17

PARTNERSHIP IN LEADERSHIP: EXPLORING THE EMERGING PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES IN RURAL SOUTH AFRICA

KP Quan-Baffour (quanbkp@unisa.ac.za)

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

ABSTRACT

The education of children, the future leaders, is everyone's business. This is confirmed by the saying that what touches all must be deliberated by all. For very long time many parents and communities did not realise that they have any role to play in children's education. The involvement of communities, in particular parents, in the education of children is not only a moral or civic obligation but also a democratic responsibility. The realisation of this fact led to the enactment of the School's Act of 1996 by the South African government which made it mandatory for communities to team up with schools for the realisation of better educational goals. This paper reports a qualitative research that explored the emerging partnership between communities and schools in governance of countryside schools in South Africa. Selected school governing body members and principals from two schools in the rural areas of Taung and Hartswater [the North West and Northern Cape provinces respectively] were involved in the study. The study revealed, among other things, an emerging awareness and interest among community members, particularly parents, to work with schools as partners in the education of children.

KEYWORDS

Partnership, leadership, countryside, education, obligation, governance, management

INTRODUCTION

Before the attainment of majority rule in 1994, education and for that matter school, in South Africa was organized along racial and ethnic lines. The apartheid policy of separate amenities partitioned the country into tribes and colour where each population, ethnic group or tribe had its own department of education and its governance system. Fleisch and Smith (2001:7) affirm that prior to the first democratic elections, the school was a local extension of the racially specific ex-Departments. Although schools in the ex-Departments did have statutory bodies associated with them such as management councils,--these bodies' powers were very limited.

Thus although school governance was not new in South Africa because of segmentation there was no common regulatory body in this regard for the schools in the entire country. Each countryside school formed its own school committee popularly referred to as Parents, Teachers and, Students Association (PTSA). The members of the PTSA were handpicked by the local chief or the village headman (induna or Kgosi) and the school principal. This kind of governance structure of [the rural and black] schools was unrepresentative, illegitimate and undemocratic. The structure did not represent the broader community interest as in most cases the few enlightened people in the community were not invited to serve on the school committees. The undemocratic school committee or PTSA had limited powers. For example the chair person only signed school cheques and contract forms of new teachers and its representative accompanied students on school trips. Most of the PTSA members themselves never attended school and knew too little or nothing about how schools run. This kind of school governance system contributed to mismanagement, dysfunction and lack of progress in most countryside schools. As Quan-Baffour (2007) attests, the rural school PTSA was a mere rubber stamp to endorse the authority of the principal.

The schools in the rural areas or countryside where most black South Africans live automatically fell under poorly managed 'black home land and Bantu system of education' while schools for the white minority were well funded and managed. There was a clear disparity between the funding and management of white and black schools. King (1998:1) affirms that prior to the democratic dispensation of 1994 white learners enjoyed a well funded first world education which prepared them for better career opportunities whilst their black counterparts received very little funding and for that matter an inferior education. Sibuyi (1997:15) adds that of the R16.1 billion government budget for education only R6,833 billion

was allocated to education for black South Africans. The vast disparity among schools in the country before 1994 which was the result of the unequal funding necessitated and contributed to the establishment of a new structure of school organization and governance. The new structure was transformative, flexible, true representative of main education stakeholders and democratic to bridge the gap between rural and urban schools and to accommodate the different contexts of all schools in the country.

In view of its inadequacy the new government sought to transform the school governance system and structure by giving schools to local communities to govern. To realise this aim the government focused on transformation of school governance through democratization and decentralization under one national regulatory body- the department of education. As pointed out by Fleisch and Smith (2001) the new notion of 'public schools' as embodied in SASA, (1996) reflects the significant change in the conception of ownership of schools. School governance was transformed to make it obligatory for stakeholders closer to learners [e.g. parents] to be involved in the running of schools. Quan-Baffour (2007:3) is of the view that the complexities of the modern society also makes it imperative for parents and guardians to come together with the school in order to offer the child suitable education that can benefit all- child, parent, guardian and society. Clarke (2009:90) affirms that school governing bodies are designed to ensure that they represent all major constituents of the school community. One of the biggest challenges of the SGBs, though, is the need to create an effective, functioning body from what can be a very diverse group of individuals. Turning a diverse group of individuals with widely differing levels of expertise, experience and with differing views on the needs of the school into an effective team is not always an easy task. It is however something that has been widely studied, because effective team work is a key ingredient for success in most organisations (Clarke, 2009).

