot of money. It makes us to be better citizens as SMTs.

JK: When we buy, there is that direct negotiation with the supplier in terms of discounts and donations. Section 21 functions benefit us because it trains the school to be self-sufficient, how to manage funds to minimize any wastage. We grow and become better people in terms of managing funds. We are now able to review our systems, check for the loopholes and tighten up. We also get experience on who is the cheapest supplier, we look for quality and do not just give them business. We also look on how we can benefit from them.

DM: It is economical, companies are willing to help. Being self-managing has made us to have a vision and to be more competent so that we are comparable with schools from overseas. It has also brought the government closer to the people. We are not scared of GDE officials anymore, we now have a voice and are being listened to.

Interviewer: How can the SMT of this school be supported in managing the school more effectively and efficiently?

JK: GDE should support the school by supplying the school with their year plan on time to prevent clashing of dates as the result the school's year plan is not followed. This causes a lack of support from educators because they see HODs as being disorganized. GDE needs to visit the school regularly not only when something bad has happened. Parents also need to support the SMT. SGBs need to help to inform parents about decisions made by the SMT. Without the support of educators, HODs cannot do their job. If educators require new information, they should share it with HODs. Educators should do their part and teach because if one fails, the whole school fails and the whole community fails.

SP: Parents should attend meetings to highlight if things are not going right. Parents in Black schools do not attend meetings. Some educators do not

support the SMT because they say they are paid for doing their job. GDE should be proactive in terms of workshops, the changes need to be communicated with the school on time. Educators need to know that the HODs are not the know it all.

DM: Some educators would like to see you fail, but if the HOD fails, the whole school fails. HODs need to support each other by coming up with workshops that will enrich each other. Educators should do their part to be the best teachers. Parents should look not for what the school and the government can do for them but what themselves can do for the school.

#### **NOTES:**

**JK stands for Kunene**  
**SP stands for Petje**  
**DM stands for Maluleke**

#### **ANNEXURE B5**

#### **SGB INTERVIEW AT EQINISWENI SECONDARY SCHOOL**

DATE: 04 December 2002  
TIME: 08h51  
VENUE: Staff Room

#### **INTERVIEWEES**

Ms Lilian Mahesu:	Parent
Mr Judas Mokwebo:	Chairperson
Mr Solly Ledwaba:	Treasurer
Mr Israel Simango:	learner

Interviewer: When did you become members of the SGB?

LM:	1997
JM:	1997
SL:	2002
IS:	2002

Interviewer: How do you understand your roles and responsibilities as members of the SGB to be?

JM: To get information to parents so that they can work together and know what their children are doing at school. How they are taught, whether the policy is followed. To check everything that is needed.

SL: Policies are drafted by the SGB. Vision and Mission is defined and explained. The budget is prepared and the SGB is accountable for the financial statements. The SGB drafts the financial policy of the school.

IS: I serve as the mouthpiece of the learners to SGB. I see myself as the go between the learners and parents.

LM: We attend workshops and disseminate information.

Interviewer: Have your roles changed in anyway under self-management? If so, How?

SL: Yes, the SGB is given all powers to govern the school. They draw a management plan and use the funds on how they have budgeted. The SGB has power to use funds according to the curricular needs of community needs. In order for the SGB to manage funds, the vision and mission statement is important.

JM: Funds are used to improve whatever is needed. We are able to raise and use funds for school projects. We have a computer project where we managed to get 90 computers through fund raising. We also use the tuckshop as the fundraiser to help the school to supplement funds from the government. When there is a shortage of staff, we can fundraise and pay out of SGB funds. We have a security that has been here for 3 years and is paid from the funds raised from the tuckshop.

Interviewer: How is your working relationship with the SMT of the school?

JM: It is good except for minor things. We are able to resolve issues.

SL: I differ from the chairperson of the SGB (JM), because when the year plan is drafted, parents have never been involved. Involvement of parents is very important.

IS: Learners have good relationship with the SMT. Workshops help parents to know their role.

LM: Working relationship is good. Problems are there but we are able to resolve them.

Interviewer: What challenges do you face as the SGB of this school?