This paper reports a qualitative research that explored the emerging partnership between communities and schools in governance of countryside schools in South Africa. Selected school governing body members and school principals from two schools in the rural areas of Taung and Hartswater [the North West and Northern Cape provinces respectively] were involved in the study. The results indicated an emerging and active partnership among major role players of rural community schools 'for the sake of the child'.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study is grounded in two important theories - Distributed leadership and the Constructivist leadership. The two theories are discussed in the ensuing paragraphs, pointing out their implications for managing, leading and governing the school as an organisation. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (2000) defines the verb 'distribute' thus: to give shares, spread out, divide into parts, to include every individual of the class to which it refers. In the context of school management and governance distributed leadership as used in this paper refers to the extent to which different groups or stakeholders share the total responsibilities to ensure the achievement of educational goals. The advocates of the distributed leadership theory which include Barth (1998), Lieberman (1985, 1988), Kellerman (1999) and Walker (2002) view school management or leadership as a shared process, activity and responsibility. Under the distributed leadership the principal i.e. the chief executive of the school, shares the management and leadership roles with other stakeholders- teachers, parents (community members) and learners- democratically elected as school governors. Modern society is too complex and complicated for anyone to think that the school alone can educate the child. As the African adage goes ' it takes a whole village to bring up a child' which is why parents must be engaged in children's education. Wolfendale (2000: 8) agrees with this researcher that parental contribution to education comes from among other things their (parents') engagement with school life, its routines, its learning opportunities and the reciprocal extension of these into the home via, for example, family literacy and numeracy programmes. Walker (2002:13) affirms that the school principal is seen as a 'leader among leaders' in a system where the organisational structure of the school is flattened and integrated with participants sharing common values and purposes. In the contemporary world the leadership of the school is 'stretched over' leaders, followers and activities within a reciprocal interdependency (Spillane, Halverson and Diamond, 2001). In this case every stakeholder has some specific role to play for the achievement of educational goal.

In self-organising systems, leadership is distributed, and responsibility becomes a capacity of the whole. Leadership, then, consists of continually facilitating the emergence of new structures, and incorporating the best of them into the organisation's design (Capra, 1997). This view of leadership has its roots in a number of theoretical constructs including human relations, systems theory and ecological thought. Distributed leadership underscores democratic and transformational imperatives and ensures co-

responsibility and accountability among all the stakeholders of the school. The school alone cannot act in isolation if it is to overcome obstacles to learning and this is why parents, families and communities should come together to share responsibility for children's development and learning (Decker, Gregg and Decker, 1994). In the modern school system the hierarchical structure of management or leadership is replaced by shared responsibility for school governance, professional growth and achievement of agreed-on goals (Walker, 2002). School management and governance in the era of transformation has entered a new dimension; it is democratic and based on community of leaders where all stakeholders- principal, teachers and parents – play some leadership role to accomplish the work of the school. Clarke (2009:38) adds that the legislation which gave parents a say in education deals specifically with issues relating to the daily operations of the school. The legislation clearly prescribes the duties and responsibilities of governors and defines the limits of their responsibilities, particularly in relation to those areas where there may be some overlap with the professional duties and responsibilities of the principal (Clarke, 2009).

The major advocates of the theory of constructivist leadership such as Kegan & Lahey (1984), Greene (1988), Walker (2002), Delpit (1995) and Carlsen (1988) see leadership as reciprocal processes among all stakeholders of the school i.e. the principal, teachers, administrative staff and parents. The purposes and goals of the school develop from among participants based on values, beliefs and shared experiences of all stakeholders. Szabo and Lambert (2002) affirm that constructivist leadership is about working differently. It is about seeing the school as an organic leadership community, one capable of living, growing, learning and transforming itself. Citing Deming (1986) Horine and Lindgren (1995) contend that this transformation is not a job of reconstruction or revision but rather "a whole new structure, from foundation upward". Constructivist leadership is transformational, and transformational leadership separates leadership from leader and situates it in the patterns of relationship among participants (Lambert, 2002). An African proverb states that two heads are better than one hence the school governing body members must advice, guide and support the principal on issues related to conflict resolution, improvement of staff and learner motivation and hiring of relevant and qualified educators whenever a vacancy arises. Quan-Baffour (2007) adds that for the SGB to be able to support the school principal and staff it must have a good team work spirit and establish a working relationship with the school management team and the entire staff. The governing body must also have a strong

commitment to the school and avoid party politics as this could interfere with its work (Clarke, 2009). In Walker's (2002:2) view the central metaphor for constructivist leadership is that of weaving whole cloth from threads of different textures, colours and lengths. These trends are the concepts that when woven together result in a new understanding of leadership. The cloth has repeating patterns, just as the field of education engages in reform cycles--- and sets the stage for further reforms. The colours and textures suggest the cultural diversity that is a reality in our country and in our schools (Walker, 2002).

The constructivist leadership theorists view leadership as something that emerges and manifests itself within the relationships built among stakeholders such as the school principal, school management teams, teachers, parents and learners. This culture of relationship among key stakeholders in the school provides opportunities for each member of the governance team to exercise leadership. The authentic presence of each member provides opportunities to engage stakeholders in genuine conversations for the achievement of the goals of the school. To this extent, leadership provides us with a 'third dimension'- a set of untapped opportunities that exist within the culture of the school. There are the individual minds of educators in the school community, the minds of others in that community, and the richness of ideas and questions as yet unexplored or unmasked that exist among us. Leadership, like energy, is not finite, not restricted by formal authority and power; it permeates a healthy culture and is undertaken by whoever sees a need or an opportunity. Leadership possibilities permeate our interactions and inform our actions (Lambert, 1998). The core tenet of constructivist leadership theory is unity among stakeholders of the school. This leadership theory is in line with the African wise saying: 'two heads are better than one', already alluded to in this paper. Holmes (1993) for instance affirms that successful school leadership embraces a wide range of cultures and practices from the relatively autocratic to the relatively democratic and from relatively bureaucratised to the relatively ad-hoc. In his view what characterises successful school leadership is a consistent commitment to a few, very important principles.

Both the distributed and constructivist leadership theories have important implications for school management, leadership and governance. In an era of democracy, freedom, rights, responsibilities and accountability stakeholders of the school, especially parents, community members and the school authorities need to form partnerships to manage the school for the realisation of quality education. The new school governance structure in South

Africa provides an opportunity for stakeholders to meet, interact and debate school matters. It is through such interactions, exchange of ideas and debates that consensus can be reached and enduring decisions taken for the betterment of the school. Horine and Lindgren (1995:9) aptly point out that the leadership within the system must work closely with all groups to achieve the goals of the system. As the Batswana often say; Kopano ke matla (i.e. in unity lies strength). The school principal who subscribes to any or both of the theories discussed above would seek advice, opinions, suggestions, expertise and support from teachers, students and the parents (community members) to achieve school improvement goals. The constructivist leader solicits advice, views, opinions and information from stakeholders and shares decision making with them (Dean, 1999: 121). It is a shift from autocratic to democratic management and leadership style in the school as an organisation. [In this era of democracy] the dominant principle of school management has shifted from management in order to control--- to leadership in order to bring out the best in people and to respond quickly to change (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990).

Experienced and knowledgeable members of the SGB and the school staff could be selected to lead some school projects or committees e.g. fund raising, discipline, curriculum innovations etc for the realisation of co-responsibility and accountability. Dean (1999) adds that the direction of change--- is away from the old concepts of leading as the downward exercise of power and authority, and toward developing respect and concern for followers and the ability to see them as powerful sources of knowledge, creativity and energy for improving the organisation- sources heretofore largely untapped by administrators whose focus tended to be on hierarchical control. With a shared enthusiasm the school governing body (SGB) and the school management team (SMT) could work together to achieve educational goals. To borrow the words of Morrison (1998) partnership and synergies are much more positive and productive, turning the vicious win/lose circle into the virtuous win/win circle; everyone can benefit from lengthening and embracing their own and each others' perspective respectively (Morrison,1998).