SL: Accountability is difficult because of people who do not follow procedures and policies e.g. receipts. Policy is flouted by other stakeholders. Transparency is a problem when disclosing sensitive information related to educators

IS: Learners want to know everything.

JM: Learners who are doing things like smoking dagga, alcohol abuse, parents are called and necessary measures taken. We are winning the battle.

LM: Late coming and drugs is a problem. We are able to solve those.

Interviewer: What opportunities are there for SGBs of the self-managing schools to improve the school?



- JM: There are no opportunities. Most SGB members are not working, no transport. SGB members are compensated for transport. Some members do not attend meetings because of lack of money. SGB members are not part of the projects so that they could get money.
- SL: Funds can be used to empower SGB to understand the needs of the learners and the community at large. Workshops empower the SGB on how to manage the school.
- Interviewer: What are the advantages of being the SGB of a self-managing school?
- JM: The advantage is that whatever the school needs can be done quickly because funds are managed within the school e.g. the blockage of toilets, something to be fixed, painting is done quickly. We don't have to apply to the Department funds that could take 5 to 6 months to fix.
- SL: Quick decisions are made for something that is needed urgently e.g. project of beautifying the school because there is no need for approval by the Department. The SGB could come up with their own policies e.g. How to employ temporary educators.
- IS: We work with learners to clean up the school.
- LM: More responsibility from the SGB to look after the school.
- Interviewer: What are the disadvantages of being a self-managing school?
- SL: There are challenges of accountability. People flout procedures e.g. tuckshop is running at a loss and the SGB is accountable. Division among stakeholders e.g. disagreement of opinion about for example transport policy. These challenges could be overcome by empowering stakeholders by means of workshops.
- IS: In fundraising initiatives learners are not cooperative e.g. civic day.
- JM: Educators are looking down upon SGB because they are not educated. The SGB is just rubber stamping what has been decided upon by educators e.g. Year Plan.
- SL: Parents have inferiority complex. They don't come up with ideas to help the school improve. There is lack of knowledge in contributing towards the vision and mission. Educators are the only contributors. I appeal to the department to workshop SGB members from time to time.
- Interviewer: How involved are you in school activities? Explain.
- SL: We buy LSM, maintain and repair the physical structure. We are responsible for drafting the budget and we are accountable for expenditure. We call parents and tell them about the developments in the school. We also ensure

- that the community is involved in school activities. We fund raise, we draft school policies. We also resolve problems regarding payment of school fees.
- LM: We plan for the year. We are also responsible for the development of learners. We also see to it that the school runs smoothly and we are responsible for financial statements.
- JM: We check the entire school e.g. neatness. We participate in excursions by accompanying children. We are responsible for financial management and we are also represented in the financial committee. The problem though is that the principal dominates in all the meetings. Some people keep quiet because they do not know what is going on.
- Interviewer: What changes have you made in the school since you became a section 21 school?
- IS: Volleyball, Football and Netball grounds developed. We have beautified the grounds with African Houses to showcase cultural diversity within the community. We are working hard to improve the garden.
- JM: We have a computer project and garden improvement. There are more projects in the pipeline e.g. paving, cover for parking.
- SL: The curriculum of the school, 8 streams were decided by the SGB and now there are more choices for learners e.g. Home Economics, Computer Science. The curriculum is developed in such a way that it will develop the child. In 2004 we will introduce tourism.
- Interviewer: What is your involvement in school finances?
- SL: SGB play a major role. The SGB has to draft a year plan and budget according to the needs of the school and community. We have hands on approach because we are accountable for every cent.
- Interviewer: What is your involvement in policy making?
- JM: Only recently we are involved. Workshops to be conducted to empower the SGB to be able to draft school policies.
- SL: There are subcommittees and SGB members are represented there. e.g. finance committee, discipline committee etc. These committees draft their own policies.
- Interviewer: Do you raise funds for the school? If so, how?
- Yes (in unison)