The distributed and constructivist theories of leadership concur that partnership with important stakeholders can provide the opportunity for the school to tap the experiences and expertise of all major stakeholders (e.g. principal, school management team, learners, parents and indeed the entire community members) for the achievement of educational goals. Partnership with community members, particularly parents, in a participatory school governance

structures seems to be the best option for school leadership. As Lambert (1998) acknowledges, partnership with parents and the broader community is essential if information and learning opportunities are to enter and leave the culture of the school. The collaborative effort of the key stakeholders of the school is an essential ingredient for the success of every school. Without a value- driven, democratic and purposeful leadership many schools, especially those in the rural areas, could remain dysfunctional and the achievement of educational goals might remain a dream. In the words of Postman (1995), "without meaning learning has no purpose and without a purpose, schools are houses of detention, not attention".

TRANSFORMATION IN EDUCATION AND THE NEED FOR PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE SCHOOL AND THE COMMUNITY.

The common feature of the contemporary world is constant and drastic change. Change has become inevitable and inescapable. It is accelerating and the paradigms that are being used to analyse society are themselves changing. The whole scale of change is being experienced in all walks of life, in society, in science, in political, economic and educational practices. Education is part of these broader currents of society and change is a fact of life; it is irresistible and unstoppable (Morrison, 1998). In education, aims, objectives, content, assessment, pedagogy, leadership, management, governance and directions of the school are not fixed but fluid due to transformation- the direct consequence of democratisation. In teaching and learning, for example, lots of changes have and still taking place. With the advancement in technology, democratisation and globalisation new careers have emerged with the concomitant changes to the school curriculum. The introduction of new learning areas which require new or updated content knowledge, teaching and learning approaches is a case in point. The profile of learners has also changed due to democratisation resulting in multiracial, multicultural and inclusive schools where both the rich and the poor and learners of different cultural backgrounds study together under the same roof.

The context of the modern school and the quest for quality education among stakeholders requires a paradigms' shift in school management, leadership and governance. The realities of the modern school call for collaboration in school management among the core stakeholders for the achievement of quality education. The two Akan (African) sayings, 'no single person's arms can embrace the baobab tree' and 'it takes a whole village to bring up a child' are

very relevant here. In the context of change and democracy it is important for the establishment of partnerships among key stakeholders of the school to share responsibilities in a democratic management structure. In the light of this the school as organisation should shift its paradigm from an individual to a collaborative or partnership management and leadership approach to emphasis the realisation of quality education through co-responsibility and accountability. As Naisbitt and Aburdene (1990) affirm, this is not the 'leadership' individuals and groups—call for when they want a father figure to take care of their problems. It is a democratic yet demanding leadership that respects people and encourages self-management, autonomous teams and entrepreneurial units.

In South Africa the need for collaboration and partnership between the school and the community became more crucial with the advent of democratisation and majority rule. Educational transformation is democracy and to develop education for democracy we must develop democratic education to teach about democracy. Our teachers and our education system as a whole must therefore practice democracy (Ministry of Education, Namibia, 1993). In an effort to make school governance reflect democratic ideals of the new political dispensation, the South African Schools' Act (1996) made a provision for the establishment of School Governing Bodies (SGBs). This was the beginning of partnership in education leadership when SASA (1996) gave schools back to the communities to govern. Morrison (1998:6) observes that in educational terms market forces are evidenced in a series of Education Acts and papers designed to touch and change every aspect of education- the total jigsaw: open enrolment into schools, the introduction of local management of schools--- and the rise of parental power on governing bodies.

A collaborative management and leadership could ensure quality teaching and learning and for that matter quality learner performance. Beare, Caldwell and Milikan (1989) affirm that outstanding leadership has invariably emerged as a key characteristic of outstanding schools. There can no longer be doubt that those seeking quality in education must ensure its presence and that the development of potential leaders must be given high priority (Beare et al, 1989). One of the ingredients of quality education is quality management of its processes and this is why parents and guardians in the communities where schools are located must collaborate with school authorities to govern the schools. The assumption is that collaboration would enable all the major stakeholders to contribute to the realization of quality education. With the coming into force of school governing bodies

every community school has established their own SGB based on national education guidelines.

The SGB as parents' or community representatives is expected to work hand in hand (as partners) with the School Management Team (SMT) headed by the School Principal. The Schools' Act (1996) spelt out clearly that the SGBs are not there to take over the duties of school principals but to assist them and their management teams for the betterment of the school (SASA, 1996 section 20). Margaret (1996:84) adds that school governors should be clear that they are not there to try to catch the head or staff out but to support, explore and promote a spirit of enquiry within the school.