- IS: Learners are sometimes requested to bring 50c each to pay for fixing toilets.
- LM: Through contests (beauty contests) and stalls to sell refreshments.
- SL: Through the tuck shop, casual day, computers (PROTEC using computers during school holidays and pay the school R19.000, school fees and excursions (for every payment done by learners and educators R2 is paid to the school)).
- Interviewer: How do you think you can help improve the school?
- IS: We are committed and dedicated towards our work. We are one and united SGB.
- SL: Moral support for all stakeholders e.g. motivating educators by SGB members i.e. addressing educators who have good results. Good plans to improve the school. Controls and checks if we are moving according to plans. Physical improvement and curriculum.
- JM: The SGB should build a good relationship with the community around the school. That relationship should be sustained so that the community takes ownership of the school to prevent burglaries. There are no burglaries at the school because everyone is around the school.
- Interviewer: What kind of support do you think you need to improve the school?
- JM: We need training in financial management so that the SGB do [does] not misuse the money.
- SL: More funds are needed. The department should pay for the use of computers by other schools. Support from the community is needed e.g. when there are problems with learners, parents are called but parents do not cooperate and do not even come. We need support from the business world (financial support). Businesses only consider former Model C schools and not the township schools. Through relationships with the former Model C schools, the school can get financial support.
- IS: Learners need training in problem solving and conflict resolution.
- JM: More money is needed for safety and security. Good fence is needed.
- IS: More money is needed so that when educators conduct Saturday schools they can have money to buy lunch.

SL: Moral support from the department is lacking i.e. giving feedback to the school.  
The IDSO instead of motivating educators, he demoralizes them.

**NOTES:**

LM stands for Mahesu  
JM stands for Mokwebo  
SL stands for Ledwaba  
IS stands for Simango

**ANNEXURE B6**

SGB INTERVIEW AT REBONWE PRIMARY SCHOOL

DATE: 08 June 2003

TIME: 14h28

VENUE: Staff Room

**INTERVIEWEES**

Mr N Ndou Treasurer

Ms P Nxumalo Administration

Ms T Sibanyoni Secretary

Mr A Mhlanga Chairperson

Interviewer: When did you become members of the SGB?

All in 2000.

Interviewer: How do you understand your roles and responsibilities as members of the SGB to be?

AM: The way I understand the role of the SGB in the school is that the SGB is putting oomph and zeal to the processes of the schools. Educational processes are concerned to provide quality education. Kader Asmal wants to see quality schools in South Africa. We also interview new teaching staff on our own so that they can push the school and meet the vision and mission of the school. We are contributing a lot in as far as educational processes are concerned.

NN: Our role is primarily governance, control of school funds and assets, recommend appointments and we are not involved in management issues. We have been trained on that.

PM & TM: Have nothing to add.

AM: A school without an SGB is a school like a desert. We have drafted so many policies.

Interviewer: Have your roles changed in anyway under self-management? If so, How?

NN: We are managing big sums of money i.e. R250000 unlike the Section 20 schools.

AM: The school processes can be improved because there is money. The life of the school has improved because we base our focus on school improvement.

PN: We have to take care of the money, there is no shortage. It is easy now because we can do other things than before, we don't depend on the state.

AM: Money is like a key that opens doors of poverty. We maintain school property, buy school books in order to have all the resources that gives the school an extra mile to meet the vision and mission of the school. Kader Asmal (laughs) loudhailed that schools should be improving in providing quality education.

NN: Before you can receive allocation for the following year, you need to have audited financial statements. A question of accountability comes in. We also pay services, before that the department was paying and now ESKOM phones the school directly if the school is not paying. City councils interact directly with the school.

AM: Its like managing your own family (laughter)

Interviewer: How is your working relationship with the SMT of the school?

AM: We have a good relationship with the SMT. When we are in a meeting we collaborate one another. There is no cause for frictions. The spirit of willingness has brought us to this stage. SMT is willing to work with SGB and vice versa. There is trust and openness and nothing can come across the spirit of working together willingly.

NN: The quality of leadership we have clarifies responsibilities so that there are no overlaps

AM: The manager is open and does not hide things. Whatever is discussed in the SGB meetings the principal takes it to the SMT. There are many projects we are involved in e.g. the beautification of the school. It goes back to the willingness.

PN: There are no hidden agendas here, there is open communication constantly.

TS: If the SMT want something they go to the principal and suggest, they have that freedom, not only the SGB.

Interviewer: What challenges do you face as the SGB of this school?

NN: Parents think the school has a lot of money. The payment of school fees has gone down even though it was the resolution taken in the mass meeting.

- AM: Mr Ndou has wrapped up everything in my mind.
- PN: We must be careful about spending and take good care of what we have. We should guard against overspending and misusing funds.
- Interviewer: What opportunities are there for SGBs of the self-managing schools to improve the school?
- AM: I think there are a lot of opportunities. If you have a properly managed money the sky is the limit. We have relationships with schools overseas e.g. interchange programmes and those schools have donated a lot of books to the school.
- NN: We budget and we don't have to go to the department for approval. Every project has an item. Different suppliers come to the school to market their products. Previously this was done by the department. We can negotiate directly with the supplier and even negotiate discounts, we operate businesslike.
- PN: Learners can go as far as they can with sports unlike section 20 schools. We can buy more computers and more books for the library. We do a lot of things than before.
- AM: We are global, we are inviting people from overseas to see what we are doing in South Africa and we would also like to go overseas. The school is global.
- TS: Sportwise the school is growing. We are able to offer different sporting activities/codes and we are able to buy equipment for those.
- NN: You can see even the school environment, the appearance of the school invites donors. The enrolment is going up.
- Interviewer: What are the advantages of being the SGB of a self-managing school?
- AM: The sky is the limit e.g. sportwise.
- NN: We go directly to the suppliers and negotiate discounts. There is no bureaucratic consultation.
- TS: There is enough room to grow as a school. The sky is the limit
- PN: Governors are managers of the school, finances are well controlled. We always have a good balance of funds.
- NN: Workshops are no longer attended by section 20 schools because they don't have money. Here there is no problem of transportation, we are never short of money.
- AM: We see the district when there are seminars.
- Interviewer: What are the disadvantages of being a self-managing school?
- AM: There could be mismanagement of funds if people do not manage the right way and if they don't have a track record.
- NN: We manage big amounts of money and if you are not accountable it can create a lot of problems. We manage amounts close to a million rands and we have to keep in touch with the District to track down expenditure. We do more administration and every Wednesday we have to write a report.
- TS: There is sometimes a problem of deciding on how to spend and how much to spend for fear of overspending and underspending.

PN: Its not safe, money can be misused. Fraud could also be a problem.

Interviewer: How involved are you in school activities? Explain.

AM: Very involved. I was involved with HIV/AIDS and seminars. Any activity,I take part except if it is during the week.

TS: Even during the week the SGB is involved, if the chairperson is not there, there is always a substitute.

PN: Finance, everything we have to know, everything, especially those activities with financial implications.

NN: Policymaking, approval of projects. SGB sometimes comes up with projects e.g. renovations of Rebonwe was initiated by the SGB.

Interviewer: What changes have you made in the school since you became a section 21 school?

AM: The sky is the limit. The place we are sitting now is a brand new school. The SGB speeded up the process of building the new school and even pushed the contractor to speed up.

PN: The painting of Rebonwe 1 [the old structure] and paving.

AM: Shades for parking and for shelter. When parents have a meeting outside they are protected.

NN: The SGB has brought incentives to staff members e.g.in December staff members are taken out as an incentive for the good work done.

PN: Awards for learners and Grade 7 farewell. We are a Model C school, we are the same as the Model C school.

NN: We are a Model C school in Ivory Park. There is transparency in the school and the school keeps growing.

Interviewer: What is your involvement in school finances?

AM: As mentioned before, nothing goes out without the approval of the SGB. We are not used as rubberstamps e.g.no signature on a blank cheque.

NN: We work on a budget. We fundraise e.g. civies day.

PN: We are members of the finance committee and so we are involved in school finances.

Interviewer: What is your involvement in policy making?

AM: Very much involved. There is no policy without the involvement of governors.

NN: We are all involved but sometimes policies are bottom up. Some policies are the competence of educators. In that case the SGB just approves.

Interviewer: Do you raise funds for the school? If so, how?

NN: Yes e.g. civies, tuck shop, movies.

AM: Through donations and sponsors, Dupoint is the official sponsor of the school.