RESEARCH METHODS AND RESULTS

The study employed a qualitative phenomenological design to explore the experiences of SGB members and the principals regarding the emerging partnership between the school and the community. In phenomenological studies human experience is examined through the descriptions that are provided by the people involved (Brink, 2006). A phenomenological research design was therefore deemed appropriate for this investigation because it provided participants with the opportunity to describe and interpret the experiences of the phenomena as it is being lived in the natural setting (Burns & Grove, 2005; Polit & Beck, 2008). In order to explore the emerging partnership between the school and the community focus group interviews were conducted on school governing body members of the two randomly selected rural schools. The principals and the governing body chairpersons agreed to the researcher's request to conduct the interviews with their members. The SGB members were purposively selected to be involved in the study because they were deemed information rich for a study that relates to their role as governors of the schools. Again the focus group interview had the advantage of providing participants with a more natural conversational environment which encouraged them to talk freely and candidly about the pertinent issues under discussion.

In each of the two selected schools the focus group interviews lasted for an hour. All the School Governing Body members of the two schools - chair person, deputy chair person, secretary, treasurer and an additional member-participated in the focus group discussions. The total number of SGB members who participated in the data collection exercise was 10 and this number was made up of 6 women and 4 men. The main issues discussed with the SGB members focused on the mandate [specific role] as school

governors, the relationship of their role to that of the principal, the extent of the collaboration between them and the school and the effect of the collaboration on the school. The researcher listened to the groups as they discussed specific issues and made notes. In some cases he recorded verbatim the statements made by group members.

In addition the principals of the 2 selected schools were interviewed individually on the role of the SGB on the new school management structure. The views of the school principals were used in triangulating the responses obtained from the SGB members. After the focus group interviews with the SGBs the researcher arranged the responses under specific themes before analysing them. The main findings from the focus group interviews were reported under the following four themes: specific mandate of SGB, relationship of SGB's role to that of the school principal, the level of collaboration between the SGB and the school and SGB's views on the impact of the partnership with the school. The findings related to the above themes are summarised in the following paragraphs.

i). Specific mandate of SGB

The SGB members concurred in their responses that they had a mandate to be part of the new school management/ governance structure which came into effect in 1996. This response was an affirmation of SASA (1996) mandate and recognition of community members as partners in the education of children. As people nearer to learners the decentralisation and democratisation policy of SASA (2006) offered them the opportunity and made it obligatory for parents (community members) to be involved in the running of local schools. One SGB member affirmed their mandate to form partnership with the school in the following words:

> I often visited classrooms to see how teaching and learning occurred
> If a teacher or a learner dodged classes I took them to task, demanded answers, made them aware of the consequences of their actions and warned them to refrain from such actions.

The indication here was that communities, particularly, parents and guardian have realised their role in education of their own children. The response from the SGB member confirmed a paradigm's shift to a collaboration and partnership between the school and the community for the realisation of educational goals. It also affirms the mandate of the SGB to support the Principal and the School Management Team (Clarke, 2009 and Quan-Baffour,2007). Hitherto

the introduction of the decentralised system of school management and governance parents and guardians were not actively involved in school matters and the education of their children was put squarely on the shoulders of the school. With the new decentralised school management and governance system parents as community members have the mandate to support the principal and staff of a public school.

ii). Relationship of SGB's role to the Principal's

Regarding how their role and that of the Principal co-existed in the school structure the SGB members concurred in their answers that they played a supportive role to the Principal and the school management team. The school governors seemed to be aware of their role in the new decentralised school management structure. As the representatives of parents and community members the SGB was there to safeguard the educational interest of the child. The response of a chairperson of one of the SGBs confirmed this growing awareness. She had this to say:

> *Our role is supportive, complementary and collaborative to enhance teaching and learning for the realisation of education goals. We were not elected to take over the Principal's work.*

The above response affirmed the view of SGB members as partners of the new school governance structure where both community members and the school shared leadership roles. The Principal remained the Chief Executive of the School and played his normal professional and academic leadership role with the support of the SGB for the realisation of educational goals (SASA 1996; section 20, Margaret, 1996). The respondents also pointed out that any conflict that might arise between them and the Principal would be quickly resolved amicably in order not to slow down the progress of the work of the school.