- NN: Dupoint has helped with the division of the library  
 PN: Shades were sponsored by Dupoint.  
 NN: We fundraise on trips by adding an amount on the fee for each learner.
- Interviewer: How do you think you can help improve the school?
- AM: Hard work and honesty. My being here today is like improving the school. If you are called to do something, anything, you have to come.
- NN: The SGB has to come up with internal teacher awards. To advocate to parents to take care of the school buildings. To create neighbourhood watch as part of security. Parents should help with the maintenance of LSM especially textbooks.
- TS: Not only academic awards but sports awards as well
- AM: Hawkers should be allowed to come. That will cause parents to spread the word to other parents and other parents will send their children to Rebonwe. More marketing for the school is needed.
- NN: Government schools to act according to SASA. We have to implement SASA and work hand in hand with the government. We should be seen in good standard in terms of the government.
- Interviewer: What kind of support do you think you need to improve the school?
- AM: The support should be from the community e.g neighbourhood watch
- NN: The music that is played loud in houses around the school during school hours is disturbing. This needs the intervention and the involvement of the community. Workshops should not be an event but should be followed by mentoring and the monitoring of implementation.
- AM: OFSTED should come to our school to support and check. By so doing we know our grey areas and fix those. They must visit regularly to check whether the school is on the right track.
- NN: Financial support. We still need more money from the state. In 2004 we are going to implement the RNCS [Revised National Curriculum Statements] and therefore textbooks will be replace. More money will be spent on LSM so the government should not reduce the budget.
- AM: Parental support to ensure that uniform is bought and worn by learners. United we stand, divided we fall.
- PN: Parents should pay school fees to supplement what the school has.
- NN: Financial experts especially PFMA to come to workshop the school. Consultants, NGOs to come to the school to mentor the school on financial management.
- AM: Global support is important. More funds are coming from the UK overseas.
- PN: One of the teachers went overseas, learners should also go and also parents.

**NOTES:**

**NN stands for Ndou**  
**PN stands for Nxumalo**  
**TS stands for Sibanyoni**



AM stands for Mhlanga

**ANNEXURE C1**

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

PRINCIPALS' INTERVIEWS

	THEMES	CATERGORIES/SUBCATERGORIES
1.	ROLE UNDER SELF-MANAGEMENT	1.1. Chief Executive Officer (CEO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More accountability</li><li>• More responsibility</li><li>• Double the effort</li><li>• Coordination of sub-committees</li></ul>
2.	CHANGES OF ROLE UNDER SELF-MANAGEMENT	2.1 Self-autonomy (biggest responsibility) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Real manager not a mere supervisor</li></ul> 2.2 Need for self-development (more responsibility)
3.	RELATIONS WITH SMT	3.1 Relate well, coordinate well, communicate well

		<p>3.2 Open door policy adopted</p> <p>3.3 Relationship is characterized by respect, trust and willingness to work</p>
4.	RELATIONS WITH GOVERNORS	<p>4.1 The best</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SGB is supportive</li> <li>• No conflict, when clashes occur, differences are sorted out</li> <li>• Meetings fruitful</li> </ul> <p>4.4 Coordinate well</p> <p>4.5 Hiccup is illiteracy in SGB</p>
5	BENEFITS/OPPORTUNITIES OF SELF-MANAGEMENT	<p>5.1 Able to access what we need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Able to get things when we need them(no waiting)</li> <li>• Able to purchase teaching aids</li> </ul> <p>5.2 Level of achievement of learners have increased</p> <p>5.3 We can be compared to former Model C schools</p> <p>5.5 Independent</p> <p>5.6 Authorities from the department no longer a threat but seen as some kind of support</p> <p>5.7 Self-management brings confidence and happiness</p> <p>5.8 We don't deal with conflict</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atmosphere positive</li> <li>• No groups of cliques</li> </ul> <p>5.9 We get to choose the suppliers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shopping horizons widened</li> <li>• Avenues opened</li> </ul> <p>5.10 We do things for ourselves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It gives us independence</li> </ul>
6	LEARNER ACHIEVEMENT(BENEFITS)	<p>6.1 Learners contribute and benefit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Willing team of staff</li> <li>• Selfless(educators treat learners as own children)</li> </ul>
7	CHALLENGES	<p>7.1 Educators think they are entitled to things</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educators not as supportive as parents</li> </ul> <p>7.2 Black Economic Empowerment drive is a challenge when it comes to auditing of books(qualified auditors scarce commodity in townships)</p> <p>7.3 Tendency to undermine workshops organized by GDE(below par)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tendency to undermine supervisors from GDE who are less informed about issues</li> </ul>
8	PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	<p>8.1 Not at the required level</p> <p>8.2 Lack of participation and impression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation ends in meetings</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not involved in disciplining learners</li> <li>• Most parents illiterate</li> <li>• Some parents have taken the call of Letsema[volunteerism]</li> </ul>
9	ASPECTS ONE FEELS UNCOMFORTABLE ABOUT	<p>9.1 Finance(Financial control)</p> <p>9.2 Consultation with educators misconstrued as asking for permission</p> <p>9.3 Spending worryingly</p> <p>9.5 More accountability needed (that is frightening)</p> <p>9.6 People feeling the school is well to do</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theft and burglaries</li> <li>• Very little fund raising is done by school, rely more on government subsidies</li> <li>• Low payment of school fees</li> </ul> <p>9.7 Selfishness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not wanting things to be done without one's consent</li> </ul>
10	SUPPORT NEEDED BY SELF-MANAGED SCHOOLS	<p>10.1 More autonomy to be given by government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give schools latitude to be themselves</li> <li>• Down to top approach needed</li> </ul> <p>10.2 More money needed</p> <p>10.3 More support needed from the District Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of SGB</li> <li>• Term of office of SGB to be extended</li> </ul> <p>10.4 Total support from parents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents are closer to the school and can prevent vandalism and burglaries</li> <li>• Parents to take ownership of the school</li> <li>• Parents to raise funds</li> <li>• Parents to pay school fees</li> </ul> <p>10.5 Big business to support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial assistance</li> <li>• Support of projects</li> <li>• Help to develop skills esp. marketing skills</li> </ul> <p>10.6 Learners to cooperate and be self-disciplined</p> <p>10.7 The sky is the limit if all stakeholders work together</p>
11	MORE EFFICIENT SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS	<p>11.1 Openness</p> <p>11.2 Ownership</p> <p>11.3 Government to continue with subsidies</p> <p>11.4 Less interference from the government could result in more creativity</p> <p>11.5 More autonomy to be given to school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This allows educators to be more creative (red tape stifles creativity)</li> </ul> <p>11.6 More parental involvement needed</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parents to take the lead and initiate projects and not come to support only</li> </ul>

## **ANNEXURE C2**

### ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

#### SMT INTERVIEWS

	THEMES	CATERGORIES/SUBCATERGORIES
2.	RELATIONSHIP WITH EDUCATORS	1.1 Healthy, fine, harmonious, synergize, teamwork 1.2 Can put differences aside 1.3 Consultation done 1.4 Professionalism
2.	DECISION MAKING PROCESSES IN DEPARTMENTS	2.1 Consensus 2.2 Guided by policies 2.3 Consultation, ownership of decisions 2.4 Sometimes the final decision is made by HODS'
3.	CHANGING ROLES (Educators)	3.1 Morale high, attitudes positive