iii). The extent of the collaboration between SGB and School

The SGB members were aware of the extent and level of their participation in the decentralised school governance structure. The responses from the focus group discussion revealed that the decentralised school management system allowed community members, particularly parents, to share the decision making processes with the leadership of the school. This distribution of leadership allowed community members to take care of certain

aspects of the school under their jurisdiction e.g. involvement in fund raising, repair of buildings and furniture, discipline matters and financial management. For example the SGB treasurer and chairperson signed cheques to enable the school leadership to get access to school funds. One of the SGB members affirmed this role in the following words:

> *We raised and administered funds of the school to ensure that only priority items received financial attention.*

The foregoing response is not only an affirmation of their role but also an indication of the level of collaboration and participation in school matters by the community representatives. They recognised the principal's professional, administrative and academic role and provided support for the accomplishment and achievement of the school's objectives. In deed governors are most effective when they use their knowledge of the community to provide advice and guidance to the Principal and his/her professional staff on the best ways to handle the social and moral issues relating to children's education (Clarke, 2009).

iv). The effects of the partnership between SGB and school

Regarding the effect of their partnership and collaboration with the school the SGB members pointed out that their supportive and complementary efforts have led to:

- Improved learner performance.
- The respondents concurred that they team up with the school to organise weekend and vacation classes for learners and this has led to tremendous improvement in learner performance in the schools. Thus the learners are doing better in their studies because of the support from both home and the school.
- Reduced indiscipline among learners.
- Both the SGB members and the principals concurred that they worked together to stamp out any behaviour among the learners that could have negative effect on teaching and learning. The findings indicated that negative behaviours such as lateness, bullying, coming to school drunk or bunking lessons which will not lead to good school and learner performance are not allowed in the schools. The SGB and the school management teams have abolished such bad behaviours in their schools.

- Recruiting of qualified teachers for the school.

The SGB members revealed to the researcher that since they wanted the best education for their children they were involved in short listing and interview of prospective teachers and have strong influence on who got appointed to teach in their schools. As people who want the best education for their children they need to hire relevant and qualified educators whenever a vacancy arises (Quan-Baffour, 2007). Despite the apparent lobbying by some teacher union to pack schools with their members the SGB members pointed out that they always argued for better and committed teachers who have learners' welfare at heart.

- **Stabilisation of school funds.**
  The respondents concurred that they discussed and arrived at consensus before funds were raised and released for school projects and no single individual had the sole mandate to disburse school funds. This strict control of the school purse has brought financial discipline to the management of school funds.

- **Curriculum innovation and changes.**
  The SGB members pointed out that in view of scarcity of jobs they have collaborated with the school to introduce modern subjects which are career oriented to enable school leavers initiate or access jobs. The respondents concurred that new subjects like computer studies, small business enterprises, mathematics literacy, tourism and accounting have been introduced into the school curriculum since the past three years. They were of the view that school leavers with strong background in the above career oriented subjects stand the chance of being employed. Indeed, curriculum must cover all learning experiences considered necessary to be taught to learners (Quan-Baffour, 2007) hence parents' concern about what should taught to their children.

RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS WITH THE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

The results of the interview with the principals of the 2 schools confirmed the findings from the SGB members. The principals were unanimous in their responses that there was indeed greater commitment from parents in supporting schools in their communities in the various ways as mentioned by the SGBs. The principals added that in spite of the generally low level of education among most parents in rural areas they were doing the best they

could in supporting schools to improve education. They cited cases where the SGBs repaired broken windows and doors, assisted in organising extra classes for learners and vigorously enforced discipline among learners in the schools. The Principals conceded that the schools could not have done all these alone without support from the community in view of too much work load for teachers.

CONCLUSION

The results of the exploratory investigation indicated how the SGBs work within the parameters of their mandate from the national department of education. Parents have now realised the need to support and encourage children to study at home for better learning output. The paper concludes that:

- The collaboration between community and the school has become an important aspect of school organisation in the new South Africa where the school and the home worked together as equal partners to bring the best in the learners.
- Although the policy on school governance is a step in the right direction the low education background of most parents in the rural communities seems to be a serious challenge (if not a stumbling block) to the successful implementation of the new policy.

Based on the findings stated above it is recommended that the department of education provides SGB members with basic literacy skills and workshops to enhance their work as school governors.

REFERENCES

Barth, R. 1998. Improving Schools from within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beare, H. Caldwell, BJ. & Milikan, RH.1989. Creating An Excellent School. London. Routledge.