		<p>3.2 Educators are empowered, they attend workshops</p> <p>3.3 Duties and responsibilities not changed</p> <p>3.4 Educators choose their LSM</p>
4.	CHANGING ROLES(SMT)	<p>4.1 Competing with ex-Model C schools</p> <p>4.2 Resources easily available, role of SMT simplified</p> <p>4.3 Able to get sponsorship from the business world to empower educators by organizing workshops for them</p>
5	BENEFITS/OPPORTUNITIES OF SELF-MANAGEMENT	<p>5.1 Decisions taken fast</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smooth running of the school</li> </ul> <p>5.2 Choice of selection of suppliers</p> <p>5.3 Buy according to need</p> <p>5.4 Manage own funds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No hobo school</li> </ul>
6	IMPACT ON LEARNER ACHIEVEMENT	<p>6.1 More resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enough LSM (especially textbooks) for every learner</li> <li>• LSM ordered and received timeously</li> </ul> <p>6.2 Teacher development done</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Able to pay for workshops</li> </ul> <p>6.3 Learners motivated and best performing learners acknowledged (awards)</p> <p>6.4 Educators are positive and are motivated to deliver [work hard]</p> <p>6.5 Learners are passing because there are resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 12 results in 2001 was 96% and 2002 was 97%</li> </ul>
7	CHALLENGES OF SELF-MANAGEMENT	<p>7.1 Over expectations for SMT by educators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expected to be:</li> </ul> <p>Innovative</p> <p>Know all</p> <p>Perfectionists</p> <p>Role models (lead by example)</p> <p>7.2 Consultation sometimes difficult</p> <p>7.3 Attitudes of some educators not good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educators not taking responsibility of their duties</li> <li>• Educators expecting miracles from management</li> </ul> <p>7.4 Constant pressure to study and improve oneself</p> <p>7.5 Lack of skills when it comes to putting systems and procedures in place</p>

		7.6 Resistance to change by educators
8	ADVANTAGES/OPPORTUNITIES PRESENTED BY SELF-MANAGEMENT	8.1 No imposition by GDE 8.2 Departments are more organized 8.3 Able to organize our own workshops internally <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous improvement</li> <li>• Empowerment</li> </ul> 8.4 Direct negotiations with suppliers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiate discounts and donations</li> </ul> 8.5 Self-sufficiency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage own funds</li> <li>• Minimize wastage</li> <li>• Review systems, check loopholes and tighten up</li> </ul> 8.6 More competent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparable with schools overseas</li> </ul> 8.7 Self-management of schools has brought the government closer to people <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not threatened by GDE officials when they come to visit our school</li> </ul>
9	ASPECTS ONE FEELS UNCOMFORTABLE ABOUT	9.1 Fear of overspending 9.2 Perceptions in communities that self-managing schools have a lot of money: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attracts hooligans and robbers</li> <li>• It is a struggle to get parents to pay school fees</li> <li>• Educators lack discipline when it comes to buying</li> </ul> 9.3 Lots of focus on money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over expectations in terms of control and responsibility</li> <li>• More discipline, accountability and responsibility needed.</li> </ul>
10	SUPPORT NEEDED BY SELF-MANAGED SCHOOLS	10.1 More parental involvement needed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance of meetings</li> <li>• More involvement in school activities</li> </ul> 10.2 Educators to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support SMT, without their support, HODs cannot do their job</li> <li>• Educators to teach</li> </ul> 10.3 More support needed from GDE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshops should be ongoing</li> <li>• Follow ups to be done</li> <li>• Regular visits by GDE officials needed</li> </ul> 10.4 SMT to support each other by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coming up with workshops that will enrich them (SMT)</li> </ul>

## ANNEXURE C3

### ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

#### SGB INTERVIEWS

	THEMES	CATERGORIES/SUBCATERGORIES
3.	UNDERSTANDING ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	1.5 Putting oomph and zeal in school processes 1.6 Interviewing of new educators <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recommend appointments</li></ul> 1.7 Control of funds and assets 1.8 Mouthpiece for parents <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Disseminate information</li></ul> 1.9 Draft and approve policies 1.10 Prepare budgets 1.11 Responsible and accountable for financial management
2.	CHANGING ROLES (SGB)	2.1 Managing large sums of money

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use funds according to budget and curricular needs of the school</li> <li>• Focus is on school improvement</li> </ul> <p>2.2 Maintain school property  2.3 Buy books and resources  2.4 Raise funds for the school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tuck shop</li> <li>• Can pay staff out of SGB funds e.g. security guard</li> </ul> <p>2.5 Run projects  2.6 Required to be take more responsibility and be more accountable  2.7 Negotiate directly with suppliers e.g. ESKOM, City Council</p>
3.	WORKING RELATION (SMT)	<p>3.1 Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration</li> <li>• Able to resolve issues</li> <li>• Open communication</li> <li>• Trust</li> <li>• Willingness to work together</li> <li>• No hidden agendas</li> </ul> <p>3.2 Quality of leadership provided by the principal contributes to good relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibilities and roles clarified</li> </ul>
4.	INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES	<p>4.1 Drafting and the approval of budget  4.2 Accountable for expenditure  4.3 Fundraising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tuck shop</li> <li>• Donations and sponsors</li> <li>• Trips</li> <li>• School-based activities e.g. beauty contests</li> </ul> <p>4.4 Members of subcommittees e.g. finance, discipline  4.5 Encourages parental and community involvement  4.6 Draft some policies and approves some  4.7 Financial management (sometimes principal dominates meetings.  4.8 Look after school surroundings  4.9 Approve projects</p>
5	ADVANTAGES OF SELF-MANAGEMENT	<p>5.1 Quick decisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No bureaucratic consultation</li> </ul> <p>5.2 Draft own policies to address the needs of the school e.g. policy on how to employ temporary educators  5.3 Go directly to suppliers and negotiate discounts  5.4 The sky is the limit in terms of:</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport</li> <li>• Growth</li> </ul> <p>5.4 Control own funds, never short of money</p>
6	DISADVANTAGES OF SELF-MANAGEMENT	<p>6.1 Challenges of accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flouting of procedures by some educators</li> </ul> <p>6.2 Division amongst stakeholders when it comes to financial management</p> <p>6.3 Fear of mismanagement of funds and overspending</p> <p>6.4 More administration (paper work) and accountability needed</p> <p>6.5 Learners sometimes not cooperative in fundraising initiatives e.g. civies day</p> <p>6.7 Educators undermining SGB because they are not educated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SGB sometimes rubber stamping what has been decided by educators e.g. Year Plan</li> </ul> <p>6.8 Lack of knowledge by parents in contributing towards the vision and mission of the school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents sometimes have inferiority complex</li> </ul>
7	CHALLENGES OF SELF-MANAGEMENT	<p>7.1 Payment of school fees is going down</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents think the school has a lot of money</li> </ul> <p>7.2 Fear of overspending</p> <p>7.3 Accountability is difficult, sometimes people flout procedures</p> <p>7.4 Transparency sometimes a problem e.g. disclosing sensitive information about educators in the presence of learner members of the SGB.</p>
8	OPPORTUNITIES PRESENTED BY SELF-MANAGEMENT	<p>8.1 Funds can be used to empower SGB</p> <p>8.2 The sky is the limit if money is managed properly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formed relations with schools overseas e.g. UK</li> <li>• We are global</li> </ul> <p>8.3 We operate business like</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiate directly with suppliers</li> <li>• Negotiate discount</li> </ul> <p>8.4 Able to offer various sporting codes</p> <p>8.5 More computers, more books for the library</p> <p>8.8 Enrolment of learners going up</p> <p>8.9 Environment conducive for teaching and learning</p>
9	CHANGES BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE SGBS	<p>9.1 Changes to the school environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beautification of the school, e.g. grounds,</li> </ul>

		<p>paving, garden etc.</p> <p>9.2 More curriculum choices for learner</p> <p>9.3 Incentives for staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educator awards</li> <li>• Educator trips in December subsidized by the SGB</li> </ul> <p>9.4 Learner awards</p> <p>9.5 Creation of neighbourhood watch as a security measure</p>
10	SUPPORT NEEDED BY SELF-MANAGED SCHOOLS	<p>10.1 Support from GDE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training in financial management</li> <li>• More funds needed</li> <li>• Follow ups on workshops and mentoring</li> <li>• Moral support from GDE officials needed</li> <li>• OFSTED to come regularly to evaluate schools</li> </ul> <p>10.2 Parents and communities to support the school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbourhood watch to prevent burglaries</li> <li>• No disruptive, loud music during school hours</li> <li>• Parents to pay school fees to supplement funds from the state</li> <li>• Parental support needed in terms of disciplining learners (also come when they are called to school)</li> </ul> <p>10.3 Support from the business world needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Businesses only support former model C schools</li> </ul> <p>10.4 Support from former model C schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forming partnerships with schools from previously disadvantaged backgrounds.</li> </ul>