Burns, N. & Grove, SK. 2005. The Practice of Nursing Research: Conduct, Critique and Utilization. St Louis. Elsevier Saunders.

Brink, H L. 2006. Fundamentals of Research Methodology for Health Care Professionals. Cape Town. Juta.

Capra, F. 1997. Creativity and Leadership in Learning Communities. Lecture at the Mill Valley School District, CA.

Carlsen, MB. 1988. Meaning –Making. New York, Norton publishing Ltd.

Delpit, L. 1995. Other Peoples' Children; Cultural Conflict in the Classroom. New York. New Press.

Clarke, A. 2009. The Handbook for School Governors. Cape Town. Kate McCallum publishing Ltd

Dean, J. 1999. The School Development Plan In: Organisational Development in Education. A Reader for MEDEM-3-S. Pedro Van Nierkerk (compiled).

Decker, E. Gregg, G.A. & Decker, V.A. 1994. Getting parents involved in their children's education. Arlington, Virginia. American Association for School Administrators.

Fleisch,B. and Smith, WJ. 2001. The Devolution of Authority to Schools: A Comparison of Legislation in Quebec and Gauteng. Ed-Lex Publication, McGill University. pp. 1-21

Greene, M. 1998. The Dialetic of Freedom. New York: Teachers' College Press

Holmes, G. 1993. Essential School Leadership. London. Kogan Page.

Horine, E. & Lindgren, CE. 1995. Educational Improvement Using Deming's Profound Knowledge. Journal of New Era Education. Volume 76. No.1. Pp.6-11

Kegan, R. & Lahey, L.1984. Adult leadership and adult development: A Constructivist view. In B.Kellerman (ed.) Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall

Kellerman, B. 1999. Reinventing Leadership: Making the connection between politics and business. Albany State University of New York press

King, K. 1998. Policy coherence in education, training and enterprise development in South Africa. The implementation challenge of new policies, In: Vision and Reality; Changing education and training in South Africa. Morrow, W. & King, K. (eds.) Cape Town. UCT Press.

Lambert, L. 1998. Building Leadership Capacity in Schools. Alexandria; VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Lieberman, A. 1985. Enhancing School Improvement through Collaboration. Paper prepared for the Allerton Symposium on Illinois Educational Improvement, Chicago.

Lieberman, A. 1988b. Building a Professional Culture in Schools. New York. Teachers' College Press.

Margaret, J. 1996. School effectiveness; who does what? The government role's In: Striving for quality in schools. Cornforth, A. and Evans. T (eds). London: The Latchmere Press.

Morrison, K. 1998. Management Theories for Educational Change. London. Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Naisbitt, J. And Aburdene, P. 1990. Mega Trends 2000. London. Pan Publishing Ltd

Namibia Ministry of Education and Culture. 1993. Towards Education For All. Windhoek: Gamsberg, MacMillan Ltd.

Polit, D F & Beck, CT. 2008. Nursing Research: Principles and Methods. Philadelphia: Lippincot

Postman, N. 1995.The end of education: Redefining the value of school. New York: Random House

Quan-Baffour, KP. 2007. The Role of SGBs in Improving School Performance in the Rural Areas of Taung. M.Ed. Dissertation; University of South Africa. Pretoria.

Republic of South Africa (RSA) 1996. The South African Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996). Pretoria: Government Printers.

Sibuyi, F.T. 1997. Parental involvement in the governance of Nyeleti High School. M.Ed Dissertation. Johannesburg. University of Witwatersrand.

Spillane, JP. Halverson, R. & Diamond, JB. 2001. Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. Paper presented at AERA, San Francisio. Chicago, Institute for Policy Research, North Western University

Szabo, M.& Lambert, L. 2002. The Preparation of new Constructivist leaders. In The Constructivist Leader. Teachers' College, Colombia University

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English 2000. Oxford; Clarendon Press

Walker, D. 2002. Constructivist Leadership: Standards, Equity and Learning- weaving whole cloth from Multiple Strands. In: The Constructivist Leader. Teachers'College, University of Colombia Press.

Wolfendale, S. 2000. Effective Schools for the future: Incorporating the parental and family dimension. In: The contribution of parents to school effectiveness. Wolfendale, S. & Bastiani, J.(eds.) Great Britain: David Falton.